

Volume 13

1994

Number 2

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction



Symposium on the Decline and
Fall of the West and the Return
of Christendom

A CHALCEDON PUBLICATION

COPYRIGHT

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction
is published as often as Chalcedon resources permit.

Volume 13 / Number 2

1994

*Symposium on the Decline and Fall of the West
and the Return of Christendom*

Garry J. Moes, Editor

ISSN 0360-1420

A CHALCEDON MINISTRY

Electronic Version 1.0 / 2012

Copyright © 1994 Chalcedon Foundation. All rights reserved.

Usage: Copies of this file may be made for personal use by the original purchaser of this electronic document. It may be printed by the same on a desktop printer for personal study. Quotations may be used for the purpose of review, comment, or scholarship. However, this publication may not be duplicated or reproduced in whole or in part in any electronic or printed form by any means, uploaded to a web site, or copied to a CD-ROM, without written permission of the publisher.

Chalcedon Foundation

P.O. Box 158

Vallecito, California, 95251

U.S.A.

To contact via email and for other information:

www.chalcedon.edu

Chalcedon depends on the contributions of its readers,
and all gifts to Chalcedon are tax-deductible.

Opinions expressed in this journal do not necessarily reflect the views of Chalcedon. It has provided a forum for views in accord with a relevant, active, historic Christianity, though those views may have on occasion differed somewhat from Chalcedon's and from each other.

THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

This *Journal* is dedicated to the fulfillment of the cultural mandate of Genesis 1:28 and 9:1—to subdue the earth to the glory of God. It is published by the Chalcedon Foundation, an independent Christian educational organization (see inside back cover). The perspective of the *Journal* is that of orthodox Christianity. It affirms the verbal, plenary inspiration of the original manuscripts (autographs) of the Bible and the full divinity and full humanity of Jesus Christ—two natures in union (but without intermixture) in one person.

The editors are convinced that the Christian world is in need of a serious publication that bridges the gap between the newsletter-magazine and the scholarly academic journal. The editors are committed to Christian scholarship, but the *Journal* is aimed at intelligent laymen, working pastors, and others who are interested in the reconstruction of all spheres of human existence in terms of the standards of the Old and New Testaments. It is not intended to be another outlet for professors to professors, but rather a forum for serious discussion within Christian circles.

The Marxists have been absolutely correct in their claim that theory must be united with practice, and for this reason they have been successful in their attempt to erode the foundations of the non-communist world. The editors agree with the Marxists on this point, but instead of seeing in revolution the means of fusing theory and practice, we see the fusion in personal regeneration through God's grace in Jesus Christ and in the extension of God's kingdom. Good principles should be followed by good practice; eliminate either, and the movement falters. In the long run, it is the kingdom of God, not Marx's "kingdom of freedom," which shall reign triumphant. Christianity will emerge victorious, for only in Christ and His revelation can men find both the principles of conduct and the means of subduing the earth: the principles of biblical law.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. The Decline and Fall of the West and the Return of Christendom

Otto Scott

The Great Christian Revolution, I	1.
The Great Christian Revolution, II	11.
The Challenge to Christianity	23.
Entering the Tunnel.....	39.
In Defense of the “West”	49.

Rousas John Rushdoony

The Decline of the West	61.
Christianity and Freedom	75.
The Future of Civilization.....	83.
The Return of Christendom	91.

2. The Current Scene

Otto Scott

Confronting the Crisis	105.
The Beltway View of Business	113.
Businessmen and the Marxists	127.

Rousas John Rushdoony

The Heresy of Political and Sociological Salvation, I	139.
The Heresy of Political and Sociological Salvation, II	147.
Socialism and Predestination.....	155.

3. Constitutional Law

The Purpose of the Bill of Rights

William D. Graves 163.

4. Theology

Joseph P. Braswell

Covenant Salvation: Covenant Religion vs. Legalism 197.

The Root of Sin: Reflections on Hamartiology 215.

5. Implications of our World and Life View

Owen Fourie

Education: Whose Responsibility? 223.

Where Shall We Begin? Biblical Thinking in all of Life 239.

God’s Strategy for the Family 255.

The State and the Church: Conflict or Harmony? 277.

Jubilee and the Fresh Start

Sheldon H. Rich 295.

Demasculinization in the Pagan Great Mother Religions and its Revival in Western Art

Forrest W. Schultz 315.

Truth Fallen in the Laboratory? Science, Ethics, and Christian Faith

Philip C. Burcham 323

Religion, Abolition, and Proslavery Arguments in Pre-Civil War America

Richard Bostan 327.

6. A Man of Faith and Courage

Robert Lewis Dabney

E W. Schitzler 345.

1.
THE DECLINE AND FALL
OF THE WEST
AND THE RETURN OF
CHRISTENDOM

THE GREAT CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

Otto Scott

Part One

I don't recall any descriptions, let alone analysis, of the tendency to whitewash the past, but it seems to be universal. Terrible wars, for instance, take on a rosy, sentimental character with the passage of time, much as our Civil War—which cost the lives of at least 600,000 men and many more wounded, which emptied the men from the farmhouses of New England and made the New England spinster a social stereotype for at least a generation and which ruined the South, is now the topic of a cascade of careful books which cleanse the memory of all the grief and suffering, blood and dirt of a dreadful period.

This tendency to romanticize the past applies especially to the distant past, which grows simpler and more distinct as its messy details fade from memory. We have no books or letters from the days of ancient Greece and Rome, Egypt and Babylon, Persia and Sumeria telling us the problems of domestic life, despite what the scholars say. We know little about the everyday life of average people of the distant past, and certainly nothing to compare to the overwhelming cataract of information we receive today from the media, from modern fiction, and—for that matter—from modern case-work.

I have a book in my library titled *Pagans and Christians*,¹ that discusses pagan and Christian life from the second to the fourth century AD “when the gods of Olympus lost their dominion and Christianity, with the conversion of Constantine triumphed in the Mediterranean world.” It is a fascinating work, {2} and especially because in the description of pagan religious practices, the term

1. Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (San Francisco, 1986).

“human sacrifice” is never once mentioned.

This omission is significant. It is like discussing the former USSR without mentioning slave camps; without mentioning that communism—once established—turned out to be a new, expanded slave society. To this day our commentators and scholars shrink from saying this—or looking at it. They euphemize, so to speak. They gloss over the harshness of much of human life, now and in the past.

Now, this may be all right in polite conversation, but it is a serious omission in terms of understanding. Students taught about the world in polite terms emerge from their studies with heads filled with illusions about life and humanity. And nowhere is this more disabling than in religion—past and present. For when we talk about religion in the past and continuing into much of the present, there is no way that we can avoid a very grisly subject known as human sacrifice. Consequently, I am going to shock some of you today. I am going to talk about the ancient world and even some of the relatively modern world, in the same tough terms that a commander uses in training his troops, in preparing them for the terrible realities of war.

I am going to talk, very explicitly, about human sacrifice. It’s a subject the historians shy away from, just as they shy away from the grisly nature of war, because it darkens our view of the human race and everybody’s forbears - without exception.

We have a tendency to shrink from the terrible facts of life and living and death, and to put a pretty face on reality. It does not work; but it helps. Nobody likes to look into the pit all the time, and God gave us the gift of laughter to make life more bearable.

Nevertheless, we have to face up to life when matters grow serious, and they are especially serious today. Not because we are involved in some immediate catastrophe such as war or plague (at least not yet), but because the faith that built the Christian civilization, the greatest and most successful in the history of the world, is seriously eroded and Christendom today is under a spiritual attack that is probably more insidious and dangerous than any it faced in its long history.

It is now clear that one of the reasons Christianity has been driven out of our universities, our Governments, our public dialogue is that its leaders have been not only weak but

intellectually unable to properly defend the faith. They mounted only a feeble defense against the so-called Age of Reason; they did not properly rally against the French Revolution, they {3} retreated before the modernistic tides of Darwin, Marx and Freud; they are still retreating today.

That is a central reason why Dr. Rushdoony turned toward Van Til, and the reason for Chalcedon. Those of us drawn to Reconstruction propose ways and means of not only defending, but *reconstructing* the faith. And in my view, one of the ways to best do this is to reconstitute the arguments by which the Christian Revolution moved and changed, lifted and advanced the world.

What the professors never make clear is what sort of world the Christian Revolution altered. They like to dwell on the glories of the ancient past: its magnificent temples and impressive statuary, its monuments and its heroes; its undoubted accomplishment in creating the tools of civilization such as mathematics and writing, art and architecture, agriculture and commerce, tools and poetry.

But the religions of the past are seldom described, excepting by specialists in rare volumes. We hear only surface accounts of the burial practices of the Egyptians or what is termed the “myths” of the Greeks and the Romans. The religions of Asia are shrouded in mist, as are the beliefs of the black Africans, the Polynesians, the Amerindians of Mexico and the Yucatan, the tribes of Peru or of the Pacific and China.

This is an amazing oversight in the education most people receive, because there is no instance in all recorded history of any civilization or even of any tribe coming into being without a religion—and not a single instance, so far as I know, of any people outlasting the loss of their religion.

Religion, in other words, is inseparable from not only history, but from life itself. Man is a spiritual as well as a physical being. A sickness in one of these dimensions is inextricably bound to a sickness in the other. He cannot survive without an awareness of a higher power.

It is for that reason that the world in which Jesus appeared was suffused with religiosity, although it took forms that astonish us today. These were forms of religion that, *in virtually every instance*, involved human sacrifice. Not only did they involve human sacrifice: they had always done so, from time immemorial.

When we discuss human sacrifice, however, we should not confuse it with killing, as in battle—or murder, as in crime. Sacrifice in the pagan world was—and is—a religious rite. The English author Nigel Davies said, “Ancient gods would have spurned a money ransom. They expected flesh and blood, {4} obtained through the medium of a ritual, without which the gift had neither worth or meaning.”²

What is most remarkable about the history of human sacrifice is that it took similar forms in every part of the world, involving every human race in every level of civilization from the highest to the lowest over thousands of years. We find it in ancient and near-modern China, in India and Africa, Mesopotamia, the Americas, in the Pacific and among the Eskimo. Human sacrifice makes the myth of the noble savage not only un-historic but anti-historic.

Archeologists excavating the Royal Cemetery of ancient UR in 1927, uncovering relics from the Sumerian civilization from which the Lord called Abraham, found startling evidence of funeral processes of which the texts of Sumer had been oddly silent. “There had been processions of musicians with their harps, of soldiers fully armed and of court ladies in all their finery, as they followed their royal master into the burial pit and drank the death potion before being engulfed by earth.”³

“It must have been a very gaily dressed crowd that assembled on the mat-lined pit for the royal obsequious, a blaze of color with the crimson coats, the silver and the gold; clearly these people were not the wretched slaves killed as oxen might have been killed, but persons held in honour, wearing their robes of office and coming, one hopes, voluntarily to a rite which would be in their belief but a passing from one world to another, from the service of a god on earth to that same god in another sphere.”⁴

Davies described the kings of UR as “the first great kings on earth, whose servants and perhaps their wives had the sacred duty to follow them to the next world, as part of a sumptuous ritual.”⁵

2. Nigel Davies, *Human Sacrifice in History and Today* (New York: William Morrow, 1981), 15.

3. *Ibid.*, 28.

4. Ernest Benn, *Excavations at UR* (London, 1954), 70–71.

5. Davies, *op. cit.*, 28.

The same sort of relics are to be found in China. Graves uncovered in the 1950s belonging to the Shang Dynasty (1523–1028 BC) show startling resemblances to UR. The same costly treasures piled up, war chariots together with a charioteer and horses, guards and retainers. In China also are to be found that other “classic form of human sacrifice, the burying of people beneath the foundations of new buildings. Skeletons, mainly of {5} children, have been unearthed that attest to the popularity of the practice...”⁶

China was unified in the Han Dynasty, and recent excavations have discovered a terra cotta army buried with its first Emperor in the second century AD. The records of the Chinese do not mention people being buried alive with their dead emperors in that period, but the archaeologists’ excavations reveal that this practice continued until the late 1400s.⁷

The same practice was common in India where Rajahs were burned with whole troops of wives and concubines. The purpose in these practices was to see that rulers were accompanied into the next world. Sacrifices were also made to ask the gods for help in misfortune during times of famine, or for success in war. The Scandinavians, who were not converted until the tenth century AD, would bury children alive to stop a plague.

Burning infants and adults was associated, as we know, with the worship of Baal by the Carthaginians. When faced with defeat in 310 BC, they threw the sons of 500 nobles into a fiery pit from a scaffold shaped in the likeness of the god. Carthage, a defeated power, has not been forgiven for these practices by the historians.

But the Greeks, those favorites of the professors who proudly call themselves “classicists,” are another story. The Pharmakoi—persons considered worthless by Greek communities—were kept in Athens and other cities at public expense and used as sacrifices for annual events. “In Athens one of these was celebrated in the middle of summer, when two men were led out and stoned to death as scapegoats for the wrongs of others. If one of these Pharmakoi were to be killed, he would first be paraded around the city, in order that he should drain off the impurities of others

6. *Ibid.*, 38.

7. *Ibid.*, 39.

and take them upon himself; he was then slain in a ceremony in which the whole population took part.”⁸ That was in the city which is hailed above all others as the birthplace of democracy.

The fact is that Plato spoke of human sacrifice as “a common custom” in the Greece of his day—and the Romans continued the practice. “Pliny records that as early as 97 BC a decree was passed by the Roman Senate against the killing of human beings to honor the gods. The Emperor Hadrian, nearly {6} 4 centuries later, had to renew that ban but it had little effect. Nero, frightened by the sight of a comet, offered up a number of Roman noblemen to avert the implied threat to his own life.”⁹ In fact, one can range all through the history of ancient Rome and come upon a continuous record of human sacrifices under every Emperor until Constantine.

This is not, of course, heard in ordinary classrooms, and the self-styled “classicists” must close their eyes when they come upon these records—although today most of them read only one another’s commentaries.

It is seldom recalled that the gladiatorial contests were sacrificial in origin. “Their first recorded use was in 264 BC as part of the funerary rites of Marcus Brutus. His sons arranged the combat in which three pairs fought “to honor his ashes.” Until the establishment of the empire by Julius Caesar, the notion persisted that gladiators fought to honor the spirits of the dead. Julius Caesar held his first combat to honor a woman, his deceased daughter Julia. Under the empire, gladiators were employed more to celebrate a victory, and fights involving hundreds of pairs were common. Pupils for gladiatorial schools were recruited largely from war prisoners, criminals and slaves.”¹⁰

Even Roman justice, if such a word can be used, had sacrificial elements. Julius Caesar sacrificed two soldiers as a penalty for mutiny, but dedicated them to the God of War. And when Julian the Apostate tried to restore paganism and suppress Christianity, he “filled his palace at Antioch with the corpses of human victims.... After his death a woman was found hanging by her hair in a temple at Carrae. He had inspected her entrails to divine the

8. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6, 848.

9. Davies, *op. cit.*, 47.

10. *Ibid.*, 47–48.

issue of his campaign.”¹¹

Pagan Europe was no better. The Druids of Britain created huge wicker figures in which they burned numberless victims to death as sacrifices. Cannibalism was reported in pagan Ireland. The Gauls, two centuries before Caesar, sought to expiate offenses against their gods by sacrificing innocent human victims. The Teutonic tribes did the same, and some continued the practice down to the 6th century. The Saxons, cruelest of the Teutonic tribes, killed every tenth prisoner of war, and one of their leaders sacrificed a Christian every day. Charlemagne had {7} to order the practice ended.

The Franks practiced human sacrifice long after the death of Clovis (466–511), and the Scandinavians continued the practice for another 500 years.

Lord Acton said that “(T)he human sacrifice was the turning point at which paganism passed from morality to wickedness. The highest possible effort at expiation became the natural source of unnatural practices and ideas. The human victim was put to death as a substitute for the conversion of the sinner, and a door was opened for rites in which all distinction of virtue and vice was ignored, and sin itself was often made meritorious.”

He also said, “The Jews and early Christians, who saw paganism in its last stage of degradation, believed that its gods were devils. In the Bible this identity is not distinctly expressed: sometimes the gods are said to have no real existence, sometimes to be demons. The same Hebrew word is translated by the Seventy in three ways—demons, idols and vanities. St. Paul is careful not to assert the real existence of the gods while he says that the devils receive the homage offered to them. The early Fathers understood that these gods were actual devils; Justin Martyr who, with all the Ante-Nicene Fathers but one, interprets Genesis VI.2 of sinful angels, holds that their offspring were the demons who became heathen gods, and actually existed in the forms represented by the idols, and perpetuated all the crimes in mythology. St. Augustine believed the gods were real devils, who usurped the place of God in order to enjoy the homage due to Him, and intercepted the

11. *Selected Writing of Lord Acton, Essays on History Religion and Morality*, vol. 3 (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Classics, 1988), 417.

prayers and sacrifices intended for Him. But this opinion in its sweeping universality has not held its ground among Christian philosophers and divines. Yet," Acton concluded, "the character of certain rites is so distinctly diabolical as to confirm the belief that in these cases particular demons both inspired and received the abominable worship."¹²

When paganism reached its final stage, its moral dimension vanished. It reeked with blood and cruelty for their own sakes. There seemed to be no remedy, because all the known world was addicted to horrible practices; every civilization appeared to be lost. It was in that climate of moral darkness that Jesus—the last sacrifice—appeared.

As we know, His appearance was the death knell of the ancient world. I have written about this before, but I am {8} sufficiently fond of it to repeat a tale told by Plutarch in his piece, "Why Oracles Fail" about an incident that occurred during the reign of Tiberius, at the time of the Crucifixion.

The father of Aemilianus the orator, to whom some of you have listened, was Epitherses, who lived in our town and was my teacher in grammar. He said that once upon a time in making a voyage to Italy, he embarked on a ship carrying freight and many passengers. It was already evening when, near the Echniades Islands, the wind dropped and the ship drifted near Paxi. Almost everybody was awake, and a good many had not finished their after-dinner wine.

Suddenly from the island of Paxi was heard the voice of someone loudly calling Thamus, so that all were amazed. Thamus was an Egyptian pilot, not known by name even to many on board. Twice he was called and made no reply, but the third time he answered; the caller, raising his voice, said, 'When you come opposite to Palodes, announce that Great Pan is dead.' On hearing this, all, said Epitherses, were astounded and reasoned among themselves whether it were better to carry out the order or refuse to meddle and let the matter go. Under the circumstances, Thamus made up his mind that, if there should be a breeze, he would sail past and keep quiet, but with no wind and a smooth sea about the place, he would announce what he had heard. So, when he came opposite to Palodes, and there was neither wind nor wave, Thamus from the stern, looking toward the land, said the words as he had heard

12. Acton, *op. cit.*, 409–10.

them: 'Great Pan is dead.' Even before he had finished there was a great cry of lamentation, not of one person, but of many, mingled with exclamations of amazement. As many persons were on the vessel, the story was soon spread abroad in Rome, and Thamus was sent for by Tiberius Caesar. Tiberius became so convinced of the truth of the story that he caused an inquiry and an investigation to be made about Pan...¹³

That investigation, by the way, is recorded in the Roman court annals. It was, like most governmental investigations, inconclusive about everything except the lineage of Pan, the {9} child of Penelope and Hermes.

I recall it merely as one of the many events that accompanied the beginnings of the Great Christian Revolution. Imagine, if you will, what that revolution meant to the world of paganism. A world that had been in existence since long before the kingdom of UR, long before the rise of India and China, long before recorded history. During all those centuries human sacrifice had reigned amid idols and gods and demons and mysterious powers, and the lives of men and women and children had been held captive to the people among whom they had been born.

Those people could be burned or flayed or buried alive or drowned or beheaded as sacrifices to either expiate sins they had not committed or to serve as offerings to gods or idols that could not be satiated, no matter how many or how often such offerings were made. There was no love in the ancient world between men and the gods: there was only fear and blood.

Into that world came the message of Jesus, who taught us to pray to our Father, who art in Heaven. The disciples and the Seventy traveled about to carry the message that every life is sacred, that men, women and children would no longer be killed alongside beasts; that God watches over every soul.

There is no logic that can explain how that message spread before the New Testament was written, or how it survived to be spread in such dark and bloody times—especially when it began in the very heart of that darkness, inside Rome itself. Nor is there any way we can explain its influence over people whose entire

13. Giorgio de Santillan and Hertha von Dechend, *Hamlet's Mill: An Essay on Myth and the Frame of Time* (Boston: David Godine, 1977), 275–77.

education, whose government, and whose history had been bent in the opposite direction.

It may seem obvious to us today that the message of Jesus was more appealing than paganism, but that was certainly not true when the Christian revolution began. It was, after Nero, a deadly and risky matter to become a Christian. Enemies existed on all sides. The arguments of Christianity offended every traditionalist in every society, went against all history and flouted the tenets of every religion on earth.

Yet Christianity did not take up the sword; did not kill those who refused to listen, did not create an exclusive group and deny access to blacks or Jews or blondes or Asians or any race or sex. Its spread is one of the great mysteries of history: perhaps that is why so few historians can bear to look at it. It makes a mockery out of every system of logic in the world.

Christopher Dawson said at one point that you can {10} always tell the ways of God because they're so different from the ways of men. If, for instance, he said, men had been in charge of the message of Jesus, they would have gone to the Court of Rome and delivered it before the scribes who would have composed books and distributed them throughout the Empire. Instead, God picked up and threw His word into the wind like so many seeds. And where it fell, great forests appeared.

Ending human sacrifice meant, in other words, the alteration of the attitudes of men toward God throughout the globe. It was a spiritual message and a spiritual revolution. To change attitudes was the purpose of the Gospel. To undertake that task at the time of Tiberius seemed insuperable—and perhaps it was, for any power except God Almighty.

As it spread, the darkness receded. There have been Christians who have taken credit for that. Church historians understandably dwell upon the regeneration of Christians, and on their virtuous lives. But “good people” had always existed. There was honor in the ancient world. There was courage. There was talent and ability—and there was virtue. All men are not monsters. To talk about the virtue that Christianity introduced, to dwell upon its charities and its justice is to describe the advance of the revolution and its effect. This is necessary and good. But it must at all times be remembered that was due not to works, but to the overwhelming message that

was brought by *irresistible grace* which lifted hearts from fear of the gods and their demons, their whims and their cruelties, into the hope of salvation that the Gospel and the Holy Ghost brought into pagan lives. The first and greatest fruits of the revolution, in other words, were to halt human sacrifice anywhere and everywhere in the world.

THE GREAT CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

Part Two

Otto Scott

Durant titled them the Ages of Faith, but we know them as the Middle Ages. Middle, because they spanned the time between the Conversion of Constantine and the beginning of the Renaissance, which is shorthand for modern times.

These ten centuries, which stretched roughly a thousand years, are incredibly treated by modern historians, who pay them less and less attention as time goes by. Columbia University, in New York City, actually decided to drop the entire Christian thousand years from its history courses some years back, and to teach mainly ancient history and then modern history—beginning in 1666. Imagine throwing aside a thousand years, during which the Christian civilization rose to heights that surpassed all previous generations, while continuing to call oneself a university! Other schools did the same.

Such a step betrays not only the deepest and most despicable of prejudices, but it violates the duty of teachers to their students, for it denies them the knowledge of the past which is essential in understanding the present.

History is the record of the human race in all its experiments, its adventures, its follies—and its successes. To be ignorant of the past is to be like a person afflicted with amnesia, who cannot recall his name or his occupation, his parents or his loved ones. Such a person is medically ill, and is hospitalized. A civilization cut off from its past is in a similar situation, but there are no hospitals large enough, nor doctors wise enough, to treat a nation that has lost its memory.

We haven't time to do more than briefly outline the thousand years of Christianity from the fourth century to the Renaissance, let alone from the Renaissance to today. All we can do is point to the peaks of progress. We know, for instance, that Christians began to speak against slavery from the fourth century onward, and that Christian leaders from the second century began to speak of spiritual liberty and from the fourth of civil equality. This would be news to a great many people today.

Christianity, therefore, brought deep political changes {12} that appeared in the wake of the Good News that God reigned, and governments administrated. This is important because, as Acton said, "popular governments had always existed, and also mixed and federal governments, but there had been no *limited* government, no State" whose authority had been bounded by an external force in antiquity. "When Jesus said, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's,' those words, spoken on His last visit to the Temple three days before His death, gave to the civil power a sacredness it had never before enjoyed, and bounds it had never acknowledged; and they were the repudiation of absolutism and the inauguration of freedom"¹

Of course this did not occur immediately. Constantine's will was supreme over the Church, which served as what Acton called a "gilded crutch." The vast weight of antiquity could not be shaken off in an instant, or a generation. Self-government had to emerge as subtly as a language. There was also the weight, however, of the barbarian tribes who elected their own kings and made them leaders in their councils, but not omnipotent authorities.

These were the people who migrated into the Empire by the tens of thousands, and who settled everywhere. Over a period of time, they threw it back. The Greeks retained the ancient records including that of early Christianity, but Rome went into deep decline. "At a time when the Bulgarians knew the New Testament by heart, western Europe lay under the grasp of masters, the ablest of whom could not write their names. The faculty of reasoning, of accurate observation, became extinct for five hundred years, and

1. *Selected Writing of Lord Acton, Essays in the History of Liberty, vol. 1* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Classics), 27–28.

even the sciences...fell into decay...”²

Only force could blend the hostile and warring tribes of Europe into nations, and for these centuries we recall mainly the names of men like Clovis and Charlemagne. Meanwhile Byzantium blended Church and State—and despotism. The West, however, undertook the massive task of conversion. The Bishops went out with their robes and awed the tribes; their message of the last sacrifice and their knowledge of the wisdom of the ancient world, of Cicero and of the new world via Augustine, armed them with irresistible arguments. The Church was obviously a higher and superior force than tribal {13} governments, and the priests were made exempt from civil authorities.

This is a story to stir the world’s soul, and it is being ignored even by the Church today. To convert man-eaters and murderers, a task now considered impossible, was performed countless times.

In time feudalism developed from control of the land, the source of all wealth; the barons became sovereigns of their own domains. The only force capable of resisting that feudal absolutism was the Church and the faith, and it was in that collision that civil liberty was born. Remember that when you next hear condemnations of Christianity.

That struggle lasted four hundred years. And if the Church and the faith had not won, Europe would have sunk into despotism. The rise of cities and the emergence of a middle class, the franchises won by the towns of Italy and Germany, the struggle between the nobles and the monarchs—all produced liberties unknown to antiquity, and without precedent anywhere else in the world. “The authority of religion,” Acton said, “was thrown on the side that denied the indefeasible title of kings. Only France insisted that the reigning house was above the law ... but in other countries the oath of fidelity attested that it was conditional, and should be kept only during good behavior, and it was in conformity with the public law that all monarchs were held subject. King John was declared a rebel against the barons, and men who put Edward III to the throne had deposed his father.”

The idea that the people had a right to pull down princes providing they had the sanction of religion was expanded in time

2. *Ibid.*, 30–31.

against both kings and the Church. When the Church backed the Plantagenets against the House of Bruce for possession of Scotland and Ireland, Rome backed the English. But the Irish and Scots refused to obey the Papacy. The Scots defied the Pope, claiming their liberties were not to be ruled against by any power, not even the Church. What school in the United States cites this in its discussions of liberty?

“Looking back over a space of a thousand years,” said Acton, “which are now called the Middle Ages, to get an estimate of the work they had done ... towards attaining the knowledge of political truth, this is what we find: Representative government, which was unknown to the ancients, was almost universal. The methods of election were crude, but the principle that no tax was lawful that was not granted by the class that paid it—that is, that taxation was inseparable from {14} representation—was recognized not as the privilege of certain countries, but as the right of all. Not a prince in the world, said Philip de Commines, can levy a penny without the consent of the people. Slavery was almost everywhere extinct, and absolute power was deemed more intolerable and more criminal than slavery. The right of insurrection was not only admitted but defined, as a duty sanctioned by religion. Even the principles of Habeas Corpus and the method of the Income Tax were already known. *The issue of ancient politics was an absolute state planted on slavery. The political product of the Middle Ages was a system of states in which authority was restricted by the representation of powerful classes by privileged associations and by acknowledgement of duties superior to those that are imposed by man.*”³

But the Middle Ages also grew rich, and riches—as the world knows—bring their own dangers. The faith began to decline, for multiple reasons. Some historians point to the changes ushered in by the Crusades, and the expanded knowledge of other cultures, other ways. Public baths and latrines appeared in Europe in their wake, as well as the other Roman habit of shaving beards. Arabic words entered European languages. Oriental romances appeared in European literature and in general the faith began to weaken. The Papacy, having discovered that huge sums could be raised to fund the Crusades, began to use similar methods for other

3. *Ibid.*, 36–37.

purposes and gradually acquired the power to tax the subjects of all the kingdoms of Christendom, to the increasing dissatisfaction of the monarchs.⁴

Meanwhile the city-states of Italy embarked on trade throughout the Mediterranean on a scale unknown since the days of Imperial Rome. Silk, sugar, spices, pepper, cloves, cinnamon, formerly rare luxuries, appeared in abundance. Plants, crops and trees were transplanted; apricots and damask, satins, velvets, tapestries, rugs, dyes, powders, scents and gems came from Islam to adorn medieval homes; mirrors of glass replaced polished bronze or steel. New markets developed new Italian and Flemish industries; new commercial instruments appeared; more money circulated. An economic revolution appeared in the wake of the Crusades, that soon engaged in battle with the Christian Revolution that had inspired and built Europe to this stage.

One sign of this decline was that “sixty years passed after {15} the emergence of printing in the sixteenth century before anybody undertook to print the Greek Testament.” Another was the spread of the idea that unity was more important than the rights of men, and that the duties of neighbors and of rulers toward them varied according to their religion, and society did not have to acknowledge the same obligations to a Turk or a Jew, a pagan or a heretic ... as to an orthodox Christian. “As the ascendancy of religion grew weaker, this privilege of treating enemies on exceptional grounds was claimed by the State for its own benefit; and the idea that the ends of government justify the means employed was worked into a system by Machiavelli...”⁵

This was a regression to paganism and to the attitudes of antiquity—and it was not the only one. How the Italians rediscovered the ancients is a fascinating tale. They unearthed old statues in their gardens, restored the literature and imitated the customs of the past; awarded one another laurel wreaths for poems and had created festivals and began to talk about their “ancestors,” although the Romans were long dead, and the inhabitants of Italy a thousand years later were another race entirely. None of this was, however, as innocent as at first blush it appeared.

4. Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1950), 611.

5. Acton, *op. cit.*, 36–37.

That was proven when Petrarch, on his first visit to Rome, saw the statues and the ruins and was so awestricken that he declared that those were the days of glory, and that the thousand years that separated him from antiquity were “The Dark Ages.” That single phrase has done more to mislead students than any other three words I can recall.

Italy underwent a metamorphosis: a great change. Its attention turned from the shrines of Christendom to the temples and groves of the pagan past, from the next world to fame in this one. Fame, in other words, came to be considered the only true form of immortality: an idea that has led to the modern cult of celebrity. It was an ancient idea, restored in Italy.

Other aspects, far darker, of the pagan past began to appear. Machiavelli, looking at the power chase in Florence, wrote that conscience could interfere with a rational form of government, and that all should be permitted the State. This doctrine was used—and is still used—by men in authority to excuse themselves in the exercise of unlimited power. James I of England said, “I rule not according to the common will, but the common weal.”

Public morality, in his eyes and the eyes of other {16} Renaissance rulers, was that public morality differs from the private, because no government can turn the other cheek, or admit that mercy is better than justice. In effect, Machiavelli gave European monarchs the rationale to break out of the bonds of the faith, and the right to assume that no authority could be higher than a government’s.

Ferdinand I and Ferdinand II, Henry III and Louis XIII—each caused his most powerful subjects to be treacherously murdered. Elizabeth I and Mary Stuart attempted to do the same to each other. The way was paved for absolute monarchy to rise again; the right of the people to resist oppression was denied, and all the evil aspects of Roman and Greek rule were reinstalled after fifteen hundred years—even torture. In one generation, the hardwon liberties of Europe were overturned—and, what was worse, overturned during times of increasing opulence, of wealth, of exploration.

Some historians persist in terming this paradox of material prosperity and spiritual decline a great step forward. It is almost impossible not to see that they confuse the two, and believe that prosperity was the result of spiritual decline. If so, they took their

eyes away from the subject too soon, for Italy's fall was terrible.

It came, as I'm sure you know, shortly after Luther's challenge, which stemmed the flow of absolutism. Not to teach all students about this heroism comes under the category of a moral crime, but it is a widespread one. Luther was confronted by the greatest international power of his time, one of the most powerful of all times. The Church was allied with the State, and much of Germany was governed by princes hostile to him. He had Charles V, ruler of Spain, the Low countries and much of Germany against him, but the democracies of the towns generally took his side.

He was shocked when revolution appeared. "A man firm in his faith," he said, "in the divinity and redeeming sacrifice of Christ, enjoys not freedom of will, but the profoundest freedom of all: freedom from his own carnal nature, from all evil powers, from damnation, even from law; for the man whose virtue flows spontaneously from his faith needs no commands to righteousness."⁶

"These arguments flowed across Europe like molten {17} lava, igniting the Reformation."⁷

Ten years after Luther pinned his scholar's challenge to the door of the church of Wittenberg, a mixed army of mercenaries dominated by dreaded Spanish troops descended upon Rome itself and sacked the city in 1527. Italy has never fully recovered.

For the next several hundred years it was under foreign domination, fragmented and broken. Its proud Humanist scholars were degraded, their prestige shattered and the power and wealth that marked Genoa, Florence, Venice and other proud city-states moved North, never to return.

The Swiss Reformers were, however, superior to Luther in terms of the rights of Christians on earth. "Zwingli did not shrink from the medieval doctrine that evil magistrates must be cashiered; but he was killed too early to act either deeply or permanently on the political character of Protestantism."⁸

That remained for Calvin. No man has had a worse press, though

6. Otto Scott et. al., *The Great Christian Revolution* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1991), 91.

7. *Ibid.*

8. Acton, *op. cit.*, 39.

he was surrounded by mass murderers upon whom the historians smile fondly. His only post was as a pastor in Geneva, where he said he found the Gospel, but no Church. His influence was entirely intellectual, which has been described by inferior minds as unjust and tyrannical. In his own time he baptized babies and performed weddings and tended the sick and presided at funerals, and preached—and wrote his commentaries, and his *Institutes*. These hardly seem despotic activities.

In Geneva he ran afoul of the Libertines—a party that wanted to be free of the rules of the church, while attending church. When Calvin excommunicated some of these free thinkers, the City Council—which had authority over him—insisted that they be unexcommunicated. He refused, and the struggle stretched over several years. In the end, Calvin won, and we owe to him the principle of the separation of Church and State. It's odd that that great victory is always overlooked, for it is one of the greatest steps toward liberty ever achieved. And it was achieved by a small, slender, sickly individual with no civil authority, no office except an appointed one—no soldiers, no money, but a following throughout all Europe who knew him only by his writing.

No Christian theologian is so often scorned, so regularly {18} attacked. He is a devil-figure for anti-Christians and even for many imperfectly educated Christians. This is odd, for America does not ordinarily attack religious leaders or faiths. Even the Ayatollah Khomeini, inspirer of a bloody purge, was not used as a peg to attack Islamic beliefs. But there has long been an open season on Calvin:

In the long run, which always clarifies what at first seems mysterious, it seems that Calvin's great crime, in the eyes of many, was that he preached that God's Grace is irresistible, that it falls wherever He chooses—and that those He chooses are known only to Him. Calvin, a citizen of a Republic, called this an election, and those that are chosen, the Elect.

His opponents in Protestantism, later led by the theories of Jacobus Arminius, argued that this may be true, but that nobody could be so elected without his own consent, and outside of the Church and its leaders. On that organizational argument, which in effect returned much of Protestantism to the policies of the Papacy, hangs the odium with which Calvin has been shrouded.

Despite the tangled arguments of the Reformation, however, it succeeded in restoring the impetus that Christianity had lost during the Renaissance, and pulled it back from the brink. That accomplishment, like most of the others I have mentioned, seems to have escaped the attention of the historians. So far as I know, no civilization has ever come as close to entirely losing its faith and surviving as has Christianity. In every other instance the loss of faith has meant the suicide of a civilization:

This has been true even when the periphery of a civilization has continued to expand its influence, as in the cases of Greece and Rome. Spain, for instance, discovered the New World, as far as Europe was concerned. Its soldiers and priests were appalled at what they found. Not since the Scythians had the Old World known civilizations so dedicated to human sacrifice. The practice was basic to the Aztecs, and scenes depicting the practice were freely painted and even set in clay all through the Yucatan and even in Peru among the Incas.

The records of the Spanish priests, scorned throughout the nineteenth century as biased, have been proven in recent years to have been factual and honest. They have also proven that the sacrifices were not invented by the Aztecs, but preceded by the Toltecs and the Mayas, the Olmecs and the Huertas. All Central America appears to have been drenched in blood as far back as recorded time. Those who deplore the Spanish practice of destroying idols should be made more aware, amid their {19} denunciations, of the careful translations and records made by the Spanish priests, their conversions and the peace they finally brought to that turbulent and war torn region:

That was, of course, only the beginning. As Christian Europe expanded around the globe, Europeans discovered similar scenes. As in the Americas, the sacrifices were all religious. India, for instance, was pervaded by cults and sacrifices. As in many Asian lands, the custom of burning widows with the cadavers of their husbands was common—and was not the only instance.

The English were baffled by people who thought that killing a cow was worse than killing a man, who buried young women alive, and who threw their children to crocodiles at the mouth of the Ganges. These practices went back to 1400 BC. Each of the numberless gods of India had suitable sacrifices, including Kali,

who was worshipped by the Thuggees. Yet England has been drenched with scorn for ending such practices, for bringing first common language to India, for ending its eternal internecine wars, its slavery and its mistreatment of its Untouchables. Today, however, the old practices are creeping back to modern India. Brides are being burned alive in their own kitchens in order for their husbands to obtain new dowries for new brides. Abortion, the modern version of ancient infanticide, is rampant, and a shortage of female children is a growing result.

What Europe discovered in black Africa is now hardly ever mentioned, but that the Leopard Societies of Sierra Leone endured for centuries is only a detail. These were men dressed in leopard skins who captured and sacrificed humans for centuries—and continued to do so even after the British occupation. The practice was so deadly that the British actually created a Protectorate to end it. In the process they discovered the Leopard Society was joined by a Human Alligator Society that expanded the sacrifices.

Unfortunately, the British authorities and the press—for the suppression was in this century—paid more attention to the atrocious nature of the sacrifices than to its religious purposes and rituals. In this they revealed that they either did not know or paid no attention to the fact that the sacrifices could have been halted by conversion more effectively than by police force. But in our century, as we now know, conversion is regarded as insulting to pagan tribes; an intrusion into their ‘culture,’ an affront to their traditions.

Religion in Africa remains for the most part unknown to us today, for the temples were built of perishable clay, rituals {20} conducted in open air, and no written records were kept. Yet we know that their sacrifices were much the same as those {22}

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY

Otto Scott

It may seem to some of you that we are faced with many different and troubling challenges to Christianity from many sources. But in reality we are confronted with only a single great challenge. That challenge can be defined, can be identified, and can be overcome.

But not easily; not immediately, not without resistance—and not without risk.

Before we discuss these dangers, however, we must first admit that the American Christian community has not faced up to its obligations, has not properly defended its fellow Christians throughout the world, and has failed in its intellectual obligation to properly describe the challenge to Christianity in terms that all Christians can understand.

In order to do that, we shall have to understand the overall pattern of events. We shall have to be able to analyze trends that include Christians in other lands as well as ourselves. For we are confronted not with an American Christian problem alone, but with a worldwide Christian challenge by forces who have studied history and learned its lessons, and who are moving with sinister intelligence to overcome us, and to destroy the faith.

First, let's look abroad. In Poland, a few years ago, the commissaries confronted food shortages and other consequences of a planned economy. To take people's minds off these troubles, the commissars relaxed their controls over the theaters, literature and the movies.

Taking advantage of this fact, some Polish movie makers produced a remarkable film titled *Danton*. As some of you may know, Danton was a famous French leader during the early stages of the French Revolution. When this event started, Danton was only 30 years old, and a prosperous lawyer. He lived in a district of

Paris fashionable among young intellectuals, and he was a member of the Jacobin Society, together with Robespierre.

When the Jacobins became powerful in the revolutions, Danton rose to the highest levels. He was a very popular speaker and a favorite with the crowd. He became rich, and changed his wife for a younger woman. This was not his only compromise: he went along with a series of grisly revolutionary murders. But when the revolutionary tribunals began to gather in his friends, Danton protested—and that got him into trouble. Because {24} revolutions don't stop: they keep rolling.

Revolutions begin with throwing men out of office, and continue to the point of massacres. Danton drew back for reasons of friendship. Robespierre hated Danton for that scruple, and those whom Robespierre hated were marked for death.

In due course Danton was arrested, charged with vague misdeeds, and condemned. At the guillotine he said to the executioner, "Show my head to the crowd. It is worth it."

The Poles made a movie about Danton in subtle defiance of the commissaries—for they know the history of the French Revolution. They also know the history of the Russian revolution—where every man who ever contradicted Stalin for any reasons at any time was later executed. It is clear that the Polish movie-makers hoped that the same fate would overtake *all* the commissars. But they also made the movie as a sort of warning to the West about the nature of revolutions. Their courage in doing so is to be admired.

Unfortunately, most Americans have never heard of Danton. The French Revolution is not taught in our schools. This is a great educational crime, because the French debacle was the first secular revolution in all history. One would expect it to be taught in every school and in every church in the land, as an example of what can happen when men declare war against God.

For the leaders of the French Revolution not only launched a war against God, they declared war against anyone who believed in God, or prayed to God, or honored God. They outlawed Christianity. For Christians to allow so great a crime to be covered over by Socialist propaganda about "social progress" has amounted to an intellectual surrender by Christians to their sworn enemies.

Of course, the French Revolution did not last. It was eventually halted and in part reversed by Napoleon. Napoleon restored the

Christian church and recreated an aristocracy, placed the family back as a basic unit of society, and elevated the concepts of honor, patriotism and traditional values in general. But his effort was flawed by military speculations. And French society was too deeply injured by the Revolution to ever fully recover.

The descendants of the revolutionaries and the descendants of those whom the revolution dispossessed, and the descendants of those whom Napoleon elevated continued to quarrel about the French Revolution for generations. Nothing, it seemed, could erase the memory of that event from the mind {25} of France—until the Socialists took control of education. You can imagine my surprise when I learned that when the Polish film was shown in Paris, that French students had to be told who Danton was—for they had never heard of him!

History is not taught in France today. It is not taught in the United States. Most Americans consider history unimportant. They are ignorant of the history of their own civilization, and even their own nation. There is little excuse for such ignorance, of course. People who know how to read and write can educate themselves. But it is significant that in general, people today are more ignorant than their grandfathers, or their great grandfathers. To consider this decline a mere matter of incompetence is to betray a sort of naivete.

Our civilization is old, and has undergone many vicissitudes. I speak not simply of the United States, but of the European civilization of which we are the intellectual heirs. I speak of Christianity, born nearly two thousand years ago, which struggled with pagan philosophers and pagan savages alike—and struggled successfully. Of a civilization which once spread across all the lands of this earth, and to every people. For such a civilization to abandon its memory, to forget its past, is to pursue intellectual death.

Solzhenitsyn said, “To destroy a people, you must first sever their roots.” That observation can be differently expressed. *When the roots are severed*, someone is out to destroy a people.

It is also significant that ignorance in the West about Danton and the French Revolution is not true in Communist countries. The Poles thought they were touching a common chord of recollection, because in Warsaw, Moscow, Budapest and Leningrad today,

everyone is taught about the French Revolution, because it was the precursor *and the model* for the Russian Revolutions—and for all secular revolutions to this day.

The Soviets reincarnated the French Revolution, and carried it further. Lenin said that Robespierre and his Committee of Public Safety which had directed the Terror and sent so many to the guillotine, *were not sufficiently vigorous*. “We,” he added, “will not make that mistake.” As we know, he did not. The Terror unleashed in Russia in 1917 has not yet come to an end. The Soviets intended to carry their Revolution to the very ends of the earth. Their successors have not ended the slave labor camps.

As in France so long ago, the Russian Revolution is a war against God, and all who believe in God. It was a felony in the USSR to give anyone a Bible who is under the age of {26} eighteen. It was and legally still is a felony to hold an unlicensed church service, and can result in exile to the Gulag and slavery. This Anti-Christianism has spread through nation after nation, to encompass half the world. Half the world lives in darkness, under paganism in power.

That is the great international challenge that confronts us. And it does not confront us only outside our borders, but confronts us here at home as well.

In order to confront this challenge intelligently, we must educate ourselves and our children on how revolutions grow, and how revolutionaries can be disarmed and defeated. This education must be spread as widely and quickly as possible, for the indifference to history and ignorance about the nature of secular revolutions has placed Christianity and our nation into dreadful danger. This great challenge cannot be overcome by intellectual indolence.

Before we can educate our children about the revolution, we must first educate ourselves. We must understand the stages and the arguments of secular revolution. These are not difficult to grasp. They have been repeated so often in this century that, were they not so deadly, they would be boring.

They involve, however, recognition of the reality of Time. The passage of time makes danger seem ever-distant, until the final moment. Administrations come and go, and the nation seems the same. King Louis XIV of France ruled absolutely for fifty three years-- and towered over western Europe all that time. France became, in that period, the richest and most populous nation of

the west. It led all others in art, literature, wealth and manners.

France had twenty-five million people when England had five million and the United States, by the end of the eighteenth century, had three million. French architecture was the grandest, its furniture the most elegant, its buildings the most magnificent, its cities the largest, its commerce the greatest in all the world. But the society that enjoyed all that splendor was sick at heart.

The Sun King outlived the patience of his people. His wars and taxes, his palaces and his extravagance drained the treasury. When he died, leaving an infant grandson on the throne, French intellectuals had caught revolutionary ideas from London. The danger of these ideas was not at first recognizable, for England had achieved a precarious stability.

The English did not easily reach that plateau. They had had two revolutions in the preceding century. The first, under {27} Cromwell, was religious and established liberties of which England is still proud. Then they underwent a reaction when Charles II resumed the Stuart dynasty. With Charles came a wave of anti-Christian sarcasm, ridicule and persecution that sent tens of thousands of Presbyterians and Puritans to our shores.

Then the English rebelled a second time—against Charles' brother James II, in what they call their "Great and Glorious Revolution." This was actually a fairly routine shift in administration, ostensibly in the name of religion, but actually part of power politics. Throughout, the English continued to hold Christianity—and especially Calvinism—in contempt.

Little or none of this is taught here. Most Americans are hazy about this nation prior to 1776. But what is more to the present point is that Voltaire visited London while ridicule against religion was still in high fashion. While he was in England spending his lottery winnings, Voltaire caught an Anti-Christian infection. When he returned to Paris he spread Anti-Christianism throughout French intellectual and artistic circles at a time when the French Government had revealed itself as incompetent.

Time passed. In modern terms, a great deal of Time. Approximately sixty years. Louis XV reigned and died, and Louis XVI appeared. Voltaire spent at least fifty of these years satirizing Christianity, patriotism and all traditional values. He succeeded in leading a fashion that was successful enough to astonish him;

toward the end he began to have doubts, as increasingly radical writers and playwrights began to outstrip his popularity and exceed his outrageousness.

But by then it was too late: virtually every French intellectual was convinced that all French history was, as Voltaire had said, a “history of criminality.”

Meanwhile France lost North America. It depleted its treasury to help our War of Independence. Its aristocracy was parasitic; its Church was corrupt, its King was stupid. Its middle class was prosperous but unhappy. Its commerce increased but crime proliferated. Pornography became fashionable, and homosexuals held fancy-dress balls. Traditional values were mocked and Christianity was held in intellectual contempt.

Rousseau argued that Man is good, and that only society is criminal. He was not alone in announcing new theories. Diderot undertook to categorize all the human knowledge the intellectuals considered worth saving. Christianity was labeled Superstition, and not included in the world’s first Encyclopedia. What Diderot and Rousseau and other intellectuals wanted was {28} to erase history and to start all over again. Man, by reason alone, would create a *perfect world*. Which meant to them, a world without God.

That was how it started, by men who thought they would “enlighten” all mankind. And to this day that naive, almost childlike assumption has been called *The Enlightenment*. History is filled with such unintended jokes, at which God laughs.

But the intellectuals did not actually launch the Revolution: they only prepared the way. They could not have done this had the faith of France been strong, if the Church had not been corrupt, and if the Government had not been incompetent. The Revolution was made possible by social, governmental and spiritual weakness, confusion and corruption. This weakness and corruption created opportunities for unscrupulous men who were willing to pay any price, commit any act, for the sake of supreme power.

Many such men were middle class lawyers and journalists anxious to attain positions of power and influence. They used arguments invented by the intellectuals: arguments that were floated against the King and Queen, against the clergy, against the military, against the aristocracy. Against all the institutions that held French society together. These criticisms appeared in vulgar

and even pornographic terms in new publications, by new writers and orators who suddenly appeared all over France.

The source of funds for these publications and individuals remains a mystery. What is not mysterious is that France then had many national enemies. Frederick the Great of Prussia is known to have sent agents into Paris and other cities; English agents became famous for their use of gold; Spanish and even Swiss interests were active, and even distant Russia was involved. The largest and richest nation of Europe was like a sick lion trailed by foreign jackals and vultures.

But the greatest enemies of Christianity and the French monarchy and French society were inside France, and were French. These revolutionaries set up a bewildering number of social clubs, published all sorts of journals ranging from cartoon books to scholarly efforts, hired halls and paid lecturers, swayed schoolteachers and seduced priests and nuns, worked day and night to bring down the Government in the name of Progress.

For the Revolution was not born in a vacuum by nobody. Revolutions do not arise by spontaneous combustion, no matter what you may have heard. Revolutions are not organized in the street, but on high. They do not spring from injustice, but from ambition. They begin—always—with men anxious for power, {29} funded by others who hope to see them succeed.

Revolutions can move forward only against confused people and weak governments. In France in the late 1780s the Government obligingly—and unwittingly—opened the gate for the final stage because it needed money. Its credit had dried up in international banking circles. Bankers refused to buy any more French government bonds, and the French national Deficit was enormous. Interest payments on the National Debt were eating up tax revenues.

The King's financial advisors told him that he had to increase taxes. Of course, that was not publicly announced. What was announced was a need to "reform" the taxes. Therefore the Estates General were convened in May, 1789, to examine the tax system—nothing more. Three Estates, as they were called: the Clergy, the Nobility and the Commons appeared, after elections. Macaulay later wrote that a Fourth Estate also attended: the Press. That was important, because from then on, the Press would play a catalytic

role in all secular revolutions.

Once the Estates General gathered, the Commoners—spurred by revolutionaries—insisted on all sorts of reforms beyond taxes, and the King agreed. New national elections were held, and a new legislature called the National Assembly, dominated by liberals, appeared. Then this new body demanded a new Constitution, to create constitutional monarchy. This too was agreed, and more elections were held.

Meanwhile the aristocrats lost their tax exemptions. After sixty years of agitation, liberal aristocrats cheerfully agreed to this. But that was not enough. The radicals pushed the liberals who pushed the monarchists; only liberals and monarchists remained politically significant. The clergy was pushed aside as unimportant. Then a new Constitution appeared, replete with wonderful words, and was nationally ratified. That document created, more elections were held, and monarchists vanished from the political scene. The King was reduced to a Constitutional monarch, stripped of sweeping authority.

All this did not take place in a quiet atmosphere. The revolutionaries had dozens of newspapers and periodicals that headlined their demands. They inspired all sorts of meetings, and demonstrations, speeches, parades and even riots. Not everywhere by everyone, however. Most people still got up and went to work every day. Most people could not afford the time to demonstrate and parade and to travel from one demonstration site to another. The revolution involved only a small minority of activists, and most people did not realize it was a revolution. {30} But newspapers and orators made it seem as though all France was on the march; that all Frenchmen and Frenchwomen were in a state of rage. The new press printed all sorts of terrible scandals about the clergy, the aristocracy, and the Monarchy. A new journalism had appeared, which stirred pornography and politics together in the name of social progress.

In the midst of this growing disorder, the Courts kept ruling against the Crown, and in favor of the agitators. Judges, after all, don't like to share authority—and the French Courts resented the authority of the King. In effect, all sides combined to cut down the Monarchy. Count Mirabeau, one of the leaders of the liberals, thought the King of France should be like the King of England—

limited.

But even after this was accomplished, the great momentum had been created. Men appeared to urge more changes, to demand more reforms—and to denounce all past injustices; all entrenched institutions. The more intelligent aristocrats began to flee the country and their estates were seized by mobs; mansions were set on fire—and inside the Assembly the Church was denounced.

Finally the churches and all their lands and buildings were declared National property. The clergy lost everything: its tax exemption, its pensions, its homes, its buildings, its lands, its altars and jewelry and clothing and status. And, of course, the nobility soon followed. It was stripped of titles and homes and lands and status while trials were held by Legislative Committees inside the Assembly.

The Courts were swept aside as unnecessary. The laws of France vanished under new rules, administered by strange new judges. The guillotine ruled; changes didn't stop. The National Assembly radicals talked about historic injustices that had to be redressed. Committees were created inside the Assembly to investigate scandals, to probe high officials, to call the aristocracy and the Church to account.

These Committees, as they were called, usurped the functions of the Courts. They not only investigated: they convicted. And then they sentenced. And a new invention, called the guillotine, was unveiled in Paris—and suddenly, the Terror started. Only then did the people realize that a revolution had been underway. But by then it was too late to halt—or to reverse.

It sounds complicated. But it moved fast. From the day the Estates General first met in May 1789 until the guillotine began to cut heads off in Paris was only *three years*. Three years. {31} And that was when horses were used to carry messages. The final stages of a revolution run *swiftly*.

By then France was in the hands of men who would stop at nothing. As if to prove this, they took a step never before taken. For there is no greater power than that which declares itself to be able to destroy God. That is the power released by the French Revolution, claimed by that revolution, and praised to this day by the intellectuals of East and West.

The next great revolution, which we need not describe in such

detail, because it is a repeat, was in Russia. As in France, it began with the alienation of the intellectuals. The monarchy, as in France, clung to absolute power until it became politically obsolete. By the late nineteenth century, the Russian aristocrats were liberalized and the clergy was held in contempt. Defeat in war with Japan in 1905 led to governmental retreat, the creation of an elected legislature known as the Duma, and a reduction in the authority of the Czar.

As in the case of France, Russia was not poor. It was an immense empire. It was moving ahead industrially and its agriculture was among the most successful in the world. Revolutions do not stem from poverty. They do not rise from below. They *descend* upon the people.

The Russian revolution, like the French, was a long time coming, but its final stages moved fast. The intellectuals paved the way for at least two generations. They spawned Nihilists and Anarchist movements. Their contempt for the Church and the Crown became notorious. They demanded liberalism and what was called Free Thought.

The Government held firm until defeats in the war against Japan forced concessions. These amounted to all the liberals demanded: open elections, a legislature that could check the Czar, called the Duma, a relaxation of censorship. Then World War I revealed even worse incompetence at the top. The disillusion of the people was deepened by rumors of scandals at Court. Wartime food shortages and tremendous casualties appeared. Finally, in March, 1917, the Czar was persuaded to abdicate.

That left Russia without a chief executive. The grand duke nominated by the Czar to succeed him refused the honor. The monarchists formed a ruling committee and, being good liberals, invited members of the Duma to help form a new Government. These were Social Democrats: men of the Left. The Left then had a slogan which is still heard: "No enemies on the Left." So the Russian Social Democrats pushed the {32} monarchists out of ruling committees Government, and invited all the men of the Left, everywhere, to come and help build a new Russian government. They released all the Leftists from prison and from exile. This call reached Trotsky in New York and Stalin in internal exile and Lenin in Zurich.

These were men who were part of the Socialist International, a movement created in the wake of the French Revolution, that had agitated and plotted inside every western nation for generations. By 1917 they called themselves Marxists, but their theories were the same as those that inspired the French Revolutionaries: rationalizations for power-seeking.

Meanwhile, Russia was at war with Germany, and the Germans had their own ideas about revolution. The German General Staff believed that if it could create revolutions inside Britain, France and Russia, it could win the war. So it financed the Easter Rebellion in Dublin in 1916, to distract and weaken Britain. It subverted members of the French Chamber of Deputies in France, inspired a mutiny inside the French Army and created a “peace” movement inside France that was supported by a number of French newspapers and intellectuals.

Finally, the German General Staff provided Lenin with fifty million gold marks—a sum roughly equivalent to a billion or more dollars today—to help him in promoting revolution inside Russia. It is interesting that the first step Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin made with that money was to buy 47 newspapers. Next they bought guns, and finally they hired an army—easy to do in a period of semi-famine and disorder—and set about taking physical control of the Provisional Government of Kerensky and the Social Democrats.

The lapse of time between the abdication of the Czar and the Bolshevik *coup d'état* was from March to October, 1917. Approximately seven months.

That was a lot faster than the final stage of the French Revolution, but the Russians had the advantage of telephones, automobiles and railroads. What did they do with their power? They followed the pattern of the French Revolution.

The Extraordinary Commission to Combat Counterrevolution, the Cheka, was created in December, 1917, two months after the Bolsheviks (who changed their name to Communists) took power. It had authority to arrest and execute anyone without trial. And it used that power indiscriminately then, as it does today.

Then the Communists of Russia launched their war against God. They declared an atheist State. Then for seventy {33} years they persecuted Christians for being Christian. Churches, monasteries, convents, church lands and schools were nationalized even before

the nationalization of land and farms and factories. Christianity was the first, and remains the primary target of Communism.

Churches were converted into Atheist Museums, with walls festooned with caricatures of priests seducing virgins and unchristian posters. You have all seen various Americans photographed against the onion spires of St. Basil's Cathedral in Moscow, but none of you have ever seen an explanation of the fact that this famous structure is, inside, an Atheist Museum.

After a time the Commissars discovered that the West would not resist such a campaign, if it was provided with an excuse to look away. So the Soviet government appoints men from the KGB to assume the role of priests of the Russian Orthodox Church. These frauds conduct false services for the benefit of tourists and fellow-travelers. Meanwhile the Soviet Government claims that Soviet citizens are free to believe what they choose—and so they are, as long as they keep such beliefs to themselves. But those who attend church are persecuted, lose their jobs, lose their homes, lose what little freedoms are allowed.

For the Soviet constitution is a Devil's Trick, worthy of the Father of Lies. The Soviet State considers God a competitor, and denies anyone the right to believe, to worship, or to obey God. When the first Soviet astronauts went aloft, they radioed back that they saw no angels, and no signs of Heaven. Of course they did not; they carried Hell with them, in their ship.

But for a considerable period, however, the Soviet revolution was restricted to the Ukraine, Mongolia and the core of the old Russian empire. And once again, Time lulled the rest of the world into believing that no great threat existed.

Then, in the early Thirties, a third great secular revolution appeared. It occurred in Germany, and has been subject to retrospective distortions as sinister as those that appeared in the wake of the French and Russian revolutions. As in those great tectonic eruptions, the preparatory stages of the German revolution stretched over a long period of Time.

Bismark introduced Socialism in the 1880s, and Socialist politicians were important in the German Reichstag from that time. By World War I the Socialist Party was large and influential. It could not have triumphed, however, had Germany not lost that war. That led to the abdication of the Kaiser, and German Social

Democrats inherited the new Government. {34}

The German Social Democrats had no love for traditional Germany and its values. They smiled upon revolutionary intellectuals who poured a flood of scalding ridicule and sarcasms upon every traditional value. The theater in Germany in the Twenties became licentious; the world's first international pornographic film industry appeared in Berlin. Literature and art broke with Christian traditions of beauty; architecture grew ugly and inhuman: all previous standards of Christian civilization were subjected to abuse. As in the Enlightenment, these insults to the Christian civilization were hailed as Progress:

Berlin in the Twenties became like Paris in the 1780s and Leningrad in 1910: a theater of vice, of political agitation and underground movements, a cockpit of ambition.

On a national scale there was competition between the ruling Social Democrats and the Communists anxious to replace them. Both were Marxists. So, in all but name, were the Nazis, whose only distinction was that they were not members of the International. These termed themselves *National* Socialists. All three groups loathed Christianity, Judaism and God.

In this final revolutionary stage, as in all secular revolutions, the legislature subverts the office of the chief executive. In France in the 1790s, it was the King, the symbol of all the people. He was first reduced, then put on trial, and finally guillotined. That left the Assembly in power—and the most radical members of that body finally subdued the rest, through a series of trials and executions.

In Russia after the long intellectual rebellion and defeat in war, the Czar Nicholas II abdicated. The legislature then ruled through committees. The most radical members pushed the monarchists and moderates out. Finally the Bolsheviks, who later changed their name to Communists, took over the legislature by force, and have ruled ever since.

In both France and Russia—the highest office was held by men unwilling to fight. King Louis XV never seemed to grasp the seriousness of his position, and was stopped from speaking even on the dais of the guillotine. Czar Nicholas II never understood his danger: not even when the revolutionaries marched him into a cellar with his wife and children to be shot. Germany's road to secular revolution was similar. The interval between the rise of a

radical legislature and the appearance of absolute rule took longer than it did in France or Russia. But the stages are the same. Social Democrats orated while disorders escalated and an increasing number of radicals {35} moved into the Reichstag. The highest office was occupied by Field Marshal von Hindenberg who was senile. At the advice of covert revolutionaries, he appointed Hitler Chancellor. That was the last step freedom took in Germany. *For within one month, Hitler received life and death power over everyone in that nation*, and launched his Terror.

That final stage arrived so swiftly in Germany that it caught even the Communists by surprise. Many of them fled, but many more were caught. I recall that one of the scandals of the postwar period was the revelation that Communists in the concentration camps organized: they were able to commandeer the best posts and obtain the most food, and positions helping the guards, and managed to send other prisoners to their deaths long before the roster reached the Communists:

Little about that particular scandal appears today. Little appears about the Christian victims of Hitler's regime, or about the anti-Christian campaigns of the Nazis. In his last full year, Hitler considered invading the Vatican and taking the Pope prisoner, but nobody has written a play about that.

Yet the central fact about the Nazi Revolution is that it was a *secular revolution*. And secular revolutions are distinguished by their hatred of God, and of all who believe in God. Secular revolutionaries violate all the commandments of God, all the traditions of Christianity, all the rights of all men and all women, and every standard of decency:

Secular revolution, is, by definition, against Christians and Christianity and all that we hold not only dear, but essential to life.

The reason I have gone into such detail about three great secular revolutions is so that everyone here can understand and recognize their stages. They always begin with, and include, an attack against the religion, traditions and history of a culture.

It is now openly admitted that our students are no longer informed about the Christian contributions to this nation, or to western civilization. It is now openly argued that Christianity has no place in education, in public life or in public debate or in politics. Television and the movies, literature and art are now

dominated by anti-Christians.

A senior editor of a national magazine said to me, “I am surprised at how easily the Wasps were pushed off the stage.” And I said, “That’s because they didn’t know there was a war.”

Today we have lived through the long preliminary stage of the revolution. We have lived through years of attacks against our traditions, against our clergy, our military, our history. This {36} onslaught has been accompanied by an increasingly vicious media, a licentious theater, aberrant art and music, inhuman architecture and anti-family legislation. As in France, the Courts have assisted the revolution:

For make no mistake about it: this is a revolution. Just because Dan Rather hasn’t announced it doesn’t mean it isn’t real. The French Revolution was never announced either—until it was too late. The Russian Revolution was assisted by the grand dukes. It was not till later that those who survived realized what they had done. The German Revolution took the form of a perfectly legal appointment, and completely legal legislative motions.

In every one of the revolutions I have cited, the moves against liberty were mounted from inside the legislature, by men officially chosen to govern—after they had first conquered the chief executive. This is a natural sequence. People do not obey orders from the streets: they obey orders from the officers of Government. Men in legislatures are skilled in making their rise to power seem a defense, instead of an attack, upon liberty. Revolutionaries rise to power from inside a Government.

We in the United States are now witnessing a protracted campaign against the powers of the Chief Executive. Not simply President Clinton’s, Bush’s or Reagan’s, or President Hoover’s powers from 1930 to 1932, President Johnson’s power during the Vietnam War, or President Nixon’s powers, President Ford’s powers, but the authority of all Presidents to exercise their Constitutional authority, and our Presidents have responded to such efforts with the weaknesses of Louis XV and Czar Nicholas II and Field Marshall von Hindenberg.

The secular revolution, in other words, has now reached deep into our Congress. Experts tell me there are between twenty and eighty members of our present Congress capable of completely altering the structure of our Government in the hopes of attaining

supreme power. But numbers in this situation mean little. What is significant is the *direction*.

Although the people are increasingly conservative and Christian, the secular revolution keeps gaining. It is gaining in terms of power; in terms of the media, which sets the official agenda of discussion and argument. It is gaining in terms of attacks on our traditions, our manners and mores. We have aborted more children in the last few years than all the population of Canada. What does that mean to our national concept of the sanctity of life? The Supreme Court has ruled that porno movies may be shown on TV across the country, {37} irrespective of the wishes of the people. What does that do to the quality of life?

Christian evangelists are indiscriminately drenched in ridicule, while the greatest series of scandals in the history of New York City are rarely mentioned on TV or in print outside the metropolis. What does that do to our freedom of information?

I could go on, but let it suffice to say that the conditions that prevailed in Paris in 1788, in St. Petersburg in 1917, in Berlin in 1933, are present among us today. Our psychological condition as a nation worries the entire West, but is undiagnosed at home. By every historic precedent, we are on the threshold of the final stage of a secular revolution.

In this extremity, we Christians are faced with the greatest and deepest challenge to Christianity of modern times. For this time the enemy is inside the gates, and his allies are camped throughout vast stretches of the globe.

ENTERING THE TUNNEL

Otto Scott

I recall thinking, when World War II began in Europe, that we were all leaving our familiar world and entering a tunnel, and that when we emerged, the entire landscape of our lives would be different. I have the same sensation today. The landscape of our lives is changing, and will never again be the same.

But before we proceed any farther into the tunnel, let's take a look around. For I also remember that if we had been better informed in 1939, and had understood the policies of our leaders better, we would not have been so surprised by the landscape of 1945.

In 1939 we were told that France had the best army in the world. It had great forts, and more guns, planes and tanks than the Germans. It had generals who had already defeated the Germans in 1918. But we did not understand that pacifism, socialism and liberalism had weakened the French culture. And we did not realize that the French government was more interested in elections than in national survival.

We were told that an embargo against Japan would help the cause of peace. We did not understand that it would deprive Japan of the materials that kept it alive, and when it attacked in reaction, we were surprised. We were told that Russia was a negligible military power. Finally, we were told that Britain's navy ruled the seas.

All these presumed facts faded during the war. Russia became our heroic ally, France was nothing, Britain a poor relation. And we were not fighting simply to defeat Germany and Japan, but for a better world.

That cliché, which has been imbedded in the American mind since Woodrow Wilson has led us into creating an International Welfare State. Very few of us in 1939 expected that our leaders

would insist that the West strip itself of all its global possessions. That insistence, heartily shared by Stalin, meant that Britain and France would cease to be world powers, and that Holland, Italy, Belgium, Portugal and Spain would slip from second to third class rank.

Western Europe, which had led the world since the fifteenth century, was pushed back to its starting place in the 14th, at our insistence. But we remained silent and acquiescent as the Soviet {40} Union moved into the vacuum we helped create. We said to the West, “You don’t need overseas armies, navies and possessions: we will defend you:”

We occupied Japan—and I remember the signs that read “No Nationals Allowed”—and we forced it into an American-style economy with strict limits on its military.

Our expectation was that newly independent countries would turn to us for guidance. They turned, instead, for money from us and guidance from Moscow. For Moscow did not insist that they change their cultures. Moscow said, “You can treat your own people as you choose—so long as you side with us internationally. You can rule with our help, using our guns. If you need help with the guns, we’ll send the specialists.”

That was Satan’s promise: “All this I will give you ... if you worship me.”

With our money, Lord Bauer, the great British economist, says the Third World consists of nations supported by foreign aid. We invented the Third World. There hasn’t been anything since the famous Rat and Cat Farm to equal it.

We lent or gave money overseas on the theory that foreigners needed our money to pay for our goods. Money and goods flowed out for years. The money is still flowing but the goods are reversed. Thanks to our technology, nations send goods to us while we keep sending money to them. That’s called Free Trade.

One result is that our foreign aid bill just about equals our National Deficit.

We are now on the verge of adding all Central Europe and the USSR to this network, as though it has not already bankrupted us. We are a rich family heavily in debt that has to borrow money to fund its charities—to keep up appearances.

Some have objected that Japan buys our bonds, so we are good

investments. They forget that the creditor owns the goods of the debtor. Some now argue we can no longer afford to defend Japan; that it should pay for its own military. But others fear a remilitarized, independent Japan.

It's been argued that a remilitarized Japan might link with a remilitarized, reunited Germany. Therefore sentiment is moving toward what the former USSR recommends: a united but neutralized Germany. That would pull the linchpin out of NATO, but why should that worry us? After all, the Cold War is over.

Why shouldn't NATO collapse? Why not cut back our military and expand our Welfare at home and abroad to include {41} Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, "Jugoslavians," Romanians, Bulgarians and all the Soviet people?

Only the more cautious among our elite say that we shouldn't make this shift overnight; that we should only provide welfare to those nations that "democratize." That is to say, adopt The American Way. After all, doesn't every culture admire our homoerotic art, our pornography, our sadistic movies, our drugs and crime, our calamity-loving press?

When we look at the present landscape before entering the tunnel, it doesn't look like our cheerful commercials: it looks like Drexel before the fall.

But that's only one slice of America. On a higher level we are a great economic and industrial power; still the largest in the world, in consumer terms. The former USSR, we keep telling each other, is short of soap and grain and electricity, and medical syringes and so on.

After all, we have color TV, as Nixon told Khrushchev, we have more computers, a higher technology, lots of soap. One scientist I know keeps telling about our superiority in Space; how we got to the Moon and the Russians didn't. I hate to tell him their satellites are armed.

David G. Wigg says that we are operating the largest and most expensive Research & Development Lab in the world, while the Soviets put the results into production. Les Aspin wants to stop production of the B2, but keep researching. Same with the SDI. In recent years the Russians have obtained key elements of the radar system of the B1, Hawk and Phoenix missiles—all developed by us at a cost of \$100 billion. Soviets are clustered at Los Alamos,

digging for information about nuclear weapons.

Who is David G. Wigg? Only a former high official and now consultant to the Defense Department; one of the many experts you never see on TV.

Another expert, General Daniel Graham, has said, “The Soviets can destroy us in 30 minutes.” How does he know? He was formerly head of all our military intelligence. He doesn’t appear on TV very often, because he’s pushing for SDI. Absurd, of course. Who needs it? Our biggest problem is cigarette smoking. The old Latin saw has been modernized to read: “A sick mind in a sound body.”

At this moment the former Soviet Navy is roughly four times the size of the American navy, and it is supreme in all waters. Yet the former USSR continues to produce a nuclear submarine every seven weeks. {42}

Why are they producing more nuclear subs when they already have more than everyone else? Ask Gorbachev. He presided over a 25 percent increase in the Soviet military when he became master of the USSR. That doesn’t sound as if he’s persuaded his comrades to abandon the Soviet world position. But we don’t hear any analysis of Gorbachev’s inner circle, mostly still in place, or *anything* about Russian goals.

Nor do we hear discussion of our military decline through the years. In the MacNamara days we were told that it was essential to permit the Soviets to attain military parity to assuage their fear of us. After they achieved parity, however, the Soviets kept expanding their military and we kept proportionately reducing ours—and no further explanations have been provided.

Meanwhile we keep talking about how pragmatic we are. No wonder John Lofton says, “American pragmatism doesn’t work.”

Instead of “democratizing” the world, we should begin to look at our own situation; at our landscape in the 1990s.

We have intellectual termites in our universities, and a governing class that seems indifferent to results and attentive only to elections, appointments—and the media.

We are burdened by a Congress that now enacts only legislative goals, leaving the details to be filled in by Agencies whose functions are to relieve Congressmen of responsibility while leaving them free to bring influence to bear behind the scenes. These Congressionally-created agencies: The SEC, the FCC, the

FDA, the ICC and so on, create “regulations” and “rulings” that have the force of law, but are created anonymously beyond the sight and reach of the people. Such regulations now control us from the cradle to the grave, while our elected leaders continue to talk about freedoms that no longer exist.

