

REVOLT



AGAINST MATURITY

ROUSAS JOHN RUSHDOONY

REVOLT AGAINST MATURITY

A Biblical Psychology of Man

By Rousas John Rushdoony

A CHALCEDON STUDY

ROSS HOUSE BOOKS

P.O. Box 67
Vallecito, CA 95251 U.S.A
1987

Copyright ©1977
Rousas John Rushdoony
Reprinted by Ross House Books 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Creationism and Psychology	5
The Nature of Man	13
Work and Dominion	17
Knowledge	22
Righteousness and Holiness	30
Personality	37
The Sexual Nature of Man	41
The Paradise Motive	52
The Satanic Image of Man	60
The Fall of Man.....	69
Imagination	78
Environmentalism	86
The Cainite	91
The Song of Lamech	97
Guilt	102
Death.....	110
The Demand for Freedom from Testing.....	116
In the Image of Adam.....	123
Tyranny	129
The Religion of Fallen Man	134
What Is Man?.....	140

Regeneration	148
Atonement	157
The Implication of Regeneration and Atonement for Psychology	163
The State of Grace	171"
Cultural Discipline	184
Justification	188
The Transformed Man	195
Adoption	203
The Renewing Nature	213
Time	225
Our Advocate	233
Man's Highest Good	238
Hope	246
Peace	251
Patience and Experience	257
Conscience	264
Confession	273
Forgiveness	279
The New	284
Sheep and Men	291
Work	298
The Tree of Life	305
The Tabernacle	309
The Resurrection Body	313
The Sabbath	321
The Reality Principle	328
Epilogue	335
INDEX	337

Introduction

In calling this work a study of Biblical psychology, it should first be stated that the word *psychology* is not here used in any sense familiar to the academic community. Our concern is totally unrelated to what passes for the science of the mind today and which actually rests on the religious presuppositions of humanism. Moreover, only in passing have we touched on those presuppositions. The world of humanism, the modern age, is now in its death-throes, and we leave it to the dead to bury their dead.

Psychology properly is a branch of theology. Theology is the word or doctrine of God; it is the study of what Scripture declares about God, and it is basic to other areas of study, such as ethics, anthropology, psychology, soteriology, eschatology, and so on. Psychology is literally the word or doctrine of the soul or mind of man; anthropology is the word or doctrine of man. Anthropology is more concerned with man's culture, history, and physical life, whereas psychology is more concerned with man's nature and inner life.

Two dangerous myths plague psychology. *First* and most prevalent in the modern age is the myth that man has no constant nature. This view of the plastic nature of man means that man can be molded at will by whatever state or agency controls man. The school has for the humanist been the great agency whereby man is to be remade at will in order to be prepared for the future. The state plans thus to create through the school a new man for its new order of the ages. As Molnar observed,

Education has been . . . the most obvious step in the direction of utopia since, with every new generation, a new

potential comes into existence. The Utopian does not believe in a permanent human nature; if he did, he could not hope to accomplish a complete break in the long line of generations; too, he would know that each generation might go through a similar and ever-repeating evolution from childhood with its fantasies to old age with its resignation, creating in the midstream of life something new which, nevertheless, resembles something old. Yet, unless human nature is permanent, we cannot speak of civilization, of the lessons of the past, or of mind communicating across the ages.¹

Basic to Greek utopianism was the belief that the mind of man is a clean slate for the educator to work on. When Aquinas revived this belief, holding that the intellect “is like a tablet on which nothing is written,”² and that “the origin of knowledge is from the senses,”³ he laid the groundwork of the renaissance and its utopianism. John Locke then developed this idea into a psychology, and he saw the mind as “white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas,” deriving its “*materials* of reason and knowledge . . . from EXPERIENCE. In that all our knowledge is founded; and from that it ultimately derives itself.”⁴ The foundation was thus laid for modern education and statism. Man’s mind can be formed by the educator in terms of a new image of man. Man has existence, but, in the beginning, no essence. Sartre’s existentialism was thus implicit in the Hellenic and humanistic view that man does not have a formed and necessary nature.

In the Biblical view, man is created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness, and with dominion. This fact about man, his creation in the image of God, cannot be nullified. He always has been and always will be a creature of God. The image can be fallen or perverted, but it cannot

1. Thomas Molnar: *Utopia: The Perennial Heresy*, p. 148f. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.

2. Aquinas: *Summa Theologica*, I, Q 84, A 3.

3. *Ibid.*, Q 84, A 6.

4. John Locke: *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Bk. II, ch. 1, para. 2.

be replaced or erased. It is permanent and inescapable in man. This is why hell is a possibility for man. For man to deny his nature and to seek a nature apart from or in defiance of God is to sentence himself to so radical a frustration and perdition that his life is turned into a denial of both existence and essence.

In speaking of the permanent in man, we must thus avoid the *second* myth about the nature of man, namely, that which sees him only in terms of the fall. The fall of man is an historical not an absolute reality. Man's history has seen a fourfold condition: first, the state of innocence, before the fall; second, the state of depravity, after the fall; third, the state of grace, with and after redemption; and fourth, the state of glory, in heaven, and then in the new creation. The state of glory (and the state of reprobation) will be permanent, but in an *historical* sense, whereas the permanence of the image of God in man is *ontological*.

Our concern in this study is in part ontological and in part historical. We are concerned with the implications of the image of God in man, as well as of the historical fourfold estate of man, for psychology. This means therefore that our concerns in psychology have little or nothing to do with the concerns of humanistic psychology, or of pastoral psychologies which are grounded thereon.

For necessary and practical reasons, our concern is mainly with the state of depravity and the state of grace. As the title makes clear, it is a discussion of man's revolt against maturity, against the requirements of his existence and essence. To deny man's essence as declared by God in His creative act and in His word is finally to deny man's existence. Not surprisingly, the death of God school, which denies man's essence, is implicitly also the death of man school, a fact which the existentialist, Andre Malraux, has conceded. Man's revolt against the maturity God requires of him is thus ultimately a revolt against life. The function of a Biblical psychology of man is to point man to life under God by defining his exist-

ence and essence as God has declared it. To do this as simply, plainly, and clearly as possible has been our purpose in this study.

Rousas John Rushdoony

Creationism and Psychology

Humanistic psychology gives us a doctrine of man radically at odds with Scripture. It has become routine for clergymen to look to humanistic psychologies for guidance in pastoral counselling, and books applying such psychologies to pastoral problems have had a ready market and a widespread influence. The result has been the steady infiltration of humanism into Christian circles and the steady erosion of the Biblical doctrines of man and of salvation.

In analyzing the Biblical doctrine of man and the psychology of man, it is necessary, *first*, to recognize that man is declared to be a creature, created by the sovereign act of God on the sixth day of creation (Genesis 1: 26-31). This fact gives us a radically different picture of man than that provided by evolution. Instead of emerging out of chaos and an animal ancestry, man is the direct and immediate work of God.

This means, *second*, that man has a short history, not a long and unknown past. That short history is very extensively documented by Scripture as well as by man's own records. Man is therefore subject to explanation by a documented record, not a long and hypothetical past. This documented record makes excuse and evasion less tenable, whereas an unknown past erodes responsibility and introduces confusion and uncertainty. Thus, for the Christian, man's psychology is a documented record.

Third, by virtue of the fact of creation according to a pattern, the eternal purpose and counsel of God, (and in His image), man's psychology is not an evolving fact but a fixed reality. Man is more than an existing being who is in process

of making and defining himself; he has already been made and defined by God. Thus, the psychology of man posited by Freud,¹ or by Sartre,² and others, is fallacious. Man's nature is neither fixed by an evolutionary past, nor an open question to be determined by man. It is a *given* fact from God.

Fourth, man was created a mature being, not a child. This is a fact of central importance. We thus cannot make child psychology basic to an understanding of man. According to Jastrow,

What we may accept is the principle that the child is an authentic embodiment of the earliest, racially oldest, most persistent, truest to nature, depository of natural behavioristic psychology.³

Humanistic psychology looks backward to a primitive past in order to explain man, whereas Biblical psychology looks neither to the child nor a primitive past to explain man but to a mature creation, Adam, and to God's purpose in man's creation. If man in his origin is a product of a long evolutionary past, man is then best understood in terms of the animal, the savage, and the child. However, since man was in his origin a mature creation, his psychology is best understood in terms of that fact. Man's sins and shortcomings represent not a lingering primitivism or a reversion to childhood but rather a deliberate *revolt against maturity* and the requirements of maturity. By ascribing to man, as humanistic psychologies do, a basic substratum of primitivism and racial childishness, this revolt against maturity is given an ideological justification; the studied and maturely developed immaturity of man is encouraged and justified. If man is reminded rather that he was created in Adam into maturity and responsibility and that his revolt is against maturity and responsibility, his self-justification is shattered. It has become commonplace for

1. See R. J. Rushdoony: *Freud*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publ. Co., 1965.

2. Jean-Paul Sartre: *Being and Nothingness*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.

3. Joseph Jastrow, "The Reconstruction of Psychology," in *The Psychological Review*, #3, 1927, p. 169, cited in Cornelius Van Til: *Psychology in Religion*, p. 58. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1935.

persons seeking counselling to discuss, not their problem, but their childhood, their parents, and their environment in order to “explain” their present “situation”, that is, their failure. The fact of a *mature creation* is one of the basic and most important facts of a Biblical psychology. It is a fact of incalculable importance.

Fifth, man was created a mature being in terms of the sovereign purpose of God, so that the meaning of man’s life transcends man. Man can never be understood in terms of himself but only by reference to the sovereign purpose of God. A humanistic psychology will always deny this transcendence and will therefore deny to man the meaning of his existence. Existentialism is more honest here than most humanistic philosophies and psychologies; it does not define man or ascribe a meaning to life and man: “Man is.” For existentialism if man *is* anything, it is because man makes and defines himself. This self-definition is essentially an anarchistic process, in that each man is his own universe and the god of that private universe. According to Scripture, however, man was created, and every man is born into, an already defined universe made by God, and every man has a specific responsibility to that triune God and to men and the universe under God. Not only is man’s existence a created and defined fact, but the conditions of his life also. At no point in his life or imagination can man step outside of God’s ordained order into a realm of humanistic or man-made freedom. The freedom of man is itself a condition of God’s creation. Every hair on man’s head, every imagination of his heart, and every fiber of his life and experience, is an aspect of God’s creation and His sovereign purpose.

Sixth, man was created in the image of God. As Van Til has pointed out,

He is therefore like God in everything in which a creature can be like God. He is like God in that he too is a personality. This is what we mean when we speak of the image of God in the wider or more general sense. Then when we wish to emphasize the fact that man resembles

God especially in the splendour of his moral attributes we say that when man was created he had true knowledge, true righteousness and true holiness. This doctrine is based upon the fact that in the New Testament we are told that Christ came to restore us to true knowledge, righteousness and holiness (Col. 3: 10; Eph. 4: 24). We call this the image of God in the narrower sense. These two cannot be completely separated from one another. It would really be impossible to think of man having been created only with the image of God in the wider sense; every act of man would from the first have to be a moral act, an act of choice for or against God. Hence man would even in every act of knowledge manifest true righteousness and true holiness.

Then after emphasizing that man was like God and in the nature of the case had to be like God we must stress the point that man must always be different from God. Man was *created* in God's image. We have seen that some of God's attributes are incommunicable. Man can never in any sense outgrow his creaturehood. This puts a definite connotation into the expression that man is *like* God. He is like God, to be sure, but always on a creaturely scale. He can never be like God in God's aseity, immutability, infinity and unity. For that reason the church has embedded into the heart of its confessions the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God. God's being and knowledge are absolutely comprehensive; such knowledge is too wonderful for man; he cannot attain unto it. Man was not created with comprehensive knowledge. Man was finite and his finitude was originally no burden to him. Neither could man ever expect to attain to comprehensive knowledge in the future. We cannot expect to have comprehensive knowledge even in heaven. It is true that much will be revealed to us that is now a mystery to us but in the nature of the case God cannot reveal to us that which as creatures we cannot comprehend; we should have to be God ourselves in order to understand God in the depth of his being.⁴

Man was created good because he was created in the image of God. Therefore, righteousness, holiness, knowledge, and do-

4. Cornelius Van Til: *The Defense of the Faith*, p. 29f. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1955.

minion are normative for man. Sin is unnatural and a deformation of man's nature, a cancer and a sickness unto death. "Thus we hold that man appeared originally with a perfect moral consciousness."⁵ Man, created in the image of God, "had to live by revelation." Since man is God's creature, every condition of man's life and every fibre of his being must respond to God's law word for its health.

This then is the basic and fundamental difference between Christian and non-Christian epistemology, as far as it has a direct bearing upon questions of ethics, that in the case of non-Christian thought man's moral activity is thought of as *creatively constructive* while in Christian thought man's moral activity is thought of as being *receptively reconstructive*. According to non-Christian thought, there is no absolute moral personality to whom man is responsible and from whom he has received his conception of the good, while according to Christian thought God is the infinite moral personality who reveals to man the true nature of morality.⁶

Seventh, God having created man in His image, ordered man to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth. This is man's basic calling and a basic aspect of the nature of man. Thus, not only is man's nature created by God, but man's calling to dominion is written into the nature of man. Inescapably, man is that creature who has been created to exercise dominion over the earth and to subdue it, to create tools and institutions whose purpose it is to enable man to bring all things to their proper development in the Kingdom of God. Man was created mature so that he might exercise dominion with his first breath, and the urge to dominion is a part of his life's blood. "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:6). This fact of dominion conditions man's life, his obedience as well as his disobedience. There can be no understanding of man's psychology apart from an awareness of this inescapable urge to dominion, which, in sinful man, becomes

5. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

6. *Idem.*

a form of warfare against God. No psychology can begin to understand man apart from this aspect of man's nature, the calling to dominion. The fact is, however, that humanistic psychologies deny man's creation into maturity and fail to recognize the meaning of his calling to dominion. As a result, they not only fail to understand man but they also give man a false picture of himself.

Eighth, we are told that "male and female created he them" (Gen. 1: 27). The sexual character of men and women is not a blind and accidental product of evolution but the purpose of God and basic to any understanding of man. Attempts to deny the validity of Biblical sexual regulations, to read homosexuality as an expression of a primitive development or as another form of man's free sexual expression, or to deny the psychological differences between a man and a woman, are thus morally as well as psychologically wrong. The facts of maleness and femaleness are basic and constitutive of God's purpose for mankind, and any psychology which denies them is thereby sterile and void of understanding. Ironically, the humanists, who condemn Biblical standards as puritanical and inhibited, are themselves guilty of the worst inhibitions in their denial of sexual differences and their psychological validity. The equalitarianism of humanistic psychologies works towards a basic castration of the sexual nature of man and woman and is a major inhibiting force in modern society.

Ninth, basic to man's psychology is the creation mandate, "Be fruitful; multiply; fill the earth and subdue it" (Gen. 1: 28, Berkeley Version). This commandment is preceded in the same verse by the declaration, "And God blessed them." The commandment itself is a blessing, and the act of obedience to every commandment of God is in itself a source of blessing.

Basic to man's nature as created by God, originally wholly good, is the urge to be fruitful and to multiply. Man's psychology as created by God is thus governed by this motive, and, however perverted, this motive cannot be destroyed

without destroying man. Hostility to this fertility will thus mark a suicidal age.

The commandment makes clear that this fertility is an aspect of man's dominion: "fill the earth and subdue it." Of children, Psalm 127:3 says that they "are an heritage of the LORD." A heritage means two things: anything received from parents or predecessors, and also the condition or status into which we are born. As an "heritage of the LORD" children are thus our inheritance from God as well as a happy condition of life in the covenant. "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: 5). Not only Scripture, but the experience of history makes clear that fertility has been seen as an aspect of dominion and as an aspect of man's glory.

Tenth, it is twice stated in the account of creation (Gen. 1: 26, 28) that an aspect of man's dominion is over the animal world, "over every living thing." Man was thus created with a relationship towards animals established as normative to his healthy psychology. Man's relationship towards animals is therefore not one of warfare but of dominion. The fact that sinful men have treated animals as merely an impediment to be destroyed has not succeeded in effacing man's urge to a normative dominion over them. Men have tamed and harnessed animals, used them as pets, protectors, and servants, and they have often recognized that wild animals have a God-given function in bringing the earth under dominion.

Eleventh, man was created to live in a perfect world and to till it and to keep it (Gen. 2: 15). Thus, man's psychology has basic to it a relationship to the earth itself, which is reinforced by the fact that man was formed out of "the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2: 7) and then made into a living soul. Man is thus earth-bound, physically and psychologically. The earth is the area of his dominion, the place for his fertility to manifest itself, and his treasure to develop into that order which God requires of him.

These are some of the elemental and elementary aspects of man's psychology. Man was created into maturity, and his sin is a resolute but futile attempt to escape from maturity. However, while man may fail to meet his responsibilities, he can never escape them.

The Nature of Man

A central error of humanism and modernism has been its belief in “the natural goodness of man.” By its failure to take into account the fact of the fall, humanism has been unable to cope effectively with the problem of sin. It has consistently added to man’s predicament by ascribing evil to the environment rather than to the heart of man, and it has been unable to penetrate man’s psychology because of its willful blindness.

On the other hand, too often Christian orthodoxy has erred by so over-stressing man’s depravity as to assure virtually “the natural depravity of man.” The depravity of man is a real and ugly fact, nor can the evil in man’s heart be underrated (Gen. 6:5). The penalty for man’s fall was and is death (Gen. 3:3). In the sight of God, man is judicially dead. Moreover, man is psychologically dead in that he cannot of himself receive God’s life-giving salvation; he is incapable of self-salvation. He is, in St. Paul’s phrase, “dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph. 2: 1). As St. Paul told the Colossians, “And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses” (Col. 2: 13). Of this verse, Calvin said, “We know . . . that men cannot live otherwise than by cleaving to their God, who alone is their life. Hence it follows, that all wicked persons, however they may seem to themselves to be in high degree lively and flourishing, are, nevertheless, spiritually dead.”¹ Only God’s regenerating grace can quicken them,

1. John Calvin: *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Philippians, Colossians, and the Thessalonians*, p. 187. John Pringle translation. Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1957.

i.e., restore them to life and to that relationship to God which is the essence of life.

Granted all this, it still cannot be asserted that sin is the natural or basic condition of man. We are told that “God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good” (Gen. 1: 31), and this is certainly true of man. Sin is not man’s natural condition nor his nature; rather, sin is a deformation of man, a fatal cancer which sentences man to death and to misery. Thus, while sin is the condition of fallen man, the basic nature of man is good because it is God-created. Man is *naturally* good and *historically* and *presently* fallen, sinful, and depraved.

Precisely because sin is an unnatural and alien fact it is therefore destructive of man, and it is a deforming hardship for man. Even as health is easier to live with than a fatal cancer, so covenantal faith and obedience is an easier and happier way than sin. Sin is no more pleasant or happy a fact than such a fatal cancer. It is an oppressive, killing fact. It is a mistake to assume that particular sins are enticing. On the contrary, sin is the means to an end, a price paid to try to gain a goal, and the goal is “to be as gods (or God), knowing (or determining) good and evil” (Gen. 3:5). The immediate and particular act of sin, theft, adultery, murder, false witness, rebellion against parents and against authority, or any other sin, is an outward expression of an inward condition, a defiance of God and a supplanting of His law with man’s will. Thus, the real enticement is not a particular sin but the principle of sin, the desire for autonomy from God. Each man then, according to his taste, picks an area in which to assert an already claimed autonomy. The particular sins will be more readily surrendered than the principle of autonomy.

What Adam and Eve desired, when they took of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, was not a particular fruit which they were intensely hungry for, but rather an autonomy from God’s law and the fancied right to be their own gods. The enticement offered by the tempter was

not a choice fruit but the opportunity to be their own gods (Gen. 3:5). Similarly, in very many cases of adultery, the affair is carried on with a person less satisfying than the marital partner, and at a considerable cost; the appeal is the principle of sin, not the sexual partner. Morton Hunt's study of *The Affair* (1969), while dedicated to the "new morality", witnesses to this aspect of adultery in spite of itself; adultery is usually a highly unhappy affair, but it is a way of asserting a defiance of morality and affirming "liberation."

J. D. Unwin, in *Sex and Culture* and *Hopousia*, saw Christian sexual regulations as basic to a high civilization, but also as difficult for most men to maintain without serious breaches. He was unduly impressed by the "difficulties" of chastity; the difficulties of unchastity are the real and impressive ones. Since the natural condition of man is "wholly good" not only is the fall and sin a perversion, deformation, and misery grafted into man, but every particular act of sin is an illustration of that same sickness. Man prospers in faith and obedience, because the covenant of God, and man's obedience to the law of that covenant, is the created purpose of his being. Man suffers in sin and prospers in righteousness. "The trees of the LORD are full of sap" (Ps. 104: 16), and vitality is inseparable from His righteousness.

Those who see sin as a perpetually powerful and inescapable factor even in the redeemed man are thus guilty of misunderstanding Scripture. While man does not overcome sin entirely in this life, man's growth in sanctification means the steady decline and mortification of sin within him. Just as man's restoration to physical health means the decline of sickness or disease in his body, so man's regeneration and sanctification in Christ means the progressive decline of sin in his heart.

The condition of man was thus an original righteousness, of which original sin is a deformation and a destruction. Sin is spoken of as a death in Scripture, because man, having been created by God for His sovereign purpose, is only truly

alive, free, and able insofar as he is in obedience to God, and is “dead in trespasses and sins” whenever he is separated from God. Very simply, life is righteousness, and sin is death. Any attempt to understand man’s psychology apart from the fact that man was created to serve and magnify God by means of knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion is doomed to fail. Whenever man forsakes his calling to be God’s man, a covenant keeper, he forsakes life and himself; he denies every fiber of his being and every talent of his nature, for, as Wisdom declared, “he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death” (Prov. 8: 36).

Work and Dominion

It is a serious but common error that work is an aspect of the curse. Justification for this belief is sought in Genesis 3: 17-19. In this passage, it is clear, however, that it is Adam who is under the curse, together with Eve. Because both are under God's curse for disobedience, every aspect of their life reflects that curse. Thus, Eve's two great joys should be, as for all women, first, her delight in the protection, care, and lordship of her husband, and, second, children. Both of these are made a source of sorrow and trouble by the fact of sin. Adam is similarly cursed; work unto dominion was his calling and his joy and privilege. Now it becomes replete with frustration and disappointment. It is thus the labor or calling of both man and woman which, because of sin, frustrates them. That work and service which was to have been their joy and privilege becomes instead a disappointment and sorrow to them.

Work was central to man's creation and nature. "And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it" (Gen. 2: 15). The Berkeley Version renders this task as "to cultivate and to care for it," and Moffatt, "to till it and to guard it." This task is inescapably tied with the creation mandate to subdue the earth and to exercise dominion over it (Gen. 1: 16, 28). The purpose of work is to establish man in his dominion under God.

Man's work has varying aspects. *First*, tilling the earth is an aspect of man's calling; this means subjugating and developing the earth and bringing it under the dominion of and into service to man. This has broad implications. It includes all manual labor, agriculture, and science. Man exercises his do-

minion over the world under God. Just as man cannot take life apart from God's law, since God alone is the Lord of life, so man cannot use the earth apart from God's law. He must be a wise steward, not a thief nor a murderer.

Second, in Genesis 2:19 Adam has a calling to name or call the animals, i.e., to understand and classify the creation around him. This is clearly a scientific task, in that it required an understanding of the nature and classification of things. It is a religious task as well, in that man must see his relationship to the animal creation, his God-given place, and the difference between man and animals. The animals are to be seen in relationship to man, and in relationship to God and His purposes.

Third, man was only given his helpmeet after he had proven himself in his work. Thus, Adam was deemed ready for marriage, not when he was physically mature, but when he had a tested maturity in terms of his work. This concept was reflected in the Hebrew and later Jewish requirements that public office was restricted to married men who had proven themselves both by work and then by marriage. This appears also in the New Testament requirement that presbyters be married men (I Tim. 3: 1-5; 4: 3).

Fourth, as we have seen, work was not only ordained before the fall, but it is the calling of God's people in the restored creation (Rev. 22: 3).

The fall meant that man, instead of exercising dominion over the earth, returns to the earth in frustration and death and becomes himself dust or earth (Gen. 3: 19). Having sought to be god by his rebellion (Gen. 3: 5), man becomes again dust, returning to the ground he should have governed under God.

Work in itself is not necessarily of any significance; work can sometimes be used to degrade and destroy man instead of furthering his dominion. Dostoyevsky described the shattering effect of meaningless work; convicts could be demoralized and broken by being required to do some pointless task

such as carrying rocks from one pile to another, and then carrying them back again. Meaningless work is thus alien to the purpose of labor under God.

Meaningless work does not gain value by being well paid work. When one of the best rewarded Soviet writers defected to England, he left a situation of eminence, prestige, and comfort for one of comparative obscurity. The material rewards could not compensate for a meaningless and dishonest position, for an enforced compliance to a hateful regime. There was no sense of dominion in such work.

Basic to true work is that it must further man's calling to exercise dominion under God. A man must feel more a man because of his work; more secure in his status as head of a household, a member of society, and a man before God. Work that is sterile in its relationship to man's calling to exercise dominion will gradually reduce man to impotence in more ways than one.

The separation of work from dominion is catastrophic for man and society. It leads to the spiritual sickness of man and to the decline of his culture. It can lead, in some cultures, to the brutalization of man. As man is degraded by his sin and his sinful society into a slave of work whose work is bondage rather than liberation, man responds by aggravating his sin. The response of man to man becomes a form of mutual urges to degrade and defile the other person.

In other instances, the separation of work from dominion leads to a moral and religious paralysis. Man becomes a sick soul, whose every response is colored by the sick hatred of impotence and its urge to destroy. Thus, Sartre, in his play *Le Diable et le bon Dieu*, defined love as the "hatred of the same enemy."¹ Such a man talks much of love and the future, but his love is hatred, and his future is the attempt to destroy the past.

The separation of work and dominion is inevitable in every

1. Cited by Thomas Molnar: *Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time*, p. 12. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.

society which denies the triune God. Having denied its God, such a society has its work cursed and its urge to dominion frustrated. Instead of dominion, it seeks expression in destruction; instead of furthering life, it finds power in death.

The exercise of dominion under God is the development of man and the earth by means of work in order to strengthen, prosper, and heighten man's life and service under God. True work and true dominion further life and the potentialities of life. Materially and spiritually, man's life is enhanced.

Where man seeks dominion outside of God and under the curse, his work is productive of death and destruction. Man under the curse works to destroy other men and societies and also himself. He works destructively also in his relationship to the earth. An age that talks most about ecology is the earth's worst polluter, and those most guilty of pollution talk loudest about ending pollution and limiting the population, and finance population control efforts.² According to Burden, "In New York City, for example, despite John Lindsay's evident concern and symbolic street closings, the city itself continues to be the worst offender against its own pollution laws."³

Work without God is thus work without dominion and unto destruction. Work under God establishes man in his ordained dominion and provides constructive social energy. Not surprisingly, the word *energy* comes from the Greek *ergon*, work. The word for *dominion* in the Greek is *kratus*, force, strength, power, and comes from the root *kra*, to perfect, to complete. *Creator* is probably a related word.⁴ *Create* comes from the Latin *creatus*, *creare*, to create, and is related to the Armenian *serem*, I bring forth. The purpose and meaning of dominion is to bring forth the meaning and potentiality, of man, his society, and the earth, and to complete or perfect the God-ordained purposes of creation.

2. See James Ridgeway: *The Politics of Ecology*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1970.

3. Carter Burden, "The Economics of Pollution," *Town and Country*, vol. 125, no. 4578, January, 1971, p. 19.

4. W. E. Vine: *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, p. 332. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1940, 1966.

A society which seeks, however vainly, to eliminate work by creating a work-free world will neither escape from the curse nor gain any dominion by its efforts. Instead, it will intensify the disintegration of man, for, while work is not the salvation of man, man ceases to be man if separated from work. Not surprisingly, men usually die within a few years of retirement, at whatever age they retire. Even fallen men, however much they fret at the curse which dogs their efforts and their work, are still concerned with realizing their manhood and dominion through work. To separate men from work is to separate them from meaning and life. Man's life is not defined by play but by work and dominion. Where man finds his work futile, there the disintegration of man becomes manifest.

Man, however, cannot be defined by his function; thus, he cannot be defined as a working animal. Work is man's function, but man himself is a creature created in the image of God and therefore far more than his function. A central aspect of that image is dominion. Work is the means whereby man manifests, establishes, and develops his dominion under God. A work-free society will finally be a man-free society.

The old Puritan and Christian association of work with the nature of man still survives in America. A visitor from England describes with some irritation "the standard opening line" of American men, whether at a bar or a party, in meeting strangers; after introductions are made and a drink brought or taken, the real conversation begins with the question, "And what do you do?"⁵ By answering this question, the stranger is identified; work is seen as a key to knowing a person and in classifying them. The question reveals both the surviving health of American life as well as a measure of decline. In an earlier era, the companion question would have ascertained what a man believed, so that, by his faith and his work, he would be identified.

5. Nancy Hawks, "Those Swinging Singles," in Norman Hill, editor: *Free Sex: A Delusion*, p. 69. New York: Popular Library, 1971.

Knowledge

In Colossians 3: 5-9, St. Paul cites the evil works of man's fallen nature which have now been put away by the believers, who "have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3: 10). Barry stated that " 'the man' is here properly the *youthful man* 'which is renewed', that is, to which is given a nature really fresh and new."¹ The old man and his works have been abolished; the new man, created by God in Christ, is constantly renewed in his original newness to fulfil his original task. As Lenski so ably analyzed it, St. Paul brings forward a very interesting aspect of man's renewal:

But now, instead of saying renewed for good works (as in Eph. 2: 10) and thus stating a direct opposite of the evil "practices" of the old man, Paul goes deeper and says: "constantly renewed for *epignosis* in accord with his Creator." For out of this true, spiritual knowledge arise all true spiritual good works. It accords with the image of God. Ephesians 4: 24 informs us that the image consists in knowledge and holiness which belong to truth. With it goes this knowledge as being in accord with the image of God. Adam was created in God's image. In Adam this image existed in its pristine newness and made him like God in righteousness and holiness. And it was combined with true knowledge and thus with truth as held by this knowledge. In these respects Adam was a miniture copy of God. This image which was lost in consequence of the fall God re-creates by grace and constantly renews unto the spiritual knowledge which keeps the image clean and unspoiled in us.

1. Right Rev. Alfred Barry, "Colossians", in C. J. Ellicott's *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, vol. VIII, p. 1131 Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

2. R. C. H. Lenski: *Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, etc.*, p. 163f. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1937,1946.

This is in essence what the Larger Catechism said in its summary description of man's nature: God "made them after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness; having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfil it, and dominion over the creatures; yet subject to fall" (A. 17).

The word *epignosis* is particularly of interest. According to Edward Robinson's *Lexicon* (1850), it means "Full knowledge." According to Joseph Henry Thayer's *Lexicon* (1886), it means "precise and full knowledge." According to Vine, it "suggests generally a directive, a more special, recognition of the object known . . . sometimes *epignosko* implies a special participation in the object known, and gives greater weight to what is stated; thus in John 8: 32, 'ye shall know the truth' . . . *epignosko* lays stress on participation in the truth . . . J. Armitage Robinson (on Ephesians) points out that *epignosis* is 'knowledge directed towards a particular object, perceiving, discerning,' whereas *gnosis* is knowledge in the abstract."³

The unbeliever seeks *gnosis*, not *epignosis*; he seeks "knowledge in the abstract", not knowledge in relationship to the object known. Abstract knowledge is the attempt to interpret all things without reference to God. God is abstracted from reality, and things are interpreted, not in terms of God, but in terms of themselves.

But what remains of a thing when God is abstracted from reality? The *thing*, whether it be a man or a plant or animal, is a creature, separate and distinct from God; its being is created being, whereas God is uncreated being. However, God having made all things, nothing exists in and of itself. Thus, to attempt an abstraction is to attempt the impossible. Nothing has any residue of being or meaning which can be abstracted from God and His creative purpose. Every atom of every particular thing is a creation of God, and it is only truly knowable in terms of Him. To attempt the interpretation of anything without God is to attempt the impossible.

3. W. E. Vine: *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, vol. II, p. 299. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1940, 1966.

The unbeliever, seeking knowledge or *gnosis*, if he is faithful to his premises, can know nothing, because he has denied any purpose, order, or meaning in the universe by denying God. The knowledge such a man garners about reality is based on assuming the validity of God's creative decree without accepting God.

No one has stated the issues with respect to knowledge more ably and tellingly than Dr. Cornelius Van Til. According to Van Til,

The first question we must ask with respect to the relation of our knowledge of God to our knowledge of the universe is, which of these two is prior?

Man cannot help but know himself at once in relation to his environment. The subject of knowledge must know itself in relation to and in contrast with the object of knowledge.

This contention that man must know himself in relation to his environment is not merely a general consideration obtained by observation of experience. It is implied in the very bedrock of Christian-theism. This may be seen by again referring to our idea of God and of God's relation to the created universe. Man exists by virtue of God's existence. Man's environment precedes man. God is man's ultimate environment and this environment is completely interpretative of man who is to know himself.

In other words man's environment is not impersonal. It is, moreover, not merely personal in the sense that simultaneous with his own appearance there are also other finite persons in relation to which he knows himself to be a person. Back of this relationship of finite persons to other finite persons and to other finite but impersonal things is the absolute personality of God. Back of the question as to whether man needs other finite persons or needs a finite non-personal environment is the question of the environment of man's immediate environment. God is man's ultimate environment and this ultimate environment controls the whole of man's immediate environment as well as man himself. The whole of man's own immediate environment as well as man himself is already interpreted by God. Even the denotation of the whole universe exists by virtue of

the connotation or plan of God. Thus we have answered our question about temporal priority by answering the question of logical priority. Because man's knowledge of God is logically more fundamental than man's knowledge of the universe, we may be indifferent to the question of temporal priority. Even if in our psychological experience we know ourselves and the universe about us before we speak self-consciously of God, we have all the while known God if we have truly known anything else.

We have constantly emphasized the concept of God as being basic to everything else which a Christian believes. This is so because God exists, as he exists, necessarily. For that reason we cannot know ourselves in any true sense unless we know God. He is our most ultimate and therefore absolutely indispensable environment. For that reason if we know him we know him truly though not comprehensively.

It follows from all this that we know the world truly too though not comprehensively.⁴

To attempt to gain knowledge without God is for man the attempt to supplant God with the autonomous mind of man as the sole interpreter of reality. The knowledge required of man is, according to St. Paul, "Knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3: 10). The Berkeley Version renders this verse, "put on the new self that is being renewed to have knowledge in the likeness of Him who created it." This knowledge is not abstract. This means not only that God is not abstracted from reality, but it also means that this knowledge is not withdrawn or abstracted from the context of life. It is *wisdom*, and it is an aspect of the context of life. We are told that "Adam knew Eve his wife" (Gen. 4: 1); to know in this sense means more than sexual relations. The term is *only* used in reference to marital relations; in cases of adultery and fornication, the expression is he "lay with her" (II Sam. 13: 14). According to Leupold, in his comment on Genesis 4: 1, the meaning of *knew*, in "Adam knew Eve his wife," "signifies, as usual, a deeper knowing, an understand-

4. Cornelius Van Til: *The Defense of the Faith*, p. 59f. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. 1955.

ing of the divine purpose, in this instance the purpose which lay behind the form of woman.”⁵

Knowledge in every area has this goal and context, “an understanding of the divine purpose.” It is closely related to what in Proverbs is called *wisdom*. Kidner has called attention to the five aspects of wisdom in Proverbs. *First*, it is *instruction*, or *training*; this emphasizes the “hard-won” nature of wisdom. “Its frequent companion is *correction*, or *reproof*, a noun whose derivation emphasizes verbal rather than physical persuasion: an appeal to reason and conscience.” *Discipline* is an aspect of this meaning.

Second, another synonym for wisdom in Proverbs is *understanding*, or *insight*, also *sense*. A *third* is “*wise dealing* . . . i.e., good sense, practical wisdom, *savoir-faire*. Its particular character shows in its verb-form, which often means ‘be successful’.” It has a companion term, *found wisdom*. The “supreme expression” of wise dealing “is in the unworldly triumph of the Servant of the Lord: Isaiah 52: 13.”

Fourth, wisdom is *shrewdness* and *discretion*, “the power of forming plans.” It means also “counsels.” *Fifth*, wisdom is also referred to in words translated as *knowledge* and *learning*, “the former implying not so much an informed mind as a knowing of truth and indeed of God Himself (Prov. 2: 5; 3: 6), and the latter tending to emphasize that doctrine is something given and received, or grasped.”⁶

There is no hint of an ivory-tower conception of learning or of knowledge in the Biblical doctrine. The rabbinic conception, while at many points departing from Scripture, did retain the intense practicality of knowledge which Scripture stresses. The modern university is a Christian institution in its original affirmation of the unity of knowledge in God, but, both in its development of a multiverse faith, and its abstractness, it had denied its heritage and is thus in crisis.

5. H. C. Leupold: *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 188. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1942.

6. Derek Kidner: *Proverbs, An Introduction and Commentary*, p. 36f. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1964.

In knowledge, moreover, the priority of God is emphatically declared by Scripture: "For the LORD giveth wisdom: out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding" (Prov. 2: 6). Revelation is thus the ground of true knowledge; the presuppositions of man's rationality and thinking must be the triune God and His infallible word. The warning is: "Every word of God is pure . . . Add thou not unto his words" (Prov. 30: 5, 6).

All this is rejected by fallen man, who assumes that he deals with a neutral world in which the facts he weighs and measures are neither created nor controlled by God. He denies that every fact is not only created by God but also revelational of Him. He assumes, after Kant, *first*, that there is "the abstract possibility of any sort of fact existing. Facts in this sense have no determinable nature. They belong in Kant's noumenal realm. They are unknown and unknowable." This denies the doctrine of creation and providence. *Second*,

The human facts that are known, that is those that somehow come into contact with the human mind, are known by virtue of the original ordering effect of the human mind upon the raw stuff of experience. These are the facts of science. They are *taken* as much as given. What they are depends not upon the ultimate determinative character of God but upon the ultimate determinative character of man, who virtually takes the place of God. Every fact then that has scientific standing is such only if it does not reveal God, but does reveal man as ultimate.⁷

If consistent to this premise, man will deny all knowledge. Man, however, is not consistent. Thus, *third*, the natural man is not consistent with his principles. "There is operative within him the sense of deity; he cannot efface it without effacing himself." Thus, while affirming Chance rather than God, he cannot be logical in applying this premise.

If the universe were actually what these men assume it to be according to their principle, there would be no science.

7. Cornelius Van Til: *A Christian Theory of Knowledge*, p. 192. Syllabus. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1954.

Science is possible and actual only because the non-believer's principle is not true and the believer's principle is true. Only because God has created the universe and does control it by His providence, is there such a thing as science at all.⁸

To affirm Chance is to deny the possibility of coherence or meaning; it is a rejection of the possibility of meaning. Thus, "With Augustine it must be maintained that God's revelation is the sun from which all other light derives. The best, the only, the absolutely certain proof of the truth of Christianity is that unless its truth be presupposed there is no proof of anything. Christianity is proved as being the very foundation of the idea of proof itself."⁹

Because man is created in the image of God, it is suicidal for man to try to escape from the knowledge of God. Man is drawn to knowledge as a plant towards the sun; if the plant turns from the sun, it is wilting and will die. Thus, an aspect of man's revolt against maturity and against life is his revolt against knowledge. Whereas the natural man may seek knowledge as a substitute for God, and as a means of becoming God (Gen. 3: 5), he soon turns from knowledge itself because it is inescapably revelational of God. The purpose of Adam and Eve was to find in knowledge a means of becoming gods. Knowledge would supposedly place them beyond the jurisdiction of God's law and government, because it would enable them to live beyond good and evil. They themselves would know or determine what constitutes good and evil. The knowledge they sought apart from God resulted not in knowledge but in guilt, and guilt led to a flight from self-knowledge. When men forsake God, they soon forsake knowledge, and there follows a guilty flight into suicidal opiates in order to escape self-knowledge. It is precisely among students and intellectuals that opiates are today most popular. The older generation finds its opiates in work and entertainment; the younger generation needs a more potent dosage.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 192,193.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 224.

The restoration of knowledge and learning means therefore that we must “put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him” (Col. 3: 10). On no other basis can there be a renaissance of knowledge. Man’s *gnosis* leads to guilt and suicide, but godly knowledge or wisdom “is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her” (Prov. 3: 18).

The attempt by Adam and Eve to have *gnosis*, knowledge abstracted from God, led to a flight from *epignosis*, true knowledge. *Gnosis* involves a self-blinding and an inability to relate fact to fact in their true sense, in that an abstract, brute factuality is posited. Because the believer has *epignosis*, knowledge which is an understanding of the divine purpose, St. John could declare, “ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things” (I John 2: 20). The verb for *know* is *oida*, from the same root as *eidon*, to see, and means to have seen or perceived. Not all things are known in factual detail by the believer, but he has the principle and the sight by which all things are seen or perceived. His ability to see or know is there; for those who attempt to know on the tempter’s terms (Gen. 3:5), there is only blindness.

Righteousness and Holiness

A basic aspect of the image of God in man is “righteousness and holiness.” St. Paul summoned men to “put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4: 24). In Colossians 3: 9, 10, it is clear that “after God” means *after the image of God*: “Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him who created him.” *Righteousness*, according to Hodge, “when it stands alone often includes all the forms of moral excellence;” when associated with *holiness*, “the one means rectitude, the being or doing right; and the other holiness. The one renders us just to our neighbours; the other, pious towards God.”¹

Ephesians 4:24 can be read as “in true righteousness and holiness,” *true* qualifying both nouns, or as “Righteousness and holiness of the truth,” which would “then mean that righteousness and holiness which the truth has, or which the truth produces.”² Christ is the truth (John 1:17; 14:6), and “Righteousness and holiness, morality and religion, are the products of the truth, without which they cannot exist.”³ Lenski renders it as “the truth’s righteousness and holiness.”⁴ Man’s calling is to serve God “without fear; In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life” (Luke 1:74-75). According to Lenski, “Righteousness is

1. Charles Hodge: *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 265. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

2. *Idem*.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 266.

4. R. C. H. Lenski: *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians*, p. 562. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1937, 1946.

God's unchanging love of right, and holiness his unchanging aversion to sin. Both attributes are ever active and never quiescent."⁵ Hodge thus defined righteousness and holiness in man, Lenski, in God. Lenski held that both attributes "refer to God and only thus to men . . . both refer to heart and conduct."⁶

Righteousness and holiness are inseparable from one another, and from truth, knowledge and dominion. Righteousness is obedience to God's law and calling with all our heart, mind, and being, and holiness is our separation and dedication to the Lord in all righteousness and truth. Man's righteousness and holiness are in and through Christ.

According to Skinner, "Righteousness in the OT is strictly a personal attribute." Non-personal uses of the word "are undoubtedly secondary." "The personal relations indicated by the term are of three kinds: Forensic, ethical, and religious. Righteousness, e.g., may denote (a) a forensic right, as when Judah says of Tamar, 'she *has been in the right* against me' (Gen 38: 26); or (b) a moral state, as Gn 6:9 'Noah was a righteous, blameless man in his generation'; or (c) a direct relationship between man and God, as in Gn 15: 6 'Abraham believed J', and he counted it to him for *righteousness*.' "⁷ The Bible does not recognize righteousness in any other god than the Lord; He alone is righteous.

According to Stevens, for the Greeks, righteousness was mainly a *social* virtue. For the New Testament, it is essentially a *religious* virtue; "it is righteousness according to the Divine standard; it is conformity to the will and nature of God Himself."⁸

This contrast is important. Humanism wants to define righteousness in terms of man and as a social virtue, whereas Christianity makes it inescapably a theocentric virtue. Other men are involved in our righteousness only by means of

5. *Ibid.*, p. 570.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 571.

7. J. Skinner, "Righteousness in OT," in James Hastings, editor: *A Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. IV, p. 272. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919.

8. G. B. Stevens, "Righteousness in NT" in *ibid.*, IV, 281.

God's law: only as we obey God's law with reference to all things, including other men, are we righteous. Our relationship to all men, and to ourselves, must be mediated by God's law. To attempt a purely social relationship with other men, entirely abstracted from God's law, is sin; it is unrighteousness. To attempt a purely personal and autonomous appraisal of ourselves is again unrighteous and sinful. God's law is the air of man's personal and social life; without God's law, man perishes.

Returning to Stevens, he added, "Since, therefore, the character of God is conceived in NT teaching as absolute moral perfection, righteousness in men becomes a name for that disposition and method of life which accord with God's holy will; in short, righteousness is Godlikeness."⁹ Thus, righteousness is "a quality of God's nature and action" on the one hand, and, on the other, "the character which God requires of man."¹⁰

The meaning of *holiness* is separation, cutting off, dedicated to a specific and restricted use, as against profane, and open to common use. Although modernist commentators might object, God's holiness thus clearly means His separation from all created being and His transcendence. Man's holiness is thus man's separation to God and his transcendence of the humanistic and social forces and influences in terms of dedication to God and His law word.

Whereas the Hebrew word for holiness means a cutting off, a separation, we have in the New Testament not only similar words translated as holiness but also others which signify *vigorous* or *strong* in origin and still others which mean *godly* or *holy*. *Pure, purity*, is the meaning of still another term. Holiness is separation from sin and consecration to God. According to Stevens,

In the absolute sense God alone is holy, and His holiness is the ground of the requirement of holiness in His creatures (I Peter 1: 16). Holiness is the attribute of God,

9. *Idem*.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 284.

according to which He wills and does only that which is morally good. In other words, it is the perfect harmony of His will with His perfect ethical nature. But the divine holiness is not to be thought of as a mere passive, quiescent state. It is an active impulse, a forthgoing energy. In God's holiness, that is, in the expression of His perfect ethical nature, His self-revelation is grounded. Nay, creation itself, as well as redemption, would be inconceivable apart from the divine holiness, the energizing of God's absolute good will.¹¹

Righteousness and holiness are aspects of the image of God in man; but man is fallen, and as a result sin rather than righteousness and holiness marks his being. In what sense then can we speak of man's nature as sinner having any relationship to these attributes?

It must be said that, in fallen man, the urge to righteousness and holiness persists. Man, although in total rebellion against God, is still not his own creator. However much Sartre tries in his philosophy to make man's nature a product of man's own creative act, man remains inescapably a creature of God. Since man cannot remake himself and since man remains always and in all things God's handiwork, man's actions are at best analogical and imitative. Man the sinner repeats what God ordains, but he attempts to do it on autonomous grounds.

It follows therefore that fallen man does strive after righteousness, but only on his own terms. As a result, what he perverts the urge to righteousness into is *self-righteousness* and *self-justification*. He justifies his ways before God and man and asserts that his sin is virtue. Man's sin thus becomes his assertion of righteousness. The tempter asserted the righteousness of rebellion against God by implying that God's requirements are sin (Gen. 3: 1-5; Matt. 4: 1-11). What he posited in so doing was a neutral realm of good and evil, entirely separate from God, whereby man can judge God. In terms of Scripture, however, "the good is good for man be-

11. G. B. Stevens, "Holiness in NT" in Hastings, II, 401.

cause it has been set as good for man by God. This is usually expressed by saying that the good is good because God says it is good. As such it is contrasted with non-Christian thought which says that the good exists in its own right and that God strives for that which is good in itself. We do not artificially separate the will of God from the nature of God. It is the nature as well as the will of God that is ultimately good. Yet since this nature of God is personal there is no sense in which we can say that the good exists in its own right.”¹²

The “neutral, transcendental” idea of righteousness which the fallen man posits is in reality a projection of his own ideas to a position of judgment over God. Instead of God’s revealed law, man projects his concepts of righteousness and justice into the universe and then asserts that his intellectual progeny is self-generated. This projection is an aspect of man’s claim of autonomy from God. Van Til has pointed out that

When man fell it was therefore his attempt to do without God in every respect. Man sought his ideals of truth, goodness and beauty somewhere beyond God, either directly within himself or in the universe about him. God had interpreted the universe for him, or we may say man had interpreted the universe under the direction of God, but now he sought to interpret the universe without reference to God; we mean of course without reference to the kind of God defined above.¹³

Adam and Eve did not say, “Go to, let us do evil.” Instead, they accepted the tempter’s assumption that God is unrighteous and thus strives to prevent man from realizing his own deity. Accordingly, they chose the true and higher way to righteousness, a course of autonomous or *self*-righteousness (Gen. 3:1-5).

Not only is righteousness redefined by the sinner but holiness also. Holiness becomes separation not to God but from God. The moral freedom of man requires, it is held, the re-

12. Cornelius Van Til: *The Defense of the Faith*, p. 69. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

jection of God's demand for slavish obedience. Man must be free, and freedom is defined as autonomy from God and a rejection of God's law.

Holiness has been an important concept in the beatnik and hippie cultures of the 1960s and early 1970s. Allen Ginsberg, in his poem "Howl", first published in 1959, defined the new holiness as anti-God and anti-law. Holiness means separation, in this kind of thinking, from everything godly and Biblical: it means a radical approval of an outlaw culture. According to Ginsburg, in the sequel, "Footnote to Howl",

Everything is holy! everybody's holy! everywhere is holy!
everyday is in eternity! Everyman's an angel!

The bum's as holy as the seraphim! the madman is holy as
you my soul are holy.¹⁴

Because anti-godly holiness means separation from God in terms of man's autonomy, it follows that its righteousness is self-righteousness.

Thus, sinful man does not deny the need for righteousness and holiness; instead he redefines these concepts in terms of his assertion of autonomy. He then strives to create a personal and social "order" in terms of this perversion. When the state, school, church, or society abandons its Biblical calling, it then seeks to establish an order of righteousness and holiness based on man's autonomy. The modern state is intensely concerned with righteousness and holiness, but in a radically anti-christian manner. It cannot be neutral. It is inescapably tied to God's order, to righteousness and to holiness, as well as to dominion and knowledge. In its sin, it turns these things into a parody of themselves; it seeks to attain these things in autonomy. Its quest is self-frustrating, and its conclusion is always confusion (Gen. 11: 1-9).

Righteousness and holiness are basic to the image of God and therefore to any personal or social renewal and progress. The great fallacy of revivalism has been its attempt to replace the force of law and law-keeping in furthering man's life in

14. Allen Ginsberg, "Footnote to Howl", in Thomas Parkinson, editor: *A Casebook on the Beat*, p. 12. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1961.

Christ with supposedly charismatic experiences. During the 1930s, much was said about “the return to religion”. The World War II years supposedly were bringing men back to faith. After the War, Billy Graham, Youth for Christ, and other movements were called the forerunners of a great Christian revival, as later were Campus Crusade, “Jesus Rock”, “Jesus Freaks”, and other movements. Instead, the United States drifted deeper into humanism and moral decay. None of these movements placed any emphasis on God’s law; most were antinomian, and the result was much emotionalism and less righteousness and holiness.

Personality

Van Til has pointed out that “the image of God in the wider or more general sense” means that man like God is a *personality*.¹ In the redeemed man, this means that man becomes progressively more and more a person, self-conscious in his growth and character (as opposed to being unconscious of his nature), and steadily manifesting more and more the image of God in knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion. Sanctification is thus the development of the personality of man, when viewed from this perspective.

The fall of man, however, has its effect on this aspect of man’s being also. Because every facet of man’s being testifies to the sovereign God, it becomes imperative for rebellious man to deny that witness by an escape from personality. Man then seeks anonymity; he wants to become a face in the crowd. The city both aggravates man’s loneliness because of its impersonal life and also gratifies man in his flight from personality. Man suppresses his totally personal and self-conscious nature because he finds it a burden to live with.

For this reason, both before and after Freud, the concept of the unconscious has had a very great appeal to man. The guilt which man feels intensely and consciously before God he ascribes to ancient and primitive forces in his unconscious mind. Guilt is thus depersonalized by Freud, with his concepts of the id, ego, and superego.² Depersonalizing guilt means depersonalizing man also. Thus, in the commission of his sin and rebellion against God, and in his profane life, man

1. Van Til: *Defense of the Faith*, p. 29.

2. See R. J. Rushdoony: *Freud*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1965, 1968.

finds his self-expression and pleasure; in this, man is still personal. When guilt ensues, man insists on depersonalizing the guilt and blaming it on ancient unconscious urges.

But man is a unity, and he cannot depersonalize one area of his life without depersonalizing other areas. Every transgression of God's law is an act of depersonalization, because it is an attempt by man to use other men and their possessions in contempt of God's law. Murder is a radical destruction of another man's life and personality, but adultery or any sexual sin constitutes a similar depersonalization of another person and of ourselves in order to serve an impulse. Our possessions are linked to our persons and are expressive of our personalities, and their theft is an assault on our persons. To bear false witness concerning any man is to attempt to damage his person and personality. Sin thus leads to a progressive depersonalization of man.

The so-called sexual revolution gives telling examples of this fact. J. W. Wells' accounts of several cases of *menage a trois* indicate the studied assault on personality. Every case cited by Wells has homosexual and incestuous aspects. These indicate an attempt by those involved to overthrow God's law and to reduce all relationships to sex. The sexual urge is moreover altered to an urge to exploit and to degrade; it is sadistic in character and masochistic and guilt-ridden in application. The delight of one man was incest with his sister, begun early in life and continued, and to know that his wife played roles in pornographic films. Pictures of his wife engaged in homosexual and heterosexual relations with others delighted him. All such acts, purely sexual in nature, in films or in life, delighted him to a far-reaching degree, because of their depersonalizing nature. He could not be *impersonal* about his wife and sister, but he could depersonalize them into purely sexual objects, to be used by himself and made available for other's uses.

With other people, this man enjoyed being *impersonal*. Hence his delight in a sexual orgy. He thus declared, "I found

it very satisfying, for example, that I would tumble a girl at a party without knowing her name or her knowing mine, without either of us giving a damn.” A high point in his experience was an episode which went “a step further;” he “took” a girl at one orgy without her “even knowing who it was that had obliged her.”³

Every violation of God’s law means either the depersonalizing of man, or an impersonal use of man. It is only in God and under God’s law that man can be personal and a personality. The common belief has it that the law is impersonal; God’s law is never impersonal, however. God is no respecter of persons (Deut. 10:17; 2 Chron. 19:7; Job 34:19; Acts 10:34; Rom. 2:11; Gal. 2:6; Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25; I Peter 1:17); moreover, judges must “not respect persons in judgment” (Deut. 1:17). To enforce the law without respect of persons does *not* make the law impersonal, or the accused less a person. Rather, it works to preserve *the personal application* of the law; not the condition of a man, his prestige, wealth, or poverty are to be the criteria of judgment but his *personal act* which is the subject of the trial.

Thus, in terms of Scripture, man can only have a truly personal relationship when it is under law, because only then does he respect his person and the person of his wife, friend, neighbor, or enemy. Every attempt by existentialism to have an I - Thou relationship is doomed: it depersonalizes all concerned because it leaves out God and His law. Not surprisingly, for existentialism the neighbor or the other person is the “devil” (Sartre). Only when relationships are mediated by God and His law, only when they are I - God and His law - and Thou relationships, can they be truly personal.

To leave out God and His law is to create a communications gap, an inability to communicate. In hell, this communications gap is total; man is totally trapped in his own ego, unable to communicate with God or man. He can only experi-

3. John Warren Wells: *3 is not a Crowd*, p. 117. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1971.

ence the gnawing, burning depersonalized pain of his own being and is eternally alone with himself.

On the other hand, God's new creation, being free from sin, sees a full, perfect, and free communication of totally self-conscious personalities, and Christ's "name shall be in their foreheads" (Rev. 22: 4). These free men in Christ are now fully that which Christ created and re-created them to be, and their personality is now open and manifest in its revelation of their new humanity in Jesus Christ.

The Sexual Nature of Man

In Genesis 1:27, we are told that “male and female created he them.” It is impossible to understand the nature and psychology of man apart from this fact. The sexual nature of man has been both overstated and under-rated. The fact of sex conditions our nature and perspective and is a basic aspect of our being. It is an aspect of our life which we cannot subtract from ourselves without ceasing to be ourselves. On the other hand, it is not an eternal condition. According to Christ, “in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven” (Matt. 22: 30). It is difficult for man in this life to imagine a resurrection body without the infirmities and limitations of his earthly body, but this is still his future. To consider man apart from his eternal life, as humanists and evolutionists do, is to reduce him to an animal and to distort the reality of man’s nature and being. Similarly, to neglect the fact that sexuality is an aspect of time and not of eternity is also to distort the reality of man. Man lives in time, but his life transcends time. Man cannot be seen as only a creature of eternity; he is not an angel but a man. However, he cannot be seen as only a creature of time whose life is limited to this world; he has been created in the image of God.

It is important thus to have a Biblical understanding of sex. According to Piper, the main points in such an understanding are, *first*, “the essentially complimentary character of man and woman,” marriage and sexual intercourse “institutes a genuine unity ordained by God for that purpose;” *second*, “the essential difference of the sexes,” a difference which is apparent in all their being; *third*, “the change of na-

ture called forth by sexual intercourse;” this last point would be difficult to sustain from Scripture.¹

Calvin, in comparing Genesis 1:27 to I Corinthians 11:1-16, observed, with reference to Genesis 1:27:

This further difficulty is also to be encountered, namely, why Paul should deny the *woman* to be the image of God, when Moses honours both, indiscriminately, with this title. The solution is short; Paul there alludes only to the domestic relation. He therefore restricts the image of God to *government*, in which the man has superiority over the wife, and certainly he means nothing more than that man is superior in the degree of honour. But here the question is respecting that glory of God which peculiarly shines forth in human nature, where the mind, the will, and all the senses, represent the Divine order.²

With reference to I Corinthians 11, 12, Calvin wrote:

When he (Paul) says, *in the Lord*, he by this expression calls the attention of believers to the appointment of the Lord, while the wicked look to nothing beyond pressing necessity. For profane men, if they can conveniently live unmarried, despise the whole sex, and do not consider that they are under obligations to it by the appointment and decree of God, the pious, on the other hand, acknowledge that the male sex is but the half of the human race. They ponder the meaning of that statement—*God created man: male and female created he them.* (Gen. i. 27, and v. 2). Thus they, of their own accord, acknowledge themselves to be debtors to the weaker sex. Pious women, in like manner, reflect upon their obligations. Thus the man has no standing without the woman, for that would be the head severed from the body; nor has the woman without the man, for that were a body without a head. “Let, therefore, the man perform to the woman the office of the head in respect of ruling her, and let the woman perform to the man the office of the body in respect of assisting him, and that not merely in the married state, but also in celibacy; for I do not speak of cohabitation merely, but also of civil offices, for which there is occasion even in the unmarried

1. Otto H. Piper: *The Christian Interpretation of Sex*, pp. 9-10. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.

2. John Calvin: *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis*, vol. I, p. 95f. Rev. John King translation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

state.” If you are inclined rather to refer this to the whole sex in general, I do not object to this, though, as Paul directs his discourse to individuals, he appears to point out the particular duty of each.

12. *As the woman is of the man.* If this is one of the reasons, why the man has superiority — that the woman was taken out of him, there will be, in like manner, this motive to friendly connection — that the male sex cannot maintain and preserve itself without the aid of women. For this remains a settled point — that *it is not good for man to be alone*. (Gen. ii 18). This statement of Paul may, it is true, be viewed as referring to propagation, because human beings are propagated not by men alone, but by men and women; but I understand it as meaning this also — that the woman is a needful help to the man, inasmuch as a solitary life is not expedient for man. This decree of God exhorts us to cultivate mutual intercourse.

But all things of God. God is the Source of both sexes, and hence both of them ought with humility to accept and maintain the condition which the Lord has assigned to them.³

Thus, Calvin clearly held that woman’s capacities for knowledge, righteousness, and holiness are no less than man’s; she is fully man’s equal in these things. The difference rests in the fact that government or dominion is given to man essentially. In all this, Calvin is right, but something more needs to be said. *First*, while the capacities of male and female for knowledge, righteousness, and holiness are equally great, they are not identical, in that each is conditioned by sex. This factor cannot be overstated; there is no such thing as a male arithmetic and a female arithmetic, but there is a difference of approach to the subject. Certain areas of knowledge are more appealing to men, and others more so to women. When both men and women are concerned with the same area of knowledge, their emphasis may well vary. This by no means implies that the male perspective is superior, merely that differences are real although not absolute. The same is true in matters of

3. John Calvin: *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, I, p. 360f. Rev. John Pringle translation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

righteousness and holiness. An exclusively male or female perspective leads to sterility and narrowness. *Second*, the fact that dominion is primarily a masculine calling has its effect on man's knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. It was, after all, a male philosopher who said that "knowledge is power", a typically male approach to knowledge. A woman would have said, "knowledge is understanding", with far more wisdom. This does not mean that men despise understanding or that women despise power, or that either neglects those aspects which are important to the other. It does mean that there is a difference of emphasis on the whole.

Because Calvin lived in an era when modernity had for some time been the intellectual fashion, he reflected to some degree the equalizing of men and women, although his faithfulness to Scripture prevented him from falling victim to this illusion.

Turning to a modern conservative scholar's comment on Genesis 1:27, we find Atkinson's comment of some interest:

The last sentence of this verse tells us the second of two fundamental facts about human nature. The first is that man is made in the image of God, that is to say, essentially a moral being. The second is that he was made in two sexes. God had two purposes in making the human race in this way. Firstly He intended that it should reproduce its kind. This important function is confined, so far as we know, to the inhabitants of this earth. It is not shared by angels (Mt. 22:30; Mk. 12:25; Lk. 20:35); It has far reaching effects. It unites the human race in a single bundle of life, making of it a unity impossible in the case of angels who appear to be separately created individual beings. It is this unity that the Bible refers to when it speaks of our being 'in Adam' (I Cor. 15:22). The united humanity in Adam is a symbol and picture of redeemed humanity, similarly united, though by different means and a closer bond, in Christ. This unity enables the one act of redemption performed by Christ to become effective towards the whole human race, just as the whole race has been affected as such by the one act of disobedience on Adam's part that constituted the fall. The power of reproduction also made possible the incarnation of Christ,

which was essentially preparatory to the act of redemption. While He was not begotten by the ordinary method of generation, it remains true that the reproductive functions of the human race alone made it possible for Him to assume human nature. This He did as the true child of Mary, through whom He took human nature from Adam. These facts enable us to speculate on the possibility that, seeing that moral evil was already in the universe before man's creation through the devil's fall, God may from the beginning have intended the creation of the human race to be a step in the redemption of the universe as a whole.

