

Volume 8

Summer 1981

Number 1

# The Journal of Christian Reconstruction



Symposium on  
Social Action

A CHALCEDON PUBLICATION

# COPYRIGHT

---

## The Journal of Christian Reconstruction

Volume 8 / Number 1

Summer 1981

*Symposium on Social Action*

Gary North, Editor

ISSN 0360-1420

A CHALCEDON MINISTRY

Electronic Version 1.0 / October 6, 2006

Copyright © 1980 Chalcedon Foundation. All rights reserved.

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

Chalcedon Foundation

P.O. Box 158

Vallecito, California 95251

U.S.A.

To contact via email and for other information:

[www.chalcedon.edu](http://www.chalcedon.edu)

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

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

# THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

---

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

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

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

The *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* is published twice a year, summer and winter. Each issue costs \$5.00, and a full year costs \$9.00. *Subscription office and editorial office:* P.O. Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251. Copyright by Chalcedon, 1980.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

**Copyright**

**Contributors**

**Editor's Introduction**

Gary North .....7

## 1. SYMPOSIUM ON SOCIAL ACTION

**Comprehensive Redemption: A Theology for Social Action**

Gary North .....17

**Evangelical Social Action**

Kerby Anderson .....51

**Christ's Kingdom: How Shall We Build?**

Tom Rose .....69

**An Epistemology for Dominion**

Tommy W. Rogers .....95

**The Imperative of Christian Action:**

**Getting Involved as a Biblical Duty**

Archie P. Jones .....113

**The Case of the Missing Blueprints**

David H. Chilton .....168

**A Biblical Basis for Survival Preparation**

Michael R. Gilstrap .....196

**Faith and Freedom: The Story of the**

**English Abolition Movement**

Edward P. Coleson .....209

**"The Great Reversal"**

George M. Marsden .....228

## 2. CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

**God Versus Caesar: Taking Steps To Protect Church Schools**

John W. Whitehead .....244

## 3. DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH

**Alexander Solzhenitsyn:**

**A Lesson in Preparation Under the Hand of God**

Rickey Cotton .....251

4. BOOK REVIEWS

**Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925, by George M. Marsden**  
Reviewed by James M. Peters ..... 258

**Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators, by David Chilton.**  
Reviewed by Tommy W. Rogers ..... 267

**Wealth and Poverty, by George Gilder.**  
Reviewed by Tommy W. Rogers ..... 272

**The New Right: We’re Ready To Lead, by Richard A. Viguerie.**  
Reviewed by Vern Crisler ..... 279

**Publication Schedule Volume IX**

**The Ministry of Chalcedon**

## CONTRIBUTORS

---

**Kerby Anderson** is employed by Probe Ministries in Dallas, Texas.

**David Chilton**, B.A., is pastor of a Reformed church in Anaheim, California. His latest book is *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators* (1981).

**Edward Coleson**, Ph.D., is professor of social science at Spring Arbor College, Spring Arbor, Michigan.

**Ricky Cotton** is a freelance writer.

**Vern Crisler** is an employee of the Institute for Christian Economics in Tyler, Texas.

**Michael Gilstrap** is a businessman in Tyler, Texas, who specializes in survival products and publications.

**Archie Jones**, M.A., teaches English literature at the Christian Liberty Academy in Chicago, Illinois.

**George M. Marsden**, Ph.D., is professor of history at Calvin College.

**Gary North**, Ph.D., is the president of the Institute for Christian Economics. His most recent books are *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory* (1981), *Successful Investing in an Age of Envy* (1981), and *The Dominion Covenant: Genesis* (1981).

**James M. Peters**, B.A., is a freelance writer and lecturer in Tyler, Texas.

**Tommy W. Rogers**, Ph.D., is a lawyer in Jackson, Mississippi. His Ph.D. is in the field of sociology.

**Tom Rose**, M.A., is associate professor of economics at Grove City College, in Grove City, Pennsylvania.

**John Whitehead** is a Constitutional lawyer in Manassas, Virginia. He is the author of several books, including *The Separation Illusion*.

# EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

---

*Gary North*

*Social action*: the words send shivers of suspicion down the spines of millions of American fundamentalists. “Social action” conjures up visions of long-haired radicals shouting slogans, committees of all kinds buried deep in the bureaucratic maze of the National Council of Churches, government bureaucrats with search warrants, higher taxes, T.V. anchormen announcing yet another Federal boondoggle, bearded professors of sociology with patches on the elbows of their tweed jackets, and pasty-faced Unitarian ministers calling for Jerry Falwell’s scalp. A few older fundamentalists may have fond memories of the good old days, when social action consisted mainly of grim-faced ladies with battle axes smashing barrels of booze in Chicago or Kansas City, Missouri. There are not that many people left in our churches who remember such a “golden age,” however, so the phrase “social action” has not produced positive responses. As George Marsden writes in his important book, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (1980):

The factor crucial to understanding the “Great Reversal,” and especially in explaining its timing and exact shape, is the fundamentalist reaction to the liberal Social Gospel after 1900. Until about 1920 the rise of the Social Gospel and the decline of revivalist social concerns correlate very closely. By the time of World War I, “social Christianity” was becoming thoroughly identified with liberalism and was viewed with great suspicion by many conservative evangelicals. The Federal Council of Churches tried to maintain some unity in 1912 by instituting a commission on evangelism to counterbalance its well-known social activism. By this time the balance was precarious, and the issue of evangelism as opposed to social service was widely debated. World War I exacerbated the growing conflict. When fundamentalists began using their heavy artillery against liberal theology, the Social Gospel was among the prime targets. In the barrage against the Social Gospel it was perhaps inevitable that the vestiges of their own progressive social attitudes would also become casualties.<sup>1</sup>

In recent years, members of the so-called “neo-evangelical” movement have begun to voice their concern about the lack of social concern on the part of American churches. The neo-evangelicals do not appear to have a great deal of influence among fundamentalist groups, despite the popularity of Billy Graham, who has long identified himself with the neo-evangelicals, {2} through his connection with Wheaton College and his financial support for *Christianity Today*, the most important single outlet for neo-evangelical writers. The uncertain trumpet sounded by the neo-evangelicals on issues like the inerrancy of the Bible and the ordination of women to the pastorate has convinced many fundamentalists that the neo-evangelicals are not to be trusted. Any appeal by neo-evangelical leaders for Christians to become active in social action projects, except in the areas of foreign missions, foreign orphanages, and skid row rescue missions, has been ignored by the vast bulk of fundamentalist congregations. Any call to social action on the part of neo-evangelicals can be interpreted as just another example of neo-evangelicalism’s drift into theological and political liberalism. The constant sniping on the part of the neo-evangelical literati at men like Jerry Falwell and other pastors identified with political conservatism has also alienated the fundamentalists, whose instincts are conservative. The neo-evangelicals are too closely identified with colleges, seminaries, and “book learning” in general, which has not won them much support inside a movement which has traditionally been anti-intellectual.

There is another problem, which is vaguely understood by fundamentalists: the recommended programs for Christian social action have a distressing tendency to be warmed-over versions of now-defunct experiments in domestic and international socialism. The neo-evangelicals parade their “deep concern for the masses” and their “contemporary relevance” by promoting programs and slogans that have been dead politically for a decade or more. Like the fundamentalist missionaries who wind up wearing the cast-off clothing of the “faithful supporters” back home, the neo-evangelicals “dress up in their relevant

---

1. George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 91.



Sunday best” ideas that are cast-offs of the humanist liberals, who have gone on to bigger, better, more bankrupting, and far more chic experiments in compulsory wealth redistribution. The neo-evangelicals are always out of style, intellectually speaking. The popularity of Ronald Sider’s warmed-over Great Society rhetoric, in *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (the title tells all!), is indicative of just this tendency. Sider’s solutions to the world’s ills are considered “hot stuff” by campus Christian leaders and Ph.D.-holding seminary professors, and the book has gone through numerous editions since 1977. Those programs that were suggested in 1957 by humanist intellectuals, passed into law in 1967 by Lyndon Johnson, and found to be bureaucratic nightmares by 1977, have been recommended by Sider and his associates in their writings since 1977. Should we be surprised to find that one of Dr. Sider’s recommended organizations, the Jubilee Fund of *theOtherSide* magazine, gave money to the Nicaraguan Sandinistas in the late 1970s?<sup>2</sup> I don’t think so. {3}

When I wrote my essay, “Drifting Along With Christianity Today,”<sup>3</sup> back in 1970 (it was published years later), I found distressing tendencies toward political liberalism. What has happened to that popular journal over the last decade has only confirmed my suspicions. In the 25th anniversary issue (July 17, 1981), we see the dilemma of neo-evangelicalism. It is desperate for academic and social respectability. Billy Graham says of his decision to create the magazine in 1956:

During 1953, I was beginning to be attacked from both the left and the right. The crusades, however, were showing that a great number of clergy in the so-called mainline denominations throughout the country were evangelical in their convictions. To the amazement of most fundamentalists, they were cooperating with us. Also, there was a tremendous vacuum in religious publishing. The *Christian Century* was about the only Protestant magazine being quoted in the secular press. It had the field to itself, and it was considered quite liberal in those days. (26)

The reason why the *Christian Century* was considered quite liberal in 1953 is because it *was* quite liberal in 1953. It is still quite liberal. That leads me to this observation. It seems altogether fitting, and

---

2. *theOtherSide*, September 1979, 41.

3. *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 2 (Winter 1975–76).

equally revealing concerning the drift of *Christianity Today*, that Martin E. Marty, a longtime theological liberal and associate editor of *Christian Century*, was asked to write the 25th anniversary issue's article on the success and impact of *Christianity Today*! It is a verbose, supercilious article—appropriate for a theological liberal whose world-and-life view is in the process of disintegration. It is a scholar's piece, obviously not aimed at Christian laymen who are deeply committed to the historic creeds of the church of Jesus Christ. One of his observations is accurate and illuminating, however:

A rereader of old volumes will find that the magazine seldom provided venturesome leadership to the evangelicals in civil rights and other struggles or social action causes. Only after a movement made its way and began to become less controversial did the editors grow less wary. Yet occasional inconveniencing positions have been aired: against unquestioning nuclear armament, needless despoiling of the environment, or neglect of the poor and hungry. Given the potential power of quickened readers of the Bible, with its many calls for justice, one looks with hope for biblical discernment by the editors who address a large evangelical constituency. (50)

I am not the editor of *Christianity Today*. The odds seem good that I will not be invited soon to take on that responsibility. I would not have invited Martin Marty, distinguished liberal and underminer of the faith, to contribute anything to the 25th anniversary issue, or any other issue. I would have returned his manuscript with a letter that read, in part: "Look, you liberal wimp, we don't need your condescending evaluation of our magazine's {4} success or failure. People whose theology is sending others straight to hell are not in a position to comment much about anything, and certainly not on the nature of Christianity." But the editor did not return Dr. Marty's manuscript; instead, he published it.

So here we are, a quarter of a century after its founding, with the enemy of 1956 (or 1953, or any other date you care to choose) invited to tell the subscribers just what it was that *Christianity Today* accomplished. The fact that such an evaluation was published in *Christianity Today* only testifies to the *paralyzing intellectual inferiority complex* of the neo-evangelical movement in general and the magazine's editors in particular. The movement's drift towards theological liberalism and compromise has been going on from the beginning. It is unlikely to be

reversed soon. For good reason, fundamentalists who happen to pick up a copy of *Christianity Today* are unlikely to be impressed with the magazine's latest call to social action. If *Christian Century* isn't worth paying attention to, then neither is *Christianity Today*. If the editor has to rely on Richard N. Ostling, the religion editor of *Time*, to write "The Last 25 Years of Religion in the News," then he should not be surprised when financially hard-pressed Christians decide not to renew their subscriptions, since they can get the news a lot earlier in *Time*—and just as slanted to the Left. If you want liberalism, get it straight from the source; don't fool around with the regurgitated liberalism that *Christianity Today* spews up every other week. (And please, if you do subscribe, don't leave copies lying around on the living room table, where impressionable children can get their hands on it.)

What, then, is the proper attitude toward a call for Christian social action? The person hearing the call had better examine the biblical justifications for the recommended program. If the Bible asks us to get involved, we should do so, if our peculiar talents as individuals lend themselves to the program. But we must also be very careful to identify the locus of authority for inaugurating and financing the called-for reform. Is it the institutional church? Is it some church-related but legally independent Christian social welfare agency? Is the person calling for reform trying to get the civil government into the act, either today or in the future? If so, then it is imperative to search the Scriptures, in order to determine whether God wants the State involved in such a program. The call for social action can be legitimate. It can also be a con job by the State's propagandists, all dressed up in black robes and flip-around collars.

Another question that is relevant in evaluating the legitimacy of any given call for social action is this: By what standard can we impose our views on the external world? Does biblical law provide us with binding guidelines? If not, what is the source of our guidelines? There are no social action programs without guidelines. It is only a question of *whose* guidelines. Show me a social reformer who claims to have no guidelines, no blueprint for {5} action, and I will show you either an incompetent ignoramus or a calculating menace to society, but probably the latter. He will either absorb all donations in ineffective projects, or else he will construct an engine of coercion that will create problems

far worse than those which his blueprint-less program is trying to solve.

There are reasons for getting involved in social action projects. In my essay, I offer a theology of social action that is grounded in biblical law. If God sent Jesus Christ to die for the world, then His death must have consequences for institutions and interpersonal relationships. The crucifixion has implications for the whole world, for God so loved it that He sent His own Son to die for it. Salvation (healing) is not simply ethical regeneration and the transformation of human character. It involves restoration of the whole cosmos (the Greek word for “world”). Salvation, in short, is comprehensive. Not everyone will go to heaven, but not all sinners will be sent straight to hell this evening, either. As Christians, we have tasks of dominion assigned to us by God. We are told to be healers. We are to impose biblical law on society, which will begin to heal the institutions of society. Biblical civil law protects life, property, and morality, so that Christians, working individually and in voluntary association, can begin to serve as agents of healing in the world.