Anyone seeking to break a strand of this legal cobweb must address appeals to the Agency that created it, and carry that appeal through its internal corridors before appealing to the Federal Courts. But Congress has ruled that the Supreme Court may select the appeals it hears.

Judges are, after all, citizens. The bureaucracy today can bring down Judges, Cabinet officers, Congressmen—and even Presidents.

Nor is this power restricted to Congressional agencies. Branches of the Executive have awesome authority. Assets can be seized in advance of a charge, and kept even if no charge is proven. The Rico Act can be applied if mails or telephones are {43} used. Try getting out of that. Persons have been arrested for carrying large sums of money; the money was confiscated, and though they were found innocent of any crime and proved the money was honestly obtained—it was not returned. Tell that to a Constitutional lawyer and see what he can do about it. These are American realities, which are light-years away from American rhetoric.

Valdimir Bukofsky, explaining the Soviet society to people who really don't want to know, said that destroying the framework of Socialism will be no easy task. “Unlike an autocracy,” he said, “where the ruling elite tainted by the regime's crimes is tiny, a totalitarian regime creates a whole class of rulers, 18 million of them in the Soviet Union, who are incapable of any other social function. They are a state within a state, an occupying army that cannot be finished off by a coup and cannot be forced to withdraw as they have no place to withdraw to.”

We have the same internal force, and it has destroyed individual privacy. Computers and master tapes and instant and total access to all records and transactions comprise the instruments by which we are monitored, categorized, licensed, instructed, limited, and supervised. Such controls are increasing by the hour, let alone the day, week and month. The liberal idea of chaos is an unregulated activity. Very few remain; soon there will be none:

Meanwhile we have sex. We have groups once hidden from public view who now parade in the streets, invade churches, scream at the people. These provide the illusion of freedom, but amount to diversions from more serious situations. On a troopship in the Pacific in May, 1944, I was intrigued by loudspeaker announcements ordering men to report to the Sergeant Major's Office "on the double," and decided to investigate. I found some soldiers typing, others mimeographing, others stapling and stacking pornographic booklets for distribution among the troops. I later asked an intelligence officer why, and he said, "To take their minds off their destination"—which was the invasion of Supine.

We are today being diverted from national goals. Not because I think there are secret goals, but because I think we have no goals. We live as a nation from election to election, with neither the will nor the talent to conceive of any but the most vague and amorphous goals, subject to change whenever Russia lurches.

Watchman, what of the night? In Southern Africa a {44} series of battles is underway in Angola. The Communist Government of that land, funded by Chevron and a French petroleum Company, armed by the USSR, using planes, tanks and chemical bombs and Cuban troops, is attacking a native army called Unita under Zavimbi.

You will recall that in December, 1988, our State Department gleefully presided over a Treaty signed at Brazzaville. South Africa agreed to leave Angola and to stop helping Zavimbi. The Cubans agreed to leave later. Peace was declared. The *N. Y. Times* and *The Washington Post*, ex-officio State Departments in our Shadow Government, broke out in cheers.

To make sure nobody would say we had brokered a sellout, Congress voted to continue military aid to Zavimbi. Unfortunately none of it was delivered until a week or so ago. That meant that Unita's supplies were depleted when the new assault was mounted. It is now continuing.

Meanwhile South Africa not only left Angola: it also left Namibia. It has also reduced its air force, army and Navy. Its own State President deKlerk released Nelson Mandela, legalized the Communist Party, the African National Congress, the United Democratic Front and 48 other once-forbidden groups.

What's happening? I've been told that South Africa has made a

deal with the Marxists. A new minerals cartel will be formed, along the lines of the diamond cartel. I'm sure you know, by the way, that the diamond cartel is officially exempt from the sanctions we apply against South Africa. In the name, of course, of the human rights of diamond dealers in Amsterdam, New York and other parts.

The South Africa-Soviet deal is predicated, I am told, on a promise that the present government will retain power. The minerals cartel will enable South Africa and Russia to dominate the world market for gold, manganese, chrome, the platinum metals and vanadium.

All these are essential to the Industrial Revolution that is now transforming the world. Neither Japan nor the United States nor anyone else can, without these minerals, build a car, a tank, an airplane or a computer. Their possession would give Russia a crucial position in the industrial world. I mentioned this to a professor and he shrugged. "What difference does it make?" He asked, "Whoever has them will want to sell them."

Meanwhile our dependence on foreign crude oil steadily increases. Petroleum marketers expect the crude price to increase by at least 50 percent in the next few years. Our {45} economy, therefore, is in for some shocks.

These will not all be market shocks. As in the case of Southern Africa, the situation in the Middle East is increasingly dark. Our liberal leaders are pressing Israel toward concessions at a time when Israel's adversaries are becoming increasingly militarized. The oil producing States no longer look to Washington for military supplies, but to France, Britain, India and Red China. We have thereby lost billions in trade and an equally serious amount of influence.

Adding all these factors together, we see that our domestic and international policies are at odds with the economic and strategic realities of our situation. We are playing Santa Claus with borrowed toys. We talk about democratizing the world while loading regulations onto ourselves. We talk about high technology while enacting environmental regulations that will lead to the worst industrial cutback in production since the Great Depression. We have lost control of the seas while becoming dependent upon foreign raw materials for our industrial and military existence.

We talk peace while the world arms for war, and Russia is

actually directing armies in the field. Dr. Tambs can tell you what the Soviets unleashed in Bolivia, Peru and Colombia. The South Koreans have just discovered another giant underground tunnel created by North Korea for a future invasion. There are Soviet arms and officers in Ethiopia, Syria, Iraq and Libya, in Cuba and Cambodia and Vietnam among other places.

All this, while we are being urged to restore the economies of the Eastern European nations that the Kremlin has reduced to beggary. That is our landscape today. Will we collapse first? I don't know. I've recently been told that South Africa is on the verge of civil war. The Afrikaners are preparing to fight. If they do, they may walk into a trap. The South African army is heavily black, and may slaughter many. A weakened white minority may then be confronted by a black uprising. The Zulus might go for the Xhosa and a Lebanese situation may result. That would be worse than even a cartelized South Africa, for it would destroy the industrial infrastructure, remove South African minerals from world markets altogether, and leave us completely at the famous mercies of the Kremlin for these indispensable commodities.

On the other hand, it is possible that the Kremlin has released a genie from the Communist bottle that it may not be able to control. It may crush, as Bukofsky says it will as soon as the snow melts, in the name of ending "disorder." But it will {46} continue to confront disorders for some time to come. If it goes too far, American welfare payments may even be suspended—for a time.

Fortunately, God does not allow us to see the future. That is one of His mercies, for otherwise we could foresee the nature and time of our own deaths, and that would destroy our joy in life.

But from a contemporary assessment, it is now possible to say that the United States, in decline since its brief supremacy at the end of World War II, has wasted its substance and is no longer a superpower. That does not mean we will all become impoverished: fortunes are made in all countries at all times. Lives are lived, happy and unhappy, everywhere.

Our decline does not mean that Japan or the USSR will rise to dominate the world. Japan lacks essential resources and will discover—as we have discovered—that money alone is not power. The Soviet Union has also depleted its resources to build a military Goliath that it may, in the end, be unable to use because of the

weakness of its infrastructure and the unrest of its minorities.

The other end of the tunnel, in other words, may open upon a landscape where no single power will be dominant for some time to come. Where all nations will be only regional powers.

That is a world where everyone's life would be easier. It could be a world where the United States would end its ridiculous effort to become the Universal Savior. Where all foreign aid would be ended, and our government would turn its attention to our own poor, our own needy, our own marketplace. A United States that would stop trying to use an elastic unit of currency and instead create a gold-backed dollar for use at home and abroad:

A United States where Congress would be returned to its original proportions and duties, and become, once again, the only federal body authorized to enact laws for the nation. That alone would break the choke-hold of our bureaucracy:

A United States that would stop using psychiatry as a foreign policy guide and start making our own cities safe for the people. A nation where the Courts would honor the laws of libel and slander, and the media would be held accountable for the libels and slanders it spreads:

The future, therefore, need not be dark. The other end of the tunnel we are entering may carry us to a better landscape than the one we know. But such a landscape cannot be shaped {47} without our participation. We cannot achieve a better future without admitting the errors of the past—and the present.

Our leaders have been profligate with the hard-won earnings of the American people. We are no longer masters of the globe (if we ever were). We should stop listening to leaders whose policies have failed, and choose new leaders; men with new visions. If we can find and support such newcomers, we can set our house in order. If we do not, the future will not be better, but worse for us all.

IN DEFENSE OF THE WEST

Otto Scott

Octavio Paz, the Mexican Nobel Laureate, said in his speech to the Nobel Prize Committee at Copenhagen, “I am not Spanish, but I write in the Spanish language, and I was raised in the culture of Spain.” He then went on to mention his Indian ancestry, which, as he said, predated the arrival of the Spaniards in Central America. He called this “an ancient heritage” which had blended with the modern in his intellectual life. To take away either of these would, he said, *diminish* him culturally and intellectually.

James W. Tuttle, writing in *The New Criterion*,¹ a publication devoted to the arts, mentioned that he is descended in part on his mother’s side “from the Cherokee Nation in the Carolinas. I find the new attention to the Indian tribes fascinating,” he said. “Certainly in our family, in my childhood,” he continued, “our parents instilled in us great pride in our Cherokee ancestors, whose lives seemed much more adventurous, tragic and romantic to us, as children, than those of our other forbears—the English, Scots-Irish and German ancestors who filled out our typically American inheritance.”

The occasion for Octavio Paz to speak about his background was the Nobel Prize; the occasion for James Tuttleton to speak about *his* background was because, in the course of a lottery review comparing historians Sidney Schama of Harvard and Francis Parkman of the nineteenth century he found it necessary to describe the terrible circumstances of North American Indian life as accurately portrayed by Parkman and fuzzed into incoherence by Schama. To avert charges of racism Tuttleton had to remind his readers that he himself has Indian blood.

The fact is that he is unusual in knowing it. Many millions of

1. Sidney Schama, *Francis Parkman, and the Writing of History*, September 1991, vol. 10, no. 1.

Americans do not know who their ancestors were beyond two generations. They are not aware of the fact that people in this hemisphere have intermarried to a far greater extent, and far longer, than is generally admitted. Europe, of course, has long experienced similar intermarriage. That is why Spengler said that if Europeans could all trace their ancestry back to the year 1000, {50} they would find that they are all related. That includes persons of color whose ancestry includes Caucasians.

I mention this because we are living at a time of tremendous population movements on a scale the world has not seen since the breakup of the Roman Empire 1800 years ago. It is affecting the United States, where we have, in the last decade alone, experienced the greatest influx of people in our entire history, and it is affecting Europe, which is also experiencing a giant surge of new people.

In 1960, for instance, Europe held 25 percent of the world's population. It now holds 15 percent. Early in the next century it will hold 5 percent. That's because the birthrate of the European people is steadily dropping, excepting along the Mediterranean. That belt, from Spain to Greece, is up 12 percent.

Other areas, however, show a different result. In Turkey and Morocco, populations are up 145 percent. Algeria, which had 10 million people when it was under French control, now has 30 million.²

When we contrast falling birthrates with an unprecedented influx of foreigners, we are really talking about great changes in every nation in the West. In Germany, for instance, the births have fallen below the replacement level, and the Germans are confronted with a huge influx of Poles at present, Russians in the near future, and the continued presence of Turks. France, the largest land mass in continental Europe, has had a falling birthrate since Napoleon's bloodlettings, and is now receiving an unprecedented influx from Algeria and black Africa. There are over 2 million black Africans in Italy, as well as a great rush from slim Albania.

Despite the fact that it operates around the clock, our media still seems unable to inform most Americans that we have well over 1 million abortions a year, and 90 percent of our legal immigration

2. *The European Journal of International Affairs*, Rome, Italy, ed. Guiseppe Sacco, *cif* 'Does the West Still Exist?' (New York: Orwell Press, n.d.).

quota of 675,000 a year comes from Asia and third world countries. Our illegals are estimated to be even higher. So we abort a million traditional citizens and all their possible descendants while receiving over 2 million Asian and third world immigrants every year. This amounts to a population exchange, in which the future of the present American majority is being aborted in favor of a new kind of American majority. {51}

All of this means that tremendous cultural changes can be expected in the future in this western civilization. The only precedent we have is in the instance of Rome. Its expansion meant both an ingathering of many diverse peoples initially in the form of slaves and later of citizens, and also the phenomenon, for the first time in history, of immense illegal immigrations into Roman territories.

It is very interesting to read the Roman literature of the first three centuries after the end of the Republic and the installation of the monarchy. Almost all of it dwells on the days when Rome was a republic; when it had heroes, when the Romans were still rulers in their own land.³ But the same first three centuries were the times when Rome lost its glory, when it actually allowed territories to break away—and when the Romans so declined in terms of births and illnesses that they can actually be said to have become extinct.

Their language remained, and so did their architecture. Their games remained, though they became progressively more bloody and sadistic. Their form of government remained, such as the Senate and the Tribunes, the Vestal Virgins and so on, but their essence was leached. The Empire ceased to be the unifying concept and Rome became an arena where everyone scrambled for whatever he could get, no matter what the cost. Once the leaders lost the idea that the Empire was a greater good than their individual situations, Rome was lost.

It was replaced, as we all know, by the idea of Christianity, which became the seedbed not simply of renewed efforts, but of renewed hope. The idea that life is worth its struggle, that there are higher values than the immediate; that there are greater goals—and that all men, not simply some, have inherent rights and values,

3. Jacob Burckhardt, *The Age of Constantine the Great* (University of California Press, 1949), 218–220.

energized a new civilization.

Winston Churchill was the last world statesmen of our time to describe that civilization as *Christendom*. The term has since been changed to The West.

People today seem to forget that the West started out not only poor, but in worse shape than even the Third World countries of today. There were no rich countries around to provide investment capital, or machinery, or technical assistance: everything had to be built from ruins. When I say ruins, I mean it. Roman Britain in the 4th century, for instance, had nice homes {52} and stable conditions; in the fifth century all that was swept away and life was short, brutal and harsh.

There was no greater power anywhere in the West, by that time, to turn to for help. The people of Europe had to contend with the forests and wild beasts and savage tribes. The Saxons and the Gauls and the Teutons, the Goths and the Visigoths and the Norse and others. Some practiced human sacrifice up to the year 1000 AD. During that period the main occupation was agriculture, which was improved virtually inch by inch. During that period the cathedrals were built, and cities grew around them; the seedbeds of rights we take for granted today were created: the vote, the specialization of skills, the basic organizations of society.

This was not accomplished in a vacuum. The Mongols appeared and were finally repelled; the Turks appeared and captured Constantinople; the Moors appeared and conquered much of Spain and almost France.

By the 13th century Europe had cities and skills that rivaled any other civilization, and it began its international trading and exploration. It is now fashionable to say that this was all for purposes of exploitation, as though trade is some sort of injury. The explorations were, it has been said, responsible for our Euro-centered view of the world. But other civilizations had ships and traders: the Muslims knew how to sail and trade; so did the Chinese and all the peoples of Asia.

The fact is that these distant regions were *not interested in* the rest of the world. They did not send out travelers; they did not write about other peoples; they were smug with their own. And, to be fair about it, they had not acquired their wealth or their cities, their goods or their skills through outside help either. They had

struggled through the centuries to take care of themselves.

It was the West that took the risk of travel and exploration and of meeting new and hostile groups. This gave rise to trade, but it also gave way to wars. Miniwars, really, in single isolated places at first, and larger territories later. These have been discussed in hindsight as international crimes—as though Rome grew by commerce alone, or the inscriptions of Egypt showing captives chained behind the Pharaoh's chariot are simply imaginings: as though China was not an empire welded by force before Rome was a city.

Wars have been one of the avenues of advancement since Man appeared on earth. But the western way of war was different from its predecessors. The West brought the fruits of {53} its own efforts to other people. It did not, like China, keep the secret of silk under pain of death, to prevent foreigners from learning it. It did not, it is true, keep the secret of gunpowder to firecrackers, but it used the secret of paper to spread knowledge everywhere, and not simply to its own learned classes.

The West, based on a religion that accepted all people everywhere and not simply on the basis of tribal birth, was based on the idea of individual instead of group effort; individual instead of group results, individual instead of Governmental efforts. This meant that the early explorers represented individual and not governmental enterprises.

All this culminated in Spanish, Portuguese and later English, French and Dutch explorations in the New World. Its attraction seemed stupendous beyond all dreams. A new world, with strange beasts and fauna, strange peoples. It was an escape from an already ancient Europe: a place to start over. Over the next few centuries it has been estimated that 65 million came here from Europe alone.⁴ “A very impersonal figure,” said Paul A. Lames, “...but it is necessary to understand that this stands for an individual 65 million times ... an individual who contributes his arm, his brain, his knowledge and his traditions, his energy and his emotions, his body and soul, in order to be successful in a common experience that has no precedents in the history of mankind. The Free World

4. German Arciniegas, *America in Europe* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich), 3.

was born this way, from 65 million small creatures during three centuries.”

The impact of all this upon the rest of the world cannot be measured or described. Encyclopedias of medicines and plants, animals birds and reptiles: sugar and potatoes, corn curare and rubber, oil and electricity—all the products of the Americas are now taken by the world for granted, as parts of a common heritage.

The West receives no credit for this. What the West risked and struggled to find and fashion is treated as though it occurred automatically. This is not only foolish, it is dangerous. To lose sight of the past is to be bewildered by the present, and the past of the Americas is more than the sum of its peoples.

It was the European fascination with the Americas that revived the ancient dreams of empire, lost since the days of Rome. First Spain, then Portugal, then Holland, England, France and finally Germany all succumbed to that attraction. We have been accused of taking the same course in our Spanish-American {54} War which ended in our possession of Cuba and the Philippines. But in reality we fought that to keep Europe—and especially Germany—out of the Caribbean, and the fact that both countries were released is proof of that:

The reason we did not seek a European-style colonial empire is usually explained as being due to our own former colonial status. We wanted to be free, and therefore approved of other people being free.

That’s a pleasant explanation. It makes us feel good about ourselves, and has some elements of the truth. But the reasons in reality, as usual, are more complicated and rooted in English history.

This is important to us, because just as Octavio Paz of Mexico is rooted in Spanish history, we are products of the English. We use the English language, which we inherited and did not invent; our literature and law, our forms of government and our measurements, our culture is basically English. That is not to say that there have not been later additions and improvements, introductions and modifications, but the overall structure remains as it was for the mainly British men whom we today call the Founding Fathers.

To understand our attitudes toward imperialism and government, therefore, we must look at England when Charles I

refused to honor its rights and tried to rule as an absolute monarch over both church and state. Both efforts created anger, but the religious one dominated. For despite Marx, money is not the most important measure of life for most people: it is an essential, but not the only one.

Europe at the time had Louis XIV, an absolute monarch—and there were others. If it had not been for England then, such tyrannies might still be with us.

To summarize, the English rose against Charles I in a bloody civil war, the largest and the worst in all English history, and it swayed this way and that for years. In the end—well, the first end, for it had several—Cromwell emerged on top with his New Model Army.

At one point in the conflict, however, Cromwell sat down with his generals and some private soldiers who were elected by their companies and called agitators, to discuss what to do in the long run. Where were they heading? Can you imagine? Forty men sat in an old church, and discussed the future of England while they held the king in captivity.

Only Cromwell and his Calvinists would have sat down with common soldiers and a sprinkling of officers to do this. That {55} was a breakthrough, for before then—before October 28, 1647—soldiers did what they were told and kept quiet. But in that unprecedented period, the common people of England were called from the shadows to take part in great affairs as thinking individuals.

We haven't time to quote the speakers, but you would recognize their arguments. It was, mind you, a time when religion and politics were the same. Modern historians, who hate the mention of religion, call it today a "civil war." It was the real thing. It divided families and regions, and armies fought all over England and even into Scotland and, later Ireland.

As I said, the question then arose of what to do next? The people still expected to have a king, because that was traditional. What kind of king? What kind of church?⁵

5. According to Paul Johnson, the English historian from whom this account is truncated, the church today is overshadowed by a huge office building and across the way there's a bar that advertises 'drag' shows.

I'm fairly sure that not even most history majors have ever heard of this meeting: it's not often mentioned. The records of the discussion, taken down in shorthand by a man unused to this, are incomplete. The record was buried, unread, in the archives of Worcester College, Oxford, for more than 25 years until they were discovered, examined and published in 1891.⁶

But the ideas these men discussed covered every major political concept known today. I haven't time to describe this in detail. You'll find an excellent description in Paul Johnson's *A History of the English People*.

"All the revolutionaries in America, in France and in Tsarist Russia, " says Johnson, "were to inherit a distinguished revolutionary corpus of theory and experience ultimately derived from the English. The English themselves had nothing even remotely relevant..." but the Civil War brought, for the first time, the people of England "who were called upon...to serve not only with their bodies, but with their mental and spiritual energies not as cannon fodder, but as sentient and thinking individuals."⁷

They spoke about votes and private property rights, the limits of government and the rights of individuals, the structure of Parliament and the role of the church, the prerogatives of class {56} and the role of the army: every area that involved the larger English society and the smallest citizen.

The French Revolution, remember, was over a century in the future; the Russian revolution even farther off. Scholars bound by libraries may wonder how these ideas floated from England to other lands, but there is really no wonder involved. Word of mouth is the fastest method of communication known: words and ideas float through space. The men at Putney represented every opinion we have known since, and each represented a body of such thought. They did not, as we know, succeed in all they hoped, but they did bind down—for all time—the monarchs of Britain:

After they left that church they later cut off the head of Charles I. And in the end, they released the idea of revolution to the modern world.

6. C.H. Firth, editor, *The Clarke Papers* (The Campden Society), vol. 1.

7. Paul Johnson, *A History of the English People* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985), 199.

Whoever, therefore, wants to understand the original Constitution of the United States and to understand the founding of this nation, must understand the English civil war, its principles—and its outcome. For in the end, of course, it was undone. Not completely, but in good measure. They were too far ahead of their time. The English people wanted a King, and after Cromwell died they got one back—a bad one. One who persecuted all the Calvinists and that is why men fled here with their families. And that is why American colonials died to get rid of London and all it did.

It was the English civil war, in other words, that set the pattern for our war against George III—and the French Revolution, which cut off the head of Louis XVI.

What does this mean? Why bring it up now? Because the West cannot be understood in terms only of its goods and its wealth, but must be assessed and, if need be, defended, in terms of its ideas.

It was the West, in Britain, France, the United States and other nations that educated the world in the meaning of human rights. It was the West that said that all children have a right to be educated and to have a decent chance in the world. It was the West that stopped the Orientals from burning or drowning Oriental women as part of the funerals of their husbands.

It was the Christian West that ended the practice of human sacrifice in ancient Rome and Greece, which was conducted by every Emperor up to Constantine.⁸ It ended such sacrifices among the savage tribes of Europe first, then in the Yucatan and Mexico, and finally everywhere.

It was the West that introduced the first global civilization to the world, and spread its ideas and its products, its methods and its inventions, its money and power and also its assistance, to every part of the globe.

One result has been the increase in population which attends all spread of prosperity among people. Advances in western medicine and living standards are primarily responsible for the living presence of tens of millions around the world.

But events since World War II indicate that this new global

8. "Human Sacrifice," *Selected Writing of Lord Acton, Essays in Religion, Politics and Morality*, vol. 3 (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Classics, 1988), vol. 3, 395–442.

community has not yet understood the world in which it finds itself. I now believe that decolonization may have been forced at too great a price. The World War II generation not only engaged in a conflict that cost 35 million lives, but it plunged into a decolonization effort that may have cost even more.

I know it sounded wonderful. The UN would keep the peace and the West would provide technology, money and advice to all the new nations. Their leaders were, it was agreed, as intelligent as any others: all they needed was machinery and money. The Soviets, however, thought that all they needed was guns. The new rulers, all too often, agreed. The first presidents of Kenya, Tanzania, Zaire, Nigeria, Senegal and the Ivory Coast were all western educated journalists. They were also all Africans, and had many admirers, who considered them representatives of a suffering race.

Unfortunately, they added many more victims to the long list of African suffering. The results of their efforts have left 14 million homeless that once enjoyed homes under colonialism; 14 million wandering and hungry, more millions dead of diseases, as the hospitals closed and the factories fell silent and the villages turned to dust.

They inherited cities like Lagos, like Salisbury of Rhodesia, like Johannesburg (which they may soon inherit), and reduced them all to urban slums.

Why? Not because they are inferior, because they are not, but because they do not understand technology, which is a process and not a product. It was mainly created in Europe and then in the United States and a few other countries by what Andrew Kenny calls “a slow and steady accumulation of human effort and ingenuity.”⁹ {58}

Kenny said he once made a small model of a steam engine. And he used to think that if he had a Time Machine, he could have created the Industrial Revolution 2,000 years earlier by bringing that to Archimedes. But, he said, he knows better now because, he says, “the progress of engineering depends on much more than brilliant ideas. Behind the factories and machines of the West lies an invisible and immense accumulation of effort through the

9. Andrew Kenny, “Why Africa Can’t Run a Railway,” *The Spectator*, London, February 9, 1991, 14–17.

centuries.”

In other words, there are no quick fixes. Decolonization in Africa was a quick fix, and it does not work. Attention is now fixed upon South Africa, which has only 10 percent of the black people of Africa. If that 10 percent takes control, Kenny believes the South African railway, which now carries food and supplies to South Africa's neighbors, will in a short time collapse. “It will join the collapsing roads, railways and electricity grids in the rest of black Africa.... Food will rot for lack of transportation, the failure of pumped water and sewage systems will spread disease...people without electricity will chop down trees for firewood, hastening the destruction of the African ecology.” The fall of South Africa, in other words, will loosen all Southern Africa:

But black Africa is not unique. I know you're all familiar with the Cargo Cult of years ago in New Guinea. The natives saw planes arriving with goods and supplies for the Western armies there during World War II. They thought a supernatural force was at work; gods, or ghosts of ancestors, operating some celestial factory.

They reasoned that their own ancestors could do the same, and they built runways for them. One tribe even built an imitation plane out of leaves and branches in the hope that it would attract a real plane to come and mate with it, and produce goods.

It sounds funny, but it actually comes close to the attitudes of millions of non-western people around the world. V.S. Naipaul, touring India, Malaysia, Indonesia and Iran observed that these nations use the technologies developed in the West: computers and radios and jet planes and TV, but they do not seem to credit the West with producing these marvels.

They give no credit to the West for its technology: they seem to think it came from the sky. They denigrate the culture they rely upon, as a matter not of pride, but of conceit. They do not, of course, believe in the Cargo Cult, but they continue in the illusion that technology is a mental situation; a matter of ideas. That is not so. Technology consists of systems and {59} processes developed inch by inch and maintained by teams of specialists.

“It takes an expert who has studied for years to understand even one section of our technology and very few can grasp more than a small part of the whole. Yet in a democracy people are compelled to form opinions and make decisions about technology that are

far outside their intellectual and emotional acquaintance...: People who barely remember their high school physics are required to take sides in a nuclear power debate. The fragmentation of modern society, and the reduction of the number of shared experiences, means that the only way to form opinions on most subjects is on the basis of secondhand experience.”¹⁰

Until relatively recently most people in the West have relied upon one another, have accepted the opinions of our experts on what is feasible and what is not, and as a result moved so far beyond other civilizations on this planet as to make the difference seem almost unnatural.

Of course, we are crammed with experts on some sector or another. We rely on special publications in business, the marketplace or whatever. For the rest we used to rely on the general media to keep us abreast of developments. The media simplifies and summarizes developments for us. In this fashion it makes many complex matters seem deceptively simple. Unfortunately, the media itself seldom understands the complexities it summarizes, and this gives rise to an infinite number of misunderstandings.

This also gives rise to the idea that the world is relatively simple. That’s why so many despair when they hear a real expert. He goes on and on, and we give up. It sometimes takes an expert to understand an expert.

Therefore we see the rise of fringe groups who believe that the world can function without the West. We have the amazing spectacle of Jesse Jackson, who twice proposed himself for the Presidency of the United States, leading demonstrators at Stanford who chanted, “Hey Hey, Ho Ho, Western culture’s got to go!”

What do you suppose would happen? I’ll tell you: the entire world would slip back to the desperate, hungry and disease-ridden world of our remote ancestors. The West today literally supports the world—including Japan. The West, and {60} especially the United States, created modern Japan. Its Constitution, its factories, its systems, its inventions and skill come mainly from the West—and its markets are in the West.

But we know, of course, what sort of campaign Jesse Jackson

10. Witold Rybezynski, *Taming the Tiger: The Struggle to Control Technology*, (Penguin Books, 1982), 77.

was really leading at Stanford: an anti-white campaign.

Nothing could be more foolish. For the white man's world is no longer white and never was in this hemisphere. The West today contains every race; every ethnic group. Anyone who doubts that has only to walk outside his home and look around.

To argue on the basis of one color against another is to spread the seeds of subversion in the greatest and most ambitious effort to lift all mankind that the world has ever seen. The Jesse Jacksons do not help Africa when they talk about it being a black continent, for it is not. The Arabs and the Afrikaners and the whites have as much right in Africa as they have here—and they have every right to be here.

It is time, therefore, that those of us who are proud of our heritage steep ourselves in the triumphs and hardwon victories of our common ancestors, so that we can proudly defend our heritage whenever and wherever it is under attack by those who know no better.

THE DECLINE OF THE WEST

Rousas John Rushdoony

Most people of our time are existentialists, even though they may never have heard of that philosophy, nor of existentialist thinkers from Kierkegaard through Camus and Sartre. The old observation is accurate, that armies march because of the ideas and philosophies of men unknown to them. Most people do not know what the presuppositions of the modern world have been and are, nor what the world's direction is, nor why it is near death culturally.

As Henry Van Til noted, culture is religion externalized. As that culture develops, the old order often continues in the new, rebaptized into respectability by inclusion. Rene Descartes, the father of the modern age, shifted the intellectual world from the triune God to the supposedly autonomous mind of man. At times, when I have made critical references to Descartes, I have received indignant letters assuring me that Descartes was a devout Catholic. A few years ago, a "model Sunday School youth" committed a horrible crime; was he a good Christian? Descartes effectively discarded the Christian world and life view; did his formal Catholicism, a wise and pragmatic stance in his day, prevent him from being a revolutionary thinker?

The new age, which had long been in process of formation, came into its own in Cartesian thinking. It was a world in which the ostensibly autonomous mind of man was the ultimate judge. The medieval criterion had commonly been, "What say the Fathers of the Church?" or "What says the Holy Father?" For the Reformation, it was, "What say the Scriptures?" The modern world, being Cartesian, responds with, "Well, I think," or, "In my opinion," or, "As far as I am concerned," and other like egocentric statements, especially since the Romantic era of the modern age, "I feel" has been determinative for many. As one person once stated

to me, “I feel....”

No man has written more devastatingly of the fallacies basic to the emphasis on man’s supposedly autonomous reason than Cornelius Van Til. Modern man begins by insisting on the necessity for rationalism in all discourse but ends in irrationalism because man’s autonomous reason ends up with nothing except itself. All else is finally swept away: man’s reason is a very jealous and exclusive god! Seriousness about things other than one’s {62} personal concerns begins to wane as the egocentricity of the modern age develops in the West. For example, Andrew Ferguson, writing in the conservative *National Review*, October 21, 1991, reported on buying two new “rock music” albums which sold five hundred thousand units the first day and continued to sell heavily. The “musicians” of *Guns’ n’ Roses* have “a file of...press clips” that “reads like a police blotter—one member was recently arrested for allegedly dropping a wine bottle on a neighbor’s head, another for urinating in the galley of an airliner.” These activities and more are described by Ferguson as “a way of life.” His only real conclusion is that he regretted the \$13.99 the albums cost him!¹

The English weekly, *The Spectator*, in a report on “Entertainment,” wrote of a French circus. “Mitterrand’s government sees it as one of the country’s most successful exports, plying it with enormous grants to travel overseas. Within four years, Archaos has become the biggest circus in Europe, is negotiating a film deal and has been asked to organize the opening ceremony for next year’s Winter Olympics.” It is a sadistic masochistic exhibition. As Joanna Coles describes some of it,

A man chainsaws a woman’s head off, then presses her twitching face against his groin and writhes in pleasure. Another man, who has been digging a grave, suddenly lies down in it; a youth shovels soil on top of him. A woman bends down to pick flowers and is raped from behind. The audiences, aged from five to 85, snigger.²

At the bottom levels of societies, it is not uncommon to find depravities, perversions, a contempt for law and order, hostilities

1. Andrew Ferguson, “Mossback Meets Guns’ n’ Roses,” in *National Review*, October 21, 1991, vol. XLIII, no. 19, 56.

2. Joanna Coles, “Big Top Perversion,” in *The Spectator*, October 5, 1991, vol. 167, no. 8517.

to church, state, school, family, industry, and more. The resentment harbored by the failures in a society is as old as history. As long as those above their level retain a living faith, they can effectually govern the lawless and disorderly element. Such failed persons can be the objects of charity, but their opinions are usually in history of no consequence, and their lawlessness is generally controlled.

What has happened to the West is that, as Christendom {63} receded, and as the church became marginal in its relevance, and as modern philosophy undermined values and faith, the lowest elements' thinking became that of the overlords. Underground man became the social model for many. The "hippy" and related movements saw the children and youth from the "best" families model themselves after the dregs of society in speech, dress, and behavior.

And why not, given the processes of modern philosophy and education? David Hume reduced all knowledge to the level implied by Descartes' "I think, therefore I am." Now, for Hume, there was only the lonely ego; the external world ceased to be real, and for Hume, God was non-existent. The "answer" of Immanuel Kant was to reduce the world to an aspect of the human consciousness:

Hitherto it has been assumed that all our knowledge must conform to objects. But all attempts to extend our knowledge of objects by establishing something in regard to them *a priori*, by means of concepts, have, on this assumption, ended in failure. We must therefore make trial whether we may not have more success in the tasks of metaphysics, if we suppose that objects must conform to our knowledge.³

In other words, the "real" world is not God's creation but the creation of a philosopher's mind. Hegel saw the implication of this: it meant that *the rational is the real*. The problem with this is that, having "abolished" God and His world, who had the right to define either the rational or the real? Why should the conclusion of a philosopher be more valid than that of one who is called a madman? On what grounds could one say that Hitler and Stalin were evil, and Churchill and Roosevelt were good, if indeed we could apply moral standards to any of them? How then can we

3. "Preface to the Second Edition," *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, translated by Norman Smith (London: Macmillan, 1934), 16.

Condemn “rock music” and television “stars” who perform public indecencies? How can any but purely arbitrary standards exist?

The state schools have seen the logic of all this, and their teachings on “value clarification” means that every student creates his or her own values. Only an “externally imposed” set of values, derived from church or family, are wrong because they are not existential, i.e., not derived from the biology of one’s own being. {64}

This kind of thinking preceded both the French and the Russian Revolutions. It is hard at this date to realize that Mikhail Petrovich Artzybashev (1878–1927) was once regarded as the greatest of the Russian novelists. His novel, *Sanin*, was internationally famous. A trifling work, it was seen as important because of its total cynicism about everything, including restrictions against incest. Artzybashev, sad to say, a grandson of the Polish patriot Kosciusko, brought the underground mentality into the overworld as enlightenment. And why not? The Enlightenment had enthroned the Cartesian premise of the sovereignty of the autonomous mind of man; it had brought God and the Bible to the bar of man’s reason and had found them wanting. Max Stirner (1805–1856) had held, in *The Ego and His Own*, that; since there was no God, there could be no moral law. He despised the atheists who were closet Christians because they refused to practice incest within the family. Morality, monogamy, restrictions of any kind, he held to be disguised forms of Christianity. Not surprisingly, in the twentieth century, the Marquis de Sade has been openly hailed as a great thinker and psychologist for his open avowal of, and even practice of, every form of perversion. Artzybashev and other writers of this century have simply applied and developed what Sade propagated.

As Otto Scott has pointed out, before the French Revolution, it was still the concept, however battered in some areas, of Christendom which prevailed. After that flood-tide of evil, the idea of *the West*, or *the Western World*, replaced it. This meant Europe and the Americas. It also meant *the white race*. Racism has been a major result of the idea of the West. Prior to that, religious differences were basic, but all men were potentially converts to Christ, and the goal was to bring them all in. This faith persisted in the church, and the evil events of the day incited the churches to

renewed action in the nineteenth century. An expression popular oppression of this, Episcopal in origin, the words by Reginald Heber (1819) and the tune by Lowell Mason (1823), was the hymn, "From Greenland's Icy Mountains,"

From Greenland's icy mountains,
 From India's coral strand,
 Where Afric's sunny fountains
 Roll down their golden sand,
 From many an ancient river,
 From many a palmy plain,
 They call us to deliver,
 Their land from error's chain. {65}

Can we, whose souls are lighted
 With wisdom from on high,
 Can we to men benighted
 The lamp of life deny?
 Salvation, O salvation!
 The joyful sound proclaim,
 Till each remotest nation
 Has learnt Messiah's name

Waft, waft, ye winds his story,
 And you, ye waters, roll,
 Till, like a sea of glory,
 It spreads from pole to pole;
 Till o'er our ransomed nature
 The Lamb for sinners slain,
 Redeemer, King, Creator,
 In bliss returns to reign.

This was taken very seriously. Converts all over the world were treated as fellow members in Christ. Great numbers were brought to the missionary churches and housed with families while they secured university or college training to enable them to return home and propagate the faith. (My father reported that, in Scotland, churches had at times waiting lists of families eager to provide a home for students from all over the world.)

With World War I, this began to decline. Modernism infiltrated the “main-line” churches and captured their pulpits, colleges, and seminaries. Christianity was seen in white and Western terms, and it was damned for this by the world at large as well as by churchmen.

Meanwhile, racism began to govern more and more, as the Church’s strength receded. This racism had many faces. Two notable forms were, *first*, the popular form, resentment and hostility towards any encroachment by alien races. Instead of a missionary challenge, these aliens were seen as threats to the West. Of course, Africa and Asia were at the same time becoming Western superficially, adopting its technologies but not the faith that made them. Racial animosities began to flourish where once the differences were religious, and, in others, tribal. *Second*, the “enlightened” Western intellectuals became, especially after 1920, and strongly so after World War II, nominally hostile to racism. Their racism, however, expressed itself in the belief that these various “other” races could not, either as individuals or nations, compete with the West without all kinds of preferential treatment, foreign aid programs, special {66} civil rights for the “minorities,” and so on and on. Japan, of course, has failed to fit this mold, so that there has been a subtle and sometimes not so subtle hostility to Japan in the West because its abilities and power have been so clear. All kinds of reasons claiming some kind of “unfairness” in Japan’s laws relative to foreigners is the reason for this advantage. This fails to take into account that, except with a suicidal nation, laws are passed normally to benefit the home country.

The West, having abandoned Christ and Christendom, has dreamed great dreams of a “brave new world” and of an ideal “new world order.” For some centuries, the knowledge and development of tools has been under way, making possible the first Industrial Revolution of the 1800s, and the second one with computers, etc., after World War II. Given the premises of humanism, the world should very quickly become a paradise. Everything on the technological side is in order. Instead, however the world since World War II, and especially since 1960, when President John E Kennedy presided over the fairy tale Camelot which was in reality a moral cesspool, we have had, not heaven on earth, but hell. The schools are moral and educational failures; the world of politics

has become war zones in conflicts between rival gangs. The West is dying, and does not understand why.

The failure began with Descartes, and with all the men of the Enlightenment, and all who have followed them. Christianity and Christendom see man as a sinner, a fallen and depraved creature needing salvation. Calvinists have held that man is totally depraved, i.e., that every aspect of his being is affected and governed by sin. Man's need therefore is salvation by the atonement of Jesus Christ. Apart from Him, man will replicate his sin in every area of life and thought. As a redeemed man, the Christian has a duty to bring all things into captivity, every sphere, and every activity.

The governing thesis of Western man is that the problem in man and society is not sin but a lack of knowledge. They have replaced man created in the image of God with rational man. At the same time, however, the thinkers of the West have undermined man's rationality by reducing man to an animal and a product of evolution. Darwin's puzzled question remains: how can we trust our thinking if we are no more than an advanced ape?

Technology thus has not led to paradise on earth, because man himself cannot live in peace with himself or with anyone else.

Not only is the West dying, but in the process it is denying its own heritage. In universities, Western Civilization required {67} courses are now damned as Eurocentric and hence evil. All kinds of nonsense, such as a supposed American Indian literature, is used to replace it. (A beginning error is to assume the existence of a people who were "American Indians"; they were a variety of tribes and cultures with very great differences and hatreds among them. For example, I found that the old Shoshones resented a term that made them one with the Navahos.) The West does not really know what it is, because it is a prodigal son culture, in revolt against Christendom and trying to duplicate the goals thereof in humanistic terms. Regularly, "popular" musicians attempt to provide a hymn for humanity, without success.

Every culture has had its idiocies, and every faith has had men claiming to represent it who are an embarrassment and an offense to it. When, however, these aberrations prevail, we know that the end is near, unless some kind of renewal intervenes. To give an example of current folly, William Trogdon was laid off from his job as a college English instructor in 1991. He took a variety of

jobs, traveled through small towns of America, and then wrote a book on his journey. He rewrote the manuscript six times, and it was rejected each time by publishers. Trogdon was of Anglo-Irish descent, of a middle class Kansas City, Missouri, family. Tradition in the family had it that a remote ancestor on his father's side had been an Osage Indian. Trogdon put the name, William Least Heat-Moon on his manuscript, sent it off, and it was accepted. It sold more than a million copies in nine years and its "Indian" character was seen as mystical.⁴ When mature adults and intellectuals are so prone to lionize anything "alien" to their heritage, is it any wonder that their children reject that heritage with savagery?

In 1961, Robert M. Landowner wrote *Rebel Without a Cause*, on the mindlessness of the rebellion of youth. The reaction of many was that Dr. Landowner was sensationalistic and was generalizing from exceptional cases. Almost as he wrote, American youth began its campus revolts. Some of the student leaders had various causes in mind; most of their followers simply welcomed the opportunity to defile and destroy. They were indeed rebels without a cause. In terms of their modernity, all things were meaningless and irrational, and they accepted these ideas from their professors and acted them out. {68}

In the October 1991 *Reader's Digest*, Robert James Bidinotto wrote on "Freed to Rape Again." It is a horrifying account of legal indulgences with habitual child molesters and rapists. Psychotherapy does them no good, but the legal system continues to employ the invalid humanistic "cures" without results. As a result, a vast number of full time molesters and rapists are nourished by the system. They go from crime to crime, with an occasional brief term in prison, or under psychotherapy, Bidinotto wrote:

When the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit in Quantico, Va., researched the backgrounds of incarcerated serial rapists, they found that 41 of them were responsible for at least 837 rapes and over 400 more attempts. In a study funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, Emory University psychiatrist Gene G. Abel found that 453 criminals admitted to molesting more than 67,000

4. William J. Cook, "Whispers From the Kansas Tallgrass," in *U.S. News & World Report*, November 11, 1991, vol. 3, no. 20, 58f.

children. Those who abused girls had an average of 92 victims each. But men who molested boys had an astonishing average of 150 victims.⁵

Many parents, and many women, find it either futile or else a degrading experience, to go through the legal system: it becomes a second rape. The problem stems from the failure to recognize the reality of man's total depravity. Bidinotto wrote:

Warren Bland, a serial rapist, was sent to California's Atascadero mental hospital, released on probation, convicted for more rapes, imprisoned and paroled. He then abducted, sexually assaulted and tortured an 11 year-old boy with clothespins, wire and pliers. "I get my fun this way," Bland told the screaming child.

Sexual predators take their primary pleasure in dominating a helpless victim. "They like playing God," says Miller.⁶

Man's original sin is to be his own god (Gen. 3:5). Some manifest that will to be god through the established order, others against it. Basic to all of it is what Albert Camus stated so bluntly: "Since God claims all that is good in man, it is necessary to deride what {69} is good and choose what is evil."⁷ In Camus' hands, Descartes' "I think, therefore I am," became, "I rebel...therefore I exist."⁸

When the West abandoned Christianity, it also abandoned the belief in the harmony of all interests in God's predestinating purpose and providence. As a result, the belief in an inescapable conflict of interests arose. People, in terms of this, have come to see themselves as under oppression. However free their condition, whether liberal, conservative, or radical, they tend to believe that a conspiracy is directed against them and controls their lives. The world order is seen as a system of oppression and domination. The business of life then becomes liberation, not from sin, but from the existing order. An English scholar reported that "there is an organization called the Leeds Revolutionary Feminists who have proclaimed that heterosexual intercourse is 'an act of great

5. Robert James Bidinotto, "Freed to Rape Again," in *The Reader's Digest*, October 1991, 55.

6. *Ibid.*, 56.

7. Albert Camus, *The Rebel* (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), 47.

8. *Ibid.*, 22.

symbolic significance, by which the oppressor enters the body of the oppressed.”⁹ The examples of such thinking are numerous. Thus, Dr. Triloke Khosia of the Welsh National School of Medicine, writing in the *British Medical Journal*, found the rules of Olympic sports unfair and discriminatory because the winners were taller than most people in the general population.¹⁰ *Minority* now means a group who believe they are oppressed, no matter how many they are, or whether or not they are a numerical majority.¹¹ Our current ideologies insist on problems which they define, and which by their process of definition are beyond resolution. In Minogue’s telling words:

In pronouncing the rottenness of a civilization, it is actually declaring a hatred of any possible human life. What it proposes is the cosmic equivalent of a suicide pact.¹²

The West is indeed suicidal, rampant with self-hatred, determined that trees and animals, for example, have a right to life that takes precedence over humanity.

Thus, the French anthropologist, Michel Peissel, in going {70} to the Himalayan kingdom Zanskar, wrote ecstatically,

I could hardly believe that only recently I had left a world which is polluted and over-populated. Everything in Zanskar I found near to perfection: nothing, so it seemed, was out of place or unnatural.¹³

He found Zanskar “unspoilt by Western technology and accompanying ideals.”¹⁴ Apparently any area untouched by Christianity is for Peissel a paradise. Despite his contempt for the West, Peissel carried Western technology with him to make life in Zanskar bearable. Thus, because of the fleas there, in order to sleep, Peissel sprayed his Western sleeping bag with insecticide! Even in a “reasonably clean” large house, he found that, despite his spray

9. Kenneth Minogue, *Alien Powers: The Pure Theory of Ideology* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1985), 38.

10. *Ibid.*, 43.

11. *Ibid.*, 44.

12. *Ibid.*, 222.

13. Michal Peissel, *Zanskar, The Hidden Kingdom* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1979), 87.

14. *Ibid.*, 198.

can, he had, from flea bites, “severe wounds, much frustration and eight days of furious scratching.”¹⁵ All the same, Peissel had found a realm outside of the West and hence ideal. The fact that the people there in Zanskar believe in witches, ghosts, gods, demons, good and evil spirits, and “endless” other things Peissel “liked to consider imaginary,” did not trouble him. Moreover, in dealing with Western science and architecture as against Zanskar, Peissel makes this remarkable statement:

But what do figures mean, or spirits, if one does not believe in them? The answer is nothing, for it is Faith that counts.¹⁶

Peissel, like Mary Baker Eddy, is a Cartesian! The only real world is within. And this is science?

The West has collapsed internally, and this is a forerunner of external collapse. Richard Sennett has pointed out that, whatever men may doubt, “Belief remains a fundamental social condition, nor is the will to believe erased, even as mankind loses a belief in gods.” Belief has been transferred from the supernatural to “the immediate life of man himself, and his experience as a definition of all that he can believe in.” As man {71} has “demystified” the gods, he has mystified himself.¹⁷

Alex de Tocqueville saw this withdrawal of public man into himself, a retreat from a common culture into an anarchistic individualism. The result is narcissism. It has taken over the West, and Protestantism also. “Nothing is real if I cannot feel it, but I can feel nothing.”¹⁸ Man as his own god defines his own reality, and he reduces the world into his own mind or feelings. Civility then begins to wane and disappear, because civility is a recognition of social obligations, a realization that there is more to the world than our own feelings and annoyances. In a sense, as Sennett pointed out, civility is a mark, but “In a world without religious rituals or transcendental beliefs, masks are not ready made.”¹⁹ The child is early trained to control his or her urination and defecation.

15. *Ibid.*, 91f., cf. 53.

16. *Ibid.*, 67.

17. Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, [1974] 1976), 151.

18. *Ibid.*, 335.

19. *Ibid.*, 264.

The student rioters of the 1960s gleefully did both in academic buildings, at the Pentagon, and elsewhere. Today, our “rock music” practitioners indulge in like actions. Civility is disowned as a part of the old order, as an inheritance of Christendom. Churches are now increasingly defaced or burned.

“Ritual is not self-expression.”²⁰ It is a participation in timeless truth, or in an affirmation of gratitude for one’s past. Leaving Christian ritual to one side, rituals in the West have commonly been patriotic. They have celebrated a country’s past. In the United States, days such as Washington’s birthday, Lincoln’s birthday, Memorial Day, Labor Day and Armistice (later Veterans) Day were important public occasions, with parades, speeches, flag salutes, and more. Now their *public* observance has receded, and they have become occasions for *private* holidays. This recession is evidence of the decline of a public affirmation in favor of a personal gratification. The West is losing its ability to do honor to its great men, its soldiers of past wars, or to see itself in other than private terms. Not surprisingly, a new “constitutional right” has developed in the process, “the right to privacy.” Is it possible to say that colonial and nineteenth century Americans lacked privacy? The meaning of this new “right” is the insistence on moral immunity for immoral acts. It is a form of secession from society into a private world of {72} irresponsibility. A police officer told me that on one occasion, called to a house where a man was brutally abusing his wife, the man told him at the door, “Mind your own damn business. This is a private affair.” Why not? If homosexuals can insist on their right to privacy, and espouse man-boy love as a human right in the same area, why not a right to privacy for all crimes?

The artists of the modern era, especially after the French Revolution, began to separate themselves from society. They rejected the world around them and insisted on being foreign to it, on being “Bohemian” in Paris. Their withdrawal often meant a rejection of marriage as well as “conventional” morality. They saw themselves as *avant garde*, ahead of the rest of the world and representative of a truer order. Thus, in France, the Goncourts saw an “exotic appeal” in the “lower depths” of society. They said:

20. *Ibid.*, 266.

The riff-raff have for me the particular attraction of races unknown and undiscovered something of that exotic quality which travelers seek in far-off lands at the cost of many hardships.²¹

Contempt for society became the norm, and still is. Nietzsche “held that the best literature is that of decadent times.”²² War was waged against the existing value structure, both of Christendom and the new bourgeois West. In a letter to Paul Demeny, May 15, 1871, the “poet,” Arthur Rimbaud, wrote: “The poet makes himself a seer by a long, intensive, and reasoned disordering of all the senses.”²³ Ernest Rowson, in his poem to Cynara, wrote with “a rapture of desolation.”²⁴

This taste for negation infiltrated the West. Even in her Unitarian isolation, Emily Dickinson revelled in it. As Glauco Cambon pointed out, she rejected “the church’s notion of sin” and identified with the criminal:

The sweets of Pillage can be known {73}
To no one but the Thief,
Compassion for Integrity
Is his divinest Grief.

If ever a poet was “of Hell’s party,” she was one. For in her boldness she accepted sin as an affirmation of existence, a passible way out of demoniac ambiguity.²⁵

Of William Carlos Williams he said: “In a short poem Williams has said that the poet must draw from chaos itself if he wants to get a valid form.”²⁶

Further documentation of the decline, more, the suicide, of the West is readily available to all. To turn on one’s television set is to witness mindless and senseless plots, people determined

21. Roland N. Stromberg, “Introduction,” *Realism, Naturalism, and Symbolism: Modes of Thought and Expression in Europe, 1848-1914*, ed. Roland N. Stromberg (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), xiii.

22. *Ibid.*, xiv.

23. *Ibid.*, 189.

24. *Ibid.*, 240.

25. Glauco Cambon, *The Inclusive Flame* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, [1963] 1965), 45.

26. *Ibid.*, 192.

to supplant God's reality with their evil imagination, and a determination to waste life on trifles. Of course, the insanity of modern politics is good evidence also. The old proverb is true: "Whom God would destroy, He first makes mad."

The West is declining because it has lost the will to live; it is eaten up with self-hatred, and it has a will to death.

CHRISTIANITY AND FREEDOM

Rousas John Rushdoony

We live in an age of illusions and fiction. At no other time in history have men given more time to fiction and myth. By means of films, television, novels, theater, plays, and the media generally, we are now immersed in fiction. From time to time, we are told how many hours children and adults sit in front of a television set watching unreality masked as reality.

As a result, shadows have come to replace substance and reality for most people, something the news media exploits. For example, it is commonplace to equate the right to vote with freedom. The peoples of the Soviet Union and other tyrant states have had the “privilege” of voting all these years, but they have not been free. The forms of freedom, voting, legislative bodies, and other like “democratic” things mark many of the “third world” tyrannies, even as they did ancient Athens and “republican” Rome. Because of this, many assume that “free societies” existed then, and that they exist now in various parts of the world.

But our very definition of freedom has changed. Red China is a free country in that it is not under the rule of a foreign state, but the people are not free. The freedom of the state does not necessarily mean the freedom of the people and it may in fact contradict it. The founding fathers of the United States hoped that the Constitution would be a chain binding down the power of the Federal Government. By means of court decisions, it is now being increasingly used to chain the people.

The word *totalitarian* is new, but the fact of totalitarianism is an old one. It was universal in pagan antiquity, and it is a central aspect of our reviving paganism. In the ancient state, there was no area of freedom; all kinds of activities were controlled by the state. There was no free economic activity; there were no unlicensed

assemblies; there were no dissenters allowed from the policies of state outside the narrow ruling clique. The state was the ultimate order, man's only true society. In some ancient documents, it becomes apparent that a stateless man was a non-person. Moreover, a state license was required for any approved activity. Torture was routinely used; it disappeared in medieval law to reappear with the Renaissance tyrants. {76} The state as the ultimate order was thus in some sense god on earth. In some instances, the person of the ruler was divine; in others, it was the office, and, with still others, the ruling class or race. Logically, there is no dissent where a god is concerned. As a result, no activity apart from his control or governance was possible or permitted.

Our English word *liturgy* comes from the Greek *leitourgia*, a public work. It had then as now reference to religion, but religion then was seen as a branch of state control; the Romans used religion, any religion in their case, as social cement, as a means of keeping the various peoples of the empire controlled and contented. No unlicensed cult could exist, and a necessary step towards gaining a license was to appear before the proper authority and testify, "Caesar is Lord," i.e., the ultimate god over us.

It was at this point that Rome and the early church came into conflict. Christians refused to be licensed and were imprisoned and killed for doing so. In effect, they were guilty of treason. The Christian position was clearly stated by St. Paul, who, in Philippians 2:9–11, speaking of Jesus Christ, declared:

9. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name:

10. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

11. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

At this distance, it is hard for us to appreciate how radical and revolutionary this statement was and still is. Jesus Christ is a name, or a power, "which is above every name," above all earthly rulers. He is the cosmic emperor. In 1 Timothy 6:15, St. Paul describes Jesus Christ as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." Every King, Caesar, and emperor is below Him

and under Him. The goal of history is then plainly stated: *every* knee is to bow to this divine King, and *every* tongue shall in due time confess that He is the cosmic ruler and Lord.

The implications of this were far-reaching. *First*, the Christian Church was *an empire within the empire* which declared its destiny to be the conqueror of the whole world for Christ (Matt. 28:18–20), and therefore more important than Rome and Caesar. The audacity of this faith appears, for example, in {77} 1 Timothy 2:1–2:

I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, and intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

In the Roman doctrine, intercessions and prayers, as well as thanks, were addressed to the emperor. Now these Christians were placing themselves above or on a footing with the emperor by praying for him. This was an unprecedented step, and it made clear that Christ was and is King indeed over all kings. Rome saw the church as an empire within the empire that had to be smashed. Moreover, St. Paul describes himself in 1 Corinthians 5:20, together with other Christian leaders, as “ambassadors for Christ.” This was an assertion of a status beyond Roman law; one of the first words applied to the Christian community still remains in our English word *parish*. In its Latin original, *parochia* could mean the residence or area of a foreign embassy.

Second, while the Christian community sought to be law-abiding without declaring Caesar to be lord, they moved in terms of another law, God’s law, and the whole Bible was seen as the law-word of the Creator Sovereign. This meant that, while Christians could tell their oppressors, as Tertullian later did, that they were Caesar’s most honest citizens and honest taxpayers, they were viewed as worse than other men because their faith, Lord, and law by-passed and in effect subverted the Roman Empire. Then as now the best citizens are the chosen victims of statism! (After all, who can pay more taxes than honest, hardworking men?) To believe in another king and another law was subversive to the Roman Empire.

Third, the early church was actually a government within the empire. It cared for the sick and needy, for widows and

orphans, and for helpless aliens. It educated its own. In terms of 1 Corinthians 6, independent Christian courts, in which both parties contracted to abide by the decision, were established, and even pagans turned to them for justice. Captives were ransomed, abandoned babies picked up and reared, and so on and on. The church was governing better than Rome. Constantine the Great, on assuming sole power, ordered all bishops to wear in public the garb of a Roman magistrate so that people could appeal to them for justice. Bishops to this day {78} retain variations of this official garb.

Fourth, this meant that the idea of a unitary state controlling all things, i.e., totalitarianism, was negated. This was a difficult lesson for converts to learn. Newly converted peoples and states in Europe and elsewhere wanted to restore the old pagan model of a unitary state. This included the control of the church, against which the medieval church fought. Slowly and with difficulty, the idea that the state is not the umbrella under which all spheres of life had to exist began to take root. The state usually fought back bitterly, as witness the pretensions and claims of the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick II. There have been numerous revivals of paganism over the centuries, during the medieval, Renaissance, and modern eras; all seek to establish again a unitary state controlling every sphere of life and thought.

All the same, a new order was developing. Very early, after the fall of Rome, merchants began to develop and determine their own rules of operation, merchants' law. At times, rulers intervened; at other times, the merchants paid protection money to rulers. Freedom to a degree was gained, although in the seventeenth century the monarchs gained exclusive jurisdiction. This was a step in line with the doctrine of the divine right of kings.

But the centuries old battles for control and for freedom have not had a straight-line history. On the one hand, works such as Plato's *Republic* have given dignity to totalitarianism, as have the works of Hegel and others. On the other hand, the Christian influence has militated against the unitary state. The starting phase of the rebellion in the late 1980s against the Soviet power in Armenia was priest-inspired. In Romania, it was a Reformed pastor.

More important: the moral world has been turned upside down. The good state is not now Plato's radically totalitarian order; it

is, however naively held, the belief in a free society. In this long history, the *church* has at times played a cowardly role, but the *faith* has maintained the subordinate status of the state to the triune God.

Fifth, many of the radically statist measures are increasingly openly pagan. The cult of Gaia, the earth mother, environmental paganism, and like movements are working to destroy freedom. In Australia, mining operations are being shut down by non-Christian, more, anti-Christian groups, as violations of the holy ground and the sacred places of the Australian aborigines. In New Zealand, the Maoris and their friends are busily turning one area after another into holy {79} ground. Paganism stresses man as a consumer and destroyer, not as a producer and creator under God. One of the initial environmental and anti-industrial manifests in the United States saw Christianity as the villain. It was, however, Christians who, very early in the Christian era, began to reclaim the sea in the Netherlands and vastly increase the land area. It was also Christians who eliminated many desert and useless areas of Europe and made them successful agricultural and livestock areas. Some lords would give such useless lands to the monks to reclaim, and then take back the lands. Such activities were seen as a religious mandate to exercise dominion, and such texts as Isaiah 35:1–2 were used:

1. The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose.
2. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of the LORD, and the excellency of our God.

It is well known that the log kept by Christopher Columbus in 1492 had many references to Isaiah; he believed he was called to fulfill the prophecies with respect to the far-off places and islands.

Sixth, by placing the triune God above all human powers, including the state, the Christian faith undermined the supreme authority of the state. The state was no longer man's ultimate authority: the God who sits in judgment on all men also judges all the nations. This did not set well with Enlightenment kings, who actually forbade the use of Mary's Magnificat in churches because

of these “revolutionary” sentences therein:

51. He hath shewed strength with his arm; he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.

52. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree.

53. He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away. (Luke 1:51–53)

Christianity has given to men a concept of truth and of freedom which transcends this world. No human ruler nor court can define truth and freedom. God is not only the Creator but also the Definer. {80} Richard Sennett, in *Authority* (1980), said, “The need for authority is basic.” We can add that, when it is not sought for in God, it will be assumed by men. Johann Fichte, rejoicing in the French Revolution, wrote in 1773 what it meant to him, the overthrow of all who refused to agree with his strange version of freedom. He wrote,

And once I throw you down, I will insult you, dishonor you, trample you under. Since you can be of no use to me, I will profit by my right of conquest to seek your total destruction.

From the French Revolution to the present-day revolutions, this has been the “new freedom.” A higher court being denied, whatever the revolutionary regime decides is truth and freedom then governs. Shortly after World War II, U.S. Chief Justice Frederick Moore Vinson denied the validity of any higher law of God and paved the way for the steady diminution of freedom. Pagan authority is destructive to freedom, because it allows no dissent from the dominant human authority, usually the state, now also the university, with its emphasis on being “politically correct.” The authority of God is inseparable from His justice, love, mercy, wrath, and all His many attributes. God’s nature being unchanging, there is no change in His justice, nor in the freedom He gives to go to hell or to heaven. The state has its own version of heaven; it is determined that we shall all go there or else, and its version of heaven very emphatically resembles hell.

Seventh, there are two old American proverbs which are relevant:

If we lose our freedom we have nothing else to lose. The grouch is the guardian of our freedom.

Perhaps these are over-statements, but there is a hard grain of truth to them. The Christian who wars against the growing neo-paganism and its statist faith is called worse than grouch usually. One of the earliest charges by Roman citizens against Christians appears in Acts 17:6–7:

6. And when they found thern not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also;

7. Whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus.

The rabble-rousers in Thessalonica had quickly grasped the implications of Christianity: another King, another law, a freedom from the state as the ultimate authority, and a freedom to live under God primarily, not under the state. Christianity was indeed turning the world upside down, even though many of its adherents have still not grasped that fact. It cannot live in peace with statism. Moral controls in most areas must replace state controls. Freedom must be a moral fact, not a state grant.

In West Germany, by law, work councils composed of representatives of all workers, were formed in enterprises. Management was excluded, although the council's concerns were "social issues" and working conditions. This is the kind of "freedom" increasingly promoted everywhere, and it is death to liberty. According to Sennett, in one study in Yugoslavia in 1965, it was found that workers in "self-managing bureaucracies were far more alienated from their jobs than workers in more traditional settings." Such concepts of freedom, which violate moral property rights, do harm, not good.

The revolutionary, anti-Christian doctrines of freedom are today leading to tyrannies and evils. Morality then becomes class domination, and justice is sacrificed. Christian freedom means moral responsibility and a respect for the God-given immunities of others. The neo-pagan doctrine of freedom separates liberty from God's moral law to make it a class privilege. The result is a warfare society, a constant conflict of interests. Freedom is more

than a matter of law or license: it is a moral premise which rests on faith in God's governing and transcendent order and law.

The enemies of Freedom have a problem. Christianity has left its mark on all the world. It provides men with a premise for resistance, and for the rebirth of faith and freedom. The resistance to this rebirth is intense, but it is coming, and it shall prevail.

THE FUTURE OF CIVILIZATION

Rousas John Rushdoony

The word *civilization* readily invokes a meaning in our minds, but its definition is a bit more complicated. The word comes from the Latin (*civitas*), *city*; it refers, in the simplest definition to a condition of organization, enlightenment, and progress. A *civilized man* is distinguished in the popular mind from a *savage*, *i.e.*, a man supposedly in a state of nature. Civilization is ostensibly an emancipation from a rural, religious, and superstitious mentality into a scientific, urban, and secular perspective. The idea of civilization for many means also equality, democracy, and secularism. Some men equate the rise of civilization with the development of secularism and science. Instead of approaching the subject from this perspective of humanism let us view it as Christians. Henry R. Van Til, in *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (1959), defined culture as religion externalized. A culture is thus not, as some now understand it, the arts of a society but the religious outworking of a people's total life. The formal organization of that culture is civilization. Sociological definitions of civilization see it as an evolutionary development, as a stage in the *natural* development of a society. Such views exclude the religious perspective whereby a particular civilization is the development of a religious faith. We can thus speak of the varieties of Islamic civilization, of Buddhist civilization, and so on and on. The various civilizations are not the products of an evolutionary development but of a religious faith and culture. The differences between a Shinto civilization and a Christian one are very great, and they are not biological; they are religious. If we neglect this fact, we are in trouble. In fact Jose Ortega Y. Gasset, in *The Revolt of the Masses* (1932) spoke of the new barbarians as scientists and specialists who believe "that civilization is *there in* just the same

way as the earth's crust and the forest primeval."¹ This kind of thinking is endemic among the believers in evolution: they see civilization as a natural development rather than a faith product.

Because civilization is an outgrowth of a faith, it will wane and decay when that faith subsides or dies. No more than a {84} tree can outlive its roots can a civilization outlast the death of its faith.

We are at present in the last stages of the death of Western civilization. Western civilization, or modern civilization, became world-wide by the end of the nineteenth century. Its visible death throes began in 1914 with World War I. Modern civilization, which began with the Enlightenment, has been anti-Christian and aggressively humanistic. It began as a surface civilization: it was the property of rulers, the aristocracy, the artists, writers, and academicians, but, after c. 1860, it began to filter downward to the peoples of the lower and the middle class. In this century, by means of films and television, it has saturated the minds of men. By eroding the lingering Christian faith of most of the people, humanism has signed its own death warrant. The modernists by means of an "apotheosis of childhood," transformed "Original Sin into Original Innocence." Men like Rousseau, Blake, and Wordsworth saw freedom from religious restraints as the liberation of man into the truest culture and civilization.² The result has been instead, in Lears' words, "a nonmorality deifying immediate experience and self-gratification."³ George Santayana, while not a Christian, saw the decline of faith in heaven and hell as undercutting moral action. Others saw the rise of criminality as closely connected with the unwillingness of churchmen and sociologists to see evil as something chosen by men rather than socially determined.⁴ As Richard Weaver had written early in the years after World War II, *Ideas Have Consequences*. Nowhere do they have more consequences than in the religious sphere, because it is faith which impels human action. Christian faith has been more

1. Jose Ortega Y. Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 1932), 126.

2. T.J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace, Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1981), 144f.

3. *Ibid.*, 146.

4. *Ibid.*, 45.

effective in moving men to action than any other faith in history. In the past two centuries, however, because of false eschatologies, combined with antinomianism, this motivating power has been undermined. In 1834, Thomas Babington Macaulay encountered an English divine, who, without any preface, accosted him thus:

‘Pray, Mr. Macaulay do not you think that Buonaparte was the Beast?’ ‘No sir, I cannot say that I do.’ ‘Sir, he {85} was the Beast. I can prove it. I have found the number 666 in his name. Why, Sir, if he was not the Beast, who was?’ This was a puzzling question, and I am not a little vain of my answer. ‘Sir,’ said I, ‘the House of Commons is the Beast. There are 658 members of the House; and these with their chief officers—the three clerks, the Sergeant and his deputy, the Chaplain, the doorkeeper, and the librarian—make 666.’ ‘Well, Sir, that is strange. But I can assure you that, if you write Napoleon Bonaparte in Arabic, leaving out only two letters, it will give 666.’

‘And pray, Sir, what right have you to leave out two letters? And, as St. John was writing Greek, and to Greeks, is it not likely that he would use the Greek rather than the Arabic notation?’ ‘But, Sir,’ said this learned divine, ‘everybody knows that the Greek letters were never used to mark numbers.’ I answered with the meekest look and voice possible: ‘I do not think that everybody knows that. Indeed I have reason to believe that a different opinion—erroneous no doubt—is universally embraced by all the small minority who happen to know any Greek.’ So ended the controversy. The man looked at me as if he thought me a very wicked fellow; and, I dare say, has by this time discovered that, if you write my name in Tamul, leaving out the T in Thomas, B in Babington, and M in Macaulay, it will give the number of this unfortunate Beast.⁵

In my lifetime, I have seen some who clung to the belief that Kaiser Wilhelm was the Beast; then Mussolini became the candidate, later Hitler, for some Franklin Delano Roosevelt (for instituting Social Security and giving people numbers), Stalin according to others, Kissinger, and so on. False eschatologies have repeatedly nullified Christian action. Some years ago, J. Vernon McGee was eloquent in opposing all Christian social action as “polishing brass on a sinking ship.” More recently, a book by Tim Timmons sees

5. Arthur Bryant, *Macaulay* (New York, NY: Harper and Row, [1932] 1979).

Christian action as “cultism.” Added to this has been antinomianism with its hatred of God’s law. I have known Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Baptist churches which barred even the reading of the Ten Commandments (once a part {86} of most communion services) as false and alien to the age of grace.

Too many churchmen are involved in a studied irrelevance that does violence to our Lord’s teaching, and to His prayer, “Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:10). God’s will is done step by step. Our Lord says, “first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear” (Mark 4:28). Things do not occur simply because we wish them to; when a seed is planted one day, a harvest cannot be reaped the second day. Just as false apocalypticism has infected too many churchmen, so too we have today a revolutionary apocalypticism which has seriously warped the modern outlook. We must remember that Lenin expected a humanistic paradise to begin the day after the revolution, and he was radically unprepared for practical measures. The *basic* policy became the eradication of real and imagined enemies as a substitute for social reconstruction.

The same problem haunts almost all states today. Woodrow James Hansen studied the issue with respect to California. In 1822, the rule of the Spanish Empire over California ended. California was subject to the same modern, secular influences which were influencing Spain, a desire for a state reflecting ideas of the French Revolution and freemasonry, secular and “anti-authoritarian.” The church and the military had been the governing forces in California, but now there was a “search” for “a system of authority to replace that of the cross and the sword.” This same quest marked all of Hispanic America.⁶ The revolt against authority, however, was without a sound concept of authority to replace the old order:

Here written in small was the tragedy of California, to be enlarged upon in the years that followed. Possessed of a political idealism that sought to erase all vestiges of Spanish colonialism in Alta California, young California liberals learned early to set aside tyrannical governmental authority as lightly as they discarded a soiled shirt, failing to realize that successful republican gov-

6. Woodrow James Hansen, *The Search for Authority in California* (Oakland, CA: Biobooks, 1960), v.

ernment depends upon an underpinning of social and economic relations.⁷ {87}

This tragedy has been re-enacted again and again all over the world. We must add that basic to “an underpinning of social and economic relations” is a religious faith which provides the basis for authority and work. The various states of Africa are constantly in trouble because of the rootless nature of their civil governments. In Europe, as Christian authority has weakened, various ethnic groups have sought independence. Whereas once a common faith united various nations, now the loss of faith has revived ethnic particularities and divisions. Authority is a religious fact. Its absence in the modern state means both fragmentation into constituent elements *and* lawlessness and the rise of crime.

There is another fact. A civilization without Christ is without justice. God’s justice, or righteousness, is set forth in His law-word. Without God’s justice, pseudo-justice prevails, and new sins are invented. One such offense is racism, or racialism; as Otto Scott has pointed out, racism is a product of Darwin’s theory; Darwin plainly insisted on a disparity of abilities among races; the term “primitive man” is a reflection of his theory. We need to remember that the ancient Christian liturgies referred to “the Christian race.”⁸ No group in history has been more under Christian influence or more given to intermarriage than the Europeans or, as they are called in the U.S., the WASPS. Humanistic doctrines of justice also stress equalitarianism of a Utopian variety, again choosing to neglect the fact that Christianity has fostered more brotherly love than any other Faith. The evil sense of unreality in some current doctrines of justice can be seen in the identification of justice with a denial of sexual differences with an acceptance of homosexuality, and with the cultivation of envy. In fact, much legislation today is based on envy not justice.

The need for justice is imperative in our time, and no justice is possible apart from the triune God and His law. Justice or righteousness is a way of life. Our Lord is clear that “no man can serve two masters” (Matt. 6:24). Either we derive our doctrine of

7. *Ibid.*, 13.