The second purpose of God in creating the human race in two sexes was to enable it thereby to reflect the eternal relationship between Christ and His Church. The apostle explains this in considerable detail in Eph. 5:25-33.⁴

This "second purpose" is valid to a limited degree. Clearly, the marital union does typify "the eternal relationship between Christ and His Church", but not because the relationship is sexual, but because marriage reveals both unity and subjection. To see the typology in the sexual relationship or act (which is not what St. Paul was talking about) opens the door to no small mystical eroticism. There was more than a little such mystical eroticism among churchmen both in the pre- and post-Reformation eras. There are traces of this in Piper, even though he denies that sex in its origin can be "traced back to the Godhead" as in many pagan religions. He does assert, however, that "the Church receives His (Christ's) spiritual gifts as the woman receives the man's seed: and therefore again these gifts are not lifeless treasures to be laid aside in a drawer, but germs from which new life proceeds: the fruits of the Holy Spirit."⁵

When the church has tried to deny man's sexual nature, the consequence has been serious moral disturbance. Men and women can and do live in the single estate as a necessary condition of their life, and they can be normal and healthy indi-

4. Basil F. C. Atkinson: *The Book of Genesis*, Part One, p. 23. Chicago: Moody Press, 1954.

5. Piper, *op cit.*, p. 82f.

viduals, and very commonly are. The problem ensues when men and women live, not in terms of necessary circumstances, but in terms of a denial of an aspect of their being, a refusal to accept a creaturely fact. It is then that serious psychological problems ensue.

The over-emphasis on sex leads to equally serious, if not sometimes more serious problems. An example of this is the Herrnhutter or Moravian experience during the mid-eighteenth century. Under the leadership of Count Nicholas von Zinzendorf, the Moravians went into an extended period of antichristian beliefs, a sexual interpretation of the doctrine of salvation. According to Tabori, the spear wound in the side of the crucified Christ was turned into a sexual symbol; the wound was identified with the female genital organs. Copulation was called communion with Christ, and every aspect of the sexual act was given a mystical meaning. Sexual acts were made a part of public worship. In one type of gathering, "The believers filed in solemn procession through the gigantic Vulva; a bed and a table was placed in it alongside with a row of headless human figures; the latter signified the fact that the wonderful nature of the 'side cavity' could only be understood by the heart, never by the intellect."⁶

Is Tabori right, or has he done the Moravians of that era an injustice and merely reported slander and libel? Bishop E. de Schweinitz limited "the time of sifting" to only four or five years (1745-1749) and denied that "gross sins" resulted but admitted that false notions concerning the atonement and Christ's wounded side prevailed. He admitted also that Zinzendorf had "unwittingly originated" this "fanaticism."⁷ Since Bishop de Schweinitz was a bishop of the Moravian Church in America, he was less than honest in his account, but more honest than some who omit or deny this

6. Paul Tabori: *Secret and Forbidden, The Moral History of the Passions of Mankind*, p. 42. New York: New American Library, (1966) 1971.

7. Bishop de Schweinitz, "Moravian Church", in Schaff-Herzog: *A Religious Encyclopedia*, vol. III, p. 1568. Third edition, revised. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1894.

aspect of Moravian history. Strickland, in writing of Zinzendorf, merely noted, "Something might be said also on the connection of a certain marriage-rite with the theory of regeneration, the efficacy of which was probably tried by the Herrnhutters in common with the Quakers."⁸ Bishop de Schweinitz admitted, in another context, that "the controlling influence of the Church was carried to unreasonable extremes, particularly as regards the sacred rights of the marriage relation and of the family. These were interfered with." He denied that the American Moravian churches were affected. The fact that these practices were ended he held to be proof that the Moravians Church "was founded upon Christ as its chief cornerstone."⁹

Sessler recognized that the period of moral dereliction was not a brief one, nor was it limited to Germany and alien to America. Zinzendorf's ideas are ascribed to "a pathological condition which broke out in demonstrations of emotionalism, phantasies, and morbidity."¹⁰ The spear-wound symbolism was carried to "extreme sensuality" and into various "rites".¹¹ The result was licence and licentiousness. "Hindu symbolism analogous to Zinzendorf's can be found in the extreme forms of Bhakti and in the Tantric literature."¹²

It should be remembered that John Wesley's "conversion" in 1738 was through the influence of the Moravians in England. To the credit of the Wesleys, John and Charles, they soon broke with the Moravians and accused them of "Universal Salvation, Antinomianism, and a kind of a new-reformed Pietism," as well as sinless perfection.¹³ George Whitefield charged Count Zinzendorf with "robbery and intrigue" in church matters.¹⁴

8. Rev. W. P. Strickland, "Zinzendorf", in M'Clintock and James Strong: *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, vol. X, p. 1100. New York: Harper, 1894.

9. Bishop E. de Schweinitz, "Moravian Brethern", in *ibid.*, vol. VI, p. 586.

10. Jacob John Sessler: *Communal Pietism Among Early American Moravians*, p. 162. New York: Henry Holt, 1933.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 163.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 176.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

14. *Ibid.*, I;177f.

It is important to understand the background of such an aberration. Scholastic philosophy had introduced a false ground for Christian thought by its use of Aristotle, and the consequence was a despair of reason and the rise of mysticism. Moreover, the introduction of the Hellenic principle of autonomous man ultimately worked against reason, in that autonomous man had no desire to be bound by any higher law reason might discover beyond or above reason. The result was a hostility on the part of autonomous reason to propositional truth. Erasmus expressed his intense dislike for “assertions” or propositional truth.¹⁵ Propositional truth binds and limits man. As a result, Arminianism rejected predestination as an unduly limiting proposition for man, and Pietism, in both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, rejected reason for the heart, the whole man for a fragmented man. The Moravian rite, during the time of sifting, of the headless men summed up the new mood and motive in religion. Reason and propositional truth were rejected for a religion of the heart, which meant, a religion of feeling. Not surprisingly, the Quakers, who earlier had placed the inner revelation above the written revelation, fell into like aberrations.

The rejection of antinomianism and Pietism by the Wesleys did not prevent Methodism from falling prey to both. Indeed, virtually all churches did. The sexual excesses have appeared from time to time, for they are endemic to headless religion, but normally they are suppressed. More commonly, they form an undercurrent behind a formalistic surface of moralism. Thus, in too many churches, fornication and adultery are very common, and sometimes taken as a routine fact of life, whereas divorce is seen as an ultimate evil, because it breaks the surface of moralism with a public act.

In headless religion, the sexual nature of man is over-emphasized, because feelings become all important. Sexual deprivation is magnified in such a culture to mean the depriva-

15. Ernst F. Winter, editor: *Erasmus - Luther: Discourse on Free Will*, p. 6f. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961.

tion of life itself. Man is reduced to his heart and his feelings, which too often winds up meaning his loins. Not surprisingly, revulsion against such a perversion of man's nature leads sometimes to an over-reaction and to asceticism, wherever an undercurrent of unbiblical psychologies exists.

Moreover, headless religion leads to a headless psychology of man, man interpreted in terms of his instincts and feelings. As a result, further violence is done to the nature of man. Because God is personal, man is a person, and every aspect of man is also personal. Man's bodily chemistry is not only human, an aspect of the race, but it is also personal. Similarly, sexuality is personal, and headless psychology leads to a depersonalized sexuality. A quantitative approach results. It is not true, however, that godly celibacy is a state of deprivation as against an ungodly marriage. Because man is personal, an unhappy and an ungodly marital relationship is a far greater deprivation of his person than a single estate.

The tragic fallacy of sexual manuals and the whole modern view of sex is that it is headless and depersonalized. Such a perspective leads, not to the sexual fulfilment of man but the radical destruction of man and a far-reaching deprivation.

Wherever psychology reduces man to drives, instincts, or primitive urges and inheritances (in terms of evolutionary faith), it inescapably works to deprive man of his personal nature and his creation into maturity. The result is a meager man who strives through pathological and phrenetic sexuality, to realize himself, only to hasten his disintegration. In headless psychology, man seeks renewal and regeneration by means of his sexual activity and further depersonalizes himself. This depersonalization is a form of death.

This depersonalization appears in what passes for sexual pleasure in modern thought. The psychoanalyst, Dr. W. D. Sprague, recognized this and commented on the aggressive aspects, and the element of hostility and hatred, in what passes for sexual pleasure, observing that

The feeling of gratification is heightened by the conscious

sense of having obtained revenge, of having “gotten even”. This revenge is not necessarily directed entirely against the husband. In many instances, it is directed against the community, against society as a whole.

The wife who seeks coital solace through adulterous or homosexual relations is, in effect, saying to the world: “You have helped restrict, thwart, and frustrate me. I am now showing you what I think of you — and especially of your rules, forms and codes. I am defying and breaking them. They have sinned against me — now I am sinning against them.”¹⁶

What Sprague does not say must be added, that this hostility is primarily against God and His law order. In such a perspective, sex loses its basic function and purpose and becomes instead a weapon and a tool of hostility.

Food which does not nourish only creates a more urgent appetite. Sexuality which violates man’s God-created nature cannot satisfy and thus creates an intensified sexuality which is neurosis laden. Headless psychology then over-defines man in terms of this neurotic sexuality.

Because man is personal in his life, his sexuality can only be personal and hence marital in order to find fulfilment and self-realization. God’s purpose in man’s creation is paramount in understanding man. Basic to that purpose is the creation mandate, that man exercise dominion and subdue the earth (Gen. 1: 26-28). Man’s sexuality is related to that calling, to provide him with a helpmeet so that together male and female may complement each other in God’s service. This calling is basic and primary; it is personal and it is theocratic as well. Children are aspects of that dominion and of the extension of God’s domain over the earth, but they are not the whole nor the heart of it.

Man is thus more than his sexuality; while sexuality cannot be abstracted from man in this life, neither can man be reduced to it. At all times, man must be defined in terms of the image of God. Headless religion neglects or distorts the true

16. W. D. Sprague: *Sexual Rebellion in the Sixties*, p. 128f. New York: Lancer Books, 1965.

head, God Himself. When St. Paul compared the relationship of husband and wife to Christ and the church, he was illustrating the meaning of Ephesians 5: 21, "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God." The purpose of this submission is victory against the enemies of God and the fulfilment of "the gospel of peace" (Eph. 6: 11-15).

It is only after man is defined in terms of the image of God in Genesis 1: 27 that it is added that mankind was created male and female. Sexuality is subordinate to the image of God. In headless psychology, men are governed by their feelings and impulses. Many twentieth century textbooks in psychology avoid use of the words *mind*, *reason*, and *consciousness*, because these are, in their evolutionary perspective, only epiphenomena. Man is discussed in terms of rat and dog experiments, or, if, in Freudian terms, the mind is recognized, in terms of the unconscious, the id, ego, and superego. The results should not surprise us: a mindless psychology produces a mindless generation that thinks with its loins and stomach and despises reason. The autonomous reason of Renaissance man has abdicated its mind, and is surrendering its very life.

The Paradise Motive

According to Robert Ardrey, "Man is a bad-weather animal, designed for storm and change."¹ This opinion rests on Ardrey's belief that "Man is a predator whose natural instinct is to kill with a weapon."² The premise being false, the conclusion is in error also. Man is not a predatory animal. If he *sometimes* thrives in bad weather, it is because he is jarred out of his complacency in sin. The root of progress is not trouble but grace. If "bad weather" or trouble made for progress, China, India, and Africa should have assumed world leadership centuries ago.

Man, having been created by God, was created for the Kingdom of God, for a perfect society under God. His first home was the Garden of Eden, and what can be called an urge to paradise remains in his nature. The myths of most peoples recall a "golden age" or an original paradise, and the politics of most peoples have as their motive force a drive to create a new paradise on earth.

The urge to establish a paradise on earth is governed, however, by the reality of the fall and the fact of sin. As a result, the political version of the dream, the Kingdom or City of Man, has as its motive the desire to be as god, knowing good and evil (Gen. 3: 5). St. Augustine, in *The City of God*, traced the history of that perverted motive and its disastrous consequences for man. Sovereignty, the attribute of God, has become a goal of men and nations. As a result, "This lust of sovereignty disturbs and consumes the human

1. Robert Ardrey: *African Genesis*, p. 327; cf. pp. 270, 330. New York: Atheneum, 1961.

2. *Ibid*, p. 316.

race with frightful ills.”³ The pagan thinkers themselves asserted that man’s life must be social, and Augustine agreed, “For how could the city of God . . . either take a beginning or be developed, or attain its proper destiny, if the life of the saints were not a social life?” But man, because of his sin, cannot live in peace with his fellow man. Even in the close and loving ties of marriage, community turns to warfare, and the pagan “comic writers” make their characters express unhappy sentiments about marriage as being misery. The home too often becomes a scene of warfare and grief.

If, then, home, the natural refuge from the ills of life, is itself not safe, what shall we say of the city, which, as it is larger, is so much the more filled with lawsuits civil and criminal, and is never free from the fear, if sometimes from the actual outbreak, of disturbing and bloody insurrections and civil wars?⁴

Centuries of marital failures have not discouraged men from marrying in the hopes of finding happiness and true community in a family. The urge is not simply sexual: it is an urge to establish an order and a community, not merely to find sexual relief.

Similarly, the political failures have not ended political hopes. Men continue to seek a paradise on earth by a variety of means, of which politics is a central one.

The fallacy in these attempts is their evasion of the primacy and sovereignty of God. Politics is an area of order, not the means to order. Similarly, marriage is an area of order, not the means to order and peace. A man and woman who are at peace with God and with one another can establish godly order in marriage because they bring order and peace to marriage. Marriage simply gives greater scope for the already existing condition and allows its extension, and, conversely, if there is neither peace nor order in the life of man, marriage will increase the scope of his disorder. Simi-

3. Augustine: *The City of God*, Bk. III, ch. 14; p. 86. Marcus Dods translation. Modern Library, New York.

4. *Ibid.*, Bk. XIX, ch. 5; p. 681.

larly, men carry their sins and disorders into the political state, and the state cannot give them and their social life a character they themselves lack.

The dream of man, however, is to make his disorder the grounds of a new order, to make his sin the new virtue, and to indulge himself in perfect peace. *The Kalevala* gives us a pagan expression of this supposedly idyllic dream:

The virgins of the island speak, the maidens of the headlands ponder

“We have house to come to, spacious farmsteads to live in, to take your songs to from out of the cold, to bring your words in from outdoors.”

Then as soon as reckless Lemminkainen came into the house he sang the stoups from farther off toward his end of the long deal table, stoups full of beer, beautiful pots of mead, dishes spilling over, bowls brimful.

Stoups of beer, pots of mead were indeed brought, butter was put in readiness and pork put there for reckless Lemminkainen to eat, for the man with a far-roving mind to enjoy.

The man with a far-roving mind is very grand, nor does he start to eat without a silver-hilted knife, a gold sheath knife.

He got a silver knife, sang up a gold sheath knife; then he eats his fill, drank beer to his contentment.

Then reckless Lemminkainen strolled about the communities enjoying the virgins of the island in the lovely bevy of those with luxuriant hair.

Wherever he turned his head then his mouth was quickly kissed, wherever he reached out his hand then his hand was gently pressed.

Evenings he went out for some fun in the pitch dark.

There was not a community in which there were not ten farms nor was there a farm in which there were not ten daughters, not that daughter, not that mother's child by whose side he did not stretch out, press down the arm.

He knew a thousand brides, lay with a hundred widows.

There were not two in ten, three in a whole hundred maids who were not had, widows not lain with.

Thus indeed reckless Lemminkainen lives in an easygoing

way all of some three summers in the big communities of the island.
He delighted the virgins of the island, satisfied all the widows, too.⁵

When men dream of being god, their only attitude towards all other people and things is to use them to their advantage and profit. The result is not paradise but hell, not peace on earth but conflict and warfare. This, however, only intensifies their hunger for paradise, but since their only means of achieving it is by means of their lust for sovereignty, their very hunger for paradise pushes them deeper into hell on earth.

Nowhere is the lust for sovereignty more marked than in men who profess peace, humility, and a democratic methodology. Their concept of peace and democracy means their ascendancy. "Power to the people" means power to them as the incarnation of the people. Thus, Professor Tadensz Kotarbinski, a Marxist scholar, has defined the humanist (who is therefore a socialist and the true man) in these terms: "The attitude of humanism is assumed by one who strives toward a given objective because he believes that it is for the good of the people." He then defines this good to make it identical with Marxist socialism.⁶ In the name of championing man, such people become the enemies of all men who dare to dissent from their position. Kotarbinski can baldly say, "The term 'for the people', 'for the individual' must be used in the universal sense if they are to characterize the attitude of humanism. But what do we mean by the words 'universal sense'? We mean that we are not referring to separate and distinct individuals or to certain specific groups of people but to people in general and to Man in general."⁷ This is the same as saying that I love my idea of

5. *The Kalevala, or Poems of the Kaleva District, Compiled by Elias Lonnrot*, prose translation, foreword, appendices, by Francis Peabody Magoun Jr., p. 210. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

6. Tadensz Kotarbinski, "Socialist Humanism", in *Poland*, no. 4 (200), April, 1971, p. 31.

7. *Idem*.

man, but I hate my neighbor and must kill him since he violates my concept of what a man should be. The principle of definition is located in man rather than in God; reality is then what the man-god defines it to be. The gospel then is not God's redemption of man but man's redemption of himself by severing every tie that would bind him to God. "Authentic humanity" becomes defined as a God-free humanity. Thus, Dr. Lewis B. Smedes of Fuller Theological Seminary summons men to "preach Christ as the reclamer of man's lost humanity." But man cannot be said to have lost his humanity in the fall without violence to Scripture. Man was man both before and after the fall; the difference was that he became a *sinful* man. Smedes writes, "The world does not need a message about a Savior who will do no more than turn us all into uptight, all-white, middle-class, comfortable champions of the law, order, and proper religion. What the world needs is the gospel of One who can restore men to total and authentic humanity — no more, no less, no other."⁸ A mythical Christ is thus made the Adam who successfully frees man from God into an "authentic humanity" which is antinomian and autonomous.

The urge to paradise in fallen man is therefore an antinomian urge. Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden decided that their homeland was not paradise but a prison because they were restricted from transgressing God's law. The law was practically manifested in a bar with respect to one tree; in principle, that restriction meant that man had to choose God's law-word as against man's law-word. The whole point of the temptation was that paradise would begin with man's assertion of his autonomy and his "authentic humanity" in defiance of law (Gen. 3:1-6). The urge to paradise was now anti-God and antinomian, and hell is simply the consummation of man's autonomous urge to paradise. In hell, man in total isolation from God and other men lives entirely to him-

8. Lewis B. Smedes, "A Modest Proposal to Reform the World", in *The Reformed Journal*, February, 1971; cited in "Credibility Gap", *The Standard Bearer*, vol. XLVII, no. 13, April 1, 1971, p. 294f.

self, without community, communication, or meaning, as his own world and god. Autonomous man's urge to paradise thus has its conclusion finally in hell.

In godly men, the urge to paradise expresses itself in faith and obedience: "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10: 7). In these words, the Messiah-King, as the new Adam, expresses the principle whereby He leads men into their sabbath rest, the true paradise or promised land (Heb. 4). "The King acknowledges a definite standard of the will of God, before He undertakes to aim at fulfilling it . . . The Law which foreshadowed the duties of a King of Israel was the rule of the King's life."⁹

The work of restoration begins with Christ's atonement, salvation by sovereign grace. Reconstruction proceeds with man's obedience to God's law. The paradise of *Revelation* is both garden and city (Rev. 21:1-22: 5). It is the restoration and fulfilment of both man and his world.

Because the urge to paradise today is divorced from God and His law-word, its application and development in one continent after another only intensifies the problems and miseries of men. Both the fall of man and the redemption of man are progressive actions. Christ by His death and resurrection destroyed the power of sin and death and re-established man's dominion in and under God, "But now we see not yet all things put under him" (Heb. 2:8). The victory was won in principle on the cross; it will be completed when "the last enemy", death is itself destroyed (I Cor. 15: 20-28).

The fall too is progressive. Between Adam and Noah, the decline and destruction was great, and from Abraham's day to Ezra's, the world saw the intensification of man's fall. The twentieth century has seen vaster destruction and far more extensive degeneracy than other centuries, because evil has been more mature, and also because human progress itself

9. Brooke Foss Wescott: *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 311. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, (1892) 1952.

gives fallen man greater scope and power in the manifestation of his depravity.

On the one hand thus, godly man's urge to paradise leads to the new creation; on the other, man's sinful urge to a paradise without God leads to the totality of hell.

As we have noted, the fallen man's urge to paradise is antinomian, whereas the covenant man's urge to paradise is by means of God's law. A further contrast can be noted. As fallen men seek to establish their concept of paradise, their means of establishing paradise is violence and coercion, revolution and totalitarian controls. In the name of man's salvation, humanistic man crucifies mankind on the cross of his controlled order. Because even totalitarian controls are failing to create the new model man of humanism, the dream increasingly is of dispensing with the old mankind that God created. A new race is to be created by biological sciences, by tampering with the genetic code and by means of like hopes.

The humanistic dream of paradise is inescapably coercive, because it requires a humanity to exist in that dreamed-of order which has little relationship to existing man. Since man is God's creature, not man's, man is simply incapable of becoming the new model man of humanistic dreams. However much he is educated, brainwashed, coerced, and threatened, he remains, in spite of all his fears and all his efforts to please his tormentors, God's creature still. Man is created in the image of God, not in the image of the state or of the covenant-breaker's dreams. Coercion and violence can harm man, but they cannot remake him. Because the humanist cannot remake man, in spite of all his coercive efforts, his every effort to create a humanistic paradise becomes an ugly nightmare and a failure.

Whereas the means to paradise regained for fallen man is outer coercion and persistent violence, the means God uses to restore man and the earth to their original destiny is an inward or inner coercion, regeneration. By God's grace man is recreated in Jesus Christ and made a new creature. Because

salvation is entirely by God's sovereign grace, it is coercive, but it is a coercion comparable to the process of birth, a deliverance into life, or, better, it is comparable to resurrection. Man is released from bondage, that he might serve and enjoy God forever. He can then say, with David in Psalm 56: 13, (in Moffatt's version), "for thou hast saved my life from death, my feet from stumbling, that I might live, ever mindful of God, in the sunshine of life."

The Satanic Image of Man

When God created the heaven and the earth, He made man in his own image (Gen. 1:1-27). Every revolt against God is a revolt against this fact. Man refuses to acknowledge God as creator, and he insists on denying that man is created in God's image.

The argument of Satan was that man is not a creature of God but a being in process of becoming a god; God in jealousy seeks to prevent man from realising himself. This self-realization Satan claimed to have, and his offer to Eve was precisely an opportunity for mankind to re-create itself in a new image, an image divorced from God and based entirely on man's creative will. Like Sartre, a pale echo of the tempter, Satan stated that man has being (he is), but he has no essence (he has not yet created himself). This opportunity Satan provided: "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:5) if you revolt against God's law and become your own creators.

Satan has rightly been called "the ape of God"; his plan is a parody of God's plan, and his standard is in essence an anti-standard, a negation, not a new creation. In rebellion against God, Satan decided to create his own heaven and earth out of the materials of God's creation. His program thus involved enlisting man as an ally, but an ally who would have to be remade in order to participate in Satan's plan of action. His approach to Adam and Eve was thus an acted proclamation which in effect declared, 'I will remake man; in my own image I will remake him.' History thus is the development and warfare of two contending concepts of man, two differing concepts of creation.

The name of *Satan* gives an indication of his nature. The name *Satan* comes from a Hebrew root word which means primarily “obstruct, oppose”, and is cognate to “hostility” or “hatred”. Satan is thus the obstructor, the accuser, the adversary. He is also called “Belial” or “The Worthless One” (II Cor. 6:15). He is also termed “the tempter” (Matt. 4:3; I Thess. 3:5; cf. I Cor. 7:5); “the evil one” (Matt. 13:19; I John 5:18); “the accuser” (Rev. 12:10); “the enemy” (Matt. 13:39; Luke 10:19); “the prince of demons” (Matt. 9:34; 12:24; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15); “the ruler of the world” (John 12:31; 16:11); and “the prince of the power of the air” (Eph. 2:2). Jesus called Satan Beelzebul on two occasions (Matt. 10:25; 12:24, 27; cf. Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15, 18, 19). In Revelation, Satan is called “the great dragon, the ancient serpent” (Rev. 12:9; 20:2-3, 10).¹ These and other terms all underscore the essential negation of Satan’s role. This work of negation has as its goal, however, a new creation in Satan’s image, a new world order without God and with only a humanity made into gods.

Strimple has described the “new theology” which undergirds much seminary training, which is the basis of ecumenicity, and which attempts to unite some Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and Marxists:

What is this newly emerging “ecumenical theology?” Its background is the secular mood of contemporary man, a mood which Harvey Cox defines as “the turning of man’s attention from other worlds and toward this one.” In turning our attention to this world, we are told, we see that it is a world which has “come of age”. It has reached maturity; it has cut God’s apron strings and it realizes that man himself can and must accomplish anything which is to be accomplished in this world.²

This is a theology of revolution, but the primary revolution is against God. The determination of history is in man’s

1. T. H. Gaster, “Satan”, in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. IV, pp. 224-228. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

2. Robert B. Strimple, “Theology for Revolution”, in *The Presbyterian Journal*, vol. XXX, no. 1, May 5, 1971, p. 9.

hands, not God's, according to this faith. God is so defined in this "new theology" that He disappears and man replaces Him. As Strimple points out,

Someone might object, "Do we not often read in the literature of this new theology of hope, this theology of revolution, that the coming kingdom is the kingdom of God?"

Yes, we do. But we must understand what the word "God" means in the new theology. God is defined by Harvey Cox as the "Not Yet". He supports the Marxist Ernest Block in affirming that "either this full life to come may be called 'God', or man in achieving his potential in the future may be called 'God.' "

This is a "transcendence" which even the Communist Roger Garaudy can accept: "There is something going beyond or transcending nature, history and individual experience: It is the future."

Saying that it is "the kingdom of God", then, is simply saying that it is a society which is still future, but it is the job of the Church to make it present. Jesus devoted His life to that task, we are told, and so must the Church. The kingdom will be brought in, as the New Testament teaches us, "by fire", by the cleansing flames of revolution, not by peace but by the sword.

Thus the Church's role in the new theology is to be the vanguard of the revolution and its ministers the revolutionary leaders or "elite". Johannes Metz, Austrian Roman Catholic theologian, calls his a "political theology" and sees as its task to awaken in the areas of church and theology a responsible understanding for the significance of revolutionary violence under certain historical conditions . . . violence in certain respects can be a disguise, a pseudonym for Christian love."³

This new "Theology of Hope" is "potentially far more radical than the Death of God ever was."⁴ It is, of course, a development of the Death of God school of thought. Having proclaimed the "death of God", it must now proclaim the

3. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

4. William Broden: *The Age of Aquarius, Technology and the Cultured Revolution*, p. 277. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970.

death of man as God made him in order to realize the “hope” of man coming to birth as apostasy and revolution imagine him.

The modern church, therefore, is doing far more than merely doubting certain aspects of Scripture. Its problem is more than a weak faith, or even no faith. It is a radically alien faith, an acceptance of the satanic plan as the blueprint for the new creation.

This fact has major implications for the psychology of man. Fallen man is aggressively concerned with an ambitious program of remaking all things. This requires a steady assault on and capture of all men and institutions for this grand plan of establishing the independence of man from God and making man over again into the new god of being.

We have seen the meaning of “authentic humanity” in the hands of the “new theology”. The British psychiatrist Laing uses the same terminology and states that “We all live on the hope that authentic meeting between human beings can still occur.”⁵ Man has become depersonalized and alienated, according to Laing; independence is necessary for man, not only from God, who is not even in the picture for Laing, but from society and from other men.⁶ In this context, “Psychotherapy must remain an obstinate attempt of two people to recover the wholeness of being human through the relationship between them.”⁷ To be human means to be independent of God and man; it means cutting all ties with society in order to remake one’s own self as a new god of being. Laing does not use the term “god”, but the meaning is clear. Schizophrenia can be used as the road to the new order. The two natures of the schizophrenic person are both impoverished, the inner of substance, the outer of meaning because of their “experiential drama”. This experience can lead the person from “a cosmic fetalization to an existential rebirth.”⁸

5. R. D. Laing: *The Politics of Experience*, p. 46. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 57-76.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 53; italics are Laing’s.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 129.

What this means is that the reborn person is now lord and maker of his own being and his own universe. Laing can write, therefore, that

Madness need not be all breakdown. It may also be breakthrough. It is potentially liberation and renewal as well as enslavement and existential death.⁹

David Cooper, a disciple of R. D. Laing, believes that schizophrenics are the only sane people among us, apparently because they have rejected the logic of a God-given world. J. R. Coyne, Jr., in his review of Cooper's *The Death of the Family*, summarizes its thesis:

Society is sick and to cure it we must first destroy it. The family is the smallest social unit, the microcosm, so we shall destroy the family first. How? Well, we go live in communes, "Revolutionary Centers of Consciousness", where we all become squirrely, where we'll each "be able to masturbate in the full vision of the other." Conversion will be difficult among blue-collar and middle-class types, admits Cooper, but like all humane intellectuals, he has a solution: "This is where . . . bombs and machine guns will have to come in, with a guiding compassion . . ." The most succinct summary of this book appears at the end, in a comment made to Cooper by a little girl "Heidi, aged four," reports Cooper, "after I had taught her the language of the trees, how to shake hands with them the right way, and then to hear their differential responses, how to hear the tree say hello and how to overcome the silent withdrawal of certain other trees: 'I think you're just nuts!'" Precisely. The problem is, however, that Cooper takes it as a compliment. And there are a few too many Coopers among us these days.¹⁰

The purpose of Cooper and others like him who so radically defy the ordered rules of sanity is a very logical one. The preordained world of God's creation, with all its standards, laws, and logic must be denied systematically in order to clear the ground for man's new creation. It is a step in the process of

⁹. *Ibid*, p. 133.

¹⁰. J. R. Coyne, Jr., in a review of *The Death of the Family*, by David Cooper, in *National Review*, col. XXIII, no. 19, May 18, 1971, p. 549.

re-making man in man's imagined image. It is an aspect of Satan's plan to remake man in the image of his revolt.

Sexuality is an aspect of God's creation: "male and female created he them" (Gen. 1:27). This fact has a fixity about it which makes it a roadblock to man's desire to remake himself. The result is a profound hatred of sex and a desire to degrade, abuse, and destroy it by means of every perverse violation of God's law order. St. Paul declared that homosexuality in particular is a direct consequence of the denial of "the truth of God" (Rom. 1:25).

For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. (Rom. 1:26-27)

J. B. Phillips rendered the latter part of v. 27 thus: "Men with men performed these shameful horrors, receiving, of course, in their own personalities the consequences of sexual perversity." Perversion has as a goal the debasement and destruction of sex.

For this reason the hermaphrodite has been important to antichristian and pagan mythologies as a symbol of overcoming any need for another person, as "the undifferentiated life-force in which all conflicts are resolved."¹¹ The hermaphrodite was thus a symbol of perfection.¹² The "perfection" is as an anti-God symbol, the hermaphrodite as a sign and symbol of chaos.¹³ According to a Japanese saying, "One must create chaos to make a world."¹⁴

To overcome the fixity of sexuality, the rebellion of the

11. Mario Bussagli: *Bosch*, p. 30. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1967.

12. Marie Delacourt: *Hermaphrodite, Myths and Rites of the Bisexual Figure in Classical Antiquity*, pp. xi, 42, 101. London: Studio Books, 1961.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 68ff.

14. Stephen and Ethel Longstreet: *Yoshiwara: City of the Senses*, p. 13. New York: David McKay, 1970.

1960s and 1970s exalted the idea of unisex. In order to overcome God's order, revolutionary youth, in its clothing and hair-length, strove earnestly to obliterate sexual distinctions. An earlier leader of the sexual revolution, Henry Miller, had called for racial amalgamation and universal human hermaphroditism as necessary before a new world order could come into being.¹⁵ Miller also called for chaos as a means to the new order.

The goal of ungodly sexuality is chaos. Homosexuality, bestiality, and every other violation of God's law have as their purpose the destruction of order, God's order. Their pleasure is pleasure in obstruction and hostility, in destruction and perversion. In the hands of the ungodly, sex is thus a tool for defacing God's image in man and of attempting to remake man in Satan's projected image. God-given sexuality must thus be destroyed.

The same is true of childbearing. Test-tube babies and clonal man are devices whereby the ungodly seek to remake man in this new image.¹⁶ Not surprisingly, the antinomian *Christianity Today* is ready to believe that "Motherhood — at least as we now think of it, may be on the way out."¹⁷

The goal of these endeavors has been well summarized by the title of Albert Rosenfeld's book, *The Second Genesis: The Coming Control of Life* (1969); the book deals with test-tube and packaged babies, the programmed mind, humanoids, a sexless society, and much more.

Clearly, while Satan's work is in essence negation, it is wrong to speak of evil as merely an absence of good; it is a positive force for destruction; it is active and aggressive. The plain meaning of the temptation in Eden, as well as the temptation of Christ in the wilderness, is that Satan is not

15. Lawrence Durrell, editor: *The Henry Miller Reader*, pp. 231-239. New York: New Directions, 1959.

16. See Edward Grossman, "The Obsolescent Mother", in *The Atlantic*, vol. 227, no. 5, May, 1971, pp. 39-50; and James D. Watson, "Moving Toward the Clonal Man", in *ibid.*, pp. 50-53.

17. Editorial, "Vanishing Motherhood?" in *Christianity Today*, vol. XV, no. 16, May 7, 1971, p. 27.

content merely with the destruction of God's Kingdom and of God's image in man, but also seeks to remake man in his own imagined image.

Two active forces are thus at war. God through Christ is remaking man in his own image and is re-establishing man in dominion over the earth, whereas Satan is concerned with his own kingdom and city, and in re-creating man in terms of his total denial of God and His sovereignty. Evil thus, while negation, is not merely an absence but an active, aggressive force trying by parody to ape God and play creator. This it cannot do, nor can it move a step apart from God's predestination and purpose.

But, in the providence of God, these forces are active, and they are the mainspring of political, educational, and revolutionary activity in the modern age. They are now also basic to religious activity within the churches.

The nature and psychology of man thus cannot be understood without a realization that man, created in the image of God, is now trying to abolish that creation and to institute a new and satanic creation.

Sartre was cited earlier as an example of the philosophic denial that man is a creature; for Sartre, man is his own maker as he seeks to free himself from everything except his own existence. As Molnar points out, for Sartre

evil is the refusal to choose freely and, through constantly renewed choice, to choose oneself as a free existent. Evil is then the fact that not everybody follows the example of (Jean) Genet, that we are not yet "immersed together" in objective totality.¹⁸

This freedom of man is to be beyond God, and beyond good and evil, which means beyond responsibility. Molnar states the case clearly:

The conclusion Sartre reaches about morality and ideology may be now summarized as follows: There is no true morality, that is, knowledge of good and evil, in man's

18. Thomas Molnar: *Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time*, p. 37.

consciousness; “morality” is the invention of those who are afraid of their amorality, their freedom; those having reason to be afraid of freedom are the possessing classes whose economic interests favor the *status quo*, therefore they invent and impose a set of gimmicks (trucs) by which not only injustices are committed but a false consciousness is perpetuated.¹⁹

Unfortunately for such men, to be beyond God and beyond good and evil is also to be beyond life. They are programmed for death.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

The Fall of Man

Thomas Boston (1676-1732), in his great work on *Human Nature in its Fourfold Estate*, gave an incisive analysis of man's psychology in the language of his day. Man's *first* condition was *the state of innocence*, before the fall.

As to the righteousness of this state, consider, that as uncreated righteousness, the righteousness of God is the supreme rule; so all created righteousness, whether of men or angels, hath respect to a law as its rule, and a conformity thereunto. A creature can no more be morally independent on God, in its actions and powers, than it can be naturally independent on him. A creature, as a creature, must acknowledge the Creator's will as its supreme law; for, as it cannot be without him, so it must not be but for him, according to his will.¹

This righteousness of the state of innocence "was mutable; it was a righteousness that might be lost, as is manifested by the doleful event . . . And herein believers have the advantage of Adam, that they can never totally or finally fall away from grace."² Because "happiness is the result of holiness", the state of innocence was a state of happiness.³

The penalty for sin was (and is) death (Gen. 2: 27).

"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The death threatened was such as the life promised was; and that most justly, to wit, temporal, spiritual, and eternal death. The event is a commentary on this: for the very day he did eat thereof, he was a dead man in law; but the execution was stopped, because of his posterity then

1. Thomas Boston: *Human Nature in its Fourfold Estate*, p. 9.
Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, n.d.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

in his loins; and another covenant was prepared; however, that day his body got its death-wound, and became mortal. Death also seized his soul: he lost his original righteousness and the favour of God; witness the pangs and throes of conscience, which made him hide himself from God. And he became liable to eternal death, which would have actually followed of course, if a mediator had not been provided, who found him bound with the cords of death, as a malefactor ready to be led to execution. Thus you have a short description of the covenant, into which the Lord brought man, in the estate of innocence.⁴

The fall led to man's *second* condition, *the state of depravity*. God's grace and mercy led to redemption and the *third* condition or estate of man, *the state of grace*, and, *fourth*, the final condition of the redeemed is *the state of glory*.

Our concern at present is with man's second state, depravity. The doctrine of total depravity is commonly misunderstood to mean that the natural or fallen man is incapable of ever manifesting any trace of human goodness. Clearly, this is not the case. What total depravity means is that the infection of depravity is total in man's being; i.e., every aspect of man's nature is corrupted and governed by his fall. The principle of the fall governs man's mind and will, his heart and his tongue, and his every thought and act is governed by this false religious principle which governs his being.

That false religious principle is stated by the tempter in Genesis 3:4,5, "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." Several premises appear in this declaration, and all were accepted by Adam and Eve and are basic to man's original sin and his psychology in the state of depravity. *First*, "Ye shall not surely die." God does not absolutely govern and predestine man and reality, and He therefore cannot predict consequences. For God thus to declare that disobedience has certain infallible consequences and that His law is absolute is held to be a lie.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 15f.

There is no eternal counsel and decree of God, no predestination, and no absolute law of God, according to the tempter. Man lives in an open universe, i.e., open to experiment and development and open to changes of ultimate law.

Satan thus operated on an Arminian basis. He was ready to acknowledge that God is, and that He is very powerful. As St. James pointed out, the devils believe that there is a God and tremble at His power (James 2:19). They refuse, however, to acknowledge His sovereign, predestinating power: "Ye shall not *surely* die;" it is not infallible nor inescapable. It is possible or probable, because God is very powerful. Because humanity's liberation movement requires that this power be defied, and a blow for freedom struck, the claim to sovereign, predestinating power must be denied. However likely God's reprisals may be, they are not absolutely certain, and this edge of uncertainty must be developed into humanity's liberation.

Second, the presupposition of the fallen man, after Satan, is that God's purpose is to frustrate man and to prevent man's self-realization. Obedience to God is the enslavement of man, and disobedience to God is man's liberation. Liberation is thus made an essentially anti-God movement. The slaves of God are summoned to freedom, which is defined as the abandonment of God's law. Just as Adam and Eve were summoned to put their new religious principle to the test by breaking God's law, so every departure from God is in every generation put to the test by a religious violation of God's law.

Humanity's liberation movement is thus by necessity lawless. Man's declaration of independence from God requires law-breaking. Proof of liberation from God is a contempt for His law. Lawlessness is thus a religious principle for the fallen man; he believes that the law is an impediment to man, an infringement on his liberty and a denial of his potentiality.

Third, basic to the religious faith of fallen man is the prem-

ise that man is his own god. If man is a god, then he cannot bow down to other gods; he must instead assert and develop his own godhead. The history of mankind is in part the attempt of fallen man to make that assertion. But to claim to be a god in the face of the Creator God means waging war against that God. Two mutually exclusive claims cannot be tolerated; one of the gods must go, and fallen mankind is determined that the God of Scripture must die.

Socially, the outcome of this religious principle is anarchism. If all men can claim to be gods, then all men, as rival gods, will be at war one with another. The alternative is to make the state into a god and men into slaves of the state.

Fourth, fallen man asserts that he can live beyond God's good and evil, because he himself can "know" or determine for himself what constitutes good and evil. This means that good and evil are entirely relative to man; there is no element of transcendence, and hence no moral necessity which binds man other than the obligation to be true to himself.

Paradoxically, this self-styled god, immediately after making his religious stand, pleaded innocence by virtue of environmentalism. Adam blamed Eve and God for his sin: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:12). Eve in turn blamed the tempter: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:13). Having asserted that they were gods, they now claimed to be less than men. Environmentalism, which reduces man from a work of God to a product of the environment, goes hand in hand with humanism, with man's claim to be god. What lies behind this apparent contradiction, the assertion of divinity and the plea of environmentalism?

To understand this strange union of ideas, let us examine the advertisement issued by a publisher of pornography to sell a book expressive of his philosophy:

Don't leave love to chance. When you meet an attractive woman, make sure she's yours — in only 5 minutes — by developing the power of "sexual visualization" that all

men have, but few know how to use.

Very crudely, the assumption is that a man can develop his powers to the point where any woman can be seduced in five minutes. Clearly, this involves a very low view of women at least. The key to this strange view can be gained by analyzing Sartre's view of man. Man has no "essence", no defined nature; he is a product of blind evolution. Because man has being but no essence, man must make himself, and he must make himself into a god. If man is a god, then his neighbor who claims to be a god is a threat and a devil to him, a challenge to his own claim. Both are without essence, in a sense; both are products of a blind, meaningless environment, and hence even more meaningless than their environment which made them. The environment, nature, and the past at least made man, but man has not yet remade or defined himself and gained an essence.

In this predicament, man, to be the god he aims at being, can only exercise his divinity in two directions: against his environment, and against other men. He must make them. As a result, fallen man is especially active against his environment; instead of living in it in terms of God's calling, he treats it as a hostile world to be brought into line by an enforced remaking which will put man's autonomous, anti-god imprint on it. Similarly, he does not live with other men under God's law but in an attempt to play god in their lives. Significantly, the common term for seduction is "making" a woman; the seducer plans to use her and shape her to his will without regard to God's moral law or the woman's life and future. Briefly, if man will play god, he must have a world of people who can be used, who are the products of an environment and can be shaped by that environment. The god-like seducer of the pornographic advertisement becomes the brief but omnipotent environment of any woman and thus and thereby "makes" her totally in terms of his will.

If, however, environmentalism is false, then men and

women are creatures of God and made in His image; they cannot plead innocent by invoking an omnipotent environment. Instead of being gods on the one hand and victims on the other, fallen men are simply sinners. They cannot escape moral responsibility. To return to the pornographic advertisement, both the seduced and the seducer are sinners, and they must blame themselves for their sin. In their sin, both were equally at war with God and His law. Both were intent on a moral autonomy from God, and both were interested in self-satisfaction. The moral code of the fallen man was very briefly summarized, without any moral pretensions, by Ernest Hemingway, whose one-sentence manifesto held that, "What is moral is what you feel good after, and what is immoral is what you feel bad after."⁵ This is faithfulness to man's fallen nature. As Thomas Boston stated it, "Every man naturally loves to be at full liberty himself; to have his own will for his law: and if he would follow his natural inclinations, would vote himself out of the reach of all laws, divine and human."⁶

There is, in the unrenewed will, an utter inability for what is truly good and acceptable in the sight of God. The natural man's will is in Satan's fetters; hemmed in within the circle of evil, and cannot move beyond it, any more than a dead man can raise himself out of the grave, Eph. ii. 1. We deny him not a power to choose, pursue, and act, what, as to the matter is good: but though he can will what is good and right, he can will nothing aright and well, John xv. 5, "Without me," i.e. separate from me, as a branch from the stock, as both the word and context carry it, "ye can do nothing;" to wit, nothing truly and spiritually good. His very choice and desire of spiritual things is carnal and selfish, John vi. 26, "Ye seek me — because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." He not only comes not to Christ, but "he cannot come," ver. 44. And what can he do acceptable to God, who believeth not on him whom the Father hath sent?⁷

5. Alexander Lowen, M.D.: *Love and Orgasm*, p. 313. London: Staples Press, 1966.

6. Boston, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 52f.

Moreover, Boston pointed out, man's claim to be as God reveals itself in his will:

The unrenewed will is wholly perverse, in reference to man's chief and highest end. The natural man's chief end is not God, but himself . . .

Most men are so far from making God their chief end, in their natural and civil actions, that in these matters, God is not in all their thoughts. Their eating and drinking, and such like natural actions, are for themselves: their own pleasure or necessity, without any higher end, Zech. vii. 6. "did ye not eat for yourselves?" They have no eye to the glory of God in these things, as they ought to have, I Cor. x. 31 . . . They seek God indeed, but not for himself, but for themselves. They seek him not at all, but for their own welfare: so their whole life is woven into one web of practical blasphemy; making God the means, and self their end; yea, their chief end.⁸

Religion which treats God as a resource to be used by man is thus blasphemy. As a result, any pretended Christianity in which the absolute sovereignty of God and His predestinating counsel are denied is "practical blasphemy; making God the means, and self their end; yea, their chief end." The starting point of the fall was man's assent to the question, "Yea, hath God said . . . ?" (Gen. 3:1), and his agreement with the assertion, "Ye shall not surely die" (Gen. 3: 4). The predestinating power of God, His absolute law and decree, were denied, and all else followed from that. Man was then supposedly free to assert the autonomy and power of his own will against God. Man has not left the state of depravity as long as he continues to say, "Yea, hath God said?" yea, doth God have an absolute law and decree? His will is then still "wholly perverse, in reference to man's chief and highest end. The natural man's chief end is not God, but himself." But the chief end of man, as the Westminster Catechism rightly declares, is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.

The "Jesus freaks" of 1970 and after claimed to be Christians, and often reformed themselves, abandoning drugs, for

8. *Ibid*, p. 74f.

example, without acknowledging God's sovereignty. God was a new resource to be used. He was "Dad", looking after them. He ostensibly provided new experiences, like glossolalia, or supposed speaking in tongues, and provided them with a perfect insurance policy. As Jane Howard noted,

These children feel invincible. "So long as we keep our shield of believing up", as they say, their cars won't crash, they won't get cancer, and if they're drafted and sent to Vietnam, "we won't be killed or even scratched." But why get uptight about the draft? "Jesus," as they say, "might be back before breakfast!"⁹

Their 53 year-old leader, Dr. Victor Paul Wierwille, was quoted in a similar vein:

"As long as I'm here," he assured his audience, "nothing bad can happen to you folks, because I'm not *believing* for it to happen. Oh, people, isn't it a beauty-full trip to live and just *ooze* goodness wherever you go? Isn't it tremendous to be able to say I know that I know that I know that I know?"¹⁰

The god of such a religion has no relationship to the God of Scripture and resembles more nearly the tempter.

That youth should desire such a god, a "Dad", is not surprising in a generation reared permissively. Frustration is then the intolerable sin, and gratification is equated with liberty and grace. In the most simple matters, the world must come to terms with the little gods, as witness a letter to the Ann Landers column:

Dear Ann Landers: I am a 20-year-old boy who has been looking for a job for seven weeks. The last three places I applied seemed promising, but I wasn't hired. I decided to check back and find out why. All three personnel heads said my qualifications were excellent but my appearance was against me. What it boiled down to was long hair and a short beard. I finally asked the last personnel guy if he would hire me if I cut my hair and shaved my beard. He

9. Jane Howard, "The Groovy Christians of Rye, N.Y.," in *Life*, vol. 70, no. 18, May 14, 1971, p. 82.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

replied, "Yes" I looked him straight in the eye, and said, "Nuts to you." and walked out.

The system is rotten and this is proof. What has my hair and beard to do with my ability? I consider it my constitutional right to wear my hair any way I please and to have a beard if I want one. I would like your opinion on this. If I get the answer I want I will take it back to those jerks and shove it in their stupid faces.¹¹

Ann Landers' comment in part was "If an employer doesn't want a kid with long hair and a beard, it's his constitutional right not to hire him."

When it has been a matter of serious belief that toilet training should not be forced on a child, it is not surprising that children have grown up unwilling to be crossed or denied. The child, as an heir of Adam, inherits a fallen nature and thus wants the world on his terms. Unless disciplined, the child is without the capacity to make useful even his own abilities and is in essence a natural anarchist.

The god of such a generation is naturally a god of revolution, having been created in the image of modern man. Sontag calls for such a god, a "free god" who is not himself tied to any law code but is a god of perpetual revolution.¹² Such a god is beyond good and evil, and thus, like his makers, beyond self-control. He resembles the tempter more than God, the sovereign creator of heaven and earth. This is not surprising. Man, the new god, seeks to make over the true God in his own image. This is his culminating folly.

11. Ann Landers, in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, Monday, May 17, 1971, p. A-12.

12. Frederick Sontag, "The God of Revolution", in *Pomona Today*, Pomona College Bulletin, vol. LXVIII, no. 9, May, 1971, pp. 2-9.

Imagination

According to Genesis 6: 5, “And God saw that the wickedness of man was very great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” The same judgment is restated in Genesis 8: 21; it is echoed in Deuteronomy 29:19 and 31:21 and Jeremiah 23:17. David warned Solomon that “the LORD searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts” (I Chron. 28:9). Not only in the Flood but through Christ, God brings His judgment to bear on man’s imagination. In the Magnificat, Mary joyfully declared, “He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts” (Luke 1:51). St Paul said of the reprobates that they “became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened” (Rom. 1:21). The Christian’s warfare requires “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” (II Cor. 10: 5).

According to James Hastings, in Scripture “Imagination has always the sense of evil purpose, contrivance.” It means “firmness in a bad cause.”¹

The New Testament usage involves three Greek words; *logismos* (Rom. 2:15; II Cor. 10:5), has reference to thoughts and “suggests the contemplation of actions as a result of the verdict of conscience.” *Dialogismos* (Rom. 1:21) means reasonings, thoughts, and has “the idea of evil purposes”. *Dianoia* (Luke 1:51) is “strictly, a thinking over,

1. J. Hastings, “Imagine, Imagination”, in Hastings: *A Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. II, p. 454.

denotes the faculty of thinking; then, of knowing; hence the understanding, and in general, the mind, and so, the faculty of moral reflection.” It refers to thoughts and ideas.²

Imagination thus refers to man’s thoughts and ideas which, in defiance to God, purpose and contrive to establish an order apart from God. Man dreams and plans a world in which God is left out and man is everything, a world in which man is his own god. This imagination may be convinced of its own nobility, as the framers of Babel were, but it is no less evil, because it seeks to bring a world without God into being. Hugh Hefner of *Playboy Magazine* reeks of his humanistic nobility as he imagines his brave new world:

“Young people today *are* different than they used to be, but it is in ways that are related to what we are all about,” he goes on. “Their moral values and life styles give them the option of staying single longer and using those years for fun and experience, which is what we’ve been advocating for years.”

“They are the same in that they still want the ‘Good Life.’ ” and anyone who says differently is wrong. What do they think, that they want the Bad Life?

“Listen,” he says excitedly, with the air of one who is discovering the truth of his own words, “the solution to the world’s problems is to get material things to more people — to give everybody the Good Life — and the thing that’s stopping this is nationalistic superstitions and hang-ups. What we really need is a workable world government. It’s not far-fetched. I devoted a whole segment of *The Philosophy* (the 25-part tract that he wrote for *Playboy* in the mid-1960’s, holding, mainly, that people ought to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor without guilt) to that, and it got a terrific response. I think I got more comment on that than anything else I wrote.

“In fact I think another article on the subject is overdue. It will be in the hopper tomorrow.”

And with that, a *Playboy* vice president, who is listening

2. W. E. Vine: *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, II, p. 248. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1940, 1966.

in, puts down his fork and applauds.³

From Babel through *Playboy* and beyond, the imagination of fallen man reeks of self-righteousness and sees itself as the epitome of nobility. Man in his imagination plans evil and sees himself as a world-liberator in the process, and as the hope of humanity.

Imagination is thus the “dream of reason”, of unregenerate, autonomous reason as it contrives and plans to bring into being its godless world. Imagination takes the normal, God-given experiences of life and attempts to read a new meaning into them. Thus Lowen sees the sexual orgasm as a religious experience:

Any response that actively involves the total organism is perceived as a ‘moving experience.’ In this feeling of *being moved*, we sense ourselves as part of the universal. Precisely because religious communion can move us (in the emotional sense), we experience it as a valid expression of our link with the universe or God. Sexual orgasm is a deeper, more biological experience of man’s unity with nature and the universe.

The following statement is one woman’s experience of this phenomenon: her description is concise and informative: ‘Once I had an experience during intercourse which was so different from anything else that I don’t think I will ever be satisfied until I experience it again. During this experience, without any effort or trying on my part, my body was moved from within, so to speak, and everything was right. There was rhythmic movement and a feeling of ecstasy at being part of something much greater than myself and finally of reward, of real satisfaction and peace.

Glow and lumination are other aspects of this phenomenon that bear some resemblance to cosmic events. The full orgasm is generally accompanied by a feeling of glow that is a ‘higher’, perhaps hotter, state of the phenomenon of sexual heat. If the intensity and extent of the orgasm reach a high peak, the glow may extend over the whole

3. Frederick C. Klein, “The World of Hef. Playboy Rabbit Seen Biting Off Too Much; Critics say Empire is a ‘Managerial Muddle’,” in *The Wall Street Journal*, Tuesday, March 2, 1971, p. 11. Pacific Coast Edition.

body and be experienced as a feeling of lumination. The external manifestation of this feeling of lumination is seen as a radiance that is the natural expression of a person in love. Glow and lumination are properties of heavenly bodies. The person in love feels that he is in heaven. In love, the individual transcends the experience of his finite existence; in orgasm, he transcends the feeling of his physical existence.

The orgasmic experience has other meanings. It is experienced as a rebirth and as a renewal. . . .

I have said that in orgasm, one reverts to the kind of movement that lay at the origin of one's being. It is a sensation that is experienced as overwhelming, as if one is being *moved* by life's deepest force.⁴

This is the language of mysticism, and it is this mystical expectation of sex, the dream and hope for a kind of cosmic coition, which leads to so much sexual frustration. To expect too much from sex means that a person is condemned to receive too little, because he has demanded from the sexual act an experience which it cannot give.

Imagination thus leads to over-expectation in one realm after another because it denies God; having denied God, it expects the world to deliver what only God can deliver. Politics is over-valued and is made into a vehicle of salvation, with the result that political order is destroyed because too much is expected from it. The economic order too is required to deliver paradise, and it too is turned into chaos by means of over-expectations.

R. Payne Smith, in commenting on Genesis 6:5, observed:

Imagination. — More exactly, *form, shape*. Thus every idea or embodied thought, which presented itself in the mind through the working of the heart — that is, the whole inner nature of man — “was only evil continually” — Heb., *all the day*, from morning to night, without reproof of conscience or fear of the Divine justice. A more forcible picture of complete depravity could scarcely be drawn;

4. Lowen, *op. cit.*, p. 201f.

and this corruption of man's inner nature is ascribed to the overthrow of moral and social restraints.⁵

Man's imagination "was *only* evil continually". His whole inner nature was given to replanning all reality in terms of his own centrality. Man having made himself his own god now began to dream and plan to remake all things after his own image. The men before the Flood, and the builders of Babel, are described as men of this evil imagination (Gen. 11:6).

It is the duty of the Christian to "cast down . . . *imagination, thoughts*, i.e., the opinions, or convictions of those who set themselves and the deductions of their own reason against the truth of God."⁶ Moreover, "It is the indispensable condition of salvation that our understanding should be brought into captivity, led submissive, as though bound, into the obedience of Christ."⁷ This same point was made earlier by Calvin, who commented on II Corinthians 10: 5,

I am of the opinion, that, having previously spoken more particularly of the conflict of spiritual armour, along with the hindrances that rise up in opposition to the gospel of Christ, he now, on the other hand, speaks of the ordinary preparation, by which men must be brought into subjection to him. For so long as we rest in our own judgment, and are wise in our own estimation, we are far from having made any approach to the doctrine of Christ. Hence we must set out with this, that *he who is wise must become a fool*, (I Cor. iii. 18), that is, we must give up our own understanding, and renounce the wisdom of the flesh, and thus we must present our minds to Christ empty that he may fill them. Now the form of expression must be observed, when he says, that he *brings every thought into captivity*, for it is as though he had said, that the liberty of the human mind must be restrained and bridled, that it may not be wise, apart from the doctrine of Christ; and

5. Rev. R. Payne Smith, "Genesis", in Charles John Ellicott, editor: *Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, I, p. 36. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

6. Charles Hodge: *Commentary on the Secondary Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 235. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

farther, that its audacity cannot be restrained by any other means, than by its being carried away, as it were, *captive*. Now it is by the guidance of the Spirit, that it is brought to allow itself to be placed under control, and remain in a voluntary captivity.

The contrast thus between fallen and redeemed man is a very marked one. The psychology of fallen man reveals a will to disobey; his hatred of anything that suggests the law of God is so intense that he consistently violates laws in disregard for his own self interest. The will to disobey is religiously motivated: it is in principle a denial of God's law and an affirmation of man's autonomy. Because of this hatred of law in fallen man, the possibility of both establishing and maintaining a social order on the foundation of man's autonomy from God must be denied. Since for fallen man freedom means freedom from law, the possibility of a social order on this principle is out of the question. For fallen man, only fear, and that within limits, can keep him within the boundaries of the law. The imagination of fallen man is dedicated to working and planning for a lawless world.

The redeemed man, however, manifests progressively a will to obey God and a delight in His law. It was as the representative man, the last Adam, and the fountainhead of the new humanity that Jesus declared, "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God" (Hebrews 10: 7). The redeemed mind finds his *freedom under law*, not in opposition to law.

Similarly, his imagination is not apostate and anti-law; rather, it is progressively directed towards the fulfilment of covenantal responsibilities under God. It is under God a creative imagination, not a rebellious and destructive one.

What apostate imagination means was clearly apparent in William Blake, for whom imagination was man's creative word whereby man remade reality as his own god. According

8. John Calvin: *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, II, p. 324. John Pringle translation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

to Blake,

Does a firm perswasion that a thing is so, make it so?
... All poets believe that it does, & in ages of
imagination this firm perswasion removed mountains; but
many are not capable of a firm perswasion of any thing.

Because of false religious opinions, Blake held, "all nations believe the jews' code and worship the jews' god, and what greater subjection can be?"¹⁰ For Blake, Biblical religion had paralyzed the imagination of man, and men could not longer see that "every thing that lives is Holy."¹¹ If all things are holy, then man's imagination is clearly holy, and the plans of autonomous, apostate man are thus holy plans. This apostate imagination sees itself, not as a sinner, but as a victim. Thus, Blake has Luvah declare, "I suffer affliction because I love."¹² This reflects the sin of Cain, who felt himself wronged and complained that his punishment was too great to bear (Gen. 4:13). Self-pity marks the sinner; he is in his own eyes always the victim, with God the ultimate aggressor.

The fearful destiny of the apostate man is that he is in reality irrelevant to God, and, ultimately, in hell, shall be irrelevant to other man and the universe. To step aside from God's sovereign purpose is to move into irrelevancy. Out of dominion and into irrelevancy, this is the destiny of apostate man.

In his imagination, the fallen man sees himself as god and creator. In his every dream, he plays god over reality. Magic and witchcraft are products of this fallen imagination. The "magic words" of witches are "As my will, so mote it be!"¹³ This magic formula, usually shortened to, "So mote it be!" (*mote* meaning *may*, *might*, is from the Anglo-Saxon *motan*, *mot*, be obliged), is a part of Masonic ritual, which is very

9. William Blake, "Marriage of Heaven and Hell", in Geoffrey Keynes, editor: *Poetry and Prose of William Blake*, p. 196. London: Nonesuch Press, 1935.

10. *Idem*.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 204.

12. Blake, "Vala, or The Four Zoas," Night the Second, in *ibid.*, p. 306.

13. Paul Huson: *Mastering Witchcraft, A Practical Guide for Witches, Warlocks, and Covens*, p. 25. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1970.

closely linked to witchcraft. According to a witch's handbook, "As a witch, you do not necessarily have to worship any complete and permanent hierarchy of spiritual beings if you don't want to. There simply exists powers to be tapped — to do good or to do evil, both of which are remarkably relative concepts."¹⁴ This statement is especially revealing. *First*, this witch or human-god is independent of or above all natural and supernatural beings and is free to use them. Reality exists to be used. *Second*, good and evil are termed "remarkably relative concepts." The imagination revealed by this statement thus is far-reaching in its presumption. All things exist for the individual, are there to be exploited by him, and there is no meaning except a relative and personal one. In hell, such people are left forever to the impotence of their imagination, and nothing else.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

Environmentalism

One of the central dividing lines between paganism and Biblical faith is its concept of responsibility. Paganism placed responsibility essentially in man's environment, in the stars, fate, or some like concept, whereas the Bible very clearly declared the individual to be responsible and morally culpable for his acts. When David said, "I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me; Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:3, 4), he spoke in moral terms and in a spirit very alien to pagan antiquity. The mature concepts of paganism exalted fortune and chance and left the individual a product of blind forces. As Cochrane pointed out, in discussing the new view of history introduced into the Roman Empire by Christianity,

But if this be history, it is history in a sense wholly without parallel in secular literature. For it is neither economic nor cultural nor political, local and particularist or general and cosmopolitan; it deals neither with problems of war and peace nor with those of competition and co-operation; and it does not concern itself in the least with the 'search for causes'. What it offers is an account of human freedom, its original loss through the first Adam and its ultimate recovery through the second. This it presents in the form of a cosmic drama; but the drama is not Promethean, it tells no story of 'virtue' in conflict with 'chance' or 'necessity'. For, with the disappearance from Christian thought of the classical antithesis between 'man' and 'environment', there disappears also the possibility of such a conflict. The destiny of man is, indeed, determined, but neither by a soulless mechanism nor by the *fiat* of an arbitrary or capricious power external to himself. For the laws which govern physical, like those which govern human,

nature are equally the laws of God.¹

Greek thought, however, persisted in the church, and the result was a revival of environmentalism, or, rather, a persistence of it. With the Renaissance, the humanistic impulses gained renewed force, and environmentalism regained ascendancy. In Shakespeare, the Christian and the pagan perspectives are both in evidence, with priority often given to the pagan. *Romeo and Juliet* is a case in point. Its prologue declares,

From forth the fatal loins of these two foes
A pair of star-crossed lovers take their life.

In this perspective, heredity is also a part of a hostile environment. Shakespeare speaks of “the fatal loins”, a heredity which determines and dooms, as well as “star-crossed lovers”, a pair doomed by their total environment to frustration and death. In *Julius Caesar*, on the other hand, a modified Christian view appears in Cassius, who observes,

Men at some time are masters of their fates:
The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings. (Act I, Scene 2).

The framework is still “fate” not God, but responsibility is asserted as against the “stars”.

It is apparent how alien a book the Bible was to the pagan world, and also how joyful a word. James declared, “From whence come wars and fightings among you? came they not hence, even of your lust that war in your members?” (James 4:1). James’ statement was an indictment of every belief of paganism about responsibility; while more than a few pagan writers speak about the individual’s responsibility, such statements are set in the context of an ultimate perversity or indifference on the part of the universe to man. Man’s responsibility thus becomes a personal nobility set in the context of a basic meaninglessness. In a world in which even the gods pass and go, man’s insistence on responsibility becomes

1. Charles Norris Cochrane: *Christianity and Classical Culture*, p. 368. New York: Oxford University Press, 1944.

only bravado. The world is alien to responsibility for such a faith.

Even more, James' statement was good news. If "wars and fightings" come from man, then man has the capacity to cope with these problems and to overcome them. The case of "wars and fightings" is not an ultimate perversity of being, a malevolence or senselessness in the universe, but rather a moral failure in man. If the moral failure is in man, then man's moral conduct can overcome the failure. This is good news: it offers hope to man. Not only so, but James declares where that moral strength can be found: "But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble. Submit yourselves therefore to God" (James 4:6-7).