**Kirby Anderson** discusses several models of evangelical social action. He demonstrates that Christians are far more receptive today to the call for social action than at any time in this century. Still, there are tendencies within contemporary evangelicalism that militate against social action. Some Christians claim that all such projects are futile in a fallen world. Such projects are “worldly,” and necessarily involve compromise. Anderson correctly identifies the source of this attitude: the other-worldly gnosticism of the early church. Pessimistic eschatologies also hamper social reform. Too many Christians equate Christianity with the status quo, and this defuses godly social change. He also challenges the radical evangelical tradition as being equally deviant. Then he offers a set of biblical principles that can serve as guidelines for social action: 1) the citizenship principle; 2) the principle of priorities; 3) divine sovereignty; 4) the distribution of individual gifts; 5) the principle of concession: becoming all things to all men, in order to save some (1 Cor. 9:22).

**Tom Rose** stresses the principle of *voluntarism*. The Kingdom of Christ is all-encompassing. The civil government is not. Therefore, we need to stress each individual’s responsibility before God for getting

involved in social action, but not by means of State coercion. There are guidelines for the economy that must be respected, just as there are guidelines to defining adultery and marriage. He then challenges Christians to become involved in several areas of welfare that are not the responsibility of the civil government: education, care of the aged, and the care of the poor. He uses the energy {6} crisis of the 1970s as an example of how civil government fails to solve problems, and in fact actually creates them.

**Tommy Rogers** focuses on the conflict between humanism and Christianity in the area of social action. The humanists want “man to take control of his destiny,” which means that they want State bureaucrats to control everyone. The Christian must take a stand against this post-Darwin view of man. The *forced perfection* of messianic liberalism is a menace to human freedom. It is this outlook which has made it so difficult for political liberals to take seriously the tyranny of the Soviet Union. They share too many presuppositions concerning the nature of man and his institutions. The answer, however, is not an equally humanistic and reactionary conservatism. We need a philosophical base for any program of reconstruction. That base is biblical law. Then he criticizes several areas in which traditional secular conservatives have failed to challenge the liberals successfully.

**Archie Jones** also points to the war between Christianity and humanism. Paganism today is increasingly statist, although anarchism has its adherents. The humanists have attacked three institutions: the family, Christian schools, and the church. We have to be prepared to resist in all three areas. Christians have retreated for a century, and this has made it possible for the humanists to gain control of the civil governments at all levels. We must be “more than defenders”: we must become aggressive *builders* of God's kingdom. The Great Commission is a call to evangelism, which includes social action. Jones then provides the names, addresses, and a description of programs for dozens of organizations that are involved in social action and education.

**David Chilton** has removed the axe he left in Dr. Ronald Sider's back in *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators*, only to sharpen it up and plant it even deeper between Sider's shoulder blades. The socialists are using Christian language to confuse naive Christian evangelicals into believing that the Bible teaches some version of

socialism. They argue that there are no biblical guidelines for economics, which is another way of denying the validity of those biblical laws that unquestionably teach free-enterprise principles. Perhaps his introductory parable does not really refer to Dr. Ronald Sider himself. Then again, perhaps it does. The remainder of the essay certainly does. What Chilton demonstrates beyond a shadow of biblical doubt is that the so-called radical Christians are indeed radical; their theology, however, is not Christian. It is humanistic and socialistic to the core. They have officially rejected the idea that the Bible provides binding guidelines for social action and human institutions. They have then offered programs based on later guidelines, such as the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848. Their technique is to offer as valid Christian approaches every perverse, rebellious program of secular humanism that they can imagine—homosexuality, feminism, abortion, socialism—and then offer a {7} “disclaimer,” saying that they are not really recommending these programs, but only offering up food for thought. Such food for thought makes a God-fearing man vomit. While *Christianity Today* offers us regurgitated liberalism, *theOtherSide* offers us regurgitated revolutionism and depravity. (Why, we might ask, does the neo-evangelical InterVarsity organization print and distribute edition after edition of Sider’s *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*? Why does Inter-Varsity cooperate with the liberals at the Roman Catholic Paulist Press in a copublication venture like this? And more to the point, why do the middle-class, conservative financial supporters of Inter-Varsity not demand a purge of those who decided to publish Sider’s book, and adopt a copublishing program with the Institute for Christian Economics to promote Chilton’s refutation of Sider? You know the answer, and so do I. Neo-evangelicals are suicidal, gullible, and ignorant of biblical law.)

**Michael Gilstrap** throws down the gauntlet to those Christians who are not willing to buy dehydrated food, weapons, and other survival gear. When these people are caught in a crisis, they will make moral demands on those who have prepared, and who were previously regarded as “fair game” for ridicule by these super-pietist Christians. We need to become survivalists, as Noah, Joseph, and Moses were.

**Edward Coleson** tells us the story of the British anti-slavery movement, which was Christian to the core. It took years of propagandizing and years of political pressure, but eventually the evil practice was abol-

ished by the British Parliament. William Wilberforce and John Newton (who wrote “Amazing Grace,” and who was a former slave ship captain) were important leaders in the anti-slavery crusade. It took half a century to get the slaves emancipated, but Christians stayed with the movement, despite the delays and disappointments.

The reprint of chapter ten of **George Marsden’s** book, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, tells the story of “the great reversal” of the 1920s, when social concerns, weak as they had been, faded from the fundamentalist movement. He pinpoints the causes, the main one of which was the reaction to the theological liberalism of the Social Gospel movement. It has taken 50 years to begin to reverse this pietistic retreat from the arenas of social conflict.

A very fine statement of the biblical view of Christian social action appears in a pair of prayers in the 1928 edition of the *Episcopal Book of Common Prayer*:

*For Social Justice*

Almighty God, who hast created man in thine own image; grant us grace fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations, to the {8} glory of Thy holy name; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

*For the Family of Nations*

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, guide, we beseech thee, the nations of the world in the way of justice and truth, and establish among them that peace which is the fruit of righteousness, that they may become the Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

These prayers are just not that common any longer.

# 1. SYMPOSIUM ON SOCIAL ACTION



# COMPREHENSIVE REDEMPTION: A THEOLOGY FOR SOCIAL ACTION

---

*Gary North*

© Gary North, 1981.

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. (John 3:16)

There is no more familiar verse in the Bible in today's evangelical world. This is the "verse of verses" in presenting the gospel of salvation to those outside the faith. It is this verse which is supposed to convey to the unregenerated the idea of the love of God. It is also the verse which most clearly offers to man the chief incentive to believe: eternal life.

It is common for men to point to the introductory phrase, "For God so loved the world," and to conclude that this verse teaches that God sent Christ to die for all men. The term, "the world," supposedly refers to all the souls of all men on earth. In other words, when we speak of "the world," we mean the aggregate of mankind. The focus of concern is the conversion of souls. Evangelicals see their area of personal responsibility as essentially fulfilled when they deliver the gospel of personal salvation to the lost. The comprehensive gospel is, in their eyes, *comprehensive* with respect to souls (Christ died to save all men), but *limited* with respect to the effects of redemption, namely, human actions and institutions.

The Greek word, *kosmos* (world), refers to something far broader than the aggregate of humanity. It refers to the *present world order*, the scheme of creation which man was designed to complete. The Bible speaks of the prince of *this world* (John 14:30). It asks, "For what is a man advantaged, if he gain *the whole world*, and lose himself, or be cast away?" (Luke 9:25). However, the Pharisees stated of Jesus that "the world"—meaning a large number of Israelites—"is gone after him" (John 12:19b). In some instances, *kosmos* was used to refer to persons

in a group, but the word usually referred to a much broader concept: *the world order*. “My kingdom is not of this world,” Jesus said (John 18:36a). He was not referring to all the souls of mankind, but to the creation, the total world order. This comprehensive world order is being steadily reconciled to Christ, in the dual sense that men are being reconciled to Him (2 Cor. 5:19), and that Satan’s {10} kingdom is being overcome by the preaching of the gospel and the establishment of Christian institutions. “For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet” (1 Cor. 15:25).

When the Bible speaks of God’s love for the world, it obviously does not include the prince of this world, Satan, for an everlasting fire has been prepared for him and his angels (Matt. 25:41b). God loves the world, meaning that which He created, but He nevertheless intends to visit the world with a cleansing fire (2 Peter 3:10). The world today will, in part, survive that fire, yet elements of it will not. In other words, the world loved by God *is now*, but it also *will be*. There is both a present and future aspect, just as there was a separate world order prior to the flood, yet God preserved elements of that world by His grace in the ark (2 Peter 2:5). There is both *continuity* and *discontinuity* in the biblical concept of *kosmos*. It was, is now, and shall be, despite major changes.

The question that has to be dealt with is this one: What is the relationship between that *kosmos* which God loves and the work of redemption which Christ inaugurated, that whosoever believes on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life? In short, *is the world being redeemed?* People are; what about the world?

### *Grace: Special and Common*

Grace means *unmerited gift*. Or more precisely, it means a gift from God to those who do not merit such a gift, on the basis of the death of His Son, Jesus Christ, who did merit God’s favor. When we speak of “common grace,” we are not speaking of God’s love of all humanity, but instead we are speaking of God’s common gifts to humanity. God sends the blessings of sunshine and rain to all men, both the just and unjust (Matt. 5:45). Nevertheless, this does not mean that He loves all men indiscriminately. The gifts to the righteous are special; any gifts to the unrighteous are for their ultimate *condemnation*.<sup>4</sup> As Paul writes, concerning our obligation to help our enemies (quoting Proverbs 25:22):

“Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head” (Rom. 12:20). The fact that our enemies receive unmerited gifts from us, and therefore from God, who is our Supreme Commander, makes their unwillingness to repent all the more devastating to them on the day of judgment, for God punishes those who have received much from His hand with greater severity than those who have received less (Luke 12:47–48).

God loves the world, the created order. He loves His own people, but He also loves the cosmic order which sustains them. Without sun and rain, {11} without life itself, His people could not be sustained. When Adam died by rebelling, he did not cease breathing immediately. He was physically sustained by God. Adam provided the seed of future generations. Adam was given life, so that those beloved by the Lord before the foundation of the world might be born and enter into His salvation. God has chosen us in Christ “before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us into the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will” (Eph. 1:4–5). Because of God’s special grace in electing some to eternal life, those who have not been so elected have nevertheless enjoyed the blessings of life. All men have participated in the plan of God; all men have played a role.

This is the proper frame of reference for the misused passage, 1 Timothy 4:10: “For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those who believe.” This is not a defense of universal salvation, meaning universal election. It is a defense of the idea that God’s grace—His *unmerited gift* of Jesus Christ—is the foundation of life itself. God’s grace heals all men. It gives them life and power to work out their destinies with fear and trembling (Phil. 2:12). This is a twofold grace: universal and particular. Particular grace refers to personal redemption. Universal grace, or common grace, refers to the providence of God: the very sustaining power which undergirds the arena of existence. God loves

---

4. Gary North, “Common Grace, Eschatology, and Biblical Law,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 3 (Winter 1976–77): 15–17.

this arena, the *kosmos*. He loves it so much that He sent Jesus Christ into the world to die for it.

The *kosmos* is comprehensive. It includes the life-sustaining features of the creation. Christ's death is therefore comprehensive, for it is the very foundation for time itself. What could exist apart from God's grace? What benefits would Adam and all his heirs, including Cain, otherwise have enjoyed? God's love for the world order does not mean that He loves everyone in it. It does not mean that the special favor of God is offered indiscriminately to all men, let alone to Satan and his angels. It means that God extends *external blessings* to those who are His *eternal enemies*.

God so loved the *kosmos* that He gave His only begotten Son to sustain it. He did not offer the blessings or even the possibility of eternal life to everyone in the *kosmos*, so the particularity aspect of His salvation is maintained. Yet He loved more than the souls of men in general, thereby preserving the comprehensiveness of His love. He loves the world order, which is the arena of the drama of history. He does not love the tares of the field, but He loves the *field*. "The field is the world [*kosmos*]; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one" (Matt. 13:38).

Evangelicals have restricted the meaning of *kosmos* to human souls in general, yet they have simultaneously broadened the frame of reference of {12} God's love, namely, to souls in general. The Bible does not teach this. God loves *souls in particular* and the *world in general*. The concern of the evangelical world has been on the saving of souls, and they have long neglected the healing of the institutions of the world. But God's Son died to save (heal) all men, even though He did not die to regenerate all men. By neglecting the task of healing the *kosmos*—the institutional world order—Christians are denying the comprehensive nature of Christ's salvation. (*Salve*: a healing ointment.)

### *The Trinity and Society*

The Trinity is a uniquely Christian concept: one God, yet three Persons, each with exhaustive knowledge of the others, and each equal in substance with the others, in perfect harmony of purpose and authority. In other words, there is unity and diversity in God's being. God is

absolutely personal. There is true communion among the Persons of the Trinity. God is simultaneously *one* and *many*.

We see in the creation a reflection of the nature of God. Society is both one and many. The human race is a unity which is distinguishable from other species, yet each individual has special characteristics that separate him from all other humans. A consistently Christian social philosophy acknowledges the reality of both the one and the many.<sup>5</sup> For example, individuals are responsible before God for all that they say or do in life, and they will be judged individually on the day of judgment in terms of their performance (1 Cor. 3). At the same time, social aggregates are also responsible for their adherence to the laws of God that are relevant for the particular aggregates: families, civil government, businesses, ecclesiastical organizations, etc. An entire society can be found guilty before God, in time and on earth (Deut. 28:15–68). We cannot ignore the laws relating to individual behavior or social behavior. Both individuals and social aggregates are responsible before God.

If we take this approach to social analysis, we have to deal with institutions. We have to recognize the covenantal relationship between men, and also under God. When a man and a woman contract (covenant) before God in establishing a family, they are responsible as individuals for the performance of their vows. Men and women have different assignments in the marriage, different responsibilities, and different degrees of authority (Eph. 5:22–33; 1 Peter 3:1–7). When men establish a civil government, they are also required to impose the rule of God's law for the civil government (Deut. 8). Men benefit as individuals from social peace, and social peace is {13} a product of a society's adherence to biblical law. Every covenant is a covenant under God's law. Without law, there is no covenant.