8. See ed. J. N. W. B. Robertson, *The Divine Liturgies of John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, etc.*, (London, England: David Nutt, 1894), 195.

righteousness or justice from God or we derive it from man or the state. The impotence of the antinomian church is due to the fact that it has an alien doctrine of righteousness. The gap between God's righteousness and man's is widening as the modern state strays further and further away from the Lord. {88} Abortion, the legalization of homosexuality, the abolition of the death penalty, the replacement of restitution with imprisonment, and much, much more mark the shift to legalized injustice. The psalmist asks,

Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law? (Ps. 94:20)

Framing mischief by a law is the usual practice of the modern state, and too often the churchman gives assent to it.

The solution to this problem is not to be sought in revolution, nor civil disobedience and violence, but in regeneration. We have a largely unconverted church. At its best, it is a weaponless army. We need regenerate men who move in God's Spirit in full faithfulness to His law. The reconstruction of society requires the application of God's law-word to every area of life and thought. In a Christian culture, God's law-word will define and limit all authority; it will set forth the requirements of justice; it will shape the lives of men and the character of society.

It is worthy of note that, in some of the most ancient Christian church buildings the center of attention is often a mosaic of Christ's transfiguration. Otto G. von Simson observed of this:

The Transfiguration miracle, as I have tried to show, is the promise and image of man's participation in the glory of Christ's resurrection and, as such, embodies the religious vision of the ancient church.... It is important that we try to understand this general impact of theological controversies. Gibbon was satisfied to recount, with sardonic amusement, what he took to be no more than the dogmatic squabbles of professional theologians. Not realizing that doctrine is no more—and does not aspire to be more—than an attempt to formulate rationally that which transcends reason, he never sounded the depths of religious experience which moved the age of the great councils. The inadequacies and inaccuracies of the *Decline and Fall* are largely due to the fact that Gibbon's rationalism prevented him from understanding both the nature and the power of religious experience in the sixth century. Might he not have avoided this pitfall by looking at the Transfiguration in

Sant' Apollinare in Classe?⁹ {89}

The transfiguration of man and society, of civilization, *beginning with ourselves*, this is the Christian calling and goal. It is not achieved by mysticism but by faith and obedience, by that spirit which says after our Lord, "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:7; cf v. 9). "Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). This fallen world, men and nations, needs to be redeemed and transfigured. The transfiguration of our Lord prefigures the transfiguration of man, history, and the earth itself. Ours is a magnificent calling, with the future of civilization as our assured goal, as Isaiah 65 makes clear. Moreover, as John tells us,

2. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. 3. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous. 4. For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. 5. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? (1 John 5:2-5)

9. Otto G. van Simson, *Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravennae* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, [1948] 1987) 46f.

THE RETURN OF CHRISTENDOM

Rousas John Rushdoony

A young man, in his early thirties, was converted from atheism to Calvinism and Christian reconstruction. His parents had never been to church but held to a vague belief in God as some kind of creative force. His mother's reaction to her son's conversion was to say that religion was fine, but one should not be a fanatic about it. She believed that faith should be useful to a man, not a commanding force. Priority for her belonged to man.

In the twentieth century, the doctrine of Christendom has become a forgotten and obsolete doctrine. It does not occur to churchmen that it should be their concern. Most theological works neglect the concept.

In *The Catholic Encyclopaedia* (1908) then lecturer in modern history at Balliol College, Oxford, Francis Fortecue Urquhart, wrote:

In its wider sense this term is used to describe the part of the world which is inhabited by Christians, as Germany in the Middle Ages was the country inhabited by Germans. This world will be taken in this quantitative sense in the article "Religions" in comparing the extent of Christendom with that of Paganism or of Islam. But there is a narrower sense in which Christendom stands for a polity as well as a religion, for a nation as well as for a people. Christendom in this sense was an ideal which inspired and dignified many centuries of history and which has not yet altogether lost its power over the minds of men.

The foundation of a Christian polity is to be found in the traditions of the Jewish theocracy softened and broadened by Christian cosmopolitanism, in the completeness with which Christian principles were applied to the whole of life, in the aloofness of the Christian communities from the world around them, and in the

hierarchical organization of the clergy.¹ {92}

Urquhart's analysis is quantitative rather than theological, although he does cite the doctrinal influence of St. Augustine. In *The City of God*, Augustine, in biblical terms, saw history as a conflict between two realms, the City of Man, and the *City of God*. He identified the City of God with the church. His eschatological outlook was, moreover, a pessimistic one. He did see sin in biblical terms, as a trespass against God's law word: "This is already sin, to desire those things which the law of God forbids, and to abstain from them through fear of punishment, not through love of righteousness."² He saw mankind possessed with a lust for sovereignty, the desire to be god.³ He saw too that theological order precedes moral order.⁴ He stated plainly that "it is sin which is evil, and not the substance or nature of flesh."⁵

Christendom was thus obviously the City of God, the realm ruled by God and His law. The City of God was thus for Augustine basic to Christian faith. It is that realm governed by Christ and under His law-word in its entirety, from Genesis through Revelation. Augustine, however, seeing the collapsing Roman Empire limited the City of God to the church. This identification of the Kingdom of God with a very limited realm, with an institution, with the church, had disastrous results for medieval thought, and for much Protestant thought. The Kingdom of God on earth, Christendom, cannot be limited to the church. This identification has done much to warp both Catholic and Protestant thinking.

John McClintock and James Strong, in their *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* (1868), defined it thus: "Christendom, the Kingdom of Christ in its diffusion among men on the earth."⁶ They then proceed with a quantitative

1. Francis Fortecue Urquhart, "Christendom," in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. 3 (New York: The Encyclopaedia Press, 1908), 699.

2. Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, Book XIV, 10 (New York: Modern Library, 1950 reprint), 456.

3. *Ibid.*, Book III, 14, 86.

4. *Ibid.*, Book XIX, 25, 706f.

5. *Ibid.*, Book X, 24, 328, see also Book XIV, 5, 446f.

6. John McClintock and James Strong, "Christendom," in *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper, [1968] 1894), 268.

description of the spread of Christianity. The first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1771) had no entry for “Christendom,” nor did the ninth edition. Insofar as church and state are concerned in the twentieth century, Christendom is a by-passed and forgotten concept. {93}

The first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* defined law thus:

Law may be defined, “The command of the sovereign power, containing a common rule of life for the subjects.”⁷

This definition tells us why Christendom is now a forgotten concept: as Isaiah 26:13 makes clear, “other lords [or sovereigns] have had dominion over us.” Law is now the enacted will of a humanistic state, and the humanistic state is a most jealous god. God’s law is the basis for government in every sphere of life and thought, and it cannot be restricted in its jurisdiction. The humanistic state had insisted on a total law, or government over every area, and, as a result, catholicity or universality has passed from the church to the state. Quite naturally, humanism and the humanistic state, mimicking Christianity, now dreams of a one world order. The United Nations represents one effort among many to create a catholic humanistic church-state. Marxism is another such effort, as is the European economy community, and other like dreams. Utopianism in the modern age is a manifestation of this will to replace Christendom with a humanistic order. There is a grim irony in the fact that Sir Thomas More, the author of *Utopia*, was made a saint by the Roman Catholic Church: he is the father of the humanistic state and of anti-Christendom.

What confronts humanity is the steady breakdown of law, a progression from law to no law. This has occurred before in history. The decay of the Roman Empire was due to a loss of faith. Cicero favored retaining the old rites of augury and auspices as “the best means of controlling the excesses of democracy.”⁸ A ruling class without faith could not communicate faith to the people, only

7. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, Scotland: A. Bell and C. Macfarquhar, 1771), 882.

8. William Armistead Faulkner, translator, “De Divinatione, “ *Cicero: De Senectute, De Amicitia, De Divinatione, II* (London, England: Heinemann, 1922), 216.

their moral degeneracy. Rome fell finally, only because no one felt it was worth fighting for, and the barbarians wandered through it, pillaging, looting, raping, and killing at will. Rome had sought to replace law with an artificial, man-created order, and, as a result, reaped disorder. {94}

At the time of the medieval plagues, the inner decay of Christendom became apparent in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, which mocked Christ, church, and faith. Written in 1348 AD, the work begins with a strong affirmation of self-preservation as "the natural right of every one who is born here below."⁹ From there on, Boccaccio, a priest, gives every kind of justification for sin. Adultery, fornication, and homosexuality are matters for humor. The Golden Rule is turned upside down:

Wherefore, dear my ladies, this will I say to you, 'Whoso doeth it to you, so you it to him'; and if you cannot presently, keep it in mind till such time as you can, so he may get as good as he giveth.¹⁰

The view of law is also clear: "laws should be common to all and made with the consent of those whom they concern."¹¹ Blasphemy is Boccaccio's delight from beginning to end. Thus, in recounting a priest's copulation with a parishioner's wife, he says, "There the priest gave her the heartiest busses in the world and making her sib to God Almighty, solaced himself with her a great while."¹² In Boccaccio's thinking, fortune had replaced God as the determinative force.¹³

Boccaccio made explicit what was implicit in the world of his day. The Renaissance represented the death of the old order; the world of Christendom had become a facade. Only the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation for a time revived it. After 1660, the Enlightenment and its humanism began the renewed erosion of Christendom. The warfare by thinkers became blood the rioting with the French Revolution, and then the Russian Revolution. The post World War II era completed the revolt.

9. Giovanni Boccaccio: *The Decameron*, Day the First, speech of Pompinea (New York: Triangle Books, [1931] 1940), 8.

10. *Ibid.*, Day the Fifth, Tenth Story, 292.

11. *Ibid.*, Day the Sixth, Seventh Story, 307.

12. *Ibid.*, Day the Eighth, Second Story, 370. The word *sib* means kin, or sister.

13. *Ibid.*, Day the Second, Seventh Story, 85.

The sexual revolution, the student riots, the rapid de-Christianization of law in the United States and the nations of the West, all meant the rise of lawlessness and disorders. Men like Henry Miller called for “the time of the assassins” and the destruction of all traces of Western civilization for perhaps two [95] centuries as a preparation for a “liberated” humanity. One exponent of a massive assault on the West was Germaine Greer, author of *The Female Eunuch*. A student at Melbourne (B.A.), Sydney (N.A.) and Cambridge (Ph.D.), and then a professor, an activist in the feminist and sexual “liberation” movements, among other things, she called for the “whole psychic orientation of sex” to be altered to create a new society.

It may mean we have to go through a phase of total polymorphism of all kinds of homosexual and bestial practices just as a kind of purgation, the way primitive tribes use it, before we can discover our own sexuality, our genuine psychic libidinous energy.¹⁴

Some groups took such counsel seriously, and homosexual and other groups “indulged” in bestiality.

The result of all this has been that the West has moved from law to no law. Of course, its humanistic law was not law at all, being the systematic negation of God’s law. Humanistic law means social suicide, because it inevitably self-destructs. If man is his own god, and his own source of law, then nothing can contradict him. He is his own absolute, and it is man’s personal will that must be done. Not surprisingly, in Jean-Paul Sartres *No Exit*, Garcin declares, “Hell is—other people!” If man is his own god and universe, then other men are enemies because they are rival claimants to godhood.

But the modern humanistic state sees itself as a step towards a world state, as the replacement to Christendom. A new world order will be created, supposedly, to provide the protecting over-order for all mankind. This is a dream common to some men over the centuries, and no less promoted in the twentieth century.

Meanwhile, however, the anarchistic course of humanism has drastically altered the significance of the modern state. It has

14. Harry McKeown, “Germane Greer,” interview in *Penthouse*, vol. 2, no. 1, September, 1991, 74. It is fair to add that Miss Greer later dropped some of her more extreme views.

undermined loyalty, and it has led to a contempt for the priests of the state, its politicians and bureaucrats. Boccaccio filled his book with “dirty stories” about the church and his fellow clergy. Now politicians are a common target for such tales and bawdy humor. The dignity that once attended public office has given way to sometimes erosive contempt. {96}

Being still humanists, whatever their church affiliation, the citizens continue to make demands of the state. It is expected to be their messiah and savior, and to provide cradle to grave security and protection. Statist agencies have replaced Providence in the popular mind, but they can never please the people. The modern state is a failed messiah, and, even as the people demand more, they grow more contemptuous in their hostility to the politician:

Meanwhile, that state has been reduced to a taxing and controlling power, and it is unpopular on both counts. The goal of the state was to give meaning to life, replacing the meaning provided by Christianity. Education was seen as the valid substitute for Christian indoctrination, the alternative of intelligence for faith and dogma. Of course, the new educational priesthood proved to be as intolerant as any the world has seen and more humorless. The intellectuals of the academic community have produced no Boccaccio, despite greater provocations. To be “politically correct” makes it too dangerous to write on the academic community in Boccaccio’s style!

The state thus has lost meaning, although it supplies benefits. Its taxing power has become more resented by the people, even as their demands increase.

St. Paul, in Romans 13:1–5, spoke of civil authorities and declared, among other things, that, *first*, they must be a terror to evil-doers, and, *second*, ministers of God. *Third*, they should by their protection be safe from evil because their honest citizenship makes them “the praise” or the glory of the state:

The modern state is more often than not a terror to the good rather than to evil-doers. Its taxes and controls hit the honest citizen more than the criminal. The state’s main beneficiary is the state. It creates an ever-increasing centralization of power, and it is resentful of criticism. Tertullian in his day asked the Roman emperor why he persecuted Christians, his best and most honest citizens, and he received no answer. Honest citizens are the most

dangerous to tyrants, because their faith and character make them an indictment to the state. The honest, hard-working citizen is the cow most easily milked and least likely to revolt.

Harold J. Berman, in *Law and Revolution* (1983), called attention to Octavio Paz's words, that a society's visible side is its works, but its important invisible side is its beliefs, desires, fears, repressions, and dreams. Berman commented:

Law is usually associated with the visible side, with {97} works; but a study of the history of Western law, and especially its origins, reveals its rootedness in the deepest beliefs and emotions of a people. Without the fear of purgatory and the hope of the Last Judgment, the Western legal tradition could not have come into being.¹⁵

By "the Western legal tradition" Berman has reference to the law of Christendom, God's law, now disappearing under the massive attacks of humanism.

Attention thus far has been centered on the West in terms of Western Europe and the United States and other English-speaking areas. Christendom was far more extensive, and an important part of it was the Hispanic empire. This realm had a dual inheritance as it entered the modern era. The influence of Queen Isabella was strongly Catholic in the medieval sense. The basic fact in society was not Lockean atomistic man but "religious societal man," man created in God's image and salvable, man having an obligation to all his fellow men and required to "be the instrument of God's immutable, publicly ascertainable law," according to Professor Richard W. Morse. Ferdinand, Isabella's husband, was radically different. (He could have been a better model for Machiavelli's *Prince* than Cesar Borgia, and a more successful one.) For him, the crown was not a moral force but a political power. This led in Hispanic America to the caudillos, who honored no law nor authority save their own.¹⁶ The weakness of Isabella's vision was

15. Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution, The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 558.

16. Brian Loveman and Romas M. Davies, Jr., editors, *The Politics of Antipolitics, The Military in Latin America*, second edition, revised and expanded (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 17ff. The citation from Richard W. Morse is from his essay, "Toward a Theory of Spanish American Government," in the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 15, (1954), 71-93.

that it rested on an institution, the Roman Catholic Church. As the church declined, especially in the late nineteenth century, the military replaced it as the force attempting to provide unity and cohesion.¹⁷ The instability of Latin America has been its inability to provide a stabilizing force. Military leaders from both the right [98] and the left have failed, as have all Latin American states since independence:

In a sense, the most “successful” modern state has been Mexico because it has applied most rigorously the separation of morality from religion and politics. It has, instead, made the state the source of law and morality.¹⁸ The state’s educational system was to provide Mexicans with morality. The result has been massive corruption, led by the state. Mexico’s belief, like other nations in the West, as witness Horace Mann and the United States, was that “The school would make tyranny impossible.”¹⁹ It was also held that “the rights of society are more important than the rights of man.”²⁰ The West, however, has replaced society with the state, and, by denying Christianity and Christendom, has rendered both society and the state corrupt and lawless. According to Gabino Barreda as summed up by Zea:

An individual should think and believe as he pleases, provided that his thoughts and beliefs do not alter the social order. The mission of public education was not merely to teach; it was to make public order possible.²¹

Not surprisingly, as the West developed, so too did the contempt for the West by many of its own creators. The historian, Roger L. Williams, has written on *The Horror of Life* (1980) as manifested in the nineteenth century by such writers as Charles Baudelaire, Jules de Concourt, Gustave Flaubert, Guy de Maupassant, and Sèphouse Daudet. All of them were syphilitic: perversions marked some of them; they saw the rise of the common man as mongrelization;

17. William H. Bull, “An Overview of the Bolivian Military in National Politics,” *Loveman and Davies*, 106.

18. Leopoldo Zea, *Positivism in Mexico*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, [1968] 1974), 96f.

19. *Ibid.*, 118.

20. *Ibid.*, 115.

21. *Ibid.*, 126.

the middle class was viewed as barbarian, and so on. The death of Christendom has begun by the late twentieth century to resemble the death of men, as AIDS and other diseases proliferate.

Christendom, when imposed from above, becomes self-defeating. Frederick II, by no means a Christian, wanted an order within his empire which would produce uniformity and loyalty. As a result, he created the inquisition as the means of providing uniformity. While Protestantism had no inquisition, it had strong measures to ensure agreement in a community. By 1660, both the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation had declined, and the Enlightenment was replacing it.

The concept of *society*, of *community*, did not change. The churches had been too prone to see institutional and external coercion as the substitute for society or community. The church too often, while professing faith in the “communion of the saints,” had and has been more prone to resort to the coercion of the saints.

As long as the churches were a counterfoil to the state, the state made pious affirmations of belief in liberty. However, as the faith of the churches has waned, the claims and powers of the state have increased. The modern state *is* the new inquisition, with coercive powers undreamed of by previous tyrannies. It has the ability through wiretaps, computerized files and more to control the people as never before. Escape from the state has been rendered more and more difficult. Inquisitions are no longer agencies of church or state but they are now the state in action.

How then can Christendom be revived or re-created? The answer cannot be institutional, because institutions cannot replace the living God; Jesus Christ cannot be confined to the church, nor can the power and work of the Holy Spirit be institutionalized. Institutionalized “Christians” are powerless because they leave the issues of the faith to the church. J. C. Ryle wrote, in his *Warning to the Churches*:

I fear for many professing Christians. I see no sign of fighting in them, much less of victory. They never strike one stroke on the side of Christ. They are at peace with His enemies. They have no quarrel with sin. I warn you, this is not Christianity. This is not the way to heaven.

In some of the wars engaged in by the United States the fire power has been low because of the low morale of the troops. Their attitude has been, "I didn't declare war on them, so why risk my life?" Church and state have had too few fighters and servants because they have made serious errors, on the one hand replacing the triune God and His law-word as the authority, and, on the other, supplanting man's assent and action by decrees. The key to human progress is the faith, initiative, and dedicated action of men of faith and vision. Institutions at their best preserve the past; usually they function to preserve and advance {100} themselves. Where institutions prevail, society suffers.

The early church became an empire within the Roman Empire because Christians created courts, homes for the aged, for the homeless, for orphans, hospitals, schools and more. Free institutions were replacing civil powers.

In the second half of the twentieth century, we have seen a dramatic return to Christendom as families and individuals have seen their responsibility to move in obedience to the triune God rather than to institutions. Christian schools have proliferated, as have home schools, so that, as of 1991, about forty percent of all grade and high school children are in such schools. The movement has spread to Canada, Australia, Britain, and elsewhere.

The overwhelming majority of these efforts is not parochial, not created by the church, but by individuals, often with church cooperation and often with resentments within the church. The home schools, where the growth is now most rapid, have their origin in parental decisions.

Now this is a very important fact. More than a few churchmen, dissenting from and denying the validity of their church's historic confessions, creeds, and stands insist that they are affirmations of the church over the generation, the Body, not necessarily personal beliefs. In terms of this, some churches recite the creed by saying, "We believe," not "I believe." It is the church's historic statement, not necessarily a personal one. Fifty persons, or fifty million churchmen, will not and cannot act on a faith not personally held, treasured, and recognized as something to live and die for. The impotence of the church is precisely because it sees its powers as primarily institutional. Its approach is a top down one.

In 1 Corinthians 6:19, St. Paul tells us:

What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?

A little later, St. Paul speaks of the church as the body of Christ:

12. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ.

13. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

14. For the body is not one member, but many. (1 Corinthians 12:12–14) {101}

Now, as Charles Hodge pointed out, Scriptures (Matt. 3:11; John 1:33; Acts 1:5) “not only distinguish between the baptism of water and the baptism of the Spirit, but they disconnect them.” Moreover, “Paul does not say that we are made one body by baptism, but by the baptism of the Holy Ghost; that is, by spiritual regeneration.” Church membership is by verbal profession and baptism after examination, where adults are concerned. As against this formal, institutional (and necessary) act there is the Divine act:

Any communication of the Holy Spirit is called a baptism, because the Spirit is said to be poured out, and those upon whom He is poured out, whether in His regenerating, sanctifying, or inspiring influences, are said to be baptized.²²

This is a fact of vast and central importance. The initiating and governing power is not the church, nor is it the individual believer; to hold so is to deny the faith. The Holy Spirit is the initiating and governing power, in the individual and in the church. We are “one body” in Christ only when we “have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” It is the Spirit who baptizes us into Christ, and therefore into the true body of Christ, the true church.

The church’s power rests therefore in the Holy Spirit as He regenerates men, women, and children and makes them members of Christ. The preaching, instructing church is like an army barrack, a training place for the army of the Lord. Men there learn

22. Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1950), 245.

how to rest in the Lord, and how to serve Him. They are trained to be members of Christ. Too much training now is in obedience to the mandates of the church.

No pure antinomianism is possible. It is always a question of whose law should govern us. All too many antinomians in the church are content to let state law govern them, which in effect is saying that state is their lord god, their sovereign. Others insist on self-law, autonomy, my will be done. We reveal who our god is by the law we recognize as governing us. Neither autonomy (self-law), state law, nor church law can supplant God's law.

Christendom in its truest sense means the return of God's {102} law. St Paul places every aspect of our lives under the rule of God: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God (1 Corinthians 10:31).

Increasingly, in one area of life after another, Christians who manifest the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, are reclaiming education, charity, law and politics, the church, the arts and sciences, and everything else for Christ. This is the return of Christendom, or, better its fuller establishment.

It is living in the recognition that Jesus Christ "is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Timothy 6:15). The word Potentate is the Greek *dunaste*, meaning lord, the sole possessor of authority. The only legitimate source of authority is Jesus Christ, and all subordinate powers have only a derivative authority, and that insofar as they are faithful to His law-word. A potentate not only has authority but he also establishes all subordinate authorities. This means that, because Jesus Christ is that Potentate who is King over all kings, and Lord over all lords, He and His law-word are the only valid source of law and authority. This is what Christendom requires.

Some pagans in antiquity saw law as the invention and the gift of the gods.²³ At this point, the pagans were wiser than the antinomians of the modern church. St Paul saw the Pharisaic laws as a yoke (Galatians 5:1), whereas, as James so plainly states it, God's law is "the law of liberty" (James 2:12). Not autonomy (selflaw) but theonomy (God's law) is liberation. Christendom

23. W. A. Whitehouse, "Law," in Alan Richardson, editor, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (New York: Macmillan, [1950] 1960), 122.

thus means liberation from ourselves and men into the fullness of faith and obedience which is “the glorious liberty of the children of God” (Romans 8:21). While Whitehouse was not a theologian, he had this to say:

.... The Law was, in the first instance, an offer of life after a prescribed and blessed pattern. To men who cannot or will not accept what is offered in this Word of God, it becomes a stern command.... To sinners, the Law presents itself as one more means of self-justification, and sin becomes more and more manifest, working death through that which is good (Rom. 7:13). But it is precisely for this reason that the law is seen to be holy, and the commandment holy, righteous, and good.... {103}

The Law is given within the one Word of God which is from the beginning good news of grace. It is given as a norm for the transformation of creaturely existence, innocent or sinful, into that righteousness which will fulfill the covenant God has established with mankind. The role which law fulfills in relation to the Gospel has traditionally been described in a scheme of three uses. (i) It serves to preserve the order of creation where there is no saving faith. (ii) By reason of fallen man’s impotence to fulfill it, it drives him to realize the need for grace, and summons him to Christ the only Saviour. (iii) For believers it has a further use as a standard of obedience to God, by the guidance of which the fruits of the spirit may be brought forth.²⁴

Without the law of God, the church offers a version of Christianity which is man-centered and which offers Jesus Christ as the great fire and life insurance agent. With the law as our way of sanctification, our salvation then becomes God-centered. We then seek “first the kingdom of God and his righteousness” or justice (Matt. 6:33). We are then citizens and servants of Christendom, of the Kingdom of God. Christendom is another way of saying the Kingdom of God. In the word kingdom, the *dom* means jurisdiction, so that a kingdom is the jurisdiction of a king. We are told of Jesus Christ, God the Son incarnate, “All things were made by him: and without him was not any thing made that was made” (John 1:3). Some related texts are:

By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host

24. Ibid., 124f.

of them by the breath of his mouth. (Psalm 33:6)

But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. (1 Cor. 8:6)

And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ. (Eph. 3:9)

For by him (Jesus Christ) were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, {104} or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. (Col. 1:16)

From this it appears that the whole cosmos is Christ's jurisdiction and kingdom. Thus, Christendom, the jurisdiction of Christ, has existed from all eternity and from the day of creation. Our problem has been that, by our sin and our antinomianism, we have placed ourselves outside of Christ's jurisdiction and on the road to hell. The return of Christendom means really the return of a prodigal son culture to Jesus Christ.

2.
*THE CURRENT
SCENE*

CONFRONTING THE CRISIS

Otto Scott

Most Americans are uneasily aware that something is wrong in the land, but few see any particular pattern in what former President Carter once called our “national malaise.”

Only *The Wall Street Journal* has described our situation as a growing political crisis. The Journal has repeatedly pointed out that Congress has steadily usurped the constitutional prerogatives of the Presidency. The paper’s conservative editorial writers¹ have pointed to successive Boland “Amendments” and the activities of Speakers Jim Wright, Tom Foley and others as unconstitutional ventures into foreign policy—an area the Constitution reserves for the Executive branch.² Attention has also been called to the role being played by “Special Prosecutors” who prosecute politically-inspired Congressional cases against the Executive Branch.

These efforts, the editorialists say, have created an imbalance in which the Congress has diminished the Executive branch. Attention has also been called to the fact that the House of Representatives has managed to become a semi-permanent body, with over 90 percent of its members assured of re-election. The Founders did not anticipate such a situation; they assumed that regular elections would ensure a turnover. They did not expect men to combine to freeze elections results.

That is not all that was not foreseen. It was never expected that Congress would be allowed by the Courts, the Executive and the people to enact laws from which it exempts itself.

There are other developments which the Founders could not reasonably have anticipated, with which we are familiar, that

1. In contrast to its leftwing news pages writers.

2. With “advise and consent” from the Senate alone.

increase the present danger.

These include a media that has escaped from responsibility, and a Judiciary that has paradoxically expanded its powers over the American society while becoming ineffectual in dealing with an explosion of litigation and an unparalleled rise in crime.

This situation has led some to call for a new Constitutional Convention. But at a time when the bulk of the media, the Academy, Congress and the Courts are in intellectual {106} thrall to the arguments of the Liberal/Left, such a Convention would push this nation further in its present drift toward total authority.³

Many people are aware that matters are awry, but intellectually unaware of the significance of the pattern of events. They are lulled by our disorder. They do not know that, politically, unchecked disorder has always led to total control.

They are unaware that all the great revolutions of modern times have emerged from runaway Legislatures that first unbalanced the orderly processes of government, then eliminated the traditional head of State, brushed Courts aside, and finally selected one of their own to wield complete authority.

But to describe a crisis is not enough. We need to know how to confront it—and how to avoid the errors that toppled other nations in similar circumstances.

In order to reduce their influence and to place the Liberal/Left in the position of having to defend its propositions rather than to continue to enjoy sacrosanct intellectual positions, it is suggested that we float arguments to reform: the Media, the Academy, Congress, and the Judiciary.

The Media

The Founders wanted a free press, but not a press that contends with the government to control the nation. They lived at a time when laws existed against slander and blasphemy. We cannot revive the laws against blasphemy at this time, but we can certainly restore the laws against slander.

It is essential that we restore the right of every citizen to be able to face his accusers and answer their charges. *This Constitutional right was removed when the press was told it could refuse to name*

3. Autocracy.

its sources. But an inalienable right cannot be taken away or even surrendered. Therefore the “shield laws” must be revoked. The press must be held responsible for what it prints.

In order for this responsibility to be restored, the rulings that a “celebrity” cannot be slandered or libeled excepting when {107} malice (an invisible emotion) is evident, must be overturned. It is clearly against all principles of justice that any citizen be denied redress when slandered or libeled.

The media should be compelled to prove its *reportage*. If unable to do so, the journalist should not only pay a personal fine, but be sent to jail—in company with his editor.

The media is, of course, not the only offender against the truth in our society. But since the media has become the well of America-hatred in the land, it is the media that deserves first attention.

The Academy

The great protective shield of the American Academy is tenure: the system whereby professors appoint one another, and where, once appointed, they are secure for life.

This system, archaic in nature, has been subjected to spectacular and extended abuse. University faculties have organized riotous demonstrations against speakers whose political views they do not share, street violence against regulations and foreign policies they do not approve, and have steadily fed the youth of the nation a diet of anti-Americanism, anti-Christianism and anti-Capitalism.

The simplest and most effective way to restore the people’s control over the universities their taxes support is to abolish Tenure. In Great Britain, where professors have similarly defied the Government that supports them, tenure has been abolished for all new professorships. Yet that nation and its schools still stand.

Our nation, however, is much larger than Great Britain. Our tax-supported institutions of higher education are more numerous and employ tens of thousands of tenured professors. It is not sufficient for us to simply block future tenures; we have too large a problem confronting us. Our universities have become seedbeds of revolution against all we hold dear.

We should cancel all tenure in all tax-supported institutions of learning. Professorial appointments should be reviewed by

outside committees. Those who have conspicuously abused their professorial podiums should be pensioned and replaced. To argue for continued tenure in the face of continued abuse is to argue that professors should be tax-supported while subverting the nation. This is clearly against the principles of justice. {108}

Congress

To begin with, Congress must be forced to obey the laws it enacts for the nation. It passes understanding how the Courts, the President and the people could have watched Congress exempt its members from obeying all laws. Such arrogance is against every principle upon which this nation was founded. It must be ended.

Congress⁴ has found a way to cement itself in office. *Minor improvements will not fundamentally change this situation*. Major change is necessary. *Congressional terms should be limited to six in the House and two in the Senate*. Persons who reach these limits should be no longer eligible to serve in Congress.⁵

And because we have far too many imbedded Congressmen, this limitation should be applied at once. Such a step would cost the nation a minority of good representatives, but the overall result will be well worth the price. Congressmen and Senators so retired should do so on a pension.

The new Congress should have its staffs limited; its frank limited, its expenses limited, so that future Congresses remain within bounds set by the people.

Finally, if the system of Special Prosecutors is retained (a moot proposition), then such Special Prosecutors should be appointed to investigate the behavior of Congressmen as well as Executive appointees in relation to conflicts of interest, and also in relation to Congressional violations of its Constitutional limits in dealing with the other branches of Government. The limits of Congress are defined, but Congressmen appear unaware of the definition. New Congresses, like new Presidents and new Magistrates, should know and respect the form of this Government, if it is not to

4. Especially the House.

5. They should be similarly barred from governmental service in any other capacity as well, lest they continue their pattern of parasitism inside governmental agencies.

dissolve as have all previous democracies, into demagogy and autocracy.

The Judiciary

It should be remembered that courts have never stopped a revolution anywhere, at any time. Courts have knowingly released murderers upon the people, in order to preserve the form rather than the substance of justice. In *Roe vs. Wade*, the {109} highest Court overturned 1,700 years of western tradition—and created a population crisis in which 24 million abortions have created an imbalance between the young and the elderly. Federal Judges have also entered into the administration of schools, hospitals, industries and even communities.

While expanding its activities and authority, the Judiciary is near gridlock in terms of cases. Even relatively simple criminal cases take months and sometimes years to conclude, and many more years to traverse all available avenues of appeal. Civil cases move glacially; take years to be heard, and are subject to differing interpretations in different regions of the nation, by different judges on different levels.

Sweeping violations of the rights of the citizens by various governmental departments and agencies⁶ are ignored by Courts intent upon placing Procrustean sociological restraints upon a society once known for self-government.

How can the Federal Judiciary be returned to its proper Constitutional limits? Not by asking it to reform itself: it will not do so.

Since the Judges have abused the trust of the people by setting themselves up as a permanent Constitutional Convention, a preliminary step might be to remove their life-terms in favor of a 12 year limitation, as with Congress and as with the Presidency (which is limited to eight years).⁷

To ensure that the Judiciary does not continue to defy the people and subvert the Constitution, groups should establish Judiciary

6. Dismissal from Governmental service for exceeding Constitutional bounds is the least of the reforms that should sweep through our Civil Service.

7. Thomas Jefferson, who regarded the Judiciary as a menace to the Republic, proposed 6 to 8 terms.

Watches, similar to Neighborhood Watches, to monitor and report all judicial decisions in their city, State and Federal District. A continuing Biographical Dictionary should be published listing the background and affiliations of all judges. This reference should be used in reporting decisions. The people should know those who detest and derail their customs and traditions, as well as those who honor and uphold them.

Finally, as in the instance of Congress, the Reform of the Judiciary should not be delayed for decades to realize. Federal judges who have already served over 12 years should be immediately retired on pensions, and new judges appointed.

If State governments adopted these reforms, especially {110} with respect to their universities, legislatures and judiciaries, much of their fabled corruption would be miraculously reduced.

Such Reforms would, of course, constitute a counterrevolution. Citadels packed by the Liberal/Left would fall to forces faithful to the origins and spirit of the nation.

The Liberal/Left today dominates the Media, Academy, Congress and the Judiciary mainly because the American intellectuals, as a class, have abandoned their traditional duty to provide the rationales that defend our civilization and have, instead, turned against it.

Conservative intellectuals, greatly outnumbered, largely blacklisted from the Academy, the Media, Congress and the Judiciary, have recovered considerable intellectual ground, and restored the hopes of millions by their defense of traditional values. But conservative organizational efforts are now confronted by massive and destructive attacks that will soon be mounted from Liberal/Left citadels in the Media, Academy, Congress and the Judiciary.

Immense and destabilizing challenges from the Liberal/ Left will be mounted in the next few years. The people must be made more informed not only of its nature and significance, *but of how it can be countered.*

The best strategy in this situation, as in war, is to attack. The long-range goal of the conservative offensive is to enable the people to regain control of their government. This cannot be done simply through elections, since the electoral process has, as with the Media and the Academy, been subtly but effectively subverted.

The people must be reminded that what the Left has done can be undone. The Constitution puts the people in charge of the government—and not vice versa. Once that realization sweeps the land, the reign of the Liberal/Left faces defeat.

I think the Reforms listed are not only reasonable, but crucial to our liberties. To argue against them will place the Liberal/Left into the intellectually indefensible position of supporting abuses.

I do not propose, at this point, a new organization to promote these reforms. No money is needed; no new jobs.

All that is needed is to *float these ideas* throughout the land; to get people talking and thinking about how to curb Congress, how to regain a Press that serves, instead of {111} propagandizing the nation, how to stop the universities from being seedbeds of disorder and denunciation of our society, how to regain a Court system that protects instead of dividing us—how to have a nation in which we have faith instead of fear.

If such discussions become widespread, Reforms will be demanded. And what is demanded will be accomplished when the nation realizes it can rid itself of its intellectual tormentors.

THE BELTWAY'S VIEW OF BUSINESS

Otto Scott

Shortly after the Civil War young Henry Adams, 32 years old, wrote what amounted to the obituary of the American dream in *The North American Review*, a leading magazine of the day.¹

The American dream, according to Adams was not owning a house, but the dream that governmental power could be controlled. The people of the thirteen colonies were led to believe that this was possible, although all Europe considered it impossible.

Blackstone had written “that absolute, despotic power which must in all governments reside somewhere, is entrusted by the Constitution of the British kingdoms” to Parliament.

Americans fought against that power and won, and then devised a system where governmental power would remain forever limited. Adams considered this an experiment. He noted, in 1870, that it had lasted 75 years, and was then set aside, temporarily, during the Civil War.

After that War he saw a chance to resume that experiment—but he saw that chance vanish in the proceedings between President Grant, the Abolitionist Congress of 1869–1870, and the Supreme Court. By June of 1870, the Old Republic disappeared, and the limitations on governmental power were lifted.

Consequently, he said, “the great political problem of all ages”—the problem of how to control governmental power— “cannot, at least in a community like that of the future America, be solved by the theory of the American Constitution.”

The American dream had been lost in what he termed “the pressure of necessity... The result,” he concluded, “is not pleasant to

1. Henry Adams, *The Session*, June, 1870, cf. *The Great Secession Winter of 1860–61 and Other Essays* (New York: Sagamore Press, 1958), 191–222.

contemplate. It is not one which the country is prepared to accept or will soon be in a temper to discuss. It will not be announced by professional politicians, who are not fond of telling unpleasant truths.² {114}

Adams's personal solution was to abandon the study of politics—or *power*, as it should be called—to become a historian. Unfortunately we do not have his lead-time. What he saw as the end of the American experiment in 1870 is now the State of the Union. We live under a *de facto* unlimited government, although it operates behind the facade and the offices of the Old Republic, much as did Rome after its civil war.

The industrial sector experiences governmental power very directly on a daily and even hourly basis. The rhetoric of a free marketplace is still being heard today, but in reality *laissez-faire* never really existed anywhere. It was a slogan, a phrase, used against taxes that impeded progress. Even Adam Smith, in the first economic treatise, did not argue for a complete absence of regulation. He excepted national defense, canals, the post office and certain other activities as matters of public welfare that needed governmental controls.

This was generally understood, and both the thirteen colonies and later the States were quite active in economic matters. There are whole libraries about legislation that benefited some industries. There are also many tomes and pamphlets from an influential socialist minority which operates itself under various names, such as liberal or environmental—which is fiercely against such assistance.

But arguments against *laissez-faire* were not common until after the Civil War.³ They appeared in tandem with the rise of industry, and especially of manufacturing. Now, it's obvious that manufactured goods, which began to appear in increasing quantity and variety in the 1870s and 1880s, made more products available at increasingly lower prices to more people than ever before.

But the new factories also ushered in all sorts of other changes

2. *Ibid.*, 193–222.

3. D.T. Armentado cites the American Economic Association, founded 1885, as saying that “the doctrine of *laissez faire* is unsafe in politics and unsound in morals.” in *The Myth of Antitrust*.

that were neither welcome nor admired. The steel mill diminished the numbers and the work of blacksmiths, the textile mills did away with home spinners, the railroads put stage coaches out of business, department stores pressed hard against small shops. All this added up to a social transformation that was upsetting and difficult—and that led to great, deep-seated confusion, envy and fear.

People hate societal change. As the nation became more secularized, the inequalities introduced by the new marketplace {115} became difficult to rationalize in terms of morality. After all, the marketplace is a material arena: goods and rewards do not seem to be equitably distributed, any more than are natural talents and intelligence. That is because the world without religion seems meaningless, a place of hit or miss, of efficiencies that do not solve economic problems, and of extravagances that do.

There was—and still remains—widespread resentment against industrialization; it has evoked emotions that cannot be calmed by rational arguments. That is because emotions block out rationality. Logic is useless against emotions. But there are always those who pander to emotions, and who use them to achieve non-emotional goals. Politicians, for instance, succeed according to their skill in organizing emotional masses to promote political goals. And intellectuals are not far behind politicians in this peculiar skill.

Intellectuals and politicians combined to argue that industrialization would carry the nation into a non-competitive, frightening world that would be dominated by heartless industrialists ruling over helpless working people. That was the argument of Marx, who advocated an uprising from below. It was also the argument of the Fabian Society, which argued for justice imposed from the top.

In 1888 Edward Bellamy, in his Utopian novel *Looking Backward* synthesized the American approach to market loathing and projected a vision of a future society smoothly and painlessly regulated by a benevolent government. *Looking Backward*⁴ expressed the longing of millions for a world free of harsh upsets

4. See Arthur Lipow, *Authoritarian Socialism in America: Edward Bellamy and the Nationalist Movement by Arthur Lipow* (University of California Press, 1982).

and wrenching changes. It played a major though unremarked role in the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890.

The idea behind the Antitrust Act was that it was the duty of the Government to ensure that everyone who entered—or wanted to enter—the marketplace should have an equal chance to compete. To say that this is a strange idea is to understate. In the real world, in which people have always lived, there has never been a time or a place where competition was equal.⁵ Contrary to what the establishment economists were arguing in the 1890s and later, the United States had not been a {116} land of competitive equality for all that was forced by industrialization into monopolies, but in fact had been forced into more competition than ever before.

Unfortunately these facts were not often heard at the turn of the century. What the press represented was a blind rage against railroad rebates, against the rise of Standard Oil, against the creation of trusts and holding companies—and especially, against the rise of rich industrialists. What occurred was the Sherman Act.

Although economists then and now agree that perfect competition is only a philosophic ideal, they cling to the idea that somehow the government can make competition more equitable in some undefined moral sense, by limiting “market shares” of single enterprises or groups of companies. This is broken down into categories too tedious for us now, but familiar to the business world. They include “barriers” to entering a market that is dominated by very large and wealthy firms, or by firms holding patents that prevent competition, or by firms whose economies of scale enable them to produce products cheaper than anyone else. But in the real world such advantages are transitory. Competition is unceasing—and governmental intervention is more likely to benefit firms with political influence than it is likely to benefit the public. Instead of creating a level playing field, governmental intervention is more apt to create favorites of the politicians.

Whenever I hear about areas too dominated by large firms for newcomers to enter, I think of J.B. Saunders, a businessman whose biography⁶ I wrote some years ago. Saunders was the sales

5. This argument was presented by Joseph A. Schumpeter.

6. Otto Scott, *The Professional: A Biography of J.B. Saunders* (New York: Atheneum, 1976).

manager of a small petroleum marketing firm who was given a box of cigars one Christmas by his employers, at the same time that the boss's son was given a house.

That convinced Saunders that he was wasting his life working for that firm. Instead of looking for another job with another firm, he decided to go into business for himself. In order to do that he borrowed some money and then visited a number of small petroleum refiners and said, "Fire your salesmen. I'll buy everything you produce for the next year."

Then, with the first few month's production of a number of refineries, he entered the petroleum marketing arena with enough product to be counted as an important newcomer—and {117} began to compete with the majors. In time he became a major marketing force all by himself. He ended up not only as a tycoon, but as a legend—because he began this effort in 1936, in the middle of the Great Depression, when everyone said, "The little guy hasn't got a chance; everything is all sewed up." Saunders didn't believe that—but the economists and the Government still do.

The Government, in its role of Nanny to industry, believes that the industrial sector of the nation cannot function equitably without regulations. Therefore it followed the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 with the Clayton Act of 1914 and the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914. Later, in 1936, the year Saunders went into business, the Clayton Act was amended (which means made stronger) and still later, in 1950, was strengthened again by the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act.

The legal basis for these progressive steps to regulate industry has never been seriously challenged, and rests upon Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several states..." In 1824 the Supreme Court affirmed the federal government's right to regulate interstate commerce (and) this interpretation provided the basis for the sweeping exercise of power which began with the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887.⁷ Since then a series of rulings by the high Court empowered the federal government to "adopt whatever economic policy may reasonably be deemed to promote public welfare, and to enforce

7. Armentado, *op. cit.*, 52.

that policy by legislation adapted to that purpose."⁸

D.T. Armentado, in his classic book *The Myths of Antitrust*, says that antitrust laws may be legal, but from a 'natural rights' or libertarian viewpoint do not seem proper.⁹ Libertarians argue that the government has no right to limit commercial arrangements made between free citizens on mutually acceptable terms; that the government should be limited to protecting the rights to life, liberty and property and to only adjudicate violations of such rights.

Establishment experts, however, hold that property rights are neither inalienable nor natural. Thus, the fruits of one's labor are under the control of the Government in their entirety. {118} Carried to its logical extreme, this could mean that all we earn is subject to legal confiscation, so long as the proper judicial procedures are followed. That is, at any rate, the reasoning of the IRS toward tax evaders, and the reasoning of the Drug Enforcement Agency when drug dealers are involved.

What this approach means in terms of antitrust, however, is equally interesting. It's clear from their history that the antitrust laws were a response to a widespread public outcry against what were termed monopolies. Foremost among such targets of hatred for both press and public was the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, headed by John D. Rockefeller and associates. There are few instances in history where the reality of a situation was more successfully distorted into myth than the public reputation of Standard Oil and its public—and governmental—image.

The petroleum industry was first discovered, developed, and expanded inside the United States. Without it, it is doubtful that the second Industrial Revolution would have occurred, because it was only the development of a reliable source of lubricating oils that made possible the great turbines and dynamos of the power industry and others. Without gasoline and other fuels the automobile and airplane could not have risen. Within a generation after Standard appeared, the petroleum industry had spread and changed the entire world. Ordinarily such a sweeping series of innovations and global benefits would have been the source

8. *Ibid.*, 53.

9. This is the argument of Murray Rothbard and others.

of enormous national pride. The living standards and even the life spans of the entire human race were lifted and extended by the introduction of petroleum. Yet our press and intellectuals encouraged the envious by portraying the petroleum as the optima of villainy.

The man in the street was convinced, thanks to the muckrakers¹⁰ and their allies, that Standard Oil had somehow created enormous riches for its managers at the expense of the people. This myth, still current and still imbedded {119} in our textbooks, was not altered even by Ida Tarbell's *History of the Standard Oil Company*¹¹ which in a remarkable chapter described the Standard's success as due to continued innovations, capital plowbacks, economies of scale and progressive lowering of product prices. Even railroad rebates, a feature often raised as indication of "unfairness," was justified from the railroad viewpoint because of the increasing value of Standard's shipments—and, of course, constituted economies for the company. Lower prices for larger purchases are, after all, still an accepted practice in every industry today. But it led early in this century to controls over the railroads—as well as to the antitrust case against Standard.

The public resentment of Standard Oil made its fate in the Courts inevitable. Although it had complied with all regulations up to and including the creation of its "trust" or holding company, it was ordered to effectively dissolve into its constituent parts in 1912.

This decision was officially reached in order to enhance competition, but Paul Blazer, founder of the Ashland Oil Company told me that it had been entirely unnecessary. "The men who built the firm grew old and rich," he said later, "and rich men are not as aggressive as men on their way up. Furthermore, Standard had outgrown itself. By the time headquarters became fully aware of a situation, it had changed, and other firms had taken advantage

10. The term "muckraker" was taken from a passage in John Bunyon's *Pilgrim's Progress* by President Theodore Roosevelt in a speech to the Gridiron Club on March 17, 1906: "the Man with the Muckrake, the man who could look no other way but downward with the muckrake in his hand; who was offered a celestial crown for his muckrake but who would neither look up or regard the crown he was offered but continued to rake to himself the filth of the floor."

11. Reprinted by Peter Smith, Gloucester, MA, 1963.

of the opportunity. Standard was, therefore, falling apart long before the Courts moved. Younger, more mobile, smaller firms were taking chunks out of its market share. If the Government had stayed out of the situation, Standard would have fallen of its own weight in the fullness of time.”¹²

Many more examples of unnecessary and even injurious Governmental interventions into the marketplace in the name of antitrust could be cited, but they would simply repeat the point. The Standard Oil case is cited because it set the tone and anchored the myth that antitrust laws are necessary, although other industrial nations seem to do very well without them.

Of course, there are some who deplore the existence of these laws. Judge Robert H. Bork and Ward S. Bowman have written a scathing denunciation of them. Morris Adelman is an {120} outstanding critic, as are an increasing string of eminent scholars.¹³ Unfortunately, according to Armentado, most of the critics deplore the *results* but not the theory of antitrust.

This seems illogical. “Capitalism is either a viable system,” said Armentado, “or it is not. An active policy of government intervention in a free market system is a contradiction in terms.”¹⁴ But the most telling evidence against the antitrust laws was provided by World War II.

It is now forgotten that World War II arrived very quickly. In the early 1930s pacifism reigned supreme. Oxford students paraded against war, peace societies proliferated. In the Pecora Hearings J.P. Morgan was hauled before the Senate and questioned about loans to Britain and other negotiations during World War I. Taylor Caldwell wrote a best-seller called *Merchants of Death* transparently blaming DuPont for helping to get us into World War I for profits. Industry was targeted, in these hearings and much of the literature of the time, as an antisocial force.

Then Japan attacked Pearl Harbor and Hitler declared war. The reason for the Pearl Harbor attack was clear. Japan needed oil and rubber, and invaded Southeast Asia to obtain these commodities

12. *c/f* an interview in 1967, as part of the background for *The Exception: the Story of Ashland Oil*, by Otto Scott (New York: McGraw Hill, 1968).

13. Armentado, *op. cit.*, fns 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 275, 276.

14. *Ibid.*, 278.

from the British, Dutch and French possessions in the region. Our Pacific fleet and the Pacific fleet of Great Britain had to be removed before the Japanese could transport their troops to these invasions. Hence, Pearl Harbor.

The plan was simple but well conceived, for Japanese observers in World War I saw that the German army had been stalled for lack of rubber. Without rubber their industries could not produce tanks, cannons, planes, typewriters and other essential products. Without rubber and oil a modern war could not be fought.

We had oil, but no natural rubber. Washington, which had in large measure relied on the British fleet in the Pacific, was forced to listen to Akron industrialists who before the war had pleaded for permission to create a synthetic rubber program. Washington said the antitrust laws would not allow the chemical, petroleum and rubber manufacturing industries to combine in such an effort. When John Collier, the CEO of Goodrich, warned of a looming national threat, both the press and Washington responded with sarcasms, because it had become an imbedded {121} belief that businessmen had no patriotism and are interested only in profits.

After Pearl Harbor, however, the Government *suspended* the antitrust laws, told manufacturers to forget about patent rights, eliminate waste by pooling patents and to ignore the government's many regulations against industries cooperating with one another. Meanwhile the Government itself fixed all prices and wages. It also allocated all materials, commodities and machinery, to wherever it believed they would best help the war effort.

Much has been written about the nation's gigantic industrial accomplishments during World War II, but these accounts badly need revision. The price controls installed by Washington created, as always, unnecessary shortages, delays, bottlenecks and inefficiencies. The wage and price controls expanded governmental authority but resulted in an artificial marketplace replete with mandated inequities. No government can equitably or even sensibly allocate all the goods, commodities and activities of a nation as immense as ours. Labor was pressed into overtime efforts under artificially low wages. Yet the myth of wartime profiteers in World War I was so deeply imbedded that President Franklin Roosevelt wanted a ceiling of \$25,000 on all *incomes* in the nation. It took many arguments to persuade him to drop

that plan. But Washington did set a ceiling of \$25,000 on all new salaries. Meanwhile it is noteworthy that Government dollar-a-year men had expense accounts that ranged from generous to lavish.

It is true, however, that American industry went into miraculous overdrive. Its accomplishments were so remarkable that it now seems obvious that the Great Depression would have quickly ended if the nation had not been hobbled by restrictive legislation, and if the antitrust laws and thwart regulations hobbling industry had been abolished during the Thirties. That very clear conclusion seems to have evaded virtually all observers. What a free nation could have done in the Thirties, and in the World War of the Forties, remains not only unknown, but even unconsidered.

Meanwhile, as we know, the Japanese opening wartime gambit was successful, so successful that if we had not developed synthetic rubbers, we would have lost the war in our second year. Meanwhile the Government prioritized the sale of gasoline, halted the manufacture of passenger cars and tires, and funded joint efforts by the rubber, chemical and petroleum industries in a frantic effort to produce synthetic rubbers. The success of that {122} program is one of the great accomplishments of American industry. Without it we would not have been able to continue the war long enough to develop the nuclear bomb, another remarkable achievement of industrial cooperation, among many.

Wartime contracts between industry and the Government were based on cost-plus ten percent. That is to say, costs plus ten percent profit. This limitation of profits was expected to eliminate what was termed “profiteering.” Industrial efforts were highly praised, factories were awarded E—for excellence—flags. But after the war the charge immediately rose that costs had unnecessarily risen. The press wrote about “more costs, more ten percent.”

Consequently “renegotiators” appeared. J.B. Saunders recalled that “they were young accountants who examined his books and didn’t understand them. I was a marketer who operated on a margin of one quarter of a cent above posted prices,” he said later. “The Government men pounced on that difference; it had to be renegotiated.” In the end they demanded the return of monies honestly earned under grueling conditions.

Of course, there is a longstanding legal basis for the sanctity

of contracts, and a Constitutional guarantee against *ex post facto* in this nation. But that guarantee did not, apparently, apply to contracts between the American government and its citizens. The fact that posted prices in such a diverse and far flung industry as petroleum, were more like averages than fixed figures was beyond the comprehension of the accountants who studied Saunders' books.¹⁵

Other industries who had contributed to the war effort endured the same treatment. Although generally accepted as normal, the fact is that such Governmental behavior was startling, and deserves attention. The fact that business did not mount an organized protest merely meant that managers knew that such a protest would have been useless. The Courts would have sustained the Government. It is difficult not to believe that the immense, elaborate network of wartime controls on all levels—federal, state and local—had so accustomed millions of people to rules and regulations that they would never again feel safe without them.

The issue of contracts was to arise again on the international markets in the postwar world. And once again the illustration is provided by the petroleum industry. The seemingly {123} permanent campaign against this industry had established its villainy in the minds of people around the world, including many in Washington and in the Middle East. Monroe Jackson Rathbone, CEO of Standard Oil of New Jersey, a player in the international group of majors known as the Seven Sisters, told me that it was the view of his firm that it paid for a commodity purchased from Arab societies that had no use for it at the time.

The American and British firms that dominated the international petroleum market had, of course, lost their holdings in Mexico in 1936 without compensation and knew from that experience that they could expect no protection from Washington, which held the view that a sovereign nation could act against a US firm with impunity.

This was, however, a departure from the well-established British system. The British had held, through their long international experience, that contracts were sacred. One might later not like the terms, but they had to be honored. If a foreign Caliph or Pasha

15. *The Professional*, op. cit., 297–98.

decided to unilaterally tear up a contract with a British firm, they would send in a gunboat to persuade him to keep his word. They intended to do that when Venezuela repudiated its contracts with the Royal Dutch Shell and expelled the firm from that country at the turn of the century. At that point Washington intervened on behalf of Venezuela, as part of our policy of keeping Europe out of the western hemisphere. Rather than fight the US, Britain withdrew. But it didn't like to, and it didn't agree with Washington's reasoning.

After World War II these issues began to arise again. While Washington was in the process of its renegotiations of its wartime contracts with US industry, the British petroleum industry was confronted by political turmoil in Iran. The entire situation is too complicated to recall in detail, but an important detail is that both the Shah and his opposition wanted to renegotiate oil prices—and the British refused.

This led to such uproar that the Shah fled the country, and London asked Washington to intervene. Washington said it would, on condition that US oil firms would be allowed to share the British concessions—if the intervention were successful. As we all know, it was—thanks to President Truman. The Shah was returned—and immediately asked for an increase in the price of Iranian oil. In other words, a renegotiation. To the great distress of the British, Washington agreed.

The Beltway reasoning on this issue at that time was that oil is a national treasure, and that a sovereign government had the right to raise its price any time it chose. In other words, Iran {124} could sell its oil and retain its ownership of it at the same time.

Or, putting it still another way, a government could do anything it chose to businessmen. I'm sure you notice that this sort of reasoning is part of a general contempt for industry that is held by so many intellectuals in official positions, who are usually simply called bureaucrats.

In the Iranian event the Shah raised the price of oil unilaterally, tearing up the old contracts, and Washington told the oilmen to obey. Then Libya raised its oil price and tore up lots of contracts. The rest of what is loosely called the "oil-producing" countries then did the same. Actually, none of these were oil producing. All the oil was produced by American and British industrialists who

sent in teams at their own expense to drill, lay pipelines, build refineries, manufacture products, carry them away in tankers and sell them on the world market.

During the years when the majors shared that market internationally but shared it with a multitude of firms within various nations, the United States was served the cheapest gasoline outside of Arabia. Our industries functioned on low-cost energy and this had more to do with our international industrial leadership than any observers seem to recall.

At any rate, that situation began to unravel once the countries with oil in their subsoil and foreign petroleum firms on their topsoil learned that they could set their own prices, more or less, with Washington's approval. Contracts began to alter every few months, and prices moved steadily upward until the great explosion of OPEC in the early 70s, when they quadrupled overnight.

Even this increase could have been met by increased prices in the marketplace, were it not for the fact that OPEC also introduced a boycott because of our foreign policy. The boycott created shortages, but the press pretended that these were created by the petroleum industry in order to raise prices and increase profits. That myth is still believed, and a thousand books and speakers will not remove it from the mind of the general public.

Meanwhile President Carter went on the air to talk against Big Oil, and established price controls over the petroleum industry. Since industry trades over the phone and draws contracts later, and also because these terms often shift hourly, this later led to a series of persecutions of petroleum firms for presumably violating the control regulations—but that's another jungle.

The important issue to remember is that our {125} Government, somewhere along the line, very obviously lost faith in contracts. It does not consider them important. It sent officials around the land to unilaterally ignore the terms of contracts it made with citizens in industry, and then told our businessmen overseas that their contracts with foreign powers did not have Washington protection.

Even contracts with the Soviets were not treated as inviolate, for the Soviets were allowed to ignore some provisions with our tacit approval. Contracts between the Department of Defense

and industries that serve the military became subject to the same uncertainties; the same “renegotiations,” the same assumption that terms can be altered at will by the Government.

Because regulations now apply to every industry, and to every aspect of not only product development but also in commerce via the SEC, the FTC and so on, every business, every industry, every activity, every commercial and industrial transaction is subject to federal, state and local regulations.

All this had to culminate somewhere, of course, and last year it all came together in a new, updated and expanded Environmental Protection Act, and the creation of a new Secretary of the Environment. The Act gives the Government the powers of God over everything, living animals and plants, every activity that disturbs the air in the United States.

It has no limits, so far as I know, and its full impact is yet to be assessed. Its origins are too complex for us to explore today. Let it suffice to say that one Congressman introduced a Bill to mandate the mileage of automobiles for the rest of the decade. It has only recently been disclosed that the Fish and Game authorities can curtail industrial activity anywhere they find a threat to any insect, fish, bird or animal in terms of its habitat or comfort.

This was enacted in the wake of a long series of environmental scares, and its effect on industry so far has been to make it impossible to build a new factory in this land in less than 10 years. That time is not taken up by plans or construction, but by the intricate process of obtaining permissions and paying advance taxes, and in overcoming the objections of environmentalists.

That is where emotional arguments have carried us. Therefore the present economic situation, the rising unemployment, the flight of manufacturers from this land, the loss of our global industrial and economic leadership all carry a label that reads: Made in Washington, D.C.

All that I have described, from the antitrust {126} interventions to the loss of contract law, is only a fragment, only a part of the overall story. Our Government has escaped the limitations of the Constitution through what Henry Adams called “the pressures of necessity.” But as he observed, they were necessities created by emotional arguments used by the Government as a means of expanding its power over everything that moves, breathes or lives

in the land.

Some of the people are in the process of discovering this the hard way. Those who expect the Government to take care of them approve of it. Those who want to lead free lives do not. It is our duty, therefore, to make new efforts, a new experiment if you will, to see, once again, if Governmental power can be controlled—for total control is now in the hands of the Beltway. Dofflemeyer Lecture, Stanford University, January 14, 1992.

BUSINESSMEN AND THE MARXISTS

Otto Scott

I once heard Newt Gingrich draw an interesting distinction. “Business,” he said, “is based on compromise. But politics is based on confrontation. Therefore businessmen do not understand politics.”

That observation was not based on any dislike of businessmen, or any lack of respect for their abilities and contribution. It was simply a professional politician’s estimate of non-politicians.

Let me put it this way. Business is a profession that requires all the time and concentration you can spare. When people, who have no experience in business, who have never launched a company or headed one, who have no record of entrepreneurial success, start telling you what business should do, your eyes are apt to glaze. You know they don’t understand the game. And it is a game. An important, even crucial game, upon which our livelihoods depend, and which is the basis of our civilization in terms of material progress.

But business is not politics. Office politics are only a faint echo of real politics. Office politics can lead to the wrong person losing a job, or a company being sent down a disastrous path, simply because some people are better actors, or more fluent liars, than others. In politics the stakes are much higher. Lives can be lost, and entire nations misdirected.

Lenin, in a letter to Maxim Gorky in 1918 wrote, “It is high time for you to realize that politics is a dirty business in which you would do better not to meddle.”

Lenin knew what he was talking about. His name still echoes because he led one of the great political coups in history. As leader of a small, revolutionary party with only 3500 members, he made himself dictator of a nation of over 100 million people who did not

know him, did not agree with his policies, and would have killed him if they could have reached him.

Students today are told that Lenin achieved this because he was a Marxist. Then the professors launch into long descriptions of Marx's theory of the class struggle, the exploitation of the working class and other cliches. Most of this is intellectual nonsense. Karl Marx did not invent revolution, and {128} he did not invent "Marxism." He was one of a string of men enchanted by the French Revolution, which saw the established government of the richest nation in Europe fall before a push by radical journalists, lawyers and intellectuals. The hero of that revolution, for all subsequent radicals, was Robespierre.

Robespierre's dictatorship was held aloft as a model of success that could be repeated. After the downfall of the French Revolution, ambitious, power-hungry radicals repeated its campaign arguments into the nineteenth century. One of these revolutionary propagandists created *The League of the Just*, which attracted Karl Marx. In due course he and others altered the name to Communist. Marx's *Communist Manifesto*, which is still hailed as a triumph of originality, echoed arguments that had been floated in Paris and Berlin for two generations.

Even the theory of the class struggle, with which Marx's name is linked, was simply another term for what the Athenians called the Plebes and the Aristos five centuries before Christ. The idea of replacing the ruling group is the essence of revolution, and the arguments used to attain that goal are, today, known as Marxism. Any other name would do as well: the essence is fairly simple.

But although the essence of revolution may be made to sound simple, the practice is difficult, much as Business can be reduced to the word profit without explaining very much.

Without taking much time, we can look at how business and revolution interacted in Russia during the Bolshevik takeover of October, 1917, and see how this relates to our situation today.

As you know, revolution broke out in Russia in early February, 1917. As in 1905, a stoppage in one factory had spread to many in St. Petersburg, escalating to demonstrations by tens of thousands. When the Government raised the drawbridges over the Neva and ordered the army to suppress the demonstrations, the troops joined the crowds. On the third day there were hundreds of

casualties, buildings were set on fire, soldiers and sailors murdered their officers. Finally mobs opened the jails and released the prisoners, who poured to the Duma, the Russian Congress, and demanded an end to the Czar's rule. The Duma was an elected body, and as such legally represented the people. Its members created a 'Provisional Government' of ministers and promised nationwide elections to a Constituent Assembly, a Parliament. The new Premier was Prince Lvov, and most of the ministers were moderates, but Alexander Kerensky, a famous radical lawyer, was named {129} Minister of Justice. In this post he issued a blanket pardon to all political prisoners and exiles, because he believed in the slogan: "No enemies on the Left." Then Kerensky plunged into the power struggle inside the Duma to control the new Government, for from the start it was clear that the Left did not believe in Government by consensus.

Meanwhile the Czar peacefully abdicated, and with his family was placed under military guard. His cousin King George v. in London, refused to intervene. In Paris and London, however, there was apprehension, because the West did not want to lose its Russian ally in the East.

When word reached them that they were pardoned, Lenin was in Zurich. Stalin was in internal exile in a Russian village. Trotsky was in New York City. Kerensky's blunder meant that the Bolsheviks headed by Lenin could come home and resume their seats in the Duma.

On the surface this all sounds simply like politics, with little connection to business or businessmen. But that is not true, because the world is not so rigidly segregated. One of the members of the Bolshevik Party in exile was a man named Jacob Furstenberg, who was president of a commercial firm that traded, from headquarters in Copenhagen, German products to Russia and vice versa. These included chemicals, surgical instruments and even contraceptives. Most of its sales agents and staff didn't know it, but this firm was operated by an espionage ring financed by the German government through a financier named Alexander Helphand, who was better known as Parvus.

Neither Furstenberg nor Parvus looked or acted like Bolsheviks. Furstenberg had semi-underworld contacts, was always very elegant, and wore a flower in his buttonhole. Parvus traveled

surrounded by girls and champagne, lived in the best hotels and constantly huddled with bankers. Historians have done little research on these strange individuals. And Marxists pretend to have never heard of them.

But these were the men who provided the Bolshevik Party with its funds. For of course revolutionaries cannot live on words. They have to pay for their food and lodging, clothes and children, like everyone else.

I don't want to give the impression that Parvus and Furstenberg were simply good businessmen, although Parvus at least seems to have been one. The fact is that they were in the pay of the German government. For by 1915 Berlin realized it was in for a long war. And it decided to see if it could create a revolution behind the lines of its enemies: {130} Russia, France and Great Britain.

Parvus was just the man for that purpose, because he knew everyone in the Socialist International. And Parvus's man for Russia was Lenin. Incidentally, there is reason to believe that the Germans, through Parvus, also provided Trotsky with money. When word came that Lenin and Trotsky could return to Russia, this German network went into high gear. Orders came from the Foreign Minister, approved by the Kaiser, channeled to General Ludendorff, to offer Lenin a safe railway passage from Germany to Finland, and to make him an offer he would not want to refuse.

Lenin knew that a deal with the Germans was treasonous; he was, after all, a Russian, though a bad one. And he tried to get international Socialist approval for such a trip. He didn't entirely succeed, but he got enough shreds of respectability—in the name of course, of Peace—to get aboard the sealed train the Germans provided. He took his common law wife and thirty more Bolsheviks with him.

London and Paris both warned St. Petersburg that Bolsheviks in favor of peace were en route to Russia through Germany. But after interminable wrangling in St. Petersburg, the decision was made to let them come home, and in the interim, the Germans talked to Lenin. Before they talked, he was just another Leftwing blow hard. After they talked, all his plans took an upward leap. In return for Russia's withdrawal from the war, Germany promised Lenin what amounted to unlimited funds. These were to amount, all told, to 50 million gold marks, a sum equivalent to 8 billion in

today's dollars.

This money, channeled through the network established by Parvus and Furstenberg, enabled Lenin and Trotsky, the twin leaders of the Bolshevik party, to buy 47 newspapers inside Russia almost as soon as they arrived. Newspapers to launch the combination of agitation and recruitment, bribery and subversion that were essential to victory.

In other words, money, and not Marxism, was the fuel of revolution. As for words, the Bolsheviks did not theorize about Marxism: they simply promised Bread and Peace. Bread for the people, peace for the country. An end to the war. We who remember Vietnam know well how much trouble the word "peace" can bring.

But the Bolsheviks were not flower children. Lenin advised Russian soldiers to "stick a bayonet into their officers," and then go home and set fire to "manor houses." When Kerensky appealed to patriotism, Lenin called him a {131} "Bonaparte." And the use of the language of the French Revolution was significant, because that example was in all their minds. A special newspaper was launched to subvert the soldiers and sailors.

Meanwhile, there were American businessmen on the scene. Washington thought that what was happening was wonderful. Revolution to the United States meant freedom from Great Britain; it was a fine, decent word. President Wilson praised the happenings in Russia, and we had just entered the war against Germany.

Money began to flow from New York's Warburg to the Nya Banken, in Stockholm, to Lenin's group in St. Petersburg. Not as much as from Germany, but enough to count: ten or twelve million in gold, at a time when the purchasing power of gold was at least a hundred times what it is today.

But I am not going to walk you through the entire revolution. You know that Lenin made his final move in late October or early November, depending on which calendar you want to use. And you know that it was successful. Turkish sailors from the battleship Potemkin, Polish and Ukrainian and Georgian revolutionaries, backed by dissident army troops, took possession of the Duma, put its members before firing squads, sent Kerensky running for his life, and established what Lenin called a "Soviet" regime. That

name was taken from the workers' parties, and served to confuse the people.

Meanwhile, what did our businessmen in Russia think about all this? Although they left no books or diaries, their actions indicate that the American consensus was that changes inside Russia opened up new market opportunities for the United States.

That is not to say that Russia was unknown territory to American business, or that our business sector was naive about revolutions. Prior to World War I our business sector was dominated by Rockefeller and Morgan interests. They were not synonymous: they were quasi-rivals, dominant in different areas. The Rockefellers were strong in petroleum, tobacco, copper and allied industries; the Morgans in steel, railroads, banking and public service corporations. The Rockefellers had the National City Bank and the United States Trust Company and the major life insurance companies; Morgan dominated General Electric, the National Bank of Commerce and Chase National, N.Y. Life Insurance and Guarantee Trust Company.

Both groups had financed revolutions in the past: in Panama, in China, in Mexico. In all instances the idea was to {132} open markets for American finance and industry. Russia appeared to them simply another such market. Both groups had raised loans for Czarist Russia during the war, prior to the Bolshevik take-over. After that take-over, Wall Street used the Red Cross Mission as a cover.

That cover was one of the more unusual in the history of the Red Cross. Its members carried military titles: they were all colonels, majors, captains or lieutenants; they wore uniforms paid for by William Boyce Thompson, a Federal Reserve director and financier. The various members of the Mission represented both Rockefeller and Morgan interests, as well as independent groups.

There is no need to go into the financial forest and label all these trees, or name all the efforts to finance the Bolshevik Government by American interests. Let it suffice to say, for the sake of brevity, that from the start the Bolsheviks wanted all the money and help they could get from the West. The record indicates that they got so much they could not otherwise have survived.

And in that context I think businessmen deserve special evaluation. American businessmen earned an excellent reputation

during the War of Independence because they were, by and large, active on the side of independence. And independence, we know, is a word that America has long associated with the word freedom.

That was true in 1776, because the British had ruled that Americans could not ship their commodities anywhere except to England. And we were forced also to buy only English manufactured goods. We were taxed by Parliament, though we had no representatives in that body to speak or to vote our interests.

To become independent of such restrictions meant that we could do business anywhere in the world. In other words, we fought for freedom to manage our own affairs at home, and freedom to do business anywhere abroad. Independence meant freedom to us.

But in modern Africa, independence has come to mean slavery under a native government. Independence is not freedom in Africa. And in Russia, the new government, which called itself Soviet, announced a new form of slavery for all the people in the Russian empire. Private property was confiscated; the right to vote was swept aside, the right to a free press was denied, and the idea of private individuals engaged in commerce was made criminal even as the entire idea of law was swept aside. {133}

One would think that men raised in a civilized society would find all this appalling. That they would denounce such proceedings, and get as far away as possible, as soon as possible. That did not happen.

That does not mean that the American businessmen were not shocked at the idea of all private property being confiscated. But our businessmen were not Russians. *Their* property was not in danger of confiscation. And there remained the matter of doing business with the new Russian, or Soviet Government.

The diplomats, however, were not of the same mind. Perhaps their educations were different, or their perceptions of the world. They advised against American assistance to the Bolsheviks and warned that Lenin was in the pay of the Germans. But William Franklin Sands, executive secretary of the Morgan-controlled American International Corporation and William Boyce Thompson of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, thought otherwise.

To assume that Sands or Thompson or the other financially and commercially-minded men who were eager to do business with

the Bolsheviks were, themselves, Communists or Socialists may seem logical, but is almost certainly wrong. They were simply businessmen, intent upon making a deal.

There is nothing new in this. The ancient Inca Empire, which was completely totalitarian and often engaged in wars with various Amerindian tribes, did not conscript merchants into their armies, nor even hinder them from trading with the enemy during a war.

In fact, the role of merchants and financiers has, throughout history, been secondary to reasons of State. One might say that business, like agriculture, has been traditionally regarded as one of the less interesting basics by which society lives, as separate from how society is governed.

When Europe expanded its commerce around the globe, for instance, it did not do so in order to change governments, but to increase and enlarge markets. That expansion began with merchants, who developed enough trade to interest western rulers. When that trade was threatened, western powers fought over control of foreign markets. And this led to colonialism.