The question is often raised as to how God's predestination can be reconciled with man's responsibility. The pagan belief in an indifferent universe meant that man's responsibility was meaningless, because there was neither meaning nor accountability in the universe. Purpose and reward had no place in the ultimate order of things for the mature pagan, and, as a result, man's only hope against the unknown was chance or luck. The minds of men were dominated, according to Cochrane, "by a haunting fear of the unknown." This mood governed "the ideologists of classical antiquity", and

In this fear we may see an explanation of many of the most characteristic phenomena of classical and post-classical times. To begin with, it serves to account for the steady and persistent growth of a belief in 'luck'. 'Throughout the whole world', declares Pliny, 'in every place, at all times, Fortune alone is named and invoked by the voices of all; she alone is accused and put in the dock, she is the sole object of our thoughts, our praise, and our abuse.' This belief Juvenal was to single out as one of the most significant aspects of contemporary 'vice'; and he denounced it in various satires, notably the fifteenth. . . .

The evil of this superstition was, of course, that it

utterly denied the reality of human freedom and responsibility, reducing men to the status of mere automata.²

If chance governs on the level of ultimacy, it governs on the level of the immediate. If the gods are governed by chance, then men are also governed by chance.

Similarly, if God, as Scripture declares, governs absolutely on the eternal level, and on every level, as the sovereign personality and creator, then man, on the level of time, created in the image of God, governs as a responsible person and an agent of God. What God does is an expression of His being, and what man does is an expression of his being. The self-determination and universal determination or predestination of all things by God is as the first and absolute cause, whereas the self-determination of man, and his determination of time and history, is as a secondary cause. Man has the freedom of a secondary cause only because of the existence, freedom, and sovereignty of the first cause, the triune God.

Cochrane said of the Biblical faith, that “it does not concern itself in the least with the ‘search for causes’.” It is not concerned with the pointless questions about heredity, environment, the stars, or any other like search for a cause. The pagan search for causes is a denial of the person and also of responsibility. The individual is reduced to a reflex action. A cause is located, and the person is then simply an effect. In the Biblical perspective, God and man are causes, not effects; rather, they are more than causes: they are responsible persons.

The pagan view of causality reduced causality to blind and necessary process. In this process, the first cause was ancient and remote, and hence essentially unrelated to the present consequence except as the first of a series. In the Biblical perspective, God as the absolute person not only created all things in the beginning but also sustains and absolutely governs them at all times. Providence thus replaces process, and an omnipotent and omnipresent person replaces the first

2. *Ibid*, p. 158f.

cause of a series of causes. This means that man's true, ultimate, and always basic environment is God, and the motive force of man's morality and freedom is his relationship to God.

Very plainly then, talk of heredity and environment obscures the basic issue. It deals with dangerous half-truths and ignores the basic fact that man is not a product but a producer, not an effect essentially but a cause, and, more than that, a person. Environmentalism depersonalizes man, and it also makes him passive rather than active.

To return to James' statement concerning "wars and fighting": they are not a product of the environment but of man. Neither an impersonal environment, nor a personal environment in the form of a conspiracy, is to be blamed for our "wars and fighting". Whatever the world around us may contribute to the problem, the root cause is in man: "come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" In this fact rests our hope: it is not a world we must cope with, but ourselves, and God is ready to give grace to the humble.

In any case, we are and always will be *creatures*, but creatures made in the image of God. The humanist sees man as an evolutionary product, a blob, a being without essence who can become a god. On both counts, the humanist is wrong. Man is neither a product with only being and no essence, nor is he a god in the making. The purpose of both alternatives is to deny God; their effect is also to deny man.

The Cainite

Cain is usually spoken of as the builder of the first city on the basis of Genesis 4:17. Cain has a son, whom he named Enoch; he then built a city and named it after his son. Enoch means “initiation” or “dedication”. Moreover, the Hebrew word for city means several things: it means city, but, as Ellul points out, it apparently also means “the Watching Angel, the Vengeance and Terror”, with *angel* here having a demonic sense.¹

The comparison to Eden is very obvious. *First* of all, Enoch was not the first city; Eden was, and Enoch was an obvious attempt to replace and supplant it. The fact that only Adam and Eve dwelt in Eden does not make it any less a city in its nature and intention. It was created to be the City of God, or the Kingdom of God. This fact is clearly set forth in Revelation 21 and 22, where the description of the New Jerusalem is merged with that of the Garden of Eden. New Jerusalem is old Eden fulfilled. Thus, Cain’s city was an imitation Eden, not the first city but the second. The city was God’s purpose and His community; Cain sought to establish a new purpose and a new community. The goal is still community, but now on the tempter’s terms, not God’s, now in terms of autonomous man rather than the law-word of the sovereign God.

Second, the word *city* has obvious reference to Genesis 3:24. God “drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.” The demonic angel implied in the word *city* is thus an imitation

1. Jacques Ellul: *The Meaning of the City*, p. 9f. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970. With the rest of Ellul’s thesis, this writer does not agree.

of the Cherubims God stationed to guard Eden.

Man had to be driven out of Eden, and a turning sword-like, or lightning-like, flame barred man from any re-entry. There was now no access to the tree of life. Both literally and spiritually, the barrier of sin barred man from the blessing of God. Man was now outside of Eden, *east* of Eden, which Ellul suggests symbolizes “The country where the sun rises, the point of departure.”² Man thus sought a new beginning, but Cain sought a new beginning *without* God and *against* God. The Cherubims kept man from re-entry into Eden; Cain, in his false Eden, had his symbolic demonic angels to keep other men from coming in. The city as a walled enclosure was designed to keep out the enemy.

Third, whom did Cain seek to keep out? It has been suggested that Cain sought to keep out his relatives by other sons of Adam, who might seek vengeance, or even his own lawless sons. But Cain had nothing to fear from his godly relatives, because God “gave Cain a sign that whoever found him would not murder him” (Gen. 4:15, Leupold). As Leupold has pointed out, the reference is not to any physical mark on Cain, but “a sign of guaranty” or a “pledge or token”.³ Moreover, as Smith pointed out, the text makes clear that the assurance is that “*no one* finding him should slay him.”⁴ Cain thus had nothing to fear from any man: he left his paternal home with this assurance from an absolute God. God’s law forbid to the family any right to take life. Thus, even more important than the execution of a murderer was this limitation of the family’s power.⁵

Immediately after this assurance from God, we are told that “Cain went out from the presence of the LORD, and dwelt in the land of Nod (or, wandering), on the east of Eden” (Gen. 4. 16). The building of the city soon follows.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

3. H. C. Leupold: *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 211. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1942.

4. R. Payne Smith, “Genesis”, in C. J. Ellicott: *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, vol. I, p. 20. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

5. See R. J. Rushdoony: *Institutes of Biblical Law*, loc. cit.

Clearly, despite God's assurance to Cain, Cain's departure was *from* God, and, as from the beginning, when he struck down Abel, God's servant, Cain's basic hostility was against God. The city thus, although an imitation of God's city, was built in defiance of God, as an aggressive act against God, and as a new beginning designed to supplant God's beginning in Eden. At this point, Ellul is right; the "secular" city has an anti-God character; it is built as man's work and as man's order as against God's work and order. Cain's city and the modern city have been built to keep out God, to replace God's law and predestination with man's law, planning, and control. As against Eden and the New Jerusalem, the Cainite's dream is of Enoch, Babel, and Babylon the Great. All things must be in terms of man. Thus, Auguste Comte, the father of sociology and founder of the formal Religion of Humanity, "looking around at the animal and vegetative kingdoms, went on to suggest that all species of these beings not useful to man should be systematically annihilated. Of course, he who could not produce nor reproduce a single species, would determine which were useless and had to be eradicated."⁶ Before Comte, other humanists had already begun this execution, now, ironically, deliberately blamed on the Bible and its teachings!

Basic to Cain's psychology thus was his enmity with God. Van Til has written of "the Cainitic wish" that "there is no God".⁷ Those possessed by this "Cain-complex" worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator, and all fallen, unregenerate men "hate God and are possessed of the Cain-complex."⁸ Being possessed of the Cainitic wish that there be no God, the sons of Cain, his spiritual heirs, seek to eliminate every trace of God from reality. Order, design, intelligence, purpose, and meaning are all denied in principle, because God

6. Vincent P. Miceli, S. J.: *The Gods of Atheism*, p. 177. New Rochell, New York: Arlington House, 1971.

7. Cornelius Van Til: *Psychology of Religion*, p. 129. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1935, 1961.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 121.

is denied in principle. But man can only eliminate God, and all sign-posts pointing to God, by eliminating all reality, including himself, for all things witness to God, their Creator. The result is, as Van Til has aptly termed it, an “integration into the void.”⁹ Man dissolves himself whenever he seeks to dissolve God.

Fourth, Cain, in creating a new city as the new Eden, and seeking to bar its gates to God, was thereby also setting himself up as the new creator. The world was to have a new beginning with Cain, and this claim is still made by every Cainite who offers a new beginning to mankind, conditional upon a barring of the gates to God. The attack of radical youth on the “Establishment” is in large measure because the Establishment still perpetuates godly elements of law and order in spite of itself. It should be noted that John Lennon, one of the Beatles, declared that it was a “political thing I did” when he said, “The Beatles are bigger than Jesus.” Politics has reference to the *polis*, the Greek city, a divine-human order; Lennon was asserting man’s new order as against God’s order and himself as against God the Son. Yoko Lennon described her own motivation in similar terms, declaring,

I want to incite people to loosen their oppression by giving them something to work with, to build on. They shouldn’t be frightened of creating themselves — that’s why I make things very open, with things for people to do, like in my book (*Grapefruit*). Because basically there are two types of people in the world: people who are confident, because they know they have the ability to create; and then people who have been demoralized, who have no confidence in themselves, because they have been told they have no creative ability, but must just take orders. The Establishment likes people who take no responsibility and cannot respect themselves.¹⁰

“Responsibility” in Yoko Lennon’s vocabulary means a rejection

9. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

10. “Lennon: The Working-class Hero Turns Red,” in *Ramparts*, vol. 10, no. 1 July, 1971, p. 45.

tion of Biblical responsibility and an assumption of a god-like freedom. Both John and Yoko Lennon see the family as a part of “the God trip or father-figure trip” which must be dissolved in favor of “Facing up to reality instead of always looking for some kind of heaven.”

This points to a *fifth* aspect of the Cainitic mentality, the masochistic urge to be cast out and somehow deprived or oppressed. Both the Lennons reveal this clearly, John Lennon carrying the banner of a broken home background as a merit badge:

John: Mine is an extreme case, you know. My father and mother split and I never saw my father until I was 20, nor did I see much more of my mother. But Yoko had her parents there and it was the same.

Yoko: Perhaps one feels more pain when parents are there. It's like when we're hungry, you know it's worse to get a symbol of a cheeseburger than no cheeseburger at all. It doesn't do you any good, you know. I often wish my mother had died so that at least I could get some people's sympathy. But there she was, a perfectly beautiful mother.¹¹

Masochism and self-pity characterized Cain, and they still mark all the Cainites. Ridden by guilt, they need to feel hurt, oppressed, and cast out. The Cainites will agitate, demonstrate, and aggravate people into some kind of action in order to indulge in their maudlin sense of persecution. “My punishment is greater than I can bear,” said Cain, the murderer (Gen. 4:13), whose punishment was life rather than a sentence of death. Cain the offender claimed to be offended. Cain, condemned to be “a fugitive and a vagabond . . . in the earth” (Gen. 4:12; “thou shalt be shifting and straying about in the earth,” translates Leupold), built a city and made a permanent habitation. God's curse is translated by Leupold in part as, “And now cursed shall thou be, driven away from the ground which has opened its mouth to receive

11. *Idem.*

thy brother's blood from thy hand" (Gen. 4:11).¹² The phrase "away from the ground," according to Leupold, means, "so that there is no ground for you."¹³ This means, *sixth*, that the earth, promised to the blessed meek, the tamed or redeemed of God (Ps. 37:11; Matt. 5:5), is denied to the Cainites. Even in their possession of the earth, they are aliens to it and are progressively driven from it. They live on earth but are cut off from it, in that there is a homelessness or alienation which marks them always. The term *alienation* has been a product of humanistic thought, and it rightly marks the humanist's psychology. "The earth is the LORD'S" (Ps. 24:1), and the Cainite feels always alien to it and in it. Even in a home, he feels homeless; in a city, he is still in spirit a stateless person.

Psalms 45:6 declares, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre." God's word, law, and judgment are fixed and settled, and, as against this unyielding fixity, the Cainite is forever homeless and a vagabond, unable ever to find rest in any beginning he makes.

Very strikingly, St. Paul in Hebrews presents a like yet contrasting picture of the believer as he finds himself surrounded by Cainites and in Cain's stronghold. Abraham and others, as strangers and pilgrims, wandered through Cain's realm, but with a destination, God's city (Heb. 11:13-17). They were not homeless wanderers like Cain, building walls against God, but rather homeward bound citizens of the New Jerusalem. "For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come" (Heb. 13:14). The Cainites are vagabonds and homeless, alienated wanderers, even when they build and possess a city. The people of God are pilgrims and citizens, destined to possess the earth and to reign in eternity.

12. Leupold, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 207.

The Song of Lamech

In Genesis 4:23, 24, we have a brief, vivid glimpse and revelation of the psychology of a depraved man. It has been observed, with respect to the doctrine of total depravity, that “Total depravity does not mean absolute depravity, nor does it imply that anyone in this life is so bad that he could not become worse. The depravity spoken of is total in its extent, not in its degree.”¹ In Lamech, we see the extent of depravity as it reveals itself in a man who places himself at the center of life in God’s place. If a man wounds him, Lamech will kill him; if a youth bruises him, he shall die for it.

But this is not all. As Leupold points out,

Lamech remembers the sentence and the divine promise to his ancestor. On this he builds up. If God will see to it that the one who harms Cain will have a sevenfold measure of punishment, Lamech, not needing or even despising God’s avenging justice, will provide for himself by the strength of his own arm, reenforced by his son’s weapon, a far more heavy punishment than God would have allowed — seventyseven fold. The arrogance and presumption are unbelievable. The spirit of self-sufficiency here expressing itself overleaps all bounds. This, then coupled with its hate and revengefulness, makes it one of the most ungodly pieces ever written. Such are the achievements of human culture divorced from God.²

The inclusion of this dramatic boast in Scripture is not accidental but essential. Clearly, it is important for us to understand its meaning. An interesting, incisive, and theological comment by Cornelius Van Til phrases the psychology of

1. “Religious Terms Defined”, *Blue Banner Faith and Life*, vol. 26, January-March, 1971, no. 1, p. 36.

2. H. C. Leupold: *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 224.

Lamech in terms of twentieth century religious thought. In a sense, it is a modernizing of the text, but, since the contemporary mind is a development of the implications of the fall, Van Til's comment is all the more revealing because it indicates the clear link between the depravity of Lamech and that of twentieth century man. According to Van Til,

Lamech had told his wives how his great-grandfather of many generations back had really believed in the objective existence of God. Lamech had told his two wives of the "myth" of Adam and Eve and of their "prehistoric" fall. Cain, he said, had actually feared that for his murder some untoward termination of his life would come to him. But he, Lamech, had outgrown all that. For him God was dead. He knew that God was a projection of the imagination of man. He knew that there had been no such thing as a confrontation of Adam with God in ordinary history. And he knew that the threats which Cain feared were purely subjective and could be cured by psychotherapy. The idea of a future punishment for murder and adultery must be taken *cum grano*. We have now a new morality and a situation ethics. Eschatology as well as pre-history must not be placed on the same line with ordinary history. Adam lived in *Urgeschichte*. So let us eat and drink and commit adultery for tomorrow we die.³

Van Til is right: very clearly we have here "a new morality and a situation ethics". We have also a deliberate contempt expressed for God's declaration to Cain, "Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold" (Gen. 4:15). To understand Lamech's reference, the meaning of God's statement must be understood. Cain had committed murder and was clearly guilty and merited death. All the same, God prevented the execution of Cain and made public His protection of Cain. The reason for this is family law, which takes precedence over the death penalty. The family had a duty to denounce a delinquent son, but it could not, as with witnesses in other cases, be an executioner (Deut. 21:18-21).

3. Cornelius Van Til: *The Great Debate Today*, p. 54. Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, 1970.

The power of the family does not extend to the death penalty. As the cradle, nursery, and school of life, its function is restricted to the discipline of life. The death penalty is the function of the state. Because the family has such great powers, to give it also the power of death is to make it totalitarian. Since mankind in Cain's day was one family, father, mother, sons, and daughters, God at the very beginning restricted the power of the family in this area. It was more important to preserve the boundaries of the family's power than to bring judgment in time to a murderer.

A very important point, among other things, is thus clearly in evidence. The righteousness of God manifests itself in law, and God reveals Himself in His word and act in the framework of His righteousness and law.

Lamech, as the new god of being, expressed his contempt for God's self-restraint and law. Lamech's concept of God, i.e., of himself, was of a free god, a god beyond good and evil and thus beyond law. He could thus declare, "Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold" (Gen. 4:23, 24).

In Lamech's thinking, if God exists, He is a fool. To have the power He claims to have and not to use it is folly. It is more logical to believe, Lamech implied, that God, if He exists, has no power: He is impotent. Not so Lamech. At his will, and without restraint, he has the power to avenge himself seventy and sevenfold, and he boasts of the death he has just brought to two men.

Lamech thus boasted that he had exploded the myth of God's law and of God's morality: he did as he pleased. It made no difference to Lamech whom he dealt with, a stranger or a son. If he were hurt or bruised, his vengeance would require death.

The proud boastfulness of Lamech involves still another factor. He denied that he had any sense of guilt over com-

mitting murder. To have any guilt feelings would be to acknowledge God's law. As a result, Lamech takes the opposite course: instead of nursing secret guilt feelings, he boasts of his crime and displays it as a virtue. It is a virtue because he has decided it must be so.

He denied having guilt feelings because he denied that such a thing as sin is possible. Lamech lived beyond good and evil. To admit to guilt feelings was to admit to a sense of sin and thereby to recognize God, however unwilling.⁴ This Lamech refused to do. Rather, he called attention to his murders and boasted of them as a way of declaring his independence from God's law.

To deny guilt feelings, and to deny the fact of sin, is essentially to deny God, and this precisely is what Lamech did. Whatever God might be, Lamech regarded as impotent or irrelevant. Lamech made the law as it suited him, and it suited him to express his radical contempt for God and God's law.

This leads to an obvious conclusion. Because the Biblical view of man is not dualistic, i.e., man is not made up of two alien substances but is a unity created by God, there is thus a basic unity of mind and body, thought and act. A man will act out his faith. The presuppositions of a man are implicit and explicit in his actions. Lamech's words and acts were revelatory of his thoughts, even as our's are.

An old saying has it that "murder will out". More accurately, a man's thoughts will come out in acts as well as words. History, therefore, does not stand still. Solomon said of man, "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Prov. 23:7). What a man says today, he will probably do tomorrow. The idea therefore that pornography will not lead to sexual action,

4. Freud sought to abolish the need for God by abolishing the status of guilt as a religious problem. As long as men feel guilty, they will feel a need for God, Freud recognized. As a result, he sought to reduce guilt to a scientific question and to call it simply a relic of our primordial past lingering on in our unconscious. See R. J. Rushdoony, *Freud* (Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, 1965, 1968.)

or murderous ideas and plans to murderous acts is naive and foolish. Ideas are programs for action, and man's imagination is his drawing-board for next year's campaigns and activities. Thus, for Sartre, man "is completely and always free, or he is not free at all."⁵ This is not unlike Lamech's position. Dostoyevsky observed that, "If God did not exist, everything would be possible."⁶ When man, like Lamech, wills himself to be his own god, then he must wage war against everything that represents the true God, His true church, law, and word. It is total warfare for a dream of total freedom. Its goal is the death of God to make way for the birth of a new god. As a result, history is a warfare between reprobate man and God. The warfare is bitter, but there can be no doubt as to the triumph of the sovereign God.

5. Walter Odajnyk: *Marxism and Existentialism*, p. 99 Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1965.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Guilt

In analyzing the psychology of fallen man, *guilt* is a central factor. Fallen man is guilty man. Guilt, according to Scripture is a consequence of sin, and the primary and original sin is man's desire to be as God, to determine good and evil for himself (Gen. 3:5). All particular sins are products of this original and basic sin.

However, in analyzing himself, man avoids the term *sin*: it has no place in his psychology or in his sociology. *Guilt* is admitted into the psychological vocabulary of humanism, but not *sin*. The reason for this is not difficult to fathom. Sin points to an act, a violation of a law, to responsibility, and to God. Guilt, as the con-comitant of sin, also points to God, but, because guilt is an intensely inner state as well as an external fact, it is less easy to dispose of. The reaction of Adam and Eve to their sense of guilt was relatively simple and naive: they hid themselves from God. They clearly felt guilty, even though they denied their sin, blaming their sin on the environment and ultimately on God (Gen. 3:7-13). Lamech's reaction is somewhat more sophisticated. Having sinned, he boasted of his sin and declared it to be his virtue, strength, and principle, so that he denied both his sin and his guilt.

Guilt feelings, however, are not easily disposed of, and modern man has found that guilt insistently plagues man. His answer, after Freud, has been to deny the fact of sin but to affirm the reality of guilt but only as a relic of a primitive past, the primal horde: The will to incest, the desire of the sons to possess the mothers and daughters, whom the father kept supposedly as his own sexual property; the will to parri-

cide, to kill the father in order to possess the women; and the will to cannibalism, to eat the killed father. As long as men felt guilty, Freud recognized, they would seek God, however much science 'disproved' God; to abolish God, guilt would have to be converted from a religious to a scientific problem.¹ Even non-Freudian psychologies at this point are Freudian, in that they separate guilt from sin, and, after Freud, see guilt as a scientific rather than a religious problem.

Ironically, however, a deadly inheritance goes with Freud's thesis. Because guilt is so basic to the will to live in Freud, to accomplish the scientific task of stifling guilt feelings is also to stifle the will to live and to unleash the will to death. The sexual revolution has capitalized on Freud's thesis; sex has been divorced from law and love and made purely a pleasureable and prophylactic exercise. In Freud himself, who did not go as far as his present-day followers, the effect was marked. His own sexual life began late, around thirty, according to his friend and biographer, Ernest Jones, and subsided and ended early, around forty.² The psychotherapist Rollo May calls attention to the "freedom" won by the sexual revolution, and with approval. "External social anxiety and guilt have lessened; dull would be the man who did not rejoice in this. But *internal* anxiety and guilt have increased."³ Moreover, the sexual revolution has not solved the problems it earlier claimed it would solve. "We are confronted by the curious situation of *the more birth control, the more illegitimate pregnancies.*"⁴ Sado-masochistic urges are clearly at work in such cases and reveal strong guilt feelings. The sexual freedom of "the new sophisticate" is called by May a new form of self-castration.⁵

The evidence from Scandinavia would tend to confirm this. Elliott observed, of their detachment from life,

1. See J. R. Rushdoony: *Freud*, Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, 1965, 1968.

2. Rollo May: *Love and Will*, p. 49. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1969.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 40f.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

But it may well be that this vague lack of deep satisfaction with the sensual life is at least partly responsible for the fact that 25 percent of all deaths during the young and most sexual viable years are suicides—an astonishing figure in a world where 2 percent of all deaths is considered a high rate of suicide. And the rate is almost double in the larger cities.⁶

Elliott found it to be indicative of Scandinavian mentality when a film hero said, “My need is to be dead. Absolutely, totally dead.” Men are largely dominated by women, and loneliness is deep and intense on all sides.⁷ It can be added that alcoholism is a major Scandinavian problem, and the use of drugs is increasing. Thus, while external social anxiety and guilt have lessened in Scandinavia with respect to sexual immorality, internal anxiety and guilt have apparently increased very markedly.

The problem of guilt, both external or social, and internal and personal, thus concerns psychologists in our day as a very present issue. The answers, while ostensibly scientific, are rather echoes of ancient paganism. As Sherrill observed in 1945,

Oddly enough, those psychologists who have most vigorously insisted that their work is scientific get results strikingly similar to views held by Greeks and others in past milleniums, who put the conflict outside of man himself and then could find no way to solve it, arriving finally at Nonsense. For in the last analysis it does not make a great difference whether the Nonsense is conceived as due to our being men at the mercy of a pack of stupid gods, or as due to our being animals bereft of rationality, trapped by a social environment gone mad, and terrorized by a physical environment of tremendous power in the hands of a crazy society. If man has thought to absolve himself of responsibility for his own plight and thus dignify himself in his own eyes, we may fairly ask whether he has accomplished more toward that end when he acted as

6. Neil Elliott: *Sensuality in Scandinavia*, p. 235. New York: Webright and Talley, 1970.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 170.

academic psychologist in modern times, than he did in previous ages by means of myth.⁸

Since Sherril's study is an important contribution to the subject, it is necessary to examine his analysis of the subject. The dialectical nature of Greek thought tended to associate guilt with either mind or body rather than to see it as an aspect of the whole man. Buddhism saw the moral conflict in man as itself evil and saw redemption in extinction. In antiquity, the problem of guilt and the moral conflict in man was seen "in terms of light against darkness, or soul against body, or reason against irrationality."⁹ "When the question has to do with ultimate responsibility for the outcome of the conflict, the two classic answers were that it is outside men, or within man himself." If the responsibility for man's moral problem is outside of man, then God or the gods are responsible or guilty, not man. The gods in such a universe are hateful, and the universe is nonsense. If the conflict is within man, and guilt and responsibility rest with man, then the answer of paganism was flight, the flight of the soul from the body in Plato, the flight into mind or reason for Aristotle and the Stoics, or the flight into nothingness with the Buddhists.

The dilemma of antiquity in its stark form was this: if the gods are responsible, the world is Nonsense. A plague then upon their whole house! A jury of Athenian burghers could render a juster verdict than these loathsome deities. Let the average citizen of the universe have a hand in his own Fate. What then? The alternative, once thought through to its end, gives startling results. If man is responsible, he must flee from himself to find rest. He may become a disembodied soul, or a passionless creature of reason all compounded, or become extinguished altogether.¹⁰

Since the Renaissance, modern man is all the more deter-

8. Lewis Joseph Sherril: *Guilt and Redemption*, p. 57. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1945.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

mined to eliminate God and guilt and to find freedom in moral autonomy from God. This he planned to do by means of reason, but he soon deserted reason in favor of emotions. Modern man freed himself from the church also, only to create the greatest tyranny, the totalitarian modern state.¹¹ Science has more recently been hailed as the savior, but is being more and more depicted as the demonic. Lena Nyman, the actress who played the fornicating “heroine” of *I Am Curious (Yellow)* is quoted by Elliott as saying, “dreamily: ‘I think I’ve wanted to be a kind of sex saviour in this film.’ ”¹² The results, however, have been impotence and an emotional sterility.

The more man has evaded guilt and responsibility, the more serious the outcroppings of guilt have become in the forms of anxiety, hostility, sadism, and masochism. According to Sherrill, “The real cause of the anxiety is not outside the person but within him.”¹³ No evasion has worked; man’s attempts to evade guilt only increase guilt. In the words of Sherrill’s masterly summation,

In Christianity it is commonly held that the responsibility is within man himself. Every possible escape from this hard conclusion seems hedged about in Christian teaching. It is hardly necessary even to recall the characteristic emphases of Christian doctrine regarding man’s responsibility, so familiar are they. What of man?

He is responsible for the outcome of his conflict; from him is taken the satisfaction of sitting in judgment on any other man, for it is his own condition which requires judging. *He* is the sinner, and the wages of sin is death. *He* is responsible for the plight into which his own sins have brought him. *He* is even accounted responsible with a kind of cumulative responsibility which reaches into the past and takes in his heredity. *He* is blocked off from attributing the blame for his own situation to his fathers or to their fathers before them. More yet, *he* is held accountable, in many lines of Christian thought, for the sins of the

11. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

12. Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

13. Sherrill, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

fathers themselves, as when it was said by Jesus that the blood of all the prophets slain from the foundation of the world shall be required of *this* generation. (Luke 11:50) Thus when to the teaching that every man is a sinner are added the yet more difficult doctrines of original sin, little more remains to be said by way of a reminder here that in Christianity the responsibility is held to be within man himself. And yet it means but little in Christianity to say that man is responsible, for man is responsible *to God*. In Christianity, as indeed in Judaism and Islam as well, man is under the judgment of God. He is a sufferer, but he is more than that, he is an offender. It is the will or the law *of God* which he has not kept.¹⁴

It is important in this context to examine the verse cited by Sherrill, because it is seen so often as an example of the “horrible” doctrines taught in Scripture. Jesus Christ, in Luke 11:50, declared “That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation.” This is true in every generation in varying degrees. No generation is ever born into an empty world: it inherits the wealth as well as the problems of the past. It cannot accept the one without accepting the other. It is a condition of being alive to be an heir, genetically, socially, religiously, and in various other ways. Every generation must give an account for its use of its inheritance of wealth, guilt, and problems. Supremely, the generation of Jews and also the Greeks and Romans of our Lord’s day had an inheritance of great wealth in His presence, but also of great guilt for their indifference to and hatred for His servants, the prophets.

Such guilt is still personal. A man, having inherited the advantages and burdens of the past, can neither pass the burdens nor the advantages on to society. He is himself responsible; he is himself a steward of his inheritance and of his life. Those who made Christ their atonement made one use of their inheritance, and those who rejected Him made still another use. The disciples found their answer to their

14. *Ibid.*, p. 162.

inheritance of guilt to be regeneration, being born again, and sanctification, obedience to the law of God.

But, turning again to the psychology of fallen man, the more he denies externally the fact of guilt, the more the internal pressure of guilt builds up. Where external social pressures force the fact of guilt on to the minds of men, some masochistic appeasement does appear in the guilty man; there is a limited but very brief satiation of the inner guilt. Sin is an offense, and it is an offense primarily and essentially against God; it is warfare against God's law-order, and its appeal is precisely that it is a lawless assault against God's world. Thus, Elliott cites "a pervert" as complaining: "They smother us with tolerance — the life of a sexual deviant is no longer exciting and glamorously illicit."¹⁵ As a result, in Scandinavia, to maintain this assault, new frontiers for sin are explored. Incest is being urged; Dr. Lars Ullerstam has suggested state subsidies for every kind of pervert, and his proposals are seriously debated in the Swedish Parliament.¹⁶ The Swedish government subsidizes pornographic films up to 75 percent of production costs, and the Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme appeared in the film "I Am Curious (Yellow)".¹⁷ Elliott reported, "I asked Palme if he had known that the film was going to be largely pornographic. 'Was it?' he asked."¹⁸ It is not illogical to assume that these films represent an aspect of an assault against remaining standards within Sweden as well as Christian standards abroad.

The fallen man talks of a new order, but the essence of that new order is a prolonged assault on God's order and a noisy denial of guilt before God. Inescapably, the politics of unregenerate man is the politics of atonement. Man needs atonement: either he will receive it from God by Christ, or he will try to work out his own atonement. Self-atonement is either sadistic or masochistic. Guilty men will either punish

15. Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 186-221.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 169-179.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 179.

themselves for their sins, as they seek to work out the burden of guilt, or they will attempt to lay the guilt on others by sadistic actions against them. The politics of atonement is thus suicidal. Instead of being geared to reality, it leads men to actions governed by their over-riding sense of guilt. If men will not have Christ's atonement for their sin and guilt, they will be increasingly governed by their guilt.

Death

The consequence and penalty of sin is death. In Genesis 2:17, the declaration by God is, literally, “dying thou shalt die”, or, “certainly die”. In its ultimate sense, “Dying is separation from God.”¹ However, because the sinner is in revolt against God, he does not experience the fear of death as fear of separation from God, but rather as a fear of separation from life. At this point, he is radically schizophrenic; being in revolt against God, he is in revolt against life and is governed by a will to death and a masochistic urge to self-punishment. However, having affirmed himself to be his own god, he is intent on living, but he wants life on his own terms.

The cause of death is sin, but it is not sin which the sinner, as the ultimate revolutionist, fears, but the consequence of sin, death. Like a child eagerly eating a forbidden dish which will surely make him ill, the sinner enjoys the eating as much as he dislikes the aftermath. But this is not all: he will insist on deceiving himself about the aftermath and will declare that the gates of hell are the doors of paradise. Scripture affirms that the dog turns to his own vomit, “and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire” (II Peter 2:22). Armenians illustrate this with the story of Nazar Edin, the stupid Turk, who was ridiculed by his fellow workmen for his inordinate love of cucumbers, so that he could not bear to throw even the peels away. To prove them wrong, Nazar Edin tossed the peels on the ground and urinated on them. A little later, having eaten all of the cucumber, he was hungry for more. He picked up a piece of peel, saying, “This piece did

1. H. C. Leupold: *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 128.

not get wet,” and then another, with the same remark, and yet another, until all the peels were eaten. The story concludes, and so does a sinner and a fool deceive himself.

A common complaint of mentally disturbed people, as well as many criminals, is that they “feel dead inside”. Since, as Laing has noted, “the only *real* death *we* recognize is biological death,” the reality of this is not noted.² According to Scripture, however, sin is death; it is spiritual death, in that rebirth is necessary to make the dead man alive before God. It is physical death also, in that the destiny of fallen man includes physical death. The “feeling of deadness” is thus a part of the human condition and an aspect of the fall. The repeated refrain of Genesis 5 is “and he died” (Gen. 5:5, 8, 11, 14, etc.). As against God’s creative work, which brought heaven and earth into being, and man to life out of the dust of the earth, “by man came death” (I Cor. 15:21), “and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” in Adam (Rom. 5:12). “The wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23).

Despair is closely related to death, in that it is a loss of any hope in life. Laing comments,

The schizophrenic is desperate, is simply without hope. I have never known a schizophrenic who could say he was loved, as a man, by God the Father or by the Mother of God or by another man. He either *is* God, or the Devil, or in hell, estranged from God. When someone says he is an unreal man or that he is dead, in all seriousness, expressing in radical terms the stark truth of his existence as he experiences it, that is — insanity.³

What Laing refuses to note in all its implications is that the “schizophrenic” is unloved because he refuses to be loved except on his own terms. Misguided attempts to love a “schizophrenic” out of his problems often intensify his “alienation” from reality.

Laing’s answer, as an existentialist, is that the individual

2. R. D. Laing: *The Divided Self*, p. 39, New York: Pantheon Books, 1960, 1969. Laing’s position is not that of this writer, of course.

3. *Idem*.

must strive to be an “ontologically secure person.” The ontologically insecure person encounters three forms of anxiety: engulfment, implosion, and petrification and depersonalization.

Engulfment is felt as a risk in being understood (thus grasped, comprehended), in being loved, or even simply in being seen. To be hated may be feared for other reasons, but to be hated as such is often less disturbing than to be destroyed, as it is felt, through being engulfed by love.⁴

This dislike of being loved characterizes the sensualist women of Scandinavia.⁵ In fear of engulfment, the individual retreats into a psychological isolation.

With respect to implosion, Laing states that “reality is . . . the persecutor” by threatening to impinge on the life of the “schizophrenic.”

Impingement does not convey, however, the full terror of the experience of the world as liable at any moment to crash in and obliterate all identity, as a gas will rush in and obliterate a vacuum. The individual feels that, like the vacuum, he is empty. But this emptiness is him. Although in other ways he longs for the emptiness to be filled, he dreads the possibility of this happening because he has come to feel that all he can be is the awful nothingness of just this very vacuum. Any ‘contact’ with reality is then in itself experienced as a dreadful threat because reality, as experienced from this position, is necessarily *implosive* and thus, as was relatedness in engulfment, *in itself* a threat to what identity the individual is able to suppose himself to have.⁶

Petrification and depersonalization are the generalized fear of death. What Laing has described is the sinner and his fear of God and of death. What Laing offers, however, is to give the sinner an inner security in his rebellion and the psychological ability to maintain his revolution without collapse. The implication is that an unsuccessful sinner will be converted into a

4. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

5. Neil Elliott: *Sensuality in Scandinavia*, pp. 222-235; etc.

6. Laing, *op. cit.*, p. 47f.

successful one. All of history records the failure of such attempts.

Since sin leads to a radical isolation of man from God and of man from man, man fears everything which can in any way infringe on his withdrawal into himself. By withdrawing into himself, the sinner plays at being his own god and his own universe. As even Laing noted, love is a threat to that attempt at a god-like autonomy, and as a result, sex is substituted for love.

But sex itself involves a dangerous relationship and dependence and is thus feared. As Rollo May noted,

The relationship between death and love is surely clear in the sex act. Every kind of mythology relates the sex act itself to dying, and every therapist comes to⁷ see the relationship ever more clearly through his patients.

The sexual revolution thus begins with an assault on a godly, loving marital relationship and an espousal of lawless sex. Moreover, it is insisted that sexuality be cultivated from the earliest years. Thus, in May, 1967,

the American Psychological Association's annual convention in Washington, D.C., heard Dr. Robert A. Harper, a local psychologist, advocate sex-play pens for nursery schoolchildren to prevent sexual hangups in adulthood, and Dr. Harold Greenwood from New York blames the first signs of sexual anxiety on a mother's removal of a child's hands from his sex organs while diapering him. Presumably, no mothers were present to remind the doctor of the necessity of removing those infant hands before the area can be talc-dusted and the diaper firmly pinned in place.⁸

However, all sexual relations involving another person mean some kind of tie to or dependence on that other person. This to a man (or woman) seeking to be his own god is the ultimate in frustration. Not surprisingly, the most recent definition of "perfect sex" is masturbation.

7. Rollo May; *Love and Will*, p. 103.

8. Lester Graham: *No More Morals: The Sexual Revolution*, p. 16. New York: Pyramid Books, 1971.

Listen to Dr. Leslie H. Faber, distinguished Washington, D.C., psychologist: "According to the laboratory there is only one perfect orgasm, if by 'perfect' we mean wholly subject to its owner's will, wholly indifferent to human contingency or context. Clearly the perfect orgasm is the orgasm achieved on one's own. No other consummation offers such certainty and moreover avoids the messiness that attends human affairs. Nor should we be too surprised if such solitary pleasure becomes the ideal by which all mutual sex is measured."⁹

The attempt of man to be his own god reduces him to this absurdity. Man's desire for aseity leads to his isolation from God and man, and his fear of death leads him to a retreat from life and love.

Man the sinner, in revolution against God, revolts against everything which might tie him to anyone else, lest he be subject to the influences of others and thereby lose something of his claim to divinity. The more man isolates himself from God and responsibility, from love and community, the more prone he becomes to every influence that comes his way. Indians who had never been exposed to measles found it a killing disease, whereas their white neighbors regarded it as a routine ailment of children. The most impressionable people are those who are most rootless. Atheistic intellectuals are more prone to accept propaganda and to be hypnotized than are peasants. Revolutionists are thus almost always rootless intellectuals who are easily swayed and who readily sway other men like themselves. Kaiser noted the radical susceptibility of the assassin of Robert F. Kennedy, Sirhan Sirhan, to influence: "Sirhan was a *tabula rasa* upon which ideas could be imposed with ease, or, better, a piece of video tape on which certain images could be electronically imprinted and certain sounds electronically etched."¹⁰

Man the sinner, as he seeks to be his own god and universe, becomes an open universe to every idea or influence which is

9. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

10. Robert Blair Kaiser: "*R. F. K. Must Die!*", p. 528. New York: Grove Press, 1970.

lawless and anti-God. At the same time, he becomes an empty universe, in that, by denying God he has implicitly denied all reality, since God is the creator of all things. He complains, therefore, of a radical emptiness or deadness, and his every attempt to fill it by his own fiat will is doomed to frustration and an intensification of his inner death: “dying thou shalt die,” is his sentence.

The destiny of revolutionary man is to hunger for life and to know that, in spite of all, death is his future. Death is for him the great enemy, but he longs for death also, because all of life betrays him in his pretended divinity. The terrors of death begin, not beyond the grave, but long before it, and they are identical increasingly with the facts of life for revolutionary man.

The Demand for Freedom from Testing

When God confronted Adam with his sin, Adam's immediate response was to blame God: "The woman whom *thou* gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:12). Adam and Eve clearly resented the fact that they had been put to the test. The only kind of paradise, indeed, the only kind of world acceptable to them was a world without problems, and with no necessity for decisions. However good Eden was, the fact that a tree was barred to them (Gen. 2:17), and that eating thereof had deadly consequences, was in their eyes unfair of God. For man, the ideal world is a world without problems and without any moral testing. Quite obviously, God does not agree.

The world is full of moral decisions and is a steady round of moral responsibility. Responsibility is as much a part of man's daily life as the air he breathes, but man resents the fact of responsibility. Rollo May has pointed out that every decision to have a baby, or not to have one, involves responsibility and therefore hidden guilt for modern man. The increased availability of various methods of birth control has only increased the extent of responsibility, for the more man by science extends his powers of dominion and control, the more he increases his areas of responsibility and potential guilt. As a result, modern man has intensified his sense of guilt. May observes:

There is also the dilemma of personal responsibility which comes from the freedom to choose to have a baby or not. It has been possible to plan babies for the last four decades, and though we have acted upon that power, we have never accepted the psychological and personal respon-

sibility for it. Our blithe evasion of that issue comes out in the guilt we feel as a whole society toward our children. We do everything for them, we cater to their development and their whims, we count it a sign of our broad-mindedness and virtue that we give in to them on every moral issue (and now on marijuana) so that the poor children have an impossible time trying to find something about these always-giving-in parents against which they can revolt. When they go away, we say, "have a good time," and we get worried if they don't have a good time and worried if they have *too* good a time. And all the while we are secretly envious of them and their youth and resentful at how good they have it compared with how hard we had it. Through all of this treating our young like little royalty, heirs apparent to heaven knows what, we are the maids-in-waiting, chauffeurs, cooks, nurses, bottomless money-bags, home teachers, camp leaders — until it is no wonder our children stand up and scream, "For heaven's sake, leave us *alone!*" And that is the biggest threat of all to us — for we are filled with some nameless, pervasive guilt about our children and can't let go. And the guilt we are expiating is not about some specific thing we did or didn't do in rearing them; it is about the basic fact of having children in the first place. For no longer does "God" decide we are to have children; we do. And who has even begun to comprehend the meaning of that tremendous fact?

Or imagine the couples — and, with the need for population control, there will be many — who will plan to have only one baby: consider the tremendous psychic weight this poor infant will have to carry. As we see in our therapy, particularly with professional people who have had their one child, there is great temptation to overprotect the infant. When he calls, the parents run; when he whimpers, they are abashed; when he is sick, they are guilty; when he doesn't sleep, they look as though *they* are going to have nervous breakdowns. The infant becomes a little dictator by virtue of the situation he is born into, and couldn't be anything else if he wanted to. And there is, of course, the always complicating and contradictory fact that all this attention actually amounts to a considerable curtailing of the child's freedom and he must, like a prince

born into a royal family, carry a weight for which children were never made.¹

May's comments can be criticized at a number of points. Mainly, guilt feelings are brought to bear by man on his every relationship, and, as a result, appear in his parenthood. The guilty parents he describes brought an already existing guilt to parenthood. Their essential sin is to attempt to be their own god, and yet to have no consequences to their acts. As a result, since all acts are consequential, their parenthood becomes to them not a joy but a constant and guilty burden.

A world of causality and consequences haunts them. Man the sinner wants to be god in a world without any consequences, guilt, sickness, disease, or death. He dreams of creating such a world, and, if he cannot have it, at least to provide it for his children.

A telling little tale sums up this attitude:

They tell the story of the Cadillac that drove up to the Plaza Hotel. The chauffeur helped the mother out. Then the 26 pieces of matched luggage. In the back of the car, a boy was sitting in a wheelchair. As he was being wheeled down a special ramp and into the hotel, the manager murmured a few discreet words of sympathy to the mother.

"Why, what's wrong?" she demanded.

"Your son, not being able to walk," he said.

"Of course he can walk. Thank God he doesn't have to."²

Jane O'Reilly gives some interesting examples of parental attempts to spare children all problems and to cater to their whims. One mother cooks a dinner nightly for her three younger children, and a separate dinner for her husband. Her 19-year-old son lives in his upstairs bedroom with a girl friend, and the mother prepares a special vegetarian dinner, on request, for them. Comments Mrs. O'Reilly:

1. Rollo May: *Love and Will*, p. 119f.

2. Jane O'Reilly, "Notes on the Paralyzed Generation." *The Chicago Tribune*, Sunday, January 10, 1971; excerpted from the *New York Magazine*, 1970.

I felt so sorry for my cousin, who arrived in his \$4,000 car, under terrible strain — a complete failure who hadn't been admitted to college anywhere. When I suggested that he leave home and get a job, he said he couldn't because: "What about the car? And my mother's credit card?" The price of independence came too high. And then came a moment of enlightenment. I asked him to help me peel potatoes.

"I can't," he said definitely, "I don't know how."

These kids don't know how to peel potatoes. Or wipe their noses. Or tie their shoes. But those are minor skills, quickly learned.

The only problem is to get out of the house where they will be free to learn. Because at home Mom and Dad are still raising children instead of adults. Turning on the bath water, organizing the Little League games, driving the kids to school, offering options and instant gratification, removing frustrations, never leaving their children alone, and in a thousand little ways paralyzing them, proving that they, the parents, are needed.

Because who needs the parents, either, aside from their kids? The child-centered society, where the children define and justify the parents' lives, especially mother's. A good person is a good mother. A bad person is a failure whose child runs away.³

The problem, however, goes beyond the rearing of children. Every attempt is made to turn the whole of society and the political order into one in which responsibility is eliminated, guilt is abolished, and man as god enjoys a continual paradise. This is the goal of humanistic politics, education, religion, and science.

In the Communist empire, a major attempt is being made to develop a vaccine against syphilis, not merely as a medical goal but a social one. Diseases of every sort are the targets of intensive attention, not merely in the older medical sense but as part of a messianic dream of abolishing problems *and* responsibility. The same impulse has led to "wars" on poverty,

3. *Idem.*

war against war, and so on. The goal is a new paradise with no tree of testing in it, and no tempter.

The reality, of course, is that this is precisely the tempter's dream, a world without God, responsibility, or guilt. The problems relative to guilt are referred to another source, so that no embarrassing questions about God and sin be raised. Thus, Menninger rejected the term "psychopathic personality" because, among other things, it had a background of reference to "the unconscious sense of guilt and the resulting self-punishment, which I do not think are the most important elements in the condition."⁴ Guilt is thus pushed into the background.

Guilt does come to the foreground of Menninger's mind in a curious comment on Freud and his *Moses and Monotheism*. Menninger said, "Freud was our Moses and, like the children of Israel, we feel guilty in connection with his death, no matter how much we consciously regret it, and despite the fact that we can be charged with no responsibility for it." Here is a remarkable fact, that Menninger should feel guilt over the death of Freud, who died in old age of cancer. The key is the resentment at Freud's eminence. Menninger wrote:

Our tendency as analysts is to react to our guilt by attacks upon one another. From our own science we know that the atonement often repeats the crime. Those who feel unable to atone for their sense of guilt may feel impelled to make overt attacks upon some symbol of the leader — his memory, his theory, his principles, or other followers — in self-justification. One recalls the querulous cry of a little man forty years ago: "Must I stand always in Freud's shadow?"⁵

Without true atonement, there is thus a renewed attack on others and an increased guilt. Menninger added, with respect to Freud:

These things we should all face. Our attitude toward

4. Bernard H. Hall, M.D., editor: *A Psychiatrist's World, The Selected Papers of Karl Menninger*, M.D., p. 211. New York: Viking Press, 1959.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 455,

Freud should certainly not be a religious one. Superstitious religion is based on the theory that men were made by a God in His own image. To recognize that man creates his God, as the ideal of a benign father and with the highest aspirations of human thought, is to exemplify the spirit of a civilized, intelligent religion not incompatible with rigorous scientific discipline. This spirit should determine our feelings toward Freud. The temptation to abandon the *elohim* concepts of single-heartedness, loyalty, affection, and peaceful cooperation for polytheistic Jahvistic concepts of conflict is to take flight from our unconscious guilt feelings in the vain illusion that by sufficient heterodoxy and a sufficient plurality of loyalties one can avoid the penalties of patricide without incurring the penalties of faithlessness.

Freud was not our God; he was our Moses. But in his death we did not lose our leader. No matter how much more we learn, Freud will always be our leader, as Galileo will always be the leader of astronomers and Newton of physicists. His physical presence was not the important thing; Freud's principles, Freud's integrity, Freud's honesty, and, above all, Freud's discoveries — these are still with us; they will always be with us. It is not only our privilege to add to his discoveries, it is our duty.⁶

The additions to Freud's discoveries must be made without parricide, without undue attention to Freud's errors out of jealousy in an effort to supplant him, Menninger held. His plea, in an address to the American Psychoanalytic Association (1942), was for "loyalty" to one another.⁷

But loyalty to Freud should have made it clear to Menninger how impotent such a rationalistic plea is against the deeply rooted guilt of man. For Menninger, "man creates his god"; the god he creates cannot remove man's guilt, however. Without atonement man only becomes more aggressive, or more self-destructive. Still, Menninger hopes that "loyalty" will somehow cure the situation, and he thereby becomes guilty of superstitious faith.

6. *Ibid.*, p.455f.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 460.

Psychoanalysts feel guilty about Freud's death. This is itself an excellent example of what Menninger himself described as the failure "to distinguish between *guilt* and a *sense of guilt*, and between a sense of guilt related to *actual* offenses and a sense of guilt related to *imaginary* offenses."⁸ Menninger to the contrary, there is no relief for a sense of guilt over imaginary offenses until the person faces up to the suppressed and evaded guilt, his sin against God and God's law.

When man imagines an offense, and when man creates a displaced sense of guilt, it is an act of sin whereby, playing at god, he attempts to reduce reality to aspects of his imagination so that he might dispose of reality at will. A sense of guilt is preferred to real and acknowledged guilt, and imaginary offenses to real offenses, because it is the real world of testing and sin which is resented. When Adam said, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:12), he was in process of fleeing from reality to imagination. Implicit in his statement was a denial of actual guilt and of responsibility; explicit was his indictment of Eve and of God.

Here the inescapable conflict of guilt becomes apparent. By his excuse, Adam blamed God and Eve and was revealing hostility towards both. Guilt leads to warfare against God, and conflict with men. Seeking to escape from testing into a world without problems, the sinner instead creates a world of continual problems and deep-seated conflicts. His dream of Eden becomes a nightmare and an endless testing, in which he is endlessly found wanting. By his denial of guilt and responsibility, the sinner only increases his guilt and underscores the requirement to be responsible. Apart from regeneration, there is no escape for the guilty man.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 781.

In the Image of Adam

A very striking expression appears in Genesis 5:3: “And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.” Calvin commented on this:

In saying that (he) begat a son after his own image, he refers in part to the first origin of our nature; at the same time its corruption and pollution is to be noticed, which having been contracted by Adam through the fall, has flowed down to all his posterity. If he had remained upright, he would have transmitted to all his children what he had received; but now we read that Seth, as well as the rest, was defiled; because Adam, who had fallen from his original state, could beget none but such as were like him-self.¹

According to Smith, “Adam handed down to his posterity that Divine likeness which he had himself received.”² This is only partially true; the text makes clear that it is not the undiluted, unmarred image of God which is transmitted by Adam but Adam’s image. Keil and Delitzsch made this clear:

As Adam was created in the image of God, so did he beget “*in his own likeness, after his image*,” that is to say, he transmitted the image of God in which he was created, not in the purity in which it came direct from God, but in the form given to it by his own self-determination, modified and corrupted by sin.³

From this time on, the image of God as it is transmitted is a

1. Calvin: *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis*, I, p. 228f.

2. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch: *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*, I, p. 124. Rev. James Martin, translator. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.

3. *Ibid.*

corrupted image, corrupted by sin and by the consequences of sin. One of the consequences of sin is a tainted heredity. In many cases, excessive inbreeding, or careless outbreeding, have led to the genetic inheritance of a variety of physical malfunctions and ills. The image in a fallen world reveals the fact of corruption also. Central to that corruption is the fact of original sin, the desire to be as god, autonomous and self-determining.

Men however, have been unwilling to admit the truth about themselves. As a result, from Aristotle on, philosophy has attempted to deny the fact of original sin and to ascribe to man's reason and experience powers independent of sin. Such a philosophy has not been lacking in church circles, as witness Scholasticism. Aquinas held that "the intellect is always true."⁴ Deception and falsehood merely creep in by accident. This is a necessary conclusion from his premise that "We must assert that the intellectual principle which we call the human soul is incorruptible."⁵ Moreover, "the intellectual principle is the form of man," form here being used in its Hellenic sense as against matter.⁶ After Aristotle, Aquinas held that the intellect "is like a tablet on which nothing is written."⁷ The common herd of men are given to passions and err; the philosopher rises above this frailty by means of reason.

This is, of course, the same psychology revived in the modern era by John Locke and made basic to modern education. If the mind is a blank piece of white paper, then the educator is in a position of rare power. By conditioning, he can make the child into whatever he chooses. As a result, conditioning has become a concept basic to modern education and also to politics, as witness Pavlov and Marxism.

In religion, we have Scholastic philosophy in the Protestant camp as Arminianism. Resting as it does on the same

4. *Summa Theologica*, Q. 58, Art. 5.

5. *Ibid.*, Q. 75, Art. 6.

6. *Ibid.*, Q. 76, Art. 1.

7. *Ibid.*, Q. 84, Art. 3; *cg.* Q. 101, Art. 1.

basic premises concerning man, it thus denies predestination and ascribes to man powers independent of God.

Arminian revivalism owes much to this concept of conditioning. It was ready to acknowledge some element of sin in the fallen man, but because it denied total depravity, it denied total inability to reform. The blank-paper mind had been besmirched by sin, but a dramatic experience by conditioning could remake that mind. The revival experience was this means of conditioning. The Rev. John Berridge was accused of exhorting his audience to “Fall! Won’t you fall! Why don’t you fall! Better fall here, than fall into hell!” John Wesley felt that revival experiences could condition man not only into conversion but instantaneous sanctification.⁸

Men may not like the revivalism of Wesley, but they will readily agree to the more favorable view of man held by Aristotle, Aquinas, Locke, and Wesley. In this view, men gain varying degrees of ostensible independence from God by denying in varying degrees their guilt and their responsibility before God. By freeing their minds from original sin, men constitute their minds into supposedly impartial and objective judges over God and His word.

But independence from God is gained at the price of dependence upon men. By denying predestination and total depravity, men deny the omnipotence of God and His sovereignty in salvation. Free will progressively replaces free grace in salvation. At the same time, however, man, because he denies that he is totally God’s creation, makes himself to some degree man’s creation, by means of conditioning in schools, revival experiences, or elsewhere. When man is ‘freed’ from God, he finds himself readily enslaved to men. This appears very clearly in those who are called “mentally sick”. They tend to dream what is expected of them, and to report childhood experiences which psychiatry or psycho-

8. William Sargent: *Battle For the Mind*, p. 101. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1957.

analysis expects in their cases. In his early work, Freud found hysterical women patients reporting instances of sexual interference, sometimes incest, by their fathers. These reports were along the lines of Freud's interests, and he had unintentionally planted such ideas into the minds of his patients, and they gave him their dutiful answers. Both Freud and his patients were influencing one another.

But up to the spring of 1897 he still held firmly to his conviction of the reality of these childhood traumas, so strong was Charcot's teaching on traumatic experiences and so surely did the analysis of the patients' associations reproduce them. At that time doubts began to creep in, although he made no mention of them in the records of his progress he was regularly sending to his friend Fliess. Then, quite suddenly, he decided to confide to him "the great secret of something that in the past few months has gradually dawned on me." It was the awful truth that most — not all — of the seductions in childhood which his patients had revealed, and about which he had built his whole theory of hysteria, had never occurred.

When people give testimonies about their revivalistic conversions, there is a sameness and a monotony in their reports. The terminology and the experience are monotonously similar, because again a stereotyped pattern is adopted as normative and definitive, and the person returns what he is conditioned to give.

To be born in the image of Adam means to be born in the image of a progressively apostate humanity which is bent on freeing itself from God at any cost. The result is a progressive immaturity as man revolts against maturity; against the requirements of the image of God. A teacher has reported on the readiness of boys who are no longer small children to burst into tears, an immaturity once unknown in boys of their age. Not surprisingly, for executives of our immature generation *Playboy* has an "executive sandbox", "a soothing

9. Ernest Jones, M.D.: *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, vol. I, p. 265. New York: Basic Books, 1953, 1961.

desk accessory for harried executives. Use the free-form digging tool (sporting our Rabbit) or simply run your fingers through pure white quartz sand encased in its own black wood-grained plastic sandbox (12" x 12" x 5")".¹⁰ No doubt, if such a culture endures long enough, pacifiers for executives will also be available.

Man, in seeking to be free from God, is seeking freedom from responsibility, and the consequence is a growing immaturity. In terms of this immaturity, a student revolutionist, self-righteous and proud of his role as a deliverer of mankind, has written, that "to destroy all limits is, in a perverse sense, to be truly free. To destroy is to *feel* free."¹¹ This is in terms of the new gospel: "Good News! 2 and 2 no longer makes 4."¹² These would-be gods, believing they have abolished God, think that reality will now conform to their imagination. Instead, they will be conformed to God's judgment.

Earlier, we referred to the elitism which marks the intellectual. The intellectual believes that his rationality gives him an autonomy from God and from the herd-like emotions and appetites of the masses. As a result, he feels that he can determine what is good and evil for mankind. For him the tempter's program (Gen. 3: 5) is the epitome of wisdom which he is called upon to impart to mankind. As a result, his proud sin becomes his gospel, and it must never be acknowledged as sin. Its principle of operation is, 'whatever happens, no remorse'.¹³ Remorse or guilt can lead to a recognition of the fact that man is a sinner, reflecting the image of Adam, whose only salvation is in God. "Freud, who saw (quite rightly) that suppressed guilt feeling was the source of neurosis, . . . contended that, therefore, *guilt-feeling must be*

10. *Playboy*, March, 1971, vol. 18, no. 3, p. 37.

11. Dotson Rader, "On Revolutionary Violence", in Dotson Rader, editor: *Defiance, A Radical Review # 1*, p. 201. New York: Paperback Library, 1970.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 287.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 191.

transcended.”¹⁴ The only way man can “transcend” guilt feelings is by the atonement of Jesus Christ, or by God’s eternal judgment on his sin.

The universe is moral. That is, it is fashioned on the principle that any and every effort of man to be self-sufficient, self-existent, self-dependent, is most certainly doomed to defeat. History is dominated by the dialectic of self-frustration.¹⁵

This self-frustration is an aspect of the image of Adam, a will to self-frustration, to masochistic self-judgment and sadistic destruction, by a will to death.

14. D. R. Davies: *Down Peacock’s Feathers*, p. 39. London: The Centenary Press, 1942.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

Tyranny

The origin of tyranny is an interesting one, and the word *tyrant* is itself a very important word theologically. Leupold translates Genesis 10:8-12 as follows:

8, 9. Cush begat Nimrod; he was the first tyrant upon earth. He was a mighty hunter in the sight of Yahweh; wherefore it is said: A mighty hunter in the sight of Yahweh as Nimrod was.

10-12. The beginning of his kingdom was Babylon, and Erech and Akkad and Calneh in the land of Shinar. From that region he went forth to Assyria and built Nineveh and Rehoboth-ir, and Calah and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah — this is that great city.¹

The Hebrew *gibbor* is translated “a mighty one” by the King James; the LXX translates it as “giant”, in Genesis 6:4 the King James translated nephilim as “giants”. The Hebrew root for *nephilim* is *naphal*, of which one meaning is to “fall upon” or “attack”. The *Nephilim* were thus attackers, or, as Luther described them, “tyrants”.² Smith denied that the root meanings were here applicable, and saw “a mighty one” in a favorable sense.³ Few have agreed with him. The intended purpose of Genesis in both cases is to show the growth of tyranny, first, before the Flood, and, second, leading to the Tower of Babel.

Clearly, then, the meaning in both cases implies *tyrant*. Our English word *tyrant* is of Greek origin, and it means one ruling without authority, specifically, without divine author-

1. H. C. Leupold: *Exposition of Genesis*, pp. 365, 368.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 258.

3. R. Payne Smith, “Genesis”, in Ellicott, L p. 49.

ity. A tyrant is one who rules without law or constitution and who usurps divine authority. It can therefore be said that a husband tyrannizes his wife and children if he tries to rule them in contempt of God's word and authority. Not surprisingly, in this age of humanism, dictionary definitions of *tyrant* and *tyranny* leave out the original religious framework of reference and reduce it to unconstitutional or illegal rule.

Tragically, the modern definition of tyranny is humanistic. If man is abused, the ruler is called a *tyrant*; the word is defined in reference to man. If men like the tyrant, then he is not so called. From a Biblical perspective, a ruler is a tyrant, whether or not men like him, if he rules in contempt of God's law.

The meaning of Scripture here is to depict the growth of tyranny. Man revolts against God and makes himself his own god; as a result, he then seeks to create his own social order, a paradise on earth, wherein he will rule as his own god. *Babel* is in Aramaic "the gate of God". The purpose of the Tower of Babel was thus to establish a world capitol and governmental center whereby man could rule as his own god and make his government the gateway to the new paradise. The goal of the new paradise was the godhood of man. God, however, called Babel *Babble*, in the Hebrew *balbal*, meaning babble, confused, indistinct speech.⁴

Babel was intended, according to Ellul, as an "advance against God."⁵ However, in every age, meaninglessness is the destiny of every builder of Babel; the more men separate themselves from God, the more they separate themselves from meaning. This, then, is the *first* and central meaning of tyranny: by its separation from God, every tyranny becomes also a separation from meaning. Humanism thus can never accomplish its purpose, because in the process of seeking its own will it destroys purpose. The closer man comes to building a Tower of Babel, the closer he draws to his own con-

4. *Ibid.*, I, p. 54.

5. Jacques Ellul: *The Meaning of the City*, p. 16.

fusion and scattering. The successes of humanism only draw it closer to its bloody suicide. Thus, "Babel will never be finished."⁶

Second, the urge to build Babel is basic, however, to revolutionary man; it is an aspect of his warfare against God. Man no sooner revolts against God then he begins to dream of a universal sovereignty without God. With Nimrod's heirs, the goal was a world government without God and with man as his own god. With modern revolutionary man, the goal is broader. Man seeks not only civil sovereignty but absolute control over life and death, the ability to create and alter life at will, and the power to extend his rule out into space as its new lord and conqueror. Speaking before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Dr. James Watson expressed fears concerning the radical experimentations with life itself which could be expected as a routine thing fairly soon. He said that "Already there is much 'population' money coming in to stop the rise of population." Moreover, Watson said,

Though many people will look with horror at any test-tube work with human eggs, others will breathe more easily that something is being done to prevent the world from being crushed by over-population. Until a few years ago, this latter group was relatively a small one and without favor in virtually any political circle. Today, however, taboos which would have seemed unbreakable just a decade ago are rapidly being overturned. Witness the recent action of the U.S. in overwhelmingly passing legislation that would promote family planning. Even more significant was the action of New York state making abortions the right of any woman who desire them . . . There furthermore need not exist the coercion of a totalitarian state (when) there already are such widespread divergences⁷ as to the sacredness of the action of human reproduction.