There is always a temptation for men to overemphasize or even ignore either the one or the many in a social order. Radical individualism or anarchy is one perspective, while socialism or totalitarianism is the other. In fact, as Hannah Arendt, J. L. Talmon, Robert Nisbet, and

---

5. R. J. Rushdoony, *The One and the Many: Studies in the Philosophy of Order and Ultimacy* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, [1971] 1978). This book develops insights in the writings of Cornelius Van Til.

other social philosophers have noted, the absolute totalitarian regime requires the abolition or absorption into the State of all intervening social institutions—institutional buffers between the State and the citizen—in order to exercise maximum power.<sup>6</sup> The absolute *one* of the totalitarian State is composed of the radically autonomous (and unprotected) *many*. A man is defined solely as a member of the State, a “citizen” and nothing else. The French revolutionaries made “citizen” the universal greeting. France’s Committee for Public *Safety* was also the Committee on Public *Salvation*; either translation is valid.<sup>7</sup> The messianic State requires undefended and isolated citizens as its foundation.

In modern evangelical circles, the tendency has been to emphasize personal and individualistic responsibility before God, to the exclusion of institutional responsibilities. Men are seen as souls to be saved from sin. Institutions are not seen to be in the need of salvation (healing). Perhaps some attention may be given to the institutional church and its various agencies. These may be understood as being in need of reform, but not the civil government or other human institutions. Men as believing souls are to be brought under the rule of God, but not institutions. Evangelicals, especially American fundamentalists, have preached and planned as if they were convinced that institutional reform is either impossible, in time and on earth, or else such reform is an automatic product of transformed lives, especially the lives of the leaders of the organizations.<sup>8</sup> But no guidelines are set forth as being morally binding institutionally; nothing as binding as the law against

---

6. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, rev. ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, [1968] 1973); J. L. Talmon, *Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (New York: Norton, 1970); Robert Nisbet, *The Quest for Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, [1953] 1962); Nisbet, “Rousseau and the Political Community” (1943); reprinted in Nisbet, *Tradition and Revolt* (New York: Random House, 1968).

7. Robert Nisbet, *The Sociological Tradition* (New York: Basic Books, 1966), 34.

8. George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980). Marsden emphasizes that this pietist strain was accentuated after 1920, in response to the increased emphasis on social change by advocates of the social gospel: pt. 3. The revivalism of 1870–1900 was at times concerned with social change, but far less so from 1900 to the First World War, focusing on the temperance movement, missions, and private charity to those in poverty.

divorce in family covenants is found in matters of, say, monetary policy.

In contrast to the individualism of twentieth-century fundamentalism, we find that theological liberals have tended to become advocates of social {14} reform. The institutions of society are corrupt, they argue. Social justice is lacking. There must be some sort of institutional reforms, they argue, before men can live in harmony with their brothers. The presupposition of *environmental determinism* is often the foundation of such social analysis. Until the institutions are reformed, there can be no hope of individual reform.

A second aspect of this form of theological liberalism is its commitment to the civil government as the primary agency of social reform and therefore of social justice. The State is a messianic institution. Somehow, the State and its agents can be trusted to exercise monopolistic power for the benefit of God's kingdom, not just in those limited areas specified by the Bible, but in every area of life. The State is an agency of social salvation (healing), and therefore of personal salvation (healing). Not much emphasis is placed on the special grace of God—personal regeneration for eternity through faith.

The Bible teaches us that *salvation is comprehensive*, just as God Himself is comprehensive. The one and the many are redeemed by Jesus Christ. They are healed because of Christ's sacrifice on the cross. But we know the fruits of salvation: adherence to the law of God. A good tree yields good fruit (Matt. 7:16–20). God so loved the world that He gave His Son as a sacrifice. If this comprehensive nature of Christ's redemption is ignored, then either one side or the other will be overemphasized: individual redemption or social transformation. Evangelicals want men's lives healed; liberals want institutional structures reformed. Both use biblical law (or some hypothetical working out of the principles of biblical law) as the standard to judge whether or not a man or an institution has been redeemed. But both sides select only certain aspects of biblical law as their criteria, a practice which Rushdoony has called *smorgasbord religion*: a convenient picking and choosing of those aspects of biblical law that appeal to the audience or the religious leaders.

Late-twentieth-century evangelicalism and fundamentalism have begun to modify this earlier perspective as one-sided, that is, their con-

cern for soul saving to the exclusion of concern for reforming institutions. Some evangelicals (and a tiny but growing handful of fundamentalist leaders) have now begun to concern themselves with social reform. This is partially a revival of an older evangelical tradition in the United States: the pre-Civil War revivalism of the Western states. This revivalism, especially under the influence of Charles G. Finney, was emotionalistic and pro-abolition.<sup>9</sup> The {15} abolitionist movement was not simply the product of a handful of Boston Unitarians and Transcendentalists.<sup>10</sup> They needed a transmission belt in order to rally Christians in the North, and revivals became one such transmission belt. Finney's perfectionism became, at Oberlin College, a crusade for abolitionism. The slavery question became a passionate cause for many Western revivalists.<sup>11</sup>

However, once the Great War was over, it was easy for this emotional commitment to dissipate into a reforming spirit, or else to dissipate into pietism. Both approaches were common in the North and West. The reforming spirit became a part of the Social Gospel movement, and pietism became part of a later revivalism. Christianity turned outward on the one hand, and inward on the other.

The same dualism marked the post-Civil War developments of the South. The antebellum religious leadership, especially the progress-minded and culture-minded Presbyterians, never fully recovered from the defeat of the Confederacy, which they had equated with Christian civilization.<sup>12</sup> The rise of the pietist and independent churches to posi-

---

9. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (Garden City, NY: Image Books), vol. 2, chap. 40, 96–97. On Finney and Oberlin's perfectionist theology, see Benjamin B. Warfield, *Perfectionism*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1981), sec. 7, pt. 1. This is a reprint of the original Oxford University Press edition of 1932. This section of the book is also reprinted in the abridged version published by Presbyterian & Reformed, [1958] 1974.

10. Gilbert Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830–1844* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, [1933]). This is not to say that the leadership of the abolitionist movement came from the evangelicals rather than the Transcendentalists in Boston and the Northeast. See especially the book by Otto Scott, *The Secret Six: John Brown and the Abolitionist Movement* (New York: Times Books, 1979).

11. Benjamin P. Thomas, *Theodore Weld: Crusader for Freedom* (New York: Octagon, [1964] 1973). Cf. Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976). Dayton is Ronald Sider's brother-in-law.



tions of local leadership transferred political power from the kingdom-minded to the revival-minded. The Populist movement, with its uneducated leaders, was one substitute for the older southern conservative leadership, but it had died out by the turn of the century.<sup>13</sup>

By the late twentieth century, the pietist position was being challenged by the political leftists within evangelicalism and by the newly recruited political right within fundamentalism. The political left within evangelicalism found an ardent promoter in Dr. Ronald Sider, whose prescriptions for social renewal are sufficiently vague on the specifics to keep the conservatives anesthetized, but sufficiently radical in language to gain him extensive support on seminary faculties and within student movements. He has gained support as a result of his denial of the social adequacy of an older generation's commitment to personal regeneration. He writes:

**THE BIBLE AND STRUCTURAL EVIL.** Neglect of the biblical teaching {16} on structural injustice of institutionalized evil is one of the most deadly omissions in evangelicalism today. What does the Bible say about structural evil and how does that deepen our understanding of the scriptural perspective on poverty and hunger?

Christians frequently restrict the scope of ethics to a narrow class of "personal" sins. A few years ago in a study of over fifteen hundred ministers, researchers discovered that the theologically conservative pastors speak out on sins such as drug abuse and sexual misconduct. But they fail to preach about the sins of institutionalized racism, unjust economic structures and militaristic institutions which destroy people just as much as do alcohol and drugs.

There is an important difference between consciously willed, individual acts (like lying to a friend or committing an act of adultery) and participation in evil social structures. Slavery is an example of the latter. So is the Victorian factory system where ten-year-old children worked twelve to sixteen hours a day. Both slavery and child labor were legal. But they destroyed people by the millions. They were institutionalized or structural evils. In the twentieth century, as opposed to

---

12. John P. Maddox, "From Theocracy to Spirituality: The Southern Presbyterian Reversal on Church and State," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 54 (1976).

13. C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974); *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963).

the nineteenth, evangelicals have been more concerned with individual sinful acts than with their participation in evil social structures.

But the Bible condemns both. Speaking through his prophet, Amos, the Lord declared,

*For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not revoke the punishment; because they sell the righteous for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes—they that trample the head of the poor into the dust of the earth, and turn aside the way of the afflicted; a man and his father go in to the same maiden, so that my holy name is profaned. (Amos 2:6–7)<sup>14</sup>*

Sider's appeal is based on several factors, not the least of which is his moral critique of the parents and pastors of those seminary students who are guilt-ridden and rebellious—students who are subsidized by those who have drawn Sider's criticisms. Another extremely important factor in his popularity is his promotion of dead programs of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, which is one more example of how Christians climb on board discarded humanist programs of political salvation.<sup>15</sup> Because conservative fundamentalists have failed to develop a comprehensive world-and-life view based on biblical law, they are (or have been) unable to refute the latest humanist fads; and these fads, when worn out, become the "latest thing" on seminary campuses. Christian intellectuals are usually about half a generation behind the humanists, since they dine under the tables of the humanists, waiting hopefully for any scraps that might fall from the tables. What Harvard regards as passé, the "radical" evangelicals regard as the {17} cutting edge of social regeneration. And the fundamentalists are seemingly unable to refute either group.

The 1980s have brought a revival of interest in the older conservative tradition of the nineteenth century within fundamentalist circles. Ideas and political programs somewhat reminiscent of the older Presbyterianism—the Hodges and Alexanders in the North, and men like Dabney in the South—have begun to gain attention. The same kinds of arguments that nineteenth-century conservative Protestant leaders

14. Ronald Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977), 132–33.

15. David Chilton, *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators: A Biblical Response to Ronald Sider* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1981).

might have offered against perfectionist revivalism and the Social Gospel movement are being heard again.

For years, liberal theologians decried the lack of political concern shown by the fundamentalists. They assumed, of course, that “political concern” would always be transformed into some version of New Deal nostrums. Now, however, the “New Christian Right” has become a major factor in American politics. The liberals in the churches are horrified, and almost daily some official of the National Council of Churches or a mainline liberal denomination blasts away at the fundamentalists’ supposed denial of “the separation of church and State.” The liberals have counted noses—an honored practice in any democratic nation—and have been startled to learn that the Moral Majority has more votes than the Barthians, Tillichians, Niebuhrians, and all the other robed humanists combined. Now they seem to think the nation would be far better off if the fundamentalists would simply return to their old ways, lock themselves in their churches, and ignore political matters that simply “do not concern them.” It turns out that “Christian political concern” does not automatically mean pamphleteering for the New Deal. This revelation has shocked the theological liberals.

### *Church, State, and Society*

The theological and political liberals have generally adopted some version of humanism. Humanism has, in turn, generally adopted some version of statism. The State, as the most powerful of the institutions of man, and by far the most centralized, has been regarded as the agency of salvation. The messianic State has gained its faithful worshippers in the pews of liberal churches, or at least in the pulpits. The liberals believe in salvation by law—humanist law.<sup>16</sup> They believe (or have believed until recently) fervently in the beneficial nature of social legislation. *Politics has been the religion of humanism since the days of the tower of Babel.*<sup>17</sup>

---

16. R. J. Rushdoony, “The Modern Priestly State: The Sociology of Justification by Law,” in *Politics of Guilt and Pity* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, [1970] 1978), pt. 4, chap. 2.

17. Rushdoony, “The Society of Satan” (1964), *Biblical Economics Today* 2 (October/November 1979).

The liberals have tended to define solutions in terms of State power. This means that they define the problems of life in terms of politics. Political {18} solutions are *the* solutions. This perspective is what has traditionally distinguished liberals from conservatives. Edmund Burke, in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), provided modern conservatism with its statement of faith. Not politics, but tradition; not social upheaval, but social stability; not the rule of politicians, but the rule of law-abiding leaders in many institutions: here was Burke's manifesto. Society is not to be subsumed under the State. The State is not society. The State is simply one aspect of society, namely, the political. It is not a monopoly of authority. Churches, families, voluntary associations of all kinds, local civil governments, educational institutions, and numerous other institutions also have lawful authority. Men are not simply members of the State; they are members of many organizations, and they have multiple loyalties and responsibilities. Burke's perspective was generally Christian. The horrors of the French Revolution after 1792 had been predicted by Burke, and the Christian West finally recognized the Jacobin movement as its mortal enemy. Jacobinism is a rival religion, the religion of humanity.<sup>18</sup>

The liberals have always tended to equate *social* reform with *political* reform. Social reform must be accomplished by top-down legislation imposed by the civil government. Only in this way, they believe, can the institutions of society be healed. Marx and the revolutionaries went one step beyond: the political orders of the old civilization must be shattered by revolutionary violence.<sup>19</sup> Lenin perfected this doctrine: capture the machinery of the old government and reform it. Then impose the will of the revolutionary cadre on the people. It was no accident of history that the French revolutionaries captured the bloated bureaucratic machinery of a monarchy and oligarchy that had lost faith in its own ability to lead, or that the Russian revolutionaries captured an even more bloated bureaucratic system, top-heavy and burdened by

18. Rushdoony, "The Religion of Humanity," in *The Nature of the American System* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, [1965] 1978), chap. 6. On the French Revolution, see Nesta Webster, *The French Revolution* (Hollywood, CA: Angriss Publishers, [1919] 1969); [Anonymous], *Seventeen Eighty-Nine* (Belmont, MA: Western Islands, 1968).

19. Gary North, *Marx's Religion of Revolution: The Doctrine of Creative Destruction* (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1968).

military defeats, economic crises, and loss of faith.<sup>20</sup> It is extremely difficult to capture a decentralized social order that resists both anarchy and centralization, and which retains faith in the moral validity and practical performance of its own institutions.