Merchants played an enabling role in this expansion of power, but not a truly governing role. To govern, after all, requires a different outlook than to trade. Gingrich put the difference politely. To put it impolitely is not fashionable, but let me remind you that governing power in the final analysis is a {134} matter of life and death. One rules or one obeys. The English ruled for a long time, over a vast area after many wars, because the English governing class was taught to have the capacity to kill. Even as recently as the Falklands War, we saw that they did not hesitate to kill Argentineans to keep them from taking land Britain considered its own. I doubt if we would kill for the same land. We have a merchandising outlook.

We had a highly developed civilization in 1917. It had developed behind the shield of England's Navy, much as Japan has developed its industrial power behind our military shield today.

When the Soviets took control of Russia, therefore, there was little reason to believe that they would change the systems which the world had evolved. Our businessmen were not theoreticians; it is unlikely that they were Marxist scholars—and equally unlikely for them to have been students of the French Revolution and its totalitarian phase.

So they helped the Commissars. Not only that. Through the years that followed they sent engineers and equipment to the USSR, after Herbert Hoover had organized a great relief effort to keep all the Soviet people from dying as a result of Lenin's insane agricultural and economic policies. I think it's doubtful that Hoover ever realized that without his relief efforts the Lenin Government would have collapsed, and Communism with it.

Hoover was simply too impressed with the need to help the starving, and in the process to make himself an important political figure. Coolidge called him "Wonder Boy."

Nor, for that matter, did the governments of the world seem to appreciate what they were up against. The Soviets created a sort of two-tier approach. The top tier consisted of officials with a diplomatic corps, a conventional army and all the rest of the traditional governmental apparatus with which other nations functioned domestically and internationally.

The second tier was based on propaganda and subversion: the two methods by which the Bolshevik Party had achieved power in Russia. The propaganda effort was, as you know, immensely successful in intellectual and artistic circles. This was due not only to the nature of the Marxist arguments, but also to the underlying subsidies the Kremlin created through all sorts of indirect avenues: prizes and publicity, books and galleries, plays and music, scholarships and commissions throughout the West. In time this led to the present dominance of Marxist professorships in our colleges, which in turn has led {135} to the intellectual domination of the media by an increasingly Marxist Academy.

Money and culture, politics and business intertwined in these sectors. Publishing firms and theatrical ventures on stage and in films, received subsidies to distort our history and elsewhere. In time a host of Marxist-oriented cultural presentations began to subvert and weaken the traditional patterns of our civilization, affecting even Court decisions and political trends.

Meanwhile more conventional military and industrial subversion in terms of espionage became such an imbedded Soviet practice that it is, today, taken for granted by non-Communist nations. The entire world has come to accept the two tiers of the USSR: the official diplomatic mask and the unofficial, unrelenting subversive underside.

Throughout all these seventy years international businessmen and financiers have worked operatively with the official Soviet level. A joint American-Soviet association of commissaries and American industrialists has been meeting regularly at the Kremlin with the approval of the Department of Commerce and the Department of State. Then a delegation of 500 American businessmen met with top-level Soviet industrial commissions to assist the Gorbachev regime to repair the ravages of the Communist economic system. Today the bankers of Italy and West Germany are competing to lend Russia money at 3 percent interest, and discussions are underway in Washington to admit Russia as a most favored trade nation.

Now, much of this may sound as if I am blaming businessmen for the rise of Marxism and the expansion of the Soviet slave system over nearly half the world. But in my opinion businessmen do not deserve this reproach. From the start, American businessmen have behaved in a traditional manner. They have pursued contracts and commercial ventures in Communist countries with Communist authorities because that is, and has always been, the nature of business.

Throughout all history, the business of trade has been tacitly allowed to continue even during wars. The Incas held the figure of the merchant to be sacred in terms of physical safety, and the merchant was allowed to cross the battle lines without harm. In virtually every war, goods have been circuitously exchanged between enemy nations, for in many instances the wars could not be continued otherwise.

Trade with the USSR on all levels, in all forms, was simply a continuation of tradition. Unfortunately the USSR did {136} not create a traditional society, unless one wants to go all the way back to the Babylonians, ancient Egypt, early China and other pre-Christian examples of unlimited despotism.

What Lenin & Co. created is a completely pagan society, which has recreated slavery on its lowest, forced labor level, which has updated Mongolian military theory, which lives on tribute from the conquered and occupied nations of Eastern Europe, which has inspired and in some instances created similar societies in the Orient, Central America, the Caribbean and Africa. It is too early to say what its future will be.

In helping this system to survive in the name of Peace is to foster the worst enemy of progress created in the last two thousand years.

But it is not businessmen who have made that decision: it is the intellectuals of the West, whose arguments have made Marxism respectable in our universities, while the Marxists have made the teaching of Capitalism a crime in their part of the world.

When the American government accepts Marxism as merely a variation of society and not as an enemy of all human rights, businessmen are hardly in a position to refuse to trade. When I wrote the history of Raytheon, I asked the Chief Executive, Tom Phillips, why he was willing to show the Sparrow missile at the Paris Air Show, when he knew that Russian observers were there to steal whatever they could.

He said, "The Department of Defense wants me to show the Sparrow. And if the DOD wants it done, why should I refuse?"

On the other hand, I recall that when Russell de Young was running Goodyear, and President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk wanted him to build a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania, he refused. I asked him later if Washington held it against him, and he said, "Hell, no. In fact, they roll out the red carpet."

Both men were right, in terms of business. One can deal or not deal on behalf of one's corporation, as one chooses, for business reasons.

But when we come to the overall, the larger issue of our survival as a civilization, I will have to say that we have gone a long way toward losing our way. And if we do not take a hard look at the larger situation, we may lose everything.

For the revolution that started in Paris and moved to St. Petersburg and is now in place in half the world, will not stop because Gorbachev and Yeltsin, like Lenin, are campaigning on {137} a program of Bread and Peace.

In the course of taking a hard look, I would suggest that businessmen begin to examine their support of Marxists in our own society. I think most experts will agree that our educational system has become politicized, and is today tilted in favor of Marxism and anti-Americanism. In my view, efforts to push back the Left in this nation should begin with the universities because we are intellectually besieged, and we cannot mount a successful

resistance without regaining our ability to intellectually defend our society.

As alumni and trustees, we should not allow football teams and basketball games to distract us from what is important and even crucial to our country, our children and our future.

For we are in a difficult position. By and large, our intellectuals have betrayed us. Instead of defending and extending our values, they have turned against them and us. We should, therefore, begin to look before we support; examine before we donate, and provide money to our friends and not our enemies.

Let me remind you that Lenin achieved his victory in St. Petersburg with money from a traditional society. He and his followers used money from traditional sewerages to fund their subversive activities. I think it is highly significant that after Lenin was in power, and Parvus wanted to come to the Soviet Union, Lenin refused to allow him entry.

He despised the man who funded him to power. "*The cause of Revolution,*" he said, "*should not be touched by dirty hands.*"

There are a number of American and European financiers and other highly placed men in our society who think, like Parvus, that by helping the Marxists the Marxists will, in the long run, help them in return.

But so far, in the course of seventy years of power, the Marxists have always murdered those in the business sector who helped them get there. The graveyards of half the world are loaded with the cadavers of businessmen who overlooked that lesson.

Do not add to their numbers. Help those few conservative intellectuals among us today, whom I represent, to block the revolutionary efforts underway, at this moment, among us.

THE HERESY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL SALVATION

Part 1

Rousas John Rushdoony

According to Darwin, the source of power in the evolutionary process comes from below. The universe evolves out of nothing; life develops out of non-life; the lower form produces the higher, and so on. Power thus comes from the lower depths, from chaos, from nothing. God as the source of all creation is replaced by ultimate nothingness.

This false doctrine has had its political and sociological consequences. In the European tradition, power resided in men at the top, kings, nobles, aristocrats, intellectuals, and the like. In the United States, there was rather a wide-spread belief in an aristocracy of talent arising out of a Christian culture. Both perspectives have given to a shift of power downward, to the workers, then to various racial and sexually disoriented minorities, and now there is a move further downward into the environment. Animals once classified as at least an impediment to the human community, such as mountain lions, wolves, and rattlesnakes, now have “rights” sometimes denied to men.

Man is no longer seen as created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26–28); he is rather an evolutionary product, and he is to be understood, not in terms of God and God’s purpose, but in terms of his supposed animal past and his unconscious. The unconscious can be distinguished from the sub-conscious. A man may hate certain persons or groups but refuse to admit that fact; he may suppress any conscious motivation by his hatred. Such a situation has no relationship to the doctrine of the unconscious. The unconscious comes, not from us, but from our primordial,

non-human past, and, for Freud, his followers, and many modern thinkers, is the governing factor in our being. Supposedly, neither our mind, family, religion, or education governs us to the degree that our unconscious does. History and biography in any traditional sense are replaced by the unconscious. Thus, Theodor Reik, Sigmund Freud's most brilliant follower, in analyzing the biblical account of the command to sacrifice Isaac, held that we cannot penetrate the meaning of that story if we see it as history, or, if we connect it with the practice of human sacrifice as it then existed.¹ To attempt an historical meaning {140} is for him an impediment to understanding the unconscious meaning in myth and ritual.

As a result of giving priority to the unconscious, i.e., to the evolutionary origins, not only is history set aside but also responsibility. The historical and responsible world is dissolved into the unconscious, and we have, both intellectually and morally, the dehumanization of man. Some of us recall a proverb which was widely used when we were young and which is now out of place in modern thought: "Manners make the man." Now man is seen as made by primordial urges beyond his control. Freud rebuked a mother who wanted her son cured of his homosexuality; psychotherapy, he said, does not cure; it simply gives self-understanding.

Thus, the Darwinian view of life both exalts the lower and denies responsibility. As Richard Weaver held, "ideas have consequences," and the consequences of these things are all around us.

The exaltation of the lower, and the denial of responsibility, may for us be disastrous things, but we must recognize that it is for many a necessary step towards the freedom of man and the liberation of nature. The English politician, Michael Foot, in writing on William Hazlitt and Lord Byron, both unswerving champions of the French Revolution, titled his book *The Politics of Paradise*. Both Hazlitt and Byron were greatly influenced by Rousseau. Byron's flouting of morals, to the point of giving the impression deliberately of various perverse practices he may have indulged in, was a part of his revolt against God and His law-order.

Some years ago, Dr. Hans Sedlmayr, professor of art at the

1. Theodor Reik, *The Temptation* (New York: George Braziller, 1961), 89.

University of Munich, documented this revolution against God, civilization, morality, and culture in modern art. As he pointed out, “The leading theme of Surrealism is chaos absolute.”²

Surrealism has thrown off the mask. Openly and without shame it pours its insults upon God and man, upon the living and the dead, upon beauty and morals, upon form, reason and art. ‘Art is stupidity.’ Openly it confesses the omnipotence of lust, giving its allegiance to a permanent revolt, to monstrosity and to the scandalous. {141} It claims to have attained to a point of view from which ‘life and death, the real and the imagined, top and bottom are no longer experienced as contradictory opposites.’ This would-be scientific definition is nothing less than a definition of chaos.

Nor does Surrealism deny this. It openly confesses that it seeks ‘the systematization of confusion’ (Dali). ‘A new vice has been born.’ It proclaims, ‘and a new form of madness given to man: Surrealism, the child of raving and darkness’ (Aragon). Words can hardly be plainer—but there are still those who will not hear them.³

This revolt in favor of the lowest was not limited to art: it marked music, literature, and other spheres. All spheres of life have felt the influence of the Darwinian mythology. Some will object that evolution is not a heresy but anti-Christianity in the name of science. This is certainly true up to a point. By analogy, Gnosticism too was anti-Christian to the core, but it infiltrated the church and became basic to heretical views. The same is true of evolution; it was no sooner propounded than many churchmen adopted it. It is basic to modernism, but many “conservative” Catholics, reformed, and Arminian scholars affirm theistic evolution. biblical thinking affirms that God is the sovereign Creator by His fiat word. Evolution seeks power and creativity, not from above, but from below, by means of miraculous accidents combined with aeons of time and a belief in the power of process to accomplish all things. No two views could be more opposed one to another. All the same, great numbers of churchmen insist on combining them.

The results, politically and sociologically, are far reaching. In its earlier years, the prevailing form of evolutionary thought affirmed

2. Hans Sedlmayr, *Art in Crisis* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1958), 142.

3. *Ibid.*, 143.

gradualism, slow, gradual changes in forms and their organs over billions of years. In the political sphere, this evolutionary faith meant a trust in democratic processes, in the power of the vote to improve men and society. The “solution” for “backward” countries was seen as voting, suffrage, one man-one vote. Given the vote, all peoples everywhere would evolve towards the Great Society. This view, of course, did not take into account nor believe in man’s depravity and the effect of man’s {142} sin in high places and low in destroying society. The belief in the power of the democratic process to produce good is basic to this heresy.

Another form of the evolutionary belief has stressed revolutionary and sudden changes. After all, how could an eye evolve gradually? It either had to be, or could not exist at all; intermediate forms are not tenable. Within the political sphere, this has meant a trust in revolution to effect dramatic and enduring changes in society. To bring about changes, people increasingly take to the streets, demonstrate, and work to destroy the old forms in order to create the new. Like the democratic faith, this too is a pathetic fallacy. It has no awareness of the sin of man, and only a blind faith in the power of deconstruction and revolution.

The Christian perspective is alien to both these heresies. Orthodoxy, we must remember, means literally right thinking, i.e., thinking faithful to the word of God, whereas heresy means self-choice. Heresies are not logical nor systematic in their ideas, because they represent a smorgasbord choice of beliefs rather than the systematic discipline of God’s law-word.

The Christian cannot place his hope in either democracy or revolution. Man’s problem in every sphere of life and thought has its origin in sin. The answer to sin is grace. Sin, we are told by Scripture, begets death, for men, states, churches, and all kinds of groups. *Death reigns in every social order where grace does not prevail*. The problem is sin, and the solution is grace, and grace is not subservient to the laws and mores of a fallen world but seeks to bring every area of life into captivity to God and His law-word. This means a break with the dying world order around us. Bathyry, in his analysis of Augustine’s predicament as a young man, observed, analyzing Augustine’s own writings,

Augustine’s own parents failed in their advice to their son to confront the most basic questions of his disgruntled youth, for

they did not understand the broader social, political, and moral roots of his disorder. Rather, their concern for his private success as a student and teacher served only to reinforce anomic feelings engendered by a corrupt Roman culture.⁴ {143}

Bathory titles his study *Political Theory as Public Confession*, an excellent title. Modern churchmen *refuse* to see a relationship. Bathory pointed out also of Augustine,

Religion, he insisted, had an important role to play in this world. Its ultimate end may be in the next world, but Augustine attacked those—pagan and Christian alike—who argued that religion has value only in the life to come. He attacked the pagan gods for failing to deal with the “life and morals of the cities and nations that worshipped them.”⁵

The grim fact is that today the political theories of the humanists are public confessions set forth in political platforms, whereas Christians have no such public confession. The idea of a confessional Christian now simply means one who subscribes to certain creeds, not one who applies them to every sphere of life. Every society, however, is an expression of a faith, whether good or bad. “Augustine never doubted that belief was necessary to society.”⁶ It is a modern heresy and illusion to believe that society can be based on a particular political structure; such a belief substitutes a political mechanism for a moral force.

George Orwell saw a relationship between politics and language; the decline of a language had, he believed, political and economic effects. We would add that behind the decay in a language is a decay of faith in Jesus Christ. To deny God is to deny the ultimacy of meaning, and to do so is to beggar life in every sphere. Deconstructionist thinking is a logical outcome.

How far we have gone is apparent on all sides. For example, the *Anglican Theological Review*, (vol. 72, no. 2, Spring 1990), devoted much of one issue toward a symposium on a “theology” for gay and lesbian marriages. The leading article was written by

4. Peter Dennis Bathory, *Political Theory as Public Confession, The Social and political Thought of St. Augustine of Hippo*, (New Brunswick, NJ): Transaction Books, 1981), 40.

5. *Ibid.*, 126.

6. *Ibid.*, 123.

a homosexual, and all the contributors were essentially favorable. Given the fact of ecclesiastical antinomianism, the biblical laws were not even considered; they were apparently seen as irrelevant. The editor, in fact, ruled out God's law at the beginning, stating,

First, judging human behavior is illustrative of the mire of the human condition. Judging is not in itself exemplary, {144} moral, a sign of integrity or intelligence. Judging is symptomatic of disorder. Judging is a symptom of unacknowledged complicity in human sinfulness. The judging of moral worth of another is indicative of the temptation to rely upon the egoic self as self-sustaining reality.⁷

The Christian is not moralistic. He lives by compassion, without judging. He knows the irresponsibility in his own egoic selfhood and accepts the graciousness of a God who constantly works to bring order out of chaos, coherence out of fragmentation with its sanctification of greed and murder. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a passionate and compassionate man. If it means anything to say so, he was a Christian—a good one, a saint for our times.⁸

The editor's *judgment* on King came at a time when King's adulteries and homosexuality were becoming known. If Editor Wentz's non-judgmental society were attained, then our police and courts would have to disappear. Certainly their authority is eroding as we move into the culture of the Marquis de Sade and Charles Darwin with power and *judgment* coming from below.

Quite logically, if life originates from chaos, then law and judgment must also come from below. In World War I, a post card in France pictured Christ as turning his back on the world and quoted "Jeremiah's prophecy of God abandoning man because of his faith in his own works." The particular text in Jeremiah centers on ch. 4:27.⁹

Man's faith in his own works, his own ideas and faith, is a product of the evolutionary perspective. The word "liberation" is important to humanistic man, and he sees its starting point as liberation from God. As George Bernard Shaw pointed out, "the

7. Richard E. Wentz, "Commentary: Sexuality and the Saints." in *Anglican Theological Review*, vol. 72, no., Spring 1990, 131.

8. *Ibid.*, 133.

9. David Anan, *Atastrophe, The End of the Cinema?* (New York: Bounty Books, 1975), 20.

world jumped at Darwin.”¹⁰ Darwin’s dull and often illogical book was at once popular because it spelled liberation from God. Queen Victoria herself welcomed the book. As Karsten Harries {145} has noted, “Freedom is put in the place of God.”¹¹

The world of humanistic man is a very sorry world. He lives without any true hope, and his mind is often his major problem. In the midst of plenty, modern man has an impoverished soul.

It is humbling to read Bernard of Clairvaux’s *The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman*. We are told:

But now our account reverts to the work of the building which Malachy had undertaken. Malachy did not have the funds—I won’t say, to finish it—but to do any of it. But his heart trusted in the Lord. As a matter of fact, the Lord provided that, although he put not his trust in money hordes, money would not be lacking.... God’s servant found in God’s purse what was lacking in his own. It was only right.... For the man who believes, the whole world is full of riches. And what is it if it is not a sort of God’s purse? In fact He says; The earth is mine, and the fulness thereof.¹²

Humanistic, Darwinian man sees the world as a poor place, and he fears the depletion of its resources. For Christian man, the world is full of riches awaiting discovery, development, and godly stewardship and use.

10. Cited by Arnold Lunn, ed., in introduction, 4, of Douglas Dewar and H. S. Shelton, *Is Evolution Proved?* (London, England: Hollis and Carter, 1947).

11. Karsten Harries, *The Meaning of Modern Art, A Philosophical Interpretation* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968), 54.

12. Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman*, translated and annotated by Robert T. Meyer (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1978), 79f.

THE HERESY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL SALVATION

Part 2

Rousas John Rushdoony

Greco-Roman thought was strongly evolutionary in its idea of origins. As Cornelius Van Til pointed out, the gods were for them limiting concepts. Because their philosophies required a starting point in time rather than an infinite regress, the Greeks and Romans were ready to affirm that some kind of first cause, nameless and impersonal, had begun the process which led to the universe of things. Divinity was thus for them not a transcendent fact, beyond time and history, but a potential in all being.

As Anthony A. Barrett has pointed out, “Among the Romans the distinction between man and god was not a sharp one.” Such thinking marked both the republic and the empire.¹ It was believed that “Every individual Roman had a *genius*, a spirit with its own divine qualities, to which prayers and offerings could properly be made.”² Thus, self-worship was legitimate. The higher one rose, the more he realized his divinity. Therefore Caligula could say as emperor, “Who dares teach me?”³ In Greek culture, the hero was a man who realized divinity. Emperor worship rested on this belief in realized deity. The emperor’s *genius* was worshipped, and also his *numen* or power.

This doctrine had meant a conflict with biblical faith. In the era before Christ, a Greek ruler, Antiochus Epiphanes, sought

1. Anthony A. Barrett, *Caligula, the Corruption of Power* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 140.

2. *Ibid.*, 142.

3. *Ibid.*, 78.

to convert the Temple in Jerusalem into a temple for himself. Caligula, in the year 40 AD, decided to do the same but died before he could do so.

As this Greco-Roman faith developed, it had important moral implications. Van Til, in analyzing the confrontation at Athens of Paul with Greek philosophy, commented of the Greek thinkers:

They believed in “the mysterious universe”: they were perfectly willing therefore to leave open a place for “the unknown.” But this “unknown” must be thought {148} of as the utterly unknowable and indeterminate.⁴

This mindless and unpredictable force could make leaps in being and thus produce new forms. Hence, Greek scientists were very much interested in freaks, because a freak might represent a new step in evolution. In the past century, Emile Durkheim has likewise seen the criminal as a potential evolutionary pioneer, breaking with the past to establish new patterns of being. The Greek interest in Paul’s preaching of Christ’s resurrection was based on this concern. They turned away from Paul when they realized,

Jesus and the resurrection presupposed the doctrine of creation. Jesus and the resurrection implied the doctrine of judgment to come.⁵

The moral implications of this belief in the indeterminacy of all things, the moral sphere, with respect to sexual behavior, for Greeks and Romans meant homosexuality, lesbianism, and more. There was, scientifically and philosophically, for them, no boundaries immune to trespass. No moral force in nor from beyond creation could impose a law on man: only man could be the source of law. The Romans had an altar to Providentia, but their concept of Providence was imperial to the core:

Providentia is essentially the power to plan ahead, and for the early emperors it personified the transmission of hereditary powers, belonging as a quality to the one who chooses the successor in the first place and then by transference to the one who succeeds him.⁶

4. Cornelius Van Til, *Paul and Athens* (Phillipsburg, NJ: L.J. Grotenhuis, 1954), 6.

5. *Ibid.*, 12.

6. Barrett, *op. cit.*, 68.

In every sphere, man was the mainspring of all things, and thus no laws nor boundaries could stand before the *genius* of a man. The more powerful a Roman became the more freely he could break all laws and boundaries. Given this fact, the historical reports of Suetonius become more credible. The attainment of power was an invitation to destroy barriers. The powerless man {149} was a failure and hence expendable.

This Greco-Roman perspective has had a profound influence on the Western world. Darwinism has led, among other things, to Kinsey and the sexual revolution. The roots of this go back over the centuries to the misguided respect for the ancient world. Scholars in the medieval era who rebelled against biblical faith found a ready alternative in classical culture. The evolutionary premises of the classical world, its worship or divinization of the ruler or the state, its insistence on moral indeterminacy insofar as any divine mandate is concerned—these things and more appealed to many men. The acceptance of Aristotle by the medieval church assured the defeat of Christendom. It is foolish for churchmen to insist that Protestantism destroyed a Christian order, or, that a corrupt Roman Catholic church was to blame. The state had in fact supplanted the church. The Reformation and the CounterReformation for a time arrested and even replaced in some instances this trend, but, in time, the state triumphed. Dr. Malcolm Vale of Oxford has observed that “during the later Middle Ages secularization was especially significant.” In fact, Vale says,

But the temporal ruler was no longer perceived as an instrument, even less as a servant, of the Church’s will because the Church had to a large extent been absorbed by the state.⁷

Long before the Avignon papacy, the Great Schism, and the Council of Constance (1215), the state had absorbed the church and had begun the process of developing *a rival plan of salvation*.

The state and its lawyers looked more to Rome than the church had. Rome had been the “Eternal City,” the source of rule, power, and salvation or social health. Religious cults had been for Rome the means of social cement, morale builders among the peoples,

7. Malcolm Vale, “The Civilization of Courts and Cities in the North, 122–1500,” in *The Oxford Illustrated History of Medieval Europe*, ed. George Holmes (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 297.

never the guides or moral directors of public policy. Coronation rites of kings began to stress their function and office as divinely ordained and as true vicars of Christ. Henry VIII, in making himself head of the church of England and declaring church and state to be two aspects of his kingly {150} realm, simply made explicit what had been the implicit political theology of his day. Henry VIII lived and died a devout Roman Catholic, a ruler who believed that the church existed for the welfare of God's vice-regent, the king. He took the Catholic faith seriously enough to hang "some rash persons who had eaten flesh on Friday against his command."⁸ The confiscation of the monasteries by Henry VIII was due to the fact that because of various factors, the state "treasury was practically empty."⁹ The welfare of the state took priority over the church.

Stepping back briefly to look again at Rome, we must take note of what Edward Fiddes said in 1902, "There was nothing... sudden or surprising in the worship of the Emperors."¹⁰ Centuries of development lay behind the cult of the divine city and its great men.¹¹ According to Fiddes,

The continuity of ruler-worship is curiously illustrated by the use of the term *Soter* or Saviour. The word bore a distinctly religious significance. It was an epithet of many of the Greek gods, of Zeus, for example, of Aphrodite, of Apollo, of Pan. When the Athenians conferred divine rank on Antigonus and Demetrius, they worshipped them under the title of Saviours. In inscriptions of the Imperial period the Roman emperors often received this title. The worthless Nero is even designated, by a monstrous abuse of language, the saviour of the world. It was therefore but natural that the same expression should be applied to the Roman proconsuls who came between the divine kings and the divine emperors.¹²

Ethelbert Stauffer, in *Christ and the Caesars* (1955) documents this

8. Geoffrey Baskevill, *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries* (London, England: Jonathan Cape, [1937] 1965), 170.

9. *Ibid.*, 172.

10. Edward Fiddes, "The Beginnings of Caesar-Worship," *Historical Essays*, eds. T.F. Tout and James Tait (London, England: Longmans, Green 1902), 16.

11. *Ibid.*, 3f.

12. *Ibid.*, 6.

role of the emperors as gods and saviors.

When, therefore, medieval monarchs and their lawyers looked to Rome, they saw the state as the great mediator between God and man. Salvation thus became a province of the {151} state, and the church an agency of the ruler. Vale was right: the church was absorbed by the state, and no reading of Western history is valid which neglects this fact. In more recent years, the state has largely abandoned Christianity and the church; it has at best a nominal or ceremonial belief in God, and Jesus Christ is no longer acknowledged as Lord and Savior.

In the late medieval and early modern eras, while the shift was under way, the royal courts took on the paraphernalia and ritual of a church. We see remarkable examples of this in Frederick II, early in the medieval era. In the modern age, Louis XIV gives us very telling illustrations of this. We are told that, at Versailles, "When the courtiers walked past the bed (of Louis XIV), they removed their hats and bowed as if before an altar." How literal this exaltation of Louis XIV was appears in the fact that "at Mass you had to turn towards the king, even if [it] meant turning your back on the altar."¹³ The king had become, as it were, a living Host. Court ritual had replaced church liturgy as the central rite of society, and the new saving power was the state.

As a result of this shift from church to state, the new target of reformation became the state. Throughout the medieval era, culminating in the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, a series of monks and priests, and at times laymen as well, began reforms aimed at cleansing the church of her evils and impurities. Because men believed that outside the church there was no salvation, reforming the church became a personal and social imperative.

As the center shifted, so too did the goals of reform. Church reform became peripheral, and state reform central. There was a dramatic difference, however. Church reform was the work of monks, priests, ministers, laymen, and theologians. The state, however, has coercive powers, the power of the sword and the power to tax. The state, and its bureaucracy, resists change unless it makes it, and it has physical power to crush its enemies. A gun is

13. Paolo Cangioli, *Versailles* (London, English: Pawlack, n.d.), 6.

the quickest argument in any conflict. Because of this, reformation in the state has taken the form very often of revolution. Short of revolution, it can mean marches, demonstrations, and riots. These are the antithesis of Christian reformation: no one is regenerated by means of guns. Mao Tse Tung believed that power flows from the barrel of a gun, one of the major false beliefs of our time. It is death that comes from {152} the gun, and revolutionary China, as well as Russia, and earlier, France, are good examples of this. The state's plan of salvation requires coercion in some sense.

When the Fabian Society was started in Great Britain to bring about the salvation of society by socialism, some of the founders had lingering beliefs from their evangelical past which led them to choose the name Fabian, and to espouse gradualism.

The Fabian Society started in the discussions of a small group of persons who debated the proposition "that an association be formed whose ultimate aim shall be the reconstruction of society in according with the highest moral possibilities." A suggested first object was "the cultivation of a perfect character in each and all." At the meeting on January 4, 1884, when the name "Fabian Society" was adopted, the first proposition was modified to read that "its ultimate aim shall be *to help on* the reconstruction, etc." The suggestion "for the peaceful regeneration of the race by the cultivation of perfection of individual character"—I am quoting from Bernard Shaw's history of the Fabian Society—was not accepted. "Certain members of that circle," says Shaw, "modestly feeling that the revolution should have to wait an unreasonably long time if postponed until they personally attained perfection, set up the banner of Socialism militant."¹⁴

Shaw's language here echoes with evangelical overtones, words such as personal "perfection," "regeneration," and "moral" reform. The Church Militant is replaced with "Socialism Militant." After 1900 especially, Socialism militant has been very much on the march. Salvation by statism, by coercion, has been the gospel of this century.

Just as men compromised with evolution and attempted to Christianize it, so too men sought to baptize socialism into the church. When Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published in 1859,

14. Karl de Schweinitz, *England's Road to Social Security* (New York: A. S. Barnes, [1943] 1961), 174.

churchmen rushed to demonstrate their respectability by adopting it. Gladstone readily adapted evolution into his evangelical theology. On the other hand, Disraeli, perhaps only nominally a Christian, bluntly said:

What is this proposition now put before us with a glib {153} assurance the most astounding? It is this: is man an ape or an angel? My Lord, I am on the side of the angels.¹⁵

The state as man's savior, and the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, combined to bring about another major change in society. The rise of the state as savior had been accompanied by an insistence on royal or statist law over God's law. John Eliot had organized self-governing Indian Christian villages in terms of biblical law. When Charles II in 1660 returned from exile, one of the first royal acts was to destroy these communities and to order Eliot's *Christian Commonwealth* book to be burned by the public hangman. Royal law replaced God's law.

The origins of antinomianism are in the rise of statism. The issue is a very simple one: whose law must govern, God's law or the state's? The antinomian church says in effect that, apart from the salvation of the soul, man's salvation rests in the hands of the state. Now an increasing number of churchmen say that man's soul requires psychotherapy for salvation. This will, as Freud saw, make the church obsolete. What is the answer? The regenerate of the Lord, whose king is Christ, believe that Psalm 1 makes the outcome clear:

Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. The ungodly are not so: but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous: but the ways of the ungodly shall perish.

As God's judgment begins to sweep across the world, we see

15. Arthur Marwick, *The Deluge, British Society and the First World War* (New York: W.W. Norton, [1956] 1970) 237.

the ungodly already being driven like the chaff. Given then these things, and God's assurance, not man's, of our victory in Christ, {154} we must, in Paul's words "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free" (Gal: 5:1).

SOCIALISM AND PREDESTINATION

Rousas John Rushdoony

When we examine the universe around us, there are only two possible views which can logically, rationally, or intelligently be affirmed. The alternatives are *chance* or *necessity*. There have been many who have attempted to affirm chance, but it is a difficult position to maintain. If chance is ultimate, then all around us and in us there exists only an ocean of brute or meaningless factuality. Brute facts are not only uninterpreted facts, meaningless data, but they are beyond meaning because they are a surd, something irrational and incapable of being expressed. Language has reference to meaning; all words are propositional truths in their limited way. Each word, such as the words *noun* and *pronoun*, represents something and is limited in its meaning. Brute facts are beyond interpretation and description. If chance is ultimate, then all actuality is made up of brute, meaningless facts, and nothing is then definable or meaningful.

As against brute factuality, there is the realm of necessary meaning. The epitome of this perspective is the biblical one. Given the fact of God's creative act, all facts are *created* factuality, and all facts have a *God-created*, God-given meaning and purpose. While this does not mean that all factuality is comprehensible by the mind of man, it does mean that all things are potentially knowable within creation. Because man is created in the image of God in knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion (Gen. 1:27–28; Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:4), the quest for meaning is basic to the mind and life of man. God's purpose is inclusive not only of all His creation, but of every possible event in that creation. Scripture repeatedly cites this total purpose:

The LORD hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil. (Proverbs 16:4)

Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows. (Matthew 10:29–31)

Meaning is inescapable for man. Marcel Duchamp {156} attempted to create a new language without meaning and failed. Meaning is the language of life. As a result, even those who deny God tacitly assume His existence in order to have a possibility of meaning. For the Greeks, the idea of God was a limiting concept to make thought and order possible. Paganism thus borrowed meaning from theism while denying God's necessary order. Another name for God's necessary order is predestination. Wilhelm Pauck wrote of this:

The doctrine of predestination is implied in the doctrine of salvation by divine grace alone. If it is affirmed that man cannot save himself by reliance upon powers (also religious potentialities) inherent in him, but that he is redeemed only by the initiative of a gracious, merciful God, it must also be said that his eternal destiny is determined by God. The doctrine of predestination therefore stands in an immediate context with that of grace and with that of original sin.¹

In Acts 15:18, St. Peter declares, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world."

The impact of this doctrine on the Greco-Roman world has been described by C.N. Cochrane in *Christianity and Classical Culture*. Pagan thinkers had freed man from God's necessity only to make him the unfree reflex of a determining natural world. A blind and meaningless necessity in the form of Nature and the environment determined man. Christian thinkers freed man from environmental determinism of a blind sort to make man lord over the world around him under God's providential determination.

This pagan perspective, never entirely dead, revived with the Enlightenment. Nature replaced God as the source of determination, and both naturalistic and mechanistic determinism began to govern philosophy and science. Such thinking often had as its presupposition that form of Deism which reduced God to

1. Wilhelm Pauck, "Predestination," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (Secaucus, NJ: Philosophical Library Poplar Books, 1945), 603f.

the role of an absentee landlord, or the great watchmaker, who, having made the universe, allowed it to govern itself by immutable laws. This view, wherein Nature replaced God as the source of necessity, as the source of law and order, collapsed with Darwin. Darwin's evolutionary theory, with {157} its struggle for survival, demolished the idea of necessity. The natural world was for him the only world, and it was a realm of brute or meaningless factuality. While Darwin assumed evolution, devolution was an equal possibility. The ideas of meaning, order, and law were dropped as theological and hence not applicable.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels welcomed Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859), because they recognized that it made socialism inevitable. If God does not exist, and if Nature, instead of being a rational order is rather meaningless, a conflicting, struggling brute factuality, then the only possible source of necessity, order, and meaning is man, most logically through the state. A professor at a distinguished graduate school some years ago insisted, as against my position, that the universe has only "a thin edge of rationality," and man's mind (and its created orders such as the state) provides that thin edge. He insisted to the people in the conference audience, students in the main, that this was the critical difference between us, and rightly so.

Man must have meaning and order; he must have law, and, if neither God nor Nature can provide it, man must, and the most logical form is then by the state, through socialism. Socialism is necessity or predestination, total law and total planning, by the state. Assuming the death of God, the state takes over the functions of God. The older Whig Liberalism held to a theistic view of Nature; socialism assumes a Darwinian view. Quite logically, therefore, as the world has moved into a belief in the mythology of evolution, it has become progressively more socialistic. *The premise of socialism is thus religious.* It is salvation by means of socialism as against salvation by God. The older belief in salvation by Nature has deep roots in the Romantic movement, and it is still with us in the environmental movement, with its worship of mother earth. Despite its current power, its romantic separation from the real world makes it essentially negative in its approach.

Socialism fills a religious need by providing necessity, meaning and order, or law, but it cannot provide morality. At best, the

morality provided by socialist states is *ad hoc*. Because of this lack of any vital or compelling moral law other than a vague affirmation of “the people,” or, “the public interest,” it has little to offer. As a result, socialist states become power states and are marked by power struggles. Robert Conquest, Solzhenitsyn, and other writers have shown that power is used brutally simply to manifest power and to terrorize the people. George Orwell, in *1984*, described the goal of socialism as a boot stamping on a [158] human face forever.

Because for socialism there is no power above or beyond the state, the state and its power become ultimate. The purpose of the state becomes the power of the state; the goal of the bureaucracy becomes the growth of the bureaucracy.

As a result, under socialism the major enemy is the people, the citizenry. A foreign power may be an occasional or a potential enemy, but the people are the constant enemy or threat. The more socialism grows in power, the more bitterly it oppresses its peoples. The slave labor camps of Stalin and others were not an accident; they were inherent to the system. The slave labor camps have not been dismantled by Gorbachev nor Yeltsin. The major threat to any socialist state is always the people. As a result, the people are given false securities, medical care, housing, and so on, all faulty but all designed to reduce a free people to a position of dependency. Talk of “Power to the People” is a facade for slavery.

The fact that “the very hairs of (our) head are all numbered” (Matt. 10:30) means, *first*, that predestination is not merely concerned with our salvation, and, *second*, that it is total. It is inclusive of all things without exception. Cornelius Van Til observed that, if man could press one button and step outside of God’s total government, he would always have his finger on that button.

Socialist planning and government aims at the same kind of total control. Up to the early 1960s, some scholars believed that this was an impossible dream. Such a total government would require total statistics in order to govern all persons totally. Shortly after World War II, the Western nations began to gather statistics on all their peoples, on industry and business, on employment and unemployment, and much more. As Murray N. Rothbard pointed out in 1961, “as new statistical techniques are developed, new divisions of government departments are created to refine and

use them.”² Even in 1960, the estimate of U.S. federal spending alone on statistics cost over \$43,000,000, and over 10,000 full-time civilian employees were used in this enterprise. Coercion was used to gather these statistics, i.e., penalties for failure to comply. These statistics, and the forms {159} which had to be filed, imposed a considerable cost on businesses small and great.³ Since 1961, the statistics gathering and its costs have increased greatly. Statistics gathering is a substitute for market data and has as its goal the formulation of a master plan. In 1960, however, statistics, while vital to socialism, was also its Achilles’ heel. How could the necessary complete knowledge for total planning be attained?⁴

Since 1960, the situation has altered dramatically. The invention and development of computers has made possible data gathering on an unprecedented scale. Some dream, for example, of the abolition of all cash and the use instead of credit cards to enable total data gathering on all transactions. Other schemes have been proposed for non-monetary surveillance. Such dreams have suffered at the hands of hackers who have demonstrated their ability to penetrate computer systems; others have planted computer “viruses” to destroy data banks. This is a problem far greater than usually imagined. The Soviet Union, desperately in need of computers, has, up to 1990, tended largely to avoid their use in fearfulness of penetration. Thus, even as computers provided an instrument for total control, they also introduced a radical vulnerability to subversion.

The result is a serious problem for the socialist state. Liberal democracy arose in the nineteenth century as a religious alternative to Christianity. Harold J. Berman calls it “the first great secular religion in Western history.”⁵ Its rival since has been revolutionary socialism, but, without a Christian faith to undergird it, democracy has increasingly developed its own version of this socialism in the name of human and environmental welfare.

2. Murray N. Rothbard, “Statistics: Achilles’ Heel of Government,” in *Essays on Liberty* (Irvington-on-Hudson, NY: The foundation for Economic Education, 1961), vol. VIII, 255.

3. *Ibid.* 256.

4. *Ibid.* 258–261.

5. Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution, The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 32.

This should not surprise us. Statism is a man-made substitute for God. While writing from an emphatically non-Christian perspective, the political economist Pierre Dockes has shown the rise of statist power in history has meant the resurgence of slavery under some name or form. He points out “The word *servus*, ‘slave,’ in Roman law originally referred to a person whose life had been spared (*servatus*) by grace.”⁶ The slave was legally dead, being cut off from the cults of family worship, and {160} being a stranger.⁷

The power of God is inherent to His being. God is by nature omnipotent, omniscient, all-wise, and totally self-sufficient in all his being. There is nothing before, nor beside, nor other than God except that which He creates by His fiat will. Therefore the Almighty can demand of man,

Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof; When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? (Job 38:4–7)

God’s omnipotence robs no man. He is man’s Creator and man’s only valid source of meaning, grace, and power. The state, and in particular the socialist state, can only empower itself at the expense of man, the church, the family, man’s economic endeavors, and man’s various institutions. Only by playing the thief, the great thief in society, can the socialist state gain power. It cannot create, and it is not productive.

Socialism has deep roots, however, in the *fallen* nature of man. Adam Smith, in *The Wealth of Nations*, pointed out that slave labor is the most expensive form of labor. “A person who can acquire no property can have no other interest but to eat as much, and to labour as little, as possible.” Twentieth-century socialism has clearly underscored the truth of Smith’s observation. Smith said further:

The pride of man makes him love to domineer, and nothing mortifies him so much as to be obliged to condescend to persuade

6. Pierre Dockes, *Medieval Slavery and Liberation* (London, England: Mathuen, 1981), 5.

7. *Ibid.*, 7.

his inferiors. Wherever the law allows it, and the nature of the work can afford it, therefore, he will generally prefer the service of slaves to that of freemen.⁸

The continuing popularity of Plato's *Republic* is clear evidence {161} that would-be philosopher-kings love the notion of enslaving the masses to the will of the elite. As against this, our Lord declares:

Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased: and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted (Matt. 23:10–12). But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever 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 you, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many (Matt. 20:25–28).

This is a religious mandate and goal. But so too is the socialist dream. It represents the purpose set forth in Genesis 3:5, to be as God, man determining for himself what is good and evil, and what is law. Man's goal, according to Sartre, is to be god, which meant for him that his neighbor, having a similar goal, is therefore a devil. The socialist goal is thus self-destructive: with every man playing 'god,' power is gained at the expense and enslavement of others. Socialism gives particularly vivid meaning to our Lord's statement, "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36).

8. Adam Smith, *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Cases of the Wealth of Nations* (New York: The Modern Library, 1937 reprint), Book III, 365.

3.
*CONSTITUTIONAL
LAW*

THE BILL OF RIGHTS, ITS PURPOSE AND MEANING

And 14th Amendment Incorporation: Original and Current Understandings

William D. Graves

The Purpose of the Bill of Rights

Edmund Burke, responding to the Jacobinists of the French Revolution, described the “rights of men” as “that grand magazine of offensive weapons.”¹ Today, “civil rights” are no less effective offensive weapons and the Bill of Rights is used as the basis for all sorts of new rights that supposedly oppressed minorities have to protect themselves from tyrannical majorities. At least, that is what we were told in 1991 by the sponsors of the Philip Morris Bill of Rights Exhibit. However, examination of the historical record demonstrates that the exhibit produced more smoke than light.

The Framers of the Bill of Rights had something different in mind. They believed strongly in Federalism, and an “immutable Constitution.”² Their main purpose was to protect the people and the States from interference by the Federal Government. The Resolution for Independence of July 2, 1776, proffered by Richard Henry Lee in the Continental Congress declared: “that these United Colonies are free and independent States.” In 1777 the Continental Congress, in recommending the Articles of Confederation to the States, declared: “each State retains its

1. Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House), 129.

2. Raoul Berger, *Federalism: The Founder's Design* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 27.

sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power...which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated..:to the United States..."³

Later, in the *Federalist* (no. 39), James Madison, father of the Constitution and ultimately chief author of the Bill of {164} Rights, wrote: "each State, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered as a sovereign body, independent of all the others." This was essentially the holding in *Ware v. Hylton*, 3 U.S. 199 (1796). The States were very jealous of this sovereignty. Alexander Hamilton said (Fed. 34) that the Federal Government was to be supreme under Art. VI only as to laws made *pursuant to the Constitution*.

Although the Federal Government's powers were to be, as Madison said, "few and defined" and extend "to certain enumerated objects only" leaving to the States "a residuary and *inviolable* sovereignty over all other objects" (Fed. 39, 45), George Mason was purportedly concerned that civil liberties would be subject to impairment by that government. Thus, Mason proposed at the 11th hour of the 1787 Constitutional Convention, a Bill of Rights.⁴ This was overwhelmingly rejected. James Wilson, Roger Sherman and Alexander Hamilton vigorously opposed a Bill of Rights. Hamilton contended (Fed. 84) that it was "not only unnecessary in the proposed Constitution, but would even be dangerous. They would contain various exceptions to powers which are not granted; and, on this very account, would afford a culpable pretext to claim more than were granted. For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do?"

It was to preclude such an interpretation that Madison later proposed the 9th Amendment to eliminate any grant of powers that might be implied by any Constitutional language that might contain a "negative pregnant."⁵ Even so, Madison initially opposed a Bill of Rights, but when Patrick Henry and others opposed the proposed Constitution and even demanded a second convention, Madison saw its necessity to insure passage of the Constitution.

3. *Ibid.*, 184.

4. Robert A. Rutland, *The Birth of the Bill of Rights* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), 119.

5. Edward Dumbauld, *The Bill of Rights and What It Means Today* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press), 63.

Moreover, Madison was encouraged by Thomas Jefferson who saw “the legal check” a Bill of Rights would “put into the hands of the judiciary” as an argument in favor.⁶

Some contend that the primary purposes of the Bill were to protect individual liberties against encroachments by the Federal Government and to assure the Anti-Federalists and the {165} States that the latter would retain exclusive jurisdiction over all civil liberties disputes. However, Irving Brant, Forrest McDonald, Leonard Levy, George Carey and other scholars contend the Anti-Federalists were not the champions of civil liberties they appeared, but were State’s Rightists who argued for a Bill of Rights as a means to defeat the Constitution or obtain a second convention.⁷ Amazingly, Madison himself described the Bill of Rights as this “nauseous project” required only for expedient reasons of politics.⁸

Nevertheless, with Madison now championing a Bill of Rights, the Constitution was ratified. Then, as Congressman, Madison proposed in the first Congress the first draft of what eventually became the Bill of Rights which he saw as creating no new rights, but as declaring rights already secured under the Constitution.⁹ The objective was to protect the States, whose powers were, as he said “numerous and indefinite” (Fed. 45) and the people from Federal encroachment.

Madison’s Proposal to Apply Bill of Rights to States Rejected

Madison had proposed in the first Congress that the rights of conscience, freedom of the press, and trial by jury be protected from interference by State Governments as well as the Federal,

6. Rutland, *op. cit.*, 196.

7. Irving Brant, *The Bill of Rights: Its Origins and Meaning* (Indianapolis, 1965), 39; Forrest McDonald, *E Pluribus Unum* (Boston, 1965), 227; Leonard Levy, *Freedom of Speech and Press*, (New York, 1963), 215; Willmoore Kendall and George Carey, *The Basic Symbols of the American Political Tradition* (Baton Rouge, 1970), 136.

8. Jack Rakove, “Mr. Meese, Meet Mr. Madison,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1986, 84.

9. Speech in the House of Representatives, June 8, 1789, in *Debates in the Congress of the United States*, 1:449.

which proposal the Senate rejected.¹⁰ Thus, the Bill of Rights was to restrict the Federal Government only, and not the States. The U.S. Supreme Court so held in *Barron a Baltimore*, 32 U.S. 243 (1833).

The Sources of American Rights

In ascertaining the Constitution's meaning, Madison said {166} the "first" of the "best guides" was "the Declaration of Independence, as the fundamental act of union of these States:"¹¹ Jefferson said, the Declaration was "an expression of the American mind." While Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes viewed rights as "what the crowd will fight for" the way a dog fights "for his bone,"¹² the Declaration affirms that there are certain "unalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" which come from the "Creator:" Moreover, the Nation's founding was based on "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God," a legal phrase for God's law revealed through Nature and His moral law revealed in the Bible.¹³ "Government" was instituted not to create rights but "to secure" God-given rights. Sir Edward Coke, William Blackstone and John Locke all held that the Law of Nature could not contradict Scripture and civil laws could contradict neither.¹⁴

It was held in *Robertson a Baldwin*, 165 U.S. 275, 281 (1896), that "The law is perfectly well settled that...the Bill of Rights was not intended to lay down any novel principles of government, but simply to embody certain guarantees and immunities:..inherited from our English ancestors..." Richard Henry Lee said American rights "are built on a four-fold foundation," namely, natural law, the British Constitution, the charters of the several colonies, and "immemorial usage." Together with Scripture, Forrest McDonald

10. Levy, 222.

11. Harry V. Jaffa, "What Were the 'Original Intent' of the Framers of the Constitution of the U. S.," *University of Puget Sound Law Review*.

12. Walter Berns, *The First Amendment and the Future of American Democracy* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970) 162.

13. Gary Amos, *Defending the Declaration: How the Bible and Christianity Influenced the Writing of the Declaration of Independence* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth and Hyatt Pub., 1989), 60.

14. *Ibid.*, 43, 44 and 57.

said these were the grounds on which the colonists based their rights.¹⁵ This was what Edmund Burke called “the chartered rights of Englishmen.”¹⁶ These terms encompassed the Common Law which the Supreme Court has acknowledged had its foundation in Christianity¹⁷ and was the law in virtually every State up to 1900.¹⁸ It was composed {167} of customs and usages, and maxims, deriving their authority from immemorial practice:¹⁹ Justice Joseph Story, described “as perhaps the greatest scholar”²⁰ ever to sit on the Supreme Court, remarked, “There never has been a period of history in which the Common Law did not recognize Christianity as lying at its foundation.”²¹ The very term “Common Law” was itself derived from the *ius commune* of the canonists of the Roman Catholic Church.²² “It is,” Story said, “the law of liberty, and the watchful and inflexible guardian of private property and public rights.”²³

The Common Law and the Constitution

It was held in *U.S. v. Smith*, 18 U.S. 153, 160 (1820), that when terms defined as Common Law are included in the Constitution, the definitions “are necessarily included...as if they stood in the text.” Madison said, “It is readily admitted that particular parts of the Common Law may have a sanction from the Constitution, so far as they are necessarily comprehended in the technical phrases which express the powers delegated to the government.”²⁴ Without

15. Forrest McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1985), 57, 83.

16. Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Constitution* (Washington DC: Regnery Gateway, 1990), 83.

17. *Vidal v. Girard*, 2 U.S. 127, 198 (1844).

18. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 138 (1973).

19. Justice Joseph Story, *Misc. Writings*, 442.

20. Raoul Berger, *Government by Judiciary* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 365.

21. John Whitehead, *The Second American Revolution* (Elgin, IL: David C. Cook Pub., 1982), 197.

22. Whitehead, 196: Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

23. Story, *id.*

24. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 195, n. 5.

the Common Law, Chancellor James Kent said, “the courts would be left to a dangerous discretion to roam at large in the trackless field of their own imaginations.”²⁵ Chief Justice John Marshall agreed, stating in *Ex Parte Bollman* (8 U.S. 75, 93 [1807]), “for the meaning of *habeas corpus* resort may unquestionably be had to the Common Law.” He also looked to the Common Law in defining the scope of the treason clause in the Constitution.²⁶ Thus, the Common Law, which is expressly included in the 7th Amendment, must be a reference point in determining what particular Constitutional terms meant {168} to the Framers. It was Madison who said that if the Constitution is not interpreted in the same sense in which it was authored and ratified “there is no security for a faithful exercise of its powers.”²⁷

Original and Current Understandings

The following examines the original meanings and current interpretations of some Bill of Rights provisions which (except for Amendment 2) have been judicially held enforceable against the States through “incorporation” in the 14th Amendment’s Due Process clause.

The Establishment Clause

The 1st Amendment provides: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” While the Supreme Court now views “religion” as “ultimate concern”, Madison viewed it as “the duty...we owe to our Creator.”²⁸ In *Davis v. Beason*, 133 U.S. 333, 342 (1889), the Supreme Court viewed religion as “reference to one’s...relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for His being...and of obedience to His will.”

Blackstone said “an establishment” of religion meant at Common Law “the setting up or recognition of a State church” to promulgate

25. James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law* (9th edition, 1858), 373.

26. *United States v. Burr*, 25F. Case no. 14, 693?55,159 (C.C. Va.1807).

27. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 364.

28. *United States v. Seeger*, 380 U.S. 163, 187 (1965); *Memorial and Remonstrance*, reprinted in N. Cousins, *In God We Trust* (Harper and Row, 1958), 315.

a creed or dogma, to require taxes in support and attendance at worship.²⁹ Prior to adoption of the 1st Amendment, five States had official State churches.³⁰ Fearing Federal interference they petitioned the first Congress to enact an amendment prohibiting Federal Government preference of one religious sect over others.³¹ Thus, Madison said his objective {169} was to prohibit a “national religion” where “one sect might obtain a pre-eminence.”³² It was not meant to prohibit government sponsored prayer or religious observances. Moreover, Madison said, “there is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion...”³³

The day after Congress completed its 1st Amendment work, it petitioned the President to proclaim a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving to God, and instituted the Congressional chaplaincy, by which official daily prayers are still offered.³⁴ Justice Story said: “The real object of the (1st) Amendment was not to countenance, much less to advance Mahometanism or Judaism or infidelity by prostrating Christianity, but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government...In a republic, there would seem to be a peculiar propriety in viewing the Christian religion as the great basis on which it must rest for its support and permanence... Probably at the time of the adoption...of the 1st Amendment... the general if not the universal sentiment in America was, that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the State.”³⁵ In fact, Congress annually funded the teaching of Christianity to the Indians from 1790 to the 1900s.³⁶ President Jefferson signed such bills, which advanced Christianity in general without preferring

29. Tuck., Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Sec. 1879.

30. A *Blueprint for Judicial Reform*, Free Congress Foundation, Washington D.C., 312.

31. R. L. Cord, *Separation of Church and State* (Lambeth Press, 1982), 6, 11.

32. *Annals of Congress*, I. 434, 731.

33. Cousins, 315.

34. Charles Rice, *The Supreme Court and Public Prayer*, 23, 40.

35. Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution*, 728; vol. 2, 630.

36. Cord, 41–59.

a particular sect.³⁷ To Madison, a man could not be considered “a member of Civil Society” unless he was “a subject of the Governor of the Universe.”³⁸ Virtually every State required public office holders to believe in God and the Bible.³⁹

The Supreme Court recommended in *Vidal v. Girard*, 2 U.S. 127, 200 (1844), not only that the Bible “be read and taught as a Divine Revelation” in a public educational institution, but that “the general evidences of Christianity” be taught in a non- {170} sectarian way. In the Mormon Church Case (1889)⁴⁰ polygamy was held to be “contrary to the spirit of Christianity and of the civilization which Christianity has produced.” In *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457, 471 (1892), the Supreme Court, after examining hundreds of historical documents, found that America “is a Christian nation.”

Nevertheless, in *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S., 1 (1947), the Court, citing a letter Jefferson wrote 11 years after the 1st Amendment’s enactment, said “the wall of separation between church and State” (a phrase not found in the Constitution) prohibited either the Federal or State Governments from establishing a State church, or aiding either religion or irreligion by taxes or to participate in the affairs of religious organizations. Moreover, Jefferson, in Paris at the time the 1st Amendment was debated, could hardly be authority for its meaning.⁴¹

The Declaration of Independence had “appeal[ed] to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions” and avowed “a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence.” Nevertheless, the Court held that public school prayer, Bible study and reading and posting the Ten Commandments on public school walls (students might be induced to “obey” them) were all violative of the 1st Amendment.⁴² So too was a law requiring

37. *Ibid.*, 45.

38. Cousins, *In God We Trust*, Id. 308.

39. Forrest McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum* (University of Kansas Press, 1985), 42.

40. *Church of the Latter-Day Saints v. United States*, 136 U.S. 1 (1889), 49.

41. Edward S. Cowin, “The Supreme Court at National School Board,” *14 Law and Contemporary Problems* (1949), 3, 13.

42. *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962); *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963); *Stone v. Graham*, 449 U.S. 39, 42 (1980) (10 Commandments);

the teaching of creation if evolution is taught because the law advances “the religious viewpoint that a supernatural being created mankind.”⁴³ As for the Ten Commandments’ ruling, it is notable that Madison said that they (the Framers) had “staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government,” but “upon the capacity of each...of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.”⁴⁴ In *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 {171} U.S. 602, 612 (1971), it was held that to pass muster any law or official action must have a secular purpose; its primary effect must be to neither advance or inhibit religion and it must not foster excessive entanglement by government with religion.

The Free Exercise of Religion

Chancellor Kent said the free exercise of religion was “one of the absolute rights of individuals recognized in our...law.”⁴⁵ Even though it had been held in 1845 that the 1st Amendment’s Religion Clauses did not apply to the States,⁴⁶ it was held in *Cantwell a Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940), that the Free Exercise clause does. The Court has held in *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), that government may restrict sincerely and deeply held religious beliefs only if an official regulation does not constitute a substantial burden on religious belief and there is a compelling governmental interest that may not be achieved by less restrictive means. In *Oregon v. Smith*, 495 U.S. 872 (1990), it was held that government need not show such compelling interest, but need show only a rational relationship to a legitimate State purpose. Some persons view this as a substantial blow to religious freedom.

Bible study had been declared invalid in *McCullum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948).

43. *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 482 U. S. 578, 591 (1987).

44. Benjamin Hart, *Faith and Freedom: The Christian Roots of American Liberty* (Lewis and Stanley Pub., 1988), 18.

45. Kent, *Commentaries on American Law*, vol. 2, 35–36.

46. *Permoli u First Municipality*, 44 U.S. 671 (1845).

Free Speech and Press

The Framers, as the Declaration shows, believed there were certain “truths” that were “self-evident.” Hamilton said (Fed. 31) “there are certain primary truths or first principles...upon which all subsequent reasonings must depend.” Professor Archibald Cox wrote: “When first considered, freedom of speech and the press chiefly meant the opportunity to hear and read the word of God and thus to discover the road to salvation.”⁴⁷ Moreover, Professor Leonard Levy said the Framers had “an unbridled passion for a bridled freedom of speech.”⁴⁸ This was in part inherited from John Milton who asked in {172} *Areopagitica* “whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter with Falsehood?” To Milton, “heresy” was more “dreaded than censorship.”⁴⁹

Seditious Libel

Liberty of the press meant publishing without a license. Blackstone said it “consists in laying no previous restraints upon publications, and not in freedom from censure for a criminal matter when published.”⁵⁰ However, free speech or press did not allow seditious libel which made it a crime to utter or publish that which reprehended government and had the “bad tendency” of lowering it in the public’s esteem.⁵¹ Benjamin Franklin called seditious statements an “infamous disgrace.”⁵² The law was altered by the John Peter Zenger case where truth was held to be a defense.⁵³

Fearful that the same radical, dangerous ideas that had destroyed France in the French Revolution were being exported

47. Archibald Cox, *Freedom of Expression* (Harvard University Press, 1981).

48. Levy, 105.

49. Walter Berns, *Freedom, Virtue and the First Amendment* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press), 24.

50. Levy, 10.

51. Levy, 10.

52. McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, 49; Levy, 127–128.

53. Levy, 130.

here, Congress made seditious libel a Federal offense in 1798.⁵⁴ Levy says no Federalist was known to have opposed the law which every member of the Supreme Court in 1798–1800 believed was constitutional.⁵⁵ Chief Justice Oliver Ellsworth said “the Common Law [as to seditious libel] of this country remains the same as it was before the Revolution.”⁵⁶ Although Madison and Jefferson thought it violated the 1st Amendment, they believed the States retained the right to enact such legislation, all of which did.⁵⁷

The Framers’ belief in free speech was also conditional. For example, at Common Law, freedom of speech was not a civil right, but a privilege for members of Parliament only, and was limited to “whatever is not against the law.”⁵⁸ The liberty did not {173} extend to that which subverted religion, or which was obscene, immoral, or seditious.⁵⁹ Blackstone listed apostasy, heresy, and blasphemy of Christianity as Common Law crimes.⁶⁰ In *Vidal v. Girard*, 2 U.S. 127, 198 (1844), the Court declared that Christianity was not to be “blasphemed against.”

Pennsylvania in 1776, and Vermont made free speech a constitutional right, but were the only States that did.⁶¹ However, to the end of the century, Pennsylvania recognized the Common Law’s restraints on speech and press. Massachusetts rejected a free speech provision in 1778.⁶² Thus, Levy says “that the Revolution almost got rid of freedom of speech and press, instead of the Common Law on the subject.”⁶³

In *Robertson v. Baldwin* (1896), free speech and press did “not permit...libels, blasphemous or indecent articles, or other publications injurious to public morals or private reputation.” In

54. Clarence Carson, *The Beginning of the Republic 1775–1825* (Greenville, AL: American Textbook Committee, 1984), 149.

55. Levy, 246.

56. *Ibid.*, 243.

57. *Ibid.*, 266–267.

58. Levy, 113; McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, 47.

59. McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, 48.

60. Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol. 4., 57–80.

61. Levy, 184.

62. *Ibid.*

63. Levy, 182.

Chaplinski v. New Hampshire, 315 U.S. 568, 571 (1942), the right did not include “the lewd and obscene, the profane, the libelous, and ... insulting or fighting words—those which by their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace.” Such were so inessential to the discovery of truth that any benefit they may have was “clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality.” Meanwhile, in *Schenck v. United States*, 249 U.S. 204, 207 (1919), Justice Holmes held that speech may be curbed if there is “a clear and present danger” that it will promote evils Congress has a right to prevent. The freedoms of religion, speech and press were held to be in a “preferred position” constitutionally in *Saia v. New York*, 334 U.S. 558, 562 (1948).

Until *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964), libel was left with the States. However, declaring “that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open” even if public officials were subjected to “vehement, caustic and...unpleasantly sharp attacks” the Court held in *Sullivan* that before public officials (later broadened to include public figures in general)⁶⁴ could recover damages for defamatory falsehood, {174} they had to prove actual malice. It also declared the 1798 Alien and Sedition Act unconstitutional. Based on Free Speech, the Court held a college professor may not be dismissed for advocating overthrow of the government by force;⁶⁵ held that Communists have the right to work in government defense plants⁶⁶ and may not be denied passports.⁶⁷ Neither could a public employee (on probation) be terminated for saying she hoped the President would be assassinated.⁶⁸

In *Halter v. Nebraska*, 205 U.S. 34, 41 (1907), a statute forbidding use of the American flag for advertising purposes upon merchandise was constitutionally upheld because “[for that flag every true American has not simply an appreciation but a deep affection...” Nevertheless, the Court later held unconstitutional State laws requiring the flag salute in public school classes and

64. *Curtis Publishing Company v. Butts*, 388 U.S. 130 (1967).

65. *Keylshian u Board of Regents of New York*, 385 U.S. 629 (1967).

66. *United States v. Robel*, 389 U.S. 258 (1967).

67. *Aptheker v. Secretary of State*, 378 U.S. 500 (1964).

68. *Rankin v. McPherson*, 107 S. Ct. 2891 (1987).

laws prohibiting desecration of the flag.⁶⁹

Justice Holmes thought it a gain to banish all words of “moral significance” from law,⁷⁰ which has substantially occurred. In *Gertz v. Welch*, 418 U.S. 323, 339 (1974), the Court held that “under the 1st Amendment there is no such thing as a false idea.” In *Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15 (1971), conviction of a defendant who exhibited the words “F—the draft” on his shirt was overturned because the constitutional freedom of expression is “intended to remove governmental restraints” from public discussion leaving “what views shall be voiced into the hands of each of us” so as to produce a “more perfect polity.”⁷¹ “[O]ne man’s vulgarity,” Justice Harlan said, “is another man’s lyric.”⁷²

In *Rosenfield v. New Jersey*, 408 U.S. 901 (1972), punishment of a man was overturned, based on free speech, who had, at a public school board meeting (with 40 children in attendance), repeatedly called members and teachers “motherf—ers.” In *Hustler Magazine v. Falwell*, 485 U.S. 46 {175} (1988), a judgment for money damages against a magazine for publishing a false ad parody depicting a nationally known minister as recalling that his “first time” was during a drunken incestuous rendezvous with his mother in an outhouse, was overturned because such was constitutionally protected expression. The *Memoirs v. Massachusetts*, 383 U.S. 413 (1966), holding that before a publication may be held obscene it must be “utterly without redeeming social value” established a near impossible burden of proof. This burden was lightened in *Miller v. California*, 413 U.S. 15 (1973), where to be obscene, the material must lack “serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.” In *Stanley v. Georgia*, 394 U.S. 557 (1969), it was held that a law prohibiting possession of obscene material in one’s own home violated the 1st Amendment.

69. *West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943); *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397 (1989); *United States v. Eichman*, 110 S. Ct. 2404 (1990).

70. John Eidsmoe, *The Christian Legal Advisor* (Mott Media, 1984), 76.

71. *Cohen v. California*, 24.

72. *Ibid.*, 25.

The Right to Bear Arms

The 2nd Amendment provides: “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.” The term “Militia” refers not to a standing army or a National Guard, but as held in *United States v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 174, 178 (1939), to all able-bodied male citizens. The Framers had a great fear of government. George Washington said: “Firearms stand next to importance to the Constitution itself. They are the American people’s liberty teeth.”⁷³ Nevertheless, the Supreme Court declared in *Robertson v. Baldwin*, that the right to bear arms does not authorize carrying concealed weapons.

Search and Seizure

The 4th Amendment protects the “right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures” and prohibits search warrants except “upon probable cause.” Professor Cooley says this provision had its origin in the maxim “A man’s house is his castle” and from the seizure (1683) of the seditious, but unpublished papers of Algernon Sydney from his home, which {176} were used to convict and execute him for treason.⁷⁴ James Otis’ celebrated battle in 1761 against the tyrannical English Writs of Assistance also provided impetus for this provision, which prohibits only unreasonable searches and seizures. *Elkins v. United States*, 364 U.S. 206, 222 (1960). Moreover, Professor Wigmore said “it has long been established that the admissibility of evidence is not affected by the illegality of the means through which the party has obtained the evidence.”⁷⁵ However, the Supreme Court held in *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383, 398 (1914), that if evidence is seized in violation of the 4th Amendment, it would not be admitted in Federal court cases. Justice Cardozo, in rejecting this “exclusionary

73. *The New American*, December 17, 1991, 25.

74. Thomas Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations*, vol. I, 612; Thomas James Norton, *The Constitution of the United States* (New York: Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.).

75. John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1961), vol. 8, Sec. 2183.

rule” in a State-court case said: “The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered.”⁷⁶

The exclusionary rule was applied to the States in *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 657 (1961), which overruled *Wolf v. Colorado*, 338 U.S. 25 (1949). After police complained that it has allowed many criminals to go free, the rule was modified in *United States v. Leon*, 468 U.S. 897 (1984), where it was held that good-faith reliance by police on a search warrant later declared invalid would not trigger the rule.

Property Rights

Since “property” has no rights, but humans do, there was no distinction for the Framers between “human” rights and property rights. Hamilton said, “the one great object of government is personal protection and the security of property.”⁷⁷ Madison agreed.⁷⁸ “The people,” or those entitled to vote, was understood to mean real property owners because of their “stake in society.”⁷⁹ This was held unconstitutional in {177} 1970.⁸⁰ The 5th Amendment prohibits the Federal Government from taking any person’s “life, liberty, or property” without due process of law as well as the taking of private property “for public use without just compensation.” It was held in *Chicago, B. and Q.R. Company v. Chicago*, 166 U.S. 226 (1897), that the 14th Amendment’s Due Process clause prohibits such taking by a State—even though that clause does not expressly prohibit such taking as the 5th Amendment does, and even though the 14th Amendment’s authoring Congress rejected an attempt to attach a “just compensation” clause to it.⁸¹ Then, in *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*, 467 U.S. 229 (1984), a State law authorizing the compensated taking of private property by a State for re-sale to private persons was upheld even though the

76. *People v. Defore*, N.Y. 150 N.E. 585, 587 (1926).

77. McDonald, *Norvus Ordo Seclorum*, 3.

78. *Ibid.*

79. *Ibid.*, 25–26.

80. *Phoenix u Kolodziejski*, 399 U.S. 204 (1970); *Hill v. Stone*, 421 U.S. 289 (1975).

81. Hermine H. Meyer, *The History and Meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment* (New York: Vantage Press, 1977), 101.

taking was not for a “public use,” but for the “public purpose” of reducing a land oligopoly.

The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

The 5th Amendment prohibits a person from being “compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.” Many believe this derived from the 1637–38 John Lilburne Star Chamber case. Lilburne, charged with printing seditious books, refused to be interrogated asserting it was “against the practice of Christ Himself.”⁸² The Common Law cases had nothing to do with murder, rape or other common crimes, but with religious heresy or those who irritated royal ministers.⁸³

Madison had originally proposed an unlimited right extending to any proceeding, but Congress inserted the words “in any criminal case.”⁸⁴ Although intended to apply to only the accused on trial in such cases,⁸⁵ this provision has been expanded {178} by judicial decisions to cover the case of any witness who testifies under oath in any kind of formal government proceeding.⁸⁶ Applying the privilege (as Wigmore calls it) to persons not on trial infringes an accused’s 6th Amendment right “to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor” in the event a subpoenaed witness claims the privilege.

Overruling previous cases, the privilege was held applicable to the States in *Malloy v. Hogan*, 378 U.S. 1 (1964). The privilege was not intended to prohibit comment by the prosecution on the

82. Leonard Levy, *Origins of the Fifth Amendment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 307.

83. Eugene Methvin, “Let’s Restore the Fifth Amendment,” *Human Events*, February 28, 1970, 8.

84. Levy, *Origins of the Fifth Amendment*, 422–424.

85. Wigmore, vol. 8, Sec. 2252, 324; Ed. S. Corwin, “The Supreme Court’s Construction of the Self-Incrimination Clauses.” 29 *Michigan Law Review* (1930), 1–2.

86. *Counselman v. Hitchcock*, 142 U.S. 547 (to Grand Juries) (1892); *McCarthy v. Arndstein*, 266 U.S. 34, 40–42 (civil judicial proceeding) (1924); *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155 (1955), and *Emspak v. United States*, 346 U.S. 190 (to legislative committee)(1955); Wigmore, Sec. 2252, 327.

accused's failure to testify⁸⁷ or to prohibit law enforcement from taking advantage of the impulse to confess,⁸⁸ but this was altered by *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), where it was held that before police, State or Federal, may interrogate a suspect, he must be warned that he may remain silent, which silence may not be used against him, that he has a right to counsel, etc. Before *Miranda*, police solved 91 of every 100 murders, but after *Miranda* the percentage of unsolved murders tripled to an all-time high.⁸⁹

The Right to Assistance of Counsel

The 6th Amendment provides: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right...to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." This did not mean a taxpayer-paid defense lawyer, but "The historical meaning of the...provision was that the Court *permit* counsel, employed by Defendants, to appear and participate in the proceeding."⁹⁰ This was the understanding until it was held in *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458 (1938), that Federal courts were required to provide {179} government-paid counsel to indigent defendants. In *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), overruling *Betts v. Brady*, 316 U.S. 455 (1947), this "right" was extended to State cases. One writer called *Gideon's* aftermath "the greatest jailbreak of all time" as hundreds of felony convictions were vacated because the defendants had been unable to afford counsel.⁹¹ In *Ake v. Oklahoma*, 470 U.S. 68 (1985), murder defendants pleading insanity were held entitled to a State paid psychiatrist.

87. Methvin, *Human Events*; it was first held in *Wilson v. United States*, 149 U.S. (1893), 60, that failure to testify creates no presumption of guilt. In *Bruno v. United States*, 308 U.S. (1939), 287, it was held that the defendant was entitled to an instruction to that effect.

88. Methvin, *Id.*

89. Rep. John Ashbrook, "Are Judges Abusing Our Rights," *Readers' Digest*, August, 1981, 80.

90. Ed. Dumbauld, *The Bill of Rights*, 69, n. 15.

91. *This Week*, February 16, 1964; *Time*, October 18, 1963.