Absolute sovereignty will be sought by man in every realm.

Third, man's revolution being essentially anti-God, man's activities will thus be governed by a systematic assault on

6. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

7. "Biologist Fears Genetic Engineering," in *Life in America* June, 1971, p. 10.

everything that represents God. Because law is a central manifestation of God's being, a central activity of revolutionary man will be *against law*. Communism breeds a radical contempt for all law in order to gain power; it can then only retain its power against the lawlessness it has created by terrorism against its people. There can be no satiation of this anti-law drive; it will not be appeased. The more the law is relaxed, the further the boundaries are pushed, and the more the diminished law is broken. Thus, the sexual revolution is not content unless it has new laws to break. After some determined and aggressive pushing, films showing bestiality are now "legal" fare. Thus, nine theatres in Los Angeles advertised on June 29, 1971, a film on "Animal Love", declaring "Some men and women require greater stimuli to achieve enjoyment in life. We frankly solicit unshockable adults." Seven of these theatres opened at noon, two at 9:45 a.m., and were "open all night".⁸ In another city, such bestial acts were being performed on stage. When such viewers do indeed become "unshockable", the drive is for a further law-boundary to be smashed. There is thus an intensification in the assault against God's law order.

Fourth, this revolution, in Ellul's words, "is much more than taking over God's power. It is the desire to exclude God from his creation."⁹ To exclude God from His own creation means that everything must be man-made. Revolutionary man thus systematically destroys in order that all reality may carry only his trade-mark. Since man himself witnesses to God, being created in the image of God, man must be hunted down and destroyed to make way for superman, test-tube man, or clonal man. Of Nimrod, Leupold commented, with respect to his being a mighty hunter before the Lord,

What the phrase then means in this connection is that the gross violation of mens rights, that this mighty hunter of

8. *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, Tuesday, June 29, 1971, p. B-8.

9. Ellul: *The Meaning of the City*, p. 16.

men became guilty of, did not elude the watchful eye of Him, who in mercy regards the welfare of men, Yahweh, but the fact was openly before Him, even if He did not at once proceed to take vengeance upon the despot. So the expression “mighty hunter” does not refer to exploits in bagging game. In fact, since *gibbor* in v. 8 means “tyrant” (Meek correctly: “despot”), *gibbor tsayidh* of v. 9 should be rendered as “a tyrant or despot of hunt,” which plainly indicates that men and not beasts were hunted.¹⁰

Revolutionary man is thus destructive not only towards God’s world around him but towards man himself. In the war against God, revolutionary man treats man as his most expendable commodity and weapon.

Fifth, in every age the end result of man’s anti-God revolutions and actions is a confusion, collapse, and scattering. Because there can be no unity, cohesion, or progress apart from God, the attempts by revolutionary man to unite reality and men without God lead instead to a radical fragmentation. As a result, while we must speak of a progression in evil and in anti-God lawlessness, we must also recognize that the end thereof is death. Man in the state of depravity is under sentence of death because of his sin. His every development of and progress in that sin only brings him closer to that final sentence, so that, dying, he shall die. Whatever the form of his revolution takes, its end is death.

Tyranny thus begins as rule without God and ends as death without God.

10. Leupold: *op. cit.*, p. 367.

The Religion of Fallen Man

Because man was created by God, man cannot escape God's creating purpose. Even in his rebellion and in all his revolutionary activity, man manifests God's purposes, however much he may deform them. Man seeks to create a paradise, exercise dominion, increase his knowledge, and, in many more ways, to manifest those aspects of God's image in him which govern him in his culture and society. Among these aspects of man's culture which reveal God's purpose is religion. Since man was created to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever, man cannot escape being a religious creature. In the state of depravity, however, man seeks a religious faith apart from God and in hostility to Him.

True religion is God-centered; false religion is man-centered. The psalmist stated the difference vividly in Psalm 115:1-9:

1. Not unto us, O LORD, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy, and for thy truth's sake.

2. Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is now their God?

3. But our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased.

4. Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands.

5. They have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not:

6. They have ears, but they hear not: noses have they, but they smell not:

7. They have hands, but they handle not: feet have they, but they walk not: neither speak they through their throat.

8. They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them.

9. O Israel, trust thou in the LORD: he is their help and their shield.

The context of this psalm is a situation wherein Israel was being mocked for its helplessness, and for its trust in the Lord.¹ The only god acceptable to these mockers was a god who met their demands, who gave them all glory as their captive power, or a bribed suzerain. While the psalmist pleads for deliverance, and a confounding of the heathen nations' contempt for God (v. 2), his emphatic and opening cry is that all the glory be the Lord's, never man's.

The idols of the nations are described with contempt. God the lord reigns in heaven over all things: "He does whatever He pleases" (v. 3, Leupold). In humanistic religions, the purpose of the gods is to please man; in true religion, God is not governed by man but governs him; in every age and in every situation, He does whatever He pleases.

The fabricated gods are dead gods; "they cannot even make the faintest and most inarticulate guttural noise, like the lower animals; much less speak as men do."² The obvious fact about idols is that they are lifeless and meaningless creatures, unable to do anything. The psalmist's climactic point is that "They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them" (v. 8). According to Alexander, "However formidable now, they shall hereafter be as powerless and senseless as the gods they worship."³ Another point needs to be added: not only is the future destiny of humanists this radical impotence, but they are impotent even now in their seeming power. Because God is the Lord, all their works add up only to a radical frustration and impotence.

1. H. C. Leupold: *Exposition of the Psalms*, p. 798. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1959.

2. Joseph Addison Alexander: *The Psalms, Translated and Explained*, p. 470. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, reprint of 1864 edition.

3. *Idem*.

The futility of humanistic or man-centered religion is that, although man is the problem, it still seeks its answer in man. This is like asking a murderer to be a doctor, or a rapist to guard a woman's virtue.

The newspapers daily give us examples of humanistic religious faith. Thus, a major newspaper carried an analysis of welfare by Kristol, who reviewed Alexis de Tocqueville's "Essay on Pauperism" of 1835. Tocqueville found that welfarism grows most rapidly in wealthier countries. Moreover because wealthier countries are more likely to have welfare grants, and to be more liberal, they bring into play man's sinful nature. According to Tocqueville,

There are two incentives to work: the need to live and the desire to improve the conditions of life. Experience has proven that the majority of men can be sufficiently motivated to work only by the first of these incentives. The second is only effective with a small minority . . . A law which gives all the poor a right to public aid, whatever the origin of their poverty, weakens or destroys the first stimulant and leaves only the second intact.

Tocqueville's perspective reflected the Christian view of man. Kristol immediately noted the religious presuppositions which separated him from Tocqueville and cited them plainly:

At this point, we are bound to draw up short and take our leave of Tocqueville. Such gloomy conclusions, derived from a less than benign view of human nature, do not recommend themselves either to the 20th century political imagination or to the American political temperament. We do not like to think that our instincts of social compassion might have dismal consequences — not accidentally but inexorably. We simply cannot believe that the universe is so constituted.

We much prefer, if choice has to be made, to have a good opinion of mankind and a poor opinion of our socio-economic system.⁴

4. Irving Kristol, "Welfare: Best Intentions, Worst Results", in the *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, August 1, 1971, Section I, p. 1; the article was originally published in *The Atlantic*.

If man is good by nature, evil must come from “the system” or the environment; if man is a sinner, then evil must come from the heart of man. The issue is religious, and welfarism is a humanistic plan of salvation.

For another example of humanistic faith, let us turn to Tom Braden, who is deeply concerned over the moral decline in the United States during the 1960s. Who could have imagined in 1960 the violence and lawlessness which we have witnessed in the past ten years, he asks? “Have we lost our belief that reasonable men may dispute the truth and thereby redefine it? Have we lost our sense of responsibility toward one another and toward the community as a whole? Or have we all gone crazy?” The root of the problem, Braden holds, is “the use of disorder, or antilaw, as a weapon,” and this “is rapidly becoming a moral problem in itself.” Braden’s answer is very revealing:

Perhaps we need a new moral code or a new education or, as Henry Adams once suggested, a new social mind. Every generation of Americans has struggled to attain and apply power, and every generation has worried about the power it created. But in 1971, we seem suddenly to be confronted with complexities in the use of that power which we did not imagine even 10 years ago.

Unless we can agree upon a morality which will unite us in dealing with them, we may be looking back, 10 years from now, on a decade that was violently coercive.⁵

Braden shows us why we have had a moral crisis. He believes that “reasonable men may dispute the truth and thereby redefine it.” He wants “a new moral code”, and he believes that men can possibly “agree upon a morality which can unite us” and enable us to cope with our problems. The root of the moral problem is humanism, and Braden’s answer is more humanism.

Man being a sinner, when he substitutes a do-it-yourself

5. Tom Braden, “What We Have Lost In The Past 10 Years”, in *Woodland Hills Chronicle*, Thursday, July 1, 1971, Citizen News Publications, Canoga Park, California.

religion and a man-made morality for God's word, his substitute becomes sin made into a system. The revolutionary activities and movements of the twentieth century, and of the modern era, have been intensely religious and thoroughly humanistic. Their net result has been to make every man his own god and law. Not surprisingly, this has led to totalitarian statism and what Braden calls "violently coercive" measures to avoid anarchy.

But Braden will not see that his own principles produce the moral anarchy, the disorder and the antilaw, which he deplors. To do so would require him to forsake his humanism, and this in principle he will not do. The problem with humanists is not a lack of intelligence but a wilful self-blinding. In his religious quest, the humanist refuses to look beyond himself for his god. The more he intensifies his quest, the more he becomes, like the idols described by the psalmist, speechless, mindless, and senseless. Not surprisingly, the heart of mysticism, a form of humanistic religion, is this same speechless, mindless, and senseless experience. The mystic calls for the exclusion of the external world, doctrine, revelation, and outer experience for total concentration on an inward blankness. The Hindu mystic declares, "Thou art that," i.e., the mystic is himself one with the ultimate power and is the ultimate power.

For humanism, man's religious consciousness and man's psychology is the real source of religious knowledge and revelation. The true word comes out of man, and therefore man's experience needs to be developed. Religion then ceases to be "Thus saith the Lord," the word of God, but rather becomes "Thus say I," the word according to man.

Because humanism ascribes the word of truth to man, it must of necessity ascribe to the source of revelation the power to meet its own revealed word. If humanistic man says that the answer to world problems is love and pacifism, he then logically believes that his revealed truth, love, can also overcome war and hatred and inaugurate world peace. Man's word becomes the word of power, because it is the word of

truth. The capacity for self-reform is assumed to be great and even limitless. In Boston's phrase, it is implicit in such thinking that a man can "leap out of Delilah's lap, into Abraham's bosom."⁶ But the sinner cannot reform himself to please God, only to please himself. "The unrenewed will is wholly perverse, in reference to man's chief and highest end. The natural man's chief end is not God, but himself."⁷ For such men, God is "The means, and self their end; yea, their chief end",⁸ if they allow God into their thinking at all.

The religion of humanistic man aggravates and furthers his fall, and it intensifies and develops his depravity.

6. Thomas Boston: *Human Nature in its Fourfold State*, p. 53.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 74.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

What Is Man?

The question, “What is man?” is both asked by Scripture and answered in the person, work, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Psalm 8, which raises the question, is a Messianic psalm in terms of the testimony of Scripture.

Jesus Christ cited Psalm 8:2 (Matt. 21:16) as fulfilled in the cry of the children in the temple, “Hosanna to the son of David” (Matt. 21:15). *Hosanna* means, “save, I pray.” Christ, in His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, declared Himself the Savior, and the children responded by crying to Him for salvation, to the displeasure of the priests and scribes, who demanded that the children be rebuked,

And said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou has perfected praise? (Matt. 21:16)

Clearly, the cry of the children was *the* fulfillment of Psalm 8:2, or, at the least, *a* fulfillment.

Psalm 8:6 is cited in I Corinthians 15:25-27.

For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.

For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.

In I Corinthians 15:24, we are told that Christ will put down “all rule and all authority and power.” It is this victory which Psalm 8:6 celebrates. Commenting on “all rule”, Alford pointed out that it meant

not *only hostile* power and government, but as the *context*

necessitates, ALL power. Christ being manifested as universal King, *every* power co-ordinate with His must come under the category of *hostile*: all *kings* shall submit to Him: The *kingdoms* of the world shall become the *kingdoms* of the Lord and of His Christ: —and see the similar expressions of Eph. i. 21, where speaking by anticipation, the Apostle clearly indicates that *legitimate* authorities, all the powers that be, are included. Compare by all means Rev. xi. 15.¹

The resurrection and universal dominion of Christ are thus apparently set forth by the psalmist.

The same verse in the psalm is cited again in Ephesians 1: 19-23 by St. Paul, who prays that the believers might truly know the richness of God toward them

And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power,

Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places,

Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:

And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church,

Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

To cite Alford again, “the resurrection of Christ was not a mere bodily act, an earnest of our bodily resurrection, but was a spiritual act, the raising of His humanity (which is our’s), consisting of body and soul, from infirmity to glory, from the curse to the final triumph.”²

In Hebrews 2:5-9, we again have citations from this psalm:

For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak.

But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man,

1. Henry Alford: *The New Testament for English Readers*, p. 1076. Chicago: Moody Press.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 1210.

that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?

Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:

Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him.

But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

The whole psalm is clearly in mind here, and the meaning of the psalm is brought into focus. Alford is again very much to the point in his comment:

The general import of the *eighth Psalm* may be described as being, to praise Jehovah for His glory and majesty, and His merciful dealing with and exaltation of mankind. All exposition which loses sight of this general import, and attempts to force the Psalm into a direct and exclusive prophecy of the personal Messiah, goes to conceal its true prophetic sense, and to obscure the force and beauty of its reference to Him. This has been done by Bleek and others, who have made "the Son of Man" a direct title here of Christ. It is MAN who in the Psalm is spoken of, in the common and most general sense; the care taken by God of *him*, the lordship given to *him*, the subjection of God's works to *him*. This high dignity he lost, but this high dignity he has regained, and possesses potentially in all its fullness and glory, restored, and for ever secured to him. How? and by whom? By one of his own race, the MAN Christ Jesus. Whatever high and glorious things can be said of man, belong *of proper right* to Him only, *in proper person* to Him only, but derivatively to us His brethren and members. And this is the great key to the interpretation of all such sayings as these: whatever belongs to man by the constitution of his nature, belongs superlatively to that MAN, who is the constituted HEAD of man's nature, the second Adam, who has more than recovered all that the first Adam lost. To those who clearly apprehend and firmly hold this fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the

interpretation of ancient prophecy and the New Tes. application of Old Test. sayings to Christ, become a far simpler matter than they ever can be to others. And so here, it is to MAN, not to angels, that the “world to come” is subjected. This is the argument: and, as far as the end of ver. 8, it is carried on with reference to *man*, properly so called. There is *here* as yet no personal reference to our Lord, who is first introduced, and that in His lower personal human Name, at ver. 9. This has been missed, and thus confusion introduced into the argument, by the majority of Commentators.³

The question, what is man?, refers to man’s weakness and low estate; yet God is mindful of him and gives him an exalted calling. According to Alexander, on Psalm 8, “We have here, therefore, a description of the dignity of human nature, as it was at first, and as it is to be restored in Christ, to whom the descriptive terms may therefore be applied, without force or fanciful accommodation on the one hand, and without denying the primary generic of the composition on the other.”⁴

We must not forget that the psalm begins by declaring that the *name* of God is majestic and exalted above all things. It is God who alone is the source of all the glory of creation, whose majesty only reflects the glory of God and His name. The attacks upon God’s name and honor by perverse men are readily silenced by the outcry of children, not because any power resides in children, but because God’s name and being silence all enemies finally by their inescapable truth. If the praise of children can unsettle the enemy, how much more so the words of the wise. Leupold translated v. 2 thus:

Out of the mouth of babes, and even infants, hast Thou
established a stronghold because of Thine enemies,
To still every enemy and revengeful person.

Man was called to a glorious destiny in Adam by God’s sovereign grace. By his fall, man destroyed that calling and

3. *Ibid.*, p. 1456.

4. Joseph Addison Alexander: *The Psalms, Translated and Explained*, p. 37. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, (1864).

made sin and death his destiny. Jesus Christ, as very man of very man, restored man to his original destiny and nature. Moreover, in Alford's words, Jesus Christ, the second Adam, "*has more than recovered all that the first Adam lost.*" Man having been re-established in the image of God, is now progressively led into dominion, righteousness, holiness, and knowledge. Both in this world and in the world to come, it is man's destiny in Christ to exercise lordship over creation under God. Man was made to have dominion over the works of God's hands, and in Christ's life, death, and resurrection the first great manifestation of that dominion appeared. All things are put under man's feet, i.e., subject to his power in Christ. In this subjection, it is the glory of God which manifests itself in the new humanity of the second or last Adam, Jesus Christ. Therefore, "O LORD our God, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!" (v. 9).

Man is thus truly defined in Jesus Christ, the second Adam, and he is that creature, made in God's image, who is called to exercise dominion over God's creation in terms of God's calling and law.

Every definition is a fence and boundary whereby a particular person, thing, or word is set apart from all else. To define man in terms of Jesus Christ means that the ungodly are deformed men, in that they are at war with their own definition. They seek to define themselves existentially, in terms of the moment, in terms of themselves exclusively, whereas the redeemed man defines and knows himself in terms of Jesus Christ. If man is his own maker, then man can be his own principle of definition. If, however, man is a creation of God, then man can only be defined by God and in terms of His purpose. In Psalm 8, God Himself through the psalmist raises the question, "What is man?" and God Himself then defines man.

God's definition, however, is not an abstraction. That which God defines, He also creates and recreates. The process of history is thus the progress of God's definition of man as it

is realized in history. The incarnation of Jesus Christ was the major step in that definition. In that process, there is a double definition, first, of man in the state of depravity, and second, of man in the state of grace. The process of history makes progressively more plain the nature of fallen man: the tares become more obviously tares. (Matt. 13:24-30), and their nature becomes more consistent with their premises and well-springs. Epistemological self-consciousness sets in, so that men progressively know themselves in terms of their nature; they become aware of what they are.

An example of this self-consciousness is Henry Miller, who is ready to see himself as “a religious person.”⁵ For Miller, “In the beginning was the Word,”⁶ and that word is man. Man denies his word when he fails to be a law unto himself and when he obeys ideas of good and evil. “There is nothing in itself, we have been told time and again, which is wrong or evil. It is the fear of doing wrong, the fear of doing this or that act, which is wrong.”⁷ According to Miller,

It is our dream life which offers a key to the possibilities in store for us. In dream it is the Adamic man, one with the earth, one with the stars, who comes to life, who roams, through past, present and future with equal freedom. For him there are no taboos, no laws, no conventions. Pursuing his way, he is unimpeded by time, space, physical obstacles or moral considerations. He sleeps with his mother as naturally as with another. If it be with an animal of the field he satisfies his desire, he feels no revolt. He can take his own daughter with equal enjoyment and satisfaction.

In the waking world, shackled, crippled, paralyzed by every kind of fear, threatened at every step by real or imaginary punishments, almost every desire we seek to express is made to appear wrong or evil.⁸

When Miller is awake, he finds that he cannot escape God’s world of good and evil, although he imagines that in dreams

5. Henry Miller: *The World of Sex*, p. 13. New York: Grove Press, 1959, 1965.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 113.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 82.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

such an escape exists. As a result, in order to escape God's definition of man, Miller declares that man as he is must be destroyed to make way for man's own recreation of man. Writing in 1940, Miller stated,

It is no longer history which is being made; the present conflagration will rage until the old order of man is liquidated. It matters little if the current war, hot or cold, ends tomorrow or fifty years hence. There will be more wars to come, each more terrible than the last. Until the whole rotting edifice is completely demolished. Until we (homo sapiens) are no more.⁹

All man's evils, for Miller, are due to the idea of God and an absolute good and evil. Wars will continue until man succeeds in destroying man as created in God's image and remakes himself in terms of his own word.

Miller's definition of man belongs to his dream world: it has no relationship to reality and is suicidal as well as murderous.

God's definition of man in Jesus Christ means that man is recreated in God's image by the atoning work of Jesus Christ and is given a specific task in history. Progress is ensured and historical development opened up by means of God's defining and redemptive act. The unregenerate seek to end history: Marx's ideal order is a static, unchanging realm, and the same is true of the dream-orders of anarchists and Pragmatists. God's creation and recreation inaugurate history: man is given an objective and a purpose. The world is to be subjected to man; for this goal to be realized, man must first subject himself to God.

From Miller's comments, and from virtually any writer, it is apparent that in humanism we face the religious alternative to Biblical religion. Both humanism and orthodox Christianity hold that man needs salvation. For humanism, man needs to be saved from God and the moral absolutes of God's revelation; For Christianity, man needs to be saved from sin and

9. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

the consequences of sin, notably death. Both humanism and Christianity, in their consistent forms, believes in the need of death and rebirth, on the one hand, by the agency of man, on the other, by the agency of God.

The “rebirth” of Humanism is into a static, end of history world, in which no progress is possible, because man, as his own god, cannot be improved on, since man is himself the ultimate standard. If no absolute law governs man, and if man is his own law, neither man nor his works need improving. Quite logically, some humanistic painters and composers insist that any chance production of man is as truly art as the greatest paintings of earlier eras. In singing, this faith has been less successful: the croaking of an incompetent singer has not yet gained ascendancy over the beautiful trained voice.

The Biblical faith, because it finds the norm in God and His word, requires training, development, and progress in the arts, sciences, and life. Logical humanism, with man as his own law, cannot require these things without being schizophrenic, or without denying itself.

One final point: when St. Paul, in I Corinthians 15:26 speaks of death as “the last enemy”, he is declaring that, before the end of the world, man will have largely overcome all other enemies by God’s grace. All things then will be put under Christ’s feet, and man’s, by the great victory over death.

Regeneration

In some form, every civilization and religion is concerned with rebirth. It sees as a major necessity the need to start afresh, to break the bondage to some aspect of the past or present and to have a new man in a new world. Historically, politics has usually concerned itself with this task in non-Christian societies. The purpose of politics has been the reordering of society and of the lives of men so as to deliver mankind or a people into a desired order.

Man has thus recognized that a *problem* exists. The question is, what is the problem? According to the dictionary, a problem is a question proposed for a solution, anything that is required to be done, something difficult to solve but having a solution. If no solution is possible, then it is not a problem but a tragedy. Thus, ultimately death comes to all men, and death in this sense is not a problem but an inescapable fact. If I call ultimate death a “problem”, then I am declaring that I can solve or overcome it; it is possible to call death by cancer a problem to be solved, but to say that death itself can be a subject of problem-solving is to break with Biblical faith. Death as a problem was Christ’s problem, and His atoning death and resurrection provided the solution for His elect. It is presumption for man to regard ultimate death as his problem.

What a man considers to be a problem is thus revealing of the man. Our problems are also assertions of competence. If a man says that his wife is a problem, he is assuming that he can change her; if he says she is a burden, he is admitting the reality of the situation. Much marital friction results when husbands and wives regard each other as problems to be solved.

It is typical of humanism to regard the environment, the world around us and the people in it, as the problem. Its answer is to remake the world and man in order to start afresh with a clean world. Most votes are cast, and most politicians are elected, on this premise: force or coercion must be brought to bear by law on man and the world in order to abolish the evil around us.

There is a difference between saying that this total environment of men and things is evil, which is humanism, and saying that because men are sinners, there are thieves, murderers, and dishonest men abroad who will do us harm, and often have done so. The humanistic premise is that evil is “outside”; it is in the environment, and in men only as products of the environment. The Christian knows himself to be a sinner saved by grace; all men have a common burden, sin and guilt. This is a problem Christ solved, not man, and the answer is in Christ’s atoning grace.

The need is seen by both as *rebirth*. But because the humanist sees it as his problem to solve, it becomes his duty to remake man. This necessitates playing god over other men by governing, controlling, predestinating, and remaking them. It requires political and religious tyranny in order to accomplish its purpose. As Dostoyevsky said of his Grand Inquisitor, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, he claimed “it as a merit for himself and his Church that at last they have vanquished freedom and have done so to make men happy.”

Moreover, since the humanist’s claim to be able to solve man’s ‘problem’ means denying that God is the problem solver, it means also denying any sensitivity to God’s claims on the part of man. On the other hand, a total sensitivity to man’s claims must be asserted. Insensitivity to God and to moral absolutes, is coupled to a total sensitivity to man without God. Rebirth, or starting afresh, thus means starting without God, or dying to God in order to be alive as a man.

To be born again means some kind of break with the past. In Oriental thought, the burden of Karma, the consequences

or effects of past acts, are inescapable and must be worked out through reincarnation.¹ They are worked out, however, *by man*, who gradually atones for his past and escapes from the burden of history into Nirvana. The *burden* is history, and the *problem* is salvation. Man can save himself, but history is a hopeless matter. As a result, Oriental thought has retreated from social problems into a quiescence with respect to history.

Western humanism is seemingly activist with respect to social problems, but this is its hang-over from Christianity. If the environment is man's problem, and man can save himself by remaking the environment of things and men, how can man escape activism with respect to social problems? Clearly, humanism, under the influence of Christendom, is concerned with social problems. However, lacking moral absolutes, its concern will diminish as its closeness to a Christian world view diminishes. If there is no right or wrong, then how can we call anything a problem, except to believe in right and wrong? Henry Miller is logical at this point: the only evil is to believe that good and evil are moral absolutes from God. John Dewey could only call for "growth" in his great society; he had no norm to give growth any meaning. Gunther Stent has described the growing inner decay in the sciences because of the absence of any standard or faith in a transcendental absolute. For him, it means "the end of progress."² The activism of India died as humanism triumphed there; the activism of the West will also decline as humanism penetrates more deeply. When this happens to a society, the domination of men by men playing god remains, but any purpose other than a lust for power disappears. The only social activism which survives is thus the delight in exercising totalitarian powers.

The common opinion of the Pharisees was that the people

1. See R. J. Rushdoony: *The Biblical Philosophy of History*, pp. 40-44. Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1969.

2. Gunther S. Stent: *The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress*. Garden City, New York: The Natural History Press, 1969.

of the land needed controlling for their own welfare. Since man is a sinner, clearly man does need controlling, but the question is, by whom, God or man? Is God's law sufficient for the government of society? According to Scripture, it is sufficient, and the answer of our Lord to Satan's temptation to implement or add to (in reality to replace) God's word with man's word was at every turn, "It is written" (Matt. 4:1-10). For Christ, the function of man in relationship to God's law is *ministerial, not legislative*; i.e., man must administer that law, not alter, add to, or revise it. As McDowell observed, "It was impossible for Jesus to abide by his decisions in the wilderness and not be treated as a heretic by the religious leaders."³

When Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," Nicodemus answered, "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" (John 3:3-4). Nicodemus understood what had been said; his problem was that he could not believe it possible for a man to be regenerated and to be changed without, in effect, losing all his life-time of experience and re-entering his mother's womb. As Hart commented,

How can a man be born again? Nicodemus is at least not stupid. He expects us to grant the obvious physical impossibility. In that case Christ is speaking figuratively, and should explain the figure. The stress of the question is on "how". If the stress were on "can" it would mean a contradiction of Christ, namely, that a man *cannot* wipe out from his mental life all established habits of thought, all expressions of the past, with its controlling pre-suppositions, any more than his physical organism can become a baby again.⁴

Nicodemus felt that it was impossible for a man to be reborn spiritually and mentally unless he were reborn physically,

3. Edward A. McDowell: *Son of Man and Suffering Servant*, p. 45. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1944, 1945.

4. J. Stephen Hart: *A Companion to St. John's Gospel*, p. 63. Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1952.

unless, in effect, his existing life were wiped out. In modern terminology, a radical brainwashing as yet unknown to man would be required. Nicodemus was not opposing the idea of rebirth but rather our Lord's version of it. For him, the control of man and society by an elite group of men provided the realistic if slow means of remaking man.

Our Lord's words, "Except a man be born again," can be also translated, as the marginal readings make clear, "born from above." A supernatural rebirth, a new re-creation by God's sovereign act, was clearly declared. It was this that brought forth Nicodemus' unbelief. He was ready to believe that man, given enough time, could remake man, but to believe that God could do so miraculously was "unnatural".

Let us examine now the like comment of a theologian in the Church of England. According to Davies,

Ideas proverbially die hard. Indeed, in a sense it may be said that, like old soldiers, they never die, but simply fade away. Ideas seem to bear a charmed life. They apparently are invulnerable against all attack, especially the attack of evidence. They finally fade away only when the attacks upon them exhaust themselves. One idea, in particular, which is reluctant even to fade away, is the peculiarly capitalist, protestant idea of self-contained individualism, that men exist as separate, isolated individuals, that the individual is a microcosmos in himself. This idea is the root, or one of the roots, from which has grown the theory of national sovereignty, which implies that a nation is self-existent. This same idea, which translates itself into politics as national sovereignty, is expressed in religion and theology as a doctrine of individual atonement. Christ died not for humanity as a unity, but for the world as a sum total of individuals. Christ died for men as separate beings.⁵

Not surprisingly, Davies looked to a one-world socialistic

5. D. R. Davies: *The Sin of Our Age*, p. 1. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. It would be difficult to compress more half-truths and errors into a paragraph than Davies has done. To cite one alone, Protestantism holds to the federal nature of man in Adam and in Christ, and the doctrine of atonement rests on this federal aspect; anarchic individualism is hostile to the idea of the vicarious atonement.

order to remake man. Although with his entrance into the priesthood Davies lost his socialistic *utopianism*, he did not abandon his socialism. After Reinhold Niebuhr, Davies had gained a socialist realism. He recognized that “*we solve our existing problems at the cost of creating new and still more difficult problems*. In other words, man does not solve the problem: he merely changes its form.”⁶ Well and good; Davies saw the human scene clearly up to a point. Indeed, he wrote that

All the gains and the progress of modern Europe have resulted in increasing the scale and depth of the problem. Something wrong there! It reveals the most terrible of all moral contradictions. *It shows how even the good of which human nature is undoubtedly capable seems to end in evil.*⁷

The need, according to Davies, is for a radical solution, and his answer seemed to be genuinely orthodox as he wrote:

The one fundamental remedy for man’s plight is that human nature shall be radically recreated, re-fashioned, so that society will be able henceforth to act, not out of the centre of self-will, but from a new centre transcending all the separated, isolated egoisms of individuals. As we have now seen, all action which arises from self-will, however good it may be in intention, is inevitably self-defeating. There is within it a principle of corruption. Therefore, if human action is to be continuously good, uninterruptedly progressive, free of the dialectic of self-frustration, it must proceed from a new source, a new will in which all men can participate. *There is no other cure for the disease of a corrupted human nature.*

As we have also seen reason to believe, this is exactly a remedy which lies beyond the capacity of human nature. Man cannot start from anything but self-will, whether in the form of naked individualism or disguised as group interest.⁸

It would be possible to spend much time analyzing the under-

6. D. R. Davies: *Secular Illusion or Christian Realism?*, p. 10. New York: Macmillan 1949.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 24f.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

current of heresies in this statement, but, for the present, let us grant Davies his desire for regeneration. He then asserted that “To abolish egoism as a source of behaviour; to act out of the supreme, all-embracing will of God means that every individual must become a new human being.” Davies meant every last individual, bar none, not a simple majority or a strong minority.⁹ Here, very clearly, is a non-Biblical idea. Moreover, Davies admitted that it is impossible in “any generation”, and he raised the question, “what possible relevance can the Christian hope of a redeemed world have in our actual social situation?”¹⁰ Davies held that “the radical re-shaping of human society is not the work of Christians in isolation, exercising a merely personal influence in corporate activities.”¹¹ The Kingdom of God is eschatological and not of this world. What is of this world is the united social order Davies envisions, “in which individuals only find rights in social relationships.”¹² But both law and the privileges man enjoys under law are God’s gifts to man; if “rights” are socially derived, then the social order is the *de facto* god of man. For Davies, again after Niebuhr, the doctrine of creation is a “myth”.¹³ His god is also essentially a limiting concept, or at best a limited being, not the omnipotent and sovereign Lord. As a naive believer, Davies gave assent to more than he allowed for in his intellectual framework, as his credo gives evidence.¹⁴ He saw the need for rebirth, but for Davies it was not Christ working in the hearts of men which changed society, and which offered hope, but a social re-arrangement of society. His social re-arrangement, moreover, carried no mark of God’s law. All the same, Davies was aware of the importance of faith, as one footnote makes clear:

Writing about the decline of serfdom in Russia in the early nineteenth century, (Alexander) Herzen says: “In those

9. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

14. D. R. Davies: *On To Orthodoxy*, p. 207f. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939.

days there used to be a patriarchal dynastic affection between landowners and their serfs . . . Today there are in Russia no more of those devoted servants, attached to the race and family of their masters. And that is easy to understand. The landowner no longer believes in his power, he does not believe that he will have to answer for his serfs at the terrible Day of Judgment, but simply makes use of his power for his own advantage.” (Vide *Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 34.).¹⁵

However, Davies’ theology is too weak to support a Biblical doctrine of regeneration. His position is neo-orthodoxy, “having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away” (II Tim. 3:5).

Man must be remade, but by whom, and how? Nicodemus saw it only as a long, slow process whereby man remade his world and thereby remade himself. An elite leadership would have to provide the method, force, and impetus for such a step. Nicodemus was ready to agree that man needed remaking, but he wanted a realistic and practical plan. He did not say, “Can a man be born” again? but “How can a man be born when he is old?” (John 3:4). Jesus answered this question as to *how* it is done: “Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” (John 3:5). *Water* signifies forgiveness of sins and purification, as set forth in baptism. *The Spirit* means that man’s regeneration is the act of God the Holy Spirit, who regenerates man into the perfect humanity of Jesus Christ, so that man, created in God’s image, is recreated in that same image in and through Jesus Christ. This rebirth is not man’s work, and it is therefore beyond man’s understanding (John 3:6).

Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.

The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof,

but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. (John 3:7, 8).

Hart’s comment here is very good:

The obviously strange experience, ideals and hopes of a

15. Davies: *The Sin of Our Age*, p. 129n.

man born of the Spirit may to the natural man be foolishness, but the facts exist all the same. Notice that it is not the Spirit but the man born of the Spirit who has the wind's mysterious character.¹⁶

The actions of the believer are to the ungodly incomprehensible. Because history is for him an entirely naturalistic and totally immanent process, he cannot imagine a force or power beyond history governing man and history. "Every one that is born of the Spirit" has this characteristic; since he is born again from above, his motive power is from above, and the more he grows in sanctification, the more his motive power manifests itself in him.

The reaction of Nicodemus was, "How can such things be?" (John 3:9). Like Davies, Nicodemus in his day was a religious leader, "a master of Israel" (John 3:10). By profession, he believed in God and upheld God's order; in reality, he had moved in the direction of Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor. God represented the ideal; the reality is man, and the motive force of history must come from man. If man is to be remade or reborn, it will have to be a man-engineered job.

Historical development and epistemological self-consciousness have brought the issue into sharper focus than it has ever before been, but the issue has not changed. Humanistic man regards his remaking as a problem for man to solve; he even speaks of God and the knowledge of God, as a problem to be solved. In so doing, he rejects revelation and he rejects God's sovereignty. If man is remade by man, then man is sovereign. If only God can regenerate man, then God is sovereign. Davies is right in this respect: man's solutions have aggravated man's plight instead of solving it.

16. Hart: *Companion to St. John's Gospel*, p. 64.

Atonement

Atonement is defined by the dictionary as

1. Satisfaction, reparation, or expiation made for wrong or injury; something suffered, done, or given by way of satisfaction. 2. *Theol.* The sacrificial work of Christ. 3. Reconciliation; agreement.

Atonement is very clearly a human *need*; man being a sinner, has many wrongs which must be atoned for. Can it be said, however, that atonement, clearly a human need, is also a human problem? Is man the problem-solver with respect to atonement? Jesus Christ, according to St. Paul, is the one, “by whom we have now received the atonement” (Rom. 5:11). Reconciliation to God is very clearly declared to be the work of Jesus Christ, not man.

Humanism, however, sees atonement as man’s problem. Man somehow will make reparation for his wrongs and reconcile man to man; reconciliation to God, of course, is not considered by logical humanism. In any case, the need to make atonement is basic to man everywhere. Because man is a sinner, and because the burden of sin and guilt is an oppressive one, men everywhere seek to find release from sin and guilt by atoning acts and rituals. Their goal is *justification*, to be guiltless and free from the burden of sin and guilt. To be justified is to be publicly exonerated, free and innocent. It means vindication and freedom. Justification by means of atonement is the goal of all men.¹

The two root forms of humanistic atonement are *sadism* and *masochism*. In sadism, an attempt is made to atone for

1. See R. J. Rushdoony: *The Politics of Guilt and Pity*, pp. 1-21. Nutley, New Jersey: The Craig Press, 1970.

sin and guilt by laying the burden on someone else. Justification is sought, as with Adam and Eve, by saying that someone else made them do what they did: the other party is guilty. To this is added a savage punishment of this supposedly guilty other person. To cite an example, a workman of superior background and very inferior station, proved to be incapable of admitting that he did anything wrong. If it were demonstrated to him that it was indeed his doing, somehow his wife was to blame, and he would, on his return home, beat her savagely. He would even boast of having beaten her in order to establish his “righteous” intolerance of mistakes. This man’s atonement for his wrongs was to lay the guilt on his wife; his justification was that she, somehow, had so distressed him that his actions were her fault: “Now see what you made me do!” This was his refrain. Sadism is a form of do-it-yourself atonement. The sadist has to blame and punish another person or persons for his own wrongs. In some cases, an entire nation or race is singled out as the target for sadistic actions: all blacks, or all whites, all Jews, Germans, Englishmen, or Japanese. Mental health usually improves during war years, if the war is a popular war, and suicides decline, because a sadistic hatred of the enemy gratifies the destructive sense of unatoned sin and guilt in men. The enemy is made the incarnation of evil, and the world’s sin and guilt are laid on the enemy. Adolf Hitler (1889-1945), clearly an ungodly man, served such a purpose, and a realistic appraisal of an essentially modern, relativistic politician has become next to impossible because his role has been that of a scapegoat for modern man.

The other form of humanistic atonement is masochism, or self-punishment. Masochism is by no means absent in the sadist. The wife-beating workman was viciously sadistic, but his masochism was also present in his every action. Often his wife-beating was deliberately public in order to bring punishment on himself. If it were not possible to make it public, he made sure that the ugliest details became known so that he

would suffer public disapproval. The masochist wants punishment in order that he may in effect pay the price of his sin. According to his accounting system, sins have their price; when that price is paid, a man has both freedom to commit the sin and to be absolved of sin and guilt.

When a man knows in his heart that he has sinned, he feels guilty and wants rid of that guilt. As a result, he will so act as to invite punishment. Thus, a man who had been committing adultery with his wife's best friend felt doubly guilty for that reason. His conscience troubled him that he had not only committed adultery but fouled a friendship. As a result, he sought masochistic atonement. He began to do things certain to make his wife angry; he precipitated one stormy scene after another over trifles and ended each by asking forgiveness for these trifles. He was also provoking her into overreacting so that he could feel that he had more than paid for past sins and had some "credit" left for future ones.

But self-atonement is an impossibility. Sinful man cannot justify himself before God, nor can he make atonement for sin when his actions, like his heart, mind, and being are governed by sin. Man's acts of self-atonement and self-justification are themselves sins.

There are two aspects to atonement. First, atonement is the reconciliation between persons who are at variance or in enmity one to another. Second, it is that act of sacrifice or expiation of the sin and guilt which makes the reconciliation possible. Expiation is that act which renders satisfaction for an offense and removes thereby the guilt and punishment.

Man is not capable of fulfilling either aspect of atonement with respect to God. Because he is a sinner, his every act reflects his nature and only aggravates his offense. When he attempts to make atonement, he is either sadistic or masochistic, and, in any case, sinful.

According to all of Scripture, efficacious atonement is the sovereign act of God through Jesus Christ; it is not a subjective experience but an objective fact. Lange's comment on

Romans 5:11 stated

The *expiation* of Christ is the ground and condition of the *reconciliation* of God and man. Bengel says, on Romans iii. 24: “*Propitiation* takes away the offense against God; *reconciliation* has two sides: it removes (a.) God’s indignation against us; 2 Cor. v. 19; (b.) our alienation from God; 2 Cor. v. 20.”²

Reconciliation changes man’s position from enmity to peace, and from guilt to grace. Our enmity with God made us at war with ourselves, with other men, and with the world itself, since it is God’s handiwork, so that we were, towards all things, would-be destroyers.

Because of Christ’s atoning work, we have peace with God; we stand justified, and we rejoice in those experiences which further our sanctification and which bring us closer to our destiny in Christ.

Calvin, writing on Romans 5:11, declared of St. Paul,

Nor is it in vain that he so often mentions reconciliation: it is, first, that we may be taught to fix our eyes on the death of Christ, whenever we speak of salvation; and, secondly, that we may know that our trust must be fixed on nothing else, but on the expiation made for our sins.³

God’s atonement takes away the self-absorption of humanistic atonement. Guilt leads to an intensive and unhealthy introspection and self-absorption. The pressing problem of the guilty is how to work off the burden of sin and guilt. Whatever activity they embark upon, whether it be religious, political, educational, or charitable, assumes a sado-masochistic orientation. It becomes an aspect of self-atonement. Much of human activity has this characteristic. Guilty men will seek a mantle of self-righteousness by means of charitable acts, or by passing socialistic legislation to “improve” mankind and its lot. These self-righteous acts can assume a politically conservative form (charitable foundations

2. John Peter Lange: *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Romans*, p. 167. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

3. John Calvin: *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, p. 199. John Owen translation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

oftentimes have such an origin), or a politically radical form (such as socialistic measures and policies). In either case, the self-righteousness involved is a form of atonement. It is also masochistic. A wealthy man who hates the poor as failures, and refuses to pay his employees except the barest minimum, will sometimes establish a major foundation to minister to these people. A politician who feels guilty for hating minority groups will work doubly hard to atone for his feelings by offering them far-reaching goals at the taxpayers' expense. In either case, human action is geared to human guilt primarily, not to God's law and only secondarily to human need. When social action becomes an aspect of atonement, it is first of all egocentric action.

The reverse is true where God's atonement governs. As St. Paul declared, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom. 5:19). Adam's disobedience made all those created in Adam's image and born of Adam to be sinners, or law-breakers. Christ's obedience makes all those born again in His image to be righteous, or law-keepers. The atonement is for them the glorious starting-point, whereas for the humanist, it is the terminal point. From the fact of atonement, the redeemed go on to apply God's law-word to every area of life and to re-order all things in terms of Christ.

For all men, atonement is a need. Because the humanist sees it as a problem to be solved, his course is a life-long absorption with his guilty burden. Not surprisingly, a humanistic age has seen a super-abundance of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, all feeding on this burden and intensifying it by their failure.

For the godly, atonement is a need which Christ has met. Now the redeemed man is no longer under the reign of sin and death but under the reign of grace and righteousness (Rom. 5:21). It is impossible, therefore, to speak of a psychology of man common to the regenerate and unregenerate: a different motive force governs both in virtue of their

relationship to Christ. To assume a common psychology is to deny the fact of the atonement.

The Implication of Regeneration and Atonement for Psychology

A serious threat to the church in recent years has been the invasion of humanistic psychologies into the pastoral relationship. Counselling has increasingly been based on radically anti-Christian foundations which do serious harm to the people they are supposed to help. Numerous books on pastoral counselling have been written which do little more than invade the pastoral domain with alien religious premises derived from humanism.

Some writers have been aware of these problems. Wurth, for example, tried to assess the contributions of “modern psychology” from a Reformed perspective. He was ready to be appreciative of its contributions while trying to conform them to a Biblical mold; the result was an interesting study, with at times telling insights, but lacking in a systematic character.¹

Adams, following the lead of the humanist O. Hobart Mowrer, has been more successful. After Mowrer, Adams rejects the idea that problems such as alcoholism, mental depression or neurosis, and related mental problems are sicknesses; rather, they are moral problems, escapes from or denials of responsibility, and their cure is the resumption of sound moral responsibility. Adams’ analysis of the failures of “the medical model”, i.e., the idea that mental problems, like physical diseases, invade the patient from without, and are to be solved from outside the man, is excellent. He strongly advances “the moral model”, i.e., the concept that mental problems are moral problems which arise from within

1. G. Brillenburg Wurth: *Christian Counselling in the Light of Modern Psychology*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1962.

as a result of moral failure and are to be solved from within by moral responsibility.

Adams calls his variety of pastoral psychology “nouthetic counselling.”²

Can a psychology be true, and can it give valid counsel to any man, if it rests on a failure to recognize the very different natures of man in the state of depravity and man in the state of grace? To cite a very specific example, Susan Griffin has called attention to lust for violence in modern man, which she believes is a myth propagated by our culture.

And this same culture which expects aggression from the male expects passivity from the female. Conveniently, the companion myth about the nature of female sexuality is that all women secretly want to be raped. Lurking beneath her modest female exterior is a subconscious desire to be ravished.³

Susan Griffin cites examples of this belief that women secretly desire rape by quoting from two radical newspapers. She points out also that “forcible rape is the most frequently committed violent crime in America today”, and that convictions are difficult to obtain, and the trial procedures brutal towards the victim. She cites also an example of the belief by rapists that their victims enjoy the act:

A young woman who was raped by the husband of a friend said that days after the incident the man returned to her home, pounded on the door and screamed to her, “Jane, Jane. You loved it. You know you loved it.”⁴

Not every sinner believes as this man does, but every sinner in some form harbors a like depravity, although it may manifest itself in other ways. In an unregenerate culture, because man must seek self-atonement, there is a proneness to violence, because it satisfies the sado-masochistic urges of the unregenerate heart. There is a need to give and to receive vio-

2. Jay E. Adams: *Competent to Counsel*. Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. 1970.

3. Susan Griffin, “Rape: The All-American Crime”, in *Ramparts*, vol. 10, no. 3, September, 1971, p. 27.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 27f.

lence, and a pleasure therein. The marked increase in rape when sexual morality becomes loose and fornication and adultery commonplace, indicates the need for violence. Moreover, only a fraction of all rapes are reported, so that the violence is greater than statistics indicate. Furthermore, violence is increasingly an aspect of consenting sexual relationships, i.e., a girl who consents readily to the sexual act will then be dealt with violently and ordered to submit to others as well in order to add the element of sadism to the relationship. The motives which govern unregenerate men are not the same as those which govern regenerate men. Man in the state of grace is a sinner still, but, because he has a new nature, he is governed by radically different motives and presuppositions. This new nature will reveal itself in “good fruit”, because every tree bears in terms of its nature. “Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?” (Matt. 7:16). Moreover, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (John 3:6). These words of Christ make sharply clear that there is a difference between men in the state of depravity and men in the state of grace. What is natural to one is not natural to the other. To assume a common motivation is to deny a fundamental fact of Scripture.

Both the fallen and the redeemed are *men*; what is common to them is their creation by God, and their common heritage in Adam. Both alike, for example, have hunger and thirst, but their attitudes towards satisfaction differ. The sexual urge in the redeemed man, despite his sinful tendencies in terms of the old Adam in him, is governed by a desire for godly fulfillment. Sin is abhorrent to him, and his own sin distresses him. The fallen man, however, covets the opportunity to sin and lives for it. For the godly, freedom means life under God and His law; for the ungodly, freedom means escape from God and His law.

We must say, therefore, that, *first*, we must recognize, in any Biblical psychology, that there is a difference in the state

of man in the state of depravity, and man in the state of grace. *Second*, this difference rests in a fundamental difference of natures, and the ground of this difference is the supernatural act of God in regenerating man.

That which is born of the flesh, of human nature, is human nature after Adam, fallen and depraved. As Hendriksen commented,

One could paraphrase as follows: sinful human nature produces sinful human nature (cf. Job 14:4, “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.” Cf. also Ps. 51:5). The Holy Spirit produces the sanctified human nature.⁵

Dean Alford made this even plainer:

The neuter gender (*that which* is born . . .) denotes not only the universal application of this truth, but (see Luke i, 35) the very first beginnings of life in the embryo, before sex can be predicated. So Bengel: “It denotes the very first elements of life.” The Lord here answers Nicodemus’s hypothetical question of ver. 4, by telling him that *even could it be so*, it would not accomplish the birth of which He speaks.

In this *flesh* is included *every part* of that which is born after the ordinary method of generation: even the spirit of man, which receptive as it is of the Spirit of God, is yet in the natural birth *dead*, sunk in trespasses and sins, and in a state of wrath. Such ‘flesh and blood’ cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, I Cor. xv. 50. But when the man is born again of the Spirit (the water does not appear any more, being merely the outward form of reception, — the less included in the greater), then just as flesh generates flesh, so spirit generates spirit, after its own image, see 2 Cor. iii. 18 end; and since the Kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom, such only who are so born can enter into it.⁶

There is a *third* area of fundamental difference in the natures of redeemed and unredeemed men, namely, with respect to atonement. With the unregenerate, sin and guilt are a burden, a source of anxiety, alienation, neurosis, and

5. William Hendriksen: *New Testament Commentary, Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, vol. 1, p. 134. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953.

6. Henry Alford: *New Testament for English Readers*, p. 482.

psychosis. Self-atonement leads to sadistic and masochistic activities and a fundamentally different culture. Much of modern literature, drama, film and television fare is simply a development of sadistic and masochistic themes because of their extensive appeal to modern man. Self-atonement is a powerful motive force, and it has left its destructive trail through all of history. While there can be lingering elements of self-justification in the redeemed man, it is no longer the motive force. The life of the redeemed is one of release from the burden of sin and guilt. In the words of St. Paul,

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. (Rom. 8:1, 2)

Redemption means the release of psychic energy from destructive to constructive channels, so that the social impact of regeneration is reconstructive, and that of self-atonement, destructive.

To discuss psychology from a Christian perspective without reference to the far-reaching implications of atonement is an amazing form of blindness.

A *fourth* fundamental difference is the fact that the drive of the unregenerate is for autonomy, essentially from God, but also for a god-like autonomy from other men. The redeemed, on the other hand, seek to place themselves under the law and will of God, and they find their peace and joy therein. Adams, in a footnote, acknowledges this fact, stating: "Dr. Cornelius Van Til, of Westminster Theological Seminary, has shown the importance of pre-suppositional analysis. He has demonstrated that at bottom, all non-Christian systems demand autonomy for man, thereby seeking to dethrone God."⁷ Adams seeks to make this a cornerstone of his psychology, and he uses the pre-suppositional critique to analyze other schools of thought. Essentially, his use of it

7. Adams: *Competent to Counsel*, p. xxi.

is to point to the non-directive psychologies of humanism as against the directive nature of Christian counseling, which assumes the authority of God's word. This is good as far as it goes, but it limits pre-suppositional analysis largely to methodology. There is too meager an application of Biblical doctrine to the issues at hand. "Atonement" is not listed in the index, (but is referred to on p. 20), and "Regeneration" gets a brief reference on pages xviii, 20, and 73. Biblical doctrine of pastoral counseling which bypasses the import of these doctrines is not possible.

In the 18th century, the English divine, Robert South, one of the most eloquent and witty men of his day, aptly described the folly of treating the regenerate and the unregenerate alike. In discussing ingratitude, South called attention to the governing character of man's nature:

And, therefore, where ingratitude begins remarkably to show itself, he surely judges most wisely who takes alarm betimes, and auguring the fountain from the stream, concludes that there is ill-nature at the bottom; and so reducing his judgment into practice, timely withdraws his frustraneous baffled kindnesses, and sees the folly of endeavoring to stroke a tiger into a lamb, or to court an Ethiopian out of his colour.

Fifth, we must recognize that autonomous man has a radically different doctrine of sanctification than does the regenerate man. Karl Shapiro has said of Henry Miller, "Morally I regard Miller as a holy man, as most of his adherents do."⁹ Of Miller's concept of sanctification, Shapiro points out that

Miller says in a little essay on Immorality and Morality: "What is moral and what is immoral? Nobody can ever answer this question satisfactorily. Not because morals ceaselessly evolve, but because the principle on which they depend is factitious. Morality is for slaves, for beings without spirit. And when I say spirit I mean the Holy Spirit."

8. Abraham Mills: *The Literature and the Literary Men of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. II, p. 201. New York: Harper, 1851.

9. Karl Shapiro, in "Introduction" to Henry Miller: *Tropic of Cancer*, p. xv. New York: Grove Press, 1961.

And he ends this little piece with a quotation from ancient Hindu scripture: Evil does not exist.¹⁰

For the Christian, sanctification is growth in obedience to God's law-word by means of the Holy Spirit. It means being separated to God by faith and obedience and being under God and His word. When the psalmist declared, "O how I love thy law! It is my meditation all the day" (Ps. 119:97), he expressed his joy not only in God's law, but his delight in the life of faith and obedience. The psalmist and Henry Miller both speak of sanctification, but there is a sharp antithesis apparent in their doctrines and in their psychologies.

Turning again to John 3:6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," it is important to emphasize afresh its meaning. Ellicott's comment is noteworthy:

The first step is to remind him (Nicodemus) of the law of likeness in natural generation. "Flesh", as distinct from "spirit", is human nature in so far as it is common with animal nature, consisting of the bodily frame and its animal life, feelings and passions. "Flesh", as opposed to "spirit", is the nature as not under the guidance of the human spirit, which is itself the shrine of the Divine Spirit, and therefore it is sinful. (Comp. Gal. v. 16 *et seq.*; vi. 8). It is this nature in its material constitution, and subject to sin, which is transmitted from father to son. The physical life itself is dependent upon birth. That which is born of the flesh is flesh.

There is an analogous law of spiritual generation. Spirit as opposed to flesh is the differentia of man as distinct from all other creatures. It is the image of God in him, the seat of the capacity for the communion with God, which is the true principle of life. In the natural man this is crushed and dormant; in the spiritual man it has been quickened by the influence of the Holy Ghost. This is a new life in him, and the spiritual life, like the physical, is dependent upon birth. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.¹¹

Clearly, therefore, a central task of Christian psychology

10. *Ibid.*, p. xv f.

11. C. J. Ellicott: Commentary on the Whole Bible, VI, p. 399.

is to ascertain this fundamental difference, to declare the necessity of rebirth, and the centrality of the doctrine of the atonement for psychology. Pastoral counseling should ascertain whether or not the person is truly regenerate, and then seek to further growth in sanctification. Christians, in their every-day life, will recognize that the testing of time and experiences will provide a revelation of man's relationship to God, and many persons will fall by the wayside as their unbelief is exposed. In a time of trial and trouble, the reactions of men will differ in terms of their faith. In the face of a crisis, both the ungodly and the godly can react with courage and bravery, but, with the one, its mainspring can be masochism, and with the other, it can be a constructive dedication to a cause. Time will reveal the mainsprings, but we must also recognize the radical difference in the mainsprings.

The State of Grace

Those whom God has redeemed are in *the state of grace*, or *the covenant of grace*. They are freed from the burden of sin and guilt, and the penalty of death, and move in the freedom of grace.

During World War II, one man was in action for a full eight years, during which time every noise meant a possible bombing, or an enemy attack. His life was one of continual tension and pressure, as well as responsibility. All of this became a way of life and a normal condition, which he lived with in almost stoical resistance. Then, after the war, he awoke one night from a frightening nightmare in which the enemy were attacking and his machine gun jammed. Shaking with fear and horror, he turned on the light to help shake off the nightmare. "The war is over," he told himself. The words and the light pushed back the darkness and the tension. His world was not without serious problems, but the war was over, and with it all the lurking horror of a bloody death in dirt and mud. He had passed from one world into another, with relief and a sense of freedom.

This man's experience had a double aspect. First, there was the objective fact that the war was over. Second, there was the subjective freedom which came when the implications of peace came home to him. The state of grace is similar. The objective fact is that the warfare or enmity between God and man is ended by the atoning and regenerating work of God in Christ. The subjective fact is the awareness that comes to the redeemed man that his life is now one of peace and grace.

Thomas Boston, in *Human Nature in its Fourfold State*,

defined the state of grace as “the state of *begun recovery* of human nature.” It is the work of reconstruction begun in man, whereby he, having a new principle of life, begins to grow and to be remade in knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion. Because he is created in the image of God, man yearns for reconstruction; because he is a sinner, unregenerate man creates disorder and destruction instead. Margaret Elizabeth Austin, in the opening lines of her poem, “Charlie Sapiens,” describes this schizophrenia:

Man is the only animal that keeps
A place for everything, with nothing in it;
Vainly he yearns for order; chaos creeps
Higher around his body by the minute.¹

In the state of grace, instead of this destructive, sado-masochistic character of the state of depravity, man’s life is marked by *growth*. Personal and social growth are not normally desired by men and civilizations. Instead of growth, they desire to continue the present, or return to the past. If men are revolutionists, they then seek to destroy the present order only to create a more static and unchanging order. The dream-states of socialists and communists is a rigid and inflexible order which has no room for growth or disagreement. Revolutionists are thus usually far more reactionary than are conservatives, but both are alike hostile to growth. Puritanism, because it emphasized the *newness* of the gospel, and the dimensions of relevance and growth, was quickly productive of science and progress. The aristocrats and nobility of England were usually Roman Catholic and Anglican, and, like John Aubrey, longed for ‘the good old days’, which to them, “was a Golden-Age.” Then lords and knights ruled the land, and the pope, “with all his authority,” ruled over Christendom.

Then the Crusado’s to the Holy-warres were most
magnificent and glorious, and the rise I beleieve of the
adven-

1. Published by the Alumni Association of Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana, in *Arrowy Time*, quoted by Wayne E. Oates: *Anxiety in Christian Experience*, p. 132. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.

tures of Knights Errants, and Romances. The solemnities of Processions in and about the Churches, and the Perambulations in the Fields, besides their convenience, were fine pleasing diversions. The Priestesses went before in their Formalities, singing the Latin-service, and the people came after making their good-meaning-responses. The Reverence given to Holymen was very great: then were the Churches open all day long, men and women going in and out hourly to and from their Devotions. Then were the Consciences of the people kept in so great awe by Confession: that Just dealing and vertue was habitual . . .

There were no Free-schooles: the boyes were educated at the Monasteries. The young maides (not at Hakney, Say schooles, & c. to learn pride and wantonnesse) but at the Nunneries, where they had examples of Piety, humilitie and modestie to imitate and practise. Here they learned Needle-worke, and the art of Confectionary: Surgery (anciently no apothecaries or Surgeons — the gentle-woemen did cure their poore neighbours: their hands are now too fine) Physicke, Writing, Drawing, etc. . . .

The Lords (then Lords in deed as well as Title) liv'd in their countries like petty Kings, had jura regalia belonging to their signories, had their Castles and Burroughes, and sent Burgesses to the Lower House; had Gallows within their Liberties where they could try, condemn, hang and draw; never went up to London but in Parliament-time, or once a yeare to do their homage and duty to the King.

No younger brothers then were, by the Custom and constitution of the Realme, to betake themselves to Trades, but were Church-men, or Retainers or Servants to great Men: rid good horses (now and then took a purse) and their bloud that was bred at the good Tables or their Masters was upon every occasion freely lett out in thier Quarrels. It was then too common amongst their Masters to have Feuds with one another, and their servants at Market or where they met (in that slashing age) did commonly bang one anothers Bucklers.

The poor boyes did turn the Spitts, and lick't the dripping-pan, and grew to be huge lusty knaves.

In those dayes the Gentry begott their own servants and copyhold tenants (the customer of Lying with the Bride the first night).

No Ale-houses nor yet Innes then, unlesse upon great roades: when they had a mind to drinke they went to the Friaries; and when they travilled they had entertainment at the Religious howses for 3 days, if occasion so long required. The meeting of the Country was not then at tipling howses, but in the Fields or Forests with their Hawkes or Howndes, with their bugle-hornes in silken baudries.

Such Joy and merriment was every Holiday; which dayes were kept with great Solempnitie and reverence. In Herefordshire and parts of the Marches of Wales the Tabor and pipe were exceeding common. Many beggars begd with it: and the Peasants danced to it in the Churchyard on Holy dayes and Holy-day-eves. Now it is almost lost: the Drumme and Trumpet have putt that peaceable Musique to silence.

In those times (besides the jollities already mentioned) they had their Pilgrimages to several shrines, as chiefly hereabout, to St. Joseph of Arimathea at his Chapil in Gastonbury-abbey. In the roades thither were severall howses of entertaynment built purposely for them.²

Not surprisingly, the writings of Aubrey are those of an antiquarian; his vision was always past-bound, and, for all his winsome and kindly nature and superior birth, he was of a lower class character, unable to manage a good estate and finally an object of charity to his friends.

Moreover, Aubrey, for all his liking for old Catholic England, was not as close to it as the Puritans he disliked. For him, the religious expression of old England had been “fine pleasing diversions.” The old order perished because this was all it had become to too many people. The Puritans took the old order very seriously: they warred against it for that reason, and they also sought to restore certain aspects of it because they took it seriously. Puritanism was in part a return to the feudal social order, a development of it, and an application and development of Biblical faith to Christendom. If their hatred of the beautiful processions and churches was sometimes, but seldom, destructive (but not

2. Oliver Lawson Dick, editor: *Aubrey's Brief Lives*, p. lxii f. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957.

nearly so as the work of Henry VIII, Charles V in the sack of Rome, and other monarchs), it was because they resented seeing a living faith become “fine pleasing diversions.”

The roots of English liberty in the old feudal order have been cited by Gaullieur:

In other words, the old feudal liberties were expanded in England, till every Englishman enjoyed all the guarantees of life and property owned by the medieval lord; on the Continent they were contracted till they had all been gathered into the hands of one or a few men, the old freemen, the nobility, being gradually reduced to the condition of the former conquered people, the serfs, with no political rights at all.

Thus have the citizens of an American “county” inherited all the rights and privileges of the mediaeval “count”; and the American county organizations, simply by the extension of the count’s authority to the people, remains to this day a vestige of feudal organization more than ten centuries old . . .

All of this is very closely related to the state of grace, because the state of grace is not static nor past or present bound, but future oriented. The state of grace is not without sin, but it is never without growth. St. Paul made it clear that the sinner is “dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph. 2:1, cf. Col. 2:13), and therefore incapable of growth.

But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,

Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)

And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. (Eph. 2:4-6)

The characteristic of death is decay, that of life, growth. The regenerate man, being alive in Christ, will therefore grow. St. Paul compared the growth to that of a child from babyhood and milk to maturity and meat. (I Cor. 3:1-2, Heb. 5:12-14).

3. Henry Gaullieur: *The Paternal State in France and Germany*, p. 29. New York: Harper, 1898. For a study of “Feudalism and Federalism”, see R. J. Rushdoony: *This Independent Republic*, pp. 9-22; Nutley, New Jersey: The Craig Press, 1964, 1971.

An often painful experience, one which separates us from family and friends, is their inability to grow, so that it becomes difficult to talk to people we love but have long since outgrown.

The conservative, fearful of the present and future, looks backward only. The revolutionist is also past-bound: his vision is one of destruction for the past and present and a static, unchanging utopia for the future. Neither is capable of growth, and victory then goes to those who destroy the most. Man in the state of grace is more conservative than the political conservatives: he has a surer grasp of the past and present because he assesses it in terms of the word of God. He is also more radical than the revolutionist, because he has a principle of growth in him which requires continual change and progress in terms of the word of God.