One criticism of churches that get involved in social action projects is that “religion and politics don’t mix,” a variation of the old doctrine of the separation of church and state. There are several comments that are in {19} order. First, social action projects need not be political in nature. In fact, *in a social order based on the Bible, social projects would overwhelmingly be voluntaristic and privately financed*. By equating social action and politics, some conservative Christians have fallen into the ideological trap set by the liberals. Social action can involve political aspects from time to time, but it is not innately political, or even predominately political.

Second, what about religion and politics? How can any political order be free from religion? Religion is a fundamental category of human life. Men live in terms of faith, a set of presuppositions that they regard as self-justifying, self-evident, and ultimate. These are therefore religious assumptions about the nature of life, man, law, and causation. How can men legislate apart from basic presuppositions? How can the civil government say “no” to anything, unless there is something immoral about the act being prohibited? All legislation is ultimately *legislated morality*.

In a Christian social order, such legislation is not intended to redeem men from sin. It is intended to restrain the outward effects of sin. It is designed to protect the innocent. It provides a *predictable restraining framework* which enables individuals to make their contributions—in church service, in business, in the professions, in the neighborhood—without fear of arbitrary interference from State bureaucrats. A framework of civil law tells men what must not be done, so that they can devote their skills, capital, and efforts to those projects that can and perhaps should be done. It even allows them to devote their efforts to projects that cannot be done, but which might seem possible and

---

20. Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the French Revolution* (Garden City, NY: Anchor, [1856] 1955). Richard Pipes, *Russia Under the Old Regime* (New York: Scribner, 1975).

worthwhile to attempt. *Civil law is not supposed to make men good; it is supposed to restrain external evil.* And evil is defined by means of a moral and religious perspective.

There is good politics and bad politics; there is never neutral politics. There is a political order based on the Bible, and there are numerous political orders based on religions opposed to the Bible; there is never a religion-free political order. Until Christians finally reject all forms of the myth of neutrality, they will remain culturally impotent. Christ rejected all versions of the neutrality doctrine when He said: “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad” (Matt. 12:30). Christians have been “neutralized”—made into ineffective gatherers—by means of the myth of neutrality. Those humanists and other religionists who are at war against the Bible and the God of the Bible have successfully promoted their religious systems at the expense of Christian orthodoxy by successful use of this preposterous myth. Some of the humanists have even believed in it in the past, although since the mid-1960s, the majority of thoughtful humanists have become more consistent with their philosophy of ultimate relativism, in which no final truth is possible. They have admitted that they, too, are promoting positions that must alienate others. They have steadily abandoned natural law theory and other forms of universalism. But {20} without some universally agreed-upon principles, there can be no neutral universe of discourse.

One of the best examples of a now-dead faith in human reason is found in a very popular book, *How to Read a Book*, by Mortimer Adler. It first appeared in 1939, and it has gone through at least forty printings. As a book on how to read critically, it is excellent. As a book on philosophy, it is naive. It is based on a nineteenth-century view of human reason. The relativism of men like Karl Mannheim, or the influential book by Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1970), cannot be reconciled with the naive rationalism of Adler.<sup>21</sup> Here is Adler’s faith:

---

21. Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); I. Lakatos and A. E. Musgrave, eds., *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

One is hopeless about the fruitfulness of discussion if one does not recognize that all rational men *can* agree. Note that I said “*can* agree.” I did not say all rational men *do* agree. I am saying that even when they do not agree, they *can*. And the point I am trying to make is that disagreement is futile agitation unless it is undertaken with the hope that it may lead to the resolution of an issue.

These two facts, that men do disagree and can agree, arise from the complexity of human nature. Men are rational animals. Their rationality is the source of their power to agree. Their animality, and the imperfections of their reason which it entails, is the cause of most of the disagreements that occur. They are creatures of passion and prejudice. The language they must use to communicate is an imperfect medium, clouded by emotion and colored by interest as well as inadequately transparent for thought. Yet to the extent that men are rational, these obstacles to their understanding one another can be overcome. The sort of disagreement which is only apparent, resulting from misunderstanding, is certainly curable.

There is, of course, another sort of disagreement, which is due to inequalities of knowledge. The ignorant often foolishly disagree with the learned about matters exceeding their knowledge. The more learned, however, have a right to be critical of errors made by those who lack relevant knowledge. Disagreements of this sort can also be corrected. Inequality in knowledge is always curable by instruction.

In other words, I am saying that all human disagreements can be resolved by the removal of misunderstanding or of ignorance. Both cures are always possible, though sometimes difficult. Hence the man who, at any stage of a conversation, disagrees, should at least hope to reach agreement in the end. He should be as much prepared to have his own mind changed as seek to change the mind of another. He should always keep before him the possibility that he misunderstands or that he is ignorant on some point. No one who looks upon disagreement as an occasion for teaching another should forget that it is also an occasion for being taught.

But the trouble is that many people regard disagreement as unrelated to either teaching or being taught. They think that everything {21} is just a matter of opinion. I have mine. You have yours. Our right to our opinions is as inviolable as our right to private property. On such a view, communication cannot be profitable if the profit to be gained is an increase in knowledge. Conversation is hardly better than a ping pong game of opposed opinions, a game in which no one keeps score, no one wins, and everyone is satisfied because he ends up holding the same opinions he started with.

I cannot take this view. I think that knowledge can be communicated and that discussion can result in learning. If knowledge, not opinion, is at stake, then either disagreements are apparent only—to be removed by coming to terms and a meeting of minds; or, if they are real, then the genuine issues can always be resolved—in the long run, of course—by appeals to fact and reason. The maxim of rationality concerning disagreements is to be patient for the long run. I am saying, in short, that disagreements are arguable matters. And argument is both empty and vicious unless it is undertaken on the supposition that there is attainable truth which, when attained by reason in the light of all the relevant evidence, resolves the original issues.<sup>22</sup>

Very few serious scholars really believe this any longer. They may do their best to make their arguments coherent, but when pressed, they really do wind up arguing that everything is simply a matter of individual opinion, individual prejudice, or individual class position. Marx believed that all philosophy is a class weapon used by the ruling social class to subjugate another. Everything for Marx was a question of ideology. Similarly, Van Til argued throughout his works that logical inference is always dependent upon one's starting point. If an argument is consistent, it must be circular. It cannot come up with a conclusion which is logically inconsistent with its presuppositions, unless there is a fundamental flaw in reason as such.<sup>23</sup> In short, we cannot use a system of reasoning which presupposes the intellectual autonomy of man, and then conclude that such a reasoning process demonstrates the irrefutable existence of the God of the Bible—a God who is absolutely sovereign, absolutely autonomous, and absolutely powerful. The existence of such a God denies the starting point of autonomous human reasoning.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, we cannot expect to see any reconciliation between rival systems of logic; since their presuppositions are irreconcilable,

---

22. Mortimer Adler, *How to Read a Book: The Art of Getting a Liberal Education* (New York: Simon & Schuster, [1939] 1967), 246–48.

23. R. J. Rushdoony, "The Quest for Common Ground," in Gary North, ed., *Foundations of Christian Scholarship: Essays in the Van Til Perspective* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1976), 33–35; Greg Bahnsen, "Pragmatism, Prejudice, and Presuppositionalism," in *ibid.*, 288–90.

24. R. J. Rushdoony, *By What Standard? An Analysis of the Philosophy of Cornelius Van Til* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, [1959] 1974). Richard L. Pratt Jr., *Every Thought Captive* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1979).



their conclusions will also be irreconcilable. In Dooyeweerd's words, these presuppositions are pretheoretical, and therefore religious in {22} nature.<sup>25</sup> They cannot be resolved by means of theoretical arguments.

The Bible says that the *work* of the law—not the law of God itself—is written on the heart of every man (Rom. 2:14–15).<sup>26</sup> There *are* universally shared ideas, but these ideas are *actively restrained or suppressed* by covenant-breaking men, as the first chapter of Romans argues (vv. 18–23).<sup>27</sup> There is a common ground of discourse among men, based on God's revelation of Himself through the creation, and also based on the image of God in man, but this common ground is ethically suppressed. No common human logic can overcome this suppression.

What is the relevance of all this for social reform? Simple: all reforms are either consistent with the Bible or inconsistent. The Bible is our point of reference, our final court of appeal. The Bible, not natural law or natural reason, is the basis of evaluating the applicability or validity of any proposed social reform. When we lobby to have a law passed, we need not concern ourselves that it is a specifically Christian law—a law inconsistent with Marxist ideology, Islamic culture, or the latest findings of a Presidential commission. We must not allow ourselves to be paralyzed by doubts regarding the supposed unfairness of a particular law—"unfair law" being defined as any law that might restrain the self-proclaimed autonomy of man. There are always valid debates about timing, or the cost of enforcement, or the strategy of getting a law passed, but questions of fairness must not be decided in terms of humanistic law or humanistic assertions that a particular law "mixes religion and State." The more relevant question to be asked of any proposed law is this one: *whose* religion does it promote?

Should the institutional church get involved in politics? The more relevant question is this: Can any consistent church *avoid* politics? Can it avoid discussing the decisions that men, including its members,

---

25. Herman Dooyeweerd, *In the Twilight of Western Thought* (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, [1960] 1968), 18–21. This is the thrust of Dooyeweerd's huge work, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, [1954] 1969).

26. Cf. John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, [1959] 1971), 74–76.

27. *Ibid.*, 36–37.

make in life? Can a church stay silent in the face of legalized abortion? On a key issue like this, you would think that the most hardened “separator” would capitulate, but the vast majority of churches in any city are publicly unconcerned about abortion. They are not identified as pro-abortion or antiabortion churches. They do not preach on the topic. They do not encourage members to get politically involved in the war against abortion. They stay silent. They remain impotent. They do not speak up when unborn children are aborted, and they remain culturally *impotent*—a fitting punishment, given the nature of the crime which they do not actively oppose.

The problem is not that of remaining outside of politics. If evil is entrenched {23} in the land, all institutions that do not actively oppose it are part of that evil process. They become agencies for smoothing over the evil. Such churches give hope to men, calm the fears of men, and promote the blindness of men. They are important agents for the humanists. They perform their task of neutralization and castration quite well, and the humanists continue to reward such institutions by allowing them to retain their tax exemption.

Today when we speak of persecution, most pastors think of the threat of the loss of their churches’ tax-exempt status. They are not worried about prison sentences. They do not stay awake nights thinking about Klan-types burning down their homes or their churches. They worry about the loss of their tax-free status. *Satan buys off Christian leaders rather cheaply*. It is my opinion that tax-exemption, coupled with confiscatory tax rates and mass inflation, is one of the most important tools in the arsenal of the humanists in the late twentieth century.

By bringing the churches back into prominence in the decision-making process at every level, Christian reconstructionists would see an improvement in the preaching and teaching of the churches. Today’s churches can afford to be irrelevant, since the pay-off for relevant preaching—the loss of tax-exempt status—is not very attractive. It pays a pastor to preach irrelevant sermons. Irrelevance is the watchword in most Bible-believing churches today. They fear loss of their tax status. They have a pessimistic eschatology which says that the church (at least in this “church age”) cannot hope to see the reign of Christian law and culture. Most of them have even abandoned the concept of a uniquely

Christian law-order, which means they have abandoned the concept of Christian civilization (for without a law-order, there can be no civilization). The churches are socially irrelevant today precisely because *they have adopted a theology of earthly irrelevance*, and they have sold their institutional freedom for tax exemptions.

Tax-exempt status is a weapon which Christians must use to undermine the enemy. It can be very difficult for the civil authorities to destroy the tax-exempt status of any given congregation. So tax-exempt status can become a weapon for churches on the offensive. Tie up the bureaucrats in legal red tape. No compromise must ever be made solely as a result of some bureaucrat's threat (or the possibility of a threat) of removing the church's tax exemption. But it is easy to compromise, and not difficult to rationalize a compromise. Tax exemption is a very dangerous "gift" from the State. Use it prayerfully.

Every human institution is a possible topic in the church. Every human institution is capable of falling into sin, so the churches must always be alert to the degeneracy of the social institutions of the nation. There is no "King's X" from God and the rule of God's law. The church which hires a {24} pastor who preaches the whole counsel of God must be prepared for him to lead them into deep waters, especially in the midst of a perverse generation. There are too many "court prophets" today. There are too many pastors who refuse to see the working arrangement between their own bland sermons and the degeneracy of the culture around them. They can remain irrelevant in "good times," meaning evil times with high per capita income. They will not survive in hard times, when the protecting institutions of society are collapsing, or becoming openly tyrannical. People will subsidize irrelevance only while it is cheap.

### *Praying for God's Judgment*

We have to take seriously the outline of Deuteronomy 8 and Deuteronomy 28. If God's covenanted nation departs from His justice by departing from His law, it must be judged. This is not an option. Either men within a nation repent, and return to God's law, or else they will be destroyed. This is the *scattering process* spoken of by Jesus (Matt. 12:30). "And it shall be, if thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify

against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish; because ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God" (Deut. 8:19–20). The scattering of Israel was God's threat against them. It is Christ's threat against men today. Men without a psychological center are regarded as crazy. Societies without a center become anarchistic, then tyrannical, and then are overcome by foreign invaders or domestic insurgents. Ours is a *theocentric* universe. We must build in terms of this principle, or be scattered abroad. God is the center of all existence, as its Creator and sustainer. Individuals must acknowledge this fact, and so must institutions. They acknowledge this by covenanting with God, and there can be no binding, valid covenant without law, God's law.

There comes a time in the life of a covenanted nation that the judgment must come if that nation is to be healed. Without the chastisement of God—external, temporal judgment—God must give up the nation to the lusts of men's hearts, which means a casting away of the society. The *judgment* is therefore a form of *long-term grace*. Without it, there is no hope.

When is this necessary? First, when leaders ignore God and God's law. Second, when the people agree with their leaders. Third, when the sins have become so blatant that foreign nations ridicule God because of the sins of His people. This is the reason Nathan brought before King David: "... by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme..." (2 Sam. 12:14). God is jealous for His own name. Even an evil king like Ahab won a victory over the "invincible" Syrians because God {25} was jealous of His own sovereignty. "And there came a man of God, and spake unto the king of Israel, and said, Thus sayeth the Lord, Because the Syrians have said, The Lord is God of the hills, but he is not God of the valleys, therefore will I deliver all this great multitude into thine hand, and ye shall know that I am the Lord" (1 Kings 20:28).