Trial by Jury

The 6th and 7th Amendments guarantee the right to jury trial in criminal and civil cases respectively. It has been held that this means a jury trial “as it was understood at Common Law in 1791.”⁹² Although it is the practice today to allow the jury to determine only the facts, the Common Law practice was for the jury to determine both the law and the facts.⁹³ “Justice, as administered by the jury, was based not on technical knowledge of statute law, but on Christian principles.”⁹⁴ John Adams said a juror should ignore a judge’s instruction on the law if it violates the juror’s “conscience.”⁹⁵ Jefferson considered the jury trial “the only anchor...by which a government can be held to the principles of its Constitution.”⁹⁶ One reason truth was held a defense to seditious libel in the *Zenger* case was because the jury was able to override existing law.⁹⁷ In *Georgia v. Brailsford*, 3 U.S. 1 (1794), the Supreme Court declared that the jury has the right “to determine the law as well as the fact(s).” One ground of impeachment against Justice Samuel Chase in 1805 was that he obstructed the jury’s ability to judge the law as well as the facts.⁹⁸

In *Williams v. Florida*, 399 U.S. 78 (1970), the 600-year old Common Law practice of requiring a jury to be composed of {180} 12 persons was overturned. In holding that 6 persons was sufficient, Justice Byron White said the requirement of 12 was “an historical accident, unrelated to the great purposes which gave rise to the jury in the first place.”⁹⁹ However, Lord Coke said the law delights “in the number 12” because ancient usage had always required 12 to determine factual matters, and 12 judges were required for matters of law “in the Exchequer chamber...And that

92. *Dimick v. Schiedt*, 293 U.S. 474, 476, 487 (1935).

93. “The Changing Role of the Jury,” 74 *Yale Law Journal* (1964), 170.

94. Whitehead, 198.

95. *Ibid.*, 173.

96. S. K. Padover, *Thomas Jefferson on Democracy* (1939), 160.

97. Levy, *Freedom of Speech and Press*, 129–131.

98. *Dates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, 8th Congress* (March, 1804), 1237–1238, Gales and Seaton 1852.

99. *Williams v. Florida*, 399 U.S. 78, 89–90 (1970).

number...is much respected in *Holy Writ* as in *12 Apostles*.”¹⁰⁰

Cruel and Unusual Punishments

The 8th Amendment’s “cruel and punishment” prohibition was taken verbatim from the English Bill of Rights of 1689 upon the passage of which “crucifixion, boiling in oil were no longer customary. Nor were those punishments which were barbarous, inhuman, and un-Christian.”¹⁰¹ However, Professor Burger says “none of the cruel” penal methods “employed in the ‘Bloody Assize’ “ceased to be used after 1689.¹⁰² Thus, “whipping, pillorying and excessive imprisonment” were not within the clause. Neither was disemboweling until it was “eliminated by statute” in 1814.¹⁰³

“Benefit of clergy” was a defense to capital punishment at Common Law. That is why the first Congress, in enacting a death penalty statute, eliminated that defense.¹⁰⁴ Thus, based on the Common Law, the Supreme Court held in *Ex parte Kemmler*, 136 U.S. 436, 446 (1890), that burning at the stake, crucifixion, breaking on the wheel, etc., were forbidden by the 8th Amendment, but the death penalty was not. However, in *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86, 100 (1958), “the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of our maturing society” had replaced the Common Law in determining what was cruel and unusual.

Notwithstanding previous rulings holding otherwise, the “cruel and unusual” clause was held applicable to the States in {181} *Robinson v. California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962). Even though capital punishment’s constitutionality is implicit in the 5th Amendment’s capital crime, double jeopardy and Due Process clauses, it was Court held in *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1971), that a State death penalty statute violated the 8th Amendment. Justice Brennan said even murderers had “intrinsic worth as human beings” and the death penalty did not “comport with human dignity.”¹⁰⁵ Nevertheless, 37 States immediately re-enacted death

100. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 398.

101. Raoul Berger, *Death Penalties* (Harvard University Press, 1982), 37, 41.

102. *Ibid.*, 35.

103. *Ibid.*, 39, 41.

104. *Ibid.*, 42–43.

105. *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, 257 (1971).

penalty laws. It was then held in *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976), that the death penalty was constitutional, but the Court continues to supervise sentencing procedures. The death penalty for rape was held unconstitutional in *Coker v. Georgia*, 433 U.S. 584 (1970).

The 9th Amendment

The 9th Amendment provides: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” Speaking of other rights “retained by the people” indicates the Amendment protects only those rights which the people already possessed prior to the establishment of the new government because they are God-given. The Amendment created no new rights.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, 484 (1965), the Supreme Court held, based on the 9th and other Amendments that there was a right of privacy “in penumbras, formed by emanations from” the Bill of Rights. Correspondence between Justices Douglas, who wrote the *Griswold* opinion, and Brennan, shows that they designed to “create” a new constitutional right.¹⁰⁷ Based on this, Justice Brennan and his brethren, in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), held there is a right to abortion (which apparently “comports” with human dignity), the unborn being non-persons under the 14th Amendment. Justice White, dissenting, called this an exercise of {182} “raw judicial power.” Lately, the Court has loosened restrictions on State regulation of abortion.¹⁰⁸ Creation of the privacy and abortion “rights” in effect fulfilled Hamilton’s prophecy that a Bill of Rights would afford a Federal pretext to claim more power than was granted.

106. Dumbauld, 63.

107. “The Secret Origins of the Right to Abortion,” *All About Issues* (American Life League, Box 1350, Stafford, VA 22554), vol. 2, no. 4, April 1989—based on manuscripts from the Library of Congress; Stephen L. Washby, *He Shall Not Pass This Way Again: The Legacy of Justice William O. Douglas* (University of Pittsburg Press, 1990), 159, n. 22.

108. “*Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, 492 U.S. 490 (1989); *Hodgson v. Minnesota*, 111 L. Ed. 2nd 344 (1990); *Planned Parenthood v. Carey*, 60 U.S.L.W. 4795 (1992).

The 10th Amendment

The 10th Amendment provides: “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.” The Court held exactly this in *United States v. Sprague*, 282 U.S. 716, 731 (1930). Based on the 10th Amendment, President Jefferson believed it was not within the power of the Federal Government to spend money for “public education, roads, rivers, canals, and... other objects of public improvement.”¹⁰⁹ Presidents Madison and James Monroe vetoed legislation, based on the 10th Amendment, for such purposes.¹¹⁰ Nevertheless, the Court in *United States v. Darby*, 310 U.S. 100, 124 (1941), downplayed the 10th Amendment by stating: “all is retained which has not been surrendered.” In *Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, 469 U.S. 528 (1985), it was held that a city’s mass transit is governed by Federal wage and hour standards, placing the States at the mercy of Congress (exactly what the Framers sought to avoid). In *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 495 U.S. 33 (1990), it was held not violative of the 10th Amendment for a U.S. District Court to override a Missouri tax limitation law and order local officials to raise taxes to finance a school desegregation plan. Of course, a major cause of the American Revolution was taxation without representation.

The 14th Amendment Was Not Intended to Apply Bill of Rights to States

During the Warren Court years, the Supreme Court selectively held that most provisions of the Bill of Rights had {183} been incorporated into the 14th Amendment’s Due Process clause and thus made applicable to the States. This occurred even though the Amendment’s history does not support incorporation which even the Court itself acknowledged as late as 1959.¹¹¹ In fact, for 57 years following the 14th Amendment’s enactment in 1868, the Supreme Court in numerous precedents, consistently rejected arguments that the Amendment made the first 8 Amendments restrictions on

109. Carson, 173.

110. *Ibid*

111. *Barkus v. Illinois*, 359 U.S. 121,125 (1959).

the State Governments as well as the Federal.¹¹²

The Gitlow Case and Incorporation

Yet, suddenly and without explanation as to why, the Supreme Court in *Gitlow v. New York*, 265 U.S. 652, 666 (1925), assumed that the “freedom of speech and of the press” were among the “liberties” protected by the 14th Amendment’s Due Process clause from impairment by the States. Constitutional historian Charles Warren observed that “by one short sentence” and “without even mentioning these previous cases,” the Court “assumes, without argument, that this right of free speech...is protected by the (14th) Amendment.”¹¹³

Due Process, Liberty and the Common Law

To understand what *Gitlow* held, one must consider the Common Law meanings of the terms “liberty” and “Due Process of law,” as used in the 5th and 14th Amendments. The phrase “Due Process of law” may be traced to the *Magna Carta*’s “by the law of the land,” which Lord Coke held meant “by the due course and process of law” in judicial proceedings.¹¹⁴ The First {184} Continental Congress declared that “Due Process” should be regarded as shorthand for Coke’s definition.¹¹⁵ The same was concluded in *Murray v. Hoboken Land and Improve, Company*, 59 U.S. 272 (1855). In fact, Alexander Hamilton told the New York Assembly in 1787 that “the words ‘Due Process’ have a precise technical import, and are only applicable to the process and proceedings of the Courts of justice; they can never be referred

112. *The Slaughter-House Cases*, (1873), 36 (7th Am.); *Walker v. Sauvinet*, 92 U.S. (1875); *Kennard v. Louisiana*, 92 U.S. 480 (1875); *United States v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542 (1875) (2nd Am.); *Davidson v. New Orleans*, 96 U.S. 90 (1877) (just compensation); *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516 (1884) (grand Jury); *In re Kemmler*, 136 U.S. 436 (1890) (8th Am.); *McElvaine v. Brush*, 1142 U.S., 155 (8th Am.); *Maxwell v. Dow*, 176 U.S. 581 (1900) (5th, 6th Am.); *Twining v. New Jersey*, 211 U.S. 78 (1908) (5th Am.); *Prudential Insurance Company v. Cheek*, 259 U.S. 530 (1st Am.).

113. Charles Warren, “The New Liberty Under the 14th Amendment.” *Harvard Law Review*, vol. XXXIX, no. 4 (Feb., 1926), 433.

114. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 195.

115. *Ibid.*, 198.

to an act of the legislature.”¹¹⁶ Thus, Professor Raoul Berger holds, as did Lord Coke, Justice Joseph Story, and Chancellor Kent, that the phrase relates to procedural process and criminal proceedings only.¹¹⁷ It was never meant to be used in a substantive sense so as to allow Courts to strike down legislative acts.

In *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516, 535 (1884), it was concluded that the 14th Amendment’s Due Process clause “was used in the same sense and with no greater extent” than in the 5th Amendment. Justice Felix Frankfurter said: “It ought not to require argument to reject the notion that Due Process of law meant one thing in the (5th) Amendment and another in the (14th).”¹¹⁸

As for the word “liberty” as used in the Due Process clauses, Professor Warren states that it had the same meaning in the 5th Amendment as it did at Common Law, which was simply “liberty of the person, or, in other words, ‘the right to have one’s person free from physical restraint.’ ”¹¹⁹ Since by the 1st Amendment Congress is absolutely prohibited from taking away certain rights, Warren asked after *Gitlow* if the same rights may now be taken by due process of law. Professor Berger says “No one in the 39th Congress intimated that the (14th Amendment’s) Due Process clause would incorporate the Bill of Rights.”¹²⁰

Justice Black’s Contention and Professor Fairman’s Response

After *Gitlow*, 14th Amendment incorporation was restricted mainly to 1st Amendment cases. Then, Justice Hugo {185} Black, dissenting in *Adamson v. California*, 332 U.S. 46, 68 (1947), attempted to document by reference to the 14th Amendment Congressional debates that all of the first 8 amendments to the Constitution had been incorporated into the 14th Amendment’s “privileges or immunities” clause and thus become restrictions on the States as well as the Federal Government. To Justice

116. *Ibid.* 194.

117. *Ibid.*, 199–200.

118. Concurrence in *Adamson v. California*, 332 U.S. 46, 66 (1947).

119. Warren, “The New Liberty,” *Id.*, 440.

120. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 139.

Black's assertion, Professor Charles Fairman, in a famous law review article¹²¹ contrasted the "mountain of evidence" against incorporation with "the few stones and pebbles" in support, and according to Professor Alexander Bickel, "conclusively disproved"¹²² Black's contention.

The Civil Rights Act of 1866

Fairman said the 14th Amendment Framers' objective was to insure the constitutionality of the 1866 Civil Rights Act,¹²³ the purpose of which was to guarantee black men certain civil rights then being denied, i.e., the rights to contract, sue, testify, own property and of locomotion.¹²⁴ Virtually every speaker said this in the Congressional debates on the bill of which no mention is made of the Bill of Rights.¹²⁵ Senator Lyman Trumbull, author of the Civil Rights Act, said the 14th Amendment was a {186} "reiteration of the rights as set forth in the Civil Rights bill."¹²⁶

Before discussing Professor Fairman's response to Justice Black as well as other evidence against incorporation, the 14th Amendment's text should be reviewed. Since Sections 2–4 reflect the victorious North's revengeful mood against the South's attempt to secede from the Union, only Sections 1 and 5 are pertinent herein. Section 1 provides: "All persons born or naturalized in the

121. Charles Fairman, "Does the Fourteenth Amendment Incorporate the Bill of Rights?" 2 *Stanford Law Review*, (1949), 5, 134.

122. Alexander Bickel, *The Least Dangerous Branch* (1962), 102.

123. Hermine H. Meyer, *The History and Meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment* (New York: Vantage Press, 1977), 70. Section 1 of the bill read in pertinent parts: "That all persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States; and such citizens, of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains and penalties, and to no other..."

124. Fairman, 7.

125. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 23.

126. Berger, *The Fourteenth Amendment and the Bill of Rights*, 40.

United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

The 14th Amendment Enforcement Clause

As shown by the text, the 5th Amendment’s Due Process clause is the only Bill of Rights provision incorporated into the 14th Amendment. Moreover, Section 5, provides: “The Congress shall have power to enforce, *by* appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.” Thus, early on, the Supreme Court held in *Ex Parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, 345 (1879), that the enforcement power resided with Congress only and not the Federal courts. Nevertheless, that decision was overturned in *Oregon v. Mitchell*, 410 U.S. 112 (1970), which held that the Amendment “grants (enforcement) power to the Court” even though the Constitution grants the Court no legislative power.

The Privilege or Immunities Argument

The argument of Justice Black that the first 8 amendments had been incorporated in the 14th Amendment’s “privilege or immunities” clause had in fact already been made and rejected in the *Slaughter House Cases*, 83 U.S. 36 (1872), which held it was never intended by Congress nor the State legislatures to “constitute this Court,” via the 14th Amendment, “as a perpetual censor upon all (State) legislatures...and the civil rights of their...citizens.” That clause was to have the same {187} meaning as the Constitution’s Article IV (2). In *Abbott v. Bayley*, (1827),¹²⁷ an early Massachusetts case, it had been held that Art. IV (2), providing: “The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States” can be applied only in case of removal from one State to another. In *United States v. Wheeler*, 254 U.S. 281 (1920), it was held that Art. IV (2) was

127. 6 Pick. 89 (Mass. 1827).

intended to perpetuate the limitations of the 4th Article of the Articles of Confederation which guaranteed ingress and regress from State to State and enjoyment of trade and commerce. It had in fact been explained by the authors of Art. IV (2) in the Federal Convention of 1787 that it was framed exactly upon the principles of that Article of Confederation provisional.¹²⁸

In *Paul v. Virginia*, 75 U.S. 168 (1868), decided contemporaneous with the 14th Amendment's enactment, it was held that Art. IV (2) gives citizens "the right of free ingress into other States and regress from them." Thus, in rejecting incorporation, the Court declared in the *Slaughter House Cases* that the purpose of and protections afforded by the 14th Amendment's "privileges or immunities" clause were identical to Art. IV (2) and that both were derived from a similar Articles of Confederation clause.

In the 1787 Federal Convention, Charles Pinckney, the chief author of Art. IV (2), explained that blacks were not recognized as citizens so as to entitle them to its protections.¹²⁹ In holding that blacks were not "citizens" under the Constitution in *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 60 U.S. 393, 422 (1856), the Court found justification for its ruling in Art. IV (2). Thus, it was contended that the 14th Amendment was needed to guarantee blacks the basic rights of citizens. Moreover, Professor Berger says debates in the First Congress contain no evidence that the Art. IV "privileges and immunities" were being "enlarged" or, indeed, that the Bill of Rights was in any way related to "privileges and immunities."¹³⁰ If it was so related, why was the Bill of Rights even necessary? {188}

Rep. Bingham and Senator Howard

Justice Black, in his *Adamson* thesis, relied primarily upon statements made by Senator Jacob Howard¹³¹ and Rep. John Bingham, the chief author of Section 1 of the Amendment (Justice Black called him the "Madison" of that Section). Bingham stated that prior to the 14th Amendment "this immortal Bill of Rights...

128. Meyer, 19.

129. Meyer, 28–30.

130. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 138.

131. *Adamson v. California*, 77, n. 7, 92–123.

rested...for its enforcement...upon the...States.”¹³² However, Fairman said Bingham not only exhibited “a novel...befuddled construction of the Constitution,” but his remarks were confused and self contradictory and failed to reflect the predominant thinking of the House of Representatives.¹³³ For example, Bingham told the House that every provision of an early version of the Amendment which would have secured all persons in the States “equal protection in the rights to life, liberty and property,” was already in the Constitution except the Congressional enforcement payroll.¹³⁴ Of course, no such provision was in the Constitution. He also mistakenly claimed that the Bill of Rights was already applicable to the States via the Supremacy Clause (Art. VI) and that the Bill of Rights contained a “privilege and immunities” clause.¹³⁵

Moreover, Bingham said: “The care of the property, the liberty, and the life of the citizen...is in the States and not in the Federal Government. I have sought to effect no change in that respect.”¹³⁶ He conceded that “this amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it” and that its “privileges or immunities” were drawn from Art. IV (2)¹³⁷—exactly what had been held in the *Slaughter House Cases*. As for the meaning of the amendment’s Due Process clause, he said “the Courts have settled that long ago, and the gentlemen can go and read their decisions” thus acknowledging the Common Law’s meaning of the term.¹³⁸ Finally, Bingham himself had said Section 1 was only to carry out the aforementioned limited {189} objectives of the Civil Rights Act.¹³⁹

Fairman shows that Senator Howard was no more reliable than Bingham. Ironically, Howard, whose participation had previously been negligible, had by sheer chance acted as spokesman for the Joint Committee in explaining the Amendment’s purposes to

132. Fairman, 65–66.

133. *Ibid.*, 25–26; Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 140–147.

134. Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 813 (1865–66).

135. Meyer, 79; Glove, 1034; Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 241.

136. Berger, *The Fourteenth Amendment and the Bill of Rights*, 51.

137. Meyer, 79; Glove, 1034; Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 241.

138. Berger, *The Fourteenth Amendment and the Bill of Rights*, 10.

139. *Ibid.*

the Senate as he was filling in for the ill Chairman Fessenden.¹⁴⁰ Professor Berger notes with sarcasm the oddity of Howard, “one of the most reckless of the radicals,” being taken as speaking authoritatively for a committee in which conservatives outnumbered the radicals and where there was a strong difference of opinion between the two.¹⁴¹ Yet, Howard told the Senate that to the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Amendment “should be added the personal rights guaranteed and secured by the first eight amendments of the Constitution..”¹⁴² This was his sole contribution to incorporation.

After Howard was finished, Senators Poland and Doolittle told the Senate that the Amendment secured nothing beyond what was intended in Art. IV (2) and that it was not intended to encompass the Bill of Rights.¹⁴³ Fairman states that had Howard’s contention, “really been accepted at the time, surely one would find it caught up and repeated in contemporary discussion. So pat a phrase would have been passed about in the Democratic opposition, and if they had understood that such object was in view, would have sought to turn it to their advantage. Yet, Fairman says one does not find the matter discussed or expressed in either newspaper editorials, campaign speeches or lawyers urging it in court.¹⁴⁴ Even Horace Flack, invoked by Justice Black in support of his theory, agreed with this.¹⁴⁵ Five Senators campaigning for re-election who had heard Howard’s speech mentioned nothing about incorporation. Neither did any member of Congress in reported speeches. It “simply did not occur.”

Bingham’s Earlier Draft of Section

It is significant that Bingham’s earlier draft of Section 1 {190} provided: “Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to secure all persons in every State full protection in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property; and to

140. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 147.

141. *Ibid.*

142. Globe, 2764–2765; Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 148.

143. Berger, *Government by Judiciary*, 148–149.

144. Fairman, 68.

145. *Adamson v. California*, 109–110.

all citizens of the United States, in any State, the same immunities and also equal political rights and privileges.”¹⁴⁶ This version failed to advance in either House. This is, as Hermine H. Meyer said, “of great importance...because it shows that an open attempt to give Congress the power of a super legislature which would have enabled it to enact for the States every provision of the Federal Bill of Rights, as well as any other law, failed.”¹⁴⁷ Thus, Senator Frederick Frelinghuysen agreed in 1871 that the 14th “Amendment must... not be used to make the General Government imperial. It must be read...together with the 10th Amendment.”¹⁴⁸

State Law Changes Incorporation Would Have Required

Had the 14th Amendment mandated application of the Bill of Rights to the States, it would have required an immediate change in State laws that, 1) allowed an accused to be charged with an “infamous crime” upon information rather than upon “indictment of a Grand Jury” as required by the 5th Amendment; 2) permitted some criminal prosecutions to be tried without a full 12-man jury as required by the 6th Amendment; or 3) denied “the right of trial by jury” in any Common Law action “where the value in controversy” exceeds \$20, as required by the 7th Amendment. Moreover, a hotly debated proposal in an Illinois State Constitutional Convention in 1869–70 was abolishment of the Grand Jury.¹⁴⁹ Grand Jury supporters “never so much as suggested that the 14th Amendment incorporated the Bill of Rights.”

State-by-State surveys by Professor Fairman and Justice Frankfurter showed that those States which had provisions in their constitutions incompatible with the Bill of Rights saw no necessity for changing them, nor did other States feel prevented from later adopting such incompatible provisions.¹⁵⁰ Moreover, {191} Congress admitted into the Union new States with constitutional

146. Meyer, 50–51.

147. *Ibid.*

148. Berger, *The Fourteenth Amendment and the Bill of Rights*, 54.

149. *Ibid.*, 99.

150. Fairman, 84–112; *Bartkus v. Illinois*, 359 U.S. 121, 140–149 (1959).

provisions inconsistent with the Federal Bill of Rights.¹⁵¹

Contemporaneous Cases

Several cases decided immediately after the 14th Amendment's adoption confirm it was not intended to apply the Bill of Rights against the States. For example, five months after its adoption, New Hampshire's highest court quoted Justice Joseph Story in concluding that, by the 1st Amendment, "the whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusively to the State Governments..."¹⁵² In *Twitchell v. Pennsylvania*, 7 Wall 321 (1869), the U.S. Supreme Court, less than a year after the 14th Amendment's adoption, followed *Barron a Baltimore* (1833), in holding that the 5th and 6th Amendments do not apply to the States. A year later, a like conclusion was reached in *Justices of the Supreme Court v. United States ex. rel. Murray*, 76 U.S. 274 (1870).

The Blaine Amendment

The proposed Blaine Amendment, introduced in Congress 7 years after the 14th Amendment's adoption, is compelling proof against incorporation.¹⁵³ Except for substituting the word "State" for "Congress," it was virtually identical to the 1st Amendment. It read: "No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." It failed of passage 20 different times. In the Congress (1875–76) considering The Blaine Amendment were 23 members of the Congress that wrote the 14th Amendment. Not one ever suggested that the 1st Amendment was "incorporated" into the 14th. If it were, why was Blaine necessary?

The Ruling in *Bartkus v. Illinois*

Justice Frankfurter observed in *Adamson*, 62, that {192} except for one "eccentric exception," of the 43 Justices (including Miller,

151. Meyer, 114.

152. *Hale v. Everett*, 53 N.H. 1, 124 (1868).

153. 4 Congressional Record 5580. Alfred W. Meyer, "The Blaine Amendment and the Bill of Rights," 64 *Harvard Review*, 939 (1951). 100. 439 2nd 266, 2698 (1968).

Davis, Bradley, Waite, Matthews, Gray, Fuller, Holmes, Brandeis, Stone and Cardozo) who had ruled on the 14th Amendment's scope in the 70 years since its enactment, none believed it made the Bill of Rights applicable to the States. Moreover, the Court in *Bartkus v. Illinois*, 359 U.S. 121, 125, n. 3 (1959), in holding that the 14th Amendment's Due Process clause did not apply to the States the 5th Amendment's double jeopardy clause or "any of the provisions of the first eight amendments," declared, based on Professor Fairman's article, *Id.*, that the relevant historical materials...demonstrate conclusively that Congress and the ratifying State legislatures "did not contemplate that the (14th) Amendment was a short-hand incorporation of the first eight amendments making them applicable as explicit restrictions upon the States."

The 14th Amendment's "Equal Protection" Clause

The 14th Amendment forbids any State to deny "any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Professor Alfred Avins points out that as to this clause "we have all cases and no constitutional."¹⁵⁴ With all the judicial innovation regarding the word "equal," which Avins says "is merely an adjective" describing "the quantity of 'protection,'" the word "protection" has been treated as the little man who wasn't there. "The laws need not be 'equal,'" Avins says, "but only the protection needs to be equal...Every person is entitled to the same protection." While it is feasible to give all persons equal protection, it is virtually impossible to treat all persons equally by law. For example, a tourist on a 10-day trip to America would be entitled to vote since he is a "person" within the State's jurisdiction. The same would be true of minors. Thus, the clause refers to no substantive rights, but to the application of the law.

On adoption of the 14th Amendment, 19 of 37 States had segregated schools.¹⁵⁵ None were abolished due to ratification. Two other States soon joined this list. During the 14th Amendment debates, Congress passed legislation perpetuating {193} segregated

154. Alfred Avins, "The Equal 'Protection' of the Laws: The Original Understanding," 12 *New York Law Forum* (1967).

155. James J. Kilpatrick, *The Sovereign States* (H. Regnery Co., 1957), 270.

schools in the District of Columbia.¹⁵⁶ Thus, Professor Buckle concluded the Amendment “was meant to apply neither to jury service, nor suffrage, nor anti-miscegenation statutes, nor segregation.”¹⁵⁷ Nevertheless, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 494, n. 11 (1954), the Court, based not on the history of the Amendment, but on psychological and sociological studies, reversed *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), and held that segregated schools violated the equal protection clause. While morally right, the decision was constitutionally dubious. It was also held in *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954), that the 14th Amendment’s equal protection provisions were incorporated in the 5th Amendment’s Due Process clause. Shades of Bingham!

The 14th Amendment’s Questionable Constitutionality

The Utah Supreme Court in *Pyett v. Turner* (1968)¹⁵⁸ shows that the 14th Amendment was never legally ratified. Experiencing great difficulty in passing the Amendment, the 39th Congress, to achieve passage, initiated in December, 1865, the first in a series of tyrannical power plays against the Southern States (for their rejection of the 14th Amendment) in blatant violation of the Constitution’s Art. v. amending process even though those States had helped enact the 13th Amendment. Moreover, it was held in *Texas v. White*, 74 U.S. 700 (1869), that a State may not secede from the indissoluble Union.

The Senate was then composed of 50 northerners and 22 southerners, or a total of 72 members. Being far short of the required two-thirds (48) for passage with only 33 northerners favoring, the Senate voted to unseat the 22 southerners, making, according to them, only 34 aye votes required for passage. Yet, they remained one vote short. To remedy this, a New Jersey Senator (who opposed) was unseated on the pretext that he had been elected by only a plurality (though consistent with his State’s law). Then, with two-thirds (33) of 49 Senators voting in favor, the Senate proclaimed the Amendment passed.

156. 14 Statutes at Large 343; See also 13 Statutes 191.

157. Alexander Bickel, “The Original Understanding and the Segregation Decision,” 69 *Harvard Law Review* 1, 58.

158. 430 2nd 266, 269 (1968); 11 S.C.L.Q. 484 and 28 Tul. L. Rev. 22.

The House was composed of 182 northerners and 58 southerners, or a total of 240 members. With only 120 {194} northerners favoring passage, the Amendment was far short of the required two-thirds (160 votes). The House then voted to unseat the 58 southerners, leaving only the 182 northerners. With proponents now counting 182 members as the total membership, they were still 2 votes short of two-thirds (122) of that number with only 120. However, since there were 30 abstentions, the Amendment was declared passed by the required two-thirds.

By March, 1867, only 17 of 37 States, or 11 short of the required three-fourths (28), had ratified the 14th Amendment. Congress then passed the Reconstruction Act providing for military occupation of all Southern States (excepting Tennessee which had ratified), which Act disenfranchised most white voters and which occupation would cease only upon a Southern State's ratification of the Amendment. Under duress, at least 6 Southern States attempted ratification and their number was added to the 22 Northern States and Tennessee, presumably making the number of ratifying States 29, or 1 more than required. However, both Ohio and New Jersey had rescinded previous ratification, but were nevertheless counted among the 29 by the Secretary of State. Congress then declared the Amendment ratified.

The Need to Restore Public Virtue

While some persons may deny that the foregoing judicially-decreed constitutional changes were unwise, it may not be denied that they occurred without the "consent of the governed" as required by Art. V. The Founders were determined to be "ruled by laws, which they themselves approved, not by edicts of men over whom they (had) no control."¹⁵⁹ Yet, the laiter has occurred by judicial use of the 14th Amendment about which Justice Holmes expressed anxiety "at the ever increasing scope given to (that) Amendment in cutting down...the constitutional rights of the States...I cannot believe that the Amendment was intended to give *carte blanche* to embody our economic or moral beliefs in its prohibitions."¹⁶⁰ To this, it may be asked, but should the

159. Rutland, 23.

160. Dissenting in *Baldwin v. Missouri*, 281 U.S. 586, 595 (1930).

Founders rule us from their graves? Professor Burger has correctly answered that “We are not, of course, bound by the Founders; rather the issue is who may revise the Constitution—the people by amendment or the judges, who are unelected, {195} unaccountable, and virtually irremovable.”¹⁶¹ Ironically, it was proposed at the 1787 Constitutional Convention to join the Supreme Court with the Executive in a Council of Revision, which was to have veto power over legislative acts.¹⁶² Although this plan was rejected four times by the Convention, the Court in effect now exercises such power by abuse of judicial review which has reduced the federalism of the Framers to shambles. Professor Lino Graglia states that “nearly all of the Court’s invalidations of State law purport to be based” on either the 14th Amendment’s Due Process or Equal Protection clauses.¹⁶³

Justice Robert Jackson warned that doctrinaire constructions of the Bill of Rights increased the danger of its being converted “into a suicide pact.”¹⁶⁴ In this regard, Hamilton said “there is no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers.”¹⁶⁵

Moreover, the Court’s policy has served to separate “right” from “obligation” which to the Framers went hand in hand.¹⁶⁶ They called this “public virtue” without which Madison said they would be in “a wretched situation.”¹⁶⁷ It meant not “license” for self-indulgence, but the liberty to do only that “which is good, just and honest” and entailed strength, courage, endurance, industry, frugal living and devotion to the weal of the public’s corporate self.¹⁶⁸ No member of the public could be dependent upon any other and still be reckoned a member of the public. Every man gave himself totally

161. Berger, *Federalism*, 8.

162. James Madison, *Notes on the Constitutional Convention of 1787*, June 4, 6, July 21, August 15.

163. Lino Graglia, “A Theory of Power,” *National Review* 35 (July 17, 1897).

164. Dissent in *Terminello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1, 37 (1949).

165. *The Federalist*, no. 78.

166. Justice Wm. Johnson, *Ogden v. Saunders*, 25 U.S. 213, 281–282 (1827).

167.

168. Berns, *Freedom, Virtue*, 228; McDonald, *Novus*, 70.

to the good of the public as a whole.¹⁶⁹ When public virtue declines or dies, the republic declines or dies. The Framers believed, as Burke did, that to be possessed liberty must be limited,¹⁷⁰ and that, as Jefferson said, it is a “gift of God” which is not to be violated “but with His wrath.”¹⁷¹

169. *Ibid.*

170. Kirk, *The Conservative Constitution*, 31.

171. Dumbauld, *The Declaration of Independence and What It Means Today* (University of Oklahoma Press, (1950), 58–59.

4.
THEOLOGY

COVENANT SALVATION: COVENANT RELIGION VERSUS LEGALISM

Joseph P. Braswell

“Legalism” is a word that is much abused. For example, some use it to designate an overemphasis upon *rules* that govern behavior. Of course, “overemphasis” is a relative term with point of reference to how much emphasis the person making the judgment personally feels should be placed upon standards of behavior. In the extreme form of this way of understanding legalism, one is a legalist if he believes that one can formulate binding, *objective* moral prescriptions of right and wrong acts, for Christians are “led of the Spirit,” not under law. Of course, any reduction of Christian life to an abstract set of rules is a serious error (but equally so is the reduction of it to existentialist subjectivism). It is wrong to emphasize standards to the exclusion of goals and motives. Nevertheless, in the interests of clarity, we must note that legalism is not the same thing as a deontologically reductionistic *moralism* in the realm of *sanctification* (and such a *reductionist error* is not the same thing as, and should not be confused with, a legitimate “third office” of the law as moral standard in Christian ethics).

Another way of defining legalism is to view it as the attempt to gain *justification* by law keeping. Whereas *moralism* is a position with respect to *sanctification*, legalism is a position with regard to justification. This approach is far more in line with the historic sense of the term within Reformational debates about the doctrine of justification. The Reformers meant by the term the error of attempting to *earn* God’s favor by means of good works that possess an *intrinsic merit* according to a principle of “pure justice.” Legalism is thus a doctrine of justification by works-righteousness, an attempt to be good enough to measure up to the standard of the

law as the principle of judgment for the verdict of justification.

Yet there still remains a good deal of unclarity and confusion in this definition. If we designate the Adamic covenant of creation as a “covenant of works,” as many Reformed continue to do, we must ask whether Adam was supposed to be a *legalist*. If the obedience required of him was to function as the meritorious ground of his justification (in something of the {198} manner of *congruent merit*), then it qualifies as the sort of “works-righteousness” we condemn as legalism, something that would *earn* him, according to the terms of the covenant, eternal life. Moreover, is Christ as the “Second Adam” a legalist?

We obviously mean something more by legalism than just a works-righteousness basis of justification as that is understood within what has traditionally (but perhaps erroneously) been called the covenant of works. Is it then the attempt by *fallen* man (in need of redemptive grace) to stand once again (illegitimately) in that original covenantal relation, thus exempting prelapsarian Adam and Christ from the charge of being legalists? Does such a view of *seeking* God and hungering to please him, however misguided and naive, adequately express the *sinful* (and therefore *antitheistic*) nature of legalism?

I will argue below that we cannot understand legalism by any reference to the original covenant, for it is not a doctrine of justification by the law of *God*, but one of justification by the law of *autonomous man*. To see this, we must first realize what the law of God is, and what it is not.

1. The “Bare Law” Abstraction

The traditional Protestant-Reformational view of the law’s “second office”—its unyielding demand for absolute and flawlessly *perfect* fulfillment and consequent *unfulfillability* in a postlapsarian situation—is an abstraction. This “charge” must be correctly understood for what it truly is. All theologizing—all concept—formation, analysis, and interpretation—involves varying degrees of abstraction. We must be sensitive to the *limited legitimacy* of abstractions as arising only within a particular context and addressed to a specific concern. To assert that a given theological proposition is an abstraction by itself says nothing and certainly in

no way impugns it.

This assertion does, however, underscore a potential danger. For an abstraction is *misused* if it is confused for a real state of affairs, if such concepts are reified and regarded as though they represent how things are in and of themselves, independent of all perspective and interpretational schemata. We may call such confusion the error of abstractionism, and Protestant interpretation has often been guilty of such abstractionism in its view of the law.

For example, John Murray, better than most Protestant {199} exegetes before him, recognized that a *covenantal* perspective on the law—the law as *covenant torah*, in its original and divine intention—did not stand in any way opposed to grace, but flowed out of a context of grace. In order to square this recognition with more traditional Protestant interpretation (the Law/Gospel schema, focusing on the “second office”), he proposed that Paul in Rom. 10:5 was speaking of an abstract concept of “*bare law*.”¹

Murray of course believed that the Judaism of Paul’s day had committed this abstraction, that the Jews were legalists who had reduced *torah* to pure *ethos*.² Only in this way—out of context—could the law stand opposed to grace as a *works-principle*. Regardless of whether we find Murray’s exegesis of Rom. 10:5 convincing (I personally do not), he has underscored {200} a problem still not appreciated by the majority of Reformed exegetes: that the Protestant “second office” view does not capture the contextualized old covenantal view of the law of Moses.

[Note: I cannot deal with Romans 10:5 in any detail here. A few points, however, are in order. The context deals with hearing and doing (cf. vv. 14, 17f., and what is said below about the Kyrios Iesous confession [v. 9] as the “new Shema”), returning us to the themes addressed previously in Romans 2 (cf. 2:13). In that context (on which see my “Lord of Life: The Confession of Lordship and Saving Faith,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, vol. 13, no. 1 [1990–91], 101–102, and D. B. Garlington, “The Obedience of Faith and Judgment by Works,” *Westminster Theological Journal*,

1. *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 249–50.

2. See discussion of the aspects of *mythos* and *ethos* in my “‘The Blessing of Abraham’ versus ‘the Curse of the Law’: Another Look at Galatians 3:10–13,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991), 81–83.

53 [1991], 54–64, esp. 58), Paul opposes a mere hearing that does not embrace doing, for it is an objective “hearing-stance” that refers to the formal status of membership in a community designated by external covenant identity-markers as the “hearing people”: the people who received the torah. In Romans 10, however, he refers to an internalized hearing that is a doing: the “hearing of faith” which is also the “obedience of faith” that makes one a “doer of the law.” For the new covenant community is assembled around the new Shema (“Hear, O Israel”) that Jesus is Lord (cf. my “Lord of Life,” 110, n. 30). Paul cites Leviticus 18:5 (a “proof-text” of covenantal nomism used by Paul’s Judaizing opponents in the Galatian controversy -- see my “Blessing of Abraham,” 77, n. 12) to stress the true doing principle of covenantal nomism (on which see below, n. 341) that focuses upon the Shema as the central tenet of Israel’s faith in God as Israel’s covenant Lord, demanding exclusive allegiance and devotion. Leviticus 18:5 in context deals with separation from idols and faithful service to the Lord. Israel, however, has Judeocentrically idolized the torah, setting it in competition to Christ the Lord as a rival allegiance (see Garlington, “E, NĪOOĒAEI and the Idolatry of Israel,” NTS, 36 [1990], 142–151, and my “Blessing of Abraham,” 83 and 85, n. 37). By seeking a distinctively Jewish righteousness by clinging to the exclusivistic torah identity-markers that serve to separate, she has missed the point of Leviticus 18:5, for she has not really heard the law and its witness to its own redemptive-historical termination (in the eschatological covenant renewal to which the Deuteronomy 30:12–14 citation in Romans 10:6–8 refers—cf. Deuteronomy 30:1–10) upon reaching its end-goal in Christ: the antitypical law of righteousness (probably the Zion-torah tradition—see Hartmut Gese, “The Law,” *Essays on Biblical Theology* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981], 60–92, esp. 81–85 and 89–92. See further C.K. Barrett, “Romans 9:30–10:21: Fall and Responsibility of Israel,” in his *Essays on Paul* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982], 144f.) that is the righteousness of God to which they ought to submit (Rom. 9:31–32; 10:3–4). Here is simply the same point made by Paul in Galatians 3:23–25: Mosaic covenantal nomism was intended merely to protect and preserve Israel as the distinct covenant people through whom God revealed himself until the “fullness of time” of the eschatological revelation of the righteousness of God (the content of the Abrahamic blessing-promise) in the Christ-event (see T. David Gordon, “A Note on ΔΑΕἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ in Galatians 3:24–25,” NTS, 35 [1989], 150–154.)

We find this failure to appreciate Mosaic law as covenantal wisdom-instruction for life, this *abstractionist* view of Mosaic *torah* as “bare law” in traditionalist interpretation of Galatians 3 as well, and this again causes exegetes to read Paul’s statements in terms of the unfulfillability thesis. For example, F. F Bruce simply dismisses the possibility of the Judaizers raising as an objection to Paul’s argument in Galatians 3:10 (as understood by Protestant traditionalists: the unfulfillability thesis) that it is based on an abstraction.³ According to the traditional Protestant interpretation of Galatians 3:10,⁴ Paul cites Deuteronomy 27:26 in order to argue that anyone who does not keep every jot and tittle of the law *flawlessly* is accursed; thus, justification by law-fulfillment (works-righteousness) is {201} impossible. Yet the *torah* does not teach what Paul allegedly is arguing. For one thing, the Deuteronomy passage used to support the unfulfillability thesis does not intend anything of the sort in context, but, more importantly, the argument is pure *abstractionism*. It removes the law out of its covenantal context which includes provision for atonement and forgiveness.

The Mosaic covenant was through and through a covenant of *redemptive grace* that, through the sacrificial system, made merciful provisions for the sins and shortcomings of the covenant people that they could be restored to right standing and be blameless before the law. Only by abstracting “bare law” out of the integral *covenantal context* of *torah* could Paul’s argument stand, but then it is *irrelevant* to the situation he addresses, for the Judaizers would need only to appeal to the *covenantal harmony* of law and grace (i.e., the old covenantal sacrificial system fulfilled in the Christ-sacrifice of the new covenant as the basis to deal with imperfect law keeping). Since the intention of *torah* is wholly determined by its place in the Mosaic covenant, it was *never* intended to assert any such impossible demand for absolute perfection as we find asserted by the unfulfillability thesis, and, were Paul to claim otherwise,

3. *Commentary on Galatians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 160–161.

4. Defended in more modern times in the commentaries by Ridderbos (*The Epistle of Paul to the Churches at Galatia* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1953], 1222–1223), Bruce (*Galatians*, 158–161), and Fung (*The Epistle to the Galatians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988], 141–143).

he would be guilty of gross distortion of the law's true meaning that makes his argument's major premise too controversial for his argument to be cogent in the problem-situation to which he supposedly addresses it.

In order for Paul's argument to work, it must be able to demonstrate some discontinuity—some incompatibility—between the old covenant situation and that of the new covenant, some principle that makes continued allegiance to *torah* incompatible with allegiance to Christ. This point, it is obvious, cannot be based upon opposing the principle of law to grace, which is irrelevant abstractionism, but must be a redemptive-historically qualified discontinuity of old covenant situation *as such*⁵ to the {202} advent of the new covenant as a new redemptive-historical economy that cannot be reconciled with continued allegiance to the Mosaic economy *in toto*. That incompatibility revolves around the exclusively *Jewish* covenantal nomism that is irreconcilable with the universally inclusive new-covenantalism in which there can be neither Jew nor Gentile. *Torah* sets forth a “wall of separation,” marking the identity of the Jews as a holy people *distinct* from Gentiles who are outside the *torah*-fence, but in Christ Jews and Gentiles become united as one holy people. The boundary lines drawn by the *torah* are incompatible with the new covenantal boundary lines drawn by the extension of the promise to the Gentiles in Christ. One need not become a Jew (one of the *torah* people, bearing the peculiar identity-markers of the Mosaic covenant) in order to be in Christ.⁶

To return, however, to the main thesis of this essay, the heresy of legalism rests upon an abstract view of the law that sees it as *bare law*, as isolated from its redemptive-covenantal context. As such, it is a fundamental disobedience, a *radical rebellion* against the

5. This, however, is not to deny the exaggerated emphasis upon separation in the Judaism of Paul's day in which the preservation of a holy people set apart from the nations (clearly identifiable by their peculiar *torah*-lifestyle and forbidden to intermarry with, or adopt the customs of, the Gentiles) became an end-in-itself, fueled by nationalism and abstracted from the service-aspect of their election as a priest-people. As such, Judaism became a form of *idolatry* that absolutized the Mosaic economy and divorced it from its redemptive-historical context as temporary and subordinated to the Abrahamic promise of universal blessing.

6. See further the interpretation of Galatians offered in my “Blessing of Abraham.”

Lord of the covenant. God's covenant as such is rejected and law is viewed *autonomously*. "Bare law" rests upon a presupposition of *pure justice*: an autonomous justice-in-itself that is independent of God, that stands over and above God as an impersonal principle to which He too is subject. In order to understand better the true nature of this heresy we must investigate that religious principle which legalism expresses in opposition to the Kingdom of God. We must investigate the antithesis between theism and antitheism.

2. Covenant Keepers versus Covenant Breakers

Reformed theology has generally revered Augustine as a theologian of grace. It is often said that he rediscovered Paul and incorporated Paulinism into his soteriology. Usually, this is said in reference to Augustine's predestinarianism and antipelagianism. For, according to the Calvinist reading of his letters (especially Romans), Paul is a staunch advocate of original sin and total depravity. He is opposed to all human efforts—works—and affirms the absolute sovereignty of God's free and unconditional election by grace. And Augustine, in his {203} opposition to Pelagius, made appeal to these alleged elements of Pauline theology.

However, the heirs of the Reformation will quickly add that Augustine did not follow through in his Paulinism to include Paul's forensic doctrine of justification by faith. Augustine remained a Catholic, holding to a view of medicinal grace and of justification as a transformational process of renewal at work within the saints to make them righteous. It is only with the Protestant Reformation that Paul's alleged imputational view of justifying righteousness comes into its own.

Augustine's Paulinism is to be found at a deeper level, however. It is to be found in the Pauline *antithesis*. It is at this point that it seriously challenges the Lutheran view of justification by faith as well as subsequent Catholicism. Paul presents us with an absolute contrast of belief and unbelief as two mutually exclusive and diametrically opposed principles that can also be expressed as *obedience* and *disobedience*. These stand in antithesis like light against darkness, God against idolatry, Christ against Belial, righteousness against unrighteousness. Paul certainly does buy into a principal total depravity that views unbelievers as at

enmity with God, haters of God empowered by *Sin* (hypostatized as a God-opposing, *demonic* force that has enslaved humanity to its dominion) to every act of defiance and rebellion. Paul's soteriology is one of transfer out of sin's dominion into the sphere of Christ's Lordship, creating an obedient people who are servants of righteousness.

It is in Paulinism that Augustine found the antithesis presented in his *The City of God*⁷ as the two loves that create the two societies. Because he is dealing with the *supreme* love that governs and informs the heart of *homo adorans*, Augustine is dealing with a radical orientation at the most fundamental level, directing all of life and thought in terms of the religious commitment formed with either the true God or an idol. Accordingly, he sets the religious ground-motive of the theocentric, theonomic, *theotelic* heart starkly over against the basic motive informing the rebellious, insurrectionist sons of Cain who comprise the *civitas terrena* in its enmity to God. Those of faith are *faithful*; they are covenant-keepers, servants of the Lord. Those yet in unbelief are covenant-breakers, with apostate hearts opposed to the Kingdom of God and seeking to build the {204} humanistic Tower of Babel. There is no shared eschatological vision, no shared value system; two disparate conceptions of the *summum bonum* separate the two cities. In norms, goals, and motives, there is no common ground to be found between the two cities. The antithesis penetrates to the level of the most fundamental religious orientation and disposition, the existential root-dimension of absolute presuppositions, basic commitments, and ultimate concerns.

This Augustinian antithesis presents a different picture of faith than that which comes to the fore in the Reformation's contrast between faith and works. The antithesis between Law and Gospel, though it too claims to be Pauline, does not capture the spiritual warfare in its global-historic proportions as does Augustine's philosophy of the two cities. The ultimate question of who shall rightfully rule over creation and direct its course is not addressed in the introspectively individualist Lutheran antithesis.

Later Reformed theology, as it developed into a *covenant*

7. Book 14. In Reformed circles, the writings of Cornelius Van Til best capture this framing of the religious antithesis.

theology, better comprehended the Augustinian antithesis. The diametric opposition of covenantal response, faithfulness, and obedience versus the apostate stance of the covenant-breaker, was placed in a better position in which to receive due emphasis. Unfortunately, Reformed covenant theology remained bound to the Lutheran Law/Gospel contrast and thus lapsed into the covenant of works doctrine with its judicially determined concerns and emphases.

The intention of this framework was to undergird the antithesis of Law and Gospel: works versus grace as two disparate, mutually exclusive and diametrically opposed ways of justification unto life. The way of works defined the prelapsarian Adamic covenantal relationship, but the sin of Adam caused this covenant to be revoked. Its curses were still pronounced upon covenant-breaking humanity, which stood condemned under it because of the representative sin of Adam. No son of Adam, because of imputed guilt, could stand in a positive relation to this covenant. Christ, as the “second [epochal] man” and “last Adam”—a new federal head not of the Adamic race, stood uncondemned by this first covenant, representationally fulfilling its terms with perfect obedience and then vicariously accepting the imputation of its condemnation on behalf of the elect among the Adamic progeny. On the foundation of this keeping of the works-covenant a new covenantal relationship—a covenant of redemptive grace—was established, renewing the offer of justification unto life *in Christ*. By grace through faith, the elect {205} stand in a relationship to Christ which imputes to them the merits of his active obedience, even as their guilt was imputed to him in his curse-bearing death.

Opposed to this plan of salvation was *legalism*. This error may be defined relative to Reformational concerns as the pursuit of justification by the attempt to accrue merit through performance of the law's requirements, reliance on works-righteousness. Legalism was seen as an attempt by postlapsarian man to gain life via the broken covenant of works, and this stood over against the way of faith in Christ's keeping of this covenant, the way of the covenant of grace offered in the gospel and grounded in *Christ's* meritorious works-righteousness.

What this abiding concern with works and grace as the foundational antithesis obscured was a perspective upon legalism

as but one form of assault upon the rightful rule of the Lord, an assault that can manifest itself in many forms. Paul's opposition to "works of the law" remained concealed by the imposition of the hermeneutic of Protestant confessional *propria* upon the texts by Reformed exegetes; thus, the real problem of allegiance could not be comprehended. Legalism was not seen clearly for what it really is as *radical* disobedience: the arrogant self exaltation of self-righteous man in self-sufficient, self reliant assertion of autonomy. Its idolatrous character as human rebellion against its creaturely status in subjection to the Creator was not brought to the forefront. Instead, the Lutheran conception falsely opposed saving faith to obedience and therein made impossible a radical embracing of the Augustinian absolute antithesis.

Evangelical Protestantism still suffers from this gross misconception of the meaning of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It has no comprehension of radical repentance, nor of unconditional surrender to the Lord in a pledge of fealty and allegiance. It creates a false dichotomy between Christ as Savior and Lord, between repentance and faith, between faith and obedience, between Law and Gospel. Because of its easy-believisit antinomianism, it has reduced perseverance to a "once-saved, always-saved" eternal security. Accordingly, the masses need only make a punctiliar "decision" and perhaps have some emotionalist experience (called "being *born again*"). Radical discipleship—following Christ in cost-counting, Cross-bearing self-denial that seeks first and foremost the Kingdom and God's righteousness with all-consuming existential hunger and thirst, that loves God supremely and wholeheartedly—is not the norm, but is merely for the few supersaints as works of supererogation. {206} Narcissism—in the guise of *self-esteem*—infects the rank and file, encouraged by the essentially anthropocentric thrust of evangelical soteriology as it teeters into the religious principle informing the City of Man. Gone is *homo adorns* with his *sensus tremendum*; replaced instead by one who asks, "What can God do for me?" and who thinks that a *sola gratia* salvation is a good deal. The servant thereby arrogates to himself the place of his lord, committing the very sin—the root error of legalism—to which he confidently is sure his appreciation of lawless "grace" immunizes him. We need to rethink the nature of legalism in true covenantal perspective.

3. The Treaty of the Great King

As is now quite commonly recognized in biblical scholarship, the biblical conception of the covenants God has established with humanity are not expressed in the form of bilaterally negotiated contracts between equal parties. Yet it is this bilateralist idea of a *parity covenant* that lies behind the error of legalism, and legalism *cannot* arise within the context of a true understanding of the biblical covenant form. For the latter type of covenant, a suzerainty treaty-form is inherently suffused with condescending goodness and loving kindness by a sovereign deliverer/provider-king who freely elects, who monergistically, unilaterally, and preveniently comes in grace to administer a relationship.

This covenant is, in its basic intent, a disposition to grant and bestow blessing. That it sets forth both promise and duty, both the possibility of blessing and curse, does not detract from the above. A framework of distinction between conditionality versus unconditionality, while clearly a distinction (of great importance in its proper context) that Paul draws between the redemptive-historical economy of Mosaic *torah* and the Abrahamic blessing-promise fulfilled in Christ (Gal. 3:18),⁸ does {207} not capture the radical rejection of grace—the absolute contempt for the suzerain-lord’s free and sovereign condescension to bestow covenant status—that characterizes legalism. This is true of the

8. Again, see my “Blessing of Abraham,” *passim*, esp. 78. Paul’s point is that the Mosaic *torah*-covenant was made with Jews, conditioned upon their faithfulness, while the Abrahamic blessing-promise has direct and immediate reference (*qua* unconditional promise) only to Christ (the singular seed), not the Jews (corporate seed). Participation in the promise is therefore grounded in and mediated through Christ as seed of promise. Conditional/unconditional does not as such distinguish between old and new covenants with reference to corporate participants, for it is Christ alone who has the unconditional guarantee of blessing (and what does this do to the mistaken notion that he was under a covenant of works in our place in order to merit the blessing for us?). There is no reference here as to participation in Christ as blessing-locus to be unconditional. Such participation is clearly conditioned upon the obedience of faith (which is not to deny that, in terms of the eternal elective decree, the elect of God are *unconditionally* elected unto this obedience, nor does it view the covenantal obedience-condition as meritorious). On the conditional/unconditional debate regarding the covenant of grace in Reformed theology, see discussion in Murray, “Covenant Theology,” in *The Collected Writings of John Murray*, 4 vols. (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1982), 4. pp 229–234.

discontinuities between the covenant of creation and the covenant of redemption as well as those between old and new covenants, for all of God's covenantal dealings with man have a basic continuity, patterned according to the suzerainty-treaty form⁹ as sovereign dispositions of grace¹⁰ that is grounded in the intrinsic structure of the Creator/ creature distinction.¹¹

The above point is of crucial importance to biblical religion. For the fundamental disparity between biblical soteriology and legalism is not due to the difference between law covenant and promise covenant as two species of suzerainty treaties. The former disparity is far more basic than the latter, for it does not comprehend those features common to all of God's suzerainty-form covenants: the identification of the suzerain in his special relationship to the vassal-people by mighty acts of deliverance and protection performed for their benefit, by special favors and privileges granted and promises of future blessings under his benevolent rule—all of which form the basis for the allegiance of the vassals as a response of love and gratitude.¹² The fundamental disparity between legalism and {208} biblical-covenantal religion owes rather to the more basic difference between parity covenants and suzerainty treaties. Suzerainty treaties assert lordship, and those who confess Yahweh as covenant Lord, if they truly understand this submission, cannot be legalists. Until this fact is clearly grasped the true nature of legalism, which is always an assault upon the lordship of Yahweh, cannot be revealed in its true depths of perversity, and the legalism/gospel antithesis will be wrongly equated with an alleged antithesis of covenant law and gospel.

Meredith G. Kline, to his credit, recognizes that the “absolute sovereignty of God in the reciprocal relationship [of the suzerainty

9. On which see Meredith G. Kline, *By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Signs of Circumcision and Baptism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968). 26–38.

10. See John Murray, *The Covenant of Grace: A Biblico-theological Study* (London: Tyndale, 1954), 30–32.

11. Cf. *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, 7:1.

12. Emphasizing here the first two of the six features of the treaty pattern as set forth by Kline (*The Structure of Biblical Authority*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972], 121): the preamble and historical prologue.

law covenant] ... prevents the legalistic distortion of the religious-covenantal bond into a mercantile *quid pro quo* contract.¹³ Nevertheless, he is vehemently opposed to the implications of John Murray's covenant theology,¹⁴ seeing in it a legalism (salvation by works) that violates the sharp works/grace contrast he posits to distinguish law covenant from promise covenant.¹⁵ This way of viewing legalism in terms of law covenant follows from his whole conception of the priority of law, for he views the covenant of creation as a pure law covenant (in form and content), a covenant bond constituted by vassal oath-swearing. As such, it is a conditional covenant, requiring satisfactory compliance of the suzerain's imposed demands by the subject vassal party.¹⁶ The covenant of redemption, though materially a promise covenant, is, in its formal structure, a law covenant in which the suzerain has unilaterally sworn the oath of self-malediction that sanction-seals the covenant in order to guarantee unconditionally that the blessing aspect of inheritance will surely prevail and all the terms for both parties will be met.¹⁷

In a law covenant, according to the Klinean view, we can speak of a works-principle imposed upon the vassal. While the covenant is freely and sovereignly initiated according to electing lovingkindness in a unilateral manner that grants covenant status to the vassal people, continuation in the state of covenant blessing is conditioned upon the vassal's faithful fulfillment of the stipulations of the treaty opted in the ratifying oath of {209} allegiance. For the covenant itself imposes demands that constitute the basis of ongoing amicable relationship. The covenant sets forth both blessing and curse as the judicial consequences rendered to obedience and disobedience respectively. A promise covenant, on the other hand, assures blessing because the suzerain himself swears the oath of self-malediction that removes the curse-threat from the vassal. The difference between law covenant and

13. Kline, *By Oath Consigned*, p 37.

14. Murray, *Covenant of Grace*.

15. See his "Of Works and Grace," *Presbyterion*, 19 (1983), 86–92.

16. See discussion of "Oath and Covenant" and "Law Covenant" (chaps. 1–2) in Kline, *By Oath Consigned*, 13–38, esp. 26–35.

17. *Ibid.* 31–35.

promise covenant, between works-principle and grace-principle, is determined by which party—vassal or suzerain—swears the sanction-sealing, self-maledictory oath of ratification, accepting the curse-threat for unfulfillment.¹⁸

As Kline sees it, the works-principle of the covenant of creation (a principle that is re-expressed in the Mosaic law covenant as a *Kingdom-typological overlay* upon the covenant of redemption)¹⁹ makes the nature of this covenant that of a conditional covenant of law, placing the vassal under the curse-threat and demanding vassal compliance. The way of blessing, of justification unto eschatological life and glorification, is by the way of vassal lawkeeping, according to a meritorious works-principle that is based upon pure justice.²⁰ This covenantal administration stands in starkest contrast to the subsequent covenant of redemption, which operates according to the principle of grace as a promise covenant because Christ has vicariously fulfilled the works-principle inherent in its formal law covenant structure. In this latter covenantal arrangement, the terms of the treaty are wholly and exclusively fulfilled by the suzerain for the vassal (for the Lord himself becomes the Servant of the Lord), guaranteeing to the vassal unconditional blessing apart from any basis in, or judicial consideration of, the vassal's works.²¹

Viewed within this Klinean framework, legalism appears as the treatment of a promise covenant as though it were a law covenant. The vassal therein attempts to construe the covenant relationship as conditional, as maintained by a works-principle that he must fulfil in order to remain in a state of blessedness and ultimately receive the eschatological inheritance promised {210} to the covenant servant who faithfully perseveres in the way of obedience. His faithfulness is the constitutive factor in maintaining the relationship to covenant blessedness. Legalism, if viewed as such, is equated with covenantal nomism whereby the blessing of eschatological justification is the reward of vassal faithfulness in

18. *Ibid.*, 16.

19. Mark W. Karlberg, "Reformed Interpretation of the Mosaic Covenant," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 43 (1980), 46–48, 54–57.

20. Kline, "Of Works and Grace," 88–90.

21. *Ibid.*, 91; *By Oath Consigned*, 17 (cf. 45), 30–35.

abiding in the sphere of the covenant by satisfactorily fulfilling the treaty stipulations.²²

Over against the above portrayal, were we to understand legalism in terms of the more fundamental contrast between suzerainty treaties and parity covenants, as John Murray's view would suggest, we would not understand it as merely a misguided, ill-conceived, and utterly vain effort toward fulfilling the treaty stipulations to the requisite degree of adequacy (for the suzerain—God—demands perfection), an attempt that ignores the exigencies demanded by the postlapsarian situation and consequently fails to appreciate the resultant necessity of redemptive grace in God's subsequent covenant renewal in and through Christ.²³ For legalism is not an attempt to treat the law covenant of creation as though it still offered life and blessing according to a (once valid but now invalid) works-principle of fulfillment—justification by works of law-obedience rendered to the suzerain.²⁴ It is indeed highly doubtful that we should construe the Adamic covenant of creation as a purely legal covenant based upon a principle of meritorious works-righteousness according to strict justice and to the exclusion of grace, as Kline believes.²⁵ {211}

As serious as is the error of failing duly to note the discontinuities between the pre- and postlapsarian situations, between the covenants of creation and redemption (for God's covenant is now grounded in and mediated by Christ, in whom alone we can be rightly related to God and stand as legitimate heirs of the blessing-promise), we do not reach the pernicious heart of legalism by

22. On the concept of covenantal nomism, see E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) passim, but esp. 422–423.

23. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 7:3.

24. It is important to bear in mind that the “works-principle” in question is one consistent with the suzerainty covenant-type in terms of the inherent lordship-submission principle of unilateral imposition and nonparity previously referred to.

25. Kline, in criticizing the traditional nomenclature of ‘covenant of works’/‘covenant of grace’ (*By Oath Consigned*, 32, 36), is far more balanced in this regard than he appears to be in his later formulations, as set forth, e.g. in his “Of Works and Grace.” It is to the stark contrast of works and grace of this more recent piece to which I here refer. Against this sharp contrast (which seems to be but a more consistent development of principles already present in *By Oath Consigned*), see the profitable discussion in G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics: Sin* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971), 206–208.

this route. Furthermore, it is equally erroneous to ignore the *continuities* between these two covenantal administrations of God's Kingly rule as the Lord who requires of man (whether unfallen or fallen) the obedience of faith as covenant response. All who are consecrated unto life in covenant with God must reciprocate in this way of covenant faith-response as existential orientation, and this obligation is never construed in Scripture in terms of meritorious achievement inherently worthy of congratulation and reward (cf. Lk. 17:7-10). Because God is the supreme and sovereign Lord, he will not share his glory with another (Is. 48:11); there can be no boast or glorying before God (Rom. 4:2). The servant's fulfillment of his covenant obligations can never be a ground for boasting (1 Cor. 1:29, 31; 4:7; Eph. 2:9), and his receipt of blessing is never the fruit of his own labors (cf. Deut. 8:17-18).

Legalism does not express this theocentric and theonomic religious ground-motive, even in the manner of a misguided, misdirected creationist religion that is deficient in hamartiological and soteriological awareness. For legalism is rather born of the rebellious nature of would-be autonomous man in his covenant-breaking declaration of metaphysical independence from God, in his desire to be as God. It expresses in its depths the very root-essence of sin. In the former conception of the matter, legalism could conceivably be a sincere (if naive) effort to submit to the lordship of God, an error correctable by greater understanding. In the latter view, however, legalism throws off the yoke of creaturely servitude, renouncing the lordship inherent in the suzerainty treaty-type.

The legalist seeks to approach God as an equal party. This approach is of course with the ultimate intent of gaining advantage over God and subordinating him, but at first the legalist comes to negotiate the terms of a relationship as a bilateral agreement among partners. He bargains with God to hammer out a mutually advantageous and agreeable contract that binds God to terms man helps to set according to an autonomous view of justice and merit. Accordingly, God becomes indebted to man, obliged to reward man's efforts and deeds according to *quid pro quo*. {212}

As such, legalist religion does not simply undermine the idea of redemptive grace in a postlapsarian situation. It strikes at the very heart of the Creator/creature distinction. It assaults the lordship of

the lawful suzerain. Proclamation of sin and gracious redemption in Christ is done in a vacuum—often with perverse consequences that distort the very meaning of grace (cf. Jude 4), as we find in many circles of contemporary evangelical religion—if we do not first lay the creationist foundation: “Know that the LORD he is God: it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves” (Ps. 100:3).

The very basis of covenant institution in true legalism is one of merit, and this sharply distinguishes it from any sort of suzerainty treaty-founded concept of religion. In the suzerainty treaty-covenant, the vassal is freely elected unto covenant status, apart from all considerations of prevenient merit and worthiness (cf. Deut. 7:7–8), by the condescending lovingkindness of the suzerain. Covenant bestows status, not vice-versa. In legalism, however, man demands to be treated from the outset as an equal, worthy of God’s respect and claiming the right to approach God on his own terms. Thus he demands to enter into a contractual relationship based upon *mutual need*—a “symbiotic” arrangement.

In this view, God is perceived as needing man’s service, which of course makes the rendering of said service inherently valuable, due a just compensation, and this intrinsic value is the reason why God seeks a covenant with man. Thus, man can bargain on this basis to extract the best deal possible, according to considerations of self-interest. He self-servingly curries favor in order to enhance his value, to attract a better offer from God, so that God will be persuaded to offer him a lucrative contract. Accordingly, the theocentricity of the suzerainty treaty-conception of covenantal piety is exchanged for a self-serving religion of anthropocentrism.²⁶

Covenant theology must free itself from the mistaken notion, so prevalent in modern evangelicalism, that the basic religious antithesis can be framed in terms of a Law/Gospel contrast as an opposition between justification by obedience and {213} justification by grace through faith. The true antithesis is rather that between theonomy and autonomy, between theocentrically oriented, covenant-keeping, faithful devotion, allegiance, and

26. See here Socrates’ point about Euthyphro’s concept of piety in Plato’s *Euthyphro*, 12e–15a (Burnet’s Oxford text) and the world of thought shared by both Socrates and Euthyphro that views piety as having intrinsic value and goodness as such, being dear to the gods simply and solely because it *is* piety (10d).

commitment to God and covenant-breaking revolt. It is the Augustinian antithesis between the two fundamental, religious loves constitutive of the City of God and the City of Man. Biblical faith—*saving* faith—is confession of/submission to Jesus as Lord, and this allegiance stands diametrically opposed, not to good works of obedience (which are but the outworkings of a living faith in action), but to the antitheistic desire of would-be autonomous man to assault the Kingdom, to usurp this lordship of Yahweh-Christ and exalt himself in *hybris*. Real obedience (which ever issues from the heart and is not the mere role-playing that bears some semblance of external conformity) does not—*cannot*—threaten to overthrow this relation of servant-subject to his Lord and King. It surely does not stand in competition with Christ the Lord, as though it were a rival allegiance-commitment that detracts from Christ the Lord in a way analogous to the nomistic service of the Judaizers in their rival lordship-commitment to covenantal nomism that functioned as an idolatrous devotion to *torah* over Christ, in the Pauline churches of Galatia.²⁷ The fundamental issue in the truly biblical covenantal-religious opposition to legalism, Judaizing nomism, antinomianism, and all false gospels and antitheistic ideologies is that of *lordship and service*: “Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.”

The Kingdom of God has been established in the exaltation of Jesus as Lord and Christ, to whom all who would be saved must bow and swear allegiance. Let us therefore submit in absolute and unconditional surrender to this Lord, seeking first his Kingdom as *summum bonum* with whole-hearted and single-minded commitment and devotion, as those who follow Christ bearing the yoke of true discipleship. This—not the cheap grace of antinomian, anthropocentric, easy-believest religion—is the way of life and salvation.

27. See my “Blessing of Abraham,” 81–83.

THE ROOT OF SIN: REFLECTION ON HAMARTIOLOGY

Joseph P. Braswell

We err seriously if we limit our definition of sin to transgression of the law. Sin is indubitably this, but far more is involved than is at first made manifest by this definition.¹ In order to understand all that sin involves, we need to approach it from multiple perspectives. I have several to propose under two headings: sin as intentional activity and sin as enslaving power.

Sin as Intentional Activity

1. Sin Is Unbelief

This was Luther's great insight. For Luther, *fiducia* was the very essence and dynamic of the living relationship of personal communion between God and man. As Robert C. Schultz observes:

Original sin is described in terms of not fearing, not loving, not trusting God. Such unbelief is accompanied by disorder within the person, and acting contrary to the law is one form of this disorder. This makes concupiscence sinful. However, whenever a person does not trust God, he sins whether he breaks the law or conforms to it. Given this assertion, sin also no longer needs to be

1. Transgression of the law is but *one perspective* from which we can approach sin in what must be a *multiperspectival* analysis, if we are to do justice to the depth and breadth of hamartiological reflection (see further on multiperspectivalism, Vern S. Poythress, *Symphonic Theology: The Validity of Multiple Perspectives in Theology* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987]). We actually stand to gain a greater appreciation of what it means to transgress the law, seeing the law as joy, peace, life and freedom, as expressive of the Kingdom of God, if we do not restrict ourselves at the outset to the single perspective of sin as transgression in the narrow way that this definition is ordinarily understood.

a conscious or deliberate act. Concupiscence is sin whether or not the reason and the will are involved. Since no one in this life fears, loves, {216} or trusts God perfectly, all people, including Christians, remain sinners who, when judged by this norm, are completely sinners before God.²

Schultz further observes:

For Luther, the primary focus of original sin is not what man is or has, but his relationship to God. Unbelief—not fearing, not loving, not trusting God—does not mean that relationship has been lost. The personal relationship to God remains but it has been converted into its opposite. Mistrust is not the absence of trust but an active relationship which not only results in the commission of sins but is the essence of sin itself.³

One may immediately recognize in Luther's view a recovery of the genuine Augustinian antithesis. It is ironic that this recovery was from the nature/grace framework into which Augustine himself lapsed, which was determinative of all subsequent Western-Medieval theologizing on the nature of sin in relation to the structure of the soul.⁴

Viewed as unbelief, the original sin of Adam is, as Schultz puts it, “*not* trusting the God who is love.”⁵ The probationary test for Adam is the serpent's sowing of the seeds of mistrust by calling into doubt God's motives and intentions in denying man access to the tree of knowledge.

Was God indeed denying to man that which was good for him, in his best interests, something that would fulfill him so that he could realize his *summum bonum*? The love and faithfulness, the very goodness of God, was called into question. Adam was faced with a trial of faith, to believe in the integrity of God's character—his abundant willingness to bless his son with everything good and needful—even if faced with circumstantial evidence to the

2. “Original Sin: Accident or Substance: The Paradoxical Significance of FC I, 53–62 in Historical Context,” in Lewis w. Spitz and Wenzel Lohff, eds., *Discord, Dialogue and Concord: Studies in the Lutheran Reformation's Formula of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 44.

3. *Ibid.*

4. Schultz, “Original Sin,” 40–43.

5. *Ibid.*, 43.

contrary. Under the serpent's goading, he succumbed to *mistrust*, believing God {217} was withholding some good out of fear and jealousy of what self-actualized man would become. The seeds of suspicion bore evil fruit in Adam's lust for autonomous power, in Adam's envious desire to seize godhood as independence from the God he no longer trusted and now perceived as a threat to self-fulfillment.

2. Sin Is Ingratitude

Romans 1:21 indicates that the Apostle Paul regarded the refusal to give glory to God (see #3 below) and *unthankfulness* as at the root of original sin. We see this clearly in Adam's response during testing. He is a creature who owes his very existence to God. God is the source of his life. Adam is *absolutely dependent* upon God. God has created him in the divine image as the crown of creation, giving him dominion over all things. God has provided him with food, home, wife, a paradise environment—free and manifold blessing as undeserved favor. “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights” (Jas. 1:17).

The proper response to such a liberal outflowing of goodness is *thanksgiving*. “O give thanks to the LORD, for he is good” (Ps. 107:1) should have been the issue of Adam's heart as *homo adorns*, the one to whom the whole world has been given as food, as covenant meal of communion, to be received as sacrament in *Eucharistic* celebration.⁶

Yet we see in Adam's suspicion and mistrust a fundamental ingratitude. To the mind of indignant Adam, God *owes* man all this *and more*, and God is holding back that which is man's *rightful* inheritance. All that God has provided was taken for granted and more was demanded by the covetous ingrate as his foolish heart became darkened, and he rationalized his ingratitude by the vain delusion that he is self-made (cf. Ps. 100:3) and has obtained all by his own hand (cf. Deut. 8:17). Self-congratulation replaces gratitude, and such pride “goeth before a fall,” as it surely did in Adam's case. {218}

6. Alexander Schmemman, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973), 6.

3. Sin Is the Refusal to Glorify God as God

Integrally bound up with ingratitude in Paul's analysis of the root of sin is man's refusal to give glory to God. Thus he explicates sin as a falling short of *the glory of God* (Rom. 3:23). As James D.G. Dunn observes, Romans 3:23 alludes to Adam in both the loss of the state and status he enjoyed *and* the goal to which he was to attain.⁷ It is accordingly gift and demand for the glory-image in his constitutive covenantal calling to reflect the glory of God by glorifying God.