Weber, Tawney and others linked capitalism to Calvinism; others, critics, cited evidences of capitalistic growth in medieval culture. In reality, growth, economic, political, cultural, scientific, and in every other area, requires a Christian culture in which the principle of growth under God has full scope. The old order Aubrey longed for had moved from growth to “diversion”, and as a result it was subjected to attacks from several fronts and finally collapsed.

Social growth rests on personal growth. In 1792, the Rev. Thomas Scott, in a letter of December 24, to Dr. Ryland of Bristol, wrote:

I entirely agree with you, that many things want mending among us; but I fear the governed are as much to blame as the governors. The nation indeed is a mass of corruption ; and throwing it into a new form will not mend it. If North-America prosper under her new government, the cause is principally to be found in the moral state of the inhabitants.⁴

Scott favored a limited monarchy, but he did not put any confidence in the *form* of a government; the basic problem

4. John Scott: *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Scott*, p. 211f. New York: Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge, 1856.

was in the nature of man. With unregenerate men, no form of government could give more than a temporary respite from oppression. Scott's son reported,

It need scarcely be said, that a man of my father's principles and discernment was never in any danger of being duped by the boasting pretensions and high expectations which accompanied the earlier periods of the French revolution. He always held, that, proceeding as it did upon irreligious principles, and being founded in false views of human nature, no good was to be expected from it otherwise than as a remote consequence.⁵

When men hope for social reform by some means other than the grace of God in the salvation of individual men, they are declaring that evil is in the environment rather than in man.

The state of grace reveals itself in man by a delight in the word of God, a readiness to grow therein, and an ability to endure the hot sun of adversity and grow stronger in the faith. The word of God which finds "good ground", or a regenerate heart, brings forth fruit: there is growth and production (Matt. 13:1-23). Because growth is a characteristic of life, it is a characteristic of the state of grace.

The state of grace also manifests itself in *true freedom* in "the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21). The unregenerate talk much of liberty, but by this they mean only freedom from God and His law; beyond that, they are lovers of tyranny. At this point, Wise, not always a sound guide, is right in declaring,

The real issue is not between determination and freedom; it is between determinism and internal anarchy. In a law-abiding universe personality cannot be other than law-abiding . . .

There is a pseudo freedom which is the opposite of the genuine sense of freedom. It is the freedom of the person who insists that he should be permitted to express his anger, or his sexuality or any other impulse without consideration of the rights and welfare of others or of what such behavior will do to him. There is the false freedom

5. *Ibid.*, p. 213.

of the person who feels a compulsion to hurt another under the guise of being helpful. There is the false freedom of the individual who tries to throw off all external restraints. These “freedoms” are illusory. . . .

A genuine sense of freedom, a positive sense that one is able to so order his life that he may achieve a higher degree of joy for himself and others, is a mark of a well-integrated, mature person. . . . Freedom and responsibility are the functions of an ever maturing self.⁶

Law is an aspect of the nature of God, and, because man is created in God’s image, he finds self-expression as a law-creature. Because of sin, this law-expression is a perverted one. When the law becomes identified with the will of man, it comes to mean the power to inflict and to degrade, as Vailland’s novel so well depicts.⁷ When mediated by science, this perverted law-expression, predestination by man, becomes a dream of total control. Scientists are at work striving to abolish true freedom as a “threat.”

Thomas Henry Huxley once wrote that “if some great power would agree to make me always think what is true and do what is right,” he would consent to “being turned into a sort of clock and being wound up every morning before I get out of bed.”

Mr. Huxley left us too soon. There are men now who would gladly accommodate him. Suddenly, 1984 is just 4,500 days or so away and George Orwell’s timing, it appears, was not that far off.

“Within 15 or 20 years,” says Dr. Marvin Karlins, “human behavior control techniques will be advanced to the point where we can control anyone.” . . .

In a new book “Requiem for Democracy? An Inquiry in the Limits of Behavior Control,” Karlins and his co-author, Lewis Andrews, tell us it’s already happening.

Transmitting signals to electrodes implanted in a charging bull’s head, Yale’s physiologist Jose Delgado caused the bull to halt in mid-charge and walk away, presumably in search of a cow. It also was Delgado who caused mother

6. Carroll A. Wise: *Pastoral Counseling, Its Theory and Practice*, p. 22f. New York: Harper, 1951.

7. Roger Vailland: *The Law*. New York: Knopf, 1958.

monkeys under the influence of electrical brain stimulation to savagely attack their young . . .

"It's also possible to take one person's memories and transfer them to another person," explained Andrews, a Ph.D. candidate at Stanford University.

"It has been done with worms. Scientists taught one worm to crawl through a maze. Then they chopped it up and fed it to another worm, which crawled through the maze." Andrews said that memory is a chemical state, and scientists are now trying to discover how to transfer memory in higher forms of life. "Most think it will be in the form of a pill," he said. . . .

"We take the position that behavior control can be used for good or bad purposes," Andrews said. "There are two ways to control people.

"The first way would be very rigid and, in effect, turn people into robots. Theoretically, this is possible, but it probably would be very inefficient because of the amount of time involved.

"In the second way, a person could be conditioned to do certain kinds of things; he would, in effect, be sent along a path and know where he was going.

"The problem posed by behavior control is not external tyranny. On the contrary, the real problem is the threat of freedom . . . if we recognize that a perfected behavior control technology is within our grasp, then for the first time in history we are truly responsible for our destiny."⁸

Several observations can be made about this report. *First*, electrodes have already been implanted in human beings, mental patients. Coughlan reported in 1963 that, for "medical purposes and techniques" there had already been "a few hundred deep implantations" in human subjects.⁹ The news report thus has nothing new to say: it merely conditions us to expect something which has been announced for about ten years. *Second*, the experiment with memory transfer with worms, by no means news, was of dubious value, if any, and has been challenged. It is an example in scientific dress of a

8. "Physiologist Predicts Complete Control of 'Anyone' in 15 Years," in *The Register*, Santa Ana, California, Monday (e) August 23, 1971, p. B4.

9. Robert Coughlan, "Control of the Brain, Part I, Behavior by Electronics," in *Life*, vol. 54, no. 10, March 8, 1963, pp. 90-106.

basic thesis of cannibalistic practice, acquiring the characteristics of someone else by eating him. *Third*, the argument that such controls can be good is easily tested. If it is potentially good, then let these scientists allow electrodes to be turned over to us. This, of course, would be intolerable to them. The controls they deem beneficial are ones which they command. *Fourth*, the heart of the matter is in their comment that “the real problem is the threat of freedom.” A god to be truly god must absolutely control his creation or universe. For these humanists, whose faith makes them their own gods, the freedom of other men is a threat to their plans. As a result, our freedom is for them “the real problem,” and, as problem-solvers, they plan to eliminate it.

God, however, as the absolutely sovereign and free-being, who predestines all things according to His sovereign will, has created us in His image. This means that our destiny is the freedom of a secondary cause, of a creature, and our regeneration re-establishes us in this freedom. The law-expression of man is then his free and willing service to God and his obedience to the law-word of God.

The rise of humanism, and its steady destruction of Christian morality, has meant the loss of liberty and the rise of tyranny. The Inquisition of the middle ages was in violation of Biblical law and principles, but, at its worst, it victimized individuals, whereas, especially since the French Revolution, humanism has victimized men wholesale, killing them by the millions and subjecting the living to the most ruthless tortures.

The state of grace is also called *the covenant of grace*, because it is life in the family of Christ. The state of grace is life within Christ, and it means first of all community with the triune God. The community sought by humanism is destructive of the individual, just as its individualism is atomistic, since there is no sound doctrine of the one and the many.¹⁰

10. See R. J. Rushdoony: *The One and the Many*. Nutley, New Jersey: The Craig Press, 1971.

As a result, there is neither true community nor true individuality. Dostoyevsky's comment is pertinent:

The isolation that prevails everywhere, above all, in our age — it has not yet fully developed, it has not reached its limit yet. For everyone strives to keep his individuality as apart as possible, wishes to secure the greatest possible fullness of life for himself; but meantime all his efforts result not in attaining fullness of life but self-destruction, for instead of self-realization he ends by arriving at complete solitude. All mankind in our age have split up into units, they all keep apart, each in his own groove; each one holds aloof, hides himself and hides what he has, from the rest, and he ends up being repelled by others and repelling them. He heaps up riches by himself and thinks, 'how strong I am now and how secure,' and in his madness he does not understand that the more he heaps up, the more he sinks into self-destructive impotence. For he is accustomed to rely upon himself alone and to cut himself off from the whole; he has trained himself not to believe in the help of others, in men and in humanity, and only trembles for fear he should lose his money and the privileges that he has won for himself.¹¹

God's covenant promise of Genesis 17:7 is, "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." The community is a continuing one, and its essence is God's providential and protecting care.

How does a man know that he is in the state of grace? It is a poor test to be able to say that, on a particular date, at a revival meeting, one was converted. Not everyone can, indeed most Christians cannot, date their regeneration. The test is not dating but the character or fruits of grace. As Thomas Boston stated it,

All men in the state of grace are born again. All gracious persons, namely such as are in a state of favour with God, and endowed with gracious qualities and dispositions, are regenerate persons.¹²

11. Fyodor Dostoyevsky: *The Brothers Karamozov*, p. 375. Modern Library edition.

12. Thomas Boston: *Human Nature in its Fourfold State*, p. 132. Sovereign Grace edition, 1957; Evansville, Indiana.

Clearly persons in the state of grace are not those who say they are, but those of whom God says these are His people, which He declares by the gracious qualities, dispositions, and works He manifests in and through them. To be in the state of grace means thus to serve and glorify God and to enjoy Him, and to unite with His people in His service and praise. This means far more than an institutional loyalty, nor is it even primarily such an allegiance. St. John declared, “And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments” (I John 2:3), words which echoed our Lord’s declaration, “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven” (Matt. 7:21). The Westminster Confession of Faith summed up the matter thus:

Although hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions of being in the favor of God and estate of salvation; which hope of theirs shall perish: yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus, and love him in sincerity, endeavoring to walk in all good conscience before him may in this life be certainly assured that they are in a state of grace, and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God; which hope shall never make them ashamed. (Chapt. XVIII, sect. I.)

In the Larger Catechism, the assurance of the state of grace is stated more fully:

Q. 79. May not true believers, by reason of their imperfections, and the many temptations and sins they are overtaken with, fall away from the state of grace?

A. True believers, by reason of the unchangeable love of God, and his decree and covenant to give them perseverance, their inseparable union with Christ, his continual intercession for them, and the Spirit and seed of God abiding in them, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

Q. 80. Can true believers be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace, and that they shall persevere therein unto salvation?

A. Such as truly believe in Christ, and endeavor to walk in all good conscience before him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God's promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises of life are made, and bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace and shall persevere therein unto salvation.

Since grace is God's work in the life of man, God neither undoes His work, nor can man undo it. Those whom God saves are eternally saved.

Since it is regenerating grace which leads a man to hear the word of God and to be converted, man is thus in a state of grace when he responds to the word of God. The grace which is prior to conversion, and which causes a man to hunger and thirst for righteousness and to mourn over his sins, is *prevenient grace*. Prevenient grace changes the heart of man from enmity to God to a readiness to hear His word. It is, as the word *prevenient* indicates, the grace which goes before conversion to effect the work of regeneration.

The state of grace is, as we have seen, a state of growth. It leads to a growing person and a progressing society. The society of fallen man can be marked by revolutions in certain phases of its history, but its basic purpose is to establish an unchanging order; whether it was ancient Chinese society, the Incas of Peru, or modern Marxist theory, its hope is a static order, in brief, the *graveyard society* to which freedom is a "threat" and growth has no place. Thus, B. F. Skinner of Harvard in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, sees only disaster ahead unless controls replace freedom.

The graveyard society of science, sociology, and humanism is inescapable unless men are in a state of grace. Men in the state of grace reign with Christ (Eph. 2:4-6); Christ, who rules all things in time and eternity empowers His people to establish that reign in history (Matt. 28:18-20). Men in the state of grace will do more than grow: they shall conquer and reign.

Cultural Discipline

The regenerate and the unregenerate have differing mainsprings and motives, and their psychologies differ. On the other hand, throughout Christendom many unregenerate men often display characteristics which seem to be clearly Christian. How shall we account for this?

A bastard doctrine of common grace, common to many Reformed circles and effectively analyzed and refuted by Cornelius Van Til, holds that all men, believers and unbelievers, share a neutral territory as a result of which much that is commendable and even in a sense godly can appear in even the unregenerate out of this common ground.

But man has neither a metaphysical nor a moral autonomy from God, nor any area of neutral activity apart from God. Since man is totally God's creation, man is at every point confronted by the necessity of submission to God. There are areas of Christian liberty, wherein the believer cannot be judged by the church, but he is no less subject to God therein. Paul made this clear with respect to meat offered to idols. While the judgment of men was precluded, that of God is stressed:

Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin (Rom. 14:22-23)

Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. (I Cor. 10:31)

Man has no neutral ground, nor any neutral area of thought and activity. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

And yet it is clear that in Christian countries we do see behavior on the part of the unregenerate which is in conformity to Christian standards. The answer is *cultural discipline*. Even in pagan societies, cultural discipline is operative to keep in check the motives of the unregenerate and to prevent such societies from collapsing into the logical end of their presuppositions. St. Paul made it clear that “the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way” (II Thess. 2:7). There is some question as to the meaning of “letteth” or “restrains”. Hendriksen commented:

Far more difficult to answer is the question, What is meant by *that which* or *he who* is now holding (him) back “from becoming revealed as the man of lawlessness”?

In order to approach this question properly, it is necessary first of all to determine the right translation. In the works of commentators the verb in question has been translated in three different ways: a. *to hold back* or *restrain*, b. *to hold* or *hold fast*, and c. *to hold sway* or *rule*.

Beginning with the last, the meaning might then become:

“And what is now holding sway (namely, the mystery of lawlessness) you know, in order that he (Christ) may be revealed in his appropriate season. For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work, only until he who now holds sway (namely, Satan) be taken out of the way.”

We can dismiss this at once. Not only is it hard to fit this meaning into the present context, but also: although the verb is of rather frequent occurrence in the new Testament, not once (in any of the other New Testament passages) does it have this meaning (to hold sway).

The second meaning (*to holdfast*) and the first (*to hold back*, *to restrain*) are closely related, and in the end probably yield the same resultant interpretation of the entire passage.¹

With all due respect to a superior commentator, one can ask if Hendriksen’s amillennial presuppositions have not led him to dismiss an interpretation which is given support by the

1. William Hendriksen: *New Testament Commentary, I and II Thessalonians*, p. 180. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955.

fact that verse 8 goes on to speak of the taking away of the power of iniquity? The words “will let” are not in the original, so that, as Gloag commented, the meaning, even if “restrains” is the correct translation, can be best read as follows:

“The mystery of lawlessness is already working, only until he who restrains is removed;” when that takes place, when the restraining influence is removed, the mystery of lawlessness will no longer work secretly, but will be openly manifested.²

At best, granted the common interpretation, what the text calls attention to is, not the triumph of Satan and of the ungodly, but the radical collapse into lawlessness of a culture which is free to pursue the logic of its godlessness. To emphasize any triumph of a supposed Satanic order is to misread the purpose of St. Paul’s statement.

It must be said rather that, any order in which the principle of unbelief prevails and goes to anything near its logical conclusion has ceased to be an order and is on its death-bed.

To hold back the fearful and demonic forces of anarchy, every society, however much in violation of its humanistic faith, has insisted on suppressing the logic of its anarchistic premises. Even more so, in Christian societies, the disciplines of family, church, and social life inculcate deeply Christian attitudes in all men, so that not even the radical humanists can construct an ideal order without reflecting their Christian heritage. In their personal lives, such men will reflect the habits and disciplines of Christian civilization even in their rebellion against it. As the rebellion deepens, each successive generation loses more and more of that heritage. It can never divorce itself from it. The Torah translation of Exodus 20:5, 6 is very important:

For I the LORD your God am an impassioned God, visiting the guilt of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of those who reject Me, but showing kindness to the thousandth generation of

2. P. J. Gloag: *The Pulpit Commentary, II Thessalonians*, p. 25. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

those who love Me and keep My commandments. This means that though old Israel has forsaken God, and that although Europe and the Americas have forsaken Him also, they can no more escape His kindness and the order it imposes than they can escape their guilt and the judgment it requires. The effects of that judgment linger to the third and fourth generation; the law-order and cultural discipline of His grace remain to some degree to the thousandth generation.

Cultural discipline thus continues habits and standards for a season after they have been discarded as a faith. If I stop for red lights in traffic, and slow down or check my speed at the sight of a traffic officer, this is not evidence of grace in my heart but of a pragmatic precaution which life in society has made a habit with me. Pragmatic habits are not acts of grace but rather aspects of cultural discipline. The pragmatic habits of a jungle tribesman are thus not those of an American or an Englishman.

Cultural discipline is present in every known society, past and present. It can erode as the faith of the society collapses, but it never disappears entirely. In Christian societies, its erosion is more dramatic, because the society has a greater height to fall from, but the tenacity of that discipline is also greater. Cultural discipline rises and falls in terms of the basic character of men. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6).

Justification

In a very real sense, *justification* must be separated from psychology: it has to do with a legal fact rather than a feeling. Berkhof has pointed out that the Hebrew word “hitsdik” means “to declare judically that one’s state is in harmony with the law, Ex. 23:7; Deut. 25:1; Prov. 17:15; Isa. 5:23.” The New Testament word “dikaio-o” means “to declare a person to be just.”¹ Berkhof’s exposition is so clear that he merits quoting in some detail:

“To justify” in the Scriptural sense of the word, is to effect an objective relation, the state of righteousness, by a judicial sentence. This can be done in a twofold way: (a) by bringing into account the actual subjective condition of a person (to justify the just or the righteous). Jas. 2:21; or (b) by imputing to a person the righteousness of another, that is, by accounting him righteous though he is inwardly unrighteous. The latter is the usual sense of justification in the New Testament.²

Regeneration is the renewing work within man which is effected by God’s sovereign grace; regeneration reveals itself in conversion and faith. Justification is the juridical aspect of salvation.

Justification is a judicial act of God, in which He declares, on the basis of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, that all the claims of the law are satisfied with respect to the sinner. It is unique in the application of the work of redemption in that it is a judicial act of God, a declaration respecting the sinner, and not an act or process of renewal, such as regeneration, conversion, and sanctifica-

1. Louis Berkhof: *Systematic Theology*, p. 511. Third edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 511.

tion. While it has respect to the sinner, it does not change his inner life. It does not affect his condition, but his state, and in that respect differs from all the other principal parts of the order or salvation. It involves the forgiveness of sins, and restoration to divine favor.³

In justification the legal consequence of Christ's atoning death is applied to the sinner whom God is regenerating. Berkhof, to bring out the meaning of justification more plainly, contrasted it to sanctification:

1. Justification removes the guilt of sin and restores the sinner to all the filial rights involved in his state as a child of God, including an eternal inheritance. Sanctification removes the pollution of sin and renews the sinner ever-increasingly in conformity with the image of God.

2. Justification takes place outside of the sinner in the tribunal of God, and does not change his inner life, though the sentence is brought home to him subjectively. Sanctification, on the other hand, takes place in the inner life of man and gradually affects his whole being.

3. Justification takes place once for all. It is not repeated, neither is it a process; it is complete at once and for all time. There is no more or less in justification; man is either fully justified, or he is not justified at all. In distinction from it sanctification is a continuous process, which is never completed in this life.

4. While the meritorious cause of both lies in the merits of Christ, there is a difference in the efficient cause. Speaking economically. God the Father declares the sinner righteous, and God the Holy Spirit sanctifies him.⁴

It is thus very important to recognize that *justification is God's judicial act*, not a process or feeling in man. Having said this, it must be added that justification is a basic psychological *need*, a felt need before, and a felt fact after the act. The existence of a pagan custom in Restoration England was noted by John Aubrey. The "Sinne-eaters" were still in existence in Aubrey's day. Aubrey's account, as cited by Dick, is of interest:

3. *Ibid.*, p. 513.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 513f.

“In the County of Hereford,” he notes, “was an old Custome at Funeralls to hire poor people, who were to take upon them all the Sinnes of the party deceased. One of these (I remember) lived in a Cottage on Rosse-high way: He was a long, leane, ugly, lamentable poor raskal. The manner was that when the Corps was brought out of the house and layd on a Biere: a Loafe of bread was brought and delivered to the sinne-eater over the Corps, as also a Mazar-bowle of Maple (Gossips Bowie) full of beer, which he was to drinke up, and sixpence in money, in consideration whereof he tooke upon him (ipso facto) all the Sinnes of the Defunct, and freed him (or her) from Walking after they were dead. This custome alludes (me thinkes) something to the Scape goat in the old Lawe.” The cheapness of the price charge for the assumption of another man’s sins is most surprising, for in the days before Hell was abolished by the Privy Council, its terrors were very real, as is shown by Queen Elizabeth’s dreadful deathbed vision of herself ringed by flames. “In North-Wales, the Sinne-eaters are frequently made use of.” Aubrey adds, “but there, instead of a Bowie of Beere, they have a bowle of Milke.”⁵

Winick defines the “sin-eater” as “A person who is paid and fed to take over the sins of the recently deceased, as in Wales.”⁶ Bagford’s letter of February 1, 1714-15, gives evidence of this same custom, Bagford’s authority being at least in part Aubrey:

Within the memory of our fathers, in Shropshire, in those villages adjoyning to Wales, when a person dyed, there was notice given to an old sire (for so they called him), who presently repaired to the place where the deceased lay, and stood before the door of the house, when some of the family came out and furnished him with a cricket, on which he sat down facing the door. Then they gave him a groat, which he put in his pocket; a crust of Dread, which he eat; and a full bowle of ale, which he drank off at a draught. After this he got up from the cricket and pro-

5. Oliver Lawson Dick, editor: Aubrey’s *Brief Lives*, p. lix f. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957.

6. Charles Winick: *Dictionary of Anthropology*, p. 487. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.

nounced. with a composed gesture, the ease and rest of the soul departed for which he would pawn his own soul.⁷

A variety of similar ways have been and are used by men to rid themselves of evil in order to stand justified before man and in their own conscience. Frazer cited many such practices in “primitive” societies.⁸ All of these have in common a belief in vicarious atonement by means of a sin-bearer, all presuppose a judicial burden of guilt which must be removed; all regard it as a social and personal necessity that justification be secured.

Justification is thus a deep personal need as well as a judicial fact. Because man is created in God’s image, he is geared to law, and he wants the moral order of the universe righted, and the moral order of his soul restored. Even in his sin, he longs for moral order, so that he brings judgment on himself and works subconsciously against his sin. Man apart from God serves God still and is thus at war with himself in his every sin. “But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked” (Isa. 57:20-21).

Even as he sins, man wants to be justified. Bouman, in describing the events leading to World War I, cited the fact that every nation began its catalog of self-justification even as it prepared for war.

The blame rested on the others, always on the others. Each nation insisted on the necessity of defense — wherefore they attacked everybody else.⁹

The need for atonement, to have the burden of sin and guilt removed, and the need for justification, to stand innocent and free before men and in one’s own conscience, are basic to men. Lacking atonement and justification, a very great

7. Theodor H. Gaster, editor: Sir James George Frazer: *The New Golden Bough*, p. 516f. New York: Criterion Books, 1959.

8. Sir James George Frazer: *The Golden Bough*, pp. 538-546. Abridged edition. New York: Macmillan 1943.

9. P. J. Bouman: *Revolution of the Lonely*, p. 170. Trans by F. G. Reiner and Ann Cliff. London: McGraw-Hill, n.d.

amount of man's personal and social activity and energy are wasted in self-atonement and self-justification. The common expression, "He's trying to justify himself," testifies to this deeply ingrained need. Men exhaust themselves trying to justify themselves, and, in their imagination, will endlessly rehearse past events, trying to find self-justification in things wherein their memory tortures and burns them.

St. Paul, in Romans 3:24-31, declares that the elect are justified by the grace of God through faith "without the deeds of the law." He emphasizes that he "is not making void the law, but establishing the law," because justification, a fact of law, is not attained by any work of man but only by God's grace. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation"(I Cor. 5:19).

When man is rid of the self-torture of trying to justify himself, he has a glorious inner freedom and peace. For anyone who trusts in Christ as Savior to waste time on self-justification is a sin and an abuse of energy. Faulty theology which requires a concentration on sins is like a leaky pipe: it delivers too little water to the tap. The pressure and energy leaks out before it can accomplish its ordained purpose.

A society in which godly justification prevails will thus be marked by social energy and vitality. Instead of dissipating its strength on inner warfare and futile self-justifications, it will move forward to re-order all things in terms of God's law-word. Instead of being group-directed, inner directed, or past-oriented, it will be future oriented and God directed.

Where self-justification prevails, there is not only a waste of energy but also blindness to the real issues. Turning again to wartime self-justification, during World War II, so capable and intelligent a writer as the British author A. P. Herbert wrote a series of poems in which Hitler was called a hog, and Mussolini "a dirty dog", and the Italians called "Wops" consistently.¹⁰ As an Irishman, writing to convince Ireland of

10. A. P. Herbert: *Let Us Be Glum*, pp. 2, 5, 14, 15, 22, etc.

Britain's cause, he said, "We are like virgins in a den of thugs."¹¹ Concerning "War Aims", Herbert wrote confidently,

We are arranging that never again

Shall a world be in pain because one man was vain.¹²

This surely is an amazing misreading of history! Before the Soviet Union entered the war, Herbert appealed for their entry, writing,

Old Auntie Russia, we know your mind

Fraternally burns for all mankind.¹³

After the entry of the Soviet Union into the war, Herbert wrote:

Brave Russia, off the fence at last,

We take your hand and praise your name.

And we will put away the past —

If all your friends will do the same.¹⁴

Here the self-justification is most naked: "we will put away the past." The role played by the allies in making World War II possible, the balance of power politics of Britain, the inequities of the Versailles treaty after World War I, the concessions to Hitler as against the pressures on Germany before Hitler, all this and more was conveniently "put away" and only Hitler's evils remembered. Similarly, Germany made into a litany of self-justification all the evils it had suffered at Allied hands after World War II and used them to excuse its own evils; Germany too very conveniently "put away the past" where her obvious sins were concerned, to remember only the sins of others. After both World Wars, the United States, through Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman, sought to "put away the past" and begin again, as though a sinning Adam can be put into Eden again without destroying it. When men, in self-justification, "put away the past" in order to deny their sins or to by-pass them, they also put away their future, because they have ensured that their same sins,

11. *Ibid.*, p. 33

12. *Ibid.*, p. 35

13. *Ibid.*, p. 50

14. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

unacknowledged, will continue to govern their tomorrows as they did their yesterdays. The only difference between 1914 and 1971 is that the nations have become more adept at sinning and in self-justification. They remain blind as to consequences. Apart from God's justifying grace in Jesus Christ, there is no vision, and the people perish. Only the atoning blood of Jesus Christ can "put away the past" and give a new future. Jesus Christ is He who, "now once in the end of the world hath . . . appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Hebrews 9:26). By "the end of the world," or "in the consummation of time" means that era in which "the whole divine disposition" has its consummation, "that is, at the entrance of the last season of God's dispensation of grace."¹⁵ It is also the *end*, in that, by Christ's atoning and justifying work, the old world of Adam is sentenced to death together with the old man, and the new world of Christ is begun by His resurrection.

Self-justification blinds men and binds them to the past they seek to put away, whereas the justification wrought by Jesus Christ opens the eyes of men to their sinful past and frees them for a glorious future under God.

15. John Owens: *An Exposition of Hebrews*, vol. IV, pp. 395, 401f. Evansville, Indiana: Sovereign Grace Reprint, 1960.

The Transformed Man

In a culture burdened with sin and guilt, society and man are incapable of coping with their problems; instead, they are busy adding to them by sado-masochistic actions. Such a society is capable of a parasitic advance by sadistic aggressions towards others and by expropriations of the achievements and wealth of other peoples. Finally, however, even this sadistic and parasitic ‘progress’ breaks down in guilt and masochism.

Dr. Woodward, recognizing the nature of masochism from a non-Christian and humanistic perspective, has noted that “Guilt must be expiated. ‘Sin’ must be punished.”¹ Woodward hopes for a humanistic settlement of the problem of guilt and masochism, observing of a lesbian’s conduct,

Although I feel that homosexuality is an affliction, I believe a person should try to attain fulfillment on his or her own terms, instead of artificially trying to conform to the decrees of “society.” For Harriet, homosexuality seems to be the right answer — and, now that she has freed herself from the masochistic guilt-scourging that was the price for her fulfillment, she is perhaps closer to true happiness than most “normal” people. I would not want to meddle with her new equilibrium for the sake of bringing her into conformity with, the “normal” world.²

The woman in question had only abandoned one form of masochistic self-atonement, we have no evidence that she abandoned self-punishment, nor is it possible that she did so. Woodward, who calls masochism and self-punishment “the

1. L. T. Woodward, M.D.: *Masochism*, p. 64. Derby, Connecticut: Monarch Books, 1964.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 82f.

Curse of Adam”,³ tries to reduce God’s moral law to “the decrees of ‘society,” which is a falsification of the facts of the matter. The “joyless” and “defeatist” life which marks “the masochistic personality”⁴ is common to every culture and is never more in evidence than when men and societies have together abandoned moral law for permissiveness. The need for atonement is more than a cultural product; it is a part of the God-created nature of man and cannot be set aside.

At the end of the “middle ages”, when faith had declined markedly, self-atonement proliferated. Many movements spread uncontrollably, satisfying the urge for self-atonement. The Flagellants, in the thirteenth century and later, were a widespread and in part secret movement which hoped to save civilization by means of self-atonement. One Flagellant hymn actually declared that

Had it not been for our contrition,⁵
All Christendom had met perdition.⁵

By whipping themselves, the Flagellants believed that they and civilization would be saved.

The same attitude is present today. Sara Winter, in a study of black and white students, concluded that

Blacks and whites find it difficult to work together smoothly in businesses, universities or other organizations, even when they are nominally equals seeking common goals . . .

Sensitive Americans in this era can easily regard both blackness and whiteness as profoundly *bad*. To be “nothing but” black is to be lost within a group that has been castigated, oppressed, hated and maligned by the majority and powerless to act in its own defense. To be “nothing but” white is to be the guilty agent of past injustices and present indignities.⁶

The author, as a humanist, is unwilling to push conclusions,

3. *Ibid.*, p. 141.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

5. J. A. MacCulloch: *Medieval Faith and Fable*, p. 254. Boston: Marshall Jones, n.d.

6. Sara K. Winter, “Black Man’s Bluff,” in *Psychology Today*, vol. 5, no. 4.

but she does recognize that, in their relationships, the blacks “demonstrated aggressive potential in relation to whites,” and the guilt-driven whites expected the black males to dominate. The black behavior can be recognized as sadistic: The guilt is laid on the white man, and he is punished at every turn, whereas the white behavior is masochistic, a readiness to be punished for supposed sins against the black man. In both cases, sin and guilt are intensified, and the likelihood of any sound relationship is lessened. In neither case is a constructive plan of action possible with respect to the problems involved. A sado-masochistic game of self-atonement is the essential and basic goal, not social progress.

Scholars are aware of the fact of sado-masochism with its two dimensions of “dominance-submission, and pain-humiliation.”

The phenomenon is variously portrayed as associated with obsessive neurosis, manic-depressive psychosis, paranoia, drug addiction, lack of achievement drive, and political radicalism. In effect, any act or condition that is realistically opposed to the individual’s welfare may be perceived as masochism. Masochistic behaviors could include practically any psychopathological symptom or illness, and any life style that is not socially condoned.⁷

Because the problem is viewed humanistically, no solution is forthcoming. Because the moral law requiring atonement is seen as social mores and customs, the basic need is evaded. As a result, sin, the cause of guilt, cannot be dealt with.

Thus, Dr. Gloria Cowan wants to establish a humanistic, psychological norm for sexual fidelity without making it a moral law. In discussing “sex away from home”, she insists that “Sex away from home has no special moral implication.” In fact, “Clearly, such behavior does not have to be classified as pathological, for surely norms do exist precisely in support of sex away from home, particularly when peer comparisons are available.” Thus, adultery is given a psychological justifi-

7. Eugene E. Levitt, “Sadomasochism,” in *Sexual Behavior*, vol. I, no. 6. Sept. 1971. p. 69.

cation and is separated from morality. Then, however, Dr. Cowan gives a psychological judgment against such adultery:

Sex away from home can be seen as symptomatic of alienation from self and a splintered existence . . . It is just another front modern man produces, no more true to himself than the other indices of alienation and self-deception practiced daily . . . Sexual freedom from overburdened roles and guilt is a problem, but sexual freedom implies responsibility toward others and oneself, particularly toward oneself. . . . Too often, sex away from home is sex away from self.⁸

What Dr. Cowan has done is to re-inforce guilt and masochism. *First*, by denying morality, she has not eliminated it; the adulterer still knows he is an adulterer, violating God's moral law. *Second*, he now has an additional burden to carry, because he is now a psychological criminal and failure. He has been branded with the word which reeks of humanism's original sin, "alienation." He is alienated from others and from himself. If his adultery is especially joyless, it is humanism which has poisoned the cup. Adultery is now not only sinful but it is also sick! It is almost enough to make sinful ascetics out of sinful men.

As a result, in St. Paul's words, "the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death" (Rom. 7:10). The purpose of the law is not to restrict man's life but to fulfill it. When man disobeys that law, it becomes a death sentence to him; when he obeys it, it becomes life to him. By Christ's atonement, we are removed from self-atonement, from sin and death, and established in truth and life.

There is a studied hopelessness about sado-masochistic activities, and such actions preclude progress. The advances made, to cite the black-white example, are made in spite of the activities of politicians and sado-masochistic blacks and whites. Progress comes from individuals whose lives are productively free.

8. Gloria Cowan, "Sex Away From Home," in *Sexual Behavior*, vol. I, no. 6, September, 1971, p. 14.

St. Paul cites, as man's necessary response to the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, a sacrifice of service in terms of a renewed and God-directed life-purpose. Way's translation of Romans 12:1-2 is especially telling:

I appeal to you, then, by all these compassions of God, O my brothers — bring your lives, and set them by the altar, as a sacrifice, a living one, a hallowed one, acceptable to God. The necessity of this rite of consecration follows from all the argument. Do not conform to the externalities of this world; nay, let your characters be transformed by the birth of a new life-purpose, so that you may put God's design to the test of your own experience, and so prove how kind, how gladdening, how flawless it is.⁹

Lenski rendered Romans 12:2 thus: "And be not outwardly conformed to this world age but be inwardly transformed by the renewing of the mind so that you test out what the will of God is, the thing (really) good and well-pleasing and complete." The "renewing of the mind" is not only an act by God, regeneration, but a "process", to cite Lenski's comment, wherein the regenerate man "is in a process of renewal that advances steadily."¹⁰ The force of the word *transformed* was stressed by a great lay commentator of the early nineteenth century, Robert Haldane (1764-1842):

This word signifies the change of the appearance of one thing into that of another. It is used by the fabulous writers to signify the change or metempsychosis of animals into trees, or of men into the appearance of other animals. This term denotes the entire change that passes on a man when he becomes a Christian. He is as different from what he was before, as one species of animal is from another. Let not men be so far the dupes of self-deception as to reckon themselves Christians, while they are unchanged in heart and life. 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature (or creation); old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new.' If there be not a radical difference between their present state and that in which they were by

9. Arthur S. Way: *The Letters of St. Paul to Seven Churches and Three Friends, with The Letter to the Hebrews*, p. 139. London: Macmillan, 1939.

10. R.C.H. Lenski: *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 745, 751. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1945.

nature, they have no title to the character of Christians. This shows that, in general, it is not difficult to discriminate Christians from the world. If the change be as great as the word of God here teaches, what difficulty can there be, in most cases, in judging of the character of those who profess Christianity? It is not the heart that we are called to judge. If the person be metamorphosed, as the word originally implies, from a state of nature to a conformity with Christ, it will certainly appear, and the state of the heart will be evident from the life. As there are degrees in this transformation, although all Christians are transformed when they are born again, yet they ought to be urged, as here, to a further degree of this transformation.¹¹

Transformation means a new life-purpose, an end to self-defeat, and a directed and purposive life of reconstruction under God. The demand for *change* comes from all quarters in a time of crisis. The New Left of the 1960s and 1970s is most vocal in demanding “change”, but the essence of their position has been aptly described by Ayn Rand as an Anti-Industrial Revolution towards pure destruction and anarchy:

What are the activists after? Nothing. They are not pulled by a goal, but pushed by the panic of mindless terror. Hostility, hatred, destruction for the sake of destruction are their momentary forms of escape. They are a desperate herd looking for a Fuhrer.¹²

The characteristic of sado-masochism is rage and destruction, whether directed against others or against one’s self.

The characteristic of the regenerate or “transformed” person is freedom from this rage and destruction. The unregenerate mind is endlessly absorbed with evil and injustice: he can chronicle all the sins of others at great length and tally up the sorry tale of conspiracies against him. Action means destruction.

The redeemed man is restored into dominion under God, first over himself and then over the world around him. He is *transformed (meta-morphoo)*; this is the same word which in

11. Robert Haldane: *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, vol. V, p. 556f. Evansville, Indiana: Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1956.

12. Ayn Rand: *The New Life: The Anti-Industrial Revolution*, p. 98. New York: Signet Books, 1971.

Matthew 17:2 and Mark 9:2 is translated as “transfigured.” “Luke (in 9:28) avoids this term, which might have suggested to Gentile readers the metamorphoses of heathen gods, and uses the phrase *egeneto heteron*, ‘was altered’, lit., ‘became (*ginomai*) different (*heteros*).’ ” In Romans 12:2 it means “the obligation. . . to undergo a complete change which, under the power of God, will find expression in character and conduct; *morphe* lays stress on the inward change.”¹³

The transformation begun in man is then developed in terms of the whole life of man, his family, vocation, society, state, and all things else. He now has a life-purpose which comes from God and His word, and therefore the transformation of all things becomes a glorious hope for him in Christ. St. Paul in II Corinthians 5:17 declared, “Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.” The word *new* here is *Kainos*, which does not mean new in time, but “new as to form or quality, of different nature from what is contrasted as old.”¹⁴ *Neos* is new in the sense of being just born, or recent. *Kainos*, as in John 13:34, “A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another,” means a very ancient law but one which is new and fresh in its meaning, coming anew to the hearer. Thus, the creation we are born again into by the grace of God in Christ is God’s original creation, which we were once dead to, but are now made alive to by grace. It is a “new creation” (II Cor. 5:17) in terms of its quality and form, in that it is close to the hand of God and ever energized by His power. Thus, instead of a world of masochistic self-atonement and self-frustration, the believer moves in a world in which all things work together for good in God (Rom. 8:28), and in which everything, whether enmities, troubles, or death itself, further his fulfilment and bring him closer to the fulness of the new creation. In brief,

13. W. E. Vine: *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, vol. IV, p. 148, Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1940, 1960.

14. Vine, *op cit.*, III, 109.

man is transformed, and, under God, he transforms the world.

When St. John in Revelation 21:1 speaks of “a new heaven and a new earth,” the word used is again *Kainos*. The new creation is as old as time itself, in that it is God’s original and constant purpose; it is the world of Christ and the transformed man come in its fulness, a world in which every experience and all life is forever fresh and new in quality. The first earth is gone; it passes away, literally, goes away. Now man is born old in time and burdened with the sin of the past. He is born new in the sense of a recent birth, but old in terms of being bound to the past of Adam’s posterity. The transformed man moves towards a new creation in which he and the world around him are forever new in quality, joy, and fulfilment.

The old man cannot cope with crisis, and history is one crisis after another. The unregenerate man either seeks escape from crisis by delaying or appeasing actions, or resorts to a futile documentation of evil, hoping to save himself by his knowledge of evil. The transformed man, transformed by God, transforms his world and resolves the crisis.

Adoption

When in April of 1970, Billy Graham held a revival campaign in Germany, the Hamburg church monthly *Viewpoint* carried both *pro* and *con* articles on Graham. The critical article made a distinction between Luther's doctrine of justification by faith and Graham's use of the same doctrine.

If you only want to have the change of heart, so Graham teaches, according to Bernd Diebner, you can have it, and everything is well between God and you . . . And he continues: 'Luther's "by grace alone" means more to me than Graham's "by free decision of the will alone." ' 'Graham', so he maintains, 'just does not know how much separates him from Martin Luther.'¹

This criticism points up an important fact. If God is the universal father of all mankind, and all men are natural sons of God, men have a natural relationship with God which cannot be entirely severed or broken. They can always choose to return home when it suits them, because God is by definition the ever-loving, ever-waiting father. Their return then is, in Graham's terms, an act of faith that there is something better at home which, by free decision of the will, they choose to return to. Such a theology can have a modernist or a fundamentalist version, but, in either case, it is a denial of the sovereign predestinating God and an affirmation that man's free will is ultimate. It holds that man's supposedly sovereign free will can open or bar the door to God, that Christ cannot enter into man's heart unless man lets Him in. In such a theology, the doctrine of adoption can have little or no place.

1. Marten H. Woudstra, "The Protestant Church in Germany as I Saw It," in *The Banner of Truth*, issues 94-95, p. 53; reprinted from *Torch and Trumpet*, October, 1970.

Chapter XII of the Westminster Confession is on
“Adoption”:

All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his only Son Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption, by which they are taken into the number, and enjoy the liberties and privileges of the children of God; have his name put upon them; receive the Spirit of adoption; have access to the throne of grace with boldness; are enabled to cry Abba, Father; are pitied, protected, provided for, and chastened by him as by a father; yet never cast off, but sealed to the day of redemption, and inherit the promises, as heirs of everlasting salvation.

Like justification, adoption is an objective fact, a change in the status of man effected by God’s sovereign grace. According to Webb,

Justification is that act of grace whereby we sinful subjects of God’s government are received into the number of, and given a right and title to, all the privileges of the kingdom of God. Adoption is that act of grace, whereby we fallen sinners are received into the number of, and are given all the rights and privileges of, the sons of God. The one terminates upon the servile relation; the other terminates upon the filial relation. The one restores citizenship; the other, to sonship.

In the fall, the sinner not only lost the rights and the footing of a child, but he lost also the heart and the spirit of a child. That is, he lost at once his filial position and his filial nature. He now stands in need of some scheme for regaining both — his filial status and his filial spirit. Regeneration is that act of saving grace which, at least incipiently, reimparts to him his lost filial disposition, while adoption is that act of grace which restores to him his filial standing. By the one, he is given the heart of a child, by the other, he is given the rights of a child. Both are unspeakably important — to have sonship as a law right and prerogative on the one hand, and to have an appropriate filial disposition to correspond to the legal status.

So, while adoption coincides with justification at one point and with regeneration at another, because the scheme of grace, however analyzed in thought, is in strict reality one and indivisible, it is eminently helpful in the

comprehension of the scheme of salvation to treat adoption as a separate article of the Christian faith.²

The *theological* aspects of the doctrine are very important, but they are not our concern here, except that they undergird the *psychological* implications.

Adoption means that our relationship to God is not only on a law basis, the need for obedience, but also on a family basis, a personal and loving one. The two go together. The more authority and obedience there is in a loving family, the greater the love as well as the obedience and the authority. Virtues feed on one another and grow the stronger for it. Whereas loneliness and alienation mark the humanist, the believer, by his adoption has an immediate relationship with God, and a relationship with other believers in Christ. The desolating loneliness of humanism which seeks by noise and clowning to drown the flood of isolation gives way in Christ to a new creation. In this new creation, St. Paul declared, "all things are yours, . . . all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I Cor. 3:21-23).

This means heirship. To be an heir in Christ is to be a blessed possessor of all things in time and in eternity. It means the realization that this earth was created as man's area of dominion under God and is to be restored to that dominion by joint-heirship in Christ. It means an eternal destiny which is beyond the imagination of man and yet is the calling of his whole being and the destiny of his every moment. Our lives are then tied to more than ourselves.

For humanistic man, this sense of life and purpose, transcending the individual while fulfilling him, is an alien thing which is dimly pursued in endless humanitarian activities and never realized in any true sense. It is the baffling quality which the humanist notes in the peasants of old Europe and cannot understand.

An observer at the Second Balkan War in 1913 reported

2. Robert Alexandrer Webb: *The Reformed Doctrine of Adoption*, p. 21f. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947.

the death of a peasant soldier at the gate of the Monastery of St. Joaquin:

His story was soon told. He was a Bulgarian soldier struck by a Turkish bullet near the spine and paralysed. Some peasants had found him in a field, and filled with pity had brought him to where he lay, so that, at least, he should not die alone.

Peasants are always kind, those that had done this charitable deed were of no special race, although their lives were hard they had not lost their human sympathies, even in time of war.

A woman brought a pillow for his head, a monk knelt at his other side repeating words that solace dying men.

And then he spoke. The voice, though weak, rang clear; in a hushed silence, it gave the final message of a man whose earthly course was run.

Neither the woman nor the priest had touched the peasant's heart. His thoughts were far away, but not with wife or children, nor did the welfare of his soul trouble his dying moments. He had a farm in the Maritza valley, not far from Phillippolis, there he had spent his life, and lavished all his love and care. To him that strip of land was very dear, and, dying, he remembered it, to give some last instructions for the next autumn sowing.³

For this peasant, the land was his calling under God and, like his family before and after him, he belonged to the land even as the land belonged to him. There was thus, even in his death, that lack of self-consciousness which has also characterized many Christian martyrs.

St. Paul spoke of adoption and heirship in Romans 8:14-17:

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:

And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs

3. Brigadier-General Christopher Birdwood Thomson: *Old Europe's Suicide*, p. 70. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1920.

with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be glorified together.

St. Paul here calls believers “the sons of God”, not children, “implying the higher and more mature, and conscious member of God’s family, see Gal. iv. 1-6.”⁴ Christ is “heir of all things” (Heb. 1:2). In Hebrew law, the first-born received a double portion.

By the Roman law, the share of the firstborn was no greater than that of the other children, — and the New Test, sets forth this view, making the redeemed equal to Christ (ver. 29), and Christ’s possession, theirs; I Cor. iii 21-23; John xvii. 22. In the joint heirship we must not bring out this point, that Christ is *the rightful* Heir, who shares His inheritance with the other children of God; it is as adoptive children that they get the inheritance, and Christ is so far only the means of it, as He gives them power to become sons of God, John i, 12; *if (at least). . . we are suffering with him, that we may also be glorified with Him: i.e. ‘if (provided that) we are found in that course of participation in Christ’s sufferings, whose aim and end, as that of His sufferings, is to be glorified as He was, and with Him.*”⁵

As Haldane noted, “Formerly, in their unregenerate state, those to whom Paul wrote had the spirit of slaves, now they had the spirit of sons.”⁶

It is important to examine the meaning of the spirit of bondage or slavery. The common melodramatic opinion of slavery is that it means brutal punishment and exploitation. Clearly, such things exist, especially in the slave labor camps of the Soviet Union. They have also existed in times past. Where slaves are state-owned, the state uses them ruthlessly and brutally, seeking maximum results with minimum costs. Since the state’s slaves are prisoners of war, or its own citizens whom it has sentenced to slavery, they are easily replaced. Thus, whereas the Soviet Union does not now have a supply of German prisoners of war, it does have its citizens, and the

4. Henry Alford: *New Testament for English Readers*, p. 907.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 909.

6. Robert Haldane: *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, III, 356.

slave labor camps never lack a supply of workers for the jobs at hand.

This is not the kind of slavery Paul had in mind, but rather privately owned slaves, and it was to the spirit of such slaves that he referred.

The Old Testament law referred to slavery as a voluntary servitude, where, except for captives of war and criminals making restitution, a slave was free to leave at any time. Such slaves were men seeking refuge from the world of freedom and responsibility; they preferred security to liberty, because liberty meant troubles and possible losses, whereas servitude meant cradle to grave care.

A telling illustration of such slavery comes from Essad-Bey's account of the abolition of slavery in the Caucasus after the conquest of that area by Tsarist Russia. The Russian viceroy called in the Caucasian chiefs and ordered the abolition of slavery; he was surprised at the ready cooperation he received. The resistance came from the slaves, who protested, "Slavery is our sacred right . . . Many of us are of die hereditary nobility, and some of us are priests. The Tsar should have a respect for the rights of the native nobility." A commission was appointed to investigate the matter.

The material which this commission assembled brought some amazing facts to light. The house slaves were indeed members of the oldest aristocratic families in the land. Centuries ago, an impoverished member of the family had sold his freedom to some prince or other, whereby the rights and duties of the new slave and his descendants were exactly prescribed. The slaves were only obliged to do the work which had been done by the first of their line. And for this they were maintained by their masters all their lives and in certain circumstance they were rewarded with presents.

In the course of time, it was the princes who became impoverished and the aristocratic slaves who increased in the most devastating fashion. It thus came about that many a slave owner had to expend his whole income in supporting the descendants of his original slave. If the first

of them had been a cook or a groom, all his descendants — and their number increased with the passage of time to dozens — could be nothing else but cooks or grooms. One slave owner with three horses had to maintain thirty grooms, who lived in his own house and demanded presents from him. Another, who was living from hand to mouth himself, had at his disposal twenty cooks, and it never occurred to a single one of them to do anything but lounge about in the kitchen. All the slaves had valid documents in their hands, which protected their position, and they regarded this attempt to free them as a brutal injustice and violation of their ancient privileges, whereas for most of the owners the riddance of their slaves meant bliss unheard of.⁷

Not all slave-owners have had such unfavorable conditions, but the mark of a true slave, the spirit of slavery, is precisely that which Essad-Bey described. The slaves of the Caucasus were some of the oldest aristocracy; today, many of the oldest aristocracy of the West, major capitalists, workers, and farmers are alike infected with the spirit of bondage or slavery, which has always a preference for security as against freedom, and the certainties of slavery as against the risks of liberty. Fear is the mark of a slave, and ultimately his fear is a fear of life and its problems and a search for the womb-like security he imagines slavery to be. The slave has the backward look, the orientation to the past, and an oblivion to the future, because he has none. True slavery is of the spirit, and it is a flight from life.

When the spirit of slavery, the fear of freedom and responsibility, characterizes a people, it is absurd to hope for relief by political action. Where people are unregenerate, they will be possessed by a spirit of slavery, and they will create a slave society, call it socialism, communism, a welfare economy, fascism, naziism, or what you will. The fallacy of political conservatives is that they put their hope in politics and thus neutralize effective action by by-passing Biblical faith.

7. Essad-Bey: *Twelve Secrets of the Caucasus*, p. 87f. New York: Viking Press, 1931. The tsar's decision was to set the slaves free but give them one year's maintenance from the state in order to prepare them for the responsibilities of freedom.

St. Paul said, “ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear” (Rom. 8:15), and the word fear is in Greek *phobos*, which in origin meant *flight*, and then that which causes flight. The fear of which St. Paul speaks is a fear or flight from God. Those whose spirit is marked by slavery are in flight from God and from their responsibility to God; they are also in flight from themselves, because the witness of God is written into the fabric of their being and in all creation. (This *fear*, *phobos*, is not the same as *eulabeia*, *fear*, meaning caution, reverence.)

The spirit of slavery which fears God and is in flight from God, life, and all reality plunges headlong into a dream world where it hopes to find escape in a universe of its own creation. In the regenerate man, however, this spirit of bondage is replaced by the Spirit of adoption which is “received”, i.e., comes as a gift of God’s grace. The adoption into sonship is by God’s grace through Jesus Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit within man. Our adoption is not yet complete, according to St. Paul, for “we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body” (Rom. 8:23). The full legal and physical fact of adoption comes with the resurrection of the body. For this fulness we have a deep psychological need and hunger.

This gives to the man of faith a God-directed, future-oriented perspective. He is a citizen of the new creation, of which Jesus Christ is the first fruit (I Cor. 15:20). “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,” or, more accurately, a new creation (II Cor. 5:17). He has an old world dying around him, and a new world coming into birth on all sides. Whatever the problems the old world confronts him with, he can always rejoice (Phil. 4:4) because he knows the certainty of the new world’s triumph. Every day men are reborn into that new creation, and every day reconstruction goes on in terms of it.

The spirit of bondage or slavery is the spirit also of sin and death, so that it is also termed “the bondage of corruption”,

from which we shall be delivered “into the glorious liberty of the children of God” (Rom. 8:21). The word translated as “corruption” can also mean destruction, so that the state of depravity is the slavery to corruption or destruction. In Romans 8:14, we are told that all who “are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.” The word *sons* is used to indicate maturity; such persons as are led by God’s Spirit are not children but rather maturing and growing persons. The word *sons* is replaced by *children* in vv. 16, 17 and 21, and *sons* used in v. 19. The difference is of interest. In the first instance, we are *children* in relationship to God, by contrast to His awesome majesty and sovereign grace; in the second, we are *children* in the sense of heirship together with *the* Son Jesus Christ, who is the only begotten Son of God and the first-fruit of the new creation; a priority and seniority gives Christ the title of son, and us of children as a contrast. The fulness of the new creation will see “the revelation of the sons of God” (v. 19) in their maturity. Third, because our “glorious liberty” in all its fulness is still future, yet present in its partial sense, we are *children* in our experience of that liberty and are so called. We shall grow and mature in our realization of that liberty.

The mind of modern humanism has been described as *the disinherited mind*, homeless like Cain, even in its home, a wanderer driven by sin and guilt, and a stranger to all things. The adopted sons of God are not disinherited; they are heirs. They are not strangers or foreigners to this world, although they are pilgrims in it; they can sing with certainty, on their pilgrimage, that “This is my Father’s world.” The hand of the disinherited is raised against all men, whereas the heir carries the good news of a rich estate to all men. The disinherited mind is at war with the estate, and he seeks to destroy it. Even when he holds possession of the world briefly, he knows he shall be dispossessed, and so he guts what he holds as a pillager and a plunderer. Only in the hands of the heirs can this world or the world to come ever flourish,

for the world to come of the disinherited is hell itself, and their self-created environment of the world they now live in is a suburb of hell. The heirs, as citizens of the new creation, make of time itself an outskirts of heaven.

The Renewing Nature

The appeal of environmentalism is that it transfers sin from the person to the world around him. As a result, it is usually easy to gain a following among troubled people by blaming their problems, not on their sins but on their environment. This is the essence of socialism in all its forms: the evil capitalists are charged with all the sins of society, and people are presented as innocent victims of this evil, plotting minority. Humanistic conservatism is no different: it holds that an evil conspiracy has misled the people and brought all the evils upon us, of ages past and of times present, in terms of a grand design of power. Clearly, evil-capitalists do exist, just as clearly, evil conspiracies exist. All the same, the responsibility for our ills rests with ourselves and our sins. This is clearly and emphatically the Biblical position. In an especially telling passage, our Lord declared that the line of division between the Pharisees and Himself was in part this fact, that the source of defilement was declared by Him to be in the heart of man. According to Matthew 15:10-20,

10. And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand:

11. Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man.

12. Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying?

13. But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.

14. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.

15. Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable.

16. And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding?

17. Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught?

18. But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man.

19. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:

20. These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.

To accept this is to declare that we are sinners, and that we sin, not because we are misled or misinformed, but because we choose wilfully to disobey God. The source of corruption or destruction in our lives and in our world is our own hearts, and only as we have a new heart in Christ Jesus do we replace that will to destruction with everlasting life.

The sinner or reprobate, however, not only insists that the root of corruption is outside himself, but he also places the blame on whatever class of people he finds himself in opposition to.

Thus, many believe in corruption from above, by kings, lords, capitalists, or a ruling class in some form. This faith can also hold that this corruption from above is a ruling race or nation, the white race, the American, German, English, French, Spanish, or Jewish peoples. These corrupters from above are held to be the source of tyranny, oppression, seduction, robbery, and theft.

On the other hand, others believe that corruption is from below, from workers, slaves, maids, and men-servants. These people, with lower standards, are held to be the persistent destroyers of peoples and cultures, being concerned only with their belly and pleasures.

Clearly, there are elements of half-truth on both sides. Anyone who looks for sin in man is bound to succeed! Capitalists have often mistreated and robbed good employees, but employees have just as often robbed and abused good

employers. Many a maid or slave-girl in history has been seduced or raped by a master or owner, and it would be needless to document this fact. But, equally true, many a maid and slave-girl has worked earnestly to seduce a master or a master's son, so that the disappearance of slavery and the decline of household servants eliminated a common source of corruption in family life. Sin knows no class or race barriers; sin is not segregated to a particular class or race: it is native to the heart of all fallen men, and its source is the heart of man.

The Biblical position thus is that corruption or destruction is from within. The old saying is true: "We have met the enemy, and they are us." Solomon therefore declared, "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life" (Prov. 4:23). Delitzsch's translation and comment are to the point:

Above all other things that are to be guarded, keep thy heart, For out from it life has its issues.

The Scripture names the heart . . . as the intellectual soul-centre of man, in its concrete, central unity, its dynamic activity, and its ethical determination on all sides. All the radiations of corporeal and of soul life concentrate there, and again unfold themselves from thence . . . The heart is the instrument of the thinking, willing, perceiving life of the spirit; it is the seat of knowledge of self, of the knowledge of God, of the knowledge of our relation to God, and also of the law of God impressed on our moral nature; it is the workshop of our individual spiritual and ethical form of life brought about by self-activity, — the life in its higher and in its lower sense goes out from it, and receives from it the impulse of the direction which it takes; and how earnestly, therefore, must we feel ourselves admonished, how sacredly bound to preserve the heart in purity (Ps. lxxiii. 1), so that from this spring of life may go forth not mere seeming life and a caricature of life, but a true life well-pleasing to God!

Fritsch has commented on this verse that, "After the heart

1. Franz Delitzsch: *Biblical Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon*, vol. I, p.115f. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

is right with God good conduct flows from its hidden springs (cf. Matt. 15:19).”²

The heart of man is thus the source of corruption or destruction, and, when regenerated by the grace of God through Christ, the wellspring of reconstruction. In earlier days, this principle was the source of progress in America. To illustrate this fact, let us turn to the sermon delivered on the evening of October 20, 1824, in the Tabernacle Church, Salem, by Elias Cornelius before the Salem Society for the Moral and Religious Instruction of the Poor. The Society had been organized six years earlier. Cornelius’ text was Leviticus 25:35, “And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; yes, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee.”

The time of the sermon is significant. Immigration was bringing greater numbers of people to the United States. The Salem Society was one of a great many formed to deal with the problems created by this influx.

It was ascertained that there were several hundred families of poor people in the town unconnected with any religious society, and of course unaccustomed to the proper observance of the sabbath and the duties of public worship, whose children in most cases, were growing up in ignorance and vice; and it was conceived that unless some effectual measures were taken to check the evil, the worst consequences might ensue, not only to the poor, but to the town. The experience of each succeeding year has shewn the correctness of this opinion, and induced the friends of the Society to proceed in their object with increasing energy.³

Elias Cornelius (1794-1832) was a Congregational minister who served not only as collegiate pastor at Salem, but earlier as an agent of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; he visited Creek, Cherokee, and other missions during his time of office. From 1826 to 1831, he was

2. Charles T. Fritsch, “Proverbs”, in *The Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 4, p. 811. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.

3. Elias Cornelius: *Sermon before the Salem Society for the Moral and Religious Instruction of the Poor*, p. 14f. Salem: John D. Cushing, 1824.

secretary of the American Education Society. Since Salem in the census of 1840, sixteen years later, had a population of 15,083 for “several hundred families” to be poor and delinquent in 1824 meant a real social problem.

Cornelius, by his text, made clear that it was the duty of Christians to do something, but, before doing anything, he made it clear that the nature of the problem had to be understood. It is a religious duty, he held, to relieve those in distress or need. The psalmist had declared, “Blessed is he who considereth the poor.” (Ps. 41:1), and Cornelius cited also the Proverbs, “Whoso stoppeth his ear at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, but shall not be heard” (Prov.21:13), and, “He that giveth to the poor shall not lack; but he that hideth his eyes shall have many a curse” (Prov. 28:27). Cornelius also cited I John 3:17, “But whoso hath this world’s good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?” As a result, he concluded,

In regard to the duty of relieving the poor, there can therefore be but one opinion. No man who cherishes the spirit of the Bible, or believes its precepts to be binding, can deny it. The only question which can be asked is, *How the wants of the poor can be most effectually relieved.*⁴

The concern of Cornelius and his fellow Christians was not merely to give the poor alms or a hand-out, but how best to relieve their condition. Accordingly, he declared, “The proposition I shall endeavor to establish is, *That the moral and religious improvement of the poor is the surest and best means of relieving their wants.*” Three objectives should be in mind: first, to relieve the temporal wants of the poor; second, to seek their elevation in society; and, third, their eternal happiness. These ends, he held, can only be truly furthered by promoting the “moral and religious improvement” of the poor.

First. The moral and religious improvement of the poor is the best means of relieving their temporal wants.

4. *Ibid*, p. 4.

I do not mean, that a moral and religious influence exerted upon their minds can satisfy the cravings of hunger, or cover the limbs that are shivering with the cold, or remove the distresses of sickness; but that, so far as these evils are the effect of moral causes, it is the most powerful and the only sure antidote against them. A thorough examination of the *causes* of what is called pauperism, will convince any one that in nine instances out of ten, if not in ninety-nine out of a hundred, they are traced to *vicious habits*. Not that every one who is poor and dependent on charity has come to this state by his own vices, although this is the fact in a great number of cases; but that to the full extent which has been mentioned the poor have become so either by their own vices or the vices of others. You shall go to any poor house in the land, and examine minutely into the history of every pauper whom it contains, and I am willing to hazard the assertion, that not one in ten will be found who has gone there in consequence of unavoidable misfortune. How many are there who have been reduced to poverty by idleness, by dissipation and prodigality, but especially by intemperance!⁵

Relief to the poor which does not also administer relief to the cause of poverty is futile. Certainly, material wants must be relieved, but nothing is solved, Cornelius held, unless the principal causes are dealt with.

But the principal causes of poverty, as has been shown, are *moral causes*. These are to be removed only by a *moral influence*; and that influence can be exerted in no way but by instilling into the mind moral and religious principles.⁶

In modern terminology, Cornelius held that the poor are present oriented and lower class; they can only improve their class status by means of a Biblical faith. As a result, he held that,

Secondly. The moral and religious improvement of the poor is the most direct and efficient means of elevating them in society, and giving them that influence which belongs to them as intelligent and accountable beings.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 5f.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 8f.

Vice, as we have seen, is a frequent companion of poverty. Ignorance is another. These combined produce a moral degradation which necessarily excludes those who are the subjects of it from influence, and even from respectability, in society. Now here, as under the last head, if we would elevate the poor, we must remove the *causes* of their depression. If a man has lost his reputation by becoming *vicious*, the proper way for him to regain it is, to become *virtuous*. And so if ignorance prevents him from having influence, the proper way to give him influence is, to enlighten him.⁷

Thirdly. The moral and religious improvement of the poor is the only means by which their eternal happiness can be secured.⁸

The Salem Society worked towards these ends. It helped get the children of the poor into common schools; it established six sabbath schools for over 600 children of the poor; it provided a chapel for seamen in “a convenient part of the town”, and it employed Eleazer Brainerd as a missionary pastor in the community.