What is the function of God's external judgment on a society? First, to remind them that He is God. Second, to bring men face to face with the relevance of His law. Third, to humble them before Him and to repent. Fourth, to remind their children of the God of their parents. This is why all those in the generation of the wilderness perished,

except Joshua and Caleb. They all were unfit to rule, being slaves mentally. But their children learned who God is, and they were fit to conquer in His name. Judgment is to demonstrate the sovereignty of God and the total dependence of His people on Him. Also, fifth, it is to provide sufficient fear so that men become willing to discipline themselves in terms of a chain of command. It is to raise up an army. Men must fear their heavenly Commander more than they fear the enemies of God. Sixth, judgment on His people is to warn the enemies of God about their own impending judgment. Chapters 15 through 24 of the book of Isaiah provide a lengthy rendering of the woes that would befall all the surrounding pagan nations. Chapters 28 through 31 provide a similar set of woes that would befall the inhabitants of Israel. No one escapes, but restoration was promised to Israel, whereas no restoration was promised to the surrounding pagan cultures. The key differentiating factor is *restoration*.

What God's prophets prayed for and announced was *judgment unto restoration*. When the culture had departed so far that men had forgotten God, God struck them down. "Woe unto them that are at ease in Zion," the prophet Amos announced (Amos 6:1), and it is this warning which is supposed to awaken the sleepwalking members of His congregations. Judgment is one effective way to awaken them, to relieve them of their ease.

What are the basic forms of judgment? There are many. Deuteronomy 28 lists several: geographical (v. 16), financial (v. 17), agricultural (v. 18), pestilential (v. 21), drought (vv. 23–24), military (v. 25), dermatological (v. 27), psychological (vv. 28, 66–67), medical (vv. 60–62), demographic (v. 62). The general curse: "And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to naught; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease ..." (vv. 63–65a). The *scattering process* was designed to provide them with a most practical education in comparative religion. They would learn what it means to be a servant of a foreign god. {26}

*Judgment is comprehensive.* This is the lesson of Deuteronomy 28. Judgment is comprehensive because sin and rebellion are comprehensive. Sin and rebellion infect every area of life. Satan is at work everywhere. He offers a challenge to God wherever he can. Because God requires His servants to exercise dominion in every area of life, across the face of the earth (Gen. 1:26–28; 9:1–7), His law is comprehensive. *Rebellion against His law is also comprehensive.*

If judgment is comprehensive, then in order for men to avoid comprehensive judgment, they must repent. This repentance must be as comprehensive as the sins had been during the period of rebellion. This also means that the standards of reconstruction must be comprehensive. If men are repenting in general, then they must be repenting from particular sins. *We do not sin in general without sinning in particular.* If men are to stop sinning, then they need to know which actions constitute sin before God. They need standards of moral behavior. Without a *comprehensive law structure*, men cannot know what God expects them to do. They also cannot know what God expects them to refrain from doing.

When the institutions of society have been corrupted—corrupted in specific ways by specific individuals—then they need to be reformed by godly men who are reconstructing social institutions in terms of God's revelation of His standards in His law. It is not enough to see men regenerated. When they are regenerated, they must ask themselves: what things did I do before that were wrong, and what must I do differently to have my work acceptable to God? Unless these questions are asked and subsequently answered, the *fruit* of men's regeneration will be minimal. In some cases, it may continue to be evil. For example, what if some persecutor in the Soviet Union were converted to Christ? Would he be fulfilling God's law by becoming an even more efficient persecutor of God's people? No; he would have to get out of that calling. There is a book written about just such a convert, Sergei Kourdakov's *The Persecutor*. He defected to the West, wrote the book, and was murdered by Soviet agents (or so the evidence indicates). It is not enough, then, to call for men to turn to Christ. They must also *turn away from Satan* and all of Satan's works.

When a society is so at ease in Zion, when men and women no longer concern themselves about the specific nature of their sins, when

social institutions are ignored as being beyond the scope of God's law, when preaching is no longer geared to helping specific Christians reform every area of life for which they are morally responsible, when leaders no longer read the Bible as a source of guidance in concrete decisions based on concrete laws in the Bible, when Christians no longer have faith in the long-term success of the gospel, in every area of life, in time and on earth, *then* the judgment of God is at hand. Then they must be awakened from their slumbers. When the steady preaching of God's law, week by week, institution by institution, is {27} no longer present in a society which was once openly under a covenant with God, then God uses other means to reform that covenanted society. If men will not respond to honest preaching, or when the preaching is truncated (cut short) to suit a false theology or rich donors, then God reforms society by *some other means* than preaching and response. *Judgment* is that grim other means.

When should preachers begin to pray for comprehensive judgment? When they have a vision of the comprehensive nature of sin, and the comprehensive nature of redemption. If they have seen that so few preachers in society share this understanding, and that the rebellion of men in the society is accelerating, and that there is no way that preaching is likely to catch up with the rebellion, then it is time to begin calling for the comprehensive judgment of God.

Such judgment must be sufficient to scare Christians into action, and to paralyze the sinners who are in control of the prominent institutions. It is to cause a shift in authority: from the ungodly to the godly, either by *conversion* of the ungodly, or by their *removal* from positions of authority. This may require years of crisis or even servitude to a foreign power. It may require paying tribute to a foreign power, just as Israel paid tribute to a long line of foreign powers, culminating in the scattering (*diaspora*, or dispersion) of Israel under the Romans in the second century AD. It does not matter how severe the judgment becomes, as long as the rebels within the society lose power, and the Christians eventually gain power. Only one thing must be preached: that *God's will be done*, that restoration come on God's terms, not on man's terms. Men pray down the judgment of God on a rebellious society the way that a platoon commander orders the artillery to lay down a barrage in his own sector, when the enemy is overrunning his pla-

toon's position. It is not an act of suicide, but a painful act of aggression.

Is the West at this stage? Yes. The single issue of abortion is proof enough. Murder of the innocent is the law of the land in most Western societies. As long as the slaughter of the innocents continues, societies store up a warehouse of wrath. If godly preaching and godly political mobilization are not enough to reverse the trend, then fear born of judgment will have to be the prayer of the saints. We must scare men into allowing the innocents to be born. (By "innocents," I do not mean sin-free; I mean judicially innocent in human courts—those who have committed no crimes.) We have lost on this issue. We have little time remaining to reverse the political process. Every year that we are delayed by the murderers in high places, a million die in the United States, and untold millions in other nations. God's judgment is preferable to this.

What godly men must do is this: *prepare for a coming cataclysm*. They must offer valid alternatives to today's social degeneration, in every sphere {28} of life. Each man need not attempt to provide guidelines for total reconstruction, but each man must find at least one area, preferably the one in which he possesses valid authority. Men must write, teach, and work to rebuild. They must prepare their families and churches for a coming cataclysm. They must do whatever they can to be in positions of leadership during and following a cataclysm. In fact, a series of cataclysms is likely, as sketched in Deuteronomy 28. *We must be ready to survive, so that we will be ready to lead*. We must confront the world with prophetic preaching, challenging those in authority to repent, to turn back from their *specifically* evil ways.

One thing should be borne in mind: God will not pity the objects of His wrath. The prophets repeated this warning: God would not pity them. "And I will dash them one against the other, even the fathers and the sons together, saith the Lord: I will not pity, nor spare, nor have mercy, but destroy them" (Jer. 13:14). Ezekiel was even more specific concerning God's lack of pity:

Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Also, thou son of man, thus saith the Lord God unto the land of Israel; An end, the end is come upon the four corners of the land.



Now is the end come upon thee, and I will send mine anger upon thee, and will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense upon thee all thine abominations.

And mine eye shall not spare thee, neither will I have pity; but I will recompense thy ways upon thee, and thine abominations shall be in the midst of thee: and ye shall know that I am the Lord.

Thus saith the Lord God; An evil, an only evil, behold, is come. An end is come, the end is come; it watcheth for thee; behold, it is come.

The morning is come unto thee, O thou that dwellest in the land; the time is come, the day of trouble is near, and not the sounding again of the mountains.

Now will I shortly pour out my fury upon thee, and accomplish mine anger upon thee: and I will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense thee for all thine abominations.

And mine eye shall not spare, neither will I have pity: I will recompense thee according to thy ways and thine abominations that are in the midst of thee; and ye shall know that I am the Lord that smiteth.

Behold the day, behold, it is come: the morning is gone forth; the rod hath blossomed, pride hath budded.

Violence is risen up into a rod of wickedness: none of them shall remain, nor of their multitude, nor of any of theirs: neither shall there be wailing for them.

The time is come, the day draweth near: let not the buyer rejoice, nor the seller mourn: for wrath is upon all the multitude thereof.

The sword is without, and the pestilence and the famine within: he that is in the field shall die with the sword; and he that is in the city, famine and pestilence shall devour him. (Ezek. 7:1–15) {29}

Most people on earth have been refugees, captives, and tribute-payers in this century. Certainly, they have been tribute-payers to the messianic State. They have tasted the fruits of the religion of humanity. A few nations have avoided outright military invasion: the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Latin America. Now Latin America is being threatened, and Central America has actually experienced Communist takeovers. No one is immune. The Chinese Communists went on the Long March in the early 1930s, to escape from the military forces of the anti-Communists. They thought it no great sacrifice to retreat, in order to fight another day. A decade and a half later, they were victorious. What conquering ideological humanist armies are

willing to suffer for the sake of the cause, few comfortable Christians are courageous enough even to contemplate as an outside possibility. They would rather die, they say. Better yet, they would rather be raptured to heaven above, sticking out their tongues on the way up at those nasty next-door neighbors who drink beer on Saturday night and play loud rock music on their stereos. After all, if drinking beer and listening to rock music in stereo doesn't constitute wickedness, what does? And if something else really is worse, it would probably be too controversial to preach against. It might involve getting personally involved. It might involve getting organized politically. It might involve donating hours to some cause, or some local charity. Worst of all, it might involve losing the church's tax exemption. No, drinking beer and listening to rock music on Saturday night are evils sufficient to the day. Do this, and you miss the rapture.

The Israelites suffered captivity, tribute, and years as refugees. They tasted the fruit of unrighteousness. They saw what the judgment of God entails. They did not learn. They finally were scattered abroad. Having abandoned the redemptive concept of culture, they lost the land. Why should we expect better treatment? Why should we pray for better treatment? Why should we live our lives as if Deuteronomy 28 were not true? Why should we want it not to be true? Why should we prefer to live in a world in which there is no relationship between comprehensive rebellion and comprehensive judgment? Why should we want to preach a gospel that offers less of a challenge than comprehensive dominion through comprehensive redemption? *Why is our faith less than comprehensive?*

Here is the tragedy of modern preaching. Most Christians have given up hope for Christian dominion, in time and on earth. The premillennialists pray fervently for the rapture. They buy endless books about prophecy, each one more colorful than the last, with the leading characters in the program changing constantly. (A remarkable study of the shifting interpretations of the "experts" in prophecy is Dwight Wilson's *Armageddon Now: The Premillennial Response to Russia and Israel Since 1917*, published by Baker Book House in 1977.) Take away their escape hatch, and they face a grim reality: they are going to die. A generation raised on Hal Lindsey's {30} books does not really believe in death, since they fully expect to be raptured out of this world before the

trouble really begins. Why should men who believe they will personally escape the sting of death before the century ends be concerned with the problems of social reconstruction? They usually aren't.

Most amillennialists are even more pessimistic. They see no escape before things hit the low ebb for Christianity. They see external defeat, but without the delightful escape hatch of the rapture. As Rushdoony has commented, they are premillennialists without earthly hope. At least the premillennial dispensationalists expect to get out before the worst arrives, and return to rule with death-proof bodies for a thousand years. (It often amazes me when I think about the final battle between Satan and the saints of God in the dispensationalist scheme. What can Satan do to death-proof saints in their resurrection bodies on that final day of rebellion? And why can't death-proof Christians protect those people who were converted after the seven-year tribulation period, that is, converted after the death-proof saints—those who buy and read the prophecy books—have returned in power and glory?) The amillennialists burden themselves with the thought that they are personally and collectively responsible for building up the kingdom of God in every institution (the Kuyper-oriented Dutch amillennialists), but they know that they cannot possibly succeed. At least the fundamentalists are not guilt-ridden about not being able to extend the dominion covenant, since they do not believe in the dominion covenant.<sup>28</sup>

Comprehensive preaching against specific institutional sins is not in favor today, precisely because most Christians do not believe they are in any way responsible for, or able to exercise power over, the so-called secular institutions of society. They have no positive eschatology of victory, and they have no program for dominion based on the systematic application of biblical law. They lack both the tools of dominion—the laws of the Bible—and a forward-looking dynamic of history. As Rushdoony has said, the liberals believe in history, but not in God, and the conservative Christians believe in God, but not in history. Both liberalism and conservative traditional Christianity are losing influence. The end of their road is visible to both sides. The liberals face earthly

---

28. Gary North, *An Economic Commentary on the Bible*, vol. 1, *The Dominion Covenant: Genesis* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1981).

Armageddon—nuclear war, or worse, the possible rule of unsystematic moralists (generally dismissed as fundamentalists)—while the fundamentalists see the impending crises and the rapture, which makes them unreliable assistants in building up the kingdom of God by means of a generations-long strategy.

Hardly anyone preaches judgment for restoration's sake. Hardly anyone speaks of judgment as the prophets did, namely, as a painful means of {31} moral and institutional restoration. The judgment which the liberals expect is that of historical defeat and impotence for liberal, humanistic values. The judgment that fundamentalists expect is one which Christians will escape, and which is not related directly to the post-resurrection rule of death-proof saints during the millennium. The judgment that amillennialists look forward to is the end of time, the last earthly event before the final judgment. None of these perspectives offers the biblical view of judgment, namely, that God chastises His people—covenantally, not just individually—as a way to restore them to faith in Him, and to enable His people to engage once again in the task of Christian reconstruction: building the kingdom of God on earth, by means of His law. In short, no one preaches prophetic judgment any more.