"Man's chief end," as the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* (Q #1) informs us, "is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever." When man failed to glorify God, he lost his possession of glory-likeness investiture (as prophet, priest, and king)⁸ as special enjoyment of communion in the presence of God which has glory-transformative efficacy (cf. 2 Cor. 3:17). In failing to *image* God by self-consciously analogical thought and action,⁹ man failed to *be* the image of God in its fullness as filled with active glory-content as developmental ethical *conformitas* in holiness, righteousness, and truth unto the eschatological glory-investiture in Spirit yet to be attained.¹⁰

4. Sin Is Rebellion

Adam denied his calling, denied his creaturehood and its basic metaphysical *dependence*, and denied his very mode of existence as servant-subject and *analogical* being. He willfully, self-consciously broke covenant as *transgressor* (cf. Rom. 5:14). In doing this Adam was revolting against the Kingdom of God, attempting to usurp and overthrow the *regnum Dei* in a treasonous declaration of independence and consequent declaration of war against heaven. This fundamental hatred and enmity toward God (cf. Rom. 8:7) becomes the antitheistic charter of the *civitas terrena* as the

7. *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38a; Dallas: Word, 1988), 167-168.

8. See on glory-investiture Meredith G. Kline, *Images of the Spirit* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdrnans, 1980).

9. See Cornelius Van Til, *Introduction to Systematic Theology (In Defense of the Faith)*, vol. V; n.p.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974), 25-26.

10. Kline, *Images*, 30-31.

community of metaphysical rebels arrayed for battle against the City of God (cf. Rev. 20:8–9). {219}

Sin as Enslaving Power

Because rebellious, faithless, and unthankful man does not wish to retain God in his knowledge, he must seek rest in something else. Inherent in his being as the *imago Dei* is a relativity that must refer itself beyond itself to the absolute ground. *Homo adorans* must worship; he must be in faith-relationship as existential orientation and basic commitment to the *summum bonum* as the object of ultimate concern, the origin of meaning. He remains restless, for “Thou hast made us for thyself and our hearts are restless until they find rest in thee.”¹¹ He thus remains a religiously seeking being, pursuing the transcendent divine with hungry heart, feeling his absolute dependence despite himself. He thus absolutizes the relative in idolatrous commitment, selling himself into a covenantbinding servitude to the demonic power of this perverse love-allegiance to idol-lords as a hope of fulfillment for that longing that arises from his “seed of religion” in its apostatic orientation of flight from God. Materially autonomous man is nonetheless *formally* determined by his created structure as a *theonomous* being, merely worshipping the creation (or some aspect thereof) instead of the Creator in the darkness of his heart as it has become idol-generative in its inherent quest for rest and fulfillment in God-knowledge. One dependence is simply exchanged for another, for man cannot transcend his creaturely mode of being or his theocentric anthropological constitution as *imago Dei*, ever self-referentially open as *self-insufficient* covenant responder to his *Arche* in self-surrender.

In this way man becomes a slave to sin as sphere of *power*. This power has absolute dominion over man; he is committed to it with infinite passion and is thus totally in its captivating grip as *ideology* that governs all dispositions, attitudes, perceptions in a distortive, *perverse* world-view conformed to the *zeitgeist* of “*the lie*” (cf. Rom. 12:2; 1:25; 2 Thess. 2:11). Scripture, employing mythological language-imagery, hypostatizes the *dynamis* involved, metaphorically personifying sin as a powerful lord that

11. Augustine, *Confessions*, I:1.

binds man to its dominion. Thus the active opposition to God by Adamic man is, viewed in this manner, also a bondage of the will to the cause of revolt as energizing ideology that holds sway over the thought and life over man in his fixed directedness away from God. {220}

The consequence of this deification of the inherently relative is that the relative good is abstracted from its reference to God as *summum bonum* and given autonomous significance as an end-in-itself. It therefore is misused: used in a manner other than its intended purpose and function within the design of God, and as such is conceived and used for evil (as *nonconformitas*—cf. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Q #14). The grip it has over the hearts and minds of men is therefore *demonic* and *destructive*. No finite good can be embraced with infinite passion without this destructive effect, for all of creation witnesses to the covenant and so reveals itself as either covenantal blessing or curse to covenant man. All of creation *threatens* fallen man with death and destruction,¹² manifesting the wrath of God “against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth

12. See discussion in Paul Tillich, *The Dynamics of Faith* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957), 12–16. However, Tillich follows Rudolph Otto (*The Idea of the Holy*) in an evolutionary cultural-anthropological approach to the history of religions, viewing the original encounter of the transcendent-infinite numinous by primitive man as one that confronts man with the ambiguity of this *holy* as both demonic-destructive and divine-creative power. The transcendence of this “Wholly Other” places it beyond good and evil. It is a late development in the history of religions that separates these forces, as they are in the prophetic religion of Israel, transforming holiness into moral goodness.

Yet the “good and evil” that the numinous lies beyond is an *autonomous* standard of good and evil, anthropocentrically conceived by men who seek to know and determine such matters without reference to God. The *good* is understood in a naturalistic teleological ethic as what is *good for man*, what is useful or beneficial, conducive to pleasure and felicity, while *evil* is the harmful or unpleasant. No moral distinctions are made regarding the character of the recipients of such pain and pleasure; there is no attempt to understand *good* theocentrically in terms of the Kingdom of God as *summum bonum*. Thus, because of the false conception of the immanence of morality (the relativism of man-measure theory), transcendence is misconstrued as an ultimate moral monism incompatible with a truly covenantal religion. Either the numinous is arbitrary and capricious—wholly unpredictable and completely detached from and indifferent to human aspirations, interests, and concerns—or else (as in legalistic thinking) it can be manipulated rmethodically—*controlled and harnessed*—toward desired results (whether for good or evil purposes) by ritual actions (magic).

in unrighteousness” (Rom 1:18).¹³ Any misuse of an aspect of creation is a suppression of its revelational witness-function {221} to the covenantal calling of man to his covenantal task of analogical thought and life, frustrating true dominion (Gen 1:28) and instead subjugating sinful man to that aspect in a bondage energized by his own sin.

The enslaving power of sin that holds man in bondage as a helpless victim is therefore fed by the impulse of his own rebellion, leaving him without excuse for his hapless state of captivity to his own depravity. For though his heart is fixed in the apostatic direction, it is as he *wills* it, according to the desire of his heart directed in *inordinate* religious love. “Everyone who works sin is the slave of sin” (Jn. 8:34).

It is only in this context of revolt by would-be autonomous man, pulled by both his innate religious impulse for a divine resting-point and his enmity for the true God, that bondage to sin can be understood as correlate to man’s awesome responsibility. Man is a helpless victim, without excuse for his wretched state, standing fully accountable before God as judicially culpable for active, self-conscious, and intentional rebellion.

Conclusion

Sin is certainly a transgression of God’s law. It is, however, at its root a *lawlessness* (anomia—I Jn. 3:4) springing from the *sarxic* mind in its inability to be subject to the law of God due to its existential stance and orientation of *enmity*. It is this enmity that

Biblical-covenantal religion rather presents the holy divine as the covenanting God who is covenant Lord. He cannot be controlled or manipulated, but he is faithful. Within the creation-fall-redemption framework of this religious faith, he can appear as both creative and destructive, and the so-called primitive religions but pervert this phenomenon, misunderstanding his general revelation in nature of common grace and common curse, of providential goodness to his creation and the wrath of God revealed against covenant-breaking man. To those arrayed against the Kingdom of God, the divine presence no doubt presents itself as death and destruction, for the “divine creative” and “demonic destructive”—blessing and curse—disclose themselves in terms of relationship to the covenantal call, demand, and task revealed in nature.

13. However, common grace mitigates the full unleashing of this disintegrative power in order that the riches of God’s goodness and forbearance might lead to repentance (Rom. 2:4).

makes bondage in sin's sphere of power and dominion appear to the covenant-breaker to be {222} freedom—that which is freely and self-consciously chosen according to the desire of the heart. To the Christian, who is set free in the Spirit with a new heart, remaining sin—missing the mark of God's holy law-standard—reveals itself as weakness and bondage, as a grievous and besetting weight, precisely because it is so against the deepest longings of his servant-heart in its desire to do that which pleases his Lord. This existential difference,¹⁴ often blurred by exclusive emphasis on sin as trespass (nonconformity to the law),¹⁵ suggests the woeful inadequacy of those popular evangelical slogans that seem to imply that Christians are merely sinners, *like everyone else*, except that their sins are forgiven.¹⁶

Against unrealistic perfectionism, we must affirm that there is *struggle* in the Christian life against the vestiges of sin. Yet there is victory as well. A definitive break has occurred, and we must affirm that sin will not have dominion over those whom God has delivered by grace from the self-destructive path of rebellion. Christians cannot be *lawless*, cannot continue *in* the sphere of sin's power and dominion. Though they feel an all too real tension in their lives, they *are* set free in Christ and must live in that freedom as bondslaves to Christ the Lord.

14. That which John Murray means by *definitive sanctification* (Murray, "Definitive Sanctification," in John H. Skilton, ed., *The New Testament Student and Theology* [n.p.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1976], 117). See, however, my remarks on this in "Lord of Life: The Confession of Lordship and Saving Faith," *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, 13: (1990/91), 105, 110–111, n. 33.

15. Of course it is not altogether obscured by this perspective, for it is in fact the meaning of the distinction between trespass (for which atonement could be made and forgiveness received) and sins "with a high hand." Transgression in its biblical sense involves more than infraction or trespass, more than mere *nonconformitas*. It is that willful, presumptuous assault upon the covenant, i.e., a commission of sin that reveals the heart of covenant-breaking, rebellious man in his spite and enmity to God. It is this man to whom the curse of Deuteronomy 27:26 is directed.

16. It is this framework of understanding the root-essence of sin that 1 John 3:3–10 is to be understood, for the Elder is obviously not teaching perfectionism (cf. 1:8–2:1), but is opposing *lawlessness*, as though Christians are existentially unchanged and merely forgiven.

5.
*IMPLICATIONS OF
OUR WORLD
AND LIFE VIEW*

EDUCATION: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

Owen Fourie

*Lecture delivered at CCA Seminar in Cape Town,
South Africa, 5/1/91*

Introduction

How shall we live? In our consideration of the structures of society we have looked at *the family* as the very basic unit of society. This is as God has ordered it. Now, the biblical family unit consists of a husband and one wife who become the father and mother of, ideally, many children. "... Children are an heritage of the Lord," says the Psalmist, "and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate" (Ps. 127:3–5). To hold to such teaching would place us clearly in the anti-sterilization camp, alongside the hyena and against the lion in the television commercial!

Even within the womb, *the child* begins to learn. It is sensitive to the behaviour of the mother and her circumstances, and after birth it learns the discipline of the home and the mother-tongue. One of the greatest educational feats is this miracle whereby the mother, the greatest and most qualified and most accomplished of human teachers, teaches her child to speak the language of the home. And if she can do that, she is capable of teaching other subjects too... Well, that is a hint concerning the matter of educational responsibility because in our consideration of the structure of society, as we ask the question, How shall we live?, we come now to *the school*. Who will educate the children of the family? But

before this question can be properly answered, we must apply the very principle that we learned in the opening session. We must begin with God. Repetition of certain points is unavoidable, but you will find this useful as the principle is now being particularly and more extensively applied.

Beginning With God

As we begin with God and His written Word we shall see *the true foundations of knowledge and education*. The opening {224} statement of Holy Scripture tells us, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Indeed, the Almighty, triune God who has “spoken unto us by his Son,” our Lord Jesus Christ, is the creator of all things including time, history, all facts and all knowledge. It is an incredible thing that while the fact of God as the creator of the heavens and the earth is readily acknowledged by many, the obvious extension of that truth to embrace every detail in creation from time’s beginning to time’s end, as ordered by the providence of God, does not receive the same emphasis. God has revealed himself to be the sovereign Lord over all. That magnificent section of the prophecy of Isaiah from chapter 40 through to 49 or so, with its recurring message, “I am the Lord and there is none else, there is no God beside me,” brings the application of God’s sovereign creatorship to the providential pre-ordering of time and history and knowledge into sharp focus:

“Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor hath-taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?” (Isa. 40:12–14)

The question is rhetorical. Only God. Only in Him is the true foundation of all things and all knowledge. The creature can never know more than, nor be wiser than, the Creator.

As for the creature:

“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)

And so the prophet continues to declare the true perspective regarding Creator and creature:

“Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in. That bringeth the princes to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity. Yea, they shall {225} not be planted; yea, they shall not be sown: yea, their stock shall not take root in the earth: and he shall also blow upon them, and they shall wither, and the whirlwind shall take them away as stubble. To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One. Lift up your eyes on high and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth.” (Isa. 40:21–26)

...Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord, the first, and with the last; I am he. (Isa. 41:4)

...Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself... That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. (Isa. 44:24, 28)

...I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts. (Isa. 45:13)

...for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. (Isa. 46:9–10)

“*Declaring the end from the beginning*” because He has created all things and orders all things. From this we surely learn that the true foundation of knowledge must therefore be found in Him, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the God of Peter, James, John, and

Paul; the God of Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Knox, and Whitefield. That being so, we have not far to look for the true foundation of all education. It is in God and in what He has revealed by His Word. And here we are bound to acknowledge a simple fact or else be found to be fools, and that is that He who created all things and who orders all things, that only He can give us the true interpretation of all His created factuality. Only an idiot will seek understanding of a work from {226} another source when the author is present. There can be no true knowledge apart from God, apart from His interpretation. Even in the Garden of Eden, before the Fall, Adam received God's direct word communication wherein the creation was interpreted to him in terms of the meaning given it by God. Adam learned from God what he needed to know. That is the true basis of all education. And, having a God-given and a God-directed knowledge and understanding, Adam was commanded to exercise dominion over the earth, under God, in righteousness and holiness. Equipped with the truth of God, Adam set about his scientific tasks of maintaining the garden and classifying the animals according to their function in God's created order.

Not long afterwards, *the false foundations of knowledge and education* were laid in *the fall* of Adam and Eve. Beginning with God means that we begin with God's Word which also informs us of the roots of falsehood and error.

Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. (Gen. 3:1-6)

What actually happened in the Fall? What were the implications of the conversation between Eve and Satan? Simply this. Eve, before she partook of the fruit, had already assumed that God's

mind, the devil's mind, and her own mind were equally ultimate. Jim Halsey (not to be confused with Hal Lindsey), in his book *For a Time Such as This: An Introduction to the Reformed Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til* explains on page 102:

By consenting to listen to the lies of the devil Eve was assuming: (1) Satan perhaps knew as much as did God {227} about reality, (2) she herself might be able to decide for herself what is right and what is wrong for her life, and (3) as a creature of time she could test God's interpretations in time. But behind these assumptions lay the grand presupposition of metaphysical contingency and her own free will. By calling God's interpretation in question Eve was assuming that perhaps partaking of the fruit would not issue in death. She, Satan, and God must all posit different hypotheses, probabilities which only an appeal to experience would be able to verify or falsify. Eve, the free person, must decide the question for herself, for if she allowed God to dictate to her concerning the fact of the tree, or anything else for that matter, she would be reduced to a mere puppet. Her reason would then be reduced to zero, for God would simply command her what and how to think and act. Satan thus 'insinuated the idea that an intelligent and decisive interpretation can be made only if reality is purely contingent. God cannot exist and be your creator, for if he did, your choices would be those of a puppet.' With the fall of Adam and Eve such God-hating assumptions became the heritage of every man (except Christ) born under the sun.

Perhaps Richard L. Pratt Jr. in his book *Every Thought Captive* puts the matter more simply and more succinctly (29):

Eve did not immediately reject the Word of God nor did she immediately accept the word of the serpent. Instead, she looked at the tree herself and determined its character by committing herself to independence from God. She said to herself, "Why listen to everyone else? I will make laws for myself; I will decide on my own!" In doing this, Eve rejected the Creator-creature distinction. She took the revelation of the independent God and put it on the same level as the serpent's words and set herself up as the ultimate judge between them. Eve gave the fruit to her husband, Adam. He ate and the human race fell, under the power of sin. This, then, is the essence of sin; man's rebellion against recognizing his dependence on God in everything and the assumption of his (false) ability to be independent of God.

What, then, were the effects of the Fall? The Fall of Adam and Eve heralded the birth of the autonomous critical mind, the beginning of *humanism*, the total rebellion against {228} God in mind, heart, and will, in our thinking, our reasoning, our affections, our feelings, our actions, our decisions, with every fibre of our being. From this source came Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, Voltaire, Hume, Kant, Schleiermacher, Hegel and company with autonomous critical thought in which man becomes judge over all, even over God, even over God's Word. So it is that fallen, unregenerate, humanistic man lays the false foundations of knowledge and education in his own falsely autonomous critical mind, in his sense impressions, in his experience, and he goes forth to exercise unrighteous dominion over everything, education particularly.

Jim Halsey again (103):

Just as our first parents, each man, before the grace of God comes to him, presupposes:

1. The originality of his mind. He believes his thought to be original and undervived.
2. The ultimate judgment of what can or cannot be lies within himself, in his powers of reason.
3. His own interpretation of reality will be true for him.
4. The facts of reality are uncreated. They are "brute" or completely uninterpreted and ultimately irrational. The universe is controlled by chance.

Regrettably, in countries with a Christian heritage, *pietistic Christians have surrendered their responsibility* to humanists in one area of life after another. God is confined to the Church, to the Sunday school, to the opinion and choice of the individual person, but God is kept out of the school, the state, economics, agriculture, medicine, commerce, industry, the arts, literature, the sciences and other so-called neutral areas. But a God who is not God over all is not God, and certainly not the God of the Bible. The point is that whoever controls the totality of life, whoever has an authoritative word that speaks to everything in life, that one is God. To claim to be Christian and to fail to live and to act in terms of God's Word in every area of life is nothing less than treason!

What is the remedy for this appalling situation? *The remedy is in God's action.* We need to appreciate afresh what God has done to reverse the effects of the Fall and to see the implications of that

action for all of life. In God's sovereign plan of *redemption*, in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, we are given the potential to reverse the effects of the Fall to a great {229} degree in our own generation. By the faithful preaching and application of the Word of God to every area of life, God the Holy Spirit, who applied our Lord Christ's redeeming work to us in the work of *regeneration*, will surely continue to turn the minds and hearts and wills of those whom He wills to come to the Father through the Son. Being thus regenerated and called to think God's thoughts after Him and to bring every thought captive to Christ as the salt of the earth and the light of the world, and, being properly instructed in the Word of God, a *correct biblical perspective* will be the result. The point is that those upon whom this burden and this calling is laid for the reviving of true biblical Christianity, which speaks to all of life and which seeks to assert the crown rights of King Jesus over all, must do this with what we call epistemological self-consciousness in order to produce epistemologically self-conscious disciples. By that I mean, preachers, teachers, and disciples, and doers who are fully aware of what they believe and what they are called by God to accomplish in terms of the cultural mandate of Genesis 1:28 and the Great Commission of Matthew 28:18–20, in clear and decisive opposition to humanism in every area, for its defeat, and for the victory of God's truth and righteousness. We would therefore agree with Professor Francis Nigel Lee when he says that:

“Christ reigns over all of life (Rom. 11:36) —

over and through the scales, in physics (Isa. 40:12)
 over and through sportsmen, in athletics (1 Cor. 9:24)
 over and through microscopes, in biology (Ps. 104:25)
 over and through swords, in warfare (Ps. 144:1)
 over and through coins, in commerce (Matt. 20:28)
 over and through notes, in music (Ps. 150:3)
 over and through judges, in politics (Ex. 22:9)
 over and through blueprints, in architecture (Gen. 4:17)
 over and through brushes, in aesthetics (Ps. 68:13)
 over and through cogwheels, in industry (Gen. 4:22)
 over and through schools, in education (Acts 19:9)”

Culture and Calvary's cross and Christ's Kingship (1 Cor. 15:1–4, 58) all root in the infallible Word of God (2 Tim. 3:16–17). “All

things were created by Him and for Him (Col. 1:16), and He reconciled all things through the blood of His cross (Col. 1:20).”

With particular regard to the school and educational responsibility, what is the biblical perspective that must prevail? It is simply this: that the creation mandate requiring our {230} dominion in righteousness, under God, over all the earth, is renewed in Christ's Great Commission. That we are specifically commanded to teach the nations “to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” That the command of Christ requires the application of God's Word to every area of life because God and His Word are the true foundation of all knowledge and education. That there is no aspect of life in which the voice of humanism can be legitimately permitted to dominate because “*the earth is the Lord's*, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein” (Ps. 24:1). That the institutions of family, church, and state are of God, each subject to God in its own limited sphere, each inter-dependent, one not lording it over the other. That the state is limited to the role of minister of justice in terms of God's Law. It is not the controller of all spheres of life in terms of its own laws and it is certainly not the controller of education. In that area, the most it can do is to ensure that the child is being educated, but it cannot dictate how, when, where, or by whom the child will be educated.

Where the state exceeds its biblical bounds, as the modern humanistic state does, to control education, the lowest common denominator of content and quality in teaching and learning will eventually prevail, as it surely will in the opening of schools to all groups. As for the fast-dying Christian National Education in South Africa, it must be noted that if a curriculum includes religious instruction while all other subjects are taught from a humanistic perspective, that system of education is decidedly not Christian. Historically, the control of education by the state is a comparatively recent innovation in the Christian world dating from the early 1800s. In this regard, the September 1990 edition of *The Blumenfeld Educational Letter* is interesting:

...in the early nineteenth century [the New England Unitarians] were in the forefront of the movement for government owned and controlled schools. The Unitarians had decided to replace salvation through Christ with salvation through secular education. The Unitarians no longer believed in the divinity of Christ or in

the doctrine of original sin. They believed that evil was caused by poverty, ignorance and social injustice, and that education would rid mankind of ignorance, which would in turn lift the poor out of poverty, which would then eradicate the causes of social injustice. The Unitarians believed in the basic goodness of human nature and of its perfectibility, and that is why they placed all of their hopes on education—not education run by Calvinists, but secular education run by government. Actually, the {231} common schools of New England were established in colonial times by Calvinists who passed laws requiring parents to educate and catechize their children in accordance with biblical principles. These schools were town schools, supported by the towns people and run by the clergy. The idea that there could be education without God was so unbiblical as to be unthinkable. As the Unitarians grew in numbers and influence, they set out to remove Calvinist teachings from the common schools by bringing the schools under centralized state control in the late 1830s and advancing the idea that the schools should be Christian but nonsectarian in character. Calvinism was replaced with a watered down nondenominational Protestantism which virtually all sects could agree on. Orthodox Calvinists fought against centralization and the watering down of orthodox doctrine. But in the end the liberals prevailed.

This same letter points out that the most remarkable achievement of state-controlled education in the United States and Canada has been its high rate of illiteracy:

“According to an article in the Spring, 1989, issue of *Education Canada*, published by the Canadian Education Association: ‘It is currently estimated that one million Canadians are almost totally illiterate and another four million are termed “functionally illiterate.” In the United States these figures are estimated respectively at 26 million and 60 million.’” (And these are people who have suffered at the hands of government educators.)”

And South Africa—the unofficial fifty-first state of the U.S.A.—will walk the same path if education remains under state control.

Educational Responsibility

The fact is that God has placed education *in the hands of parents*. Christian parents are commanded by God’s Word to see to it that their children receive a Christian education, either at their own

hands or at the hands of truly regenerate and epistemologically self-conscious Christian teachers, in a school with a completely Christian curriculum based entirely on God's Word and free of state registration and control. (Regrettably, some Christian schools in South Africa have failed to see the {232} real issue—the conflict between Christ and Caesar—and have bowed to state registration and minimum standards).

The Word of God is clear and unequivocal. *Thus saith the Lord:*

“...thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up... Ye shall not go after other gods of the gods of the people which are round about you... And when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments which the Lord our God hath commanded you? Then thou shalt say unto thy son, we were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt; and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand: ...and he brought us out from thence, that he might bring us in, to give us the land which he sware unto our fathers. And the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God, for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as it is at this day. And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.” (Deut. 6)

And I ask you, shall we who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ do less than that? Would a godly Israelite have sent his children to be educated by the Canaanites? Deuteronomy 11:18–21 virtually reiterates the commands of Deuteronomy 6.

In Psalm 78 we read that God:

“...established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: That the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children: That they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments: And might not be as their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not {233} steadfast with God.”

The Proverbs declare:

“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge; but fools despise wisdom and instruction. My son, hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother.” (Prov. 1:7–8)

“He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes.” (Prov. 13:24)

“Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child: but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him.” (Prov. 22:15)

Ephesians 6:4 declares:

“And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

Colossians 2:6–8 declares:

“As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him; rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”

Where are your children? Who is teaching them? What are they being taught? Is what they are being taught in conflict with your Christian faith and convictions? Have they been tricked into attending a leadership course such as was reported by the October 29th 1990 edition of “Personality” (before it was forced to go bad)? Parents of the greater Durban area were horrified to learn how a particular leadership course was nothing less than an ANC indoctrination programme. The present upgrading of standards of immorality in South Africa is the fruit of years of humanism in the universities, the colleges, and the schools ably assisted by the media and passive, pietistic Christianity—a situation which is going to grow worse with the opening up of the schools and especially with the present {234} intensive campaign for sex education which could become as explicit as it has become in America under the pretext of AIDS prevention. The September 1990 edition of *New Dimensions* devotes an article to the American situation which it describes as “increasingly graphic sex education—so graphic that some are now calling it a form of sexual molestation in the classroom.” For parents to fail to take responsibility for the

specifically Christian education of their children is to sacrifice them to the modern political state and its false god, humanistic man. It is no less a sin than the sacrifice of children by burning to the false god, Molech—an act utterly forbidden by God: “And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech” (Lev. 18:21). Dr. Rushdoony is correct when he says: “To have other gods and other laws, other schools, and other hopes than the one true God is to invoke the whole weight of [God’s] law in judgment” (The Institutes of Biblical Law, vol. 1, 40).

In an age of humanism such as ours is, *Christian parents are particularly accountable to God* to withstand the forces of humanism which demand the sacrifice of our children to their control. What we have to recognize and acknowledge is that we are in a war situation—the war between Christianity and humanism—in which the issue is victory for the future by control, the lordship of Christ or Caesar. Whoever controls the children will control the future. So it is not a matter for debate. It is not a question of, is it better to send my children to a Christian school or to school as we know it today, whether state controlled or humanistically run private or church schools? The question is, are we obeying God’s requirement or not? By our answer we shall either stand or fall in the judgment of God.

There can be no doubt, then, that we need Christian schooling for our children under the lordship and authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, not under the lordship and authority of the state, nor of the Church, nor of the teachers, nor of the parents. But parents are immediately responsible to ensure that their children’s schooling is subject to the rule of Christ speaking in Holy Scripture. As Dr. Rushdoony puts it: “*The Christian school is...a necessity*. There can be no Christian future without the Christian school and a Christian curriculum.”

Practical Aspects

We must come, briefly, to some practical aspects. It is all very well speaking about these matters but the time has come to {235} take action for, unless we act, we shall lose even what we still have in terms of Christian liberty.

Firstly, God grant, by the working of His Holy Spirit that there

will be parents who will be deeply *convicted* and who will feel greatly burdened to put the matter of their children's education right with Him, parents who will grasp this biblical truth and reality and who will catch the *vision* of what can be done in the strength of the Lord by faithful and obedient families. We need a growing number of families who will be prepared to take on their God-given *responsibility* while consciously putting themselves at *risk* by either educating their own children or forming Christian schools with no reference to the state. That is what parents have been doing in America for over two decades now knowing that at this point they are certainly required "*to obey God rather than men*" (Acts 5:29). Many have counted the cost and suffered even to the point of imprisonment and seeing their children being forcibly taken away by the state. But there have also been victories and today numerous states in America no longer interfere with home-schooling parents.

While I was in London, I was privileged to be in conversation with Samuel Blumenfeld, one of America's leading writers on public education and a keen advocate of home-schooling. He expressed interest in visiting South Africa to speak on these matters. The major point made by Mr. Blumenfeld, and this is the second practical aspect, was that we must *motivate the freedom of education* in South Africa. Let me quote once again from the September, 1990, edition of his education letter:

"True religious, academic and economic freedom will never be restored...until educational freedom is regained... The compulsory attendance laws are the linchpin of the whole totalitarian plan. Such laws have been used by every modern dictator and tyrannical government to control their people and mold the minds of the children. Such laws are not only not needed in a free society, but ultimately lead to its demise. Let us launch a drive to pull that linchpin and unravel the whole convoluted web of statist control and regulation that is strangling individual and religious freedom..."

Here we need guidance from Mr. Blumenfeld regarding his strategy.

Thirdly, concerned Christian parents must make it their business to obtain as much information as possible about {236} Christian schooling. There is a wealth of material available. A good starting point would be to become a member of Great Christian Books, P.O.

Box 8000, Elkton, Maryland 21922-8000, U.S.A., at twelve dollars per year and receive their catalogue which includes regular special editions on *Christian school information* and material. Christian parents and teachers, who would take on the responsibility of teaching at home or in a Christian school, should also become fully conversant with books by Dr. R. J. Rushdoony such as his brilliant work, *The Philosophy of the Christian Curriculum* published by Ross House Books, P.O. Box 67, Vallecito, California 95251, U.S.A. We need self-supporting volunteers who would be prepared to dedicate their time and talent to learning and understanding all that there is to know about Christian schooling and to gather information and material and to receive queries and to act in an advisory capacity. Their first task would be to avail themselves of this information and material from the sources mentioned. May I suggest that potential volunteers and other interested and concerned families should keep in touch with Frontline Fellowship and Gospel Defence League where names and addresses and telephone numbers could be listed and coordinated for positive action and continued communication.

Fourthly, in my opinion, *home schooling* is far superior to the formation of a Christian school but not every family will find it practical. There is also certain legislation that militates against it:

“South African law requires that if (parents) refuse to send their children to a registered public or private school, they can be fined a nominal amount for the first offence, which is doubled for the second and succeeding offences. If the parents will not bow to threats of fines and even of prison, no force can be applied by local government to place a child in a state approved school. However, a children’s court could be approached and it could order that the child be sent to a children’s home or be placed in the care of a relative or a friend who would ensure attendance at school. Failing this, the court could order that the child be placed in the charge of a probation officer. Whichever way, it is clear that the state will have (what it regards as) “its” children educated in terms of its requirements. There are exceptional circumstances where the state will permit home education, such as in the instance of a child living more than 100 kilometers from the nearest available school but, even then, the requirement is that one of the parents must be a qualified teacher. (O.F. {237} *Chalcedon Report*, no. 290, September, 1989)”

American Christian parents have faced tougher legislation and gained ground.

Fifthly, there is an interesting point made by Samuel Blumenfeld concerning *modern technology*. He says:

Technology has now made compulsory school attendance obsolete. One can now learn much more at home than in any public classroom, at less cost to everyone.

Sixthly, we need the involvement of ministers and their *churches* who will see the issues and who will *support* parents who are determined to take on their responsibility for the education of their children. The various gifts and talents which are available by God's grace in any congregation can be usefully directed to supply any shortfall of skills in any particular subject.

Seventhly, we need the involvement and good counsel and *support of Christian men whose profession is the Law*. Men who clearly see the issue between Christianity and humanism and who have thoroughly imbibed Dr. Rushdoony's *Institutes of Biblical Law* and who are in agreement with his thesis. Men who will take up the cause of educational freedom.

Eighthly, the Kingdom of God is financed by *the tithe* on gross income before the deduction of tax by the modern political state. A tithing people will be able to finance the Christian education of their children and they will be prepared to sacrifice their comforts rather than sacrifice their children to the idols of humanism.

Ninthly, the quality of Christian schooling is so superior that American Christian school children, when tested, have been found to be well ahead of their peers in the state school system. There need be no fear that the state's standard will not be met when it comes to matriculation. In this regard, it is not the preparation for a *state examination* that is pre-eminent but obedience to God in an education for life. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

Conclusion

I can do no better than to conclude with a quotation from {238} Dr. Rushdoony's work, *the Philosophy of the Christian Curriculum* (103–104):

"It is urgent therefore for Christians to proclaim the rebirth of man

in Christ and the rebirth of society through Christian education. In a world of dying men, the living will command the day. It is imperative therefore that mature Christians be reared to exercise dominion in every area of life and thought. Most Christians today are immature and unlearned in terms of covenant knowledge, and as a result are ineffectual Christians. It is interesting that one of the New Testament Greek words translated as “unlearned” or “ignorant” is literally in the Greek idiots. Its modern meaning is a departure from its original meaning, but there is a valid connection. Unlearned or “idiot” Christianity is ignorant of the faith and ignorant of the necessary connection between every area of life and thought and the presuppositions of biblical faith. Without the Sovereign and triune God, no knowledge is possible except on the borrowed premises of biblical faith. With faith in the God of Scripture, a thorough Christian education, and the development of its meaning for every area of life, is mandatory. Christians have an obligation to develop grade schools, high schools, colleges, universities, and graduate schools... Just as humanistic education is leading to the death of humanistic man, so a truly Christian education alone offers life to man and society in and through Christ.”

WHERE SHALL WE BEGIN? BIBLICAL THINKING IN ALL OF LIFE

Owen Fourie

Introduction

WHAT DO YOU THINK? This is a common question. An idea is put forward and we are asked, “What do you think about it?” What you think is important. It will affect the situation. A course of action is the product of thought, and what you think can influence the course of history.

But even more important than the *substance* of your thinking is the *process* of your thinking. In other words, HOW DO YOU THINK? The *way* you think determines *what* you will think about any situation and the whole of life. To appreciate this, here is a test: If you were not looking at this page, would it exist? If you have said YES, you are correct, but do you appreciate the implication of your answer? If you have said NO, this is incorrect, but it is not surprising, given the influence of thinking in the past 300 years or so.

Modern Historical Development

The sixteenth century was the century of the birth of the Protestant Reformation which saw the restoration of biblical truth, particularly in respect of the doctrine of salvation. The teaching of justification by the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ emphasized the objective truth of God’s work in contrast to the old subjectivism of self-flagellation, inward grace and meritorious good works. The seventeenth century, building on the preaching and writings of the sixteenth century reformers, saw the production of great confessions of faith such as the Westminster Confession of 1646 and the Savoy Declaration of

Faith and Order of 1658. Here was objective truth, the absolutes of God Almighty, absolute standards drawn from the inspired, authoritative, inerrant and self authenticating written Word of God, the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The received and established position was simply this: God is holy. His revealed Word is true. Anything that contradicts it is false. *Thus saith the LORD*. On this foundation, people could reason together about truth and standards of conduct. On this basis, {240} parents could establish rules and standards for their children. On this bedrock, society could be ordered and governed in godliness and righteousness. But in the midst of these heights of godliness and righteousness, seeds of disruption were already being sown. Remember that in the Garden of Eden Satan's temptation called into question the thinking of Adam and Eve concerning the Word of God. The battleground was the mind of man: 'Come, come, Eve, let us reason together, you shall not surely die..'

So too in the seventeenth century, to counteract the good of the Protestant Reformation, the tempter was active in the thinking of men such as: the French philosopher, Rene Descartes (1596–1650). His great statement was, *cogito, ergo sum*. "I think, therefore I am." Where did he begin? Not with God, but with himself. How did he hope to establish what was true? Not by looking to a reference point outside of himself, but by *making himself the reference point*.

Next was the English empiricist philosopher, John Locke (1632–1704). Where does all knowledge come from? God? No. No. *All knowledge is derived from experience*, according to Locke, "for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The stage was set for the so-called Enlightenment of the eighteenth century which would employ rationalism to call into question previously accepted doctrines and institutions.

For Irish philosopher and clergyman George Berkeley (1685–1753), *material objects had no existence apart from a mind perceiving them. We have only sense impressions*. The continuous nature of the universe is because there is a divine mind always perceiving everything.

French philosopher Voltaire (1694–1778) retained God as the Creator of the universe but a universe now independent of God. For him *the mind of man was capable of creating a science which*

depended upon man alone.

Scottish philosopher and historian David Hume (1711–76) eliminated God. According to him, *all we have are sense impressions* and there is no evidence either for God or for the reality of a material world.

For German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), truths regarding God, man, and the relationship between God and man were untrustworthy. The search for truth could not be conducted without mathematics and physics. *The external world for Kant was, to a great degree, the making of our mind and a part of it.*

German theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) {241} also *defined existence empirically in terms of the subjective.* He was the master-builder of liberal theology.

German philosopher Hegel (1770–1831), a contemporary of Schleiermacher, presupposed that *science was more reliable than the Bible.* He treated God as a human concept. What we hold as actual history in scripture was reduced to mere imagery. For example, the Incarnation was regarded as having never happened but since people believe it did, the words of the Bible describing the event are to be treated as meaningful. This opened the door for using biblical terms emptied of their true meaning and filled with new meanings to influence the thinking of people. After all, it is so much easier to get people to respond to the call to follow Jesus Christ instead of saying, *“let’s promote revolution,”* if that old call can be used by the liberationists for the purpose of revolution. In this context, the Incarnation has become the political involvement of the church to liberate society from oppression...

Austrian physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach (1838–1916) left no doubt that *the world is simply the subjective perceptions of men.* For him, this page would certainly not exist if he were not looking at it.

German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), a contemporary of Mach, defined reality in terms of the subjective. Since *the source of knowledge was limited to the perceptions of men* there was no place for God.

German born American physicist Albert Einstein (1879–1955) was influenced by Mach’s ideas in his formulation of a theory which made the objective existence of space and time in the matter of mechanics of no consequence. And, as engineer

Richard L. Heldenbrand in his recent work “Christianity and New Evangelical Philosophies” notes: The scientific community has paid a terrible price for incorporating anti-biblical presuppositions into disciplines such as physics. *Replacing objectivity with subjectivity in the definition of what is real*, places science on a mystical foundation and blurs the distinction between fact and fantasy This mysticism grows naturally out of the presupposition that human perception is all there is. With such a presupposition, it proves impossible to maintain a distinction between fact and fantasy.” (p.15)

Later, Heldenbrand shows the extent of this warped thinking as he exposes the fatal flaw in the basis of such things as Power Encounter and the Signs and Wonders Movement where the name of John Wimber springs to mind.

Swiss theologian *Karl Barth* (1886–1968) is the father of {242} neo-orthodoxy. He was influenced by Kant, Schleiermacher and Hegel, and he placed *emphasis on human perception by stressing the interpretation of the reader over the divine inspiration of the Bible*.

One could go on to mention other men of this century. *Eugene Nida*, secretary for translations of the American Bible Society who believes that reality is defined subjectively so the door is open for the translator to take more liberty with the text and to trim the text according to the response of the reader. *Charles Taber*, Nida’s research assistant, saw in the name Jesus Christ mere symbols which could be filled with any content acceptable to the reader; so much so that neo-orthodox British theologian *Kenneth Cragg* would readily avow that there is no reason why a Muslim might not remain a Muslim after becoming a Christian!... I am indebted to Richard L. Heldenbrand for bringing these facts to light.

Do you see the shift from the objective biblical thinking of the Reformers (with their emphasis on the absolutes) to the subjective thinking of men who reinstated the rebellion of Adam and exalted their minds above the mind of God so that what is seen is believed to be the product of the perceptions of the human mind? No wonder, then, that archaeologist William E Albright fell into the snare of the Hegelian presupposition that science is more trustworthy than the Bible, and sought to establish the Bible on the foundation of archaeology as though the Bible is not self-

authenticating and its own final authority as the very Word of God.

Now, you might never have heard of Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, Voltaire, Hume, Kant, Hegel and company but these men raised the problem of knowledge and its source, and their unbiblical thinking lies at the root of today's social and spiritual chaos.

How do you think? If you were not looking at this page, would it exist? No? That is unbiblical thinking and it begins and ends without God because the existence of God is made to depend on man's conception or non-conception of God. Yes? That is biblical thinking and it must begin with God.

Peruvian Catholic theology professor Gustavo Gutierrez says: "Dogmatic Theology today has to be theological anthropology instead of using only revelation and tradition as starting points, as classical theology has done, [the church] must start with facts and questions derived from the world and from history" (Heldenbrand, 90-91).

In other words, in line with the unbiblical thinking we {243} have just considered, theology, in this definition, has shifted from a God-centered concept to a man-centered concept and this is particularly evident in Liberation Theology.

Where Shall We Begin?

So to think unbiblically is to *begin with man*; to make man and his mind, his perceptions, the reference point. That is humanism and it is a recipe for disaster. As Dr. R. J. Rushdoony has noted: "Man, having made himself his own ultimate and his starting point, is unable to know anything except himself. Having dispensed with God, man has also in effect dispensed with a knowable universe." (The Word of Flux, 6)

Again, to understand this, we must take note of the nature of our historic fall in Adam and Eve. In the fall, Eve first, then Adam, when tempted by Satan, failed to begin with God. Being tempted by Satan, they forsook the Word of God and made their senses the beginning. Instead of holding to God's Word and continuing to hold fast to God's Word in the midst of the temptation, they began to reason apart from God's Word in accordance with their senses: "And when the woman *saw* that the tree was good for

food, and that it was *pleasant* to the eyes and a tree to be *desired* to make one wise, she took the fruit thereof, and did eat..." Eve made an independent judgment of the situation apart from God's Word. She began with what she saw, being tempted, instead of turning from temptation and holding to God's Word and therefore beginning with God, so to speak. She allowed the temptation to begin to influence her judgment, and so did Adam, and so our first parents fell. As a direct consequence of the Fall, we are faced with the problem of the ages—the fact that *fallen human nature begins* in its reasoning about things, away from God.

But where, then, shall we begin with our thinking? There is a vitally important biblical principle which we must note. In Genesis 1:1, we read: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." In John 1:1–3 we read: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." In Revelation 1:8, we read: "I am Alpha and Omega the beginning and the ending saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." These few verses leave us in no doubt as to the starting point of all things. "In the beginning {244} God..." God is the true starting point. All life began by his action and in the Gospel of John and in the book of Revelation we see that it is particularly through the Lord Jesus Christ that this activity was mediated both in creation and in redemption, for the Lord Christ is also the divinely promised seed of Genesis 3:15. It is the triune God, who has revealed himself in the holy scriptures and who has spoken finally through His Son, who is the author of creation and redemption. Creation and redemption began with God and since this is so we may deduce this biblical principle that *if creation and redemption*, and therefore the totality of life, have their beginning with God, then surely it is the greatest wisdom, in every detail of our life, to begin with God. In Matthew 19:3–8, our Lord Jesus used this biblical principle:

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that [now note the use of this principle] he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man

leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: *but from the beginning it was not so.*"

Beginning With God

Clearly, our Lord began not with the situation but with what God ordered in the beginning. He answered the Pharisees in terms of God's given norm. *He began with God* and that is true wisdom. Born as we are in sin, we cannot escape the nature nor the consequences of our rebellion whereby we turn away from God and make ourselves the starting point and reference point until God most graciously brings us out of that state by the redeeming work of Christ and the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. Being thus translated from the kingdom of darkness and man-centeredness to the kingdom of light and God-centeredness we who believe are a new creation in Christ with minds and hearts and wills renewed by the Holy Spirit. No longer must we {245} be conformed to this world, but we must be transformed by the renewing of our minds that we may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God (Rom 12:2). With renewed minds we must think God's thoughts after him as we steep ourselves in the study of the Holy Scriptures. Thus prepared and equipped, we must walk contrary to fallen human nature, by *beginning with God* in all things, and we must enter into the battle of the ages against humanism and even the remnants of humanism in our own thinking, remembering that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds: casting down imaginations and every, high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ..." (2 Cor. 10:4-5).

Application

It now becomes necessary to apply this biblical principle of beginning with God to various subjects. So we are following

the epistolary style of the apostle Paul. In other words, having propounded the doctrine, let us now look at the practice. In most instances we'll *consider the truth gained from beginning with God after a consideration of the falsehood that captures the minds of those who do not begin with God.*

Firstly, let's consider the Origin of the World.

How did this universe begin? To understand its origin is essential to an understanding of life and the purpose and the destiny of everything, especially mankind. But where does fallen man begin? With God? No. With what he sees and observes. And, because he fails to begin with God and God's Word, he makes wrong judgments and comes to wrong conclusions and produces a theory of evolution. The consequences are disastrous. Evolution eliminates God. Theistic evolution, which purports to retain God as the creator of the original substance of the world and the orderer of the evolutionary process, is a contradiction in terms. Many Christians try to reconcile the Bible and the theory of evolution in this way, and in South Africa there is at least one very prominent and deeply respected scientist and professing Christian who is a theistic evolutionist. But evolution is in conflict with the Word of God. It promotes ungodliness. It creates confusion in the minds of children who, being brought up to believe the Genesis account of creation, have eventually to conclude that God is confined to spiritual matters and irrelevant {246} to material things where the word of science is said to be authoritative.

Evolution is the underlying philosophy of communism. Karl Marx was a great admirer of Charles Darwin. Evolution was the underlying philosophy of Nazi Germany and it is the underlying philosophy of ever increasing state-control which produces a basically incapable and impotent twentieth century man who looks to the state for the answers to all his problems from cradle to grave only to find more problems. Away, then, with the false theory of evolution and let us begin with God and learn and believe, as it is declared in Genesis, that God Almighty and Omnipotent spoke the Word and created the universe in six literal twenty-four-hour days, and this was accomplished a mere six thousand years ago—a fact which is well substantiated by biblical chronology and the universally catastrophic event of Noah's flood which leaves no

ground for the evolutionist's doctrine of uniformitarianism. We have a young earth spoken into being by the Word of God and having maturity at the outset, just as Adam and Eve were created not as babies but as mature adults. We have a young universe which was filled with the distant stars and planets after the earth was established. In the biblical perspective, there is no room for billions of years. Evolution is a lie. Our universe is not the antiquated product of chance given to ultimate meaninglessness and requiring the intervention and control of elitist men who have fertile imaginations and who think they can do as they please with other men who, to them, are simply higher animals—mere specks in the vast span of nature and time. Our universe is the recent handiwork of an ever-present and ever-ordering God whose predestined purpose is being worked out with meaningfulness in every detail to His honour and to His glory. God is there and His Word is the undergirding truth for every aspect and detail of life. Having His revelation of the beginning we can speak authoritatively concerning the origin of the world. Ah, the impertinence of fallen man who would presume to declare as fact his fairy tale of evolution as though he were an objective observer from the very beginning:

“Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge. Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? {247} Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the cornerstone thereof...?” (Job 38:2–6)

Secondly, let's consider History and Geography.

Humanism, which does not begin with God, tells us of millions and millions of years of pre-history before the arrival of man, directly contradicting the historical record of Genesis one. Some Christians, to accommodate this, have dreamed up the gap theory which speaks of a long period between verse one and verse two of Genesis one which is sheer nonsense.

Humanism tells us of long geological ages of thousands and millions of years in which the earth evolved to its present state directly contradicting the historical and geographical authenticity

of Genesis and particularly denying the universal and catastrophic effect of Noah's Flood. Humanism describes the history of man in terms of man's greatness and ingenuity but without reference to God as the first cause and God's sovereignty over all. Such a view, which fails to begin with God, produces a man who is ignorant of his place and calling, a man who moves not in terms of God's Word but in terms of his own sinful desires, a man who is easily manipulated for evil ends.

In any study of history and geography we must begin with God and His Word, especially the opening chapters of Genesis, and, if we begin in this way, these subjects will bear witness to the sovereignty of God over all things, over the earth and the history of mankind: the providence of God ordering each region's geology, vegetation, natural boundaries, climate, seasons, weather, and minerals for the working out of His purposes; God as the first cause ordering the history and development of men and nations. Beginning with God in this way we shall see ourselves as we are, our place, and our calling as valid and responsible second causes required to exercise dominion over the earth by faith in Christ and by applying the Word of God to all of life to the glory of God. The rise and fall of nations and the state of the earth will be traced to the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of that calling. Is this how history and geography are taught in the schools?

Thirdly, let's consider Mathematics.

Here, I would like to quote from the introduction to a book by James Nickel called "Mathematics: Is God Silent?" published by Ross House Books (P.O. Box 67, Vallecito, California 95251, U.S.A.): {248}

"Skeptic: 'You say Christian schools are different. How?'

Christian: 'Everything is taught from a biblical worldview.'

Skeptic: 'Is that so? What about mathematics?'

Christian: (Dead silence)...

How many Christian parents, students, and educators are there that can articulate a biblical approach to mathematics let alone affirm that there is such a view? As a Christian educator, and more specifically—a mathematics teacher, the author has been

confronted with such questions time and time again. As the result of almost a decade of research and teaching, the author has come to the conviction that there is a distinctive, biblical approach to mathematics; an approach that will not only convert any skeptic but also provide a potent motivation to anyone involved in Christian education. The dumbfounded response of dead silence can be turned into a dynamic declaration; the voice of God is not silent in mathematics. Most of us have negative impressions of mathematics. Why is this? ...This book attempts to unveil...[why] mathematics teaching has created this [impression and remains a] mystery of meaninglessness [to many.] It may surprise many laymen to realize that professional mathematicians are in a quandary as to the ultimate foundation and meaning of mathematics... The author believes that this mathematical uncertainty is caused by a philosophical prejudice; an assumption that the biblical God is silent in the realm of mathematics. The book attempts to show not only the ramifications of this assumption, but also the difference in perspective and meaning that results from assuming that the voice of the biblical God is speaking in mathematics. Understanding and teaching mathematics from a Christian perspective does make a difference. First, when anyone removes God from any discipline, he ends up approaching the subject assuming, not the autonomy of God, but the autonomy of man's mind. Given this assumption in the discipline of mathematics, a fundamental question cannot be answered. Why does a mere product of man's autonomous mind accurately model the workings of the physical world? Why can you, with the aid of mathematics, figure the trajectories, velocities, and fuel needed in order to place a man on the moon with an unrivalled degree of accuracy? Humanistic mathematicians and scientists answer using terms like "incredible, unreasonably effective, and mysterious." For the Christian, the answer to this "mystery" lies in the biblical doctrine of creation. Man's mathematical constructions and the workings {249} of the physical world cohere because of a common Creator....A biblical Christian teacher will not be content to teach students just the mechanics of mathematics. A vast gold mine of history, philosophy, and revelations of the manifold wonders of God's creation lie behind the mathematical formulas.... Before the eyes and mind of the student, the teacher must dig up these treasures and bring them to the surface....It is the hope of the author that anyone who reads this book will, perhaps for the first time, hear the voice of the living God speaking in and through the discipline of mathematics. May they also come to appreciate, in a

fresh and exciting way, the relevancy of biblical revelation to every aspect of life. The Word of the living God is authoritative in every aspect of life because it speaks to every aspect of life.”

Enough said!

Fourthly, let's consider Economics.

We will consider economics very briefly because this is the subject of a separate paper. Humanistic economics fails to begin with God's Word. The result is that there are multiple debts, the creation of credit facilities and paper money serving only to increase debts and economic slavery, no sabbatical release from debt, inflation, and a decline in the quality of goods.

Economics must begin with God. Ordinary monetary transactions must revert to the use of the original biblical and God-blessed, pure, weighted gold and silver coinage. Debts must be payable within a period of six years; ideally, in the shortest time possible. Multiple debts must be forbidden and a Sabbath release from all debt for God's covenanting people must be observed every seventh year. Such sabbatical release also for the land, to lie fallow every seventh year, is necessary for “the earth to yield her increase.”

In a biblical order, the greatest counterfeiter of all, the state printing press, will cease to produce its unbacked, inflation-producing paper money. Inflation, by the way, is the judgment of God upon a world that flagrantly disregards God's laws concerning economics. The bursting of the paper bubble is not far off.

Fifthly, let's consider Politics.

Humanistic politicians begin without reference to God, and if God comes into the picture at all, it is for their own ends, it is to gain the ear and the vote of Christian people who are only too keen to believe that Mr. Politician is a {250} Christian or at least pro-Christian.

Humanistic politicians build on humanistic ideologies and philosophies which they seek to apply to all of life. They are anxious to control and order the whole of life, and they give prominence to the machine of state and the system of bureaucracy, whereby the state becomes a god decreeing how we shall live from cradle to grave. This is so in varying degrees from Western democracy

to Communist totalitarianism. In the process they confirm to gullible Christians, who long ago withdrew into their churches and became irrelevant to the concerns of daily life, that they have freedom of religion as long as they are good citizens, who respect the state's ordering of those apparently neutral areas of life such as economics, social welfare, housing, education, the media, the arts, sport, agriculture, and so on.

With the return of Christians to God's Word and their application of God's Word to every detail of life, the state will be confined to its God-appointed role as a minister of God's law and order, an impartial minister of justice in terms of God's Word. The humanistic politician will be out of a job. He will have to become a hard-working member of a godly society in which he will no longer be able to frame mischief by a law. And, to this end, Christians need to acknowledge their responsibility to be involved in politics. It is the failure of Christians to speak to every area of life in terms of God's Word and therefore to speak theologically and politically, that has left the field wide open for humanistic politicians to dictate how we shall live and to open the door to the present influx of demons who say the land is theirs and that they will rule over us. Christian politics will simply put into effect what God requires of us in His Word, obedience to His Law in every area of life and then "God shall bless us: and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him" (Psalm 67:7).

Sixthly, let's consider Crime and Punishment.

Humanism regards the criminal as a sick person who is in need of reformation and rehabilitation. Society is blamed for the condition of the criminal and, often, the victim is penalized while the criminal is let off lightly. For example, not only does the thief steal your motor car and damage it beyond repair, but he robs you a second time when he is put in prison and your tax money gives him free board and lodging!...

The outcry against capital punishment is part and parcel of the humanistic viewpoint which begins with the condition of the criminal and society but not with God and God's Law. To begin with God on this point is to see the criminal not as one {251} who is sick as a result of his social environment, but to regard him as a transgressor of the Law of God who must be punished in a

measure equal to his crime, either capital punishment for murder and adultery and other crimes listed in God's Law, or restitution where restitution can be made. The thief who stole your car and damaged it beyond repair will not waste expensive time in unbiblical imprisonment. In terms of Exodus 22:1 ("If a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it; he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep.") he owes you five cars; and if he cannot give you five cars he will have to be subjected to indentured servitude until his earnings have fully paid his debt. In a godly order, crime will no longer be profitable and the criminal will be out of business.

Seventhly, let's consider Sin and Justification.

The humanistic view of man begins with man as he is now or as he was in a primitive state of so-called innocence. There is no concept of man as he was before the Fall. Man is not a sinner. There is no concept of an absolute standard of morality for all mankind and a shortcoming and the need of justification. We are reduced to a personal and relative, yours-and-mine, morality and the result is a conceited, self-sufficient rebel who cannot fulfill the cultural mandate in truth and righteousness. If there is any consciousness of shortcoming at all, justification consists of a beginning with self, a self justification, a self-righteousness.

To begin with God in this matter is to acknowledge the fact of sin against God's absolute standard of righteousness—His Holy Law—and to see the need of justification. It is to see and know and understand and grasp the fact that the work of justification is the work of God alone. It is because of what God has done in Christ, legally exchanging His righteousness for our sin that we can be justified in His sight. The result is a humble, dependent, servant of God who is obedient to God's Laws in thankfulness for His saving grace, and who is obedient to God's calling to exercise dominion over the earth, in righteousness, under God, and for the glory of God.

Eighthly, let's consider Personal Tragedy and Loss.

When faced with personal tragedy and loss, the humanist fails to begin with the revelation of God and resigns himself to his own idea of God or to passive fatalism—what will be will be—or to

bitterness and a resentment against life itself.

To begin with God in these circumstances would be to acknowledge that God is sovereign over all and that He can afflict us for His purposes. Sometimes it is because of {252} impenitence and the reason is easily discovered. At other times there is no known second cause but simply that He has willed it to effect His own purposes as in the case of Job. At all times it is that we might grow in grace and be conformed to the likeness of His Son. In all this, we learn that He who has given us of His bounty can also take it away and yet be just and merciful and forever blessed. As Job declared: "the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord"

Ninthly, let's consider Personal Problems and Difficulties.

Humanists begin with the problem and not with God and God's Word. They seek solutions from humanistic counselors, psychologists, psychiatrists, and astrologers, and in drugs or alcohol or perversion, everything and anything but God and His Word. The result is more problems, more difficulties, and social chaos.

The solutions to the problems and difficulties which come our way are to be found when we begin with God; in this sense, that through the unceasing study of God's Word we become so tuned to God, and our faith and our understanding of God's ways and of life are so built up, that we shall, in the midst of problems and difficulties, readily resort to God and rest in the truth and the fact of God's sovereignty, justice, mercy and love, and find biblical principles which will direct us in our dealing with specific problems and difficulties as we think God's thoughts after Him.

Tenthly, and finally, let's briefly consider The Family, the subject of the next paper.

Here, humanism begins with evolutionary thought and regards family life and marriage as a passing phase in the evolutionary scale. The result is a low view of the sanctity of marriage and family life, no concept of the authority of the family especially the authority of the husband and father, and a promotion of the independent and nonsubmissive wife and lawless and delinquent children or children who are educated as guns in the state machine.

With this comes the high rate of divorce, abortion, and euthanasia, and the dissolution of social order.

But to begin with God is to see the family as God's basic unit in society. It is to hold a high view of marriage and the sanctity of marriage and the authority of the husband and the father and the submission of the wife and the obedience of the children. It is to restore the family to its authoritative position in society as the possessor and ruler of property, the builder of an inheritance, the teacher of its children, the disciplinarian of its children, the guardian of the welfare of its members. The result will be a well-ordered and godly society.

Conclusion

So to conclude. We could go on to consider much more following the biblical principle of beginning with God in every detail of life—business, education, current developments in South Africa, the squatter problem, pornography, child abuse, satanism, the Gulf crisis, and so on. Much has already been written on various subjects from this biblical perspective and the time has come for thinking Christian people to take note and to put these things into practice. We are required by God's Word to begin with God in all matters which affect us personally and individually and corporately in society. Failure at this point must surely bring God's judgment upon us. The words of our Lord are clear:

“Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (Matt. 4:4). “Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men” (Matt. 5:13).

GOD'S STRATEGY FOR THE FAMILY

Owen Fourie

*Lecture delivered at CCA Seminar in Cape Town,
South Africa.*

The subject is God's strategy for the family. The title is an interesting one particularly because of the word strategy. It comes from the Greek *strategia* meaning office or command of a general. The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary indicates that it could be used to refer to a government or province under a commander-in-chief. It could describe the art of a commander-in-chief; the art of projecting and directing the larger military movements and operations of a campaign.

We Are at War

We are involved in a battle and we must have a strategy. This battle is for the family and it is the major battle of the war between Christ and Satan, the war between Christ's true Church and the world, the war between Christianity and humanism. True Christianity, in all its thinking and practice, begins with God and holds to God and His written word, the Bible, as the ultimate point of reference while humanism, in all its thinking and practice, begins with man who, in his fallen state, rebelliously suppresses the truth of God, sets up his mind as judge over all, even over God's Word, and makes his falsely autonomous mind the ultimate point of reference.

Many who profess to be Christian are unaware of this war. They accept the status quo as the norm. They seem to be blissfully unaware that the structures that have been protecting them have crumbled in the New South Africa, for with the end of apartheid

under the pressure of philosophical unitarian thinking we are also seeing the disappearance of once firmly held biblical distinctions between good and evil. Today, the qualification for good standing and respect in our society with its roots in Christianity has become the planning of sabotage, arson, and murder. Once you have been convicted of such things you are well-qualified to voice your opinion in the world at large and civil government will be anxious to negotiate the future with you. Despite this radical change in values many fail to see the vast extent to which every aspect of truth and righteousness is under fire. {256} We are at war and too few realize this. They are asleep. The house of faith is on fire but they are enjoying the warmth. The problem is that they separate the spiritual from the material turning their eyes on Jesus while the things of the world which God has made and which belong to God grow strangely dim! This is a Christian Humanism, if one can call it that, in which we shall find many devout believers in Christ who have regrettably surrendered their minds to humanistic thinking. They confine the practice of their faith to the life of the individual and the church but they have no biblical message for society and other areas of life such as education, economics, politics, law, and so on. If they knew that the Word of God actually speaks with authority to every area of life and that in terms of the cultural mandate of Genesis 1:28 and the Great Commission of Christ and many other passages of Scripture, God's people are required to apply their biblical thinking to all these areas and to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world to bring every thought captive to the obedience of Christ and to pull down every stronghold that exalts itself against God, if they knew this, they would be aware of the war. They would not be satisfied to see humanism reigning anywhere.

We need to be aware of the vastness of this war and how it touches all of life in a struggle to the death. There are two kingdoms. The kingdom of God and the kingdom of man engineered in his fallen state by Satan. It is an unequal battle. Since God is the Sovereign Lord over all, there can be no victory for fallen man or Satan, but in terms of the reality of life here and now and the responsibility that we have to God, the responsibility to walk in obedience to Him and to put away every disobedience, we have a real struggle on our hands. If we fail to fully obey God's Word in every area of life,

society will be torn apart under the displeasure of the Almighty and at the hands of the propagators of humanism, Marxism, liberationism, the New Age, and other ideologies and history will record that we deprived our children of the rich heritage of godliness and righteousness, both spiritual and material blessing, that would have been theirs had we been faithful. To our shame, a faithful and fearlessly obedient generation will arise in our stead for even though we might fail through faint-heartedness, God's kingdom will triumph on the earth before the end of history.

The unshakable fact remains "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" (Psalm 24:1), and as we are told in Proverbs (2:21-22): "The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it. {257} But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." There is no place for the wicked. They have no rights in God's earth apart from God's law and common grace.

Our Position Direction

Let Christians awaken, then, and join the battle, for, with no apology to Hal Lindsey, this is the great fixed earth where Satan must continue to suffer under the heel of the triumphant, risen and living Lord Jesus Christ. Far from being alive and well, he is ailing badly. His present course speaks of the death throes of a fatally wounded lion.

"And were this world all devils o'er,
And watching to devour us,
We lay it not to heart so sore;
Not they can overpower us.
And let the prince of ill
look grim as anter he will,
He harms us not a whit;
For why, his doom is writ;
A word shall quickly slay him."

Did the Lord Jesus not say of His Church that the gates of hell shall not prevail, shall not hold out, against it? (Matthew 16:18). Let the Church of Jesus Christ arise, then, against this present tide of iniquity and Satan and his minions will quickly shut the gates

of hell and tremble within. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you," advises James. How? The first part of that verse (James 4:7) says, "Submit yourselves therefore to God." Submit yourselves therefore to God. Do not tremble before wickedness. On the other hand, do not obtain a master's degree or a doctorate in the ins and outs of the variety of Satan's ways in order to combat these things. There is a far more positive direction. Know about these things, know their effect, know that they are out of order in God's earth and submit yourselves to God and to His Word. Study His Word, obey it, and apply it to every area of life. Be positive.

In the place of pornography and sodomy and child abuse bring whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely and of good report (Philippians 4:8). In the place of horror toys, the product of those who hate God and who therefore love death (Proverbs 8:36), bring the love of Christ and eternal life and {258} instill the desire for the good and wholesome activities and objects in God's creation. In the place of abortion bring the sense of God's purpose and the preservation of life to God's honor and glory and the godly responsibility of motherhood and fatherhood. In the place of Satanism bring the blood bought triumph of the Lord Jesus Christ over all evil. In the place of the myth of evolution bring the truth of God's direct act of Creation in six literal twenty-four hour days a mere six thousand years ago and the consequence of that act in the sovereign Lordship and providence of God over all things. In the place of feminism bring the reality and dignity of true manhood and true womanhood, of male authority and love, and of female love and submission. In the place of humanistic education bring the parents' responsibility for the education of their own children in a God-centered, Bible-based curriculum. In this positive manner, we submit to God, our commander-in-chief. Being governed by His Word and enabled by His Spirit in this battle, we apply His strategy. In so doing we shall be resisting the devil and he will flee from us.

We have noted then that God's strategy is the positive requirement of putting His Word and the values of His Word into practice in every area of life. That must be the foundation from which we operate—His Word and the positive application of His Word, not merely protesting against this evil or that evil only to find the multiplication of evils behind our backs. Indeed, there

must be the immediate confrontation with the forces of wickedness and their instruments. It is necessary to stop the circulation of *Penthouse*. It is necessary to prevent an open door to abortion. It is necessary to resist compulsory sex education in schools. But in carrying out this shorter term strategy we must also be busy about the long term strategy of rebuilding the foundations and the walls of biblical values in every area of life by a positive teaching and application of the Scriptures in our homes and in our churches and wherever we find opportunity to do so.

The Functioning Creedal Base

The point is this: the evils we are seeing now are the fruits of a long term strategy. They come from a creedal foundation—a creed which had its birth in the Garden of Eden: “Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?...ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, {259} then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil” (Gen. 3:1–5). This creed has been restated in the *Humanist Manifestos* of 1933 and 1973 and similar documents. For instance, there is this statement in the preface to the 1973 *Humanist Manifesto II*:

As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to love and care for persons, to hear and understand their prayers and to be able to do something about them, is an unproven and outmoded faith. Salvationism based on mere affirmation, still appears as harmful, diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter. Reasonable minds look to other means for survival.

In the same *Manifesto*, this so-called “reasonable” mind proceeds to deal with religion and confesses that it begins “with humans not God, nature not deity”; then it speaks of ethics which it declares to be “autonomous and situational”; then it speaks of the individual, then the democratic society declaring that “the state should encourage maximum freedom for different moral, political, religious, and social values in society”; then it speaks of the world community and its disdain of the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds.” Finally, it speaks of humanity as a whole and it discloses its goal that each person should become “in ideal

as well as practice, a citizen of a world community?"

Here is its sixth statement which, for all its apparent abhorrence of promiscuity, actually opens the door to it and is the creedal base of the current destructive attack on family life:

In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religious and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct. The right to birth control, abortion, and divorce should be recognized. While we do not approve of exploitive denigrating forms of sexual expression, neither do we wish to prohibit, by law or social sanction, sexual behaviour between consenting adults. The many varieties of sexual exploration should not in themselves be considered "evil." Without countenancing mindless permissiveness or unbridled promiscuity, a civilized society should be a tolerant one. Short of harming others or compelling them to do likewise, individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue their lifestyles as they desire. We wish to cultivate {260} the development of a responsible attitude toward sexuality, in which humans are not exploited as sexual objects, and in which intimacy, sensitivity, respect, and honesty in interpersonal relations are encouraged. Moral education for children and adults is an important way of developing awareness and sexual maturity.

But without God and His word it is an immoral education.

What we have to realize here is that as we move to counter the evils of our day, we must deal not only with the fruits—pornography, abortion, sex education in schools, and so on—but with the root, the creedal base itself. We have to do battle with the root of a humanistic worldview and the only way to do that is to move in terms of a Christian worldview based on God's Word which requires that we build up a Christian mind, a biblical way of thinking about everything in life which will give substance to our offensive against various evils. The rebuilding of our foundation of biblical values is an imperative without which we cannot hope to cause the enemy's foundation to crumble.

The weakness of contemporary Christian conservatism is that it has departed from the system of the Reformers and the Puritans; it has forsaken the practical use and effect of the great confessions of faith, the subordinate standards of the Church, and it has failed to carry on what the Reformers and Puritans began to do—it

has failed to apply God's law to all of life. In so doing it has given ground to humanism to take over with man aspiring to be God in every area of life. Christian conservatism, without a proper grasp of its biblical and historical confessional foundations, finds itself in a reactionary role. Instead, the enemy is the one who has the functioning creedal base. Whoever has such a base inevitably sets the agenda and everyone else reacts. We need to get back to our foundations. We need to set the agenda, an agenda speaking from the foundations of our faith and causing deep and mortal cracks in the enemy's foundation of faith; an agenda that will place the enemy in the reactionary role.

In other words, our action must be that of the lawful heirs of God's earth dispossessing the false heirs whose reaction will be illegal. Presently, because of the entrenchment of humanistic law, any Christian action against evil might be branded illegal. That is why we need to embark on an extensive, deep-rooted re-education of Christians to think biblically and to establish and entrench biblical laws in every area of life thereby undermining the foundations of the false heirs of God's earth. If

'261} we fail to do this, we shall spend a lifetime firing away at the fruit of evil and never shaking its foundations. For instance, we can protest forever about the proposed removal of Christian religious instruction and biblical studies from school curricula to make way for a compulsory so-called neutral life-orientation course which will destroy the remnant of Christian influence in the schools. But all our protesting will be in vain if nothing is being done to rebuild the creedal foundations of our faith so that biblical Christianity will be the norm and humanism the aberration, so that biblical law will be at the root of the nation's life and humanism deprived of all nourishment.

Several of us are engaged in such a rebuilding of the foundations and the walls of our godly heritage and we are working to produce a manifesto for Christians in Southern Africa which speaks of God, truth, the created universe, authority, life, the family, work and private ownership, freedom and responsibility, providence and history, man, salvation, society, the Church, governments, education, moral law, protection, charity and justice, stewardship, and confrontation. Here is its statement concerning the family:

We affirm that the family is the basic building block of society as well as of both the civil and church governments. The family is a governing sphere directly under God and does not derive its authority from any earthly institution. It is formed by one man and one woman in a permanent, marital relationship. God has ordained that the family should be fruitful so that the righteous would fill, own and inherit the earth, over which they must exercise dominion under God's Law. The relationship within the family is patterned after the relationship between Christ and the Church. It is therefore the place where every person is best nurtured and developed. It is through the family that God's heritage is passed on to the godly offspring who continue His dominion over the land. God ordained wives to be wise and virtuous helpers and husbands to be the godly covenant-head of the household, representing it in the state and church. He is responsible to humbly and lovingly administer the word and appropriate discipline to all under his protective authority, knowing that he must give an account of his responsibility to God.

This is a foundational statement backed up by Scripture references and a commentary. With a statement like this we are setting the course for a biblical Christian mind that will nurture {262} and promote godly family life that will eventually see the crumbling of the foundations of humanism and which will give substance to our immediate acts against the manifestation of evil.

The Battle for the Family

Having considered the nature of the battle we are in, we must come more particularly to a consideration of the family and God's strategy for it. That strategy is essentially a positive one which has to do with how the family should live. We must look at this in terms of the high and holy pattern given by God in His Word. Clearly, this is the ideal that we must seek to attain.

While acknowledging that there is no perfection in this life, the biblical ideal must remain and we must move in terms of it. Obviously there will be the exceptions but they must remain exceptions and not become the norm or the rule. Here I am thinking of such things as broken marriages and forced single parenthood and mothers who are compelled by dire circumstances—serious illness, death, or the desertion of a husband—to go out and work

while leaving their children in the care of others. This is where the compassionate role of the local church comes in especially through the ministry of its deacons. But such cases must be helped to rebuild toward and in terms of the biblical pattern as soon as possible. They are not to become permanent dependents of the church but living and active members of the body of Christ who in their turn will be able to help others.

The Covenantal Aspect

Family life is a matter which affects everyone from the youngest to the oldest, from infants to grandparents and great-grandparents. None of us can escape the relevance or the responsibility of family life. Even grandparents cannot simply wash their hands and go off into the sunset and say, "we have done our duty." As long as we are in this life, our duties and our responsibilities and our care with regard to our families remains. One of the weapons of the enemy to destroy family life is to lead people to think that family life is essentially what happens at the level of a husband, his wife and their children who are still at home. Certainly that is the core of family life, that is the {263} immediate and functioning family; but a biblical family, a godly family has roots in a godly past and it extends into a godly future.

There is this covenantal aspect of the godly family that does not simply allow young couples to go off and live life according to a different set of rules and a different belief. There is this covenantal aspect of the family that stretches down through the generations from godliness to godliness, from righteousness to righteousness, from small and perhaps poor and struggling beginnings to an accumulation of property and wealth for dedication to the service of the Almighty. There is this covenantal aspect of the family that is careful to pass on instruction in godliness and righteousness through the generations. There is this covenantal aspect of the family by which it is the basic building block, the basic unit of society for the establishment of godly nations, godly civil governments and godly churches. Family life is a covenantal life that is from generation to generation for the purpose of the advancement of God's kingdom in all the earth, hence the Bible's emphasis on the covenant and on the effects of obedience or

disobedience on future generations, hence the attack on the family for the enemy knows that in order to succeed and to establish the kingdom of fallen man the biblical covenantal family must be destroyed.

The Undermining of Family Life

In his subtlety, the enemy can begin that destructive process by leaving people to enter into marriage, to have children and to think that this is what family life is all about. But at the same time he sows the seeds of the dissolution of family life as the basic unit of a stable and God-fearing society by getting parents, Christian parents, to become pleasure oriented and bent on the good-life of fun, laughter, ease and comfort. To achieve this, the responsibility to educate children is given to humanist bureaucratic experts while both parents bring in as much money as they can. In some instances babies and young children are left in the care of servants of another culture or in the care of others whose concern might be money more than the well-being of the children. The income of the mother becomes the price of the child's sale to influences that contradict the religious profession of the home. Moreover, the children's free time is taken up with activities, the content of which is not always known to the parents.