Cornelius called attention to the social consequences of such Christian efforts:

For what can be plainer than, that if you remove the *causes* of poverty, you lessen the taxes which are necessary for supporting it? Accordingly it will be found, take the world through, that where there is most morality and religion, there are fewest of the evils of poverty. If any one doubts this fact, let him compare New England with the more southern parts of the United States; or Scotland with England. “I know,” says Dr. Chalmers, “a parish in Scotland, the average maintenance of whose poor is defrayed by twenty-four pounds sterling a year; and a parish of the same population in England, where the annual assessments amount to thirteen hundred pounds sterling.” And what is the cause of this difference? It may not be the only cause, but no one will deny that it is chiefly owing to the superior moral and religious culture which the Scottish peasantry have received. Similar facts might be brought from other

7. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

countries; and they speak volumes in praise of the design of the Society which solicits your patronage this evening.⁹

At the time that Cornelius lived, the United States was facing potentially revolutionary changes. The great influx of immigrants was beginning; people were pouring into the country who had little or no knowledge of its faith or heritage. They were simply seeking escape from tyranny and poverty and a better life for themselves. The country clearly needed these people to help occupy a continent before Britain, Spain, and Russia took the west. On the other hand, these peoples could also change the country beyond all recognition.

The reaction of some conservatives was political and repressive. Hostility towards foreigners led to the creation of various “native American” movements and political bodies. These organizations fed on hatred for outsiders and stimulated it by highly emotional charges and claims. More than a little violence was unleashed against various immigrant groups. These organizations not only did not accomplish their purpose but also did much damage to American life.

The orthodox Christian reaction was very different. A wide variety of societies were created to minister to the new problems: Sabbath Schools for immigrant children and Christian day schools as well were created; English was taught to adults; missions were started; orphanages, relief societies, Bible societies, societies to deal with various vices, these and hundreds of other organizations were established to cope with every kind of problem which arose. The future of America was shaped by this massive effort at Christian reconstruction. The “native American” movement failed; the Christian reconstruction was so extensive that it became the real government of American society. A few years after Cornelius’ death, Alexis de Tocqueville, in commenting on the impact of non-ecclesiastical, societal Christianity on

9. *Ibid*, p. 20f.

America, noted that authority in America was religious and that “there is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America.”¹⁰

The “Native American” movements did much harm to American life. They were noisy in their claims that they represented “real Americanism”, but they were at best a neutralizing force to progress and Christianity. At their worst, they were anti-Christian and un-American in the name of Christ and America. By claiming to be the conservative force, which they were not, for they had no appreciation for their puritan heritage, they brought discredit on that heritage.

On the other hand, orthodox Christians, by their zeal to bring every man under the renewing power of God, did more than anyone else to cope with the central problems of American life between 1800 and 1850. Timothy Dwight, (1752-1817) often pictured as a reactionary, was in this respect progressive, in that he saw the need was Christ and the reformation of all things in terms of Biblical faith. For his famous and influential sermon on “The True Means of Establishing Public Happiness, A Sermon Delivered on the 7th of July, 1795, Before the Connecticut Society of Cincinnati”, Dwight took as his text Isaiah 33:6, “And wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times.” This verse echoed the Puritan spirit, and the reason for its progressive power and vitality. Dwight declared,

Connecticut can never be distinguished for extent of territory, superior wealth, or great numbers of inhabitants. This, instead of being a misfortune, ought to be esteemed a blessing. A nobler distinction is thrown by a good providence into its hands. It may rise to pre-eminence in knowledge, virtue, and happiness. We need not grudge the dross while the gold is ours. It may be the Athens, not of a savage, idolatrous, and brutal world, but of a world enlightened, refined, and Christian. Let its citizens unite in

10. Alexis de Tocqueville: *Democracy in America*, vol. I, p. 332. New York: Langley, 1841.

well-concerted and determined efforts for this end, and it will be accomplished.¹¹

It is difficult for men today to realize how much such a goal appealed to men then and commanded their hearts and minds. "Pre-eminence in knowledge, virtue, and happiness" was in much of the country the American dream and goal. It was a Christian concern, and the key was seen in the renewing nature of the redeemed man, who, having been redeemed in Christ, works then to order all things and reconstruct all things in conformity to God's law-word and under His dominion.

A very short time after the Rev. Elias Cornelius preached before the Salem Society, Alexis de Tocqueville visited America and wrote about its urban problems. In an important footnote, he saw the grim problem of the urban slums and their alien and criminal elements, declaring:

The United States have no metropolis; but they already contain several very large cities. Philadelphia reckoned 161,000 inhabitants and New York 202,000, in the year 1830. The lower orders which inhabit these cities constitute a rubble even more formidable than the populace of European towns. They consist of freed blacks in the first place, who are condemned by the laws and by public opinion, to an hereditary state of misery and degradation. They also contain a multitude of Europeans who have been driven to the shores of the New World by their misfortunes or their misconduct; and these men inoculate the United States with all our vices, without bringing with them any of those interests which counteract their baneful influence. As inhabitants of a country where they have no civil rights, they are ready to turn all the passions which agitate the community to their own advantage; thus, within the last few months serious riots have broken out in Philadelphia and in New York. Disturbances of this kind are unknown in the rest of the country, which is nowise alarmed by them, because the population of the cities has

11. Carl Bode, Leon Howard, and Louis B. Wright, editors: *American Literature*, vol. I, *The 17th and 18th Centuries*, p. 479. New York: Pocket Books, (1966) 1971.

hitherto exercised neither power nor influence over the rural districts.

Nevertheless, I look upon the size of certain American cities, and especially on the nature of their population, as a real danger which threatens the future security of the democratic republics of the New World; and I venture to predict that they will perish from this circumstance, unless the government succeed in creating an armed force, which, while it remains under the control of the majority of the nation, will be independent of the town population, and able to repress its excesses.¹²

Unwed pregnant girls were often disposed of in Europe by buying them a one-way ticket to America, for them there to seek their ostensible level, usually prostitution. "Black sheep" sons were also sent off to the United States, or ran off to it. Tocqueville felt that the United States would surely "perish" under this invasion "unless the government succeed in creating an armed force . . . independent of the town population" and able to control it. Tocqueville was wrong, as were the "native American" reactionary groups whose answer was also force. Christian orthodoxy met the challenge by evangelization and largely won the day. It was far from a total victory but it was a very significant one.

One further point on Tocqueville's blindness: Timothy Dwight's famous Connecticut sermon was preached in 1795. In 1830, Tocqueville noted, "thirty-six of the members of congress were born in the little state of Connecticut." He then added,

The population of Connecticut, which constitutes only one forty-third part of that of the United States, thus furnished one eighth of the whole body of representatives. The state of Connecticut, however, only sends five delegates to congress; and the thirty-one others sit for the new western states. If these thirty-one individuals had remained in Connecticut, it is probable that instead of becoming rich landowners they would have remained humble labourers, that they would have lived in obscurity without

12. Alexis de Tocqueville: *Democracy in America*, vol I, p. 316f. New York: Langley, 1841.

being able to rise into public life, and that, far from becoming useful members of the legislature, they might have been unruly citizens.¹³

But it was not immigration that made the difference. The possibility of becoming “unruly citizens” was far greater in the newer states. The people of Connecticut carried with them in their migrations a faith and character which gave them eminence.

13. *Ibid*, I, 321.

Time

In a poem which very early expressed the existential spirit, Trumbull Stickney (1874-1904) declared:

Live blindly and upon the hour. The Lord,
Who was the Future, died full long ago.
Knowledge which is the Past is folly. Go,

.....
... Give thyself to the lovely hours,
Drinking their lips

.....
Thou art divine, thou livest.¹

Stickney's point was a very simple one. Since God is supposedly dead, then knowledge is folly, and the future died with God. Man is now his own god, and he has only the present hour as a certainty. Man should therefore seek passionately whatever he desires and gratify himself "blindly" without any thought of the future.

If man has no future but only a fleeting present, then whatever he wants requires instant gratification. There can be no waiting, nor any patience. Instant gratification means *revolution*. Not surprisingly, criminals in the 20th century have come to be regarded by some as revolutionary heroes.² Some of this is exploitation of criminals and their cause by revolutionists, but the exploitation is possible because there is a ready sympathy for criminals among many peoples. The criminal lives usually in terms of instant gratification, and he thus appeals to the people who share this temperament. There is thus sympathy for and a kinship with criminals on

1. Cail Withers, editor: *The Penguin Book of Sonnets*, p. 225. New York; Penguin Books, 1943.

2. See George Schuyler, "Krazy Kats", in *The Review of the News*, vol. 7, no. 39, September 29, 1971, pp. 23-32.

the part of existential humanists.

A society demanding instant gratification is a society which denies the necessity *of growth*. Growth means development, readiness, and maturity. It means that a child cannot expect the privileges of maturity but must grow into them. It means that a mature person recognizes that many goals require years of work, and that many if not virtually all social objectives cannot be realized in a man's lifetime. The mature person lives and builds for himself and for yet unborn generations. Instead of living "blindly and upon the hour", he builds today on a past inheritance towards a future goal.

The goal of Stickney's fellow humanists is a *graveyard society*, whether they admit it or not. Marx wanted a communist society in which a man could realize himself in every area immediately.³ In Marx's dream society, a man could do as he pleased all day, and with competence in every area. His dream world is a static society, an unchanging communist utopia. A changing society involves a developing order, not a final one. In a developing society, instant gratification is not possible, because all things have not been brought to a final, gratifying state of perfection to enable man to have instant paradise at every turn. Marx was more naive and more open than most humanists, who also dream of the unchanging instant gratification society, but are less honest about confessing it.

Engels in *Anti-Duhring* held a position similar to Marx: he predicted that communism would render all experts and specialists unnecessary. As Clark quite rightly asked, "I wonder who will perform brain surgery?"⁴ Like Marx, Engels believed in an unchanging society in which potentiality and actuality are one.

An unchanging society in time, is, however, a graveyard

3. Karl Marx: *The German Ideology*, p. 44-45. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1965. See Gary North: *Marx's Religion of Revolution*, (Nutley, New Jersey: Craig Press, 1968).

4. Gordon H. Clark: *Historiography, Secular and Religious*, p. 86. Nutley, New Jersey: The Craig Press, 1971.

society, because life in time means growth, development, experience, and a future. For this reason, the new creation is described by the word *kainos*, not *neos*; it is ever new in quality and in opportunity while not new in time. It is thus very much unlike the stagnant society of Marx and Stickney. Those who, after Stickney, try to “live blindly and upon the hour”, soon find the hour palling, and suicide attractive.

According to Mumford, the desire to escape from time was basic to the appeal of the “New World” to humanistic man after the fifteenth century. It was “an attempt to escape time and the cumulative effects of time (tradition and history) by changing it for unoccupied space.”⁵ Men sought to escape from their problems and history by imagining that the “new world” would allow man to become a new man. It was to be a return to Eden, and the Indians were sometimes portrayed as unfallen Adamites. However, the “new world” quickly became an area where the old man revealed himself in all his sin, and only in the areas where Christ’s new men, the Puritans, established themselves, did the “new world” truly become new.

Today there is no less a desire for the old man to escape his old world of guilt, sin and death. Philosophically, existentialism is his means of attempting an escape. He tries to “live blindly and upon the hour” as a way of avoiding God and the future, and he substitutes change for growth as an alternative to responsibility. Physically, man tries to escape from time by exploring space. Mumford has noted that, “To justify space travel, its exponents must brazenly vilify earthly life.”⁶ Much has been made, in both the popular press as well as in scientific reports, of Einstein’s theorizing that a man could take a space journey lasting centuries and return to earth only slightly older. Popular imagination and science fiction have played with the idea as a means of escaping time.

To escape from time means to humanistic man to escape

5. Lewis Mumford: *The Myth of the Machine, The Pentagon of Power*, p. 13f. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich: 1970.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 310.

from history and judgment: it means evading the consequences of sin and a day of reckoning. It means also eluding death and avoiding aging. For many people, the landing on the moon meant, psychologically: we have done this, and now nothing is impossible for man. Arthur Clarke has said, "The dullards may remain on placid Earth, and real genius will flourish only in space — the realm of the machine, not of flesh and blood." Mumford sees space exploration as Satanic, declaring,

The actual genius that will "flourish only in space, in the realm of the machine", is the genius of entropy and anti-life. With space exploration, the traditional enemy of God and man has already re-appeared, in post-Faustian form. And as of old, if one is willing to sell one's soul to him, he offers his ancient bribe — unlimited power of control, control absolute, not only over all other kingdoms and principalities, but over life itself.

In ancient paganism, and in some areas still, humanistic man sought to govern time by means of rites whose purpose was to control time and nature. In fertility and chaos cults, men believed that they could make nature fruitful again, wipe out past history and sins, reverse time and order, and regenerate themselves, nature, and history. Pagan man had a poor sense of time, because time was something his acts and rites supposedly rendered meaningless. Some scholars speak of pagan man's view as "sacred time", and every year as a "year of salvation". This is true in a sense other than Gerardus Van Der Leeuw and Mircea Eliade intend it. Pagan man, in effect his own god, fructifier of nature, and self-atoner, made time sacred by his acts. Nature and its cycles were holy, and man, as the high point of nature, was the lord and priest of the holy; it was a power for him to manipulate and use, with caution, but still his to use.

For this reason, Paul at Athens proved offensive to the pagan philosophers. He declared, among other things, that God "hath determined the times before appointed" (Acts

7. *Ibid.*, p. 311.

17:26), and that “he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he raised him from the dead” (Acts 17:31). Time thus was not in man’s power but an aspect of the creation of an absolute God. Time thus moved in terms of God’s purpose and plan and brought all men to His sovereign judgment seat. This to the philosophers was not acceptable.

The pagan calendar had a nature-cycle; the festivals and events which governed the calendar were natural events, the equinox, the solstice, the death of vegetation, the birth of vegetation, and so on. The government of time was thus within time, from nature and man. The Christian calendar was the antithesis of all this: every year is “the year of our Lord”; time and the universe are His creation. Time and the cosmos are thus governed from before and beyond time and history. Not only are they absolutely controlled from all eternity, but God Himself enters history from the beginning by His revelation and His prophets, and supremely in Jesus Christ, so that history moves, not in terms of *nature-dates* but *historical-dates*. The old calendar celebrated nature and rites of nature; the new calendar celebrates God’s year and the works of men under God.

According to St. Paul, men having been redeemed, are required then to redeem time:

Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time. (Col. 4:5).

See that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, Redeeming the time, because the days are evil. (Eph. 5:15, 16).

The word used for *time* is *Kairos* in both cases; it means, according to Vine, “a season, a time, a period possessed of certain characteristics . . . *Chronos* marks quantity, *Kairos*, quality.”⁸ *Chronos*, time, means duration; *Kairos* means a particular kind of time, a season or era of some quality or meaning. “Redeming” (exagorazo) means to buy up,

8. Vine: *Expository Dictionary of N. T. Words*, III, 332f.

in Ephesians 5:16 and Colossians 4:5, “buying up the opportunity.”⁹ Way’s paraphrase of Ephesians 5:16 is of interest: “Grasp at each opportunity (like merchants who eagerly buy up a scarce commodity); for ‘the evil days’ are on us.” Alford commented, on the latter part of this verse, “let it (the opportunity) not pass by, but as merchants carefully looking out for vantages, make it your own’ *because the days* (of your time, — in which you live) *are evil*.”¹⁰

On the one hand, *the days*, times present, are evil; on the other hand, these days must be eagerly redeemed as a season of great value and meaning. The contrast is a dramatic one. Instead of flight from evil days, there is an eager purchase or redemption of them as a time or season of great profit and advantage under God. Now, instead of the days being mere duration, they are a thing of quality to be eagerly purchased. Way’s version grasps the sense of the text: the godly man is like a capable merchant who sees and eagerly buys a scarce commodity, in this case *time*. Time thus is neither a burden nor a nature cycle but a potential wealth, a pearl of great price whose value is concealed from the ungodly.

Time is thus a valuable and scarce commodity; it is a wealth and an opportunity. It is also a *promise*, for all time points ahead to the Lord of time, and the quality of all time is eternity and God’s glorious kingdom. The promises of time are implicit in every moment, and they undergird every hour with their hints and glimpses of fulfilment.

For this reason, because the godly man’s concern is to redeem the time, Christians, and especially Puritans, have been highly conscious of time and the clock. As a valuable commodity, time cannot be wasted. This horror of wasting time is alien to those outside the world of Biblical faith. Consciousness of time is for the ungodly a consciousness of decay and death, and drunkenness and a sick gaiety are sought as escapes from that awareness.

9. *Ibid*, III, 263.

10. Henry Alford: *The N. T. for English Readers*, p. 1241.

Humanists have ridiculed the “Puritan work-ethic” and its supposed slavery to the clock, because humanists are in unhappy conflict with time; they want to arrest time by means of a graveyard society, and to abolish death, because it is a bitter reminder that time passes, and the cessation of this hated and fleeting duration is death.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy has called attention to the modern secular version of time, (which has, we can add, become duration, not a season of opportunity. Moreover, it is either a play-duration, or a work-duration. As a work-duration, it is seen as bondage).

The new solar calendar trains man to think of the future not as something new, but as something that can be calculated in advance. Future, in this world of economy and technique, is the prolongation of the past. If former civilizations had dared to think of the future as an annex to what we know about the past, a special grammatical form for the future would probably never have been invented. Real future, in its proper meaning, implies a change in quality, a surprise and a promise. To live in the future means to be indifferent to present hardships . . .

. . . The frame work of an industrialized world leaves the cog in the machine in the precincts or antechamber of real life, in a pre-arranged world without a future. The question arises: where is he going to find his future?¹¹

Rosenstock-Huessy shares the humanist’s fear of the machine and work, as well as of organized time. He is however, right in seeing the modern calendar and its philosophy as a desire to have a future which prolongs the past, *provided* that man can create that past and therefore create the future. The goal is a static society which is wholly man’s creation. Time is a problem, an enemy to be captured and chained.

The Biblical view is different. The Bible, as Henry has noted, “Instead of viewing time abstractly as a problem, it regards time as a created sphere in which God’s redemptive

11. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: *The Multiformity of Man*, pp. 20, 22. Norwich, Vt.: Beachhead, (1936), 1949.

plan is actualized.”¹² For the believer, time is God’s appointed area for man’s opportunity and fulfilment. Time is man’s surest wealth, and, when, after the Flood, the length of man’s life was drastically curtailed in a few generations, it was both a punishment and an impoverishment of man. When God promises to restore length of time to man’s life as the earth is restored to God’s rule under man, it is very clearly seen as a great endowment of man and his new creation (Isaiah 65:20).

The psychology of fallen man is thus again markedly different from the mind of the redeemed man. Their differing views of time clearly mark their basic differences.

12. Carl F. H. Henry, “Time”, in Everett F. Harrison, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Carl F. H. Henry, editors: *Baker’s Dictionary of Theology*, p. 523. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960.

McPhaul, in his account of the gang lords of Chicago in the 1920s, paints an ugly picture of studied lawlessness, murder, and contempt of law and order.¹ An important aspect of the power of these gang lords was their ability to buy justice: they could walk in and out of court knowing that the judge was their henchman, and the good citizen was bound to be a loser against them. The courts had become instruments of oppression in too many cases. Instead of being a terror to evildoers as God requires (Rom. 13:3), the courts then were, and too often are today, a terror to the godly.

A court should be a friend to the friends of law; it should protect the godly against all evil and strictly judge all criminals brought before it. Where such a court exists, a people can live in reasonable security. If, in addition to this, the judge is a personal friend who, when we are involved in any infraction of the law, intercedes for us and administers us a private rebuke or discipline and a public defense, our security and peace of mind is certainly greater!

A similar situation, perhaps a far more favorable situation, is our's in Christ before the court of Almighty God. St. John describes the privilege clearly in I John 1:8-2:3:

8. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

9. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

10. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.

1. Jack McPhaul: *Johnny Torrio, First of the Gang Lords*, New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1970.

2:1 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.

2. And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins* of the whole world

3. And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments.

This is a remarkable passage, in that, very clearly, Jesus Christ is declared to be our Advocate, not merely when we are righteous, but when we sin, John Bunyan wrote a telling book on the significance of this text, declaring,

When a man's cause is good, it will sufficiently plead for itself, yea, and for its matter too; especially when it is made appear so to be before a just and righteous Judge. Here, therefore, needs no advocate; the Judge himself will pronounce him righteous . . . But if it was to plead good causes for which Christ is appointed Advocate, then the apostle should have written thus: If any man be righteous, we have an Advocate with the Father. Indeed, I never heard but one in all my life preach from this text, and he, when he came to handle the cause for which he was to plead, pretended it must be good, and, therefore, said to the people, 'See that your cause be good, else Christ will not undertake it.' But when I heard it, 'Lord, (thought I,) 'if this be true, what shall I do, and what will become of all this people; yes, and of this preacher too?' Besides, I saw that by the text the apostle supposeth another cause, a cause bad, exceeding bad, if sin can make it so. And this was one cause why I undertook this work.²

With this in mind, let us examine St. John's statement. St. John begins, in 1:8, by condemning as heresy the idea that the believer is made sinless by Christ's redemption: if we claim sinlessness, we are self-deceived, "and the truth is not in us." In 1:9, according to Ross, a further fact is set forth: "The existence of sin is a patent fact, but it does not make fellowship with God impossible."³ In fact, St. John declares

2. John Bunyan: *Israel's Hope Encouraged: The Work of Jesus Christ as an Advocate Explained: The Acceptable Sacrifice: and The Water of Life*, p. 23. Swengel, Pa.: Reiner Publications, 1968.

3. Alexander Ross: *The Epistles of James and John*, p. 146. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.

in 1:10, our communion with God is non-existent if we claim to be sinless, because “we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.” Thus, the very ground of our fellowship involves the fact that we *know* ourselves to be sinners who stand before God only by the atoning work of Jesus Christ. It is thus the confession of our sins which makes God “faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (1:9). It is only when we stand before God as sinners saved by grace that we stand at all.

We are to avoid sin, John makes clear, but, when we sin, “we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (2:1). “Our Advocate does not plead our innocence; He acknowledges our guilt and presents His vicarious sacrifice as the ground of our acquittal.” (2:2).⁴ We know that He is our Advocate, “if we keep his commandments” (2:3). “*Keeping* the commandments means being vigilant and watchful to discover them and to observe them strictly — such is the force of the word.”⁵ We are thus on the side of the law, but we are sinners still.

It is necessary to understand what St. John means when he speaks of sin. In 3:4, he writes, “Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.” The word translated as transgression is *anomia*, without law. The man who continually practices sin is lawless, without law: he cannot be a Christian. The Christian can be guilty, not of continual sin, or lawlessness, but of sins, particular breaches of a law he seeks more and more to obey.

In his sinning, the Christian has an attorney for the defense, Jesus Christ as *Advocate*. The word translated as *Advocate* is *parakletos*, which we have in English as the Paraclete. It is also translated in John 14:16, 26; 15:26; and 16:7 as “the Comforter.”

Parakletos. lit., called to one’s side, i.e., to one’s aid . . . and suggests the capability or adaptability for giving aid. It was used in a court of justice to denote a legal assistant,

4. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 154.

counsel for the defense, an advocate, as in I John 2:1, of the Lord Jesus. In the widest sense, it signifies a succourer, comforter. Christ was this to His disciples, by the implication of His word “another Comforter,” when speaking of the Holy Spirit.⁶

Christ is our *propitiation*, *hilasmos*, expiation, “a means whereby sin is covered and remitted.” Vine noted,

It is used in the N.T. of Christ Himself as “the propitiation”, in I John 2:2 and 4:10, signifying that He Himself, through the expiatory sacrifice of His Death, is the Personal means by whom God shows mercy to the sinner who believes on Christ as the One thus provided. In the former passage He is described as “the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world.” The italicised addition in the A.V., “*the sins of*”, gives a wrong interpretation. What is indicated is that provision is made for the whole world, so that no one is, by Divine predetermination, excluded from the scope of God’s mercy; the efficacy of the propitiation, however, is made actual for those who believe.⁷

Vine sought to make the passage rule out predestination, a blasphemous attempt, since Scripture so plainly affirms it. Calvin’s comment is sound here and a corrective to Vine: “the design of John was no other than to make the benefit common to the whole church. Then under the word *all* or whole, he does not include the reprobate, but designates those who should believe as well as those who were then scattered through various parts of the world. For then is really made evident, as it is meet, the grace of Christ, when it is declared to be the only true salvation of the world.”⁸

The effect of this doctrine on the godly man is very great. In his righteousness, he is blessed by God the Father; in his sin, he has an Advocate with the Father. His favorable standing with the court is *predetermined*. The result is not a freedom *to* sin but a progressive freedom *from* sin. His Advocate has made propitiation for his sins; He is the regenerating

6. W. E. Vine; *Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words*, I, 208.

7. *Ibid*, III, 224f.

8. John Calvin: *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles*, p. 173. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

power in the sinner's heart and his defense against all enemies.

Because the believer, the redeemed man in Christ, has a *predetermined release*, he has a concomitant *freedom*, and, by God's renewing grace, a concomitant *power*. His forgiveness carries with it a freedom and power to do God's will, and, as a result, the redeemed man goes out of court with power to conquer his enemies. The man who enters a human court to plead guilty comes out under sentence and in bondage, and rightly so. The man, however, who goes into God's court to plead guilty, and does so, as a member of Jesus Christ, has an Advocate who secures his release and sends him out to conquer the world in His name.

The Christian man is the only free man. The Christian man alone can undertake and sustain a true reconstruction of society, because he alone has both the freedom and the power to accomplish that task.

Because the Christian man recognizes himself as a sinner before God, he alone can fulfill the ancient commandment of the humanists to "Know thyself." He can cope with crime, because he knows the roots of it in himself, and he knows its cause. As Ewing has written of crime,

The first and primary cause is *spiritual*. It is the expression of wrong *heart* conditions (Matt. 15:16-20). Nothing short of a radical change of heart wrought by the *Spirit of Christ Jesus* in the persons involved will meet this need. But we are told it is not the province of the state to deal with morals. But we shall find out before we solve this problem that this is a most fundamental issue. When we get ready to *equate crime and sin as the same* and deal with this matter as sin and not just sickness we'll solve the problem.

The Christian man can see the relationships of things, because he is not blinded by sin. Because he has an omnipotent Advocate, he is a free man, and a powerful man.

9. Curtis Clair Ewing: *Views and News*, October, 1971, p. 1. Pasadena, California.

Man's Highest Good

There was a time when the *Summum Bonum*, the supreme good, was not only the highest and ultimate goal of human conduct but also the major concern of ethical theory by philosophers. The formal consideration of the *Summum Bonum* has disappeared; the practical concern is more intense than ever, except that it is now a political and sociological rather than a philosophical concern. The Marxist and Fabian Socialist versions of the *Summum Bonum* have largely displaced the Scholastic and Calvinistic concepts.

Hausheer's comment on the *Summum Bonum* makes clear the problem from the standpoint of modern philosophy:

A term applied to an ultimate end of human conduct the worth of which is intrinsically and substantively good. It is some end that is not subordinate to anything else. Happiness, pleasure, virtue, self-realization, power, obedience to the voice of duty, to conscience, to the will of God, good will, perfection have been claimed as ultimate aims of human conduct in the history of ethical theory. Those who interpret all ethical problems in terms of a conception of good they hold to be highest ignore all complexities of conduct, focus attention wholly upon goals towards which deeds are directed, restrict their study by constructing every good in one single pattern, center all goodness in one model and thus reduce all other types of good to their model.¹

What Hausheer is in effect saying is that, since he does not believe in the sovereign God, there is therefore no possible focus or center of life; the universe is for him a blindly

1. Herman Hausheer, "Summum Bonum," in Dagobert D. Runes, editor: *Dictionary of Philosophy*, p. 306. 15th edition, revised. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960.

evolving and rather miscellaneous collection of things. Since things have no coherence, they can have no focus, and to speak therefore of a supreme good is to be both arbitrary as well as to ignore all other aspects of reality. Logically, in fact, Hausheer can only speak of a relative good, never of an absolute, good, nor of a pattern or purpose to life. The answer thus must be sought elsewhere.

At the beginning of his *Confessions*, St. Augustine declared of God, "Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee." Clearly, for Augustine God and God alone is man's highest good. Previously, in pagan thought, man's supreme good had been seen in humanistic terms. Usually, the supreme good was a statist social order, which was assumed to be the incarnation or manifestation of justice. The individual and his will was also seen as the highest good. The history of the ancient world is the wreckage of these faiths. With Biblical faith, a new and different concept of the supreme good dominated life and philosophy. Bavinck has described the problem of man's highest good very aptly:

The conclusion, therefore, is that of Augustine, who said that the heart of man was created for God and that it cannot find rest unless it rests in his Father's heart. Hence all men are really seeking after God, as Augustine also declared, but they do not all seek Him in the right way, nor at the right place. They seek Him down below, and He is up above. They seek Him on the earth, and He is in the heaven. They seek Him afar, and He is nearby. They seek Him in money, in property, in fame, in power, and in passion; and He is to be found in the high and the holy places, and with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit (Isa. 57:15). But they do seek Him if haply they might feel after Him and find Him (Acts 17:27). They seek Him and at the same time they flee Him. They have no interest in a knowledge of His ways, and yet they cannot do without Him. They feel themselves attracted to God and at the same time repelled by Him.

In this, as Pascal so profoundly pointed out, consists the greatness and the miserableness of man. He longs for

truth and is false by nature. He yearns for rest and throws himself from one diversion upon another. He pants for a permanent and eternal bliss and seizes on the pleasures of a moment. He seeks for God and loses himself in the creature. He is a born son of the house and he feeds on husks of the swine in a strange land. He forsakes the fountain of living waters and hews out broken cisterns that can hold no water (Jer. 2:13). He is as a hungry man who dreams that he is eating, and when he awakes finds that his soul is empty; and he is like a thirsty man who dreams that he is drinking, and when he awakes finds that he is faint and that his soul has appetite (Isa. 29:8).²

Before going further, let us note that some would say that Bavinck's statement is beautiful in language and poor in fact, for to what extent can it be said to apply to the modern man, or to tribal men in backward cultures? These men seem to give no evidence of a burning need to know God. Clearly, they are not interested in the living God, but their lives nonetheless are given over to the service of a god, a false god. *Portnoy's Complaint* is an example of a sickly mysticism of sex, in which the female genital organs are like a magnet draining the man with an insatiable urge. The urge is not physical sex, nor is it physiological; it is a mystical, religious urge which only intensifies itself because it can never be satisfied.³ The result is mania and radical discontent. The same moral sickness marks "primitive" cultures, which are really decadent ones. Masters has said that "The North American Indians, for example, who are for some reason supposed by the ignorant to have been paragons of manliness and repositories of all stoic virtues, were notorious sexual exploiters of children, using very young children, boys or girls indifferently, for their pleasures."⁴ In my own experience among Indians, I saw that the Indians, a people of

2. Herman Bayinck: *Our Reasonable Faith*, p. 22f. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

3. Philip Roth, "Civilization and Its Discontents," in *New American Review*, no. 3, p. 23f. New York: New American Library, 1968; a major portion of the subsequently published novel.

4. R.E.L. Masters: *Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality*, p. 321f. New York: Lancer Books, 1962.

mental abilities and calibre, usually were, unless Christian, so radically absorbed with sex at all ages that it was a detriment, together with liquor, to effective action as individuals. This absorption increased with age and was not physiological but rather religious.

Behind this absorption lies a deeper problem than sex: it is the apostate religious dream of man to be as god, to be his own god, determining good and evil for himself. The more man's science gives him power, the more his sexual immorality gives him sexual "freedom", and the more his revolt from God leaves him "free" to follow the imagination of his heart, the more insatiable he becomes. Gratification increases insatiability.

William Blake, in one of the engravings in *For the Sexes: The Gates of Paradise* (1793, 1818), depicts a man with a ladder reaching to the moon and himself on the first step upward. The title is "I Want! I Want!" The title is significant: with a ladder against the moon, the wish being realized, the cry is not, "I have!" but "I Want!" There is no rest in gratification: yesterday's paradise is today's hell, because, man rejecting God is still content with nothing less than God. The humanist, having made man his god, then plots the murder of man as a step towards a better man-god.

In the broader aspects, therefore, Bavinck is right, but God as the highest good needs more precise definition. By defining this *summum bonum* as the vision of God, Scholasticism paved the way for mysticism and a non-historical quest for God in private experience. The Westminster Catechism is right in declaring that man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever. In concrete terms, what does this mean?

The answer is in Scripture, but it cannot be found by trying to find an ethics of the Bible apart from the triune God of the Bible. More directly, the ethics of Jesus cannot be separated from the person of Jesus when we try to define the highest good, for then we would have an abstract and

non-theistic good which finally has no way of being defined as good. Man, moreover, cannot be the judge of what is his highest good, because, as Van Til has pointed out, “even in its original perfect condition the moral consciousness of man was derivative and not the ultimate source of information as to what is good.”⁵ This is all the more true of man in his fallen estate:

Now this doctrine of the total depravity of man makes it perfectly plain that the moral consciousness of man as he is today cannot be the source of information about what is good or about what is the standard of the good or about what is the true nature of the will which is to strive for the good. It would surely seem plain enough that men have to choose on this point between the Christian and the non-Christian position.

It is this point particularly that makes it necessary for the Christian to maintain without any apology and without any concession that it is Scripture, and Scripture only, in the light of which all moral questions must be answered. Scripture as an external revelation became necessary because of the sin of man. No man living can even put the moral question as he ought to put it, or ask the moral questions as he ought to ask them, unless he does so in the light of Scripture. Man cannot of himself truly face the moral question, let alone answer it.⁶

The regenerated consciousness submits itself to the word of God and tests all things in terms of the moral verdict of Scripture. In thus considering man’s highest good, we must declare, Van Til points out, that “God himself is naturally the end of all of man’s activity. Man’s whole personality was to be a manifestation and revelation on a finite scale of the personality of God.” Moreover,

When we use the common expression that the world, and man especially, was created to glorify God, it is necessary to make a distinction between the religious and the ethical meaning of these words. In a most general way we

5. Cornelius Van Til: *Christian Theistic Ethics*, p. 18. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1947. A greatly expanded edition published in 1971 by the den Dulk Foundation: p. 21.

6. *Ibid*, p. 19; in the 1971 edition, p. 22f.

may say that God is man's *summum bonum*. Man must seek God's glory in every act that he does. Yet there is a difference of emphasis between seeking the glory of God religiously and seeking it ethically. To seek the glory of God ethically is to seek it indirectly. This distinction, however, needs explanation and qualification. In explanation we want to make clear that we do not mean the distinction to be taken strictly and absolutely. There is a sense in which all of man's activities glorify God indirectly only. Man's activities fall in the temporal sphere. God alone is eternal. This means that, strictly speaking, God's glory cannot be increased. No temporal being can add anything to the eternal being. In this sense, then, all activity of man can only indirectly glorify God. The glorification of God on the part of man must always take place in the temporal sphere. And it is this fact that should be kept in mind when the distinction is frequently made that religion is directed toward God, while ethics is directed toward man. This is only relatively true. In one sense all of man's activity is directed toward God. Man's ethics is not only founded upon a religious fact but is *itself religious*. Though we do not mean it in the way that modernism means it, it is true that in seeking the welfare of our fellow men we seek the glory of God.

For this reason, too, we cannot make an absolute distinction between the religious attitude and the moral attitude on the part of man. It is sometimes said that in the case of religion we have *adoration* of God, while in the case of ethics we have *obedience* to God. This is only relatively true. We need obedience in our adoration, and if we are truly obedient, we adore God.

The Kingdom of God is man's highest good. "By the term kingdom of God we mean the realized program of God for man."⁸ This means that "man should *realize himself as God's vicegerent in history*."⁹ To do this, man must become spontaneous in his reaction to God's purpose, and self-determined in his obedience to God's determination or plan for man. This program of God, which is man's highest good, in-

7. *Ibid.*, p. 41, den Dulk 1971 edition; p. 35, 1947 edition.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 44, 1971 edition; p. 37, 1947 edition.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 44, 1971 ed.; p. 38, 1947 ed.

cludes not only the saving of individual souls but also the subjection of all things to Christ and His absolute and comprehensive ethical standard of perfection, while realizing that this perfection is only attained with His second coming. This requirement to realize God's plan involves the redemption of men, the conquest of all institutions, and all spheres of life, the destruction of evil, and, at all times, to live in terms of a lively hope in Christ and His triumph.¹⁰

Grace was given to man to re-establish him in obedience to God's law, which is the ordained way whereby man's highest good can be realized. To cite Van Til's excellent analysis again,

As both the Old and the New Testaments teach that the *summum bonum* cannot be reached except by the complete destruction of all evil, so both give us a standard in which not one bit of evil is tolerated, but evil must be completely destroyed. No other system of ethics ever demands the complete destruction of evil. Finally, as both teach the *summum bonum* cannot be fully reached till some time in the future, so both give us a standard that none can fulfill in the present, that can be and is fulfilled in the present in a substitutionary way alone, but that will be fulfilled by us in the future. No other system of ethics promises the fulfillment of their ideals in the future, as none of them come from above, so none of them look above.¹¹

Augustine, as we have noted, declared, in terms of Scripture, "Thou has formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee." When man deflects his being from its ordained purpose, and when man seeks his highest good apart from God and His word, he not only enters into a world of insatiable hunger, anxiety, and chronic discontent, but, instead of destroying evil, he increases it. The philosophical quest for man's supreme good has been abandoned by humanistic philosophies and adopted by humanistic politics, science, and sociology. The result is the

10. *Ibid.*, p. 122ff., 1971 ed.; p. 103ff., 1947 ed.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 151, 1971 ed.; p. 127f. 1947 ed.

growing evil of the modern scientific socialist state; its goal is life, and its end is death. By seeking its supreme good apart from God, humanism ends with no good at all, only despair and death.

Biblical faith does not despise the lesser forms of the good. It is a serious error to read Matthew 6:24-31 as in any sense a condemnation of food, clothing, shelter, planning, or any other material goal. Rather, the promise is that, if we seek *first* or essentially the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, “*all* these things shall be added unto you” (Matt. 6:31). These lesser aspects of the good can only be truly realized as the supreme good is sought. The Kingdom of God and its law-order will give us that stable society in which our tomorrows are made stable by the certainties of a godly law order. Instead of fretting about tomorrow, we take care of today’s problems and evils under God’s law. That same law assures us that our labors are not in vain in the Lord, and that food, clothing, and shelter, in a godly society, come readily to those who work and who exercise providence. Thus, to establish God’s Kingdom in our midst is to assure ourselves of the lesser goods, and of a society in which every man dwells safely under his vine arbor and under his fig tree.

Hope

Every culture represents a hope, or a loss of hope. Man in society organizes himself in terms of an expectation concerning life and the future, and, as long as the hope survives, the culture is alive and growing. Civilizations crumble when men lose hope. The stagnation of Asia prior to its invasion by Western thought was due to the loss of hope. Philosophy and religion in Asia, in one culture after another, had lost hope and had succumbed to a world and life negation in its faith. The result was cultural decline and decay, and sometimes collapse, and the same symptoms are again apparent, this time in the humanistic societies of the Western world.

Hope (elpis) is an important word and doctrine in the New Testament. It means “a favorable and confident expectation.” Hope means, *first*, “the happy anticipation of good,” as in Titus 1:1, 2, wherein St. Paul declares,

Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God’s elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness;

In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.

Before all creation, God’s purpose included our eternal life, so that our confident expectation rests on an eternal purpose which preceeded our creation. We can thus joyfully look forward to the good God has purposed for us in confidence and faith.

Second, hope means “the ground upon which hope is based,” as in Colossians 1:27, “Christ in you, the hope of glory.” Christ, the new man and the new life within us, is also the ground on which our hope is based. Our hope is thus as sure as that ground.

Third, hope also describes “the object upon which the hope is fixed,” as in I Timothy 1:1, “Jesus Christ, which is our hope.” This usage is similar to that of Psalm 65:5, wherein David speaks of the “God of our salvation; who are the confidence (or hope, as in Coverdale’s trans.) of all the ends of the earth.”¹ *Hope* for the Christian means all the promises of God concerning life in this world and in the world to come.

When St. Paul spoke of the three central graces or gifts of God to the believer, faith, hope, and love, he thus declared that hope is not a human virtue in the believer but a gift of God (I Cor. 13). In the Old Testament, *hope* is often rendered as *confidence* or *trust*. The New Testament speaks of hope as “an anchor of the soul” (Heb. 6:19), giving it stability in a changing world. “The blessings it seeks are not limited to the future life, but include all that is promised to faith in the present life.”²

The gospels have less to say on hope than any other part of Scripture, because Christ’s very presence concentrated so much attention on the present, on Christ Himself as “the Hope of Israel itself.”³

As noted earlier, civilizations begin to crumble when men lose hope. Rudyard Kipling, a far superior man than many who disdain him, foresaw the collapse of humanism. In his old age, in 1919, he described tellingly the coming collapse of humanism, its loss of hope, and its devastation by its own follies and by God’s judgment:

As it will be in the future, it was at the birth of Man —
There are only four things certain since Social Progress
began: —
That the Dog returns to his Vomit and the Sow returns
to her Mire,
And the burnt Fool’s bandaged finger goes wabbling back
to the Fire;

1. Vine, II, 232f.

2. J. S. Banks, “Hope,” in James Hastings, editor: *A Dictionary of the Bible*, II, p. 413. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1919.

3. Charles T. P. Grierson, “Hope,” in James Hastings, editor: *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, I, p. 747. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1917.

And that after this is accomplished, and the brave new world begins
When all men are paid for existing and no man must pay for his sins,
As surely as Water will wet us, as surely as Fire will burn,
The Gods of the Copybook Headings with terror and slaughter return!

Humanism having been built on a false hope is inescapably doomed to disaster today as always in the past.

Hope is not only man in the present affirming a conviction about the future, it is also the future acting on the present. Lukacs has commented on this tellingly;

We have to recognize the existential causality of human life, the relationships of human causes and human effects which are different from the mechanical relationships of causes and effects that have been monopolizing the concept of causality for at least three hundred years now. Their categorical presumption has been that a cause must always precede its effect, and that the same causes must necessarily produce the same effects, a presumption which Freud himself was incapable of transcending. Yet for human beings the very process of thinking on the conscious and also on the subconscious level, complicates, disturbs and transforms the relationship of causes and effects, whereby this relationship becomes far more complex than the primitive mechanical relationship of causes and effects in the outside world. Moreover, in human life the cause of something may not always lie in the past but in a vision of the future . . . This kind of purpose/cause exists in the future, not in the past. In any event, it resides within us, within our organism, of which our mind is an integral, and not a separable, part. The kind of science that is incapable of thinking in other categories than in those of mechanical (and therefore predictable and calculable) causes and effects, that has eliminated the notion of purpose from the world, has not much more to tell us; indeed, it is the principal agent of the destruction of nature and of man.⁴

The fact that, during the past century or two socialists have believed that the future means socialism has been a case

4. John Lukacs: *The Passing of the Modern Age*, p. 143f. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

of the future determining the present. The momentum of socialism has been its offer of hope; its growing crisis and coming collapse rests in the fact that it is a false hope.

When post-millennial thinking has governed Christendom and the church, the result has been the progressive conquest of all things for Christ: a hope concerning the future became the cause of that future.

In a far more valid sense, we must therefore say that God's plan for the future is the cause of past, present, and future, because with God potentiality and actuality are one. All He has purposed from all eternity He does, and the beginning and the end are predestined and are woven together as a perfect and seamless garment.

The Christian hope thus is the entrance into and the confirmation of the believer in the sovereign plan of the future by the omnipotent God. St. Paul describes this confirmation in Romans 5:

1. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:
2. By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.
3. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience;
4. And patience, experience; and experience, hope:
5. And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.

Justification means peace with God and opens up to us a world of grace and hope; it teaches us, moreover, to glory in tribulations, "not in tribulations considered in themselves, but in their effects."⁵ In terms of Romans 8:28, we know that *all* things work together for our good in Christ. "Tribulation worketh patience", and patience "is a habit of endurance and Christian patience implies submission to the will of God."⁶ The result of patience is "experience", or, in the Greek, *dokime*, meaning the process of proving, or testing.

5. Robert Haldane: *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, II, p. 188.

6. *Ibid*, II, p. 189.

The meaning here is *proof*, the testing and proving of faith. This testing and proving produces hope, a hope that does not disappoint us but rather makes us bold in the face of all things, confident in the conquering power and triumph of Christ and His Kingdom.

The English word *hope* conveys in its origin something of the Biblical sense also. It comes from the Old English *hopian*, the late Old Norse *hop*, and is related to the English *hop*, so that hope means “a leaping, or to leap, with expectation.”⁷ To hope therefore is to make a leap of faith with respect to the future. Only the Christian, with God’s infallible word as His guide and assurance concerning that future, can make a valid leap of faith. His is indeed a hope that “maketh not ashamed.”

To be without God is to make a false leap concerning the future and thus finally to be robbed of any hope. St. Paul spoke of this aspect of the life of unbelievers, declaring “That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12). To be without God is finally to be without a valid hope and to be aliens and strangers from God’s covenantal promises. Civilizations crumble when men lose hope, even though men may, as today, enjoy marked material advantages in the present. This is not surprising. Important as material advantages are, by themselves they cannot satisfy man’s hunger for a hope that matches the purposes of God in creating man. As our Lord declared, “It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (Matt. 4:4). Man needs bread, but, even more, he needs the *every word* of God, for it alone is the word of certainty, and the word of hope.

7. Walshe, in Eric Partridge: *Origins, A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, p. 295. New York: Macmillan, 1959.

Peace

In a world in which war and hatred are chronic, men have much to say about their longing for love and peace. It is questionable, however, that they truly want love or peace, because their actions make for war. Winston Churchill, in the last volume of his memoirs of World War II, wrote a motto for that history: "How the Great Democracies Triumphed, and so Were Able to Resume the Follies Which Had so Nearly Cost Them Their Life." When men's actions are guaranteed to insure war and hatred, we are entitled to question their professions of love and peace.

It is important for us to understand the meaning of *peace*, since it is so widely professed as a social objective and so little practiced as a way of life. The English word *peace* comes from the Latin, *pax*, peace, which is akin to *pacere*, to make an agreement, and *pangere*, to fasten; an agreement or unity of some kind is clearly implied. Such a unity must be more than a mere tying together of people, because then every unhappy marriage would qualify as a *peace*, and a tyrant's rule over another people would also be *peace*. Peace thus requires a mutual assent and content in the unity.

The New Testament word for peace is *eirene*. As Vine has pointed out,

It describes (a) harmonious relationships between men, Matt. 10:34; Rom. 14:19; (b) between nations, Luke 14:32; Acts 12:20; Rev. 6:4; (c) friendliness, Acts 15:33; I Cor. 16:11; Heb. 11:31; (d) freedom from molestation, Luke 11:21; 19:43; Acts 9:31 (R.V. 'peace' A.V., 'rest'); 16:36; (e) order, in the State, (f) the harmonised relationships between God and man, accomplished through the gospel, Acts 10:36; Eph. 2:17; (g) the sense of rest and

contentment consequent thereon, Matt. 10:13; Mark 5:34; Luke 1:79; 2:29; John 14:27; Rom. 1:7; 3:17; 8:6; in certain passages this idea is not distinguishable from the last, Rom. 5:1.¹

Peace is inescapably a religious concept, because the agreement, unity, harmony, and contentment which are aspects of peace rest on a principled achievement. Those who have gained peace are ready to give eloquent testimonials to the faith (and its practitioner) who gave them peace. Some will thus witness to “How I Found Peace Through Christ”, and others, on how psychoanalysis gave them peace.² If the principles and faith which govern and structure a peace are fallacious, the peace that ensues is doomed to collapse and disillusionment.

Peace is more than a transitory state of mind. Narcotics and liquor can give a seeming peace briefly, and more unrest thereafter. Peace means, as the Old Testament word *shalom* indicates, a state of wholeness. In its full meaning, peace is both individual and communal, and it is an aspect of the covenant, and the salvation, righteousness, and blessing of the covenant.³ Peace is used in the New Testament, as opposed to strife; it means serenity of mind, and, above all, “the restoration of right relationships between God and man.”⁴

St. Paul uses peace in this sense when he speaks of the fact that, “being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:1). Because Christ has made atonement for our sins, we have now a right relationship with God. This right relationship means restoration into our intended status in Eden, to be God’s people and to exercise dominion under Him, to obey His law-word in our everyday affairs and to live in all things by God’s “every

1. W. E. Vine: *Expository Dictionary of N. T. Words*, III, 169f.

2. See Lucy Freeman, editor: *Celebrities on The Couch, Personal Adventures in Psychoanalysis*, Los Angeles: Ravenna Books, n.d., c. 1970.

3. See E. M. Good, “Peace in the O.T.,” in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. III, pp. 704-706.

4. C. L. Mitton, “Peace in the N.T.” in *ibid.*, III, 706.

word” (Matt. 4:4). *Peace* in the New Testament rests on the Old Testament meaning of wholeness, “prosperity, well-being, good of any kind.” This is its primary meaning. Christ restores us into that relationship with God which brings us into communion with Him who blesses us with wholeness and prosperity. Peace in this sense is declared by both Testaments to be characteristic of the Messianic times, for God’s covenant is a covenant of peace (Isa. 54:10, Ezek. 34:25f, 37:26). The Messiah is Himself the Prince of Peace (Isa. 9:6f., Mic. 5:5, Zech. 6:13). It is a time also of joy: “For ye shall go out with joy, and shall be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands” (Isa. 55:12). It is a time of universal knowledge of God: “And all thy children shall be taught of the LORD; and great shall be the peace of thy children” (Isa. 54:13). Peace shall be worldwide and centered in the true Zion or City of God: “For thus saith the LORD, Behold I will extend peace to her (Jerusalem) like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowering stream” (Isa. 66:12).

From the time of Christ’s birth, this same vision of peace is stressed. God has sent His son “To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace” (Luke 1:79; cf. 2:14, 19:38, Acts 10:36, etc.).

Peace is thus first of all a restored communion with God, a present possession, and then a growing material and spiritual well-being and prosperity which encompasses the world. Peace “is the direct result of the redemption of Christ (Eph. 2:17), and consists primarily in a state of conscious reconciliation with God (Rom. 5:1), though often used in a broader sense to denote all the blessings which accompany and flow from that reconciliation.”⁵

Some of the basic aspects of peace are thus, *first*, reconciliation with God the Father through the atonement of Jesus

5. W. Adams Brown, “Peace”, In Hastings: *Dictionary of the Bible III*, p. 733.

Christ. *Second*, this peace with God enables us to be at peace with ourselves. Instead of being at war with ourselves through sado-masochistic hostilities, we are at peace. *Third*, Christ and His law-word are the principles of our peace with men. This means, *fourth*, that Christian reconstruction is a basic aspect of peace. To re-establish Christian churches and schools, states, homes, institutions, sciences, and callings on the law-word of God is a necessary task of the peace-maker. It is the blessed or joyful peace-makers who are called the children of God (Matt. 5:9), because they are those who do the will of their Father in heaven.

Fifth, it must be emphatically stated that peace, in its Biblical sense, does not in any sense mean compromise. Compromise is a form of surrender; the word *compromise* is not to be found in Scripture. Peace rather is akin to power and is an aspect of the manifestation of God's power unto salvation and victory. Frederick Douglass once observed that "Power concedes nothing."⁶ Least of all does the sovereign and omnipotent God concede anything: His peace is on His terms and is grounded on His righteousness and grace. For us to imagine "peace" as compromise to be acceptable to Him is to imagine a vain thing. For men and nations to expect peace on any other ground than God's salvation and our obedience to His law is to ask for judgment, not peace.

The kinship of peace with power appears in the old concepts of the peace of God, and the citizen's peace. The peace of God prevailed where godly men were able to enforce the concept of the immunity of unarmed churchmen and husbandmen from attack by warring feudal factions. This peace prevailed where faith was sufficiently strong to enforce it morally (Related to this was the Truce of God, which limited the days of warfare.) The subject's peace meant his immunity on his land from the contention of others. The King's Peace meant that the protection and sanctity of the King's house and servants was extended to all peaceable subjects,

⁶ Shirley Chisholm: *Unbought and Unbossed*, p. 59. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

so that peace and justice were the common property of all. The King's Peace functioned admirably when the King's power was great, not otherwise. Power and peace are coordinate, not separate. The pacifist fallacy which sees the hope for peace in a renunciation of power is an implicit denial of peace.

Peace is thus more than an emotional state. It is also not to be confused with silence. The Greek has a word for peace as silence, *sigao*, to hold one's peace, and it is used only in that sense in the New Testament. Peace, *eirene*, is very different; it is not silence, nor is it merely an emotional state. When Christ spoke of peace at the Last Supper, it was after He promised the coming of the Comforter or Advocate. Then, He declared, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid" (John 14:27). In commanding His people to be neither troubled nor afraid, our Lord was not advocating "positive thinking" or psychological self-help. He was assuring them of peace in a troubled world precisely because "all power" was His (Matt. 28:18). As a result, His people have the assurance of peace, because Christ absolutely rules and reigns over all things. As He declared, "These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33). Christ's peace is thus grounded in Christ's victory. His is the only true King's Peace, which covers all His household with His protection and justice. All who strike against us strike against Him, and His justice shall overtake them. If we do not renounce Him, He will not renounce us. As members of Christ's household, we are under the King's Peace and must appeal to Him for justice against all disturbers of the peace. If we fail to sue for His peace in our prayers, we have not placed ourselves under the King's Peace.

St. Paul, in Romans 5:1-3, associates peace with the fact

of tribulation, as does our Lord in John 16:33. We have peace in tribulation, not because we find refuge in a flight from the reality of troubles and griefs, but because we have, in the midst of the worst trials and persecutions, the assurance of the certainty of Christ's power and victory, and the redress of every wrong.

Patience and Experience

In Romans 8:24, 25, St. Paul brings out clearly both the meaning of hope and patience when he declares:

24. For we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

25. But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.

Very simply stated, what this means is that, where we have a confident expectation of something, that hope or confidence gives us the patience to wait for it. Thus, even as patience is associated with hope, so by implication the loss of hope means impatience. When we have no hope, both waiting and tribulations become meaningless to us, and we cannot then patiently endure them.

Patience, in the Greek *hupomone*, means literally an abiding under (*hupo*, under; *meno*, to abide). It can be passive, in the sense of endurance in trials (Luke 21:19, cp. Matt. 24:13), or active, in the sense of persistent and persevering action (Rom. 2:7; Luke 8:15, Heb. 12:1).

Patience is thus not stoicism; it is not blind submission to meaningless events. Biblical patience is thus radically different from the hopeless submission to a meaningless universe which marks the religions of the far east. It is also different from the stoicism of Roman society, again marked by a hopelessness and a despair of life. Biblical patience is inseparable from hope; it means a waiting with confidence, that the future holds a great reward and an assured fulfilment.

Twice in Revelation we are reminded of this fact that patience is inseparable from victory and justice:

He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword.

Here is the patience and the faith of the saints. (Rev. 13:10)

And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand,

The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb:

And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day or night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.

Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus (Rev. 14:9-12)

Very explicitly, we are told that those who have patience are those who “keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” This patience means that they believe God’s law and rest assured that its judgment will fully overwhelm all evil-doers. Patience thus has, *first*, a confidence that, this world being totally God’s creation, will see God’s victory and the vindication of His people. *Second*, patience means also the certainty that God’s total judgment will be meted out to all offenders, who “shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God.”

The psychology of Biblical patience is thus radically different from pagan patience. The counsel given by a pastor to someone in trouble that we can only be “patient” until life is ended, or we are raptured out of this evil age, is thus false, in that it counsels a defeatist view of history, and a stoical view of patience. The comment of another pastor to a bereaved person, that we too will soon be dead and freed from this sinful world, and that we should wait with patience for the release of death, is again not a Biblical counsel. The view of godly patience with respect to death is that, *first*, before the end of the world, man’s life span will be greatly prolonged, and his life richly blessed (Isa. 65:20-25), and, *second*, that, with the end, “the last enemy”, death, shall

itself be destroyed, which means that, before then, other enemies shall have been extensively destroyed.

Whenever stoical patience is preached as though it were godly patience, great harm is done to the faith, and it is paganized. The psychology of stoicism is not the psychology of godly patience, but, almost without exception, it is stoicism, or paganism, that is preached as a godly virtue. As a result, in the name of Christ people practice a pagan virtue which denies the Biblical faith in victory, which is another word for salvation.

What, some may ask, is the virtue in preaching to someone dying of cancer that patience with respect to death means both a long life span before the end of the world, and the overthrow of death itself finally, with Christ's second advent? A soldier dying in a battle which is important to him will welcome the news of impending victory for his side. Even more, he will welcome the fact of eternal life for himself immediately. Patience, whether during a brief period of dying pain or over long years, means confidence in victory. To deny this is to deny the faith and affirm stoicism, which cannot comfort or strengthen but only deaden man.

Experience (dokime) or experiment means the process of proving, or proof itself. St. Paul thus in Romans 5:1-4 declares that faith, peace, tribulation, and patience develop proof. Arthur S. Way rendered it as "tested strength", and James Moffatt as "character". For them the implication is that it is man's faith that is proven. Dean Alford rendered it, after the Authorized Version Revised, as "approval (of our faith and trust, 2 Cor. ii. 9; ix. 13: not, 'proof', as some; nor 'experience', as A.V.)."¹ In II Corinthians 9:13, the King James Version renders the word as *experiment*; in Philippians 2:22, it is translated as *proof*; in II Corinthians 8:2, it is *trial*. In every instance, it is man and man's faith that is proven. *Thus, it is not man who tests God but God who tests and proves man.* The man who is tested by God

1. Henry Alford: *The N.T. for English Readers*, p. 878.

develops a progressively stronger hope, a greater confidence in moving into the future under God.

The humanistic concept of experience, experiment, or proof is to subject God and His law to the test, and to regard all things as an open question. A scientific experiment conducted by faith in God's law order and within the bounds of moral law is a godly experiment, but one which in fact denies God and His moral law (in the pretense that all things are an open question) is a sin and a high-handed offense against God. Thus, experiments in abortion, in electrodes in the human brain, and in sexual response represent a deliberate contempt of moral order.

The same is true of "investigations" and "reporting" which consider "experience" of an anti-biblical nature as a necessity for arriving at the "truth". To cite an example, Kate Coleman, formerly with *Newsweek* and then a free-lance writer, published a "study" of prostitution for *Ramparts Magazine* which was simply a report on conversations with various prostitutes. The opinions and comments of these women was important in her eyes for any decision about "the truth" of the matter. The attitude of the whores was even more humanistic: they urged her to try "turning a trick" in order "to gain first-hand knowledge of the subject." (*For a Christian, first-hand knowledge means God's knowledge, since God, as the creator of all things, is the first-hand source of knowledge on all things. For a humanist, as his own god, his own experience is the source of first-hand knowledge.*) Kate Coleman finally decided in favor of the experiment, but she chose a "superior" and pleasing customer, a photographer in his thirties, who, according to his statement, "had frequented Clare's (whorehouse) for years as a means of being faithful to his wife." With this carefully selected young man, "urbane and marked with modish good looks . . . a charmer, in fact," she found what she described as "stunning pleasure." On leaving the bedroom, a paunchy, unpleasant man demanded her services next:

The other hookers urged me to go with him, but I was adamant. The whole idea of going to bed again with anyone save my John was at that moment most repulsive. And this man was flaccid, gross and wore an American flag pin in his lapel — a complete turn-off.

One of the hookers chided me, “But you see, that’s the point: your research is unreal . . . you do not have the right to refuse. You don’t have that kind of freedom of choice.” Had I any vestigial doubts, she had dispelled them. The full implications were clear. I took my \$25 from Clare; red-faced I bolted for the door. Hi-ho the phony hooker. The following day I somehow managed to blow the money on a huge and ridiculous plant² with furry leaves for an apartment I did not even live in.

Clearly, as Kate Coleman’s account reveals, the idea of *experience*, of test or proof, has undergone some very radical developments. A philosophical definition of experience will help us to understand this change:

Experience: (Lat. *Experientia*, from *experiri*: to test). The condition or state of subjectivity or awareness. (The term differs from Consciousness by emphasizing the temporal or passing character of affective undergoing. Usage, however, is not uniform, since its definition involves a theoretical standpoint. Thus Bradley identified it with Consciousness, while W. James used it to mean neutral phenomenon, a That or Given³, without implications of either subjectivity or objectivity.)

What this means is that experience has been detached from God and an objective norm and become completely an inner aspect of man’s life. As such, it has taken on a god-like character and become a world and existence unto itself. The test or proof which remains is thus purely a personal one. The text thus of modern art is not an objective norm but the purely personal feeling of the artist and the purely personal and separate response of the viewer; there need be no common factor in the two experiences. Thus, whether in Kate Coleman or in modern science and art, experience or experi-

2. Kate Coleman, “Carnal Knowledge: A Portrait of Four Hookers,” *intern-parts*, vol. 10, no. 6, December, 1971, p. 28.

3. Wilbur Long, in D. D. Runes: *Dictionary of Philosophy*, p. 103.

ment today means moral and intellectual anarchy.

What *purpose* remains in experience serves to promote such anarchy. Thus, the modern novel, film, and television fare has as its purpose on the one hand to give us the Kate Coleman kind of experience vicariously, and, on the other, to stimulate us to like experimentation in every realm of life.

We are often told, whether it is with respect to the use of drugs, or a variety of immoral and degenerate practices, "Don't knock it if you haven't tried it." The only valid test of knowledge is held to be experience. This attitude is a logical product of modern humanistic education.

Godly experience is radically different. First-hand knowledge is to view all things in terms of the triune God and His infallible word. God being the maker of all things in heaven and on earth, nothing can be truly known or proven apart from Him. "For with thee is the fountain of life: in thy light shall we see light" (Ps. 36:9). The most direct experience of all things is thus under God. For a man to seek a direct experience of anything apart from God is both to deny God and finally to deny the object he seeks to experience. When philosophy, after Descartes, sought a direct knowledge of the world of sense objects by means of experience, it ended in Hume by denying not only God but the world around us. All that remained then was the mind of man, which Kant converted into a new universe, comprehending all things within itself, as the logical step in philosophy. One of the results was existentialism, modern art and science, and the Kate Colemans of the world, but few are as honest as she is. The only thing proven by humanistic experience is that an individual exists, nothing more, and even that is a frail and tenuous proof. The world is reduced into nothing and then pulled into the mind of isolated man. The destiny of isolated humanistic man is to feel, but without meaning or purpose, and to exist, but without reason. The more humanistic man isolates himself from God, the lower the moral level on which he seeks existence and feeling. The only objective factor in

his inner experience is that he is now testing within himself the very real boundaries of hell.

The experience of the godly man is his testing and proving by God, whereby he is strengthened and prepared for that fulfilment which his growing hope is a promise of. God tests and proves man, and produces in him a lively hope that “maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us” (Rom. 5:5). Those whom God proves, He delights in.