### *Infiltration and Replacement*

The French Revolution, like the Russian Revolution, relied heavily upon the existing bureaucratic structure for the implementation of social change. The revolutionaries recognized that the incumbent bureaucrats were vital, at least initially, for the consolidation of power by the new rulers. The stability of bureaucracy is perhaps its greatest strength. Loyalty of bureaucrats is directed toward the prevailing offices, not to individuals. When the revolutionaries replaced the king or czar, it made little difference to those holding bureaucratic positions. Lenin was the son of a minor Russian bureaucrat. Many of the French revolutionaries were lawyers and others who had worked with the various levels of the bureaucracy, either as employees or as hired representatives of business or the nobility.

The revolutionaries understood how bureaucracies operate. If Christians are to be equally successful in reshaping the civil government, they also must learn how the bureaucratic system works. Christians

need to understand what motivates members of bureaucracies. They need to gain experience in working with bureaucracies. They need to have their own people inside bureaucracies, either as employees or as representatives of the civil government or business. Such an education must not be undertaken in order to make the present order function more smoothly, but the opposite: *to gum up the existing humanistic social order through its own red tape*. We need to *infiltrate* the bureaucracies in order to secure a foothold in the existing social order's transmission belts of power. We must be prepared to *misdirect* bureaucratic efforts against Christian organizations, and also to smooth the transition to Christian political leadership, thereby cutting short any attempted resistance movement within existing bureaucracies against such a transition of power to the Christians. Christians must begin to organize politically within the present party structure, and they must begin to infiltrate the existing institutional order.

Unquestionably, the churches have no such long-term plan. They are not {32} used to thinking in terms of long-term plans for social change. They have almost no comprehension of how civil government works. Only recently, as the threat to Christian institutions from secular humanists within the government has become more visible, have we seen the partial mobilization of Christians. They are pathetic in their vision, strategy, and execution, but they are numerous enough so that they have exercised considerable political strength. As they become more familiar with political techniques developed by the so-called New Right—such organizations as the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, the Conservative Caucus, and Richard Viguerie's direct-mail machine in Falls Church, Virginia—they will exercise even more power. When a few prominent “electronic church” preachers can mobilize tens of thousands of citizens and millions of dollars, the “old Left” has to be worried. A new political force is on the horizon.

Nevertheless, it is a long-term project. Max Weber, the prominent German social scientist, wrote back in 1918 about the difficulties of politics. It takes diligence combined with charisma, a knowledge of details and an understanding of widespread political forces, a willingness to become involved in the slow boring of holes.<sup>29</sup> Politics is not easy, and Christians (like ideological conservatives) want quick fixes. They, unlike the humanist liberals, do not believe in political salvation.

They are interested in other aspects of life: education, family activities, business, church life, and so forth. The humanist liberals devote far more of their hearts and capital to politics, for politics consumes them. Therefore, they have succeeded in establishing strong footholds in the bureaucracies, as well as in the political institutions. Those who wish to replace them have been unable to do so, even when elections have gone their way. The bureaucrats can afford to wait. They get paid to wait. All they need to do, they believe, is to wait out the latest political fad. They will be in control when the next batch of political novices is put into office. This strategy works, until a really significant political change occurs. When a new political group comes into office which truly understands the ways of bureaucracies (mainly, through the control of their budgets), and which has sufficient support or control over the political process to rule as long as the bureaucrats can, the bureaucrats can be brought under control. But it takes time, dedication, skill, and great understanding. This is what the Christians lack. This is why a new generation of conservative Christian political operatives is needed. This is why Christians must begin training such young men to take over the reins of power, especially at the local level, when the crises shake the faith of men in the present humanist political order.

So far, I have been discussing political power. But as I stated earlier, {33} change is far more extensive than mere politics. The State is only one agency in the transformation process. We need to become active in another replacement process: the replacement of existing voluntary institutions. We know this much: *power flows in the direction of those who exercise responsibility*, especially in a major crisis. We must become prepared to lead during a humanist-created crisis. We need to be ready to provide leadership, food, clothing, and the necessities of life. The Mormons have understood this far better than any Protestant denomination. They have created institutions within their church to handle major crises. They will become even more formidable competitors to mainline churches in a crisis—and they are already formidable competitors. God's law works for everyone who imposes it, as the book of

---

29. Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation" (1918), in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mill, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, [1946] 1965).

Jonah should reveal. The Assyrians in Nineveh who repented, through the king's person, became Israel's conquerors. Power flowed toward them. When men honor the external laws of society that God has set forth, they will be blessed externally. When they tithe, they will experience church growth. When they store up food, they will escape the ravages of famine. When they save, they will experience economic growth.

Today's Protestants resent such teaching. When I spoke at Gordon Conwell School of Theology, debating against liberation theologian Ronald Sider, I was hissed at by the students for arguing along these lines.<sup>30</sup> There is enormous hostility to the idea that adhering to God's social laws brings external prosperity. Both the pietists and the Christian socialists refuse to consider such a proposition. For this reason, Christians are not in positions of leadership in any major social or political institution. They are fed by the scraps of power that fall from the humanists' tables.

Where are the Christian orphanages? I am not referring to Christian orphanages operated by Christians in Korea or some other foreign land. Where are the orphanages run by Christians in their own nations? Where are the Christian homes for the retarded? Where are the Christian schools for the deaf or blind? There are almost none. Why not? Because there is no tithing. Because there is no vision of a Christian social order. Because there is a futile faith in neutrality, so that Christians assume that the State has the right to educate the deaf and blind—that education is essentially technical, and that so long as a competent instructor is located and financed by taxes, the handicapped children will receive all the education they need, irrespective of the theology held by the technically proficient instructor. They are assumed to be theologically second-class citizens. In some perverse way, Christians assume that all that the deaf and blind kids need is the ability to read and write—the same preposterous error which enables the humanists to gain continuing support from Christian taxpayers for the humanist-controlled {34} government school system.

The Christians have transferred power to the humanists because the humanists long ago recognized that power flows in the direction of

---

30. A pair of audiotape cassettes of this debate can be ordered from the Institute for Christian Economics, P.O. Box 8000, Tyler, TX 75711: \$5.00 per set.

those who exercise responsibility. And when you can get the majority to subsidize the program, while turning its administration over to you and your accomplices, you have pulled off a major coup. That is precisely what the humanists did, and are still doing. Just convince the Christians that the State, rather than the church or other Christian voluntary institutions, is responsible for the care of the poor, the education of the young, the care of the aged, the womb-to-tomb protection of the least productive members of society, etc., and you can get them to finance the religion of secular humanism with their own tax money.

This has many important benefits for humanists. First, the humanists control the institutions that certify competence (universities, colleges, accreditation boards). This means that only those people screened and certified by them will get the jobs. Second, the humanists believe in salvation by politics, so more of their efforts will be devoted to the capture and control of the State and all State-subsidized institutions. Third, the humanists are long-term builders, since they have no faith in the after-life. In their theology, “what you see is what you get,” and all they see is life on earth. Fourth, by taxing Christians, they reduce the amount of money left to Christians for the financing of Christian social institutions—the alternatives to the State’s institutions. Incredibly, the vast majority of Christian voters believe that this system is not only justified, but that it is the very best system possible. They rarely protest. They limit their protests to feeble, misguided, and ineffective efforts to “win back the public schools,” as if public schools had ever been consistently Christian to begin with. Such efforts must fail, precisely because the initial premise—that the State has the primary responsibility to care for the weaker members of society—is itself fallacious. *It is not the civil government, but the individual Christian, who is responsible.* He joins with other Christians to improve the delivery of services, since a group can make use of the *division of labor principle*, but he must always see himself as the responsible agent. He can withdraw financial support when he is convinced that the agency has sufficient funding, or even too much. This keeps the salaried people in line, which is far more difficult in a Civil Service-protected State bureaucracy that operates with funds confiscated by the monopoly of State power.



## Conclusion

We need a new theology of dominion. We need to rethink the prevailing assumptions about the true locus of responsibility in social institutions. We cannot go on operating under assumptions that by their very nature transfer {35} both power and responsibility to institutions that are coercive, tax-supported, and controlled by those whose primary skill is the capture and maintenance of political and bureaucratic power. We need to infiltrate existing organizations in order to make them less effective in carrying out humanist goals. We need to create alternative schools, orphanages, poorhouses, “halfway” homes, drug rehabilitation centers, day-care centers, and all the other institutions that bring the gospel of salvation and the message of *healing through adherence to God’s law*. It is imperative that the issue of responsibility be faced. When we find what God’s law says about the locus of responsibility, we can then determine who shall finance the program. Alternatively, when we find where God’s word assigns the *financial* responsibility, there we have the locus of authority in that institution.

Social action is imperative. Without godly social action, the fundamental institutions of State power will remain in the hands of the humanists. They believe in salvation through politics. They are the ones most skilled at political manipulation. They have mastered the techniques of bureaucratic delay, as well as the politics of guilt and pity. Unless Christians create *privately financed alternatives to existing State agencies*, they will never counter that most crucial of questions: “Well, what would you people do about the care of the poor?” There is an old rule of politics: *you can’t fight something with nothing*. For a century, Christians have ignored this rule. They have not only tried to fight something with nothing, they have even abandoned the fight altogether. They have allowed the humanists to capture the institutions of political power by default. They have allowed the humanists to increase the tax burden of the public to levels at least double that which was imposed by Pharaoh over Egypt, which was “only” 20 percent (Gen. 47:26). They have allowed the humanists to increase taxes to four times (or more) the level warned against by Samuel in describing an evil State tax system of 10 percent (1 Sam. 8:15). They have not only allowed this, they have hired ministers who actually approve of it, and they have financed so-called conservative seminaries to train up the next genera-

tion of ministers by assigning them books like Ronald Sider's *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*. Conservative Christians have adopted a theology of social responsibility which is essentially humanistic. They have retreated from the arena of social responsibility, but have failed to understand that this arena is basic to the world of fallen man. They have by so retreating transferred power to those who have proclaimed the doctrine of salvation by politics. Without a theology of private social responsibility, without the doctrine of the mandatory tithe—no tithe-no full church membership (voting)—and without an understanding of the theology of humanism, the Christians have promoted the build-up of the society of Satan.

Both pietism and the Social Gospel have undercut Christian civilization. {36} This retreat from the world of earthly responsibility, and this transfer of power to the State in the name of Christian charity, have led to the modern messianic State. The pessimism and retreatism of the pietists have given the field to the humanists and the Social Gospel defenders. The optimism of the Social Gospel theologians has died in our day, and possibly as early as the 1950s. The faith in salvation by politics is waning, but it is not being replaced by an orthodox theology. Instead of adopting a theology of salvation by God, the political and theological liberals have begun to adopt a theology of *no salvation at all*, since the State, humanism's only possible candidate for the office of God, has failed. The old quip about Unitarianism's dogma—"There is, at the most, one God"—is coming true for the spiritual heirs of Unitarianism. Their faith in the phrase, "at the most," is waning. But without a "holy State," there is only an unholy State. If the State is not God, in the theology of contemporary humanism, then the State is Satan. Men must worship something, and though their faith in the benevolence of the State is waning, they are not ready to cease worshipping it. They are only more likely to fear it, grovel before it, and curse it behind closed doors. They do not abandon it, if the alternative is *faith in God*. Today, that is the only remaining viable, benevolent alternative. The old statist theology is losing its adherents. It is time for Christians to present them with a systematic, disciplined, tithe-financed alternative. And if they still will not repent, it is time to replace them in the seats of power.

# EVANGELICAL SOCIAL ACTION

---

*Kerby Anderson*

Evangelical thinking in the area of social action is undergoing a renaissance. The presence of this journal devoted to this discussion is but one illustration of this renewed interest. In the nineteenth century, Christians were involved in a vast array of social concerns, but the rise of the social gospel among the ecumenical denominations served to turn evangelicals away from meaningful social involvement.

With the increased political activity by evangelicals in the 1980 elections, renewed interest in social and political affairs has developed. Since World War II, there has been a steady rise in evangelical social responsibility, but the greatest activity has come most recently. Evangelicals have had a long history of having to deal with arguments against their involvement in social action.

## *Trends in Evangelical Social Action*

In St. Augustine's great work, *The City of God*,<sup>31</sup> he recognized that the church and its members live in two worlds: the city of man and the city of God. The church represented the city of God and served as a conscience of society by providing ethical values for judgment of policies. The city of man represented the state which had responsibilities to provide justice and domestic security.

Evangelicals have felt that their primary emphasis should be on the city of God and not on the city of man. Today there still is a very strong emphasis on spiritual concerns over social and political ones. Evangelicals have been wise in learning from the history of the ecumenical movement that often a church or denominational body speaks to an issue without sufficient expertise, and therefore have shunned this arena. They have also wisely noted that an overemphasis on social issues can lead to a detrimental effect on theology.

---

31. St. Augustine, *The City of God* (New York: Image Books, 1958 ed.).

The evangelical error has been that they assume that an emphasis on theology must exclude social ethics. The two are intricately related. It is not only possible but *mandatory* that a strong and comprehensive theology have a meaningful and relevant program of social involvement. Christians are not only called to save a person's soul (James 5:20) but also to be the salt of {38} the earth (Matt. 5:13) by preserving and giving flavor to the society and setting a standard for the culture.

Until recently, there has not been much evangelical interest in social ethics. The development of an evangelical social ethic has taken place mostly among the leadership of the evangelical movement. The average lay person does not show this same interest in social ethics in most cases. Evangelicals usually feel that their theological position excludes social ethics and therefore social action. There are five major factors for this:

(1) First, there is a tendency within the evangelical movement to *emphasize evangelism and spiritual teaching over, and usually to the exclusion of, social and political involvement*. While it might be easy to criticize the evangelical movement for its neglect of social ethics, part of the problem stems from the fact that the tremendous need for evangelism prevented much emphasis on social ethics. Earlier in this century, the ecumenical movement's emphasis on the social gospel to the exclusion of evangelism "forced" fundamentalists and evangelicals to pursue evangelism and world missions to such an extent that the development of an evangelical social ethic was retarded.