The years pass and the parents and the children have {264} become strangers to each other, especially in matters of faith. Yes, there is still a relationship and perhaps even a great deal of respect from parents to son John who has become a medical doctor after graduating from the university where, unbeknown to them, he indulged in sex-orgies and in satanism and in various protest marches. They are troubled by his avid support for scientific socialism but he is a doctor now and they really are pleased about that. Daughter Mary ran off for a while with some man her parents had not met but she is back on the straight and narrow and has a family of her own. She is working hard too and the maidservant who looks after the baby, Monday to Friday, is very good. Meanwhile, strangers with anti-Christian doctrines have come into the land. Their way has been prepared from within the land for years by university lecturers and liberationists in the pulpit and in the media. John says it is a good thing but Mary is

not so sure. However, it does not worry her too much because she has become quite attached to the nearby church where her baby was dedicated (or was it christened, or baptized? I am not sure) and there she has heard so many comforting sermons from the minister who firmly believes that “the rapture” will take place before and not after the great tribulation. So family life carries on but the covenantal aspect and the faith aspect are no longer in evidence in the majority of families with the effect that the many nations in this geo-political area are on the brink of utter disaster.

Prerequisites for an Effective Strategy

The battle for the family is real. It requires our immediate protest against the invasion of evil in its many forms and it requires the employment of a positive rebuilding of biblical values in terms of what God requires families to be. And what God requires families to be is God’s strategy for the family. That strategy must be put into effect against a background that includes an awareness of the crucial differences between Christianity and humanism particularly in the area of thinking. We need, by the grace of God, the instruction of God’s Word and the work of the Holy Spirit to develop a biblical Christian mind in all our thinking in every area of life. Then there must also be an awareness of the fact that the law of God is applicable in every sphere of life and that it is relevant to the whole of society, to every nation under the sun; and that, in terms of God’s law, all of us, individually and corporately, will know either {265} blessing for obedience or cursing for disobedience.

Furthermore, there must be an awareness of the fact that our calling is to establish the claims of Christ in every area of life and to work for the victory of His Gospel on earth. In the area of family life this will involve biblical marriage, parenthood, responsibility, and dominion work; the establishment of Christian schools and home schools; and the limiting of the state to its God-given role as a minister of justice who will act positively and swiftly to punish the evil-doer according to the specific requirements of God’s law and who will actively protect and seek to promote the well-being of the doer of good, clearing the path for the doing of more good.

God's Strategy for the Family

Very well then, what is God's strategy for the family. What is intended by God, indeed, what is required by God when boy meets girl? Before the fall of Adam, God ordained marriage. Marriage is a creation ordinance of God that came into effect before Adam fell into sin. Sexual matters pre-date the entrance of sin into the world and sexual activity was ordained for expression only within the bonds of marriage between one man and one woman, hence the statement in Genesis 2:24, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." Clearly, God made Adam and Eve not, as someone has said, Adam and Steve, nor, for that matter, Eve and Genevieve.

As the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony in the Book of Common Prayer so clearly puts it:

...holy matrimony...is an honourable estate instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church... [It] is not by any to be...taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, to satisfy men's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts, that have no understanding; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God; duly considering the causes for which matrimony was ordained. First, it was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name. Secondly, it was ordained for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons {266} as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ's body. Thirdly, it was ordained for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity.

Here we may further clarify by saying that it was ordained as the essential starting point for a new family unit as the basic unit of society in which and through which, if it be godly in its faith, practice, and development, the kingdom of God may be advanced to fill the whole earth to the glory of God. That is how God has ordained it. The godly family is the foundational, the major building block in the growth and spread of the Kingdom of God. No wonder, then, that it is the object of attack by every force opposed to the Kingdom of God and zealous for the establishment of the kingdom of fallen man and, ultimately, the kingdom of

Satan. The tactics they employ are not unknown to us but, at times, they are extremely subtle, and unless we are wide awake and filled with spiritual discernment, what might purport to be beneficial to family life will prove to be the very thing that will undermine it. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the field of education and this will become more and more obvious in South Africa.

We have begun with the matter of boy meeting girl and we have to place that vital meeting in the context of God's purposes. Our problem is that today, more often than not, boy meets girl in a context which does not acknowledge the God of the Bible and which has not prepared them for such a meeting. Without regard to God and His revelation, the meeting and what follows simply become the sensual lifestyle of "higher animals." There is no true and biblically informed sense of the purpose of God. This leads to a degraded form of family life which in many instances is no better than temporary and promiscuous living together because the partners in that relationship are lacking in the true and deep and godly conviction of their particular responsibilities and the necessity of commitment to each other.

Therefore we have broken marriages and confused and hardened children. Some are spoilt by material gifts. Others are pitiable waifs who become the victims of perverts. Here is no good ground for the survival of family life and society. But this is once again the negative side and we need to emphasize the positive pattern for the family, God's strategy for the family. And for the meeting of boy and girl to be ordered and meaningful in terms of God's holy requirements, the role of the parents is {267} crucial, so before we can really speak about boy meets girl we must consider what precedes it and that is the existing relationship and role of the parents.

The Man's Role

We shall begin with the man. In the God-given order of things, the man is the head. He is the head of the woman and he is the head of his family. The apostle Paul emphasized that point in a different context, and the principle is foundational. Said he to Timothy (1 Tim. 2:12-13):

"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the

man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.”

That is God's order. Authority is vested in the man and a return to godliness will see the revival of a patriarchal society and the right of voting will be the domain of men and only godly covenant-keeping men, heads of households; one vote per covenanting household to the consternation of all feminists and suffragettes and lovers of that heresy, unbiblical democracy. That it is not so now is simply a witness to the fact that men have abdicated their God-given role and this is reflected first of all in family life.

In the Lord Jesus Christ alone do we have the key to true manhood. He, who came to reverse the effect of Adam's historic and ethical fall into sin, is our Prophet, our Priest, and our King.

As our Prophet, He reveals “to us, by His word and Spirit, the will of God for our salvation.” More than that. As Cornelius Van Til pointed out:

“He is our wisdom not only in the sense that he tells us how to get to heaven. He is our wisdom too in teaching us true knowledge about everything about which we should have knowledge.” (*Apologetics*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1976, 19)

As our Priest, He once offered up “himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God.” And he now makes “continual intercession for us.”

As our King, he subdues “us to himself, in ruling and {268} defending us, and in restraining and conquering all his and our enemies.” The relevance of these three offices of Christ to our consideration of true manhood and the position of the man as the head of his wife and of his family may be seen in this quote from Cornelius Van Til:

Next to noting that man was created in God's image it must be observed that man was organically related to the universe about him. Man was to be prophet, priest, and king under God in this created world. The vicissitudes of the world would to a large extent depend upon the deeds of man. As a prophet man was to interpret this world after God, as a priest he was to dedicate this world to God, and as a king he was to rule over it for God. In opposition to this all non-Christian theories hold that the vicissitudes of man and the universe about him are only accidentally and incidentally related. (*Apologetics*, 15)

Now, fallen man cannot truly fulfill this triple role. Only the man who is redeemed by Christ and regenerated by the Holy Spirit can be truly the man God intended him to be. So, in application to family life we see this:

As a prophet, a man, a husband, a father is to be the one who teaches his wife and his children from the inspired, inerrant, authoritative, written Word of God, by the enabling of the Holy Spirit, the knowledge of God and the will of God in all matters of faith and practice. This will require of him that he be truly Christ's man by repentance, faith and obedience. It requires that he should regularly, preferably daily, personally read and study the Bible and teach its contents to his family in a regular, preferably daily, gathering. It requires that he should consider every subject in terms of God's Word and that he should be able to teach his family to think biblically on every matter under the sun. As a prophet, he bears the responsibility of ensuring that the education of his children is always in line with God's Word and anything contrary to it must be exposed, corrected or forbidden and banned. For that reason while he may indeed delegate the task of educating his children to someone else, he cannot give up the responsibility to ensure that his children are being taught the truth and not falsehood. He must be in the position to hire and fire teachers. If he is not in that position, or cannot be in that position, because of a school system which he cannot quickly change by legal means, then the onus is on him to do all that he can to establish the means to fulfill his God-given {269} responsibility. That would be to promote the freedom of education leading to the setting up of Christian schools and, where possible, home schools.

One of the biggest myths of our age is that the comparatively recent (1819 or so) Prussian born state-control of education is the norm. It is not. God placed the education of children in the hands of parents and to deny them that responsibility is tantamount to the crime of kidnapping for the purpose of entrenching a bureaucratic power state, the religion of humanism, and the kingdom of fallen man. As long as there is this intrusion into family life whereby the children come to be regarded as the children of the state (and this will become more and more so in South Africa) there can be no hope of a godly society. The question: to whom does the child belong? has yet to be answered in South Africa. The educational

war has yet to be fought. Already parents (not necessarily Christian parents) are being heard on local radio phone-in programs expressing their objections to the high-handed manner of state bureaucrats, not only towards children but even towards parents.

As a priest, in the context of his family, a man must, in humble prayer and submission, dedicate his wife and his children to the Almighty triune God, for His rule to be over them and His grace to be with them and His wisdom to guide them.

As a king, in the context of his family, he must rule over his family, under God and in humble submission to God, with love and with the exercise of discipline to root out rebellion and every sinful way in his children, by the proper use of the rod and care to explain his actions from the Word of God so that they will learn submission to God and to lawful authority. In such a way, a healthy, godly society is cultivated.

Up, then, men of God, rise to your calling! You have authority given you by the sovereign Lord of the universe. Be “the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church” (Eph. 5:23). “Love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church...” (Eph. 5:25). And loving your wife includes time out for companionship. There are times when business will have to wait. As for the rugby match and the “night out with the boys,” companionship with your wife takes priority... Without provocation, bring your children up “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord” (Eph. 6:4). As the prophet, the priest, and the king that you are, teach them the Word of God, apply it to everything in life, sanctify them in prayer, and rule your family by God's Word. Furthermore, fulfill your calling to work to subdue the earth for God's glory, provide for your family without {270} debt, protect them, and set a godly example for them to follow. This is your calling under the authority of God. Any denial or abdication of this must lead to anarchy for, says Isaiah:

“As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths” (Isaiah 3:12).

The Woman's Role

What of the woman, the wife, the mother? She must rise to her calling for God has also ordained her vital, indispensable, and unique role. Holy Scripture says that she must submit to her own husband, as unto the Lord (Eph. 5:22). She is governed by the requirements of her husband and her children. She has to see to it that the household is run in such a way that her husband can fulfill his calling. She is the primary teacher of her children and it could be that she will have to be their teacher in a home school situation. There she need not doubt her ability for she is the most wonderful and capable of all human teachers. She has already proved that by accomplishing the most gigantic task that no other teacher can do so well—she has taught her children the mother tongue. With such a qualification behind her, she is surely capable of teaching other subjects too, and there is a great availability of teaching materials for that purpose. As a wife and mother she has a high and holy calling. See how Proverbs 31 describes her:

“Who can find a wife with strength of character? She is far more precious than jewels. The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will never lack profit. She does him good and not harm all the days of her life; she seeks wool and flax, and works with willing hands; she is like the merchant ships: she brings her food from afar. She rises while it is yet night, and gives food to her household, even a portion to her maidens; she considers a field and buys it; with the fruit of her hands she plants a vineyard. She girds her loins with strength, and makes her arms strong.” (That is not a reference to female weight-lifters but to the fact that this virtuous woman will engage in work that will require all her strength.) “She sees that her merchandise is profitable; her lamp does not go out at night; she puts her hands to the distaff; she manipulates the spindle; she opens her {271} palm to the poor and reaches out her hands to the needy. She does not fear the snow for her household, for they are clothed with scarlet; she makes herself coverings, her clothing is fine linen and purple. Known in the gates is her husband, when he sits among the elders of the land. She makes linen garments and sells them, and delivers sashes to the merchants. Strength and dignity clothe her and she laughs at the future. She opens her mouth with wisdom and gentle teaching is on her tongue. She looks well to the ways of her household and eats no bread of idleness. Her children rise up and call her blessed; her husband, too, and he

praises her: 'Many daughters have done nobly, but you transcend them all! Charm is deceitful and beauty is passing, but a woman who reveres the Lord will be praised. Acknowledge the product of her hands; let her works praise her in the gates.' (The New Berkeley Version)

The person described here is far from inferior. Without the fulfillment of her role in the smooth running of the home and much else besides, a godly society is unattainable. She must be the noble prime minister to her king!

The Position of Children

What of the children? God has commanded their obedience. It is plainly stated in the fifth commandment:

"Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Exodus 20:12).

The apostle Paul endorsed this:

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth" (Eph. 6:1-3).

Respect is due from children to their parents and their elders regardless of their shortcomings. It is in the home that the child comes into contact with his first school on his mother's lap. It is in the home that the child comes into contact with his first church, with prayers at the cradle and family devotions led by {272} father. It is in the home that the child becomes familiar with the nature of government in the exercise of discipline, in correction, in rewards, in punishments. It is in the home that children must learn to respect authority and then carry this respect with them and show it to all their elders and also to all that is good in their cultural inheritance. The reward is great. Long life in the land of their inheritance. That marks a society given to godliness and under the blessing of God. But this road to godliness and blessing is denied to us if we relinquish our God-given authority over our children by allowing their formative minds to be influenced by humanistic elements in education and entertainment.

Property and Inheritance

Now, there is a major biblical factor in the strengthening of family life and in the exercise of parental authority and discipline and that is the possession of property and inheritance. God, family and property are inseparably linked. The importance of this link can be measured by the fact that four of the ten commandments protect family and property. The fifth which links the respect due to parents with the possession of the land. The seventh against adultery and therefore against the disruption of the family unit both in its composition and in its united ownership of property. The eighth against theft and the tenth against covetousness, both protecting the family and its property.

Dr. R.J. Rushdoony states most clearly:

“What was the consequence of the biblical Law of inheritance? It meant simply that power was concentrated into the hands of the family. This meant that the authority of the family over its children was a very real one, and an undiminished power. The discipline of the parents over their children was unquestioned, because authority and economic power rested in the family. The Bible is a realistic book. God knows that man respects only authority which has power behind it. When an order is given, that order is futile unless it can be supported by the power to enforce it. If power is transferred from the family to the state, then the ability to give orders and to maintain order is transferred from the family to the state. Educational philosophers begin to speak of “the children of the state,” because parental authority has been transferred to the state... When Jacob became the heir, his father Isaac blessed him and {273} charged him, and said unto him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of ‘Canaan’ (Gen. 28:1). In other words, the father had the power to require a godly marriage; because Isaac was leaving a sizable inheritance, he had a stake in the future, and because he had a stake in that future, he had a right to control it by requiring a godly marriage. This was a legitimate and godly power... where the father possesses private property and provides for his children’s care and future, and controls their inheritance, it is the authority of the father which governs the family.” (Law and Liberty, Craig Press, 1971, 73f)

Karl Marx summarized communist theory in a brief statement: “abolition of private property.” Abolish private property and you

will destroy the family and the hope of a peaceful and ordered life and society will be lost. Anarchy will be followed by the totalitarian enslavement of man by man. By ever increasing taxation, the modern political state is weakening the economic power base of family life and this is becoming a definite threat in South Africa.

Proper Preparation for Marriage

Well, the quotation from Dr. Rushdoony touched on the prospect of marriage so we have come back to where we started in our particular consideration of God's strategy for the family. Boy meets girl. How will a young couple raised in godly family circumstances approach marriage? In God's strategy for the family, the proper functioning of the godly home will ensure that boys are prepared for manhood while girls are prepared for womanhood.

The godly home will ensure that the young man learns that his primary calling is to a life of work and increasing knowledge, faith and wisdom. On finding his prospective wife he will be well prepared to stand the test of her godly parents who will examine his faith and character to see if he is a worthy prophet, priest, and king. That is precisely what his own parents will do when they examine the man who seeks his sister's hand in marriage. The primary calling of the Christian man is to righteous dominion over the earth, under God, in work and knowledge. This must be in evidence before marriage to which he comes well prepared with dowry in hand to give his bride and their offspring a necessary security. That {274} dowry, as Dr. Rushdoony points out:

“...was about three years' wages. The dowry thus represented funds provided by the father of the groom, or by the groom through work, used to further the economic life of the new family... The dowry was thus the father's blessing on his son's marriage, or a test of the young man's character in working for it.” (*Institutes of Biblical Law*, 177)

The bride leaves her godly parents' home well prepared for her submissive role as her husband's helper. She is far from helpless and weak. She is the woman of Proverbs 31, competent, innovative, and responsible, firstly as a helpmeet and secondly as a mother. She knows that she must do all that she can to assist her husband in his calling over which she cannot demand priority. In

such submission she shows her love.

In this way, then, the young man and the young woman come to marriage, not as a mere personal affair but as a working partnership which will affect society for good or ill depending on how it is conducted. Marriage involves the making and keeping of solemn vows to God and to one's spouse. The name of God is solemnly taken and the very foundations of society are at stake. A covenant is made in marriage not only with a person but also with a people and their faith. If it is pursued in godliness, righteousness will be extended over the earth, under God, and the kingdom of God will be advanced on earth.

In terms of this strategy which God has for the family and which is also his strategy for the triumph of His kingdom on earth you will realize how important the battle for the family is and you will see to what a great degree we are failing in this battle. But now it is time to repent and believe and labor in obedience to God's requirements knowing that "greater is he that is in [us], than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4). Much more can be said especially concerning the God-given foundation of family relationships.

The Practical Relevance of the Doctrine of the Trinity

Briefly, and with this I shall conclude, it concerns the doctrine of the Trinity and the practical application of that doctrine firstly in its ontological sense and then in its economical sense.

In its ontological sense, when we consider God as He is {275} in Himself, we see that He is one God and three Persons. He has in Himself the equal ultimacy of the unity and the diversity which is the ground for the equal validity of the unity and the diversity in creation in every area of life. The practical importance of this for the family is simply this: The unity is the marriage. The diversity is found in the marriage partners—the husband and the wife. The unity and the diversity are equally valid. The unity cannot swallow the diversity. The individuality of the husband, the wishes, shall we say, the godly wishes of the husband cannot be denied and, likewise, the wishes of the wife. On the other hand, the diversity cannot disrupt the unity. The unity of the marriage cannot be sacrificed to an overriding individuality of either spouse. The unity and the diversity are equally valid. The same principle applies to

the family where the unity is the family and the diversity is found in parents and children.

Now, if we look at the doctrine of the Trinity in its economical sense we must understand that—although there is no subordination of the substance or being of each person and that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God; one God not three Gods—there is a certain subordination of function or operation of the three persons in the acts of creation, providence, and redemption. For instance, the Son of God declared, “I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me” (John 5:30) and then again the Son spoke of “the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name...” (John 14:26) and again, “the comforter...whom I will send unto you from the Father” (John 15:26). And it seems to me that the extended application of this on the human level is that this is the primary ground of authority and subordination in the family, so that, while each member, husband, wife, son, daughter, has equal value as a precious life in the sight of God, there is the functional authority of the husband and the functional subordination of the wife; the functional authority of the parents and the functional subordination of the children, such authority and subordination being limited by God to remain within the bounds of Holy Scripture.

The doctrine of the Trinity is of key importance in our understanding of the functioning of the family.

Now to the triune God be all glory, honor, and praise.

THE STATE AND THE CHURCH: CONFLICT OR HARMONY?

Owen Fourie

Lecture delivered at CCA Seminar in Cape Town, 5/1/91.

Introduction

How shall we live? As we conclude our study of the structures of society, we have to consider the institutions of state and church. Although the family is the basic unit of society, church and state are the institutions that have filled the pages of the history text books and dominated the headlines of the daily newspapers, the state more than the church in this age of statism; but the church, plagued as it is by wolves in sheep's clothing, is not far behind in the press's popularity stakes.

There is an important biblical word which is basic to the existence of the various institutions of society. It is the word "government." It is a beautiful word which speaks of authority and order. It is found in Isaiah, chapter 9.

"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."

This tells us immediately of the origin and source of government. It begins with God and, with regard to the earth, it rests on the shoulders of our Lord Jesus Christ by whom all government stands or falls. And government is basic to the progress of the kingdom

of God as that kingdom pursues its predestined course to fill the whole earth (Daniel 2:35), breaking in pieces and consuming the kingdoms of humanism (Daniel 2:44).

It is a common error to equate the word “government” with civil government, but civil government is not the only form of government in existence. There is *individual government* operating through personal conscience grounded in the created and ineradicable knowledge of God—the sense of God together {278} with the sense of right and wrong in every human being—that sinners suppress to varying degrees to bow to fallen mores or personal standards or whims and fancies. But in the believer the conscience is convicted by the Holy Spirit and informed and directed by the Word of God.

There is *family government* operating through the parents who hold the *rod* for the discipline of their children. Here too, government is either informed and directed by the Word of God or it falls short of God’s requirement and blessing.

There is *church government* operating in various forms (episcopal, presbyterian, and congregational) but which, ideally, must certainly manifest itself at individual congregational levels through the eldership of a local congregation under the direct Lordship of Christ, the eldership holding the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the Word of God and its faithful interpretation and the application of the Law of God in a process of governmental and disciplinary binding and loosing described in Matthew 16, verse 19.

Then there is *civil government* operating within biblically defined bounds through the ruler-magistrate who holds the *sword* by which the transgressors of God’s Law are restrained and punished for the protection and blessing of the law-abiding and the advancement of godliness.

We note then that there are various *spheres* of government that are all subject to God’s Word and limited in their action to their own spheres of authority, yet they are cooperating spheres for the proper functioning of life on earth as God has ordered it for the establishment of His kingdom and for His glory. This point, that they are cooperating spheres, is surely seen in the fact that the family is the basic unit of society with far-reaching effect on the well-being of society. This is emphasized in the qualifications of

elders described in 1 Timothy, chapter 3:

“A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, hab-ing his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach {279} and the snare of the devil.”

And I do believe that although these qualifications are stated with specific regard to the Church, they are surely given by God for guidelines in the matter of the appointment of leaders and elders in all of life, including civil government. The family, its godliness, its care of the education of its children, are basic to the good order of the other governing spheres of society and the leading of “a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty” which is “good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour.” (1 Timothy 2:2–3)

Beginning With God

Again, in order to understand our subject, “The State and the Church: Conflict or Harmony?” we must employ the principle of beginning with God. Repetition of points made in earlier papers is unavoidable because of the inter-relationship of what we are considering, but there is no harm in that. It simply serves to emphasize the importance of what we are saying.

Now, for our purposes in this lecture, and because of the confusion which exists amongst many in this subject, the state will receive greater attention. Nevertheless, the basic principles that apply to civil government find application in the other governing spheres.

Let us, then, consider *the true foundations of government*—civil government—and here Deuteronomy 17:14–20 speaks volumes:

“When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me;

thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.”

(Name the odd man out: Jan van Riebeeck, Andries Pretorius, Paul Kruger, and Nelson Mandela.)

“...thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother. But he shall not multiply horses to himself, {280} nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, ye shall henceforth return no more that way. Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold. And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites. And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them: that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left: to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he, and his children, in the midst of Israel.”

Many lessons can be drawn from this passage. In summary they are these:

1. God in Christ is the ruler of the nations and it is He who appoints their land and their boundaries both geographically and historically. (v. 14a).
2. Israel was the foundational covenant-keeping nation through which the redemptive purpose of God was worked out until the first coming of Christ. (v. 14a)
3. By the preaching of the Gospel and the work of the Holy Spirit many Gentile nations have been turned to truth and righteousness to become, historically, covenant-keeping nations. (v. 14a)
4. A nation, in biblical terms, is a people of one God, one faith, one covenant, one language, and one blood (and possibly assimilated, but covenant-obedient, blood) contrary to the modern humanistic and political concept of a nation that produces racial conflict by placing disparate ethno-linguistic

groups under one umbrella in defiance of God-given diversity. (v. 14a)

5. A nation will have a form of government which it will model either on a corruption of true government or on the Law of God. (vv. 14b–15a){281}

6. God, acting as the first cause, is the one who elects a nation's ruler. (v. 15a)

7. A covenant-keeping nation, acting as an epistemologically self-conscious second cause will choose a godly ruler from amongst its own people and not a stranger. (v. 15)

8. A covenant-breaking nation, acting as a valid second cause, will rebelliously choose an evil ruler, yet God, as the first cause, orders it thus for judgment and cursing upon disobedience. (v. 15)

9. The ruler of a nation, having his appointment first and foremost from God, is duty-bound to observe the following order:

a. He will not misuse his position of authority to enrich himself. (v. 16a)

b. He will not reverse the covenant commitment of the nation and seek his gain thereby. (v. 16b)

c. He will ensure the nation's continuance in the way of covenant obedience to God and will act against any turning away from that covenant. (v. 16c)

d. He will not enter into covenant with ungodly rulers and ungodly nations. (v. 17a)

e. He will not enrich himself by undue taxation. (v. 17b)

f. And here is the core of the true foundation of government (vv. 18–20):

1. In the very exercise of his office, the ruler will make it his business to study and know precisely the content and application of the Law of God to his particular circumstances. (v. 18)

2. He will not formulate his own independent set of laws but will have only the laws which accord with the laws of God. (v. 18)

3. He will therefore, for the duration of his rule, and, indeed, his life, fear God and be diligent in constantly reading, keeping and doing the Law of God. (v. 19)

4. By this means he will know his place under the authority of God in humility and not pride, in obedience and blessing, not disobedience and cursing. (v. 20)

Of vital importance in our understanding of this true foundation of government is that the source of the ruler's {282} authority is God, and that the direction and standard of the ruler's authority is the Law of God, and that the ruler's accountability is to God and, by implication from this passage in Deuteronomy, we must add that it is the responsibility of his subjects, particularly the lesser magistrates and elders, to hold him to this standard or be cursed with him for disobedience.

Now, the foundations of government obviously run contrary to all that is laid down for good government in Deuteronomy 17 and it is in I Samuel, chapter 8, that we see a remarkable declaration of the false foundations of government which accurately describes precisely what we find today in the varying degrees of humanistic state control. It was not out of keeping with the Law of God for the people of Israel to ask for a king, as we have seen that there is provision for this in Deuteronomy 17, but what is wrong here is their reason in asking for a king. The latter part of verse 7 of 1 Samuel 8 reveals the matter. God says to Samuel: "they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." Verses 5 and 20 make it clear that they desired to be like other nations:

"...make us a king to judge us like all the nations... that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles."

In other words, their quest was not for God's law-order but for a humanistic law-order. And so, Samuel proceeds to describe the kind of king that will reign over such a rebellious people. Truly, the character of a nation is reflected in its ruler and for rebellion on Israel's part there would be tyranny in the ruler and slavery for them. Here is Samuel's description of what such a ruler would do:

"This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you. He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And

he will take your daughters to be confectioneries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your olive yards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your {283} seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your men servants, and your maidservants, and your godliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day.” (1 Sam. 8:11–18)

What is clear here is that contrary to the requirements of Deuteronomy 17, the ruler is bent on his own power and wealth, and he regards himself as the source of his authority; not only its source but also its direction and standard with the consequent loss of any appeal to God in the day of reckoning. Humanism begins with man, looks to man for salvation, and, finding no salvation, it reaps the judgment of God.

As we have noted, Samuel’s description of the king accurately describes our day which is one of humanism and statism in which man, not God, is regarded as the source of sovereignty and salvation, which means the growth of state-control in one area of life after another for the enslavement of the whole of society. In this way, life is centralized in the modern political state which is the preparatory phase for the one world government of the globalists in the so-called New Age. The current moves towards the privatization of various spheres are seemingly more in keeping with the requirements of God’s Word, but these are a drop in the ocean of the massive structures of bureaucracy which continue to hog-tie and bind every sphere of life, making the cry of privatization “as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.” Furthermore, privatization if placed in libertarian hands without reference to God’s Word will ultimately end in new forms of bureaucratic control.

Christian Surrender of Responsibility

There is another falsehood which must be dispelled. It is a pernicious twisting of a particular statement by our Lord Jesus Christ which receives the support of many sincere Christian people who have swallowed the humanistic bait. Matthew, Mark

and Luke record the occasion when certain lackeys of the chief priests and scribes asked Jesus (Luke 20:22 f):

“Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesar, or no? {284} But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, why tempt ye me? Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Caesar’s. And he said unto them, render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s and unto God the things which be God’s.”

This saying has been taken to mean that the state (Caesar) has its realm and God has His realm. For many, God’s realm is regarded as being the Church while part, if not all, of the rest outside of the Church is the domain of the state, and some would even posit a large degree of *neutrality* which I shall explain in a moment.

What is the correct understanding of “Render...unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s and unto God the things which be God’s”? Simply this. Biblically, the state is not even so much as a property owner. It is an office, a function, a minister of God exercising justice. It is a servant of God deserving due honour in the maintenance of God’s law and order and entitled to the taxes necessary for that function. “Render...unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s...” And God? He is Lord over all. “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof...” (Psalm 24:1). He is Lord over all the institutions He has ordained, even the state. Therefore the family, the school, the church, Caesar—the state—must render to God “the things which be God’s,” namely, due acknowledgement of His sovereign rule, authority and claims, and due obedience to His laws, the point being that God’s Word speaks to all of life even in those areas that Caesar would either falsely claim to fall within his jurisdiction or falsely declare to be neutral. It is therefore a blasphemous act for Christians to surrender their God-given responsibilities in the various areas of life in deference to the false claims of the state. Clearly, the text does not say, “Render therefore unto the sovereign, unlimited lordship of Caesar all things temporal except the Church and its eternal concerns which render to God.”

The extension of this falsehood is the belief in neutrality. Dr. Joseph C. Morecraft III wrote as follows in an essay entitled, “The Counterproductivity of Not Linking Christianity and Politics.”

Before Christians today can hope to make any contribution to the solution of the social and political ills afflicting our nation this is an imperative: they must dispose of the humanist myth of the neutrality of politics {285} so far as religion is concerned. What is religious neutrality in politics? Hebden Taylor answers, "According to this neutrality principle Christians may participate in the political process only as citizens but never as believers....[To advocate] that Christians must abide by the prevailing doctrine of neutrality which seeks to exclude religion from politics and [to suggest] that Christians should restrict their religion to the field of personal relationships, [is to]..fall..right into the secular liberal humanist trap which tried to place religion alongside man's other activities and interests, whether these be academic, social, economic, political, or artistic. This modern idea of 'religion' is one which the secular apostate world around us today loves to have Christians accept. Secular humanists have no objection to our Christian faith at all, provided we reserve it strictly for ourselves in the privacy of our homes and church buildings, and just so long as we do not try to live up to our Christian principles in our business and public lives. On no account must the Spirit and Word of the Lord Jesus Christ be allowed to enter the ballot booth or the market place where the real decisions of modern life are made, nor must religion interfere with such vital matters as education, politics, labor relations, profits and wages. These activities are all supposed to be 'neutral' and they can therefore be withdrawn from *sectarian influences* so that the *secular* spirit of the community may prevail. This is the spirit of reason, science and pure technique of the practical pragmatist. For him truth is only what works out in practice and for whom the God of the Bible is thought to be the projection of the father image or at least a being concocted out of man's image of himself or of the society in which he lives." Bernard Zylstra has well spoken... "Neutralism is the view that man can live wholly or partly without taking God's Word into account. Those who pay homage to the fiction of neutrality maintain that many segments of modern culture are merely technical. It is then thought that a corporation, a union, a school, a government can be run by making exclusively factual, technical decisions which have no relation to one's ultimate perspective on the basic issues... This 'technicism' is the result of a pragmatic philosophy..." Joe Morecraft concludes, "Since religious neutrality is a myth, those who profess to be such, have, in fact, laid aside their Christian presuppositions and have [unintentionally perhaps] taken up another religion.

The humanists will not lay down their presuppositions, goals, and objectives. And when the Christian does so, he falls into the humanists' well-laid trap. He, in reality, joins the humanist {286} in striving for his goals and objectives. He adopts, in the political arena, the humanist's presupposition, which is the belief that man-in-community can solve his problems without reference to God or to His written revelation....Religious neutrality in politics, then, is a subversive, revolutionary, and anti-Christian principle!"

Strong words, but true. Since God's Word applies to all of life there is no escape from the political implications of true preaching. Inevitably, theology cannot be divorced from politics but the relationship must be one of theology giving a godly and a righteous foundation to politics. The idea of separating theology and Christianity from politics in acceptance of the myth of neutrality and thus leaving the field of politics wide open to humanism, which is a religion, and to revolutionary liberation theology for these agents of Satan to take over and dictate the politics of how we shall be governed and how we shall live, must be given the burial it deserves. It is that concept that has landed us in the mess we are in.

Correct Biblical Perspective

It is very necessary, then, for us to come to a correct biblical perspective in these matters.

The issue is, *Who is Lord?* Christ or Caesar? Not, Church or state. Scripture leaves us in no doubt.

"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..." (Psalm 2:10-12)

"By me kings reign, and princes decree justice." (Proverbs 8:15)

"For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us." (Isaiah 33:22)

"..Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever; for wisdom and might are his. And he changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings, and setteth up {287} kings..." (Daniel 2:20, 21)

"For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that

are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him.” (Colossians 1:16)

“...Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince (or ruler) of the kings of the earth...” (Revelation 1:5)

God in Christ is Lord over all, Lord over both Church and state. Christ is Lord, not the state nor the Church.

Then, what is the state? What is its function? What is its jurisdiction? Romans 13:1–6 gives us the answers:

“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. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.”

Here we learn:

1. That the authority of the state is ordained by God. (v. 1b)
2. That to be subject to the state is the requirement of God. (vv. 1a & 5)
3. That to resist the state in the exercise of its God-given authority is to resist what God has ordained. (v. 2a)
4. That such resistance to authority will meet with judgment and punishment. (v. 2b)
5. That only they who do evil will receive such punishment, for the state is not a terror to good works which will {288} be praised. (v. 3)
6. That the state is a servant of God for the good of the obedient and for the punishment of the evildoer. (v. 4)

7. That the state is to be supported in this function by the taxes due to it. (v. 6)

But there is more, for if we simply leave it here, we are guilty of a superficial dealing with God's Word which will place us in the same dilemma that so many good Christian citizens are in already by their failure to see the limitations on the state in this passage. Let me explain. The key to our proper understanding of the passage is in the words, "*good*" and "*evil*." Who defines what "*good*" is and what "*evil*" is? If it is the civil government, then there can be no doubt that the state has a passport to limitless authority and Christians are bound to obey the civil government in whatever it decrees. So if a humanistic civil government rules that all children shall be educated in state-approved schools by state-approved teachers using state-designed curricula with humanistic content, that is its good and resistance is evil. But if it is God who defines good and evil, then both Christians and the state are bound to obey God in all things. Verse one of Romans 13 plainly teaches that there is no authority except from God and, since that is so, it is God who establishes the rules and defines good and evil and, in terms of verse four, the state, as a minister, a servant, of God, cannot make its own laws. The state's authority is ministerial and not legislative. The state has to abide by and act in accordance with the definition of good and evil as given by God. This places a limit upon the state. Not only is the state only a minister of justice and not a minister of education, nor a minister of social welfare, nor a minister of health, nor a minister of transport, nor a minister of economics, and so on, but in the exercise of its God-ordained ministry of justice it is restricted to act only in terms of what God has defined to be good and evil in His Word, and evil doers (breakers of God's laws) are to be punished, while doers of good (keepers of God's laws) are to be praised and protected to live and function in godliness and righteousness.

"But what happens when civil government is in rebellion against God?" Tom Parent in his excellent essay on "Christian Resistance" included as an appendix in the Legal Manual of Christian Liberty Academy Satellite Schools asks this question and continues: {289}

What happens when (civil government) takes the law into its own hands and seeks to act in place of God? Are Christians required

to obey such a government? This was the question facing the Christians at the time of the apostles. The Roman government demanded the worship of Caesar as a sign of loyalty to the Roman state. A citizen of that day could believe in whatever he wished as long as he demonstrated this supreme allegiance. The emperor was considered the highest authority on earth and, therefore, divine. For Rome to rule the world, her authority had to be accepted above all other authority. Anyone who refused to worship the emperor was challenging this authority and considered an enemy of the state. Consequently, in the eyes of Rome, such a person was guilty of treason and subject to the death penalty. Christians were the most law abiding citizens of the Roman Empire. They paid their taxes and obeyed the laws. But to worship Caesar meant recognizing his authority as being higher than God's. The Christians saw this as a violation of Romans 13:1: "For there is no authority except from God." ...But the Roman government maintained: 'For there is no authority except from Caesar.' The Christians refused to accept this and, as a result, were considered by Rome to be in rebellion against the state. The Book of Acts bears this out: "These men who have upset the world have come here also...and they all act contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, Jesus" (Acts 17:6-7). The Roman government did not care that Christians worshipped Jesus. They objected to Christians putting Christ above Caesar. For this reason Christians were thrown to the lions."

We must also consider the Church in respect of its function and jurisdiction. Peter's inspired statement, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," is the confession of faith upon which our Lord Jesus Christ builds His Church as we are taught in Matthew 16:

Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. (Matt. 16:18, 19)

So the Church exists by the authority of the Lord who is {290} the author of its faith and its preserver who requires its faithful interpretation and application of His word to all of life, its faithful administration of the signs and seals of the covenant of grace, baptism and the Lord's supper, and the faithful discipline of its members in terms of His word. The church has been commissioned

by its Lord to:

Go... 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 alway, even unto the end of the world (Matt. 28:19, 20).

The Church's function is therefore that of a minister of grace through the preaching of the gospel by which God's people are awakened out of sin to serve Him as the salt of the earth and the light of the world in the application of His Word to whatever spheres they are called and gifted to serve in in order to assert the Crown Rights of King Jesus in all areas of life and to facilitate the advancement of His Kingdom of Grace in all the earth. Through the faithful preaching of God's Word it must also exercise a ministry of admonition to warn sinners not only as individuals but also in their corporate institutions (1 Cor. 10:11), family, church, state and so on, to heed the Word of God and to turn from error in thinking and practice. By the specific statement of Christ in Matthew 16:19 concerning the keys and binding and loosing, the Church does have the authority to shut that Kingdom against the impenitent and to open it to penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel. The Church is not a minister of justice, and, in its shutting of the kingdom against the impenitent, it can excommunicate, but it cannot exercise capital punishment or take any other action which belongs to the state as a minister of justice. Churches can and have erred by falling into heresy and apostasy and by failing to function in terms of God's Word. Such churches are under obligation to repent of their errors before God or suffer the just judgment of the Almighty. Churches that harbor criminals in defiance of the Law of God can have no protection from the biblical action of the state as God's minister of justice and, indeed, they come under the wrath of God through the state.

What shall we say, then, concerning the relationship between the state and the Church? What can we expect? *Conflict or Harmony?* In the light of what we have learned today, this much is clear concerning the situation in South Africa. The real {291} issue, the real battle, was not the previously intense conflict of government apartheid policy versus liberal churchmen, nor is the present liberal government versus raging liberation theologians who will

not rest until they see the materialization of the end-product of their Marxist ideals, while evangelicals withdraw into their practically ineffective churches. The real battle will take place where biblical Christianity applies and practices God's Word in every area of life under the banner of CHRIST IS LORD as opposed to the state's claims of Lordship. So the true and existing conflict that really matters is the conflict between biblical Christianity and the Humanistic state in which the South African government is entrenched by its commitment to Internationalism and the breaking down of Christian nationalism. Harmony between church and state will be found only when biblical Christianity is operative in those God-ordained institutions.

Practical Aspects

It remains now to consider some practical aspects.

Firstly, we have to acknowledge the sovereignty of God and that even *in a humanistic situation*, such as we find ourselves in today, there are *certain God-given structures that must be preserved* and not destroyed, as *they* would do who incite many to *ungodly* revolution. In all our practical application of God's Word we must promote the well-being and the good order of the existing structures of family, school, church and state while leading these institutions, as God enables us, to biblical perspectives and obedience to the Law of God.

Secondly, we have already considered the matter of Christianity and politics and it will suffice to say here that *Christian political involvement* is required by God in terms of the cultural mandate and the Great Commission.

Thirdly, we have also considered the functions and jurisdictions of state and church and in all our practical application of God's Word we must seek to bring these institutions to a correct and proper functioning within their *God-ordained limits*.

Fourthly, the guiding biblical principle of obedience is Acts 5:29, "we ought to *obey God rather than men*." Francis Schaeffer in his work *A Christian Manifesto* put it succinctly:

While we must always be subject to the *office* of the magistrate, we are not to be subject to the *man in* that {292} office who commands that which is contrary to the Bible.

We speak then of the obedience of Christians who seek not to destroy the God-given structures and authority in society but who, following God's directions for these structures, seek to obey God rather than the disobedient men who fail to promote God's Word in their appointed office. For example, Christian obedience will involve parents who will deny the claims of the state in the matter of education and who will take on the responsibility and the consequences of schooling their children.

Fifthly, from the sixteenth century through to the eighteenth century much of Europe was subject to the false doctrine of the Divine Right of kings. It was advocated that since the king reigned by God's appointment, his word was law. In 1644 Samuel Rutherford wrote "Lex Rex" which means "the Law is King." He taught that all men, even the king, were under the Law of God, not above it. In accordance with Romans 13 he taught that civil government was indeed ordained by God but it had to be administered with due regard to God's Law. In view of this, any acts of civil authority that contradicted Divine Law were, in fact, illegal and lacking in God's approval and certainly were not to be obeyed but resisted instead. Failure to resist the tyranny of the king was to resist God. The ruler was given power conditionally, and if he did not meet those conditions, his subjects were duty bound to withdraw their allegiance. They were under a moral obligation to resist the tyrannical ruler. Their resistance was to the disobedient man in the office not to the office and its authority. For a single breach of contract the ruler could not be dismissed. Resistance was justified only when it was clear that the governing structures of the country were being destroyed through the ruler's disobedience to God's laws. The resistance of the citizenry was not a matter of their taking the law into their own hands. With the biblical example of David in mind, Rutherford considered the nature of resistance individually and corporately and concluded that the biblical order was firstly a legal approach, failing which there could be flight, and only then could force be used. For duly constituted corporate bodies flight was not an option. Concerning the use of force, Rutherford drew a clear distinction between lawless uprising and lawful resistance conducted under the protection of lesser magistrates as a duly constituted authority. Under them the use {293} of force was not allowed to degenerate

into mob violence. The point was that either a people passively cooperated in their own enslavement to tyranny or they stood firm in the faith to restore godly law and order.

As far as the invoking of the doctrine of the lesser magistrate in South Africa is concerned it needs to be asked, can the latest actions of civil government be regarded as tyranny? If so, are the people properly prepared theologically, spiritually and in every way to act under lesser magistrates in terms of God's Word? I believe that the answer to the latter question is that they are not, and, furthermore, the invoking of the doctrine of the lesser magistrate requires proper nationhood, a nation being one people, of one blood and one language, with one God, one covenant, one law and one faith.

Sixthly, South Africa is not one nation, but many, and in our application of God's Word to all of life, we shall have to reckon with the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity and its practical application in terms of the equal validity of the unity and the diversity in every sphere of life reflecting the equal ultimacy of the unity (one God) and the diversity (three persons) in the Godhead. Now that is a mouthful but it does receive brief treatment in a book entitled, *The New South Africa: the Biblical Prescription*, obtainable from Gospel Defence League. The upshot of this biblical thinking is that the solution to South Africa's problems does not lie in the much vaunted single democratic unitary state but in the natural and biblically-required partitioning of the many ethno-linguistic groups to live ultimately as good neighbours in a commonwealth of separate Christian nations.

Seventhly, let us give the *heresy of democracy* the burial it deserves. It is not a biblical concept and it is not the way of blessing. Democracy is humanistic to the core. The word means rule by the people, inevitably, a sinful people not subject to God's Law. Sovereignty resides not in the people but in God.

Eighthly, the form of government that we need to advocate as we apply the Word of God to all of life is *Biblical Federal Republicanism*, a decentralized representative civil government under God and God's Law and functioning on the basis of covenants between God, the covenanted families of a nation and their chosen human representatives. Mark Kreitzer has produced a brilliant paper on this subject which, at this stage, is possibly

a rough draft. I consider him to be the foremost scholar on this subject in South Africa and what he has to say about this matter deserves careful attention. {294}

Conclusion

So to conclude, in South Africa we are a far cry from where we should be in terms of scripture. We are heading rapidly along the wrong road of humanism. Given a referendum, Christians need to use that opportunity to call a halt to the downgrade despite threats of disastrous consequences for standing in the way of the progress of the unbiblical democratic unitary state. Greater disaster will overtake us if the present course continues. It will end in greater humanistic and statist control. However, the cure will not be a return to the old state but rather to provide and promote the correct application of biblical civil government, that is, limited government and godly freedom. Christians, awake! or a generation will pass in desolation and ruin. Conquer the land for Christ and His truth by the application of the Word of God to every area of life, by the sword of the Spirit, the holy scriptures, or perish in the wilderness of humanism until God raises a faithful and obedient people who will conquer.

In 1897, Dr. Abraham Kuyper said, and with this I close:

One desire has been the ruling passion of my life. One high motive has acted like a spur upon my mind and soul. And sooner than that I should seek escape from the sacred necessity that is laid upon me, let the breath of life fail me. It is this: that in spite of all worldly opposition, God's holy ordinances shall be established again in the home, in the school and in the state for the good of the people; to carve, as it were, into the conscience of the nation, the ordinances of the Lord, to which Bible and Creation bear witness, until the nation pays homage again to God."

JUBILEE AND THE FRESH START

A Comparative Analysis of Insolvency under Levitical Law and the U.S. Bankruptcy Code

Sheldon H. Rich

Introduction

Insolvency is both an ancient and a modern problem. The peasant farmer of the Israelite amphictyony and the over extended American credit card holder have often shared essentially the same economic dilemma; having liabilities in excess of assets coupled with the inability to meet debts which have fallen due. Although separated by almost 3,500 years, both societies are linked by the phenomenon of insolvency and the institution of law. The options available to the debtor and creditor have always been primarily a matter of law. In ancient Israel, the treatment of insolvent debtors was defined by a system of law which was revealed directly by God to Moses and subsequently refined by generations of priests, scribes and prophets. In America the law of insolvency derived from English common law and has developed into a complex statutory scheme of state and federal legislation. Anglo-American law, like most western legal systems, is of course a lineal descendent of the Levitical law. It is therefore no surprise that our present body of law is infused with Judeo-Christian values. To what extent can we discern those common values with regard to the law of insolvency? This paper will examine the evolution of Jewish law regarding insolvency and contrast it with the center piece of American insolvency law, the United States Bankruptcy Code.

The purpose of this paper is not to simply present an exhaustive legal analysis of insolvency. The aim is to use the law as a context

for understanding God's intentions for the problem of insolvency, and the relationship between debtor, creditor and the state; what are the underlying principles revealed in Scripture and to what degree are those principles reflected in current law? {296}

1. Levitical Law and Insolvency

The Law of God, presented in the first five books of the Bible, represents a diverse legislative code which was developed during a period of transformation among the Hebrew people. The Decalogue (Ex. 20:2–17 and Deut. 5:6–21) is given to Moses while the nation of Israel is still a confederation of nomadic tribes in the Sinai. The Code of the Covenant (Ex. 20:22–23:33) is like wise given before the Israelites take full possession of Canaan. However we also see in the Pentateuch a body of law indicating a transition from nomadic culture to a settled agrarian peasantry.¹

Insolvency During the Amphictyony

It is perhaps during this period of the amphictyony, or pre-monarchy, that the provisions and context of Levitical law concerning insolvency is most understandable. Land was allotted to families through the tribal/clan structure and the Israelite economy is geared toward crops, vineyards and herds. Archaeological evidence from this period indicates that there was a relative equality of income.² In a primarily subsistence peasant economy the need for credit was limited, but crucial. As long as the rains came and the soil remained fertile, the Israelite peasant prospered. However these cycles were inevitably interrupted by drought, famine, war or pestilence. During these periods of upheaval the peasant farmer had two objectives; keeping himself and his family alive until the next harvest and replacing capital stock (land, seed, animals, etc.) that had been a casualty loss. Recapitalization for these losses usually required credit.

1. Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (New York), 143.

2. *Ibid.*, 72–73.

The Tithe and Gleaning Rights

With regard to the first concern, the distressed farmer could rely on those laws which made provision for the sustenance of all persons in financial need. First there was the institution of {297} the tithe (Lev. 14:22–27). All Israelites were to set aside one tenth of their annual production for a feast of thanksgiving. However, every third year the tithe was to be collected for the benefit of the Levites (who had no allotments of land), the fatherless, and the widows (Lev. 14:28). The poor also had the right to glean in the fields and vineyards of any Israelite, and the prosperous farmer was enjoined to make sure that there was something remaining for the gleaners (Deut. 24:19–22). This right was preserved even during the Sabbath year, when the land was to lie fallow and the owner had to feed his own family with the voluntary yield (Lev. 25:1–7).

It is important to note that these provisions were more than obligatory charity, these were essential legal rights:

“There is no word in the Hebrew vocabulary for “charity” in the modern sense. The word used is *Tzedakah*, which literally means “righteousness.” *Tzedakah* is not an act of condescension from one person to another who is a lower social and economic status. *Tzedakah* is a fulfillment of an obligation to a fellow human being with equal status before God. It is an act of justice to which the recipient is entitled by right, by virtue of being human.”³

Credit and Lending Law

With the rights of gleaning and the tithe, one could sustain a basic existence until the next season. Replacement of the capital stock needed to start over, however, was a more complicated matter. The financial options open to the distressed peasant were to sell land, personal property, or in extreme cases, one’s children (see Ex. 21:7–11) or to seek credit. It is the latter option which seems to be preferred in the Law, although the restrictions on the giving and receiving of credit were fairly strict.

On one hand, it is clear that God intended for credit to be

3. Richard Hirsch, “There Shall Be No Poor,” *Judaism and Human Rights* (New York, 1972), 238–39.

freely given whenever necessary; “If there is a poor man among the brothers in any of the towns of the land that the Lord God is giving you, do not be hardhearted or tight fisted toward the poor brother. Rather be openhanded and freely lend him whatever he needs” (Deut. 15:7–8). Rabbinical scholars have [298] interpreted this passage to mean “...that if a man did not have sufficient funds to marry, the community should assume responsibility for providing him the means to support a wife.”⁴ Maimonides, in his “eight degrees of charity” held the highest form to be that which enabled a person to become self-sufficient.⁵

While credit was to be freely accessible, the terms of repayment were carefully prescribed. Loans to the financially distressed were to be interest free; “If one of your countryman becomes poor and is unable to support himself, help him ... so he can continue to live among you. Do not take interest of any kind from him, but fear your God, so that your countryman may continue to live among you. You must not lend him food at profit” (Lev. 25:35–37). Security for loans was also restricted. If a creditor took a man’s cloak as a pledge, it was to be returned each night in case he needed it. (Deut. 24:13). Nor was any personal property allowed as security which the debtor needed for his livelihood (Deut. 24:6). In the event of default on such a loan, the creditor was prohibited from entering into the debtor’s home to seize collateral. Instead, he was to wait outside so that the debtor would not be embarrassed (Deut. 24:10–11). As we will see later, Jewish law began to create separate provisions for commercial loans as economic conditions became more sophisticated, but the clear intent of the Law was that no one was to gain by providing credit to the poor and that basic human dignity was to be respected.

Shemmitah and Jubilee

The capstone of Jewish insolvency law were the institutions of the Sabbath year (*shemmitah*) and the Jubilee year (*Yovel*). The former occurred every seven years, and provided for a general discharge of all indebtedness within Israel. The latter occurred every fifty years and included with the general discharge a nation

4. *Ibid*, 242.

5. *Ibid*, 243.

wide release of slaves and a return of land which had been previously sold or taken as security on defaulted loans. These two provisions were extremely important for insolvent debtors, not only for the general discharge of debts, but because of the recovery of human capital (freedom) and physical capital (land). {299} In an agrarian society, land is the asset that is desired above all others. The patrimony of land which was the birthright of each Israelite (other than the Levites) was highly prized and jealously protected in the Law. It was an institution unique in the Semitic world. Jezebel, a Phoenician princess, could not understand the intransigence of Naboth in holding on to his family property nor the Law which prevented Ahab, the king, from simply seizing it (1 Kings 21:7). To put land up as security on a loan was considered a drastic step. To default and lose it was a disaster.

The law of Jubilee made clear that even if land were taken as a defaulted security, or sold outright, the transaction was more in the nature of a long term lease; eventually the land was to come back to the debtor. "If you sell land to one of your countryman or buy from him, do not take advantage of each other. You are to buy from your countryman on the basis of the number of years since the Jubilee. And he is to sell to you on the basis of the number of years left for harvesting crops. When the years are many, you are to increase the price, because what he is really selling is the number of crops" (Lev. 25:14–16). Even if a secured borrower defaulted on a loan, the Law provided his family with a right of first redemption on the property, to prevent the loss of patrimonial land (Lev. 25:25). Jubilee, however, was the ultimate safeguard; whether land was sold to repay debts, to recapitalize, or seized as security in default, the debtor had hope of eventually recovering his patrimony.

Slavery and Insolvency

The law of *shemmitah* and Jubilee were also of significance to the debtor because of their relationship to the institution of slavery. Levitical law recognized several categories of slaves. These included prisoners of war (Judges 5:30, Dent. 21:10–14), or foreign born purchased for money (Lev. 25:44–45, Ex. 12:44). The law of Jubilee did not apply to these slaves. They could be kept for life

and passed on as an inheritance. (Lev. 25:44–45).

Israelite slaves were in a distinctly different category than all others. Although the Hebrew word *'ebad* was most frequently associated with the word “slave” in Old Testament writings (its root means “to work” or “serve”) it in fact designated several categories of laborers. Leviticus 25:39–40 indicates that an Israelite who is reduced to slavery must not serve as a slave (*'ebad*), but as a *sakir*, or “hired {300} man.”⁶ No Israelite could be permanently enslaved unless he or she did so on a voluntary basis. (Ex 21:5–6). The law of Jubilee applied explicitly and solely to Israelite slaves, and the reason for it related directly to the issues of debt and insolvency; “The only reason why an Israelite was ever reduced to slavery was his own, or a relative’s, poverty. Usually, if not always, they were defaulting debtors, or persons given as security for the repayment of debt.”⁷ The Law permitted a Hebrew to sell himself or his children for a term of service as a recourse for bad debt. (Lev. 15:12, Ex. 22:7). However, it was for a limited term of service, generally no more than seven years (Deut. 15:12). As noted above, these Israelite indentured workers were to be given preferential treatment over other slaves. They were to be treated as day laborers, and were not required to do jobs considered degrading, such as milling and bathing the master’s feet. (Judges 16:21, 1 Sam. 25:41). These workers could not be resold, and at the end of their term of service, they were to be generously resupplied by their master in order to start over. (Lev. 15:13–15).

In addition to the general release of Jubilee, the Law provided for an indentured slave to be redeemed by any member of his or her family. The *go'el*, or “redeemer” would negotiate a redemption price based upon the wage rate paid to hired men and calculated on the number of years remaining until the next Jubilee (Lev. 25:47–53).

2. Insolvency Law in the Post-Amphictyony

From the testimony of the later prophets, and from the evidence of archaeology, it is clear the insolvency provisions of the Levitical

6. J. M. P. Van Der Ploeg, “Slavery in the Old Testament,” *Supplements to Vestus Testamentum* (Leiden, 1972), 81.

7. de Vaux, 83.

law were less than successful in preventing a wide disparity of income from developing within Israelite society. Excavations show that between the 10th and 8th century BC dwellings went from being relatively uniform in size to large and small homes, indicating inequality of income.⁸ Amos decries the creation of a new class of rich who maintain their wealth at the expense of the poor (Amos 2:7, 4:1, 8:4). They have perverted {301} the very laws which were created to protect the poor (Amos 5:11–12). The prophetic writers indicate that the neglect and oppression of the poor were linked to the political disintegration of the kingdoms and eventual exile.⁹

Although Scripture does not give a clear indication that all of the insolvency provisions were ever consistently followed, particularly *shemmitah* and Jubilee, the rabbinical scholars of the Inter-Testamental period incorporated them by reference into the body of oral law (Mishna) which was being developed. By this time Israelite society had become more complex, and rabbinical lawyers were evaluating credit and insolvency laws which were no longer wholly suited to a more commercial economy. Of particular concern were the laws regarding usury and *shemmitah*, the septennial discharge of debts. “The Rabbis were well aware of the distinction between a provident loan and commercial financing. Yet, the prohibition against interest became so firmly established that only by resort to legal fiction was it possible to develop lawful modes of paying for the hire of money when economic changes made such a change imperative.”¹⁰

One of the most creative of these “legal fictions” was the institution of the *prozbul*, devised by Hillel the Elder. The word is a hybrid from *proz* (“protective enactment”) and *bul* (“rich man”). “The *Gemara* adds that the proper form is really *prozbulei-butei*... i.e., a protective enactment (*proz*) for rich men (*bulei*) and poor men (*butei*). The rich benefited in that they were able to safeguard their loans, and the poor benefited in that it enabled them to obtain loans.”¹¹ Apparently creditors during this period were simply not

8. de Vaux, 72–73.

9. John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1952), 254–255.

10. George Horowitz, *The Spirit of the Jewish Law* (New York, 1970), 487.

11. “*The Mishnah* (New York, 1986), 233.

willing to extend loans, for whatever purpose, particularly when a *shemmitah* year was approaching. Hillel's waiver became widely used, although there were dissenting opinions concerning its use among the rabbis.¹²

To their credit, the rabbis did not routinely seek ways around *shemmitah*. The *Mishnah* holds, for example, that wage claims cannot be avoided during the *shemmitah*, nor can debts arising from judgments based upon punitive damages, such as slander and seduction.¹³ However, the rabbis did hold that {302} although *shemmitah* might discharge a secured loan, the creditor was not required to return the underlying collateral.¹⁴

The rabbis also held that any debt normally discharged by the *shemmitah* could be reaffirmed by the debtor, although it was not required. "One who repays a debt on [the occasion of] the seventh [year], the Sages are pleased with him."¹⁵

As for the institution of Jubilee, there is considerably less comment. Even contemporary Jewish scholars concede that it was probably never widely observed. "The law of the fiftieth year was too complex to be observed and fell into disuse early in Jewish history."¹⁶ De Vaux concluded that Jubilee was an idea extraneous to *shemmitah*:

"Taking all these elements into account, one may advance the hypothesis that the Law of Jubilee was a late and ineffective attempt to make the sabbatical law more stringent by extending it to landed property, and at the same time to make it easier to observe, by spacing out the years of remission. It was inspired by ancient ideas, and made use of the framework of an archaic calendar, which had not lost all its value in rural practice and in the religious sphere. But it was a Utopian law and it remained a dead letter."¹⁷

3. Policy Implications of Levitical Law

12. *Ibid.*, 235.

13. *Ibid.*, 228–229, 232.

14. *Ibid.*, 233.

15. *Ibid.*, 249.

16. Hirsch, 236.

17. de Vaux, 176–177.

Regarding Insolvency

Regardless of the relative success or failure of the Levitical insolvency laws in Jewish society, certain basic principles can be derived regarding a biblical approach to this area of law. It is submitted that the following principles can be inferred, and will be the basis of examining contemporary bankruptcy law in the next section.

1. While it is recognized that some may become impoverished by their own sloth and imprudent behavior (Prov. 6:6–11), provision should be made for those who find themselves in financial distress through no fault of their own. (Lev. 25:24) {303}
2. These provisions should provide some mechanism for the discharge of debt and hope for a fresh start. (Deut. 15:1–11)
3. These provisions should be a matter of legal right, and not simply voluntary charity. (Lev. 25:35–37)
4. These provisions should protect the debtors livelihood and provide for basic human needs. (Deut. 24:6)
5. These provisions should preserve basic human dignity. (Deut. 24:10)
6. The costs of these provisions should be spread over the whole society. (Lev. 25:35–37)

4. Insolvency and the U.S. Bankruptcy Code

This section will discuss the United States Bankruptcy Code¹⁸ in light of the biblical principles outlined in Section IV. The Bankruptcy Code (hereafter “Code”) represents only one Act among many in American law pertaining to insolvency and other debtor/creditor issues. However, of all the state and federal legislation dealing with insolvency, the Code is without question the most significant and far reaching in its impact.¹⁹ The Code itself is designed to deal with a wide range of corporate and personal circumstances, including restructuring of distressed private

18. Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1979, Pub. L. no. 95–598.

19. Henry J. Sommer, *Consumer Bankruptcy Law and Practice* (Danbury, CT, 1988), 37.

corporations,²⁰ insolvency of municipalities,²¹ and liquidations²² (also known as “straight bankruptcy”). A full examination of all relevant sections of the Code would be far beyond the scope of this paper. Discussion will therefore be limited to the impact of the Code on the individual debtor and his or her family. With regard to individuals, the most frequently used sections of the Code are Chapter 7 (Liquidation), Chapter 13 (Adjustments of the Debts of an Individual With Regular Income) and the recently enacted Chapter 12 (Family Farmer Reorganization). {304}

Development of Bankruptcy Law in the United States

The roots of American insolvency law are to be found in the English Common Law and in a collection of statutory law, beginning in the sixteenth century, which came to be known loosely as the “Law Merchant.” This body of law was absorbed into the budding legal systems of the early colonies and eventually became incorporated into the newly created federal government. Of particular interest were two common law actions and a statutory process introduced by Parliament in the mid-sixteenth century. These laws, in particular, had a significant impact on the evolution of modern American bankruptcy law.

Under the Common Law a creditor could choose between two processes to gain the ultimate advantage over a debtor; putting the latter in jail until the debt was paid. In the first process, the creditor filed an action on the debt. If he received judgment, a writ of execution could be obtained, which permitted seizure and sale of personal and real property. In the event of any deficiency, the debtor could be imprisoned and held until the balance of the judgment was satisfied.²³ The second process, called *mesne*, was a prejudicial action (i.e., it could be filed and executed before obtaining a final judgment). “It was simple, cheap and swift. [The creditor] did not have to wait until the next court session... but simply appeared before a court official and swore either that a

20. 11 U.S.C., Chap. 11.

21. 11 U.S.C., chap 9.

22. 111 U.S.C., chap. 7.

23. Peter Coleman, *Debtors and Creditors in America* (Grand Rapids, WS, 1974), 4.

debt was overdue or that the debtor intended to hide, run away or conceal property. The court then directed the sheriff, through a writ called *capias ad respondendum*, to seize the debtor.²⁴ In theory, the debtor was willing to pay his debt or turn over property to regain his freedom. The downside was that in using *mesne* the creditor lost his right to attach the debtor's property. It was not uncommon for an imprisoned debtor to choose to remain in jail rather than endanger his estate, causing a frustrating legal stalemate. Nevertheless, *mesne* tended to be the creditors weapon of choice.

Imprisonment for debt remained one of the most commonly used debt collection tactics in England and America until well into the nineteenth century. The resulting oppression of the poor is well documented. *Mesne* process, coupled with the draconian provisions of England's Poor Law Reform Act of 1834 {305} (implemented by the followers of Adam Smith) resulted in the misery chronicled in the writings of Charles Dickens. One writer has noted that after passage of the Reform Act "...it was publicly known that it was almost a crime to be poor in England."²⁵

In America imprisonment for debt resulted in the same sort of oppression. Some studies have indicated that 60 percent of all imprisoned debtors in America after the revolution were in default on debts of less than ten dollars.²⁶ However, around the beginning of the nineteenth century public sentiment began to move against the imprisonment laws, partly on humanitarian grounds, but also on practical ones. Foremost, it finally became clear that *mesne* was only a response to insolvency, and not a cure. Moreover, it was not an efficient means of collecting debt. "It probably worked in barely a tenth of the cases and least well for debts exceeding fifty dollars... the fear of imprisonment encouraged deceit and fraud, and... honest debtors went to jail while rogues often went free."²⁷ Public expense also became an issue. Often these debtors were being lodged at the taxpayers expense, and the debtors dependents

24. *Ibid.*, 5.

25. Walter Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America* (New York, 1974), 49.

26. Coleman, 254.

27. *Ibid.*, 255.

became community burdens.²⁸

Eventually some states began to revive an on-again-off-again approach that had been around since colonial times; a legal process in which an insolvent debtor, "...petitioned the legislature or courts, offering to exchange his assets for a discharge from prison and protection against arrest for the same debts."²⁹ The process had grown out of a statutory proceeding created by the English Parliament in 1542 called bankruptcy.

The sixteenth century bankruptcy proceeding bore very little resemblance to its contemporary counterpart. First off, it was an involuntary proceeding, from the debtors perspective. It was usually brought by one or more creditors, and was often used in conjunction with a *mesne* proceeding to coerce repayment. The estate of the bankrupt was seized and assets were sold for the benefit of the petitioning creditors (slower creditors were often left in the cold). It did not provide for any full discharge of debts, although debtors might negotiate for a composition of debts, {306} providing all creditors would agree. It was also a limited process, only available to "... traders and merchants, persons who earned their living buying and selling."³⁰

In 1697 Daniel Defoe, himself no stranger to bankruptcy proceedings, published an essay titled *Of Bankrupts*. In it he proposed an amendment to English bankruptcy law, permitting a voluntary petition to a court for bankruptcy. The estate of the debtor would be turned over to the court for equal distribution to the creditors, and the debtor would in return be given a full discharge of all debts.³¹ His modest proposal was largely ignored for the better part of a century. In the mid-eighteenth century some colonies began passing acts providing for the discharge of debts under limited circumstances, although such acts were frequently barred by the Crown.³² Coleman notes that these early

28. *Ibid.*, 250.

29. *Ibid.*, 10.

30. Jay Cohen, "The History of Imprisonment for Debt and Its Relation to the Development of Discharge in Bankruptcy," *The Law School Record* 5, (1985), 6.

31. John C. McCoid, "The Origins of Voluntary Bankruptcy," *5 Bankruptcy Development Journal* 361, (1988).

32. McCoid, 369.

laws had four principle objectives;

They had the overall purpose of protecting the community from the kinds of damage that highly dependent, staple oriented economies suffered when crop failures, wars, or political or financial crises disrupted exports, markets, and normal trading activities... In the first place, legislators wanted to halt the race to bring individual suits against defaulters... The second objective was to reduce the incidence of fraud...Third, legislators wanted the insolvents' property distributed equitably... finally, colonial insolvency laws had both practical and humanitarian objectives: they gave an insolvent a second chance by wiping out his debts, and protected property acquired in the future from seizure for the satisfaction of these old obligations.³³

The colonists, however, rarely agreed upon these laws, and inter colony litigation made them difficult to enforce. The debate carried over into the early days of the new republic. The new Constitution expressly gave Congress the power to create a uniform national bankruptcy law.³⁴ However, Congress spent {307} most of the nineteenth century debating amongst themselves and squabbling with the state legislatures over this issue. "Before the Civil War, only two federal bankruptcy acts were passed. The first, in 1800, lasted only two years. The second, in 1841, was repealed with even more indecent haste."³⁵ One of the main reasons for the slow acceptance of voluntary bankruptcy was because "... most Americans considered discharging debtors to be immoral and against public policy."³⁶ In the end, however, it was a combination of humanitarian and common sense reasoning that prevailed. As William E. Nelson noted:

"Bankruptcy and insolvency laws are sensible arrangements in industrialized society; a man does not lose his productive capacity when bankrupt, but he does in jail. Land, on the other hand, can remain productive while a man is in prison; but when a man goes through bankruptcy he is stripped of his land or most of it. The end of imprisonment for debt, therefore, and the rise of bankruptcy

33. Coleman, 272.

34. Art. I, Sec. 8 [2], United States Constitution.

35. Lawrence M. Friedman, *A History of American Law* (New York, 1973), 238.

36. Coleman, 272.

and insolvency, reflected economic change in the modes of social control over debtors.”³⁷

The Bankruptcy Act of 1898 represented a final culmination of national policy concerning bankruptcy. The original act remained largely intact, with only minor amendments, until Congress passed a comprehensive revision in the Bankruptcy Law of 1978.

5. Voluntary Petition and Discharge

When Defoe wrote his famous essay in 1697 proposing voluntary petitions in bankruptcy and discharge as a matter of law (and not creditors’ grace) the immediate objection from the moneyed interests was that the process would be abused. The same arguments were raised in 1984 when a number of revisions to the Code were enacted by Congress.³⁸ No doubt the bankruptcy laws have been abused from time to time. But in most cases the Code has fulfilled its primary purpose: “... to {308} relieve the honest debtor from the weight of oppressive indebtedness and permit him to start afresh.”³⁹ This purpose is entirely compatible with the intent of the first, second and third principles outlined in Section IV. The Code enables the honest debtor to seek relief from insolvency as a matter of law and provides some hope of starting over with a clean slate.

Most individuals will initiate bankruptcy proceedings under Chapter 7 or Chapter 13 of the Code. The former, a straight liquidation, is usually considered for the worst case scenario, in which the debtor is “...unemployed, has no unsecured property, or is overwhelmed by debts to the point where he no longer has prospects of paying them...”⁴⁰ Chapter 7, because of its relative simplicity is also usually the least expensive. Chapter 7 requires no proof of insolvency, only that the petitioner is domiciled within the United States and has not been granted a discharge within the past seven years.⁴¹

37. Lawrence, 240.

38. McCoid, 388.

39. *Local Loan Co. vs. Hunt*, 292 U.S. 234, 244 (1934).

40. Richard B. Herzog, *Bankruptcy: A Concise Guide for Creditors and Debtors*, (New York, 1983), 32.

41. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 532 (a) (2).

Chapter 13, although more complex, is generally more advantageous to the individual debtor. Enacted on the heels of the Great Depression, this section is the “nonbankruptcy” bankruptcy for wage earners. It is based partly on the same reasoning as Chapter 11 reorganization for businesses; a “going concern” is usually more advantageous in the long run for both debtors and creditors. Given temporary protection from creditors, and with proper supervision, the business could be saved and the creditors paid. A wage earner with regular income is also a “going concern,” and Chapter 13 often enables him to restructure debts and make payment based on a systematic plan. Congress also hoped that by eventually paying their bills, “... debtors retained their self esteem and avoided the stigma of being labeled a bankrupt.”⁴² As will be shown, Chapter 13 provides several distinct advantages over Chapter 7 for individual debtors.

Just as *shemmitah* and Jubilee gave the poor Israelite some hope for the future, discharge of debt is the ultimate relief for the bankruptcy petitioner. The Code, however, like the *Mishnah* before it recognizes that not all debts are the same. Discharge is allowed for all debts filed prior to the date of filing {309} except for: taxes,⁴³ debts obtained by fraud,⁴⁴ liabilities of “fraud or defalcation while acting as a fiduciary,”⁴⁵ alimony and child support,⁴⁶ judgments for “willful or malicious acts,”⁴⁷ and obligations incurred as a result of the debtor driving while intoxicated.⁴⁸ Except for taxes, most of these exemptions are in accord with the provisions of the *Mishnah*, which did not permit discharge of domestic obligations or judgments for evil conduct. It should be noted, however, that under the broader provisions of Chapter 13 a debtor may be eligible for discharge of all excepted debts other than alimony and child support.

One other aspect of discharge might be noted here. Once the

42. Herzog, 7.

43. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 532 (a) (2).

44. *Ibid.*

45. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 523 (a) (4).

46. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 523 (a) (5).

47. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 523 (a) (6).

48. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 523 (a) (9).

Bankruptcy court has granted relief, all non-exempt debts are fully discharged and a creditor cannot attempt to collect. However, the Code (like the *Mishnah*) does permit the petitioner to reaffirm a dischargeable debt.⁴⁹ This provision recognizes that a debtor may feel a higher obligation to repay certain types of debt. No doubt the “Sages” are pleased with him as well.