Conscience

The idea of conscience is a very familiar one in Western civilization, so much so that we are inclined to forget that it is a Biblical concept and not, as we know it, an idea common to men in general. For the Greeks and Romans, *conscience* and *consciousness* meant essentially the same thing, a joint knowledge held in common with other men of one's culture because of one's intellectual awareness. It was a development of Christian culture that distinguished *consciousness* as an intellectual, psychological fact, and *conscience* as a moral or ethical fact. For Plato, the distinction was between "rational" and "irrational" conduct, and conscience or consciousness was essentially Reason. As Hyslop pointed out,

It was the general character of Christianity that gave rise to the new conception of conscience, and this was because it created a new morality. The Greek never got away from the secular view of things. Whatever his talk about the Divine, he associated it with the aesthetic and political view of the world: his ethical interests were confined to the present life and its joys.

After Scripture, the church fathers saw the moral function of conscience, and they saw it as an aspect of man's psychology.

This is not to say that paganism lacked remorse over sin or failed to feel guilty. The Assyrians and Babylonians had a sense of sin, but too commonly they saw the failings of a religious man as "due to causes over which he had no control-the effects of the actions of evil spirits, or the ritual uncleanness brought about by acts of forgetfulness or by the effects

1. James H. Hyslop, "Conscience", in James Hastings, editor: *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. IV, p. 31. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, (1911) 1935.

of illness.”² Thus, *conscience* for them tended to be dissociated from a strictly personal sense of responsibility, and this was a deadly failing in their moral ideas and character.

“Egyptian thought arranged the operations of the moral conscience in separate and independent categories, whereas we make them a unity.” They lacked any one word for conscience. Their concept of conscience was social and natural, not religious in a supernatural sense. “The Egyptian idea, then, ends in something very analogous to the statement of Chinese wisdom, that the natural order of the world is bound up with its political, social, and moral order, and is even quite identical with it. Only — in spite of passages of certain texts — the Egyptians do not seem to have been able to formulate this view with the same theoretical clearness.”³

Because of humanism’s political orientation, it always has tended, apart from a Christian influence, *to identify morality with legality*. As the power and calibre of the state declined, in Greece and Rome conscience was divorced from the state and attached to Reason, a divine reason immanent in man.⁴

Since Mohammedanism is essentially in origin a political religion, the statist orientation of conscience in Islam has been pronounced. St. Paul, in Romans 2:28, 29 declared,

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:

But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

On the other hand, Mohammed declared, “he is a Muslim who is one outwardly,” i.e., one who pronounces certain formulae, practices certain rites, and obeys Islam, the statist social order. Despite certain later developments in Islam, the basic emphasis was on formalism and externals.⁵

In Biblical faith, conscience is grounded upon the fact that man is God’s creature and is in all things and at all times

2. T. G. Pinches, “Conscience (Babylonian),” in *ibid.*, IV, 33.

3. George Foucart, “Conscience (Egyptian),” in *ibid.*, IV, 34, 37.

4. W. H. S. Jones, “Conscience (Greek and Roman)” in *ibid.*, IV, 37-41.

5. D. S. Margoliouth, “Conscience (Muslim)” in *ibid.*, IV, 46f.

responsible to God. Because man is created in God's image, man is inescapably geared to God's law, for which he was created, and cannot transgress it without knowing and feeling it. The reaction of Adam and Eve, on sinning, was to hide themselves guiltily from God. Man can no more escape conscience than he can escape the fact that God created him. His conscience can be dulled as he moves into sin and death, but it cannot be silenced or destroyed. Conscience is thus an internal enemy to man in his sin. As Hamlet observed,

Thus conscience doth make cowards of us all;
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought;
And enterprises of great pith and moment,
With this regard, their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action.

Examples of such a reaction to conscience are many. In my student days, one student, later a cynical professor of philosophy, dropped out of a course on the Russian Novel, because his reading of Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* had so drastic an effect on him. His own intellectual position was so much like that of Raskolnikov that, when Raskolnikov committed murder, the student reacted with such guilt that, rounding a corner and seeing a police officer, he ducked back and hid. Then, furious with himself for reacting so, he denounced Dostoyevsky's book angrily to me and dropped the book and the course.

St. Paul repeatedly makes note of the centrality of a good conscience to a free and godly life. Thus, in writing to Timothy, St. Paul declared,

Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned . . .

Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck. I Tim. 1:5, 19.

For the redeemed man, the law has as its purpose "Charity out of a pure heart", a good conscience grounded on obedience to God's law, and an unfeigned faith, unfeigned because

it moves in obedience to God. Thus, a good conscience is joined with soundness of faith, obedience to law, and charity, and a bad conscience with an unsound or bad faith, disobedience to God's law, and an uncharitable heart. Paul further declares,

Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure; but both their mind and their conscience is defiled.

They make confession that they know God; but in their works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate. (Titus 1:15, 16, A.V.R.).

As Chrysostom observed, in commenting on the fact that, while pork was forbidden meat, it is not therefore in itself unclean:

In short, if we wish to be very nice, everything is unclean, otherwise if we please not to be nice, nothing is unclean. Yet all things are pure. God made nothing unclean, for nothing is unclean, except sin only. For that reaches to the soul, and defiles it. Other uncleanness is human prejudice.

This then is uncleanness. They are themselves unclean . . . So it is here, when the soul is unclean, it thinks all things unclean. Therefore scrupulous observances are no mark of purity, but it is the part of purity to be bold in all things. For he that is pure by nature ventures upon all things, they that are defiled, upon nothing. This we may say against Marcion. Seest thou that it is a mark of purity to be superior to all defilement, to touch nothing implies impurity. This holds even with respect to God. That He assumed flesh is a proof of purity; if through fear He had not taken it, there would have been defilement . . . MORAL. What then is unclean? Sin, malice, covetousness, wickedness.⁶

For Chrysostom, Scripture definitely ruled out any dualistic condemnation of or abhorrence for the material: As God's creation, it is pure and good. The pure in heart, the redeemed of God know that all things, in terms of their God-ordained purpose, are good and pure; evil comes

6. St. Chrysostom, "Homily III, Titus 1:12-14," in Philip Schaff, editor *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. XIII, p. 530. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

from man's heart, not from things. To the impure, all things are impure, in that all things are misused and made an instrument of sin. Their conscience and mind is defiled or polluted, so that they seek to vindicate their false religiosity, their ascription of evil to things rather than to themselves, with an evil or polluted conscience. Thus, while conscience gives no rest to the ungodly, such conscience lacks the clarity and purity of a godly conscience.

Our conscience is purified from such "dead works" by "the blood of Jesus Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot (or fault) to God" (Heb. 9:14). We then serve God with a sensitive conscience which responds to rather than resists His law-word. Christ's atonement cleanses from our hearts "an evil conscience" (Heb. 10:22). An evil conscience is one "seared with a hot iron" (I Tim. 4:2), i.e., one so branded with sin that "the conscience has been cauterized so that it has lost all sensitiveness and fails to respond."⁷ The phrase can be translated, "*Branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron*. The image is drawn from the practice of branding slaves and certain criminals on their forehead with a mark."⁸ Spence commented further:

These men tried to teach the efficacy of a substitution of certain counsels of perfection in place of a faithful loving life. They based their teaching on wild Oriental speculations about the evil nature of all matter. (Such speculations were as much Greek as Oriental — RJR.) They were often themselves evil-livers, who, conscious of their own stained, scarred lives, strove with a show of outward sanctity and hypocritical self-denial to beguile and to lead astray others, and in the end to make them as vile as themselves.

(3) *Forbidding to marry* - This strange and unnatural "counsel of perfection", St. Paul, thinking and writing in the Spirit, looked forward to as a perilous delusion which

7. R.C.H. Lenski: *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and to Philemon*, p. 621. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, (1936) 1947.

8. H.D.M. Spence, "Epistles to Timothy and Titus," in C. J. Ellicott: *Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, VIII, p. 196.

would, as time went on, grow into the impious dogma of certain of the great Gnostic schools. This teaching was probably, even in those early days, creeping into the churches. The Jewish sects of Essenes and Therapeutae had already taught that “abstinence from marriage” was meritorious. Men belonging to these sects doubtless were to be found in every populous centre where Jews congregated, and it was always in these centres of Judaism that Christianity at first found a home. St. Paul, however, saw no reason to dwell on this point at any length; the gross absurdity of such a “counsel” as a rule of life was too apparent; it was a plain contradiction of the order of Divine Providence. But the next question, which presented itself in the teaching of these false ascetics, as we shall see, required more careful handling.

And commanding to abstain from meats. — Once more we must look to those famous Jewish religious communities of Egypt (the Essenes and Therapeutae), the precursors of the great monastic systems of Christianity, as the home whence these perverted ascetic tendencies issued. These precepts too, like the counsel respecting marriage, were adopted in after years by several of the principal Gnostic sects; and it was especially those times St. Paul looked on to, although, no doubt, the seeds of their false asceticism had already been sown broadcast in the principal Christian congregations.

It is important to note that, when St. Paul speaks here and elsewhere of an evil conscience, he associates it also with a religious conscience, although an ungodly one. Man’s conscience is geared to God; it requires justification, and, if it will not find it in Christ, then it will seek it elsewhere. An evil conscience thus holds down the truth of God in unrighteousness, i.e., it suppresses God’s witness within it (Romans 1:18), in order to supplant that witness with its own self-justifying practices. The religious justifications it seeks only reveal more clearly the mark of the slave or criminal conscience.

In the modern era, conscience was again made a faculty of reason and in part a product of reason. Subsequently, with

9. *Ibid.*, III, 196.

the rise of sociology and anthropology, conscience became increasingly a social and emotional product. Thus, according to A. J. Bahm, conscience is

Any emotionally-toned experience in which a tendency to act is inhibited by a recognition, socially conditioned, that suffering evil consequences is likely to result from acting on the impulse to act.¹⁰

Freudianism, with its doctrine of the super-ego, re-inforced such ideas. The social framework of conscience theory had very early strengthened the statism of the modern era by tying conscience to legality. The Freudian emphasis cut this tie by making feeling more important than reason. Hegel's *Mind* was incarnating itself in the state, and, as a result, conscience was tied to the state by the Hegelians and Marxists. Marxist theory refuses to recognize any right of conscience in independence of the Marxist state, because the dictatorship of the proletariat is reason and therefore conscience incarnate. In Marxist areas, therefore, the voice of the dictatorship cannot be dissented with, for dissent is by definition treason and sin. Just as the medieval inquisitors sought to secure the condemned heretics confession of sin and heresy before his execution, for the good of his soul, so the state prosecutors of Marxist nations demand public confessions of sin from condemned traitors to the incarnation of reason and conscience, the communist state.

In the Western democracies, conscience has been tied to feeling by the non-Marxist humanists. The essence of a good conscience is to be "sinless" and to do what one feels, to "do your thing" without any restraint of religious law or inhibition. True religion is attained by this sincere surrender to impulse and feeling. Religion is seen as an existentialist reading of Eastern religions. A psychiatrist, in defending the character of existentialist youth, has said,

It is hardly surprising that youth looks eastward for

10. Archie J. Bahm, "Conscience," Dagobert D. Runes, editor: *Dictionary of Philosophy*, p. 63 15 edition, revised. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960.

salvation. Faced with the world as it is, and the evident impotence of their elders to solve its manifold problems, they find that a religion which teaches detachment from the world has its evident attractions . . .

It is better to love physically than not to love at all; and orgasm may become one step on the path towards mystical union with the divine in a way which is totally alien to Pauline asceticism. The smoking of "pot" has become a ritual uniting the young on both sides of the Atlantic.¹¹

Apart from the absurdity of talking about a religion of "detachment from the world" which calls for uninhibited and amoral sexuality, Storr's position is absurd also in speaking of "mystical union with the divine" in a faith which has no divinity but rather an ultimate nothingness.

More important, Storr puts his finger on a central impulse in the new conscience, orgasm as a "step on the path towards mystical union with the divine." When sex is burdened with this kind of expectation, it cannot fail to do other than disillusion man, and to fail him. Man's answer then is to seek even heightened sexuality as the key to this mystical experience. The literature of modern writers is full of this expectation of cosmic coition, a great, earth-shaking (after Hemingway) experience. When normal sexuality fails, the answer is sought in perversions. At this point, Germaine Greer is right in ridiculing the mystical nonsense which modern male writers have ascribed to the orgasm.¹² The women's liberation movement is in part an immoral revolt against this over-valuation of sex, but the result of women's acceptance of an independent role is usually either cynicism or pessimism. Thus, one English girl, from a prominent family, a nude model and staff member of a "men's magazine", has said,

"I am permissive, if that means acting instinctively, without reference to my establishment training. It's inevitable that we behave in this way these days, because we haven't

11. Dr. Anthony Storr, "Why go East, young man?" in *Realities*, October, 1971 no. 251, p. 30.

12. Germaine Greer: *The Female Eunuch*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

got a future, and that makes us insecure. Our generation can no longer have children because we want to; we've got to weigh up the odds of survival." She does not believe that the "alternative society" is a constructive solution — "my life is absolutely non-constructive." But personal relationships are "much more important to young people than plodding away in a little job. That is the one redeeming feature of our generation."¹³

Conscience tied to feeling leads people down the road of self-delusion and into a burning out in phrenetic experiences.

A godly conscience, informed by the word of God, leads men into a productive life and into a freedom before God. Conscience having its origin in God's creative act, can only thrive under God and His law.

13. "Body Politic," in *Penthouse*, vol. 3, no. 3, November, 1971, p. 59.

Confession

As we have seen, Mohammed declared, in contradiction to St. Paul's declaration, "He is a Jew, which is one inwardly" (Rom. 2:29), that "he is a Muslim who is one outwardly. His concept of Allah supposedly made God sovereign and ultimate, but, by defining religion as outward conformity, God was barred from the center of creation, the mind and the heart of man. Man, the king of creation, was left free to think and act as he pleased provided that outward assent to a few simple duties prescribed by the Koran was followed. Mohammed ensured the congenital stagnation of the Moslem world as far as true growth was concerned by eliminating from God's total government the mind and heart of man. The restlessness of the orthodox Christian, and especially the Puritan, with the status quo, and his continual desire to improve himself and his world, and his delight in growth, is lacking in the Moslem, who sees all outward things as fate and is content to leave things inward alone.

The inwardness of Biblical faith reveals itself, not only in the requirements of God for man's heart, but in the doctrine of *confession*. Two verbs in the New Testament are translated as *confess*, *homologeo*, to speak the same thing, to confess or agree with, and *exomologeo*, to confess forth, to acknowledge publicly, an intensive form of the other verb. The noun, *homologia*, means confession or acknowledgement of the truth. Its usage in the New Testament is both with reference to the confession of guilt, and the joyful confession of Christ and of faith. We shall return to the meaning of confession in the New Testament later.

Confession is a necessary aspect of man's psychology
and

nature. Man was created by God to be a confessing creature, to confess God in all his activities, research, study, and science. In every area, man makes a religious confession in all that he does and is. Man's life is a confession before the world of the faith and purpose which govern his heart. Man's life is also a continual confession before God and to God. Every thought and motive of man is naked and open before God. This is a joy to the godly man, in that he is never alone; the hopes and wishes he dares not reveal to men he knows God sees, understands, and either reproves or prospers. Instead of a fear of a prying God, the godly man has the assurance that, however much alone he may be among men, there is not a lonely thought in all his life as he stands before God. The perfect wisdom, understanding, mercy, and grace of God form the environment of his every thought and impulse. The godly man thus flourishes in his confession; to confess his sins to God brings him grace and renewed strength; to confess Christ before men by his godly life and witness is the motive force of his life and calling.

For the unregenerate, the God of Scripture is a prying God who must be barred from the mind of man. His resentment against such sovereign power is intense. His thoughts are his totally private property, and he will not allow to God title over a single thought. In his imagination, the sinner plays God; he peoples a universe with his fancies, executes men for every real or fancied insult or exacts ugly and humiliating vengeance on them, makes himself the center of all love, sex, and authority, and then quarrels with the real world of God because it neither bows down to him nor conforms to his imagination.

The sinner refuses to confess his sins to God and to acknowledge his guilt, and he refuses to confess Christ in his daily life and motives, but he does not thereby escape *the need for confession*. Where men refuse to make a godly confession, they will make an ungodly one. They will confess with their lives, in word, thought, and deed, their rebellion

against God, and they will confess with their mouth their sins whether in bravado or in spite of themselves.

The popularity of psychoanalysis and psychiatry rests in part in its ability to provide for confession on humanistic terms. There is less healing or recovery among patients of psychoanalysts and psychiatrists than among those who avoid treatment. "Treatment" thus is an impediment to recovery, but this does not discourage people from resorting to such practitioners. The need for a father confessor overrides practical considerations, but such confessions are without healing or grace.

Confession of sins has become a more important part of life in the twentieth century than for a few centuries past, but the confession is humanistic and thus futile; the humanistic confession is an evasion of guilt. The significance and importance of confession for humanism appears very clearly in the "group sex" circles. These groups hold to a relativistic philosophy and an emphasis on experience. Their perspective is summed up in the statement, "don't *ever* knock anything unless you've tried it."¹ The moral premise of group sex is the sharing of guilt by confession. Group sex has supplanted wife-swapping; instead of mutual private adultery, the group sex cultists practice their rites openly and in the same room; husband and wife then later confess to one another their every act and thought. This sharing is seen as moral; mutual guilt means no one can "cast the first stone." By mutual confession after mutual guilt, each feels cleansed and free supposedly.² The marital partners each play god and give mutual absolution.

The result instead of cleansing is *the burning out* St. Paul described in Romans 1:18-32. The group sex cultists move on rapidly to perversions, to homosexuality, sodomy, bestiality, incest, and whatever else their minds can devise.³ Having

1. John F. Trimble: *The Group Sex Scene*, p. 59. New York: Pinnacle Books, 1971.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 165, 173f., 176ff.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 59ff., 65, 175f., 197, etc.

forsaken God, they derive their vitality from sin, and it takes continually fresh and intensified sin to revitalize them. Their confession is indeed of sin, not as guilt but as achievement. The guilt is there, but also an exultation in having transgressed another time another moral boundary.

Because of this urge to confession, both because of guilt and because of pride, the sinner cannot avoid confessing his sin to someone. Just as the covenant man confesses his sins to God, and confesses Christ before men, so the covenant-breaker must also confess both his guilt and his faith, and the two are one: sin.

It is for this reason that the most easy and the most common form of apprehending criminals is by means of informers. The urge to confess is strong in criminals, and some have been known to “drop” their cards or identifying data at the scene of a clever theft or crime. Every man’s life is a long confession: the important fact is, what is he confessing?

Our Lord declared,

Everyone, therefore, who shall confess in me before men, I also will confess in him before my Father who is in the heavens; and whoever shall deny me before men, I also will deny him before my Father who is in the heavens. (Matt. 10:32-33, Robert Young: *Literal Translation of the Holy Bible*.)

The meaning is that, whoever confesses Christ before men in the things concerning His Kingdom and word, Christ will confess that man before God in the things pertaining to his case. Thus, the two meanings of confession are tied together. Men are to confess Christ before men in word, thought, and deed. Their lives and work must set forth Christ and His Kingdom: it is Christ whom they must represent before men. When men are faithful in confessing Christ, Christ is faithful in confessing them before God. He intercedes for them in their confession of sins, and He summons God’s prospering hand upon them for their faithful confession of Christ’s name, Kingdom, and saving power. As man sets forth the claims of

Christ before men, so Christ sets forth the cause of man before God: this is the fulness of confession.

Another aspect of confession is confession of sins to men. This is an important aspect but dangerous when over-stressed. Our confession of sins is primarily to God, because it is against God essentially that we sin. As David said, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:4). Confession of sins is sometimes a necessary aspect of restitution, but it can also be a further sin in many cases. One literal minded and malevolent woman made a great show of piety by her ready confessions. She would say, "Please forgive me, my dear, but I said something very unkind about you to Jane yesterday, and I am deeply ashamed of myself," or "My dear, I am so ashamed of myself, but I listened to Betty say some nasty things about you last night, and I kept quiet; please forgive me." What she maliciously accomplished, in the name of faith, was to slander people to their faces, repeat to them what they would never otherwise hear, and then require them to "prove" their faith and charity by forgiving her. Sin in such cases masquerades as faith. The same is often true of adulterous men who insist on telling their unsuspecting wives of past adulteries with a great show of contrition and repentance. Such confessions manifest a pseudo-piety used as a form of absolution and as a license to sin. Ann Landers, in her column, reported such a case:

Dear Ann: My husband has been unfaithful three times that I know of. His first playmate confessed by telephone. I had no idea who she was; I'd never heard of her and was shocked.

The second blow came when my husband sobbed out the details of a torrid affair after we had seen a very touching movie together.

The third woman showed up at my home and said she wanted me to know what kind of man I was married to. I nearly collapsed.

Dumb? Yes — but true. Knowing didn't help. Why did these people tell me? — Ignorant Wife.

Dear Wife: Because they needed to unload and they didn't care who was hurt.⁴

Ann Landers' comment is to the point. For the humanist, absolution and virtue are too often in the fact of confession itself, not in a change of heart and restitution. The adulterous husband felt "greatly relieved" after his confession, as though his act as a virtue cancelled out his sin. Such confession has as its goal the satisfaction of human goals, whereas godly confession is Christocentric. Man confesses his Lord before men, maintaining an open and confessing heart before Christ, who in turn confesses man before God the Father. The verb *confess*, *exomologeo*, is translated also as *praise*, or *thank*, in Luke 10:21, when our Lord declared, "I *thank* (or *praise*) thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Praise, celebration, and gratitude are basic aspects of *confession*. Men not only confess their faith and their sins, they also confess their values and rejoice in their thoughts, actions, hopes, and calling by their confession. A man confesses that which he delights in by the totality of his life, by his every word, thought, and deed.

4. Ann Landers, in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, Sunday, December 5, 1971, p. G-6.

Forgiveness

Forgiveness in Scripture is a term which has reference to a court of law, God's court. It means, *first*, the remission of the punishment due to sins, and man's deliverance from that penalty which is imposed by God in His justice; *second*, such remission rests on the vicarious and atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ. In brief, forgiveness means that the charges are dropped, because satisfaction has been rendered, or, in the case of Luke 23:34, charges are deferred for the time being.

As Vine noted,

Human forgiveness is to be strictly analogous to Divine forgiveness, e.g., Matt. 6:12. If certain conditions are fulfilled, there is no limitation to Christ's law of forgiveness, Matt. 18:21, 22. The conditions are repentance and confession, Matt. 18:15-17; Luke 17:3.¹

That there are limits to God's forgiveness appears in Matthew 12:32, and I John 5:16.

God's law makes clear that restitution is a central and necessary aspect of forgiveness, but, however necessary, it is secondary to the atoning work of Christ and His grace, i.e., Christ's restitution, so that our restitution is a consequence of grace, never a cause of it. This appears clearly in all of Scripture and is summed up in two sections of the Westminster Confession:

Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth: not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other

1. W. E. Vine: *Expository Dictionary of N. T. Words*, II, 122.

evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God (Chapt. XI, sect. I.)

Although repentance be not to be rested in, as any satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of God's free grace in Christ; yet it is of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it. (Chapt. XV, sect. III.)

The Confession uses the word *pardon* rather than *forgiveness*, but the meaning is the same. What is stressed is God's initiative in forgiveness; no act of repentance and restitution (or "satisfaction for sin"), however much of "necessity to all sinners", can be seen as the ground of God's forgiveness or pardon: that rests in "the act of God's free grace in Christ."

Forgiveness is a crying necessity for man the sinner. As a humanist, the sinner demands that other people play god, even as he in his sin plays god. A frequent problem husbands and wives face with erring partners is an endless nagging for forgiveness. The sinning spouse wants to reduce the offense to a humanistic level, with only people involved. A confession is followed by a demand for forgiveness so that the sin can be blotted out. If there is any reluctance about forgiving because of a healthy distrust of the confession, there is then a bitter resentment. One man justified another act of adultery by saying of his wife, "If serves her right. She was so stinky about forgiving me when I confessed to her."

Absolution from sin is thus reduced to a humanistic confession and forgiveness. Forgiveness is thus entirely of man and is essentially a matter of an exchange of words. It is more than a change of heart and restitution which is omitted: God is entirely left out. The demand is for cleansing, on man's terms.

In spite of all humanistic attempts at absolution, man remains guilty, in fact before God and in his own heart. The effect on man's heart is drastic. Like all things God created,

man was created good (Gen. 1:31), and it is basic to man's nature to rest only in communion with God in a state of righteousness. Man in sin is man in flight from God, in hiding from God and man. The heart of his being is then veiled and covered to prevent God and man from recognizing him for what he is. If he admits to sin, or even boasts of his sin (as Lamech did, Gen. 4:23-24), even the sin he claims as a virtue is a cover for the radical nakedness of his being. Better to reign in hell, reasoned Milton's Satan, than to serve in heaven. Better to make a virtue of sin, reasons the sinner, than admit the depravity of my heart and my inner warfare.

The result is *hypocrisy*. The sinner in his hypocrisy may mask his sins with seeming virtues he does not possess, or he may hypocritically find virtue in sin and boast himself of righteousness in this way. The existentialists have made a virtue of their sin and are loud in their self-praise. They forgive themselves and seek absolution in semantic exercises.

The only ground of religious forgiveness, of absolution, is the atoning work of Jesus Christ. (Civil forgiveness follows on restitution.) Neither the guilt nor the punishment are remitted apart from Him. For the Christian, forgiveness means a release from the power and penalty of sin. St. Paul declared,

And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. (Col. 2:13-14)

Christ by His atoning death brings us out of the death of sin and the burden of guilt. Having forgiven us all our trespasses, He then also quickens us, or makes us alive, together with Him. This forgiveness means also the "blotting out" of all our transgressions. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them" (II Cor. 5:19). Instead of guilt, forgiveness is by grace given to us, and the guilt is removed.

In Isaiah, God declares, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins" (Isa. 43:25. cf. Isa. 44:22). The fulness of forgiveness thus involves regeneration, the remission of sins, and God's promise that He will not remember them. Man's memory of sin is a burning part of his guilt. Painful experience in which no guilt or sin is involved are themselves a troubling memory and a reminder of life's uncertainties and burdens. Even more so, the memory of sin is a hidden cancer which eats away at a man's mind with its ever fresh reminder of guilt and folly. To be freed from the power and penalty of sin by Jesus Christ means not only new life in Him but a healing of the memory. This in itself is a revitalization of man, for the greatest tyranny men face is often the tyranny from within, the unrelenting whiplash of a guilty conscience and an unforgiven heart. The condemnation of the law is nailed to the cross, to Christ's cross, St. Paul declared; it is thus executed and destroyed, and the new man in us is made alive together with Christ.

Without forgiveness and regeneration, there can be nothing new in history. Man the sinner would then endlessly repeat his sin, compound his guilt, and have no escape save the hope of eternal death. Asiatic religions, recognizing this inevitable and persisting inheritance, formulated the doctrine of Karma. Man's life, his cycles of birth and death, or transmigration, *samsara*, is a product of *Karma*. A man's *Karma* is the physical causation or causality in his life; it is the unmitigated, un-forgetting, and unforgiving law of retribution working out precisely the good and evil in his life. Because evil predominates in man, good becomes little more than a form of escape from *Karma*, causality, into death and oblivion. History thus is an endless cycle of retribution with a minimal possibility of escape. The stagnation of the Orient has thus been religious. Islam has sought escape from the inner problem by Mohammed's religion of externalism: "He is a Muslim who is one outwardly." The Orient, having developed a refined inward-

ness of religion, sought escape in the doctrine of *Karma*. In both cases, stagnation has been the result, for man and society.

The energy of the West has not been racial: it has been religious. Because of the fact of forgiveness and regeneration, man has been able to break out of the bondage of his past and the burden of his guilt. Instead of being chained to his *Karma*, the causality born of Adam, man introduced a new life and a new motive force into history when he is “quickened together with” Christ. In the translation of Arthur S. Way, “And you too — for dead you lay in the charnel-house of your transgressions and the impurity of your sensual nature — you God thrilled with that same new life of Jesus.”

The new man in Christ, having forgiveness of sins, is able to introduce a new motive force in history and to regenerate society even as he has been regenerated. He can bring the word of God to bear on all problems and establish God’s law order in every realm. Not surprisingly, the word *new* is a common one in Scripture. Because God’s people shall be the renewing force of history, God declared through Isaiah, “thou shalt be called by a new name” (Isaiah 62:2), because a new nature has been given. “For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind” (Isa. 65:17). Again, St. Paul declared, “For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature (or, creation)” (Gal. 6:15). What Christ offers is “a new and living way” (Heb. 10:20). The word from the throne of heaven is, “Behold, I make all things new” (Rev. 21:5). This emphasis on *the new* is uniquely Biblical; it is not novelty or change, but a fresh, ongoing, revitalizing social energy and force, the power of God unto salvation.

The New

As has been already noted, the word *new* is an important one in Scripture. To review briefly, two words are translated from the Greek as *new*: *kainos*, which means, not new in time, but new as to form, quality, or nature, and *neos*, new in time. The word *newness* (Rom. 6:4; 7:6) is *kainotes*; “newness of life” thus means a life of a new quality.¹ The more commonly used word is *kainos*, newness of form, quality, or nature.

A repeated statement of Scripture is the promise of a new creation: “For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind” (Isa. 65:17; cf. 51:16; 66:22; II Peter 3:13; Rev. 21:1). Christ declared, “Behold, I make all things new” (Rev. 21:5), His word from the throne. The promise of God throughout the Old Testament era was a “new covenant”; the word used (Heb. 8:8, Rev. 21:5) is *kainos*, newness of nature or quality. The *new creation* is one which, while outwardly the old world and the old individual, is a renewed one, changed in life and quality by the power of God unto salvation. The source of this new creation is Jesus Christ, who in Revelation 3:14 describes Himself as “the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” The commentary by W. Boyd Carpenter is at this point very good:

The beginning (better, the origination) of the creation of God. This title of our Lora does not occur in the Epistles to the other churches, but very closely resembles the language used by St. Paul in writing to the Colossians

1. W. E. Vine: *An Expository Diet. of N. T. Words*, III, 109f.

(chap. i. 15-18). The “beginning” not meaning that Christ was the first among the created, but that He was the origination, or *primary source* of all creation. By Him were all things made (John i. 1-3; comp. Col. 1. 15, 18), not *with* Him, but *by* Him creation began. In short, the word “beginning” (like the word “faithful”) must be understood in an active sense. He has originating power (Acts iii. 14) as well as priority of existence. The appropriateness of its use will be seen when we remember that the Laodicean Church was exposed to the temptation of worshipping inferior principalities. (See Col. i. 16; ii. 15, where the plural of the word here rendered “beginnings,” or *origin*, is used, and is translated “principalities.”)²

St. John states the matter simply: “All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made” (John 1:3). God the Son, indeed, all the Trinity, was involved in the work of creation, so that creation cannot be understood nor can it exist apart from Him. Creation having fallen, no re-creation is possible apart from Him who is the origin of all things, and the creating power of the universe. By the sovereign word of God, all things were made out of nothing, and by the sovereign word of God, all things are regenerated and made new.

Salvation, health or victory, means this regeneration of all things by God the Savior. This is the meaning of the name *Jesus*, God the Savior, “for he shall save his people from their sins” (Matt. 1:21). Since it is sin that destroys, sin which introduced death into the world, it is God, who by destroying sin and death, renews and redeems His people. This new birth of creation, new in nature, quality, and life, had its beginning and “sign” in the birth of a babe, the incarnate Son of God: “And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger” (Luke 2:12).

A *sign* in the New Testament “denotes an outward indication of an inner or hidden purpose, usually that of God him-

2. W. Boyd Carpenter, “Revelation” in Ellicott: *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, VIII, p. 549.

self.” Simeon spoke of the infant Jesus as a “sign that is spoken against” (Luke 2:34). Jesus condemned those who looked for a miraculous sign from heaven (Matt. 12:39; Mk. 8:12; Luke 11:29; cf. 1 Cor. 1:22), because all that He was and did was a sign to those ready to receive it.

But it was not so much his actions as his person which Jesus regarded as being primarily the sign of God’s redemptive activity. The Son of man was himself the sign vouchsafed to that generation that the day of redemption was at hand; perhaps this was one of the reasons why Jesus adopted the title “Son of man” as his own personal self-designation. Ezekial had, like other prophets (e.g., Isa. 8:18), regarded himself as a sign to his generation (Ezek. 12:6; 24:24), sent to speak God’s word, whether they would hear or whether they would forbear (3:4, 11, etc.) So the Son of man, Jesus, is sent to proclaim God’s word and to be a sign to a disobedient people; cf. Ezekiel’s “He that will hear, let him hear” (3:27) with Jesus’ “He who has ears to hear, let him hear” (Mark 4:9 etc.).³

Jesus Christ declared Himself to be a *sign*, and, at His birth, the angel declared to the shepherds that He was to be a *sign*, a sign of something new, of “good things of great joy, which shall be to all people” (Luke 2:10). The message of the angelic multitude was, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men” (Luke 2:14). Lenski renders this, “Glory in highest places to God, and on earth peace, on men good pleasure!”⁴ The word rendered *good will* or *good pleasure* is *eudokia* (Eph. 1:5,9; Phil. 1:15; 2:13; Rom. 10:1, II Thess. 1:11; Matt. 11:26; Luke 10:21). The *eudokia* or good will towards men is not to be interpreted humanistically; it does not refer to a new order in which men feel a good will towards one another. Rather, it means that the essence of the new world is God’s good will towards men which is revealed in the birth of Jesus Christ. St. Paul refers to this fact in Ephesians 2:14, declaring

3. Alan Richardson, “Sign in the NT”, in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, R-Z, p. 346f. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

4. R. C. H. Lenski: *The Interpretation of St. Luke’s Gospel*, p. 133. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946.

of Christ, "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us."

Thus Jesus Christ, who is the origin of creation, is also the renewing of creation, bringing to it a newness of life and nature by purging it of sin and death and regenerating it by His power.

Practically this means that the psychology of regeneration moves a man to an acceptance of that which is new through Christ. It is very easy for men to grieve over the past and to be past-bound. In the 20th century, men with roots centuries old in a place found all things destroyed forever and they and their people scattered. Men whose work and love had gone into the life and walls of a church found that church to be a blasphemous parody of its purpose and calling. The ruthless march of humanism has trampled underfoot the painstaking work of generations and laughed at the cry of the aggrieved. Destruction has been called a virtue, and novelty heralded as the new.

The word of the Lord still stands: "Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God" (Luke 9:60). That which perishes is dead, and often needed to perish. We are not to turn back, to be wedded to the past, or to grieve. We are the people of Jesus Christ, He who makes all things new, and, above all other men, to move forward in time in confidence that the *new* comes only from the hand of God. The newness of life, the newness of quality and nature, can come from no other source than Jesus Christ. Hence, as against burying the dead, as against grieving over the past and lingering amidst the ruins, the essence of the Christian's new life is to recognize that Jesus Christ is "the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending . . . which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1:8). The future comes only and entirely from the hand of God, and, having begun the work of making all things new, God shall only continue to reveal His *eudokia*,

His good will or good pleasure towards men. Towards this end, the powers of darkness shall be shaken and destroyed, His Kingdom proclaimed and extended, and His power manifested.

The old man in us, the fallen man, clings to the past, ready to compromise for a little peace, to be undisturbed in our yesterdays and preserved from the claims of tomorrow, but the new man will not permit it, nor can we rest on past victories. We cannot view things personally, how they affect us, but how they affect God's purpose. To seek an escape from problems is to ask for an escape from God, because it is the essence of that *new* life that it confronts and moves against every barrier to Christ's conquering reign. Christ is "a sign . . . spoken against", according to Simeon (Luke 2:34), because His coming is a threat to the old world and its claims. He is the stone of stumbling to all those who war against God: "Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder" (Luke 20:18).

Thus, it is death to cling to the past. Time is not eternity, and that which is must pass away in order for that which must be to develop. The Christian is a pilgrim who refuses to find permanency in time, nor newness in novelty. In Christ, who is his redeemer, he finds his newness of life and the marching orders for time, so that he is fixed as to his faith, and on the move in his time.

A charge often levelled against those who break with an established order is that they do not truly love it. On the contrary, it must be held that those who most love a church are those most ready to break with it in the name of the faith when it forsakes the faith. The men who first left their homes in England for America were more loyal to their heritage than those who remained, and they named their new land New England. What were matters of indifference to those who remained were matters of faith and life to those who left, and the greater vitality of the English and Scottish cul-

tures soon manifested themselves in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere. The role of colonials all over the world in revitalizing their homelands has never received the attention it deserves.

In every age, the future belongs to those who live in terms of it in Christ. However important technology and economics are, man's future is never determined by them. They are first of all products rather than causes: the causes rest in the mind and faith of man. If technology and economics determined the future, then the twentieth century should be the happiest and most peaceful of eras rather than one bent on committing suicide. But men, having forsaken Christ, have also forsaken the future. Instead of newness of life and a future, they lack also a present and live in blind revolt. Men who cannot make a future destroy even their present and despise their past. The present order can be destroyed either by revolution or by a refusal to grow and to accept the requirements of renewal.

In most churches today, if not almost all, the evil men are both those who seek to put the church to the use of revolution rather than Christ, and also those who are content to let the church continue as an unbelieving and ungodly social center for those who want a form of godliness without the power thereof (II Tim. 3:5). The godly men "turn away" from such and rebuild the church apart from them, for the church is neither a building, an organization, a hierarchy, or a tradition, but the living, growing body of Christ which in every generation breaks the old wineskins and demands new forms for a new day.

At this point, Scripture gives us an interesting usage of the word *new*, whereby the Holy Ghost brings us to a clearer knowledge of the meaning of *the new*. In Matthew 9:17, the wine is new, *neos*, but the new wineskins are *kainous*; the same is true in Luke 5:37-38. The wine, the life of believers, is ever new in time as each generation sees the regenerating power of Christ in its day. The institutional containers of

that new life are the same, church, state, school, family, and others, but they are either new in quality and nature, renewed, or they break under the pressure of the new wine. The true Christians are those who in every age break the old wineskins of the past because they are the life of the future and require the renewed forms of the future. We are called “the new wine” (Matt. 9:17; Mark 2:22; Luke 5:37-39) *neos*, “as being of recent production.”⁵ We are new in time, not merely because we are born in this era, but because by Christ’s regenerating power we are freed from the world of sin and death, from karmic necessity, and made the force and power of the future.

Thus, the Christian, while respecting the past, cannot involve himself too deeply with the past. Too often, as we listen to others, and to ourselves, we find that the major concern of our lives, what we talk and think about, is what happened yesterday, the past. We grieve over the past, talk about it, rehash it endlessly, and thus sadden and distort the present and neglect the future. The problems of yesterday and today are very real, and they are inescapable in a fallen world. The test of a Christian is in part this: Christ having declared, “Behold, I make all things new” (Rev. 21:5), do we work confidently under Him towards that goal, or are we endlessly troubled over who said and did what yesterday and today? Are we merely *reacting* to what others say and do, or are we *acting* to reconstruct all things in terms of Jesus Christ? Are we more concerned with the sins and imperfections of others than our duty to build for the future?

5. Vine, *op. cit.*, III, 110.

Sheep and Men

Some years ago, in the intermountain area, when I spoke one Sunday and cited the 23rd Psalm, one rancher remarked after the service, that, among cattlemen, Psalm 23 and other Biblical references to men as sheep were very unpopular. Sheep, after all, are dirty, stupid animals, and, for a cattleman, sheep are the lowest of animals.

The cattleman's opinion of sheep has real merit to it, to a considerable degree. Sheep are dirty animals. The common image of sheep comes from pictures of newly born lambs. The wool of sheep becomes quickly matted with dirt, burrs, and dust, and it smells strongly. Sheep, moreover, are helpless animals and need constant watching to protect them from their enemies. Wolves, coyotes, bears, and many other animals will readily prey on sheep unless the sheep-herder or shepherd and his dogs are constantly alert.

But this is not all. Sheep need to be protected from themselves. They will readily follow the leader into trouble, or, faced with a road or path, begin to follow the trail instead of grazing. Sheep need a shepherd; they require constant care, and they are helpless, dirty, and too prone to follow a leader blindly.

This is precisely why God calls men sheep. It is not intended as a compliment, and ranchers who find the 23rd Psalm distasteful are closer to understanding it than urban churchmen who see it as a beautiful psalm and find its imagery entirely charming.

Because men are seen by God as very much like sheep in some respects, they need a shepherd. God Himself is repeatedly depicted in Scripture as the Shepherd of His covenant

people (Ps. 80:1; Ezek. 34:12, etc.). Zechariah spoke of the coming Messiah as a shepherd (Zech. 11:16), as did Isaiah (40:11), and Jesus Christ declared Himself to be that Good Shepherd (John 10:14). Hebrews 13:20 sees Him as “that great shepherd of the sheep”, i.e., as God incarnate. In I Peter 2:25, Christ is “the Shepherd and Bishop” of our souls; the flock is God’s; pastors are under-shepherds, and Christ, God incarnate, is “the chief Shepherd” (I Peter 5:2, 4).

The divine kings of the ancient world declared themselves to be the shepherds of their people, their guardians who controlled and determined their destinies. As shepherds, they assumed the right of total control over their people, and they expected and required total subservience. It was assumed that the people were helpless apart from their shepherd-king, and that to be stateless and ungoverned by their shepherd-king was the same as being dead or in hell.

Very clearly, the Bible portrays men as sheep. The important question is this: whose sheep are they, God’s or the state’s? If sheep are not governed by a shepherd, they will follow another sheep blindly and to disaster. If men are not governed by God, they will be governed by men. To be governed by God means to be entirely and totally subject to His government and subservient to His word and will. To be governed by the state means ultimately to be the creature of the state, governed entirely by and totally subject to the will of the state.

Men are sheep, but whose sheep? If men are the flock of God, then they are not only kept in His care, but they are free in their relationship to men, not to be sheep, but to be themselves, free and confident in their own calling. Men were not created by God to be the sheep of the state’s pasture.

Moreover, men are more than sheep, although the Biblical imagery rests on a solid basis. They are created in God’s image to be His people; the image of God in man draws man to God, so that, even in his sin, man seeks a god, albeit a false one. St. Augustine said, in his *Confessions*, “Our hearts

are restless till they rest in thee.” Every false shepherd appeals to this restlessness and anxiety of man and offers a false hope. When men find their rest, their true sabbath, in Jesus Christ, then they are free to be men, to exercise dominion, to grow in righteousness and holiness, and to gain knowledge under God. They are then not sheep in relationship to other men, but free men in Jesus Christ. They are then freed also from any urge to follow, sheep-like, the dictates of men. The question is closely related to the matter of hypnotism. Estabrooks has said that “Hypnotism is a special form of direct or prestige suggestion, something to which we are all exposed every day of our lives.”¹ In other words, whenever a speaker or authority impresses us with his “prestige suggestion”, it is a form of hypnotism, even though we have not gone completely and openly under his influence. Marks has held that “People can be conditioned to any kind of appeal and will respond whole-heartedly en masse if the appeal is sustained long enough.”² In answer to the question, “What is Hypnotism?”, Marks answers that “Hypnotism is unquestionably a form of conditioning, a triggering of predispositions.”³ Moreover, Marks points out,

Hypnotism is induced infantilism. It is regression to the individual’s early period of will-less safety. The degrees of hypnosis are correlatives of the extent of regression.

The hypnotist bears the same relation to the subject a father or a mother bears to the child. The subject surrenders his will. He surrenders because the hypnotist recreates a situation for which the subject has an unconscious longing. The hypnotic situation, in short, is a temporary love relation in which the hypnotist symbolizes either the caressing, understanding mother, or the all-knowing, all-powerful father.

Resistances to hypnosis recapitulate the subject’s identifications with or dependencies on parent symbols. Freud distinguished “Mother Hypnosis” and “Father Hypnosis”,

1. George Estabrooks: *Hypnotism*, p. 235. revised edition. New York: Dutton, 1957.

2. Robert W. Marks: *The Story of Hypnotism*, p. 191f. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 104f.

the techniques which utilize these opposed symbols. The regressive tendencies of some subjects are associated with maternal patterns; they will respond to stroking, soothing words, assurances of well-being and love. This is the technique of the lullaby: *Mother Hypnosis*.

Father Hypnosis is the command of authority. "You are going to sleep. You cannot resist. It is impossible for you to fight it. Sleep!" This is a re-enactment of the part of the stern father. It says, in substance, "I will give you love and protection — but only on one condition: You must obey me. If you refuse, I will destroy you."⁴

Intelligence increases susceptibility to hypnosis.⁵ People are easy to hypnotize because they "have an incurable weakness for authority."⁶ The parallels of crowd behavior to the behavior of sheep are rather suggestive:

In the panorama of crowd behavior, we can isolate a number or generalities. The first is that a crowd vaporizes the capacity for ratiocination which its members exhibit when in isolation. The second is that a crowd tends to cast off inhibition. The third is what Hitler's spiritual predecessor, Le-Bon, called, "the thirst for obedience," the yearning to be led. The fourth is the sharp distinction between the behavior trends of led and leaderless groups.⁷

Two kinds of people are more or less immune to hypnosis. First, people who are extremely neurotic and in radical rebellion against God, parents, and society, are unwilling to submit to any authority and withdraw into a solitary existence which is insanity finally. In such people, blind rebellion is so far-reaching that it replaces every other aspect of the individual's activities. Second, people are immune to hypnosis to the degree that they are truly subject to God as their sovereign Lord and their heavenly Father.

The implication of this godly immunity is that, instead of infantilism, which marks the hypnotic subject, whatever his intelligence, the Christian is marked by maturity. Since God is His all-sufficient heavenly Father, the Christian's relation-

4. *Ibid.*, p. 106f.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 132.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 219f.

ship towards other people is not infantile but mature. His dependence on other people is as a mature man, not as a child. The result is a freedom from hypnotism and hypnotic suggestibility.

Both the Christian and the non-Christian are suggestible, but in different areas, one towards God, the other towards man. The difference is a very great one and marks the division between infantilism and maturity. To be open to command by man apart from God's law, to be under man's hypnotic suggestions, means to be open to sinful and false leadership. On the other hand, to be open to God's word is to be under the absolute and sovereign God and His infallible word. Our response to that infallible word is, because we are not perfectly sanctified, both at times sinful and fallible, but it is still a response open to correction and growth. Man is a man under God.

For the believer who walks by God's word, Isaiah declared, "thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left" (Isa. 30:21). Of this verse Young wrote, "It is generally assumed that the figure is that of the shepherd who follows his sheep calling out to them"⁸ Alexander wrote earlier,

The direction of the voice from behind is commonly explained by saying, that the image is borrowed from the practice of shepherds going behind their flocks, or nurses behind their children, to observe their motions. A much more natural solution is the one proposed by Henderson, to wit, that their guides were to be before them but that when they declined from the right way their backs would be turned to them, consequently this warning voice would be heard behind them. The meaning of the call is, this is the way which you have left, come back to it.⁹

In brief, those who are God's sheep are men in relationship to men. To be under God is to be free with respect to men,

8. Edward J. Young: *The Book of Isaiah, II*, p. 357. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.

9. J. A. Alexander: *Commentary on the Prophecy of Isaiah*, p. 481. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

so that, even where we are subject to men according to God's word, our subjection is to the Lord and not to man as such. Marks was right: "Hypnotism is induced infantilism." Obedience to God is maturity, and it is freedom.

Not surprisingly, church members and especially ministers who reject Christ as their shepherd and follow either a modernistic or a humanistic-pietistic faith are sheep-like in their readiness to follow men. Styles in thought, speech, and dress are solemnly cultivated in the name of relevance. If long hair and revolutionary ideas are the drift of the world, then they join in, claiming that this makes their's a relevant religion. Some theologians produce sermons, lectures, articles, and books on the portentous import of every youth fad and movement. If tomorrow the leaders of modern intellectual currents would adopt a cultic practice whereby all men and women would walk around with exposed buttocks, these churchmen would follow suit. There would then be solemn sermons and publications on the social and theological significance of bare buttocks, or "Putting hypocrisy behind us," or "Bared Buttocks, An Expose and Indictment of the Hypocrisy of our Times," or "Prophetic Protest: Bared Buttocks as Enacted Parable," and so on. These churchmen would parade with buttocks bared and would tell themselves that the protests of members constituted a persecution of bold and prophetic religion. There is no limit to the folly of men who follow man: they are the sheep to be sheared by men.

The picture of man in Psalm 23 is radically different. The man who makes God his shepherd has the security and protection which only God can provide; he need "fear no evil." In relation to God, his attitude is one of confidence and trust, and a willingness at all times to be led by the Lord. In relationship to men, his attitude is radically different. God the Lord, the Good Shepherd, anoints His own: "thou anointest my head with oil" (Ps. 23:5). This is a symbol both of royal and of prophetic anointing. In relationship to other

men, the covenant man is thus not a sheep but a king and a prophet, a free man in Christ. In the presence of his enemies, God prepares a banquet table for him, a symbol of assured victory, ease, and confidence in God's assured government and victory. His "cup runneth over"; choicest wine is filled to overflowing as a symbol of prosperity and wealth; the man of God is surrounded and followed by "goodness and mercy" (Ps. 23:6) all the days of his life. Those who are the sheep of God's pasture are free men and kings among the peoples of the earth.

A note needs to be added with respect to the compliment paid to religion (with Christianity in mind) by both Marx and Freud. The compliment came in the form of insults. Both found Christians extensively immune to socialist propaganda on the one hand and neurosis on the other. Marx therefor countered by calling religion the opium of the masses, by which he meant that they had been made immune to socialist propaganda by their faith. Freud explained away the mental health of believers by declaring that such people avoided personal neurosis only by accepting the "cosmic neurosis", God. The fact that such nonsense was and is convincing to many people is evidence of their sheep-like qualities. The peevish resentment of Marx and Freud at the resistance by Christians to socialist propaganda and humanistic neuroses led them to heaping on their enemy their own sins.

Work

When we consider man in the state of glory, we are of necessity seriously limited in our ability to discuss or even imagine life in that estate. We still live in a fallen world, which, though partially redeemed, still feels the effects of sin and death. We are subject to the frustrations, not only of other men, but to those arising from our own far from perfectly sanctified natures. It can be safely added that most men are their own major source of frustration by virtue of their sins and follies. It is thus difficult for any of us to imagine a world without frustration, sin, or death.

We do have definite indications, however, in Scripture concerning life in the state of glory. We cannot go beyond these indications, nor must we fall short of recognizing their clear meaning. We need to ask also which of the many hints concerning the state of glory gives us a key which ties together the fourfold estate of man?

The answer is that it is *work* which is the connecting link in the activities of man in the states of innocence, the fall, grace, and glory. Schilder's comment was thus to the point:

"Covenant of Works" is the name given to the initial relationship between God and man. This relationship was a covenant simply because service of God is possible only in the form of a covenant. The term "Covenant of Work" was applied in retrospect, in contrast with "Covenant of Grace", and the very Covenant of Grace adds depth and meaning to the concept of the Covenant of Works. It is evident, then, that the Covenant of Works must not be looked upon as merely temporary; it is rather the original, fundamental, and therefore irrevocable covenant.¹

1. K. Schilder: heaven - *What Is It?* p. 91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

The sequence of events must be explained by their beginning, if we would see whither they tend. If we proceed from the Covenant of Grace as starting point, we go astray; but when we see the Covenant of Works as basic to all covenant relationship, we are on the right track.²

In other words, grace re-established man in his ability to function again in his calling under God, namely, to work purposefully and faithfully under God.

To understand what work is, it is helpful to examine again the meaning of a key word, *work*, *ergon* in the Greek. *Ergon* is also the origin of our word *energy*, which comes from *en ergos*, at or in work. The dictionary definition of energy is also of interest:

1. The power by which anything acts effectively to move or change other things or accomplish any result.
2. Habitual tendency to and readiness for effective action.
3. Power in active exercise; force in operation. (Funk & Wagnalls)

The religious origin of work is thus preserved in the word *energy*.

The image of God in man cannot be reduced to work, but neither can it be separated from work. Man has been created in the image of God, who is maker of heaven and earth and all things therein. Knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and dominion are useless in man unless put to work, both in time and in eternity. Man therefore was from the beginning created to work, to follow God's handiwork with his working mind and hand and to develop all things under God and in terms of His purpose. God is omnipotent and omniscient mind. In man, mind and power focus in work; work is the expression of man's energy, man's mind and power at work.

Man's calling in the state of innocence was thus to work under God and to subdue all things and to exercise dominion over them under God (Gen. 1:26-28). The goal of this work was the fulfillment of the Kingdom of God on earth, putting God's rule and word into effective government through man

2. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

in every realm of life. The sin of man did not set aside this calling; it merely frustrated it, but the calling remained, and the purpose of grace has been to restore man to that calling.

But, before considering the implications of grace for work, let us examine the meaning of sin and the state of sin for work. The curse was not *work* but *upon* man's life and work. Work, wherein man was to realize the dominion and power of the Kingdom, was placed under a curse; in other words, man's attempts to attain a world paradise were frustrated, because both his life and work were now tainted by sin. Moreover, work, instead of being man's life and joy, became a frustrating thing for man. In an ungodly era, men want to escape from work, because they find it so frustrating; in a godly age, men thrive in work. In an ungodly era like our's, it is a cause of difficulty to godly men that the conditions of work are so often governed by ungodly men and made frustrating.

An Austrian Catholic and nobleman, Dr. Erik Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn has analyzed the significance of the "work ethic" developed by Calvinism and Puritanism. (He also sees a Confucian work ethic in China and Japan; in China, however, work is a part of a relativistic world-view which makes gambling destructive of real capitalization and work does not lead to effective capitalization; in Japan, the impact of early Catholic missions on the Japanese character needs study, since it was deeper than normally recognized; as evidence of this Christian survival, prayers in Hebrew survived among many Samurai and common people up to the 1930s at least.) According to Kuehnelt-Leddihn, work is despised in much of the world, including Latin America, and hence the lack of progress in those areas. Colonization by European powers was a costly expense to the mother countries because of the great expenses of roads, hospitals, personnel, and improvements, and the limited returns. Work in most places is limited and inefficient:

In Uganda, farmers toil two to two-and-a-half hours a day;
At a hotel in India, where the speaker recently stayed,
the help worked 45 minutes a day.

“You can’t have a prosperous economy in India with those kind of work habits. If Indians would work, two states in the country could produce a food surplus for the entire nation.”

In South and Latin America countries, the work ethics are “just not there.”

In Russia, most workers won’t stay on the job more than seven hours a day and there is rampant stealing, negligence and dreaminess on the job.

“In a hotel, there’s no breakfast before 9 a.m., and no store is open before 10 a.m. You don’t get the proper motivation in socialism.”

“In Russia, a worker can work all month just to buy a pair of shoes if he saves all his money. A factory director’s wife must work to help support the family. Professors, however, are better off.”³

Man in the state of sin dreams endlessly of creating a paradise on earth without God. This dream is a hopeless one, because its realization is frustrated constantly by man’s sin, whereby he poisons and destroys all that he attempts to do, and by sinful man’s inability to work effectively, whereby his efforts are feeble, cursed with a sense of frustration, and devoid when active, of meaning and true direction. It is significant that so many people, contrary to Scripture, believe that work is a curse; they believe this, because, in a sinful world, sinful men often find work to be so. Work is a curse of men, as is leisure, when men are sinners, because all their activities are then overshadowed by the curse.

Charles Lamb, in his poem, “Living Without God in the World” (1799), spoke of

Man, who, trusting in his mortal strength,

Leans on a shadowy staff, a staff of dreams.

Man’s “shadowy staff, a staff of dreams,” leads man to deny God in favor of his own imagination, and to perish finally in his blindness.

They wander “loose about”, they nothing see,

Themselves except, and creatures like themselves,

3. Ed Finkelstein, “Hard Work Said To Be Unpopular In ‘Third World’ ”, *Tucson (Arizona) Citizen*, November 25, 1971.

Short-lived, short-sighted, impotent to save,
So on their dissolute spirits, soon or late,
Destruction cometh “like an armed man”,
Or like a dream of murder in the night,
Withering their mortal faculties, and breaking
The bones of all their pride.⁴

In the state of grace, the redemptive work of Christ restores man to his calling, to his work. To the extent that the individual is sanctified, *and* to the extent that his area and place of work are redeemed ground and in process of being sanctified, to that extent the curse is removed from his work, and to that extent in *work, en ergos*, he can manifest, as the image of God, the energy of God’s image-bearer at work. The more clearly redeemed and sanctified the man and the ground he stands upon, the more energetic his work, and the more successful his capitalization under God.

Men can become wealthy, of course, without faith, but true capitalism is a religious product, and it is not surprising, however inaccurate at points the thesis of Weber and Tawney, that it has been associated with the Protestant work-ethics of Calvinism and Puritanism. Apart from a Biblical faith, wealth is accumulated as much by fraud as by work, and it fails to capitalize society. The great wealth of the elite of old India and China failed to capitalize society, and, in the modern west, as capitalism ceases to be Christian, it ceases to be a capitalization and becomes an exploitation, in part also an exploitation by use of the state to gain subsidies and advantages. A free-market economy in which godly work predominates is as little desired today by capital as by labor. Men’s trust is not in work but in statist policies and advantages, in “a staff of dreams.”

True work is the religious energy of a society in action, remaking all things in terms of God’s Kingdom, and developing the potentiality of all things in terms of His calling. The redeemed man is a working man.

4. R. H. Shepherd, editor: *The Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Charles Lamb*, p. 699f. London: Chatto & Windus, 1875.

Work is no less important to the state of glory. According to Revelation 22:3, "And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him." Lenski's comment on the meaning of the *curse* or of *accursed* is pertinent:

To hang upon xulon or "wood" was to be accursed. So Christ hung on the cross as one accursed of God. This is the mark of the old Jerusalem. Christ bore the curse and removed it from us. Nothing of the kind shall be, i.e., exist, any longer . . . as it once existed in the case of the cross of Christ for our salvation. The foundation of the cross has attained its consummation, in the Eternal City the xulon is entirely a "wood of life." For here in this city, behold, "the throne of God and of the Lamb," symbol of the eternal rule and dominion in glory of God and the Lamb; "in her" in this consummation, in this eternal union of these two, God and the Lamb, with us.⁵

The cross thus has a double meaning. It is both a symbol of the curse, of God's full and unswerving *condemnation* of sin; it is a sentence of death. It is for us also, both in the state of grace and in the state of glory *the tree of life*. Because of the cross, we are re-established in life and blessed in our work; we have access to "the throne of God and of the Lamb" and are a free people in Christ. All the conditions of frustration are gone: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Rev. 21:4).

What work means in those circumstances is beyond our imagination. We can only dimly guess at it. It will be the unfettered application by man of his dominion under God to creation. It will be the unfrustrated and untainted *energy* of man applied to creation. It will be man's joyful expression of himself, of the form of the image of God within him, in terms of his own particular calling and nature. Thus, the new creation, contrary to popular myths, will have very few

5. R. C. H. Lenski: *The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation*, p. 652. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1943.

harpists more than it has now; it will have many of us finding our truest callings in a new world.

The Tree of Life

The tree of life, which appears in Eden, re-appears in the New Jerusalem, the new creation. Its relationship to Christ and His cross has already been cited. Its implications for the doctrine of man need to be recognized.

And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.

In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. (Rev. 22:1, 2)

Very obviously, this is symbolism. There is a river of the water of life which proceeds from the throne of God, the author of life, and there is also a tree of life, “in the midst of the street, and on either side of the river.” It is one tree, and it is many, a forest of them, in a city, yet a garden. The City is walled (Rev. 21:12-21); it thus has perfect protection; yet it is open, like a garden and is both garden and city. The walls and the foundations of the walls are of precious and semi-precious gems and stones, indicating that, because no enemy can ever threaten the City, the wealth thereof is open and absolutely safe.

Especially important, the tree (or trees) of life bear twelve kinds of fruit, and they bear every month. *Twelve* here obviously has reference to the year, twelve months; in other words, the tree bears fruit continually. But *twelve* in the symbolism of the New Jerusalem also refers to the twelve tribes of Israel, i.e., to the fulness of all the people of God, of every tribe, tongue, and nation. These are all present in

the new creation, and all are totally nourished and totally productive unto God.

Schilder's interpretation of this verse points us toward the meaning:

We may interpret Revelation 22:2 in its broadest sense. When the tree of life gives its fruit "from month to month", Scripture means that all living things will enjoy such regularity. Promise and fulfillment will have become one. Indeed, the very words "promises" and "fulfillment" will fall away. There is no longer a possibility of promise when fulfillment is rich and full. Thus the glory of the fulfilled covenant with nature is one of the foundation stones upon which heaven rests. All that which was created blossoms full in the sun of God's righteousness.¹

What the symbolism of the tree of life tells us is that, in the new creation *potentiality and actuality are one*. In this world, the gap between the two is very great. Because of sin, neither the earth nor the people thereof realize their potentialities. Very commonly, because of various frustrating circumstances, we fail to find our true calling, or are deflected into side avenues, during most or all of our lives, so that we fail to develop those potentialities which are deeply imbedded in our being. The *life* of the new creation is symbolized by the perpetual fruition of the trees.

With God, potentiality and actuality are one; there are no hidden potentialities in God. His infinite, omnipotent, and omniscient being is one in which every potentiality is an actuality. God, in brief, is totally self-conscious; He knows Himself absolutely, and He is in all things fully Himself. When He speaks, His word is a certain word: what He declares, He performs, because all things are by His ordination and predestination. God's word is thus of necessity always an infallible and omniscient word, because He brings total government and total knowledge to bear on His every word.

Man created in the image of God, is a finite, created being,

1. Schilder, *Heaven - What Is It?* p. 96.

whereas God is infinite, uncreated Being. In this finite, created sense, however, man is destined to enter by grace into that state of glory wherein for him too potentiality and actuality are one. Man's potentialities are only and exclusively creaturely potentialities, as of necessity his actualities are also. These man shall realize in the creation; he shall be totally self-conscious, fully expressive of himself, and able to bear fully and totally that fruit which it is his nature to bear, because he has been grafted into Christ, the tree of life (Rom. 11:17ff.).

There are those who would question how such a state can be productive. The fact that infinite potentiality and actuality are one in God does not limit God: it makes Him truly God. The fact that a finite and creaturely nature shall be realized in man does not limit the future of man: it makes him truly man, fully able to be that which he was created to be. The closer a writer or an artist comes to realizing his potentiality, the more productive he becomes. Our potentiality is not something that exhausts itself but rather becomes more fertile and alive with development and use.

Thus, instead of a stagnant new creation, we have in Scripture a symbolic picture of a world which is forever renewed, *kainos*, new in nature and quality, because it has the unfallen, unfettered, and uncursed freedom to be itself, to realize its potentialities and make them fully actualities. It is not the springs which flow fully and freely which stand in stagnant waters.

In Revelation 21:26, we are told of the new creation, "And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it." Again, in Revelation 22:2, "and the leaves of the tree were for the healing (or health) of the nations." Christ is the only true heir of the Kingdom, and we are heirs in Him. Christ is heir of all things, including all nations; all the God-given potentialities of all nations, their glory and honor, belong to Him who brings them healing or health and enables them to give to the new creation that which they are created

to give. On this aspect, the great Dr. Schilder commented:

The universality of the covenant requires that not one race or people be left out. Yet during Old Testament times there was one nation singled out of the many as the “chosen people”. Such separation was but an *ad interim*. We may look upon the covenant as then *en marche* toward fulfillment, towards the time when all nations, from the uttermost parts of the earth, would belong to the covenant.