When faced with the decision between evangelism and social action, evangelicals rightly chose evangelism first. However, the primacy of evangelism does not justify pursuing it exclusively. Both evangelism and social action are necessary and enhance the effectiveness of the other. During the second great awakening, the preaching of people like Charles G. Finney also helped produce such reform movements as women's suffrage and the abolition of slavery. Later in the nineteenth century, however, evangelist Dwight L. Moody preached a lifeboat ethic that separated believers from society. He said: "I look on the world as a wrecked vessel. God has given me a lifeboat and said, 'Save all you can.'" Evangelicals retreated from social action in what historian Timothy Smith has called the "Great Reversal."

These separatist tendencies can be found in the evangelical movement today. They argue that social action will never save men's souls and therefore is useless. In one sense, this is certainly true. Christians are not idealistic utopians who assume that complete social justice will be brought about by man's actions. But it neglects the fact that God's redemption was intended for every realm including the social and political ones. Jesus Christ was not only challenging individuals to repentance, but he was challenging the status quo of religious and political institutions. Spiritual conversion not only entails an internal change but an external change in lifestyle which affects social and political institutions.

(2) Evangelicals often feel that social and political involvement is wrong because *it is a worldly activity*. They feel this for a number of reasons. First, there is the recognition that *politics involves conflict and compromise*. This {39} leads to the fear that involvement in politics would require a compromise of biblical principles. While it is true that there is conflict and compromise, it is very idealistic to reject the political arena on that ground since every human activity involves some of this, including church government. Further, compromise need not take place on the level of principles. It usually takes place on the level of programs, and it is the realistic person who recognizes that any political program can, at best, only represent the best possible solution given the constraints placed upon government by certain political, economic, and social realities.

Evangelicals also see politics as "worldly" because they often emphasize the spiritual over the social and political. This view harkens back to the *Gnostic heresy* which had a dualistic view of the world, in which the body was seen as evil and the spirit as good. By emphasizing such a dichotomy, evangelicals fail to recognize that God's sovereignty extends over all aspects of the world and that government itself is under God's authority (Rom. 13:1-7).

Evangelicals not only see politics as worldly, but they also see it as Satanic. Biblical prophecy concerning the end times speaks of an Anti-christ government (Dan. 7:23-28; Rev. 17:9, 18) which causes many cautiously to avoid involvement. They are fearful of social and political involvement which might align them with Satanic forces. What they

fail to realize is that noninvolvement is the quickest way to turn politics and society over to Satan.

(3) A third major factor is the *psychology of eschatology*. Premillennial evangelicals have a view of eschatology which creates a psychological attitude which often precludes political and social involvement. They argue that social evils will never be totally defeated until Christ returns; thus, many de-emphasize political and social involvement.

This attitude of *noninvolvement* and *fatalism*, however, does not square with the Bible. In a parable which Jesus used to describe His return and kingdom, He said they were to occupy until He returned (Luke 19:13). Further, He did not set a time limit on being salt and light to the earth (Matt. 5:13–16). The return of Jesus Christ in the *future* does not negate the need for activity *now*.

(4) A greater evangelical danger has been its *tendency to equate the biblical message with the status quo*. Often the average lay person is unable to distinguish between his faith and his culture. North American Christians are especially guilty of developing a syncretistic religious culture in which many values are endorsed and made to seem Christian even though they are not truly biblical.

This civil religion that has been developed simply reinforces the culture rather than critiques it. The power of Christianity is lost and the ethical cutting edge is blunted if it is merely aligned with the American culture. {40}

(5) A final factor is *lack of political and social education*. There is a need for pastors to educate their congregations and activate them towards important issues. The local church need not become a debating society for every social issue, but if evangelical preaching does not touch on the major issues of the day, it will be less than effective. Martin Luther once said, "If you preach the Gospel in all aspects with the exception of the issues which deal specifically with your time, you are not preaching the Gospel."

In conclusion, these five factors seem to be the major reasons for evangelical uninvolvement in social and political affairs over the last few decades. A number of studies done in the area of the sociology of religion have shown that there was a general tendency for evangelicals and fundamentalists to be less involved in social issues than those of a less orthodox theological orientation.<sup>32</sup> This seems to be changing.

### Survey of Evangelical Social Ethics

In 1980, *Christianity Today* and the Gallup Poll surveyed various adult groups concerning their views of social ethics. This poll showed some surprising similarities and differences among the general public, Catholics, Protestants, and evangelicals.<sup>32</sup>

In the area of *ethical values*, evangelicals showed an expected higher percentage of support for biblical absolutes as they related to such issues as abortion, homosexuality, premarital sex, and extramarital sex. In the survey on abortion, for example, 13 percent of the public believed abortion was acceptable under any circumstances; 19 percent believed it was unacceptable; and sixty-two (62 percent) felt it was acceptable only under certain circumstances. Evangelicals were much more conservative, with 5, 31, and 64 percent, respectively.

In the area of *social action*, evangelicals indicated that they felt that it was important for religious organizations to make public statements and pronouncements in ethical-moral matters. Eighty-one percent of the clergy felt that such pronouncements were “very important” or “fairly important,” and evangelical laity agreed (60 percent). Both evangelicals and clergy favored (62 percent and 82 percent respectively) religious lobbies which attempted to persuade senators and representatives to enact legislation they would like to see become law.

This rather dramatic increase in interest in pronouncements and religious lobbies most likely reflects the general fear of many evangelicals over the regulation by government. It is not that they are so much interested in {41} enacting so-called “Christian legislation” as it is a fear of their *inability to defeat restrictive legislation* which would curb their activities, or *permissive legislation* which would hasten the moral decline of the society.

In the area of *personal concern*, evangelicals showed a stronger sense of obligation to help the poor than did the general public. While both agreed, nearly unanimously, that society has a duty to meet the basic

---

32. See David Moberg's summary of various studies in *The Great Reversal* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1977).

33. For a summary of this survey, see David O. Moberg, “Do the Pious Really Care?” *Christianity Today*, September 19, 1980, 25, and Carl F. H. Henry, “Henry on Gallup: Faith and Social Concerns,” *Christianity Today*, September 19, 1980, 39.

needs of the poor, handicapped, and elderly, there was some difference in their personal response. Fifty percent of the evangelicals contribute to organizations that help the poor (about two-thirds of the clergy do), compared with 38 percent of the general public, while 30 percent of the evangelical population personally help and give directly to the poor, compared with 19 percent.

However, in this area, it is still the *clergy* who are most active. While one-third of all evangelical laity are personally and directly helping the poor, clergy are twice as active. Also, by almost three to one, clergy are more active than evangelicals, and by four to one more active than the general public in trying to persuade church, religious, and government organizations to aid the poor.

In general, the survey provided some surprising conclusions. Studies in the 1960s seemed to indicate that these sociological groups who were most conservative theologically, were also least active in social issues. The *Christianity Today*-Gallup Poll indicated just the opposite. It was found that those people who read the Bible frequently (at least once per day) and those who tithe exhibit higher levels of *religiosity* on almost every indicator than other people, and also have higher levels of *social concern* and donate more time in volunteer services.

### *Evangelical Models for Social Action*

There are a number of different models for social action. One rather extreme group has been the fundamentalists. They are usually dedicated to a strong separation from society due to their former history of reaction against modernism (later to become the liberal Protestant movement). Theologically, they tend to be premillennial and usually are also dispensational. As has already been mentioned, this theological view tends to foster a pessimistic view of social and political involvement.

Fundamentalists are usually conservative in their political persuasion. They generally align themselves with the status quo, the Protestant work ethic, and strong military defense. The primary focus of most fundamentalists has until recently been upon the threat of Communism.

Prominent institutions in this category are: Bob Jones University (Greenville, South Carolina), Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Comm-



nism Crusade (Long Beach, California), and William Stuart McBirnie's "Voice of Americanism" (Glendale, California). The three most prominent individuals {42} in the fundamentalist movement have been Billy James Hargis (formerly of the Christian Crusade), Carl McIntire (American Council), and Jerry Falwell (founder of the Moral Majority).

Among the evangelicals, there are two major groups: establishment evangelicals and radical evangelicals. The former group numbers the largest and also shows the greatest political and theological diversity. Major figures include such men as Edward J. Carnell, Harold John Ockenga, Bernard Ramm, and Carl Henry. Their major organs of publication are *Christianity Today*, *Eternity*, and the *Reformed Journal*.

A subgroup of these establishment evangelicals would be the charismatic and Pentecostal denominations. They show many similarities in political outlook though there are fundamental theological differences. The major charismatic figure in the area of social and political issues is Marion Gordon (Pat) Robertson (president of the Christian Broadcasting Network).

The radical evangelical movement, though relatively young, is exerting greater influence over evangelical thinking. They seek to apply the radical (from the Latin *radix*, meaning root) implications of the biblical message. They combine the pacifist, communitarian, and simple lifestyle of the counterculture with the Anabaptist theological structure. They represent the most liberal of all evangelical voices in the area of social and political issues. Major voices of the radical evangelicals are *Sojourners* magazine, *Radix* newspaper, and *theOtherSide*. Major figures in the movement are Ronald Sider, John Howard Yoder, and Jim Wallis.

### *Critique of Evangelical Models*

Any critique of evangelical models for social involvement should begin with the realization that there must be a healthy balance between evangelism and social action. These two activities have often been seen as mutually exclusive in the evangelical history, but there are encouraging signs that evangelicals may be finding a balance. If they emphasize either extreme of the evangelism/social action spectrum, there is great harm that can result.

At one extreme there has been the *ecumenical position*. Historically, they have emphasized the city of man, often to the exclusion of the city of God. In an attempt to be relevant to the current social issues, there is little biblical content that is expressed, and ultimately this position becomes indistinguishable from the contemporary liberal positions. Their motto has often been, "If you can't beat them, join them."

At the other extreme is the historic *fundamentalist position*. This mentality argues that, "If you can't beat them, hide from them." Fundamentalist involvement in social issues has been sparse, except in the area of planting rescue missions in the inner city. The emphasis has usually been placed upon the city of God and not on the city of man.

Between these two extremes lies the *evangelical movement*. If evangelicals {43} are to maintain their theological integrity and confront social issues of their day meaningfully, they must maintain a balance between these two extreme positions. If they separate their faith from society, this compartmentalization will create a theology which has little relevance to the issues of the day. On the other hand, if they seek to reduce their faith to social concerns, there is a risk that Christianity will become nothing more than an issue-oriented civil religion which has lost its ethical cutting edge.

Evangelicals need to develop a *systematic theology and strategy* for engaging social and political problems, so that they may engage an issue quickly and meaningfully. Each time a new issue confronts the evangelical world, there is a long process of evaluation and discussion. By the time an evangelical stand is formulated, the issue has nearly become obsolete.

While we may applaud the fact that evangelicals have not been quick to issue pronouncements they later regret, we must also realize that if evangelicals are going to have any significant voice, *they must be able to handle the issues that confront them in a systematic and comprehensive way*. As more issues come their way, evangelicals often seek out other non-biblical systems which help them develop some critique. Both radical evangelicals and mainline evangelicals have been guilty of this.

(1) *Radical evangelicals* have been guilty of attempting to associate Christianity with a liberal political philosophy. The biblical message has often been made to conform to a particular line of thinking

espoused by the political left. Robert Price has described three key characteristics of the transformation of the biblical message.<sup>34</sup>

The first he calls *hermeneutical ventriloquism*, in which the Bible is made to speak to issues it does not address. If the issue is the Equal Rights Amendment, the developing of a radical evangelical social ethic is approached in this way: “Feminism is true; the Bible teaches truth; therefore, the Bible *must* teach feminism.” In order to accomplish this act of ventriloquism, some passages must be emphasized over others and important passages must be reinterpreted.

The second characteristic is the use of *false pretenses*. Conclusions are already decided before an investigation into the Bible is begun. Even though there is an emphasis on building exegetical arguments from the biblical text, the position taken does not fundamentally rest upon the text, but upon prior presuppositions made about a particular issue.

A third characteristic is called *political snake-handling*. Radical evangelicals often seek to present answers which are cut off from the political realities of the situation. Questions concerning funding, coalition building, legal jurisdiction, etc., are often neglected. The operating principle is an absolutist application where the “means justifies the end” (just the opposite {44} of the normal construction). In other words, evangelicals are to obey the “biblical mandates of radical discipleship” and let God worry about the consequences.

This might mean that the radical call to discipleship would require the U.S. unilaterally to disarm themselves of nuclear weapons. Because this is what God has called us to do, we should expect His protection in this action. However, if He does not, then we should recognize that we probably deserved the consequences anyway.

As a general trend, there has been a tendency to align the Bible with various social issues uncritically. If the issue is civil rights, then the radical evangelical position is for all aspects of Black liberation, and the Bible is seen as a theological text of liberation. If the issue is world hunger, then the Bible becomes a theological exposé on poverty and exploitation.

---

34. Robert M. Price, “A Fundamentalist Social Gospel?” *Christian Century*, November 28, 1979, 1183–86.

In the end, these attempts to align the Bible with particular social positions have failed. As a result, the Bible is manipulated to become everything to every issue, and it thus becomes of little value. In trying to make the Bible relevant to every issue, they diminish its authority and in the end make it meaningless as a basis for social engagement.

(2) *Establishment evangelicals* have also been willing uncritically to identify the biblical message with the American political and social culture. While radical evangelicals have *confronted* this culture by replacing it with another cultural model, establishment evangelicals have simply *accepted* this culture. In both cases, the evangelical voice does not develop any unique characteristics because it either reflects the culture or is replaced by another culture.