The Automatic Stay and Exempt Property

One of the most humiliating and demoralizing aspects of insolvency is being dunned by creditors. Perhaps the most humanizing aspect of the Code is the automatic stay⁵⁰ which brings an immediate stop to all collection efforts by creditors. Since the Code is enacted under the Federal Constitution, the doctrine of pre-emption bars any actions brought under state law, which is where the majority of collection activity occurs. This protection begins on the date of filing and lasts until the proceeding is concluded, unless the Bankruptcy Court permits relief for certain categories of debt.⁵¹ Like the Levitical creditor who is enjoined from entering into a debtor’s home to seize secured property, the automatic stay preserves basic human dignity. {310}

The great trade off for bankruptcy discharge and protection of creditors is that the debtor must surrender what ever assets he has to the Trustee for liquidation and dispersal to creditors. However, some provision must be made for the debtor and his family to meet basic human needs. The Levitical law recognized this need (Deut. 24:6), and so have virtually all state legislatures. The concept of exempt property predates modern bankruptcy law. Every state has exempted from seizure and execution certain basic personal property so that the insolvent can keep himself and his family from becoming a burden to society. However, some states have not revised their exemption statutes since the nineteenth century. In these states insolvents may keep, for example, one plow, two mules, a rifle and the family Bible. Other states have updated exemptions to include “tools of the trade,” household goods and a specified amount of equity in house and car. These exemptions,

49. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 542 (c).

50. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 362.

51. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 362 (c) and (d).

particularly for wage earners, may help the family stay housed and working. The Code provides its own list of exempt property,⁵² but permits states the right to “opt out” of the federal list and require debtors to use the exemption list in the state where the petition is filed.⁵³ Exempt property is perhaps best comparable to the “stake” provided to the emancipated slave at the end of his term of indentured service (Lev. 15:13–15).

The Code does not give any special rights to the extended family of the bankrupt such as Levitical law invested in the *go'el*. Indeed, the Trustee in bankruptcy looks with suspicion on any inter-family property transfers shortly before or after filing of the petition, and has powers to avoid those transactions.⁵⁴ However, Chapter 13 does extend the protection of the automatic stay to co-debtors of the petitioner.⁵⁵ Since co-debtors are often family members, particularly with regard to mortgages and property loans, the effect is positive, since it protects and preserves family unity and solidarity.

Creditors Rights and Remedies

It is a fact that risk is an element of any entrepreneurial based economy. When losses occur, in business ventures or in {311} personal finance, there is a cost. Numerous mechanisms have been created for sharing, shifting and absorbing loss: corporations, limited partnerships, insurance pools, etc. One of the principles derived from Levitical law concerning insolvency was that its costs should be spread over the whole of society. In bankruptcy, this cost is shifted from the individual debtor to his or her creditors. It may be argued that, as a class, creditors represent a significantly smaller segment than the whole of society. However, this argument may be countered by remembering that in current business practice, bad debt is recognized as a fact of life; that it is an accepted accounting practice to make allowance for such losses, which are in turn passed on to the general public. In this sense, the cost of insolvency is indeed spread across society.

52. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 522.

53. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 522 (b).

54. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 547.

55. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 1301.

Although no creditor likes a loss due to bankruptcy, the Code is in many ways beneficial to creditors. One of the earliest intents of the original drafters was to end the proverbial “race to the court house” by creditors of a failing debtor.⁵⁶ The common law principle of “first in time, first in right,” which characterized most debt collection laws, often worked for fraud and great injustice between creditors. Most sophisticated business persons, by the end of the nineteenth century, had concluded that insolvency was simply a risk of business and that all were better served by having an orderly and predictable means of disposing of the debtor’s estate.⁵⁷

Under the Code, any creditor listed in a petition for bankruptcy must be notified⁵⁸ and has the right to appear in Bankruptcy Court to contest the validity of the petition or obtain other relief. Although the degree of influence creditors ultimately have over final disposal of the estate depends on which form of bankruptcy is being used, they are not voiceless. The Code also divides creditors and claimants into separate classes, depending on the nature and priority of the debt. Secured creditors may petition for relief from the automatic stay in order to retrieve their collateral.⁵⁹ General creditors may ask the Trustee to recover debtor property which was illegally transferred just prior to filing of the petition in order to hide assets. Employees of an insolvent business may ask for a special {312} priority for wages owed to them by the debtor.⁶⁰ These are just a few examples of how the Code recognizes and deals with the diversity of creditors and claims in bankruptcy. On the whole, it is a vastly superior alternative having legions of creditors and claimants battling over limited assets in multiple forums. At the same time, it provides for a just means of settling the insolvent’s estate, for all parties concerned.

Bankruptcy and the Family Farm

In 1986 Congress passed an amendment to the Code that brought modern bankruptcy law a step closer to Jubilee. This was

56. Coleman, 12.

57. *Ibid.*, 28–29.

58. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 521, 342.

59. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 362.

60. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 507.

the addition of Chapter 12: Family Farm Reorganizations.⁶¹ Like most previous bankruptcy acts, it was passed in a time of perceived financial distress; “The decline in prices paid to the farmer for farm products coupled with the rise in farm production costs make farming less profitable. Traditional commercial creditors largely left the field of agricultural lending, the federal credit programs filling the void ultimately over lent to farmers, undercutting property values and equity.”⁶² With small farm loans heading into default in record numbers, it was recognized that the Code was not fully responsive to the plight of the small family farmers:

Since most farmers wanted to keep their farms, reorganization was the preferred option. However, several provisions of Chapter 13 made the wage earner process unavailable. Given the value of real estate and large farm equipment, small farm debt was often far beyond the \$350,000 secured debt limitation imposed under that chapter. Chapter 13 also requires the petitioner to be an “individual with a regular income,”⁶³ something most small farmers did not have. Payments under the reorganization plan are required within 30 days of filing, which was not always possible for farmers.⁶⁴ This left only Chapter 11 reorganization, which is oriented toward large business insolvency and therefore much more costly and complex. Under this chapter, creditors have a greater say in plan {313} confirmation and can force the debtor into liquidation. With the passage of Chapter 12, Congress essentially made a Chapter 13 type of reorganization available to the small family farm operation. The aggregate debt limitation was raised to \$1,500,00 for debts arising from farm operations,⁶⁵ the debt structure of the farm homestead can be included in the restructuring,⁶⁶ and payments under the plan can coincide with farm income production. The exemptions for “tools of the trade” and livestock are also drafted with the small farm in mind.

61. Section 302, Bankruptcy Judges, U.S. Trustees, and Family Bankruptcy Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-554.

62. Sommers, 277.

63. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 109 (e).

64. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 132 (a) (1).

65. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 101 (17) (a).

66. 11 U.S.C. Sec. 1222 (b) (2).

Chapter 12 represents a significant step forward (or perhaps “backward”) for a small but important segment of American society. By extending the option of reorganization to small farmers, the Code echoes the intent of Jubilee; the family patrimony is preserved and the honest debtor avoids falling into wage slavery.

6. Conclusion

This paper has examined the basic aspects of insolvency under the Levitical law, with particular emphasis upon the institutions of *shemmitah* and Jubilee, in order to determine what biblical principles can be derived and to what extent those principles are reflected in the United States Bankruptcy Code.

It should be noted that *shemmitah* and Jubilee did not concern themselves exclusively with the issue of insolvency. Broadly speaking, this body of Levitical law was concerned with maintaining justice and a relative economic equality among God’s chosen people; besides providing for the poor and regulating terms of credit and repayment, Jubilee envisioned a periodic leveling of wealth within Israelite society. The U.S. Bankruptcy Code was never intended to accomplish anything so radical as reducing income inequality, but it has provided millions of oppressed debtors with hope, and that is nothing to be minimized.

The Code is not perfect and bankruptcy proceedings are frustrating. The process is slow, complex and, ironically, very expensive. Most debtors cannot hope to take advantage of its protections without the aid and assistance of an attorney, and this writer has never encountered a Legal Services Corporation office or law clinic willing to represent a debtor *in forma* {314} *pauperis*. Banks and credit institutions constantly complain and suggest revisions weakening its protection of debtors. American society in general still tends to view it with distaste and suspicion.

Nevertheless, the Bankruptcy Code offers hope and protection to insolvent debtors, gives them a discharge of debt as a matter of right, preserves a minimum of basic assets and at least attempts to guard human dignity. It may not embrace all aspects of Jubilee, but one might argue that it has been more successful in its implementation:

Since “reform” of the Bankruptcy Code is a frequent and common

demand by the nation's powerful financial community, Christians who are concerned with the plight of the poor and oppressed must be vigilant in ensuring that the Jubilee provisions of the Code are not weakened. Unfortunately bankruptcy does not always receive the same priority or attention by Christian policy advocates as the higher profile issues of civil rights, welfare entitlements, foreign aid or discrimination. This may be due partly to the complexity of bankruptcy, but perhaps also to some lingering doubts as to its inherent morality. The societal prejudice against bankruptcy remains strong, and many Christians unfortunately share that bias. It is submitted that Christians should actively oppose this intolerance and support the biblical values reflected in this law.

DEMASCULINIZATION IN PAGAN RELIGIONS AND ITS REVIVAL IN WESTERN ART

Forrest W. Schultz

Preface

If what Camille Paglia says in her *Sexual Personae* (Yale University Press, 1990) is true, and I believe it is, then I regard her book as the most important intellectual work since Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* (N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1987). A knowledge of her thesis is vitally important because it corrects a glaring omission in our understanding of Western art and Western history.

Although I highly recommend the reading of her book, let me warn you that it is not an easy thing to do because the subject matter is so disgusting. (I will say of her book what she says of Sade's: "Don't read it right before lunch!") It is, no doubt, the very repulsiveness of the matter which is perhaps mainly responsible for its neglect or glossing over by most art critics and historians (xi-ii).

This repulsiveness consists in the enormous amount of sexual perversions to be found in what is usually considered to be "great" art, especially the art of the Renaissance, Romanticism, and modern times. The sexual perversions—or at least the ones noted by Paglia—consist mainly in a degradation of masculinity. For this reason I refer to them as a "demasculinization." The main point of her book is to show how this demasculinization, which arose in the pagan "Great Mother" religions of antiquity, has been revived in Western art.

All page references here will be to Paglia's book.

Demasculinization in the Pagan “Great Mother” Religions

Demasculinization, especially of the priests, was an integral feature of the worship in the so-called “Great Mother” cults. Included among this priestly demasculinization were castration, other forms of mutilation, transvestism, the adoption of female speech and behavior and hairstyle, and a passivist attitude toward history (43, 44, 45, 53, 87, 89, 90, 137, 138). {316} The theological basis for this is the belief that nature is ultimate and nature is feminine, so that masculinity is something which she—the Great Mother—generates and recalls at her will, a conception dramatically depicted in the notion that she annually kills and then resurrects a male god who functions as both her son and consort (e.g. Tammuz, Adonis, etc.) (43, 52f).

Demasculinization Revived in Western Art

A key feature in Paglia’s thesis is her (unfortunately true) argument that Christianity never defeated paganism (xiii, 23, 138f, 222). Paganism has survived, first in the medieval period in weakened latent form (such as clergy celibacy) (44), then later in much stronger more overt forms. Rather than defeating paganism, the Church compromised with it by means of adjustments to it and by dilutions of its doctrines (25).

Although it is generally known, in a vague sort of way, that the Renaissance involved some sort of recrudescence of certain pagan ideas, Paglia shows (53, 140–169) that this pagan influence was far stronger and much more detrimental than generally believed. I now think that I have some understanding of why Ruskin called the Renaissance a “foul torrent:” Lack of space prevents me from even listing, let alone discussing, all the Renaissance art works Paglia characterizes as androgynous. I do, however, wish to note here two of the most blatantly obvious of them, namely Donatello’s *David* (146149) and Michaelangelo’s *Pieta*’ (53), which are so revolting and so blasphemous I hate to even speak of them at all.

Her discussion of demasculinized men (and masculinized women) depicted by Romanticism is even more extensive (230–622). All I can do here is pass on her capsule summary, namely that Romanticism is characterized by “flamboyant androgynous sex roles” and “a return of the Great Mother, the dark nature goddess

whom St. Augustine condemns as the most formidable enemy of Christianity” (230), and that Rousseau, its founder, “feminizes the European male persona” (232) and he himself lived out the mother goddess cult by relating to his first patron (Madame de Warens) as a transvestite male priest related to the Great Mother goddess (232f), and that “decadence” and “sodomasochism” are inherent features of Romanticism (260). If you want the gory details you’ll have to read her discussion yourself since I have neither the space nor the stomach to present them here!

Paglia only takes her discussion in this book up to the {317} year 1900 because she plans a successor second volume to deal with the twentieth century. However, she does briefly mention a few twentieth-century examples of her thesis in this book, which I shall now mention, because I believe they will have especial relevance for us today.

First of all, she mentions a very significant work, *Suddenly Last Summer*, by the late Tennessee Williams (who, by the way, was a homosexual). This play (and film) consists of a modern day re-enactment of the Great Mother/ritually slain son theme (53, 263, 435). Secondly, she gives two illustrative examples of what she regards as a fairly common modern phenomenon which has been going on for over 50 years, namely cults of male homosexuals around female superstars similar to the cults of male priests around the Great Mother goddess. These examples are actress Judy Garland and opera singer Maria Callas (54). Finally she notes the transvestism which is found in such modern pagan celebrations as the Rio de Janeiro Carnival, the New Orleans Mardi Gras, the Philadelphia Mummers Day Parade, and Halloween (91).

Unintentionally Promoting What You Wish To Condemn

One of the most interesting subjects in art criticism—as well as one of the most difficult on which to reach a conclusion

is controversies concerning whether a particular art work promotes something which its creator intended to condemn. For instance, there is the longstanding—and I believe still unsettled

debate about whether or not Milton portrays Satan in a favorable light. I do not pretend to know the answer to that one, but I do strongly believe that an art work is defective if it leaves anyone

with even a shred of doubt about where the artist's sympathies lie or about what he really believes about such major themes as the conflict between good and evil.

Paglia provides several extensive, thought-provoking discussions on this matter, especially with reference to Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* and to Coleridge's *Christabel* and *The Rime of The Ancient Mariner* (190–193, 228f, 326–328, 331f, 340–342, 345). Paglia claims that although these poets apparently intended to side with Christianity, the actual poems themselves convey the opposite impression due to the strong influence of pagan ideas upon their thinking. So, if Paglia is right here, and I have a hunch she is, then the revival of paganism has been so strong that it has even infected those who are Christians—or those who intend to promote Christian principles of morality. {318}

I intend to give this subject some very serious thought and I would exhort you to do likewise because I believe it is a very important matter, not only for the proper understanding of a genuine Christian aesthetics and the production of genuine Christian art works, but also for many other kinds of things. For instance, I have heard some Christians give testimonies in which it sounded like their life before their conversion was more interesting than it was after their conversion.

This brings us now to what I think is the heart of the matter here. It was said of C. S. Lewis that he was one of the few writers who “made righteousness readable.” That is, he showed both in his didactic works as well as in his fiction that, contrary to much of popular opinion, good is more interesting than evil. Evil is not only wicked; it is also *boring* and *banal*. It is not only our duty to obey God and to act righteously—it is also interesting, and it is a joy, not a burden. God is not only righteous and good, He is also interesting, has a great imagination, has a great sense of humor, etc; and His interestingness/imagination/ humor is not adventitious but is an integral feature of what it really means to be good and righteous.

Now if our understanding of or belief in this all important theological principle is defective, then our art (and other things we do and say) will communicate the opposite of this biblical truth, namely it will make it look like God and goodness are boring, and that Satan and evil are interesting. I remember hearing someone

a long time ago complaining that in most plays “The Devil has all the best lines!” Now if this is the way we are writing our plays, then we will make it look like Satan is actually a more attractive person than God. Thereby we will actually be promoting what we are trying to condemn.

The upshot of all this can be succinctly stated: *Don't expect to be taken seriously if you violate your own principles.* Ruskin showed the great importance of this principle when he pointed out that Gothic architecture brought about its own demise when in its late stage it began to violate its own principles. Cornelius Van Til warns us not to expect the unbeliever to take us seriously when we say God is ultimate if we do not treat God as ultimate in our apologetics.

Paglia's Concept of Nature

I have stated that I believe Paglia is right concerning her central thesis pertaining to demasculinization in the Great Mother cults and its revival in Western art, and that I have a {319} hunch she is right in her analysis of Spenser and Coleridge noted above. But she is radically amiss in her view of nature:

The biblical view, the correct view, of nature is that: (1) God created it as a good thing to be in harmony with man whom He also created as good (Gen 1 and 2); (2) nature since the Fall has been under a curse (Gen 3:17–19; Rom 5:12; 8:22) so that it (like man) is a good thing spoiled by the banes of death, disease, and suffering under which it groans and travails; and (3) nature (along with man) shall be redeemed by God from these curses (Rom 8:19–21) after which it shall be totally good again. Now Paglia, like most humanists, grievously errs in her view because she regards nature as it is now in its *fallen* condition as identical with nature *as such*. That is, she thinks that nature itself has always been like it is now and always will be like it is now, so that, in effect, she is regarding the evil now found in nature due to its Fall as an inherent feature of nature itself, not as an unnatural thing which will be removed at its redemption. Secondly, she overemphasizes the evil in nature so as to virtually equate nature as a whole with the evils of nature. In short, her view of nature is almost totally negative. Thirdly, and following from this, she identifies nature (and our

bodies and the Freudian “id”) with a Dionysian disorder which we (i.e. the Freudian “ego”) should seek to master a la an Apollonian rational ordering (see especially Chapter 3, 72–98). Consequently, sin is attributed not to our sinful *spirit*, but to nature.

Now the evils she notes are indeed evil, but she errs greatly in identifying them with nature. I say this not so much for reasons of critique, which is not really my purpose here, but to warn the reader not to be misled into adopting her unbiblical view of nature.

A Few Noteworthy Odds and Ends

In addition to her main thesis there are various tidbits scattered throughout her *magnus opus* which are worthy of note, which I shall simply pass on without comment.

She says that long hair on men is associated with effeminacy and/or a rebellious spirit (329f).

She says that there is no evidence for the primitive matriarchy idea, now being promoted by many feminists (42). She does not oppose the portrayal of androgynous characters in literature if in the course of the plot they renounce their androgynousness and reassume their sexual identity, as, for instance the character Rosalinda did in Shakespeare’s play *As You Like It*; or if an unrepentant androgynousness is shown to lead to disastrous consequences, as in Shakespeare’s play *Antony and Cleopatra* (211f, 227).

The decadent late stage of Romanticism, seeing the dead end to which it led, satirized the progressivistic optimism of the early Romanticism (429, 430, 437).

Art Nouveau, whose theme is “growth without fruitfulness,” was popular among homosexuals (496f). (Can you guess why?)

The Importance of Paglia’s Work

Paglia’s scholarship is obviously important for gaining a better understanding not only of the artists and art works she discusses, but also of Western history and Western culture in general.

Perhaps of equal or even greater importance, it will now be easier, following in her wake, to denounce these supposedly “great” works of art for the abominations they are. Heretofore the art establishment has conned us into accepting this trash as

art. Francis Schaeffer said, referring to existentialist theology, that it is high time we started calling nonsense by its name. I say, analogously, that it is high time we started calling trash by its name.

We need to stop being intimidated by the art establishment. Generally (especially if we are well educated) we have shrunk from calling this stuff junk for fear of being thought uncouth or philistine. We are not supposed to denounce an art work for its sexual perversions because that is in bad taste. It just isn't done in polite circles.

Well, says who? And who says this stuff *is* great art anyway? "Great" by whose definition? Certainly not God's! If an art work advocates androgynousness or other sexual perversions, is God going to call it "great"? We need to find out what God's definition of great art is and then use that instead of accepting what the humanistic art establishment says. Unfortunately, not much attention has been paid to discovering God's principles of art. Some good pioneering work was done by John Ruskin but it has been egregiously ignored. If you are interested I would exhort you to read the works by Ruskin listed in the bibliography of my paper "An Introduction to the Biblical Philosophy of Art," which is a summary of Ruskin's discoveries. Now let me conclude by pointing out the seriousness of this matter of the recrudescence of paganism and the {321} compromising response of the church. As my Pastor, Bob McCurry puts it: "Hell has come to the top of the ground!" Here is how Paglia puts it:

"Historiography's most glaring error has been its assertion that Judeo-Christianity defeated paganism. Paganism has survived in the thousand forms of sex, art, and now the modern media. Christianity has made adjustment after adjustment, ingeniously absorbing its opposition (as during the Italian Renaissance) and diluting its dogma to change with changing times. But a critical point has been reached. With the rebirth of the gods in the massive idolatries of popular culture, with the eruption of sex and violence into every corner of the ubiquitous mass media, Judeo-Christianity is facing its most serious challenge since Europe's confrontation with Islam in the Middle Ages. The latent paganism of western culture has burst forth again in all its demonic vitality." (25)

TRUTH FALLEN IN THE LABORATORY?

Science, Ethics, and the Christian Faith

Philip C. Burcham

The principle of the division of labor inherent in biblical economics has ramifications for many areas of life, but its importance to the scientific enterprise is often overlooked. Thus a major reason for the dramatic scientific advances of recent decades is that most scientists tend to be very specialized, focusing on problems that are only a small part of a much larger discipline. Hence progress within a given field normally results from the summation of a series of small-scale yet related findings made in separate laboratories:

The success of this venture largely depends on the accurate transfer of information between scientists, the main vehicle for which is the refereed journal. There are now hundreds of these publications spanning most fields of scientific endeavor. Ready access to this information greatly facilitates the practice of science, since investigators can rely on the research findings of others and avoid the waste of time, resources and manpower during the needless duplication of experiments. It is clearly very important that scientists make honest, factual accounts of their work when they publish, otherwise they derail the whole process.

Disturbingly, a number of instances of fraudulent reporting of data have recently come to light, raising fears that this practice could be widespread. For example, the field of immunology was rocked in 1991 when the following paragraph appeared in the January 25 issue of "Cell," a leading molecular biology journal. Penned by the distinguished Caltech immunologist Leroy Hood, it simply read:

“We have become aware that certain of the original data referred to in the article by Urban *et al.* (1989) are unavailable, and thus we are unable to verify that all the conclusions in that paper are correct. Therefore, we would like to retract that paper. We are now repeating those experiments. No one regrets this episode more than we.” {324}

The retraction followed the discovery of doctored data in a notebook belonging to a Postdoctoral Fellow in Hood’s lab, a finding which lamentably took place after the data was published. This unhappy event occurred at the same time as a long controversy surrounding a publication from the laboratory of Nobel laureate David Baltimore was capturing renewed attention. This episode began over five years ago with the charge by a Postdoc in Baltimore’s lab, Margot O’Toole, that some of the data published in a 1986 paper by Baltimore and co-worker Thereza Imanishi-Kari was fabricated and thus untrustworthy. This controversy appears to have been resolved with Baltimore’s reversal of his long-standing policy of defending the data in question, and his public acknowledgment that Dr. O’Toole’s accusations were justified.

The incidents cited are the best publicized of many misconduct episodes currently under investigation in research institutions across America. Because of their increased frequency of occurrence, the NIH Office of Scientific Integrity has drawn up new guidelines for the management of fraud episodes, and it recently held several regional symposia that explained the new procedures to university officials. Furthermore, a number of universities, including Harvard Medical School and Washington University, recently sponsored conferences on the topic of scientific fraud, indicating that concern over this matter is increasing.

In today’s climate of academic opinion it would be astonishing if any participants in these conferences traced a cause of the ethical malaise in science to the weakening of religious belief amongst its practitioners. Nonetheless, such an attempt is surely overdue.

A few notable historians of science have correctly highlighted the indebtedness of Western science to the Christian Faith. They have observed, for example, that Christianity permeated Europe with the concept of an orderly world that is the handiwork of a wise, rational Creator. This outlook displaced the organismic, occultic worldviews of pagan antiquity that had previously inhibited any

sustained rational interest in nature. Of equal importance was the Christian belief that the same Creator formed both the human mind and the world “out there.” Without this faith, fledgling scientific ventures repeatedly ran aground because of recurring skepticism about the power and relevance of human thought.

Nonetheless most contemporary chronographers of science ignore the role religion has played in the development of {325} scientific thought. Instead, they labor under the illusion that the question of the origin and maturation of science can be understood apart from a consideration of the cultural and religious context in which science is done. Of particular relevance to our topic is the tendency of scholars to ignore the way the prevailing moral environment influences the transfer of knowledge between researchers. In disregarding this influence many overlook, as Stanley Jaki put it,

“The general truth that the effective cultivation of science needs an atmosphere if not of actual honesty and virtue, at least an atmosphere in which crime, falsehood, vices of all kinds are clearly recognized for what they are. For it is the very soul of science to call a fact a fact in all truth and honesty ... Historians of science would do well to meditate at length on this.”¹

The way Christianity produced societies in which truth-telling was praised, and dishonesty frowned upon, is thus important in understanding why the seeds of science thrived only in Western soil. In this respect, it is profitable to reflect on just how often in Scripture we are reminded that honesty is to be a conspicuous attribute of a God-pleasing life. This is explicit in the Mosaic legislation, as we are told in the ninth commandment: “You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor,” and also, “You shall not circulate a false report” (Ex. 23:1). The Psalmist tells us God “will destroy those who tell lies [and] deceitful men the Lord abhors” (Ps. 5:6), while the Proverb forthrightly states, “the Lord detests lying lips, but He delights in men who are truthful” (Prov. 12:22). Our Lord also emphasized honesty when communicating with others: “Simply let your ‘Yes’ be ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No,’ ‘No’; anything beyond this comes from the evil one” (Matt. 5:37). St.

1. *Science and Creation: From Eternal Cycles to an Oscillating Universe* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1986), 156.

Paul exhorted the Church at Ephesus in similar fashion: “Each of you must put off falsehood and speak truthfully to his neighbor” (Eph. 4:22). Since these exhortations predate the invention of the modern printing press, they primarily lay down standards for verbal communication. Nonetheless the principles underlying these passages are normative for all forms of communication. {326}

The relevance of this to science, in which the accurate transfer of information is critical, should be obvious. Indeed, in Professor Jaki’s opinion the way in which Christianity prepared the way for science by shunning dishonesty was even more important than individual scientific discoveries themselves. As he put it:

“Scientific breakthroughs, or new scientific instruments, are never easy to make. But they should seem to appear child’s play when compared with the task of bringing about a never before experienced cultural or rather moral climate in which the good, right, and truthful are accorded, in principle at least, unconditional respect.”²

Ever since Darwin, the God of the Bible has been placed in the dock, and “Modern Science” has usually been marshaled as the primary witness against Him. In our day scientists have continued this trend, deriding miraculous elements in Scripture as myths best relegated to the realm of fairy tales. However, in light of what we have just seen, this attack on Christianity amounts to little more than a foot-shooting exercise. If science is deprived of the transcendental ethics grounded in the revealed character of God, what protects it against the erosion of honesty by unprincipled self-interest? In fact, such an outcome seems almost inevitable when the pursuit of personal career goals becomes the sole motivation for a life in science. Modern biology, which reduces men and women to the mere level of amoral walking digestive tubes (whose highest end is to ensure that their genes are transferred intact to their offspring), only exacerbates this problem.

We may be tempted to regard the modern science establishment as invincible. But as Jaki points out, the history of science is littered with many “stillbirths,” when in spite of promising beginnings, scientific efforts were fatally undermined by the logic of prevailing worldviews. It would be tragic if our science went the same

2. *Ibid.*

way, scuttled by a loss of honesty amongst its practitioners. The message of Proverbs 12:19 is worth dwelling upon in this respect: “The truthful lip shall be established for ever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment.”

RELIGION, ABOLITIONISM, AND PROSLAVERY ARGUMENTS IN PRE-CIVIL WAR AMERICA

Richard Bostan

Cardinal Manning, whose reputation withered the instant Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians* made Strachey's, was at least sage enough to realize that all differences of opinion are theological at bottom: the political problem reduces to the social problem, the social problem to the ethical one, the ethical to the religious. The proposition, true as it is, might be hard to illustrate to a skeptic had one only the contemporary scene from which to cull evidence. Common sensical and scientific people nowadays bow to little gods and idols largely unawares, but bow they do. In the past men were not so quick to hide the religious presuppositions of their convictions, and repair to the example of the controversy in *ante-bellum* America over the legitimacy of slavery, the South's peculiar institution, bears out Manning's idea. Southern slave ownership posed a political, social, and ethical problem for the entire nation, but from roughly 1830 to 1860 divergent religious assumptions drew antagonists to the fore to damn or to defend the property of man in man's labour. Both the North and the South were professedly Protestant Christian, hence the common idiom for discussion. But still the two sides of the dispute were animated by commitments to incompatible religious visions, the clash of which, and the fissures that developed in their edifices, presaged the clash of arms of a nation torn in two, and before long torn within their divided portions:

Though the American Founding was struck with not a little help from the hands of idealism—the *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, or New Order of Ages, signified a break with a tarnished past that saw the rights of man trod underfoot—some evils were suffered

to persist in American society, most conspicuously slavery. This for the sake of expediency, and because it was believed slavery would in time die a natural death. Southerners, even slave owners like Thomas Jefferson, believed slavery a momentarily necessary evil, ultimately doomed to extinction. Northerners, after the War of Independence, possessing less invested capital in slavery, freed their own slaves but were content to let the South follow in step when it was content to follow. What is curious on its face, then, is the rise in {328} the North of the 1830s, in the wake of decades of moderation and tolerance, of people harboring a burning sentiment that slavery had to be abolished root and branch from American society, immediately, not another moment to wait, as if to avoid the imminent retribution of a wrathful Heaven.¹ What spirit, beatific or vile—the judgments of historians vary between the two imputations—what spirit enthused these “Abolitionists”?

America’s Second Great Awakening got underway in the North, in New England especially, around 1800, and exhausted itself by the 1830s. It was the steam that wafted up from the friction of Deism and Enlightenment thought rubbing against the old American orthodoxy of Calvinism, which history seemed to be fast consigning to its ash heap. Like Calvinism, Enlightenment doctrine was forthrightly rationalist, but it concealed a strong Romantic and Rousseauian strain, and that more than Deism, as equally staid as the old orthodoxy, mixed with evangelical religion to capture the imaginations of multitudes. Calvinism had breathed law, order, fidelity to the establishment, tolerance of an imperfect, flawed world, this side of eternity.² But that stale breath was after the Founding ready for sweetening, congregations wanting to believe in free will, the triumph over sin, improvement in man’s lot and the reformability of his environment. The revivalism, the preaching of the Second Great Awakening, destroyed predestination in the North outright, the First Great Awakening

1. David M. Scott, “Abolition As a Sacred Vocation,” in *Antislavery Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Abolitionists*, ed. Lewis Perry and Michael Fellman (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1971), 51.

2. William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change in America, 1607-1977* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 109.

having pummeled it years before into terminal fragility.³ Revivalism smuggled the once abhorred Arminian subversion into American evangelicalism, at least in the North: man was not impotent to save himself; he could work in partnership with God to accomplish the Divine will, for his own welfare and that of his neighbours.

The Second Great Awakening may have declined at the start of the 1830s, as all bacchanals of emotional outpouring trail off from their highpoints of intensity, but that did not bring to a close the spiritual agonizing, the quest for transformation and rebirth, that attended the Awakening. The enthusiasm of the {329} Awakening was channeled into associations and movements directed to redeem the social organism from iniquities said to be sapping the vitality of the righteous. Temperance, Women's Rights, and Abolitionism were the most prominent of these children of the Awakening. In the 1830s activity in the North advancing the cause of immediate abolition of slavery in the South centered around the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS), led by the fervent William Lloyd Garrison, also the editor of the Abolitionist organ, *The Liberator*. For Garrison immediate abolition was a principle, a norm, but not a program of action.⁴ Garrison and his devotees spurned force, and political involvement as well, either or both of which a program of action would demand to bring their desired ends to pass. Paralleling the injunctions of Christ in the Gospels to give alms to the poor, to demonstrate a charitable heart, anti-slavery agitation looks like a posture adopted for the benefits it could bestow on the Abolitionist's soul, serving as a testimony to personal regeneration, rather than a means to change an objective condition: the slave's bondage, or in the New Testament, the pauper's deprivation. That is how it appears, and that motivation may even have been one factor; but while Christ did not hate poverty—it could be a blessing, if it caused those in its grasp to put not their trust in the goods of earth and the flesh—Abolitionists could not have loathed slavery with a greater passion.

3. *Ibid.*, 114.

4. Aileen S. Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism: Garrison and His Critics on Strategy and Tactics, 1834-1850* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), 79.

Ownership by one man of another human being did not of a sudden excite a natural distaste. Such a “gut level” repugnance was not new or alien to the majority of Northern people, or the peoples of the white, European countries. To the likes of Garrison, lately washed ashore by the tumultuous waves of experiential religion, the possessor of slaves deserved the brand of chief of sinners because he was a god figure, a usurper playing God with the affairs of creatures entitled to exercise their wills to live autonomously, outside of the decree of another.⁵ Lewis Perry suggests this was a reflex of Calvinism: only God is sovereign, and none of His created may appropriate the quality {330} of His sovereignty. However, that is unlikely the correct picture of the Abolitionist’s mental dynamics. Abolitionist religion was anti-Calvinism, so a better hypothesis is that in the slaveowner/slave relationship the Abolitionist discerned the same God sovereignty, the identical thwarting of man’s determining agency, that he despised in the thankfully defunct Calvinism of his Puritan forefathers. Both Garrison and Theodore Weld, number one and number two in the ranks of antislavery leaders, apotheosized the moral free agency of men.⁶ Slavery supposedly levelled persons to the status of things, by robbing them of free agency. Calvinism also denied men autonomy making them—consistency would have it—“things.” The notion that God is a potter and men and women vessels of clay, which God can honour or annihilate to satisfy his good pleasure (Romans 9:19–21), delighted and cowed previous generations of American Christians, but appalled the post-Awakening generation. Perhaps the disgust with the lingering phantasm of a God arbitrarily disposing of people for His pleasure was manifest in the portrait of the slave-holder as a sexually debauched tyrant, preying on helpless, nubile Negro girls—a much believed scenario in anti-slavery circles.⁷

Where Perry is quite right is in putting to the center for consideration the strange role Abolitionism, and the self-conscious

5. Lewis Perry, *Radical Abolitionism: Anarchy and the Government of God in Antislavery Thought* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973), 47.

6. *Ibid.*, 48.

7. Anne Norton, *Alternative Americas: A Reading of Anti-Bellum Political Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 155–60.

members of that juggernaut, carved out for itself, and themselves, *vis a vis* organized religion. “Immediate abolitionists,” Perry writes, “were inclined to think of their societies, not as adjuncts to religion, but as a kind of ‘surrogate religion.’”⁸ Part of this was surely a reaction to the cold shoulder the movement was accorded by the churches when they were approached for support. When the AASS was started in 1833, Garrison endeavored to enlist Lyman Beecher, one of the more prestigious of the evangelists to scorch the air during the Second Great Awakening; but Beecher balked, telling Garrison his zeal was praiseworthy but misdirected. In the North, up to the Civil War, Abolitionists carried with them the taint of disrepute, the curse of all eccentrics, especially vocal ones. More important to explain the “surrogate religion” nature of the movement, though, is the manner in which preaching and receiving abolition {331} displaced preaching and receiving Christ as the hallmark of piety. Beecher, with his more conventional evangelistic message, may have known of what he spoke when he said Garrison’s energies were “misdirected.” Garrison’s priorities as they were, he had to wonder why he or anyone else in Abolitionism should terrorize the demonic powers and principalities of the air, when in the United States devils incarnate were running amok, dishing out Hell’s punishments to black folks. The wisdom of Heaven had very terrestrial implications for Abolitionists. When those could not be pursued within the church structure or with church aid, an *ersatz* church was erected around abolition activity. Garrison became the prophet, “and even, to some people, a... savior.”⁹

One subject that frequently found its way into *The Liberator* for discussion was the Bible. At first the subject was specifically what the Abolitionist could do with those Bible texts that buttressed the view that slave-holding was licit in God’s sight. Initially Garrison answered the question tamely, if not by any stretch of the imagination in a fashion hospitable to evangelical orthodoxy, pre or post Second Great Awakening. Certain verses of the Bible were obviously incompatible with God’s will, Garrison illuminated

8. Perry, 43.

9. Douglas C. Strange, *Patterns of Antislavery Among American Unitarians, 1831–1860* (Canbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1977), 46.

inquirers; Scripture had to be perused with great care and discrimination, separating the wheat from the chaff, as it were. This translated, in due course, into discarding the written will of God as the sanction of right precepts and morality. One judges truth and falsehood not by what Holy Writ enjoins and forbids; one instead, according to Garrison, makes use of human reason to explore Scripture and find in its pages what is true:¹⁰ Logically that is what the vaunted moral free agency of man requires, as much as it beckons holy and righteous men to step out of the church, as Plato's philosophers step out of the cave, to salvage the world with what private stock of knowledge one has imbibed from the church, while outgrowing its narrowness.

Garrison would become bolder in his repudiation of biblical truth, or at least more overtly heretical, contending that Scripture is not the unique word of God to the minds of His Chosen; it is a "compilation of Jewish and Christian manuscripts," "the product of many minds, ... never designed to {332} be a single volume, to be received as an infallible authority of divine origins."¹¹ He continues that the Bible is a bad master, but a "good servant,"¹² in his essay titled "The Divine Authority of The Bible." In so acknowledging the exploitation of what in American society was still a formidable authority, beside which moral and ethical opinions were measured—the Bible selectively employed can "serve" the cause, but Abolitionism could not be subjected to evaluation in the light of the Bible—Garrison announced simultaneously the propagandistic character of his movement, and the religious transcendence of Abolitionism over mere Christianity. And yet Garrison was sincere in invoking God's will to bless the grand enterprise, oddly. Perhaps not so oddly. The locus of God's will *moved*: it left the objective text, where God's commands could be received by anyone with reason to read and infer, and understand. It took up residence in the inner being, in the heart of the reformer as he works out his salvation and society's.

The Second Great Awakening promoted a doctrine in former

10. Kraditor, 92.

11. William Lloyd Garrison, *Selections From the Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison* (New York: Greenwood, 1968 [1852]), 223.

12. *Ibid.*, 228.

times in favour with Anabaptists on the European continent, and more recently with Wesley's Methodists in England. The doctrine was *perfectionism*. The redeemed sinner, the regenerate man, was no longer a slave to sin: inward he was a new creation. The internal struggle between the new, Christian nature and the old one besotted with original sin—a battle that dogs the Christian to his grave—that Calvinism posited, vanished in a whirlwind. Perfectionists transferred the Christian's struggle from the depths of his soul to the outside: the foe was not the self, but one's environment; every sin and every immorality was a metaphorical dragon to slay. The Baptists responded by retreating from the world; the dragon might just devour *them*. But the products of the Second Great Awakening did not flinch or run for cover. Not all perfectionists became Abolitionists, but Garrison did. Hand in hand with perfectionism went antinomianism, or an antipathy toward law.¹³ An "inner light" of the sort Quakers revered guides the antinomian, from it the will of God emanates. Garrison could write against the Bible and an external prescriptive standard without wincing at his sacrilege because "the letter...killeth,...what the spirit... {333} maketh alive."¹⁴ God's will, not original sin, indwelt Garrison. Not sin, but God's will, indwelt every Abolitionist. Communion with the Almighty was reached and enjoyed not in Scripture reading or prayer, but according to one evangelical quoted by Abolitionist Orange Scott, in holy action: when "we rise to a higher sphere, the sphere of doing...we rise to the knowledge of God...we give life to our speculations, and substance to our creed, and meaning to our professions."¹⁵ Immediate abolition infused the profession of Christianity with significance; the creed, the law of God, neither did nor could entail Abolitionism, an occupation of transcendent virtue.

Perfectionism and antinomianism were inevitable paths to a stance that led to the fracture of the antislavery movement, cleaving Abolitionism in two over several years around 1840. Garrisonians were always wary of plunging into politics because they subscribed to "non-resistance," or what their critics saw fit to

13. Perry, 20.

14. Kraditor, 93.

15. Scott, 65.

label “no-governmentism.”¹⁶ The latter appellation is not entirely fair, from the perspective of Garrison, because the nonresistance people exalted the “government of God”; it was human government that was to blame for most injustices, depending as it did on force. Whether government carried out its duties on the plantation by the employment of whips, or in the commonwealth by armies and policemen, the difference was infinitesimally minute: slavery and civil government were cut from the same block.¹⁷ This was not an aberration, or an unexpected evolution, in the Garrisonian position. It had been debated in the pages of *The Liberator* almost from the beginning. Opposition to it had to crystallize, organize around plausible splinter groups and Garrison prove unreformable, before the exodus from the American Anti-Slavery Society could be gone through with. Lewis Tappen, Orange Scott, and other schismatics were generally more theologically conservative; some of them warmed to the prospect of carrying the anti-slavery torch into the political fray. They did not grasp—or learned late in the game anyway—that perfectionism could not help but overflow into political anarchism. If God be inside the man, and civil government’s *raison d’être* be to check human evil, government is at best superfluous, at worst it is a standing rebuke and {334} obstacle to man’s full display of his well-nigh Divine capacities. Emancipation from slavery to the Garrisonian Abolitionist was very much the first stage of emancipation from government, or the presumptuous human variety. And such emancipation was itself a stepping stone on the way to the ultimate Promethean goal of what Perry calls “the Kingdom of God,”¹⁸ the promised Millennium, nicely sanitized of the theonomic¹⁹ encrustations attached to it in yore by unsavory Calvinists.

However, much non-resistance was the scaffolding that supported the anti-slavery plank in the Garrisonian system. Garrison was sufficiently politic to keep the two apart

16. Perry, 57.

17. *Ibid.*, 33.

18. *Ibid.*, 43.

19. “Theonomy”—Theological term, meaning “God’s Law,” as enscriptured in the Bible, specifically the Old Testament. Greg Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1984).

organizationally. The formal breakup within the Abolitionist ranks can not be laid at his feet, as his responsibility. The deflating of his balloon was probably one of the best things to happen to the cause, however. Garrison's religious heresies—and more seriously to the masses not versed in theological dogma, Garrison's open war with the church denominations, manifest in exhortations to “come out” of the counterfeit religious institutions—doubtless put a fright into souls who might otherwise have been ripe for recruitment. Starting in the 1840s antislavery opinion slowly, slowly penetrated to the establishment, and thus began its long trek to semi-respectability in the North. This happened thanks to the anti-slavery men like Tappen, and associations like the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (AFASS); the latter paraded itself as a *reform* group, as distinguished from the *radicals* such as those in cahoots with Garrison. Garrison peaked too early, but for many historians he remains the quintessential Abolitionist, a specimen frozen in amber for inspection and contemplation. He merits the attention. The religious views of Garrison are the keys to understanding the man's broader vision, understanding the vineyard where Abolitionism grew. Though he spoke so indiscreetly he provoked rending of garments by less audacious fellow travelers, it is worthwhile to speculate if behind their professions of orthodoxy the conservatives—the Tappens, the Scotts—did not feel secretly stirred by the heady thrill of bringing the Kingdom of God to earth.

Previous to the 1830s the occasional tract or disquisition {335} fluttered forth from the South to offer the case for the slave economy, but the voice seldom rose above the falsetto, and was not paid much attention, even by Southerners. Most Southerners likely were innocent of feelings of guilt for keeping slaves or having them in their midst. But articulate Southerners did not fall over themselves to celebrate slavery, and legions lamented the wrong that time was bound to put right, gracefully, minus too much discomfort for either the white man or the black. However, in the 1830s, and largely in reply to the blows devolving on their heads from the Northern Abolitionists, plus out of some cockiness—the slave system *was* after all prospering, showing none of the degeneration into profitlessness once anticipated by doomsayers—Southerners got up a veritable cottage industry of defenses of

slavery and the Southern way of life. Arguments were written, published, and studied, with diligence. Commencing in that decade and carrying through till the North's big battalions closed debate by vanquishing the debaters, proslavery statements were "more systematic and self-conscious," than they had ever been, says Drew Gilpin Faust. Proslavery "took on the characteristics of a formal ideology with its resulting social movements."²⁰ The body of slavery apologias is valuable to the historian on two counts. One, it is a witness to the religious and ethical bed where the Southern people thought they made their repose—many moralists today could not believe that possible—in embracing slavery, as well as the *kind* of religion, which contrasted violently with that behind Abolitionism. Two, the change in the mode of proslavery argument, a tendency to turn secular, or to scientific justifications, is interesting to ponder. It may provide insight into the Southern and the American mind and the role of religion, after the survivors emerged from the brutality of war to live, though slavery was left for dead:

Bertram Wyatt-Brown, in an evaluation of proslavery with otherwise a lot to commend it, leads off misleading his audience. He believes "post-1830 proslavery defenses owed much to the same source as abolitionism. Their common influence was the evangelical experience:"²¹ Unqualified, that is {336} simplifying things rather more than can be permitted to pass without remark. By identifying the vernal groves in which Abolitionism and proslavery bloomed, or uncoiled and slithered into the light, whichever one would have it, as religious in character, it is not established that there is a single, common grove. What is called "religion" is not an indivisible monolith, all the same. The "evangelical experience" does not narrow it down satisfactorily. The evangelicalism of the Second Great Awakening was a strange and exotic animal to the Southern evangelical, and its exaltation of experience, of subjective spiritual feeling, over the logic of Scripture and exegesis, smacked of unabashed paganism. The

20. Drew Gilpin Faust, "The Proslavery Argument in History," in *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Ante-Bellum South, 1830-1860*, ed. Drew Gilpin Faust (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 155.

21. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Yankee Saints and Southern Sinners* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 155.

South had no Puritans in its history, but Calvinism and the temperament of Protestant Scholasticism was entrenched in the South of the early nineteenth century, despite clergymen typically adapting it to the understandings of their flocks. The proslavery documents produced in the 1830s, read and preached to assemblages, were theological in stripe, and followed a classical kind of rhetoric, a practice in keeping with Calvinist rationalism. The Bible is the axiom or first principle, from which are deduced, moral and ethical principles, God's law for living. If slavery can not be reconciled with God's law, the Abolitionist is vindicated. If before that bar slavery stands and is not found wanting, the South is vindicated against the charges the Abolitionist brings against it. Abolitionist antinomianism precluded all of this.

The clergymen James Henley Thornwell, a South Carolinian and college president, made no bones about the proper methodology to follow to the truth on slavery or any disputed question, in his address to a synod of the Southern Presbyterians in his state, called "The Church And Slavery." He claims, "Beyond the Bible she [the church] can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal; and when they are silent it is her duty to put her hand upon her lips."²² One of the comprehensive Southern critiques of the biblical teaching on slavery came from the pen of Albert Taylor Bledsoe, not a Calvinist, but a Pelagian, in his milieu a sort of penguin in the tropics. His book *An Essay on Liberty and Slavery* covers slavery from a host of diverse angles, but the chapter on {337} Scripture boils down to the essence of all defenses from the Bible. The Hebrews had slaves, Abraham had them, "the Mosaic Institutes not only recognize slavery as lawful; they contain a multitude of minute directions for its regulation,"²³ Bledsoe contends. The Old Testament sanctions slavery, as any number of verses showed, but in addition it vouchsafed polygamy and divorce. Bledsoe considers that, but points out that whereas

22. James Henley Thornwell, "The Church and Slavery," in *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, vol. IV* (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1986 [1875]), 384.

23. Albert Taylor Bledsoe, "Liberty and Slavery," *Cotton is King, and Proslavery Arguments*, ed. E.N. Elliott (New York: Johnson Reprints, 1968 [1860]), 341.

the New Testament heralds an alteration in the laws of marriage, slaves are therein still bidden to obey their, as Ephesians 6:5 has it, “masters according to the flesh.”²⁴ And a number of corroborating verses are adduced.

The defense of slavery from religion for Southerners was an intellectual project, quite unlike the attack from religion by advocates of abolition, a sanctifying or soul-purging experience of the heart. A Northern theologian, named in this century as the foremost American theologian of the nineteenth century, commented on the tactics of the antislavery publicists, curious at how precious little argument could be gleaned from their writings. “Denunciations of slave holding, as man stealing, robbery, piracy, and worse than murder,”²⁵ coupled with *ad hominem* vituperation targeted at the slave owners and all Southerners for their complicity, seemed to Charles Hodge to sate the Abolitionists’ appetite for discourse. For the Southerners, and for men of the North like Hodge (he threw in his lot with proslavery because he dared not put beyond the pale an institution God allowed—who was he to have higher standards than God?) the Bible was master, not a “good servant,” in Garrison’s words. Cool, dispassionate ratiocination was their orthodoxy, the same that reigned once upon a time in the North and most of all in New England. Presumably the lingering odor of intellectualism from the Puritans helped spark the reaction of an “Awakening,” awakening from the deep slumber of rational religion, devoid of the turbulences and euphoria of emotional vitality.

It did not fall to the Christian defenders of slavery to aver that slave-holding was ideal, or normative—God did not command it—let alone justify every nuance of the institution as {338} it was fleshed out in the South, or in particular Southern states. That slavery *qua* slavery was acceptable theologically, morally, was deemed adequate to send the Abolitionist agitators reeling. To the extent slavery in practice deviated from the prescriptions of the moral law, or masters behaved outside of their rights in the handling of slaves, such was cause for the reform or enforcement

24. *Ibid.*, 850.

25. Charles Hodge, “The Bible Argument on Slavery,” in *Cotton is King, and Proslavery Arguments*, 841.

of the civil laws, or for sermons and exhortations by ministers and concerned citizens. Advice literature aimed at the erring or negligent master abounded in the *ante-bellum* South. Hodge was quite clear, in refusing to be detracted from the main issue of the slavery debate: abuses could not be used to discredit the authority of the slave owner any more than “the abuse of parental authority, or the unjust political laws of certain states, is an argument against the lawfulness of the parental relation, or of civil government.”²⁶ Holding fast to the predestinating force of God in history, and acknowledging that there are flaws intrinsic to human society one can try to cope with but can never overcome, be one a Christian or not, proslavery people did not traffic with the hopes of sinlessness ever dangling before Abolitionist eyes, like the impetus and torment of Tantalus. Slavery was a condition, not an iniquity, or a positive good—it had the potential to be whatever sinful or holy Christian men made of it. The “positive good” phrase may crop up promiscuously in the political speech of the era, and have even evoked cheers and huzzas, but moral neutrality was the quality slavery was more often invested with in consciously biblical defenses.²⁷ Slavery did not have to see the slave degraded to mere chattel—slavery was not property of man in man but property in man’s labour, Dabney, illustrious theologian and pastor, said.²⁸ The slave could be a member of the extended patriarchal family of the biblical pattern, a child cherished with affection by a benevolent master.²⁹

It is hard to miss now, surveying the slavery literature of Christian Southerners and their friends in the North, how small a comfort talk of biblical slavery must have been to the Southerner eager to hear that his society was not only committing no crime by having slavery, but was forthrightly {339} deserving of praise, and was in every respect superior to what passed muster as a civilization in the North. The “positive good” argument waited in the wings throughout the 1830s. The sentiment was there, but

26. *Ibid.*, 850.

27. Wyatt-Brown, 165.

28. Robert L. Dabney, “Wilson’s Slave Power in America,” in *Discussions, vol. 4 Secular* (Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle Publications, 1979 [1892]), 251.

29. Wyatt-Brown, 161–162.

the idealism of the Christian apologetic stifled it inasmuch as it implicitly damned abuses of the Southern masters' prerogatives, in addition to many state laws, such as ones restricting Christian worship among slaves and the right of an owner to manumit his property. (In the Mosaic Institutes which Bledsoe mentions in *An Essay on Liberty and Slavery* as "regulating" as well as justifying slavery, God forbids keeping a converted heathen in unwilling bondage after his sixth year of service; at the end of six years the slave was to be given a choice of going free or of remaining forever with his master.)

Thomas Stringfellow wrote a standard Christian piece for slavery, "The Bible Argument: or Slavery in the Light of Divine Revelation," but more merit lies in examining the essay he appended to the end of that essay. Titled "Statistical View of Slavery," it is evidence of a transition, in the 1840s, in the typical apologetic approach, to celebrating the South and the expediency of slavery, rather than its moral legality. Stringfellow draws on the Census of 1840 to compare and contrast the Northern free states and the Southern slave states, their achievements and misfortunes. At length it is demonstrated: 1) the South had more churches and pew spaces per capita;³⁰ 2) the North was plagued by more homelessness;³¹ 3) the birth rate was higher in the South, and the death rate lower than in the North;³² 4) pauperism was a significant malaise in the North, not in the South;³³ 5) insanity was more prevalent, and bodily health worse, among Northern free blacks, compared to Southern slaves;³⁴ and, finally, 6) the disparity of wealth in the North was greater than in the South.³⁵

It is a legitimate question whether Stringfellow used the Census of 1840 accurately, or even if the census itself was accurate. But the empiricism inherent in the very effort to milk the cold, hard facts of everyday existence for their value to the cause of defending

30. Thomas Stringfellow, "Statistical View of Slavery," in *Cotton is King, and Proslavery Arguments*, 525–526.

31. *Ibid.*, 529.

32. *Ibid.*, 530.

33. *Ibid.*, 531.

34. *Ibid.*, 531.

35. *Ibid.*, 536.

slavery contrasts markedly with the deductive {340} and classical rhetoric of Bible exegesis, and the tone of reasonableness and humility it carried. The fascinating discussion in “Statistical View” of the number of pew spaces available in the South for would-be church-goers leaves the impression that religion has taken on the mundane dress of sociological datum, similar to the place it occupied in numerous Abolitionist circles. The biblical and classical defense from first principles would survive in the 1840s and 1850s, at the level of popular-culture particularly,³⁶ but the romanticism in which leading Southern men increasingly snuffed and rolled, feeling awfully good about themselves, dictated that the foreground of proslavery be taken over by positivist and secular appeals. Southern intellectuals were no longer preaching to the choir, but to Northerners and Englishmen, for whom one’s Sunday best should be worn. In the modern world the best was whatever was naturalistic, “objective”—in short, the best was science.³⁷

Science, or pseudo-science, would come in handy to crack a nutshell too thick for the proslavery advocate with only a Bible in his hands. For the Christian, the subjection of the African heathen was readily justifiable from Holy Writ, but after heathenism was stamped out in the United States, and the African Slave Trade defunct, the problem was how one could make the black pigment of the Christian Afro-American’s skin the badge of rightful servitude. From the Bible, the thing was impossible to do. Popularly, there was the “Children of Ham” argument, based on Genesis 9, which was echoed by some intellectuals like Stringfellow. But most clergymen knew it was specious. Robert Dabney, the Virginian pastor of Stonewall Jackson, and Jackson’s first biographer, was one such.³⁸ Even if the descendants of Ham included the Africans, a matter of conjecture, the prediction of their penal servitude would not absolve Christians from accusations of tyranny. God preordained the Babylonian Captivity of the Jews for sins against the Most High, but the Babylonians were hardly in their moral rights in fulfilling that decree. The relationship of slavery to race

36. Wyatt-Brown, 169.

37. Faust, 11.

38. Robert L. Dabney, “Liberty and Slavery,” *Discussions*, vol. 3: *Philosophical* (Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle Publications, 1980 [1892]), 69.

was consequently ignored in Christian defenses, outside of the references to the need for Christians to support weak and infantile peoples. With the arrival of ethnology on the scene in {341} the 1840s, Southerners were able to at once give the newly desired scientific gloss to their defenses, and stand up for the racist nature of Southern slavery.

Ethnology, or that branch of anthropology geared to the study of different races, their origins and characteristics, cast a spell over scores of Southern intellectuals who glimpsed in its esotery the infallible proof of what had always been assumed about race—the negro is the natural inferior of the white man. There was not an abundance of whites in the North who would openly challenge the assumption of black inferiority; the trick for the proslavery ethnologist was to expose the black as so low and abject by design he was fit for no station higher than that of slave. Samuel Cartwright offered the notion, in the essay “Slavery In The Light Of Ethnology,” that the negro was beyond being just of another race than the white man; why, he was in truth of a different *species* entirely. This did not mean he was not human. He was genus *Homo*, a man, but his species Cartwright called *Prognathous*: “not that the negro is a brute, or half man and half brute...,” the negro is “a genuine human being, anatomically constructed, about the head and face, more like the monkey tribes and the lower order of animals than any other species of the genus man.”³⁹ It is adduced by Cartwright that negro blood flows more slowly than the blood of whites,⁴⁰ he consumes less oxygen,⁴¹ and the shape of his cranium, elaborately compared in its development with the cranium of the orangutan,⁴² precludes the development of the intelligence to put him remotely on the level of the Caucasian. On the whole, the black is, Cartwright thought, so indisposed for a life of freedom it is “a mercy and a blessing to Negroes to have persons in authority set over them, to provide for and take care of them.”⁴³

39. Samuel Cartwright, “Slavery in the Light of Ethnology,” in *Cotton is King, and Proslavery Arguments*, 707.

40. *Ibid.*, 705.

41. *Ibid.*, 698.

42. *Ibid.*, 707–708.

43. *Ibid.*, 703.

Cartwright decorated his theory with the appropriate theological garnishments; Negroes are labeled “the Canaanitish race,”⁴⁴ the sons of Ham, and all the right buttons are pushed by an endorsement of more emphatic instruction from the pulpit declaring that “the white man derives his authority to govern the {342} negro from the Great Jehovah.”⁴⁵ Obviously the attempt was undertaken to stay on good terms with Christians who were bound to be flabbergasted at the repudiation of the biological unity of created man. One of Cartwright’s fellows, Josiah C. Nott, rattled clerical cages, shattered, in fact, any prospect of forging an alliance between the Christian and the new, scientific style of proslavery apologetics. Nott’s 1845 pamphlet, “*Two Lectures on the History of the Caucasian and Negro Races*,” elaborated an ethnological critique of the black similar to Cartwright’s, but Nott did not cringe at heaving doubts on the Genesis account of a single creation: the two species of man, one white and one black, called for twin creations—possibly more if ethnology could find any more species of man. Ham’s “lineal descendants were pure Caucasians,”⁴⁶ according to Nott, but he echoed the opinions of many orthodox people on that subject. His object, though, was to displace the Bible as the starting point in discussion, substituting for it “...facts, induction, and...the universal and undeviating laws of nature.”⁴⁷ The inerrancy of Moses is by Nott banished to outer darkness,⁴⁸ and for “Thus Saith the Lord” Nott invokes Alexander Pope, quoting at the end of *Two Lectures* that famous line, “WHATEVER IS, IS RIGHT.”⁴⁹

Natural science was not the only science to receive the call to rule in slavery’s favor in Southern intellectual circles. By the 1850s sociology too was dragooned into the fight. George F. Hughes’s

44. *Ibid.*, 701.

45. *Ibid.*, 716.

46. Josiah C. Nott, “Two Lectures on the Natural History of the Caucasian and Negro Races,” in *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830-1860*, ed. Drew Gilpin Faust (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 216.

47. *Ibid.*, 210.

48. William Stanton, *The Leopard’s Spots: Scientific Attitudes Toward Race in America, 1815-1859* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 75.

49. Nott, 328.

Treatise on Sociology of 1854 looked to no eternal scales of right and wrong to weigh the equitableness of the Southern form of human bondage. The be-all and end-all of Hughes' universe was utility, and "warranteeism," slavery rebaptized, struck his fancy as the surest instrument for securing the perpetual contentment of the negro, with its cradle to grave security: "the happy warrantees... banquet in plantation refectories, worship in plantation chapels; sit in plantation {343} salons, at the cool of evening, or in the green and blooming gloom of cold catalpas and magnolias, chant songs, tell tales; or to the metered rattle of chanting castanets, or flutes, or rumbling tambourines, dance down the moon and evening star."⁵⁰ In the same vein wrote George Fitzhugh; treated in his own day as a loose cannon, he is a darling of present day historians of proslavery, a unique and grotesque specimen. In his 1857 tract *Cannibals All!, or Slaves Without Masters*, he strove to prove Northern wage earners were as much the property of capitalists as Southern Negroes were the chattels of plantation owners. The capitalist to Fitzhugh was "a master, without the [paternal] obligations of the master."⁵¹ Fitzhugh concluded that "the Negro slaves of the South are the happiest, in some sense, the freest people in the world."⁵² Such were the findings of thoroughgoing inductive research, beheld by the jaundiced eye. Brute "facts" have a curious habit of changing guise to suit the spectator. All told, science furnished plentiful ammunition to men who—unlike previous Christian apologists for slavery, committed to an abstract, ethereal kind of order, that condemned the South in other respects while it declared it blameless in one—deeply wished to see the Grail at the end of what Wyatt-Brown calls their "visionary quest for the perfect slave society,"⁵³ and see it they did, alive and well in Dixieland.

Antislavery in the North progressed out of the fever swamps of extremism with the break that left the Garrisonians at the

50. Cited in Wyatt-Brown, 176–177.

51. Cited in C. Vann Woodward, "George Fitzhugh, *Sui Generis*," quoted in George Fitzhugh, *Cannibals All!, or Slaves Without Masters* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960 [1857]), xxiii.

52. *Ibid.*

53. Wyatt-Brown, 172.

margins—something of a self-imposed exile really, reluctant as they were to sully their spotless hands with the germs of politics, and enthusiastic to burn bridges where more moderate men labored to build them. Southern proslavery was scarcely as blessed. Over time it became more outlandish. In the 1830s the logic of the Bible defense carried with it the seeds that might have given life to reform, or better, forced the peaceful dissolution of a system miles short of the biblical norm, and irreparable. Arguments at very least had aesthetic elegance to them; pride was taken in the consistency of the defense, and the unity of the apologists. From that pinnacle everything fell to {344} ruins. Proslavery decayed to a strident, tragi-comic *ad hocery*, with intellectuals grasping at every plausible and implausible vehicle to advance their claims to virtue. Also the gulf widened steadily between the proslavery intellectuals, who wrote more and more for other intellectuals, hither and yon, and the common Southern man, for whom the Bible remained the last word.

The Abolitionism of Garrison, without honor when it bestrode New England and other enclaves of enlightenment, won a belated victory. The religious assumptions on which it relied for vigor thrived in America long after the Civil War. They were resurrected in the Social Gospel, and that is still present under the surface of American Protestantism. The new Protestantism is a religion of social messianism, a religion of works, that one can imagine has often had Martin Luther spinning in his grave. It is not out of line to call the theology of Abolitionism fanatical, for the fanatic is always moved by an enthusiasm of his heart, that feels like a fire in his breast till it is doused by some do-good ritual. The fanatic observes the standard of propriety inherent in his own experience; there can be no reasoning with him, or repair to a standard outside of himself and what he “feels.” The man who says “No law but love” is as much the epitome of fanaticism as he who says “No law but hate.”

With the defection of the Southern intellectuals from biblical religion, at least in considering as important a social and ethical conundrum as slavery was for their region, the elite abandoned the orthodox Protestant faith to the fate that awaited it after the Civil War, from which it has yet to recover. Intelligent and scholarly votaries survived. But popular culture, the plain people,

became the keeper of the flame of orthodoxy, and the full-orbed faith of the Whole Counsel of God before long was reduced to "Fundamentalism," a reflexively anti-intellectual thumping of only five or six essential tenets of Christianity. Fundamentalism is culturally retreatist. It hides ostrich-like, raising its eyes into the sunshine only at the most blatant outrages to God and decency till it is inevitably repelled by the peals of laughter from the *cognoscenti*, then back into the earth it plunges its head. Such a religious vocation is quixotic; it is more quixotic arguably than the Confederacy, which screwed up its courage and resisted the onslaught of the modern world.

6.

*A MAN OF FAITH
AND COURAGE*

ROBERT LEWIS DABNEY

F. W. Schnitzler

Bruce Catton, noted Civil War scholar, once wrote, "...the men who enacted the terrible, tragic drama of the Civil War were men who have to be remembered. They have not been flattened out by the age of big cities, machinery, mass transportation, and unending television shows. They stand out: whether the Civil War veteran was a private soldier unknown outside of his own company, or a General Grant, a General Lee, a Stuart or a Sherman or a Jackson, he is somebody you feel like taking a second look at."

Without question, the Civil War was a great turning point in American history and continues to demand our attention. The issues that brought about the "Southern War for Independence" were very real issues; the men that fought over them were real men; the battles they fought were real battles, and the blood spilled was real blood. It was a campaign destined to be one of the most fascinating stories ever told, a story more compelling with every retelling. Many of those who participated in its unfolding became very famous. Monuments and statues have been constructed in memory of them. Books have been written about them. Towns and colleges have been named after them. Many are easily brought to mind. Most participants remain virtually unknown, however, lost in the pages of history. While the men were very brave, very gallant, very determined and fearless, some deserve wider recognition as well as a second look.

Robert Lewis Dabney was born of aristocratic Virginia parents in the year 1820. Reared in an "old school" Presbyterian home in Louisa County, his early education was conducted in plain log cabin day schools under the tutelage of his father and some of his neighbors. By the age of fifteen, he concluded his training in English, Geometry, an extended course in Latin and Greek, and thus, prepared himself for college. From the beginning to

the middle of 1836, the young "R. L. Dabney" pursued further studies under the direction of the Reverend James Wharey, his pastor. As a student of Hampden-Sydney College (1837), the University of Virginia (1842), and Union Theological Seminary (1846), he was, according to historian Francis Butler Simkins, "the Virginia gentleman par excellence." Lest we think Dabney's mental capabilities were anything less than extraordinary during his college years, consider that at the {346} age of twenty-two he was offered the editorship of a newspaper, and of whom it was said, "no man of your age in the Union is superior as a writer!"

Ordained and licensed to preach in 1846 by Union Theological Seminary, Dabney spent one year in ill health as a missionary in his native county before assuming the pastorate of Tinkling Spring Church, in nearby Augusta County, where he remained for over six years. During this time Dabney was elected to the chair of Ecclesiastical History at Union Seminary and occupied that position until 1869. Dabney led this active life as a pastor and educator in the Shenandoah Valley uninterrupted until the secession of the South.

When Confederate artillery opened fire on Fort Sumter in 1861, the regular Seminary session was near its end, and Dabney suggested the College Church pulpit be occupied by another during the summer months while he was himself to enter the confederate army and serve as a chaplain. Against Dabney's wishes, and despite the escalating war, the Seminary directors ordered the faculty to keep the Seminary open and operating fully. Dabney regretted this decision as it interfered with the chaplain's work, which he felt should continue without hindrance throughout the course of the war. To him the troops were as wheat ready to be harvested. But he was obliged to return to the Seminary in the fall of 1861.

By early 1862, however, the conscription of new soldiers emptied the Seminary's classrooms (as Dabney had foreseen) and General T. J. "Stonewall" Jackson, being informed that Dr. Dabney was virtually free of his obligations to the school, offered him the post of Adjutant-General (chief of staff) with the opportunity of doing missionary work among the soldiers every Sunday. Dabney accepted Jackson's offer and served in both capacities until his health broke down in the latter months of the same year. Resigning his position, he returned home.

C. H. Vaughan, a biographer of Dabney, recalls Dabney's involvement in the war. "When the War for Southern Independence broke out, he threw himself into it on the side of his own people with characteristic energy, and the peculiar traits of his practical and strong understanding came out on a theater altogether foreign to the habits of a man of his profession. He joined the army as chief of staff to General 'Stonewall' Jackson. It is a strong tribute to the sagacious and energetic qualities of the man that that cautious and keen soldier should have selected a teacher in a theological school as the chief of his own military family. The two men were of congenial spirits, and on the strong {347} common sense and keen habit of observation of his clerical officer Jackson placed more reliance than he did on others far more thoroughly drilled in military technics." In the capacity of Adjutant-General, General Jackson himself referred to Dabney as "the most efficient officer he knew."

As a chaplain to the Southern forces, Dabney proved himself to be an energetic minister of evangelical Christianity. In the following excerpt from a sermon delivered in the presence of General Jackson and his staff, and a large assemblage of men and officers, Dabney chose to address a subject not inappropriate to soldiers preparing to enter battle. It was hoped that the sub line message would be impressive to all, but especially those who "according to God's will might be appointed to death." The sermon was given nearly one month after the Confederate victory at Manassas. Dabney urgently pressed both the officers and the men to "commit their ways to God through Christ" with the words. "On whom will you call, you who have neglected your Saviour, when you pass down into this valley of great darkness; when the inexorable veil begins to descend, shutting out human help and sympathy from your despairing eyes; when death thrusts out your wretched soul from its abused tenement; when you launch forth into the void immense, a naked, shivering ghost; when you stand before the great white throne? Can you face these horrors alone? How will you endure a beggared, undone eternity? Call on Christ, then, today, in repentance and faith, in order that you may be entitled to call upon him in the hour of your extremity. Own him now as your Lord, that he may confess you then as his people." Many were no doubt moved by Dabney's powerful preaching.

Dabney resumed his professorship at Union Seminary following the war's end and was a short time later made full Professor of Theology. He discharged his Seminary duties until 1883, when his physician recommended a change of climate. The University of Texas took advantage of this recommended change and offered Dabney the chair of Moral Philosophy, which he accepted and served in until his failing health gave way to blindness and eventually death in 1898.

Dabney was as a teacher of theology both profound and influential. As an educator he was in constant demand. Charles Hodge, Princeton's renowned professor of Systematic Theology, repeatedly invited Dabney to teach at Princeton Seminary. A. A. Hodge was to call Dabney "the best teacher of theology in the United States, if not in the world." And Professor A. H. Freundt Jr. of the Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, {348} Mississippi, recognized Dabney as "a man of extraordinary gifts of perception and analysis, of logic combined with warmth and moral sensitivity."

Despite his busy life, Dabney managed to author many books and to produce article after pertinent article relevant to the theological, ecclesiastical, and philosophical developments of his day. Such literature might seem of little value today, since so much time has expired since it was first written, but Dabney's perception and foresight were remarkably prophetic (so much so that he considered himself "predestined to prophesy truth and never to be believed until too late"). Dabney commented on developments that were then only in their infancy, but we now know that Dabney accurately assessed those developments and the consequences they were likely to produce. Darwinism, labor unions, strikes, secular education, the abandonment of the gold standard and modernism were all accurately assessed by Dabney while they were yet fledgling movements. So as not to think such praise is undeserved, consider Dabney's comments on communism. "Communism is slavery! Moreover, all history teaches us, that the more paternalistic any government becomes, be its form either impersonal, monarchical, aristocratic or democratic, the more will its officials engross the powers of the State, and the earnings of the citizens to themselves." It reads like something from yesterday's editorial page, but was written well over one hundred years ago!

Robert Lewis Dabney was truly a remarkable man and is worthy of greater recognition. For those interested in reading more of his work, the following books are recommended: *A Defense of Virginia and the South*, *The Practical Philosophy*, *Selected Discussions*, and *the Life and Campaigns of Lt. Gen. T. J. "Stonewall" Jackson*. {349}

THE MINISTRY OF CHALCEDON

[Proverbs 29:18]

CHALCEDON (kal-SEE-don) is a Christian educational organization devoted exclusively to research, publishing, and to 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 layman 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 challenges directly 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 announced that "all power is given unto men in heaven and in earth" (Matthew 28:18). Historically, the Chalcedonian creed is therefore the foundation of Western liberty, for its 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 (Galatians 5:1).

Christians have generally given up two crucial features of theology that in the past led to the creation of what we know as Western civilization. They no longer have any red optimism concerning the possibility of an earthly victory of Christian principles and Christian institutions, and they have also abandoned the means of such a victory in external human affairs: a distinctly biblical concept of law. The testimony of the Bible and Western history should be clear: when God's people have been confident about the ultimate earthly success of their religion and committed socially to God's revealed system of external law, they have been victorious. When either aspect of their faith has declined, they have lost ground. Without optimism, they lose their zeal to exercise dominion over God's creation (Genesis 1:28); without revealed law, they are left without guidance and

drift along with the standards of their day.

Once Christians invented the university; now they retreat into little Bible colleges or sports factories. Once they built hospitals throughout Europe and America; now the civil governments have taken them over. Once Christians were inspired by “Onward, Christian Soldiers”; now they see themselves as “poor wayfaring strangers” with “joy, joy, joy down in their hearts” only on Sundays and perhaps Wednesday evenings. They are, in a word, pathetic. Unquestionably, they have become culturally impotent.

Chalcedon is committed to the idea of Christian reconstruction. It is premised on the belief that ideas have consequences. It takes seriously the words of Professor F.A. Hayek: “It may well be true that we as scholars tend to overestimate the influence which we can exercise on contemporary affairs. But I doubt whether it is possible to overestimate the influence which ideas have in the long run.” If Christians are to reconquer lost ground in preparation for ultimate victory (Isaiah 2, 65, 66), they must rediscover their intellectual heritage. They must come to grips with the Bible’s warning and its promise: “Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he” (Proverbs 29:18). Chalcedon’s resources are being used to remind Christians of this basic truth: what men believe makes a difference. Therefore, men should not believe lies, for it is the truth that sets them free (John 8:32).

Finis