So also we read in Revelation 22:2 that the leaves of the tree of life are for the healing of the nations. And we see therein the beautiful fulfillment of the Covenant of Grace. Throughout the centuries the healing power of the tree of life has been active, bringing the heathen to repentance and sanctifying their lives. The universality was evident even before Abraham; it was never wholly lacking during the time between Abraham and Christ; it strode toward fulfillment at Pentecost; and it reaches its glorious fulness in the new Jerusalem.²

Long before Schilder, the wonderful Dr. Thomas Scott observed, “‘The leaves of the tree’, being appointed ‘for the healing of the nations,’ implied, that the favor and presence of Christ would finally remove and prevent the return and entrance of all evil, as well as communicate all good, to the inhabitants of that blessed world.”³ It is Christ who by His redemptive work overthrows the power of sin and death, breaks the curse, and brings in the new creation. It is Christ who brings men and nations to their fulfilment and makes their potentiality and actuality one. It is His word that summons us:

And the Spirit and the bride say Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. (Rev. 22:17).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 93f.

3. Thomas Scott: *The Holy Bible, With Explanatory Notes*, vol. VI, p. 788 Boston: Armstrong, Crocker, and Brewster, 1830.

The Tabernacle

A tired man projects his weariness into the future. He tells himself that, when he has finished doing certain things, he will rest, or, if he succeeds with this, he will retire. When that day arrives, he is usually again at work, refreshed as much by his success as anything. So too, men have projected their weariness with work in a sinful world onto heaven: when they get to heaven, they will rest forever.

The new creation, however, is not only portrayed as man's eternal sabbath, but also as man's eternal and unfettered place of work. Let us examine some of the implications of Scripture at this point. Revelation 21:1 speaks of "a new heaven and a new earth." Jewish tales held to a belief in a totally new creation, a completely new universe, as witness I Enoch 72:1, 91:16 and II Esdras 7:30, 75.¹ The word used for *new* is, however, *kainos*, new in quality and nature, rather than *neos*, new in time.

Both heaven and earth were created by God, and thus both have a history. Since they are both destined to be renewed, this means that God does not despise or throw aside His original creation, although He purges it by fire (II Peter 3:12, 13). Even when St. Peter speaks of the dissolving of the old creation by fire, he still describes the new creation with the word *kainos*, new in quality and nature rather than in time. Creation and its history are not destroyed but rather renewed, so that the new creation is essentially linked to the old.

Schilder has seen the implications of this fact:

Therefore it will not do to say: those things which are

1. Martin Rist, "The Revelation of St. John the Divine" in *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 12, p. 528. New York: Abingdon, 1957.

passing away have only relative worth; only that which remains has absolute worth. That which passes by and perishes is included in God's decree, and hence has equal value with that which remains, which is established by His decrees. All has worth *in* history, and therefore *for* eternity — all that is in accordance with the will of God. Heaven has great worth, but the earth of today also. Heaven of the future has great worth, but heaven of today no less. Because God works in history, the embryo is equal in worth with the matured body; the corpse with the healthy body. For in all He attains His purpose. Whether His Word calls a thing into being or causes it to return to dust, it matters not; by that Word all of history has its value.²

This may be an over-statement, but it is true in that all things accomplish God's purpose, and nothing is without meaning in terms of Him. The meaning of history is fulfilled or put into force in the new creation.

We are given a glimpse of the meaning of that new creation, of our fulfilled history in action, in two startling verses of Revelation 21:

3. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.

22. And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.

Very obviously, these verses declare that the communion of God with man will be a full and glorious one, surpassing Eden. God's presence with His people is emphatically restated: "God is with men . . . he will dwell with them . . . God himself shall be with them." This meaning is important and clearly central: the essence of the new creation is the full communion with God.

There is, however, another meaning which is also of great importance and is overlooked, namely, the reference to the tabernacle and the temple. From the perspective of this fallen earth, the new creation is the end of the journey. We are now like the people of Israel in the wilderness, on a

². K. Schilder: *Heaven - What Is It?* p. 23f.

journey to the promised land, the fixed habitation. The wilderness was the place of the tabernacle, the Tent of God's presence, the Royal Tent of the King; in the promised land, the tent or tabernacle later gave way, when a capitol city was established, to the temple, the fixed and stationary house of God. We should expect God's presence with His people now to be described as a tabernacling presence, with the temple ahead of us in the new creation. Instead, the figure is reversed. The temple, the fixed house of God, disappears; we have instead the very presence of "the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb." This is no surprise; we expect this of the new creation and of man's restored communion with God. What is surprising is the re-introduction of the tabernacle, the Royal Tent for life on the march.

The framework of reference for the tabernacle is a journey, a pilgrimage, and a march. The tabernacle is made to be moved from place to place, not to stand still. The use of so important a symbol cannot be accidental: what it clearly means, when seen also in the light of the plain statement, "and his servants shall serve him" (Rev. 22:3), is that, in the new creation a whole new horizon of work, dominion, and movement will be opened to man with God in the camp permanently to lead man therein. It will be a movement, work, and dominion without the curse and without death. Our imagination collapses before such a prospect; we cannot visualize such a world. We are, however, very clearly shown that such a prospect lies ahead of us. We must neither deny it nor embroider it with our imagination.

It is clear that our ideas of the after-life have been molded by pagan rather than Biblical sources. In paganism, the after-life is a land of shades, shadows, or ghosts who do nothing, and who look back with longing to the old world before death, the world where the action is. The afterlife in paganism is precisely that, "*after-life*"; the remnant of a man is barely alive, and real life is behind him; he pines hopelessly for the world he left behind. The reason why

ghosts are so much dreaded in paganism is because pagans logically assume that the dead have no liking for their pallid existence, and they seek to return to the old world. Some peoples believe that the dead actively resent the more abundant life enjoyed by their relatives who have not died, and they supposedly return to show their resentment at that fuller life.

The life of ghosts is static, pointless, and meaningless. Life has passed them by, and they have no function except to hate the living. The fear of ghosts is a major factor in the lives of many pagan peoples, and only those who have lived among the so-called “primitive” peoples can begin to be aware of their terror of the dead.

Clearly, this static, pallid idea of the life to come is not Biblical. The Bible points us toward the more abundant life in Christ, in time and in eternity. It gives us a vision of a new creation, more glorious than the old Eden, in which a redeemed humanity is on the move, on the march, with God the King. It indicates that God’s purpose in creation was not set aside by the fall, nor is it set aside by death or by the new creation. It indicates a consistency of purpose in God’s creative activity and a magnificent destiny for man. Very clearly, in God’s glorious creation, the best is yet to come.

We can begin to understand something also of our Lord’s meaning in the parables of judgment when He promises authority to those who wisely use their “talents”:

And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou has been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. (Luke 19:17)

His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou has been faithful over a few things. I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. (Matt. 25:21)

Very clearly, a full and working society, organized and functioning as God’s Kingdom, is plainly presupposed and declared.

The Resurrection Body

As we have seen, the pagan concepts of life after death are of an *after-life*, pale, shadowy, and essentially meaningless. Platonism had a theory of survival in which that which survives death was mainly the power of abstract thought, contemplation for eternity on the abstract “Ideas” of Plato. For Aristotle, pure intellect alone survived, to be absorbed into the divine mind.¹ Homer’s ideas reflect a more popular opinion. In Homer, the dead are shades, pale, bloodless ghosts who have no joy and are barely alive. Odysseus, in Homer’s *Odyssey*, Book XI, is able to communicate with the dead by sacrificing animals and allowing the shades to drink the blood, which gives them temporary vitality and revives their memory and strengthens their speech:

Anon came the soul of Theban Teiresias, with a golden sceptre in his hand, and he knew me and spake unto me: “Son of Laertes, of the seed of Zeus, Odysseus of many devices, what seekest thou now, wretched man, wherefore hast thou left the sunlight and come hither to behold the dead and a land desolate of joy? Nay, hold off the ditch and draw back thy sharp sword, that I may drink of the blood and tell thee sooth.” (Butcher & Lang translation)

This fact makes clear how easily the Greek tradition received the apparently Slavonic tradition of vampirism, and incorporated it into Greek beliefs. The thirst of the dead for blood as a means of temporary revitalization had a meaning to ancient Greece. In both Slavonic and Greek traditions, the vampire directs his violence “first and foremost against his nearest of kin.”²

1. C. Harris, “State of the Dead (Christian), in Hastings *ERE*, XI, 833.

2. John Cuthbert Lawson: *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, p. 387. New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, (1910) 1964.

The essential pessimism of non-Christian cultures led them to assume either a stagnant state of ostensible bliss, sexual in the case of Mohammedanism and sterile, or to regard the future as an *after-life*, a pale relic of life. In the case of Islam, and other views of future bliss, the essence of the life to come is a selected series of pleasures transferred from this life, so that it still remains an *after-life*. It is essentially a belief in man's retirement from the life of this world to enjoy eating, drinking, copulating, and other like pleasures. Thus, the "favorable" views of the *after-life* are basically pathetic dreams of catching up on lost or dreamed of pleasures. There is no hint in these views of the Biblical vision of a *new* life, new in nature and quality, and a movement and work in terms of it.

The Stoic view of immortality was clear in its pessimism. Whether or not it was believed that men had any personal life or memory in the after-life, the Stoic did believe in a periodic destruction and reconstruction of all things. This was a logical conclusion from the cyclical view of history and time held by Hellenic and other pagan thinkers. Eternal recurrence was re-introduced into Western thought and became especially conspicuous in Nietzsche. All is meaningless and repetitious. If death does not end all, the beginning of a new cycle requires the destruction of the things of the past, so that man in some sense is nothing more than a meaningless product of chance who has a mind that seeks with futility to find meaning in meaninglessness.

Still another strand of pagan thought held that the soul was in some sense divine, either as spirits, or as aspects of ultimate divinity. "Peace with the dead" thus became important to families and to a state, as in Rome.³ Such beliefs readily led to ancestor worship and to attempts to appease and satisfy the dead as a means of public safety.

In sharp contrast to all pagan views is the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. St. Paul, in I Corinthians

3. J. S. Reid, "State of the Dead (Greek and Roman)" in *ERE*, XI, p. 839.

15:39-50, not only declares the resurrection of the body but a new and perfect dimension of life. Instead of being an *after*-life, it is the true life, and it bears a relationship to this life as a plant does to its seed. It is “flesh” but “not the same flesh”; just as differences exist between men, fish, birds, and beasts, so there are marked differences between “celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial” (I Cor. 15:39-42). The body “is sown in dishonour”, and “weakness”; i.e., burial and the fact of death dishonors the body, and indicates its basic vulnerability; it is, however, raised in “glory” and “power”. As Hodge noted, “The future body will be instinct with energy, endowed, it may be, with faculties of which we have now no conception.”⁴ It is a “spiritual” body, which “does not mean ethereal, refined, much less *made of spirit*, which would be a contradiction. Nor does it mean animated by the Holy Spirit.”⁵ Calvin, however, declares that this is exactly what it means: “Now that is called *animal* which is quickened by (anima) the soul: that is spiritual which is quickened by the *Spirit*.”⁶ Just as we have a body adapted to our life now, so we shall then have a body adapted to our new estate and nature (I Cor. 15:44).

This is the meaning of Scripture, St. Paul tells us. Christ comes as “the last Adam . . . a quickening spirit.” “The first man, Adam was made a living soul,” “a creature endowed with animal life, whereas Christ has life in himself, and can give life to as many as he will, John 5:21, 26.”⁷ Then St. Paul declares, “Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual” (I Cor. 15:46). Hodge commented thus:

This does not mean simply that the natural *body* precedes the spiritual *body*. But it announces, as it were, a general law. The lower precedes the higher; the imper-

4. Charles Hodge: *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p.347. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 348.

6. John Calvin: *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. II, p. 50. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

7. Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

fect the perfect. This is true in all the works of God, in which there is a development. Adam's earthly state was to be preparatory to a heavenly one. The present life is like a seed time, the harvest is hereafter. The natural comes before the spiritual; as Calvin says, we are born before we are regenerated, we live before we rise.⁸

Having been first born of Adam, we have Adam's earthly body; being now born of Christ, we shall have a body fashioned like His own glorious and immortal body (Phil. 3:21; I Cor. 15:48). "As we have borne the image of Adam as to his body, we shall bear the image of Christ as to his body."⁹ "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption" (I Cor. 15:50). "Flesh and blood", i.e., our bodies as now constituted, cannot inherit the Kingdom nor the mortal be immortal; a new body is required for that.

This great change affects more than man. Abraham Kuyper believed that the new creation included the animals, a belief which Pieters regarded as 'speculation'.¹⁰ Calvin, however, held the same view of the resurrection of the animal creation, as a result of his exegesis of Romans 8:21, and he commented,

It is then indeed meet for us to consider what a dreadful curse we have deserved, since all created things in themselves blameless, both on earth and in the visible heaven, undergo punishment for our sins; for it has not happened through their own fault, that they are liable to corruption. Thus the condemnation of mankind is imprinted on the heavens, and on the earth, and on all creatures. It hence also appears to what excelling glory the sons of God shall be exalted; for all creatures shall be renewed in order to amplify it, and to render it illustrious.

But he means not that all creatures shall be partakers of the same glory with the sons of God; but that they, according to their nature, shall be participators of a better condition; for God will restore to a perfect state

8. *Ibid.*, p. 351.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 353, comment on I Cor. 15:49.

10. Abraham Kuyper, in *De Heraut*, June 7, 1912; Albertus Pieters: *Studies in the Revelation of St. John*, p. 329f. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

the world, now fallen, together with mankind. But what that perfection will be, as to beasts as well as plants and metals, it is not meet nor right in us to inquire more curiously; for the chief effect of corruption is decay. Some subtle men, but hardly sober-minded, inquire whether all kinds of animals will be immortal; but if reins be given to speculations where will they at length lead us? Let us then be content with this simple doctrine, — that such will be the constitution and the complete order of things, that nothing will be deformed or fading.¹¹

The word “resurrection”, *anastasis*, means a raising up, to cause to stand up, and implies an exaltation and an advance or victory. The general resurrection and the new creation is thus the victorious standing up or raising up of all creation. The creation comes into its own, according to God’s sovereign purpose. Thus, however transmuted the physical universe and our bodies may be, they are still resurrected and are not destroyed but rather brought to their ordained purpose.

The doctrine of the resurrection is inseparable from the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The Egyptians, who seemed to approximate a belief in bodily resurrection, actually held to a divinization of man. This concept, though totally wrong, had at least the shrewd insight that any kind of bodily life in the future involved some kind of divine miracle; therefore, it meant that man had become a god. This belief is for Biblical thinking simply a part of man’s original sin, to be as God (Gen. 3:5), and is impossible. Created being is forever and only created being, and the uncreated Being of God is forever and only God. In Jesus Christ, the last Adam, there is a perfect union without confusion, as Chalcedon declared, of the two natures, so that Jesus Christ was very God of very God and very man of very man. The incarnation is unique, and without any mingling of the natures but rather a perfect union without confusion. As the last Adam, Jesus Christ is the perfect man and the fountainhead of a new

11. John Calvin: *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, p. 305. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

humanity which is born again through His sovereign grace and power. The purpose of history is revealed in Him, the greater Adam, so that we must say, "The meaning of history has its ground not in history but in Christ."¹² Not only the meaning but also the determination of history are from beyond history. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18). This means moreover that "the resurrection of Jesus is an anticipation of the new world of God. This endows the resurrection of Jesus with the character of a turning point in the ages, in such a way that the old aeon is still present as the new aeon begins."¹³ Thus, two worlds are now in existence and conflict. The old world seems at times to be the stronger, in that sin and death beset every man, and the universe feels a helplessness and futility in the face of its decay and death. The seeming power of the old world is in reality the judgment of God upon it: the stronger the old order seems to become, the nearer to self-destruction it is. The powers of darkness have God's judgment written into their every fiber, and in their every pretension and move they set forth God's judgment upon themselves. "Over against the sovereignty of the 'power of darkness', 'the Prince of Death', the demonic forces in the old world epoch, there stands in the resurrection aeon the 'Prince of Life', the sovereignty of the Kyrios, the victory in principle over all that destroys life."¹⁴

Christ by His resurrection destroyed the power of sin and of death. By His ascension, His glorified humanity entered into a new condition of existence in heaven, where He reigns as sovereign and intercedes with God the Father for His people.¹⁵

St. Paul declared, "For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root is holy, so are the branches"

12. Walter Kunneth: *The Theology of the Resurrection*, p. 254. St. Louis: Concordia, (1951) 1965.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 255.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 256.

15. J. G. Davies: *He Ascended Into Heaven*, p. 170f. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

(Rom. 11:16). He applied this principle to draw the logical implication: "Now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep" (I Cor. 15:20). His destiny is made the destiny of His redeemed humanity, His people. Those who are Christ's are those who acknowledge His lordship, stand in His atoning grace, and submit to His law-word.

God's being is marked by aseity, i.e., He is self-derived and His being is entirely of Himself; God is eternally and forever Himself, uncreated, wholly omnipotent and omniscient, and owing nothing to any creature. He declares "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else" (Isa. 45:22).

As against this, the ungodly affirm their own aseity, and hell is the realm of those, who in eternal isolation, affirm their independence from God and man. Duffey has said of the writer Jack Kerouac, "For if a philosophical point may be made about a largely unphilosophical movement, the Beat Generation may be said to have all its character compressed into the radical aseity of the formula, 'I am that I am.'"¹⁶ The existentialist and modern world is dedicated to a belief in the aseity of man. As a result, the existentialist mentality, where articulate, as in writers, is marked by a "frantic religiosity without God, this sense of the holiness of violence." It offers violence and death as the new revelation and as the only possible goal of history. It seeks "to become Christ in a Christless world" and to "take over and destroy all that has come before."¹⁷ Existentialism leads man to a "demonic quest", to "the demonic desire to prove that he is beyond any form of divine mandate — that he is his own God . . . to be the source of his own fate . . . Satan has once again become the modern hero, Hell the modern scene."¹⁸

16. Bernard Duffey, "The Three Worlds of Jack Kerouac," in Joseph J. Waldmeir, editor: *Recent American Fiction, Some Critical Views*, p. 177. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

17. Leslie A. Fiedler, "The Breakthrough: The American Jewish Novelist and the Fictional Image of the Jew," in *Ibid.*, p. 89.

18. Richard Lehan, "Existentialism in Recent American Fiction: The Demonic Quest," in *Ibid.*, p. 65.

Yet it is a bad faith which follows from the tenets of existentialism itself. Existential choice and freedom are constructed along asocial lines: existential commitment, on the other hand, is a principle of social involvement. The hero is thus torn between the instinct to live outside society and the guilt which follows such a choice. These two positions are mutually exclusive — and yet to see them both in existential philosophy is only to place Sartre's *No Exit* next to his *What is Literature?* . . .

Destruction — either death or a kind of insanity — is at the end of the existential quest. And yet the quest, the dramatic means of revealing a free will in search of identity, is absolutely necessary to existential literature. The existential hero believes at times that hell is other people. He also believes that there is no longer a dichotomy between good and evil and that evil is a gratuity, a latent part of existence . . .¹⁹

The culmination of this demonic urge for aseity is Hell and the eternal isolation of the reprobate. There is no community in hell; every man there is his own universe, insistent that the only real world is the world of his own imagination.

The culmination of redemption is the resurrection of the body, life in the new creation, the perfect community of God, and the fullness of self-realization in God's service eternally.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

The Sabbath

The idea of a day of rest observed weekly is unknown to paganism. Occasional religious festival days did provide a time or some days of inactivity, but their purpose was not essentially rest but some other reason. Certain weather cycles were observed by many people; in other cases, rest was a byproduct of various tabus imposed upon work, sex, or play on certain occasions. These periods of quiescence were often observances connected with rituals associated with planting, hunting, or fishing. Not only did certain tabus impose occasional rests on some cultures, but also the idea of “unlucky days” also necessitated periodic rests.¹ We still encounter these “unlucky day” rests among followers of astrology, who find certain days unpropitious for activities. To call such observances “Sabbaths” as Hutton Webster does is ridiculous.

In Babylon, the 15th day of the month was observed as a ‘moon-day’.² This was not, however, a sabbath in anything resembling a Biblical sense. The Mohammedan observance of Friday is an imitation of the Jewish and Christian observances, but its essential emphasis is on worship at the mosque rather than abstinence from work.³

In Israel, the sabbath was a sign of the covenant with God. According to Abraham, “Israel hallows the Sabbath as a sign of the people’s sanctification by God.” In the home, on Friday evening, and in the synagogue, the *Kiddush*, on sanctification, was recited:

And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold,

1. Hutton Webster, “Sabbath (Primitive),” in Hastings, *ERE*, X, 885-889.

2. T. G. Pinches, “Sabbath (Babylonian),” in *ibid.*, X, 889-891.

3. G. Margoliouth, “Sabbath (Muhammadan),” in *ibid.*, X, 893f.

it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.

And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. (Gen. 1:31-2: 3).

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the universe, who createst the fruit of the vine.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the universe, who has sanctified us by thy commandments and has taken pleasure in us, and in love and favour hast given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance, a memorial of the creation — that day being also the first of the holy convocations, in remembrance of the departure from Egypt. For Thou has chosen us and sanctified us above all nations, and in love and favour hast given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hallowest the Sabbath.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth.

The sabbath was seen as an eschatological sign of rest, a present blessing in this world, and a sign of the world to come. It was a day of joy: “This day is for Israel’s light and rejoicing,” Israel declared in song. As Abraham noted, “The liturgy speaks of the Sabbath as a hallowed and blessed day which ‘in holiness giveth rest unto a people sated with delights.’”⁴ It should be recognized, from the *Kiddush*, that the sabbath tied together the beginning and the end of creation. It is “a memorial of the creation”, a reminder of the rest of God from His work, and it takes its pattern from the seven days of creation. It is also a memorial of the day of salvation, the passover, “the first of the holy convocations, in remembrance of the departure from Egypt.” But the *Kiddush* also declares,

4. I. Abraham, “Sabbath (Jewish)” in *ibid.*, X, 891-893.

that God has “given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance.” It is an inheritance already received and still to come, with every sabbath drawing the people of the covenant closer to the great and everlasting sabbath of God.

The sabbath is thus a promise of things to come as well as a present reality. To those who are the redeemed, the sabbath signifies our present rest in the Lord. “But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked” (Isa. 57:20-21). The sabbath and the rest given and promised by the sabbath is a sign of the covenant (Ex. 31:13, 16; Ezek. 20:12). For covenant breakers, there is no sabbath and hence no rest. The eternal restlessness and torment of false aseity in hell is thus a vindication of the covenant, as Dr. Schilder pointed out. “Without such vindication of the broken covenant we should have miscarriage of the covenant. To put it bluntly, if God failed to punish covenant breakers, He himself would be a covenant breaker.”⁵ Similarly, because God keeps His covenant with His people, there is a sabbath rest for them.

The paradoxical fact concerning the ungodly is that their cultures decline both in productivity, the ability to work effectively, and in the ability to rest. In most pagan cultures, the ability to work effectively is severely limited, and productivity is low. Prior to the influence of Christendom on some pagan societies, the difference was even more marked. While the hours of work were sometimes long, the total accomplishment was slight, and the productivity was normally barely enough to sustain life for most peoples. Rest was also unproductive of anything but dissipation, so that both work and leisure dissipated human energy and provided little return. A culture which fails to give a functioning meaning to life will fail to the same degree to give meaning to work and play. The will to live is then weak in every area, and man’s energy is dissipated into the void of pointlessness

5. K. Schilder: *Heaven - What Is It?*, p. 88.

living. To have a capacity for a true rest or sabbath means to have a life that has a transcendent purpose and meaning.

The Hebrew sabbath was not our Saturday although it was the seventh day of the week in the Hebrew calendar.⁶ Its place then at the *end* of the week of the Hebrew calendar was significant:

Under the old covenant, the sabbath pointed forward to Him who *was to come* and bring rest; thus the rest followed toil, and the sabbath was the seventh day, the closing day. The weary laborer was given a day of rest lest he die.

Under the new covenant a remarkable change took place, based upon the mediator who, in principle, *has brought rest*, who *has risen* from the dead, who henceforth reigns and lives to all eternity. Therefore the sabbath of the New Testament falls upon the first day of the week. It is a change in principle. Under the old economy the laborer struggled toward the day of rest; under the new economy he begins with rest; he no longer needs to seek rest lest he die; he is richly endowed, an anointed partaker of God's feast, performing works of gratitude.⁷

On Israel's journey from Egypt, Canaan was a symbol of rest, the promised land. "To Israel *in* Canaan (see Psalm 95) it meant a life according to the law of God and, closely associated therewith, rest from enemies."⁸ In the new creation, we *begin* with the fact of rest as basic to our being. Sin and death and the frustration thereof having been removed from our lives, we do not begin under an enervating burden. Moreover, the crippling memory of sin will not handicap us; "the knowledge of sin in heaven will be *insight* rather than *recollection*."⁹ As the people of the sabbath, it is our duty to

see the earth not primarily as accursed but as an instrument for God's glory. Its development and unfolding (civilization and culture) is then preparatory to God's sabbath, and the perfecting of its development is that sab-

6. On this important fact, see Curtis Clair Ewing: *Israel's Calendar and the True Sabbath* (Los Angeles: National Message Ministry, n.d.); and R. J. Rushdoony: *Institutes of Biblical Law*, Section IV, ch. 1, (Nutley, New Jersey: The Craig Press, 1973).

7. Schilder, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

bath. Our task is to hew a path by which that sabbath of God will come. We are not merely to “enjoy” that which is left of beauty and pleasantness in this world.¹⁰

When Genesis 2:1-7 tells us of the creation rest of God, it signifies a cosmic peace in which all things were not only God’s creation but fully and joyfully in submission to Him. This peace was broken by sin, by man’s attempt to substitute his independent work for God’s work. Man, claiming to be his own god, asserting a pretended autonomy and aseity, refused to remain subject to God and insisted instead that God submit Himself to the requirements of man’s reason. If man determined something to be good or evil in terms of his own autonomous standards (Gen. 3:5), then God would have to recognize the validity of man’s independent evaluation. Man thus broke the cosmic peace by his declaration of independence from God and entered into a world without rest in which he began to erect his Towers of Babel as principles of a new world order without God. The world of the fall is an *anti-sabbath world*; its goal is a man-made rest, an impossibility, because man cannot be a god, nor can he be a creator of a new earth and a new cosmic peace and rest. God’s sabbath is thus a hated reminder of another rest and peace, one which man seeks to suppress in order to realize his own peace. God’s sabbath requires rest from our own works because this signifies our trust that our hope and salvation are in God’s work. As Calvin commented on Hebrews 4:10,

We must indeed confess, that then only is our life rightly formed when it becomes subject to God. But through inbred corruption this is never the case, until we rest from our own works; nay, such is the opposition between God’s government and our corrupt affections, that he cannot work in us until we rest. But though the completion of this rest cannot be attained in this life, yet we ought ever to strive for it.¹¹

The significance of the sabbath appears also in the sabbati-

10. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

11. John Calvin: *Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 98f. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.

cal years designated by the law (Ex. 21:2-6, 23:11; Neh. 10:31; Deut. 15:12-18; Lev. 25:5, etc.). The law required cancellation of debts, release of slaves, rest for the soil and for animals, and more, and also promised increased fertility and prosperity for obedience. It was called “a year of dropping” or “cancellation” (Deut. 15:9), a significant term. The burdens, debts, and labors of the past were dropped or cancelled by a refreshing and enriching rest, so that, what would seem, from a humanistic perspective, an impoverishing of man, was in reality his enriching.

And if ye shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? behold, we shall not sow, nor gather in our increase:

Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years.

And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat yet of old fruit until the ninth year; until her fruits come in ye shall eat of the old store. (Lev. 25:20-22)

From a naturalistic perspective, the sabbath of the soil makes good sense; it means the restoration and revitalization of the soil. But the text points to a promise of a miracle: before the sabbatical year God will grant a sixth year of sufficient richness to feed them, not only through the seventh or sabbath year, but up to the harvest of the eighth year. Having sown again in the eighth year, their old store will survive until the ninth year's harvest. This is “a special providence every sixth year.”¹² A rest with bounty is thus at the beginning of the new week of years. The eternal sabbath thus begins with the remaking of all things, a regenerated creation. It thus begins with the changed, transfigured, and fulfilled wealth of the old creation purged of sin and death, made new in and by Christ, and a new creation begun with great wealth. We are told of the new creation that “the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it” (Rev. 21:24), and also that “they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it” (Rev. 21:26). The cosmic rest of Genesis 1:31-2:3 began

12. C. D. Ginsburg, “Leviticus”, in Ellicott: *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, 1,456.

with the wealth of God's creation. The cosmic rest of Revelation 21:4, 5 and 22:3 begins with the regeneration by God of all things made by Him and by man to endow His eternal Kingdom with the abundance of peace.

The sabbath is thus not only rest but rest in wealth and peace. It is indeed the "day of rest and gladness", but also the day of wealth and delight therein. The promise of Psalm 37:11 is a sabbath promise for time and eternity: "the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace."

The Reality Principle

What we have had to say about the nature and psychology of men has had little relationship to what is normally called psychology in humanistic institutions of learning, as well as in most modern seminaries. These are governed by opinions which are anti-Biblical and grounded in principles which assume the autonomy of man from God. The dependence of man upon man is recognized by many humanistic psychologies, but man's absolute and total dependence upon God is denied. But if God has created heaven and earth and all things therein, and has decreed beforehand all things that come to pass (Acts 15:18, Rom. 9, etc.) then nothing can be understood apart from this sovereign God and His word. The reality principle, in psychology as in all things, is to admit the claims of this sovereign and triune God and the authority of His word. It means recognizing the fourfold estate of man and its governing character in men's actions. It means recognizing that existing schools of psychology are implicit or explicit attacks upon Biblical faith.

This does not mean that some interesting things have not been discovered by psychologists, psychoanalysts, and psychiatrists. To recognize an enemy as an enemy does not mean we cannot learn from him, but we must at all times be aware of the framework of his ideas and discoveries.

As Van Til has pointed out, in his *Psychology of Religion*, we cannot overlook the fact that non-Christian psychologies make two untenable assertions. *First*, they assert the metaphysical independence of the self-consciousness of man from God, and, *second*, they assume the ethical or moral independence of the self-consciousness of man from God. The

creation doctrine requires us to hold that man is God's creature and thus metaphysically dependent upon God. Again, as Christians, we recognize the fact of the fall and of sin, and that man, while ethically alienated from God, is still dependent upon God.¹ The roots of modern psychologies are in Eve's readiness to listen to the temptation of Satan and to find an explanation for man and life apart from God. It was an attempt to understand life, man, and the mind of man independently of God, and this attempt is still basic to psychology. Implicit in this is a rejection of God and an assumption that man is a creature of the void who can, in the future, remake himself in terms of his own autonomous mind and will.

The result, depending upon the school of psychology, is a concentration upon the mind or consciousness of man, or else upon the actions of man, upon the periphery or surface of man, because his nature is an open question; it is not to be determined by Scripture, and it is either to be determined by research which presupposes anything except God, or assumes the malleability of man by man. The "evidence" studied by psychology thus is a culled evidence; God is removed from the picture, and nothing is allowed to intrude which can alter the picture of autonomy from God. How evidence is dealt with by modern science appears in an account of a scientific meeting in April of 1966, at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia. According to Dr. Bolton Davidheiser,

Dr. Marcel Schutzenberger, professor of Mathematics at the University of Paris, reported that when an evolutionary situation is simulated and a computer is programmed to answer the question of the probability of evolutionary advance under these conditions, the computer jams! This is interpreted to mean that the probability is less than one chance in 10^{1000} . (Calculation shows that if this number of digits were typed, 4000 digits per page, the paper would fill the known universe about 5×10^{915} times.)

Professor Waddington, who was acting as chairman of

1. Cornelius Van Til: *Psychology of Religion*, p. 3. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1935.

that meeting, said, "We are not interested in your computers!" He asked Dr. Schutzenberger whether he was arguing that life came about through creation, and Dr. Schutzenberger replied, "No!" Other voices in the room echoed his "No!" No matter what the evidence or the results of mathematical computations, they consider it very important that no one dare conclude that anything they say might be interpreted to mean that they do not accept evolution.³

This is clear evidence of a radical presupposition of the autonomy of man and the universe from God. Had the evidence of Schutzenberger been accepted, it could still have been used to assert man's autonomy, because God or creation would have then been ruled a probability, a factor to be evaluated by man. God cannot be God if He is not the absolute sovereign, the governing presupposition and ground of all knowledge. As Van Til has pointed out, the premise of modern psychologies is that, by eliminating God as the governing premise, and by reducing Him to at best a supposedly open question, these men claim, "that they by this method are for the *first time really getting in touch with reality*."³ Reality is thus defined as the autonomy of man from God and the right of man to evaluate God and all things else in terms of his own, self-generated principles of ultimacy, meaning, and factuality (Gen. 3:5). The ultimacy of God and of God's distinction between good and evil are replaced with the ultimacy of man and of the world as man imagines it to be without God.

Thus we sum up our argument . . . and say that at any rate the psychology of religion school takes for granted the non-theistic assumption of the total self-sufficiency of the religious consciousness metaphysically and in the second place that it takes for granted the non-theistic ethics of the ultimacy of evil. Every one of God's creatures is therefore promised a little island of his own and in addition is given the privilege of an eternal moral holiday; he

2. Bolton Davidheiser: *News and Notes*, vol. VIII, no. 11, Whole number 95; La Mirada, California, 1971.

3. Van Til, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

may take his pet sins with him and practice them forever.⁴

The meaning of things is sought in time rather than in God. Because the meaning is sought in time, there “is a desire to seek for the interpretation of life by trying to find the absolute particular.”⁵ In the natural sciences, this means atomism; in psychology, it means subjectivism: the evidence is sought in the mind of man. This search for the absolute particular in explaining man has meant a downward quest, an investigation of the child, of primitive man, and of animals, of abnormal persons, of the unconscious, and so on, all aspects of a broader move away from God and “an integration into the void.”⁶ The alternative to “man *in the void*” is “man *before God*.”⁷ In psychology, as in religion and all things else, the issue is the necessary objective reference: is it the absolutely self-conscious and sovereign God of Scripture, or is it some sort of impersonal and autonomous universe?⁸ In this latter humanistic perspective, the love and service of man is foremost, and God, however formally recognized at times, will in fact be hated and denied in His claims. Men are then governed by the “Cainitic wish” that there be no God.⁹

As against humanistic psychologies, a psychology which does justice to the fact of creation and the sovereignty of the God of Scripture, must, Van Til points out, do certain things:

We will in the first place fearlessly take our concept of God as absolute personality as the standard of human thought. We hold that human thought is analogical of God’s thought. Hence we keep the universal and the particular together always. Mankind was created as a unity. The individual experience of one human being could never bring an independent and so called *native* witness to the nature of religion. No one man ever existed or

4. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 59.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 99.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

was meant to exist in total independence of all others. Each human being was meant, to be sure, to show forth something individual and in this way add something to the witness of the whole of humanity as to what God means to man, but this individual should always be thought of in conjunction with the whole race.¹⁰

Second, “this witness of humanity as a whole must have God as its objective reference and could not exist without this objective reference.” God is the presupposition which undergirds the existence of man and his possibility of knowledge; in no aspect of his being can man exist or function apart from God.

Third, this means that, in a Biblical psychology “we will not set the feeling in opposition to the intellect. God has created man as a harmony. One aspect of man’s personality cannot lead us deeper into reality than another aspect can.”¹¹

Fourth, the solution to our problems rests in the direction of rationality, not a sea or void of irrationality, because the self-conscious God is ultimate, not a void or chaos.

Fifth, “there can be only one true religion” when the God of Scripture is our standard. Scripture thus must be used to determine not only the truth or falsity of religion but also of psychology, since man is a creature of God and is to be understood in terms of Him. We begin with God and the fact of creation rather than with a search for the absolute particular as a basic fact for knowledge. Van Til says of the psychology of religion, “We throw its method overboard completely.”¹² This we must say of all humanistic psychologies. They are varying aspects of man’s revolt against maturity and forms of justification for man’s apostasy and rebellion. Where they admit the fact of sin, sin is redefined as an offense of man against man, or man against himself, as immaturity or arrested development, as anything other than an act of war or rebellion against God.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 53f.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 54.

But man is God's creature, subject to God's judgment, and only to be truly known in terms of God's word. The medieval morality play, *Everyman* (c. 1493-1537), began with the statement, "Here beginneth a treatis how the High Father of Heaven sendeth death to summon every creature to come and give account of their lives in this world and is in manner of a moral play." The theology of *Everyman* may be defective, but its central point, that man is in all things accountable to his Maker and is without excuse in his sin, gives us a God-centered account of man and his nature. The "Everyman" of 18th century literature is the *Gil Blas* of Alain Rene Le Sage (1668-1747), a picaro or rogue, an anti-hero. Gil Blas is, as Evans pointed out,

the young, unprincipled simpleton falling among thieves, duped and duping until, achieving power and hence being able to sin far more than to be sinned against, he sees that statesmanship is rascality writ large and that the sum of practical wisdom is to know when to grab yours and run.¹³

Gil Blas learned the psychology of humanistic man in the process of gaining power. Because man without God moves in terms of humanistic considerations, Gil Blas was able to use this fact to seduce women. In an assignation scene with a woman, the following exchange occurred:

Hold, said she, you are too importunate, this is like a rake. I fear you are but a loose young fellow. For shame, madam, exclaimed I; can you set your face against what women of the first taste and condition encourage? A prejudice against what is vulgarly called vice may be all very well for citizens' wives. That is decisive, replied she, there is no resisting so forcible a plea.¹⁴

The spring of human action here is in apostasy from God and hence subject to the will of man. The *reality principle* in Gil Blas is not God, nor is it in Freud, Jung, Watson, Skinner, or any other modern psychology. Such a psychology can report on trifles; it cannot know man, because it does not know God.

13. Bergen Evans, in "Introduction," to Alain Rene Le Sage (trans. by Tobias Smollett): *Gil Blas*, p. vi. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, 1962.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 1118.

It does not know God, because it refuses to know Him.
“The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Ps. 14:1).
But first he has said, ‘I shall be as God’ (Gen. 3:5).

Epilogue

Perhaps the clearest area of success in the modern pulpit is in the preaching of psychology. Indeed, it can be said that psychology has in the main replaced theology and the social gospel in most pulpits. Today man is more interested in himself than in God or society.

Psychology was once a branch of theology, as was anthropology. With the rise of humanism, psychology began to develop new orientations. In the 19th century, with Wilhelm Wundt, who was the son of a Lutheran pastor, psychology became the science of experience. Evangelical pietism and scientific experimentalism came together to exalt experience as the new area of reality and truth.

The exaltation of experience meant that *life* now meant experience; in its truest, fullest sense, the meaning of life was sought in experience, not in God's enscriptured word. Experience became the new means of revelation.

To cultivate experience means to cultivate also sensitivity to experience. Self-pity, endless and maudlin introspection, and a lust for fiction and theatre fare dealing with experience, the more intense and violent the better, came into respectability and prestige. A reviewer of a particularly immoral film, strongly larded with sex and violence, praised it highly by calling it "an intense theatre experience."

Every bar today has a generous helping of drinkers who are sensitive souls. Whores have a humanistic dignity as persons of experience and purveyors thereof, and their "clients" are also sensitive souls who go to them for therapeutic purposes, we are told.

It should be clear by now that this study regards psy-

chology as a theological, not a scientific or a humanistic concern. Moreover, the popular psychology of our time has no rightful place in the church, in that it is implicitly anti-theological and man-centered rather than God-centered. For pastors to borrow from contemporary humanistic psychologies means to introduce an alien doctrine of salvation to their congregations. Sigmund Freud sought self-consciously to undermine religion by substituting the psychiatrist, psychoanalyst or psychologist for the pastor and priest. Implicit or explicit in any and all psychologies is a doctrine of salvation which is radically at odds with Biblical faith.

If the Bible is right, mental health is a product of justification, of the atonement effected by Jesus Christ, applied and developed in the life of man. This means sanctification, and the rule of faith is clearly the law. Man cannot find mental health apart from faith and obedience. To assume that mental health is possible on any other grounds is to deny that the fall of man was occasioned by sin; it is to deny moreover that the sovereign and sole remedy for the fall is the atoning, regenerating, and sanctifying work and power of God the Son, and of God the Spirit, in terms of the calling of God the Father.

Humanistic psychologies are aspects of the revolt against maturity. Not surprisingly, they interpret man, not in terms of the doctrine of mature creation, but in terms of the essential infantilism of man, and they in part remake man in terms of their false image of him. The consequence of this disastrous course is not mental health but the aggravation of man's fall, and the development of his depravity to further degrees.

A Christian psychology must thus be theological, and systematically Biblical, or else it will be a facet of man's revolt against maturity.

INDEX

- Abraham, 57
 Abraham, I., 327f
 Absolution, 275, 280
 Abstraction, 23
 Actuality, 306
 Adam, 14, 17, 22, 25, 29, 34, 56, 57,
 60, 69, 70, 92, 98, 102, 116, 122,
 123, 126, 127f, 158, 161, 193,
 266, 283, 329
 Adam, image of, 123-128
 Adams, Henry, 137
 Adams, Jay E., 163f, 167f
 Adoption, 203-212
 Adultery, 15, 50, 197f, 277, 280
 Advocate, 233-237
 Africa, 52
 After-life, pagan, 311f, 314
 Alexander, J. A., 135, 143, 295
 Alford, Henry, 140f, 142f, 144, 166,
 207n, 230, 259
 Amillennialism, 185
 American Psychological Association,
 113, 121
 Anarchy, 186
 Andrews, Lewis, 178f
 Animals, 11
 Animals, resurrection, 316
 Anomia, 235
 Antinomianism, 36, 47, 48
 Aquinas, 2, 124, 125
 Aristotle, 48, 105, 124, 125
 Ardrey, Robert, 52
 Armenia, Armenians, 20, 110
 Arminianism, 71, 124f
 Aseity, 319, 325
 Assyrians, 264f
 Atkinson, Basil F. C, 44f
 Atonement, 120, 157-162, 163-170,
 191f
 Aubrey, John, 172-174, 176, 189
 Augustine, 28, 52f, 239, 244, 292f
 Austin, M. E., 172
 Authentic humanity, 56, 63
 Autonomy, 35, 75
 Babel, 79f, 129, 131, 325
 Babylon, Babylonians, 264f, 321
 Bahm, A. J., 270
 Balkan War, Second, 205f
 Banks, J. S., 247n
 Barry, Alfred, 22
 Bavinck, H., 239f, 241
 Beatles, 94
 Berkhof, L., 188f
 Berridge, John, 125
 Bestiality, 132, 278
 Blake, William, 83f, 241
 Block, Ernest, 62
 Blood, thirst for, 313
Blue Banna- Faith and Life, 97
 Bode, Carl, 222n
 Boston, Thomas, 69f, 74, 139, 171f,
 181
 Bouman, P. J., 191
 Braden, Tom, 137f
 Brainerd, Eleazer, 219
 Broden, William, 62n
 Brown, W. Adams, 253n
 Buddhism, 105
 Bulgarian soldier, 206
 Bunyan, John, 234
 Burden, Carter, 20
 Burning-out, 275
 Bussagli, M., 65n
 Buttocks, bared, 296
 Cain, Cainite, 91-96, 211
 Calendar, 229

- Calling, 18
 Calvin, John, Calvinism, 13, 42f, 44,
 82f, 123, 160, 236, 300, 302,
 315f, 316f, 325f
 Cannibalism, 103
 Capitalism, Capitalists, 176, 213,
 214f
 Carpenter, W. Boyd, 284f
 Caucasus, 208f
 Causality, 89f, 118 Celibacy,
 49
 Chaos, 65f
 Charcot, 126
 Charles V, 175
 Chicago, 233
 Children, 11, 117, 119
 China, 52, 265, 302
 Chisholm, Shirley, 254
Christianity Today, 66
 Chrysostom, 267
 Churchill, Winston, 251
 Churchmen, 296
 City, 9
 If City of Man, 52
 Clark, Gordon H., 226 Clarke,
 Arthur, 228
 Clock, 230
 Cochrane, C. N., 86f, 88f
 Coition, cosmic, 271
 Coleman, Kate, 260-262
 Colonials, 288f
 Common grace, 184
 Communism, 132
 Comte, Auguste, 93
 Confession, 273-278
 Connecticut, 221f
 Conscience, 264-272
 Consciousness, 51
 Conservatives, conservatism, 176,
 209, 213
 Control of life, 66
 Cooper, David, 64
 Cornelius, Elias, 216-220, 222
 Corruption, source of, 214ff
 Coughlan, Robert, 179n
 County, 175
 Courts, 233
 Covenant, 298f
 Cowan, Glora, 197f
 Cox, Harvey, 61
 Coyne, J. R. Jr., 64
 Create, 20
 Creation mandate, 10
 Creation, new, 309
 Creationism and psychology, 5-12
 Criminals, 225f, 233, 276
 Cross, 303
 Curse, 17, 20, 300, 303

 Davidheiser, B., 329f
 Davies, D. R., 128n, 152-155, 156
 Davies, J. C., 318n
 Death, 68, 69f, 110-115, 128, 133,
 147, 148, 228, 285, 288
 Death of God, 225
 Death of God school, 62
 Death of man, 63
 Death penalty, 98f
 Decision, 116f
 Defilement, 213ff
 Definition, 144f
 Delacourt, M., 65n
 Delgado, Jose, 178
 Delilah, 139
 Delitzsch, F., 123, 215
 Depersonalization, 38f, 112
 Depravity, state of, 70-77, 97
 Descartes, R., 262
 Despair, 111
 Destruction, 127, 200, 211, 287
 Determinism, 177
 Dewey, John, 150
 Dick, O.L., 174n, 189f
 Diebner, Bernd, 203
 Discipline, cultural, 184-187
 Dominion, 9, 11, 17-21, 42f, 134,
 200
 Dostoyevsky, F., 18, 101, 149, 156,
 181, 266
 Douglass, Frederick, 254
 Drinkers, 335
 Duffey, B., 319
 Durrell, Lawrence, 66n
 Dwight, Timothy, 221f

- Earth, 11
 Eden, 91f, 305, 310
 Education, 1f
 Egypt, Egyptians, 265, 317
 Einstein, 227
 Eliade, M., 228
 Elitism, 127
 Ellicott, C.J., 22n, 169f
 Elliott, Neil, 103f, 106, 108, 112n
 Ellul, J., 91f, 93, 130f, 132
 Energy, 20, 299, 302
 Engels, F., 226
 England, English, 21
 Enoch, 91f
 Environment, Environmentalism, 24,
 72ff, 86-90, 149
 Epignosis, 23
 Epistemology, 9, 22-29
 Erasmus, 48
 Erotic mysticism, 240
 Essad-Bey, 208f
 Estabrooks, George, 293
 Evans, Bergen, 333n
 Eve, 14, 17, 18, 25, 29, 34, 56, 60,
 70, 98, 102, 116, 122, 158, 266,
 321
 Evil, 137, 308
 Ewing, Curtis Clair, 237, 324n
 Existentialism, 7, 63, 319
 Experience, 2, 257-263
 Expiation, 160
 Ezra, 57

 Faber, Leslie H., 114
 Fall, 325
 Family Law, 98f
 Family planning, 131
 Fertility, Fertility cults, 11, 228
 Fiedler, L. A., 319n
 Finkelstein, E., 301n
 First-bom, 207
 Flagellants, 196
 Fliess, 126
 Flood, 129
 Force, 20
 Forgiveness, 279-283
 Foucart, G., 265n

 Frazer, Sir James George, 191
 Free god, 77
 Freedom, 180
 Freeman, Lucy, 252n
 Freud, S., 6, 37, 51, 100n, 102f,
 120f, 122, 126, 127f, 297, 333,
 336
 Fritsch, C. T., 215f
 Fuller Theological Seminary, 56
 Future, 225, 287f, 289, 309

 Garaudy, Roger, 62
 Gaster, T. H., 61n, 191n
 Gaullieur, Henry, 175
 Ghosts, 311f
 Gil Bias, 333
 Ginsberg, Allen, 35
 Ginsburg, C. D., 326n
 Glory, state of, 303
 Gnosis, 23f, 29
 Good, E. M., 252n
 Good, highest, 238-245
 Good will, 286
 Grace, state of, 171-183
 Graham, Billy, 36, 203
 Graham, Lester, 113
 Grand Inquisitor, 149, 156
 Gratification, 225f, 241
 Graveyard Society, 183, 226f
 Greek thought, dialectical nature,
 105
 Greenwood, Harold, 113
 Greer, Germaine, 271
 Grierson, C. T. P., 247n
 Griffin, Susan, 164
 Grossman, Edward, 66n
 Growth, 172, 226
 Guilt, 37f, 100, 102-109, 120, 122,
 127, 157-162, 166, 195ff, 227,
 264f, 274f, 276, 280

 Haldane, Robert, 199f, 207, 249n
 Hall, Bernard H., 120n
 Happiness, 69
 Harper, Robert A., 113
 Harris, C, 313n
 Hart, J. Stephen, 151, 155

- Hastings, James, 78
 Hausheer, H., 238f
 Hawks, Nancy, 21n
 Headless religion, 48-50
 Health, 285
 Heaven, 212
 Hefner, Hugh, 79f
 Hegel, 270
 Heirship, 205, 206f
 Hell, 55, 56f, 212
 Hemingway, E., 74, 271
 Hendriksen, W., 166, 185f
 Henry, C. F. H., 231f
 Henry VIII, 175
 Herbert, A. P., 192f
 Heredity, 87-90
 Hermaphrodite, 65f
 Herzen, Alexander, 154f
 Hill, Norman, 21n
 Hinduism, 47, 138, 150
 History, 150
 Hitler, Adolf, 158, 193, 294
 Hodge, Charles, 30, 31, 82n, 315f
 Holiness, 30-36, 43f
 Holiness of violence, 319
 Home, 53
 Homer, 313
 Homosexuality, 38, 50, 66, 195, 275
 Hope, 246-250
 Howard, Leon, 222n
 Humanism, 31f, 36, 55, 58, 79, 87,
 102ff, 130f, 136f, 146, 149f,
 157ff, 180, 195ff, 205, 211, 228,
 231, 248, 275, 280, 287
 Humanoids, 66
 Hume, D., 262
 Hunt, Morton, 15
 Huson, Paul, 84n
 Huxley, T. H. 178
 Hypnotism, 293-295
 Hypocrisy, 281
 Hyslop, J.H., 264

I Am Curious (Yellow), 106, 108
 I-Thou relationship, 39
 Idols, 134f
 Imagination, 78-85

 Impersonalism, 24
 Incest, 38, 102, 108, 126, 275
 Independence, 125
 India, 52, 300f, 302
 Indians, 114, 240f
 Infallibility, 306
 Ingratitude, 168
 Innocence, state of, 69, 299f
 Intellect, 124
 Islam, 265, 282
 Ivory tower learning, 26

 James, William, 261
 Japan, Japanese, 65, 300
 Jastrow, J., 6
 Jesus Freaks, 75f
 Jones, Ernest, 103, 126n
 Jones, W. H. S., 265n
 Judah, 31
 Justification, 157ff, 188-194, 204

 Kaiser, R.B., 114
 Kalevala, 54f
 Kant, I., 27
 Karma, 149f, 282f
 Keil, C. F., 123
 Kennedy, Robert F., 114
 Kerowac, J., 319
 Keynes, G., 84n
 Kiddush, 321-323
 Kidner, Derek, 26
 Kingdom of God, 52, 243, 245
 Kings, divine, 292
 King's Peace, 254f
 Kipling, R., 247
 Klein, F. C, 80n
 Knowledge, 22-29, 44, 134
 Kotarbinski, T., 55
 Kristol, Irving, 136
 Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. von., 300f
 Kunneth, W., 318n
 Kuyper, A., 316

 Laing, R. D., 63f, 111, 112
 Lamb, Charles, 301f
 Lamech, 97-101, 102
 Landers, Ann, 76f, 277f

Lange, J. P., 159f
 Larger Catechism, 23
 Latin America, 301
 Law, 132, 178
 Lawlessness, 235
 Lawson, J. C, 313n
 Le-Bon, A., 294
 Le Sage, A. R., 333
 Lehan, R., 319n
 Lemminkainen, 54f
 Lennon, John, 94f
 Lennon, Yoko, 94f
 Lenski, 22n, 30f, 199, 268, 286, 303
 Leupold, H. C, 25f, 92n, 95, 97,
 129, 132f, 135, 143
 Levitt, E. E., 197n
 Liberty, 177f
 Lindsay, John, 20
 Locke, John, 2, 124, 125
 Long, Wilbur, 261
 Longstreet, S. & E., 65n
 Los Angeles, 132
 Love of man, 55f
 Lowen, Alexander, 74n, 80f
 Lukacs, John, 248
 Luther, Martin, 203

 Magoun, F. P., Jr., 55n
 Malraux, Andre, 3
 Man, 140-147, 165
 Man, created mature, 6
 Man, defined, 144
 Man, fall of, 69-77
 Man, in image of God, 2f
 Man, nature of, 1-3, 13-16
 Man, religion of fallen, 134-139
 Man, Satanic image, 60-68
 Man, short history, 5
 Man, transformed, 195-202
 Margoliouth, D. S. 265n
 Margoliouth, G., 321n
 Maritza Valley, 206
 Marks, Robert W., 293f
 Marriage, 18, 53
 Marx, 226f, 297
 Mary, 78
 Masochism, 95, 158f, 167

 Masters, R. E. L., 240
 Masturbation, 113f
 May, Rollo, 103, 113, 116-118
 Memory, 282
 Memory transfer, 179f
 Menage a trois, 38
 Menninger, Karl, 120f, 122
 Metz, Johannes, 62
 Miceli, V. P., 93n
 Miller, Henry, 66, 145f, 150, 168f
 Mind, 2, 51
 Mind, unfallen, 124
 Mitton, C. L., 252n
 Moffatt, J., 59
 Mohammed, Mohammedans, 265,
 273, 282, 321
 Molnar, T., 1f, 19n, 67f
 Morality, 168
 Moravians, 46f
 Motherhood, 66
 Mowrer, O. Hobart, 163
 Mumford, Lewis, 227
 Murder, 98, 100
 Mystery of Iniquity, 185f
 Mystical eroticism, 45-47, 80f, 271

 McDowell, Edward A., 151
 McPhaul, Jack, 233

 Nagging, 280
 Native American movements, 220f
 Nature of man, sexual, 10
 Nature, renewing, 213-224
 Nazar, Edin, 110f
 New, 201f, 227, 282, 283, 284-290,
 309
 New morality, 98
 Newness, 172
 Neurotics, 294
 New world, 227
 Nicodemus, 151f, 155f, 169
 Niebuhr, Reinhold, 153, 154
 Nietzsche, F., 314
 Nimrod, 129, 131, 132
 Nirvana, 150
 Noah, 57
 Nonsense, 104f

- North, Gary, 226n
 Novelty, 287
 Nyman, Lena, 106

 Oates, Wayne E., 172n
 Odajnyk, Walter, 101n
 Omnicompetence, 226
 Opiates, 28
 O'Reilly, Jane, 118f
 Orgy, 38f
 Orwell, George, 178
 Over-expectation, 81
 Owen, John, 194n

 Paganism, 311f, 321
 Palme, Olof, 108
 Paradise, 55, 57, 58, 134
 Paradise Motive, 52-59
 Parkinson, Thomas, 35n
 Parricide, 102f
 Pascal, 239
 Past, 288
 Patience, 257-263
 Pauperism, 136
 Pavlov, 124
 Peace, 251-256
 Peace, cosmic, 325
Penthouse, 272n
 Perfection, 65
 Personality, 37-40
 Petrification, 112
 Pharisees, 150f
 Phillippolis, 206
 Phillips, J. B., 65
 Pieters, A., 316n
 Pilgrim, pilgrimage, 96, 211, 288, 311
 Pinches, T. G., 265n, 321n
 Piper, O., 41f
 Plato, 105, 313
Playboy, 79f, 126f
 Politics, 5 3f, 81
 Poor, poverty, 216ff
 Population control, 117f
 Pornography, 72f, 100f
 Post-millennialism, 249
 Power, 254f
 Power to the people, 55
 Potentiality, 306
 Predestination, 71, 75, 88f, 125, 149, 318
 Problems, 148f, 157
 Procreation, 10
 Proof, 249f
 Propitiation, 236
 Propositional truth, 48
 Prostitutes, 260
 Providence, 89f
 Pseudo-piety, 277
 Psychoanalysts, 122
 Psychology, 49, 51, 67, 83, 102, 124, 161f, 163-170, 328-334, 335f
 Psychology, branch of theology, 1-3
 Psychology, humanistic vs. Biblical, 5-12
 Psychology, myths of, 1-3
 Pulpit, 335
 Puritans, Puritanism, 21, 174, 230f, 300, 302

 Quakers, 47, 48

 Rader, Dotson, 127n
 Rand, Ayn, 200
 Rape, 164f, 215
 Rapture, 258
 Raskolnikov, 266
 Reality principle, 328-334
 Reason, 51
 Rebirth, 147
 Reconciliation, 160, 253f, 281
 Reconstruction, 254
 Recurrence, eternal, 314
 Regeneration, 148-156, 163-170, 181, 188, 199f, 287
 Reid, J. S., 314n
 Reincarnation, 150
 Remission of sins, 279
 Repentance, 280
 Responsibility, 86-90, 213
 Restitution, 279f
 Resurrection body, 41, 313-320
 Retirement, 21
 Retribution, 282

- Revivalism, 35f, 125
 Revolt against maturity, 6f
 Revolution, 130f, 225
 Richardson, Alan, 286n
 Ridgeway, James, 20n
 Righteousness, 30-36, 43f
 Rist, Martin, 309n
 Rome, 265, 314
 Roosevelt, F. D., 193
 Rosenfeld, Albert, 66
 Rosenstock-Huussy, E., 231
 Ross, Alexander, 234
 Roth, Philip, 240n
 Russia, 301
 Rushdoony, R. J., 6n, 37n, 92n,
 100n, 150n, 157n, 175n, 180n,
 324n

 Sabbath, 309, 321-327
 Sadism, 157f, 167
 Sado-masochism, 38, 103, 106, 108f,
 172, 195ff, 254
 Salem, Mass., 216-222
 Salem Society for the Moral &
 Religious Instruction of the Poor,
 216ff
 Salvation, 285
 Samsara, 282
 Sanctification, 37
 Sargent, William, 125n
 Sartre, 6, 19, 39, 60, 67f, 73, 101
 Satan, 60f, 66f, 71, 151, 319
 Seduction, 73, 215, 333
 Self-atonement, 195f
 Self-pity, 95, 335
 Sessler, J. J., 47
 Sex, 53, 103f, 197f, 240f, 271
 Sex, group, 275f
 Sex, perfect, 114
 Sex, sexual nature of man, 41-51
 Sexual revolution, 66, 132
 Sexuality, 65
 Scandinavia, 103f, 108, 112
 Scapegoats, 158
 Schilder, K., 298, 306, 308, 309f,
 323f
 Schizophrenia, 63, 111f

 Scholasticism, 48, 124
 Schutzenberger, M., 329f
 Schuyler, George, 225n
 Schweinitz, E. de, 46f
 Scotland, 219
 Scott, John, 176n
 Scott, Thomas, 176f, 308
 Shakespeare, William 87
 Shapiro, Karl, 168
 Sheep and Men, 291-297
 Sheppherd, R. H., 302n
 Sherrill, L. J., 104f, 106f
 Sign, 285f
 Sin, 13-16, 33, 102-109, 166f, 195ff,
 215, 227, 264f, 274f, 276, 280,
 281, 282, 285, 300, 329
 Sin-eaters, 189-191
 Skinner, B. F., 183, 333
 Skinner, J., 31
 Slavery, 208f, 215
 Slavery, spirit of, 207-211
 Smedes, L. B., 56
 Smith, R. Payne, 92, 81f, 129
 Socialism, 213, 248f
 Sodomy, 275
 Soil, sabbath of, 326
 Sontag, Frederick, 77
 South, Robert, 168
 Sovereignty, 131, 203
 Soviet Union, 207
 Space, 227f
 Spence, H. D. M., 268f
 Sprague, W. D., 49f
 State, fourfold of man, 3
 Stent, Gunther, 150
 Stevens, G. B., 31, 32f
 Stickney, Trumbull, 225f, 227
 Stoicism, 257, 259, 314
 Storr, Anthony, 271
 Strickland, W. P., 47
 Strimple, R. B., 61f
 Subjectivism, 331
 Suicide, 104
 Sweden, 108
 Syphilis, 119

 Tabernacle, 309-312

- Tabori, Paul, 46
 Tamar, 31
 Tawney, R. H., 302
 Temple, 310f
 Test-tube babies, 66
 Testing, freedom from, 116-122
 Thayer, J. H., 23
 Theology of Hope, 62f
 Theology of revolution, 61
 Thomson, C. B., 206n
 Time, 225-232, 288
 Toqueville, Alexis de, 136, 220, 222-224
 Transmigration, 282
 Treatment, 275
 Tree of life, 304-308
 Trimble, John F., 275n
 Truman, Harry, 193
 Tyranny, 129-133

 Uganda, 300
 Ullerstam, 108
 University, 26
 Unwin, J. D., 15
 Utopianism, 1f

 Vailland, Roger, 178
 Vampirism, 313
 Van Der Leeuw, G., 228
 Van Til, C., 6n, 7-9, 24f, 27f, 34, 37, 93f, 97f, 167, 184, 242-244, 328, 330-332
 Vice, 219
 Victory, 285
 Vine, W. E., 20n, 23n, 79n, 229n, 251f, 279, 284n, 290n
 Violence, 164f
 Void, 331

 Waddington, 329f
 Watson, James D., 66n, 131

 Way, Arthur S., 199, 230, 283
 Wealth, 302
 Webb, R. A. 204f
 Weber, M., 302
 Webster, H., 321
 Wells, J. W., 38f
 Wesley, Charles, 47f
 Wesley, John, 47f, 125
 Westcott, B. F., 57n
 Westminster Catechism, 75
 Westminster Confession, 279f
 Westminster Standards, 182f
 Whipping, 196
 Whitefield, George, 47
 Wierwille, V. P., 76
 Wife-swapping, 275
 Wilson, Woodrow, 193
 Winick, C., 190n
 Winter, E. F., 48n
 Winter, Sara, 196
 Wisdom, 26
 Wise, Carroll A., 177f
 Witchcraft, 84f
 Withers, Carl, 225n
 Woman's lib, 271f
 Woodward, L. T., 195
 Work, 17-21, 298-304, 309, 323
 World War I, 191, 193
 World War II, 36, 171, 192, 193
 Woudstra, M. H., 203
 Wright, Louis B., 222n
 Wundt, W., 335
 Wurth, G. B., 163

 Young, Edward J., 295
 Young, Robert, 276
 Youth for Christ, 36

 Zinzendorf, N. von, 46f