Because evangelicals lack a comprehensive and systematic philosophy of social and political involvement, they have been guilty of *silence*. The number of evangelical pronouncements has caught the attention of a number of people in governmental service. For example, a White House staffer in the Carter administration with responsibility as a liaison with the religious community expressed concern that evangelicals showed so little interest in issues like the SALT II treaty. After carefully surveying *Moody Monthly*, *Christianity Today*, and the *Reformed Journal*, he noted that during all of 1979, not one substantive article on SALT II appeared in any of these Christian periodicals. The only evangelical magazine he surveyed which regularly addressed this issue was *Sojourners*, which promoted a pacifist stance toward disarmament.<sup>35</sup>

If a comprehensive and systematic philosophy of social and political involvement is to be developed by evangelicals it must be developed along the lines of *sound exegesis of the biblical text*. Second, evangelicals must develop *biblical principles which can then be applied to specific situations*. {45} Much of the problem in the past has been due to the willingness to move from passages to programs without developing intermediate principles.

This can be very dangerous, since most social issues involve more than a single biblical principle. For example, an issue in the area of bioethics may involve consideration of a biblical view of human life, mar-

---

35. John A. Bernbaum, "Peacemaking in the Nuclear Age," *Reformed Journal*, May 1980, 14.

riage, social rights and responsibilities, technology, and the future. A question in the area of welfare reform might involve some biblical principles concerning the family, society, government, poverty, and church responsibility. To tie specific social issues to specific passages without consideration of the diversity and complexity of social concerns is to develop a naive and superficial perspective.

### *Biblical Guidelines for Government*

In pursuing a set of biblical guidelines, it is important to recognize that the Bible describes human nature in a particular way. There are two different stages of humanity. First, man was created in the image of God and placed in a good environment (Gen. 1). Second, the fall of man and the world (Gen. 3) created a situation in which there was a need to control sinful human behavior (Rom. 3:23) through civil government.

Human nature, therefore, today has both a noble and rational side, as well as a sinful and irrational side. The basic function of civil government is to control sinful behavior. This, however, does not mean that no civil government would have been necessary if man was not sinful. There is some indication that there would have been some structuring of authority in the Garden (Gen. 1–2), and the Bible speaks of the angelic host as being organized into ranks with gradations of authority. The created order is governed by instinct (Ps. 30:24–28), but because man is volitional and created in the image of God (Gen. 1:27) who is a God of order (1 Cor. 14:33), he seeks governmental order.

The biblical view of government is quite different than that proposed by many political theorists. The *basis* of civil government lies in man's constitution by creation: (1) he is a rational and volitional being; (2) he is not determined by internal or external factors; (3) he can exercise delegated power over the created order.

The *need* for civil government grows out of man's sinfulness. Because man is sinful, many proposed political models are not possible. For example, since all are sinful (Rom. 3:23), there is no possibility for finding enlightened philosopher-kings to lead a country as Plato postulated in *The Republic*. All will be affected by the sinful effects of the fall (Gen. 3) and therefore lack the benevolent and enlightened demeanor necessary for Plato's republic. Another example would be

the difficulty with a Marxist scheme of government. Although the Bible does talk of believers becoming new creatures (2 Cor. 5:17) through spiritual conversion, even in this case, {46} the effects of sin are not completely overcome. Karl Marx's eschatology of the new man is a contradiction of this teaching because it assumes the possibility of complete transformation of human behavior.

The civil government from a biblical perspective is seen as necessary and divinely ordained by God (Rom. 13:1–7) and ultimately under His control. Citizens are to render what is due to the government (Matt. 22:21) and submit to civil authority (1 Pet. 2:13–17), but a Christian's final authority is to God. We are to obey civil authorities (Rom. 13:5) in order to avoid anarchy and chaos, but when a conflict arises between absolutes and governmental policy, Christians must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29).

In determining the legitimate sphere of governmental functions, it is often difficult to set limits or draw lines. Part of the difficulty arises from the fact that promises given to the Hebrew theocracy are not automatically transferable to our present democratic government in a technological, pluralistic society. However, there are some general principles that can be drawn which are helpful in determining the limits of governmental authority.

The Bible indicates that God has ordained other institutions besides the civil government that are sovereign in their spheres of influence. First, there is the *church* which was created by God in the Old Testament (1 Pet. 2:9–20; Heb. 12:18–24) for particular functions. In the New Testament, Jesus taught that the government should work in harmony with the church and recognize its sovereignty in spiritual matters (Matt. 22:21).

Second, there is the *family* (Eph. 5:22–32; 1 Pet. 3:1–7). It is an institution of God and under His authority (Gen. 1:26–28; 2:20–25). When the family breaks down, the government often has to step in to protect the rights of the wife (wife abuse) or children (child abuse, adoption), but the biblical emphasis is not so much on rights as it is on responsibilities and mutual submission (Eph. 5).

A third institution which was part of the family in Old Testament times was *education*. Children are not seen as wards of the state but belong to God (Ps. 127:3). In the Old Testament, fathers were to teach

their sons (Deut. 4:9), while in the New Testament, parents were to have an influence in their children's education under tutors (Gal. 4:2). Much of the recent furor among evangelicals concerning federal intervention into education (both public and private) derives in part from their belief that the government regulates education by their permission, and that ultimately, the education of their children is in their hands as parents.

Governmental intervention into the spheres of church and family is necessary when there is a threat to life, liberty, property, or moral stability. In the Old Testament theocracy, legal action centered not only around external behavior but also around internal attitudes (Ex. 20). In a modern, pluralistic society it is not possible nor desirable to enforce biblical attitudes upon an unbelieving populace. Thus, governmental activity is most germane {47} to social ethical behavior. Personal ethical behavior is legitimately the domain of the church and the sphere of the city of God. The limits for governmental intervention can best be set by distinguishing between sinful behavior, immoral behavior, and criminal behavior. It would be unwise for the civil government to control all sinful behavior, since that would include coveting, blasphemy, etc. It also would not be good for civil government to try to control *all* sinful behavior, since some attitudes are best influenced by the church. The civil government's most important role should be to control criminal behavior which threatens life, liberty, or property.<sup>36</sup>

### *Biblical Guidelines for Social Action*

In developing a strategy for social action, it is important to recognize that there are two facets of Christian discipleship. On one hand, the Bible teaches that *Christians have their citizenship in heaven and not on earth* (Phil. 3:17–21), and are not to fix their attention on current affairs, but instead upon the expectation of Jesus Christ's return. God, not man, is seen as sovereign over nations, and He controls their destiny (Dan. 4:17).

---

36. Further development of this argument can be found in the article by Lewis B. Smedes, "Cleaning up the Nation: Nine Theses on Politics and Morality," *Reformed Journal*, June 1980, 10–13.

On the other hand, the Bible also teaches that *Christians are to function as citizens of this earth* (Matt. 22:15–22), and are to give respect and honor to governments (Rom. 13:1–7). They are also commanded to pray for leaders in authority (1 Tim. 2:1–4). In many cases, Bible figures assumed leadership not only in the Hebrew theocracy (i.e., David, Solomon) but also in other pagan governments (i.e., Joseph, Nehemiah, Daniel).

Both of these teachings are important to a biblical perspective of social action. Jesus declared that his disciples were not *of* the world (John 17:14–16), but were not to be taken *out* of the world. Christians are called to be *in* the world not *of* the world. In other words, they need to be influencing (Matt. 5:13–16) the culture not conforming to it (Rom. 12:1–2).

Jesus also compared the kingdom of heaven to leaven or yeast which was hidden in three pecks of meal (Matt. 13:33). The original Greek for ferment means to “ferment from within.” The meal represents the world and the leaven represents the Christian presence in the world. Like the yeast or leaven, Christians are placed within the mass of human society and exert their influence in a profound way. The Christian presence may seem insignificant, like yeast in meal, but the potency of the Christian witness is very great and can have a transforming effect on all of society.

It is often argued that Jesus never engaged in what we would call social action. This is not true. His entire ministry was a fulfillment (Luke 4:17) of the *messianic prophecy of liberation* in Isaiah 61. By his sinless life, He {48} triumphed over the powers of evil, and by His resurrection, He vanquished the power of death and set in motion the coming of the “day of vengeance” in which all evil will be destroyed and justice will reign.

It is fitting, therefore, to see that Jesus provides our model for Christian involvement. He said: “As thou didst send Me into the world, I also have sent them into the world” (John 17:18). His birth, life, death, and resurrection provide the model for Christian involvement and discipleship. His model was not one of conformity to, nor withdrawal from, the world. Likewise, Christians are not called to imitate the world but to imitate Christ (2 Cor. 3:18) and to shun the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life (1 John 2:16) which is in the world. In



shunning these aspects of the world, Christians are not to withdraw from it but instead are called to be the leaven which will ferment constructive change.

There are five major principles which can be found in the New Testament which relate to a Christian's responsibility and involvement in society. The first is the *principle of salt and light* (Matt. 5:13–16). Christians are called to be examples for society and to act as a preservative to the culture and expose evil in the world through their light.

The second is the *principle of priorities*. The primary task of Christians is to fulfill the Great Commission (Matt. 28:19–20) by preaching the gospel. When Jesus healed Simon Peter's mother-in-law, and the whole city gathered at his door for healing, He arose the next morning and said to His disciples, "let us go somewhere else to the towns nearby, in order that I may preach there also; for that is what I came for" (Mark 1:38). Christians must not get side-tracked on social involvement to the extent that they depart from the task of preaching the gospel. In their zeal to become relevant, evangelicals must be careful not to neglect their primary task.

A third principle is that of *divine sovereignty*. God is sovereign over nations and "bestows them on whom He wishes" (Dan. 4:17) and can turn the heart of a king wherever He wishes (Prov. 21:1). Christians must acknowledge God's sovereignty over human governments, but also see that they have a *responsibility* to effect constructive change. This is an important balance which must be maintained. They should never build their hopes on the actions of governmental officials, but neither should they shirk their responsibility to be involved.

A fourth principle is the *distribution of individual gifts and callings*. There are a variety of gifts and ministries (1 Cor. 12:4–6) to which each Christian may be called. Given this diversity, it is important to recognize that some may be called to a greater social involvement than others. All have a responsibility, but some may take on more responsibility than others. In most cases, it is better that individual Christians or parachurch groups take over the specialized tasks which the church as an institution should not assume. {49}

A final principle is the *principle of concession*. The Apostle Paul recognized that if the major priority is preaching the gospel, then he should not let various distinctions inhibit his effectiveness. He said, "I

have become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some” (1 Cor. 9:22). As we have already noted, there is some danger in the current evangelical trend to identify their message with conservative groups. In areas where the Bible clearly speaks, concession is not allowed. But in many other areas, the principle of concession should be followed more than it is.

As Christians become involved in social action it must be characterized by a number of traits. First and foremost, it must be consistently informed by *biblical principles*. The Bible leaves to Christians the application of revealed principles to concrete situations. In this sense, there is a situational aspect to social ethics, but its determination lies on God’s revelation in the Bible.

Second, social ethics based upon biblical absolutes must be *realistic*. It must not fall prey to utopian idealism, but must face squarely the sinful nature of man and the important place government has in God’s creation. Evangelicals have been guilty of neglecting their role in society due to a general cynicism about the role of government and an idealism which has prevented them from taking a realistic look at our fallen world. Biblical realism is a needed ingredient in future evangelical perspectives on social ethics.

Third, social ethics not only considers individual responsibility and regeneration but also focuses due attention on the level of structures. Changing individual lives is important, but must be implemented with constructive changes in laws and institutions. The agent of change in many cases will result from spiritual renewal, so that the change will take place “with” the parties concerned and not “against” them. Christians should be catalysts of social change through preaching and teaching rather than revolutionaries who seek to impose “Christian morality” on unbelieving populations.

Finally, the focus of social actions should be in the *local church*. Social action in the church is better named social service, since it is an attempt to move from the theoretical area of social ethics to the practical level of serving others in need. Evangelicals are to be commended in their interest in the poor and even in their contributions, but the most neglected area is personal service.

The local church is the place to begin to meet social needs of the society. Not all needs can or should be met by the church, but it is the

appropriate place to begin. In the New Testament, the local church became the training ground for social action (Acts 2:45; 4:34) by providing a context by which the needy were shown compassion. If we are truly concerned about the poor, we will meet the needs of the poor within our local community. If we are concerned for the aged, then we will meet the needs of the elderly in our {50} community. The local church should be a catalyst for further service and social action by implementing these programs in the local community.<sup>37</sup>

In conclusion, the future for further evangelical social action seems bright. If evangelicals continue to awaken to the biblical mandates for social action, revival and reformation will occur. If they retreat to their fundamentalist origins of separatism, then only disaster can be predicted. In their involvement, evangelicals must be aware of these very important principles. If they do not follow them, they are destined to follow the ecumenical movement to the realms of unorthodoxy. Evangelicals need to choose, and choose wisely.

### *Christianity Today—Gallup Poll on Evangelical Social Ethics*

	General Public	Catholics	Protestants	Evangelicals
ETHICAL VALUES:				
The Ten Commandments are valid today.	84%	86%	85%	92%
Abortion is unacceptable in all circumstances.	19	27	17	31
Homosexuality is wrong.	62	59	68	81
Premarital sex is wrong.	50	49	59	81
Extramarital sex is wrong.	83	82	87	96
Divorce should be avoided except in extreme situations.	40	43	42	60

---

37. A further elaboration of this section on the local church can be found in Douglas Webster's "Social Action Begins in the Local Church," *Christianity Today*, October 10, 1980, 28–31.

<b>SOCIAL ACTION:</b> It is very important for religious organizations to make public pronouncements about:				
—ethical-moral matters	36	31	41	70
—political-economic matters	19	17	22	36
—spiritual-religious matters	44	37	52	74
Religious organizations should lobby.	41	44	42	62
The top priority (of 5 choices) for Christians is to help win the world for Jesus Christ	26	17	33	53
<b>PERSONAL CONCERN FOR OTHERS:</b>				
Gives help personally and directly to the poor.	19	13	21	30
Contributes to organizations that help the poor.	38	44	39	50
Does volunteer work for church or other religious organization.	40	36	48	81
Contributes 10% or more of income to religious organizations.	16	8	22	54

# CHRIST'S KINGDOM: HOW SHALL WE BUILD?

---

*Tom Rose*

© Copyright by Tom Rose, 1981

And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever . (Dan. 2:44)

Immediately before ascending to heaven to reign at the right hand of His Father, Jesus made an astounding statement and left His disciples with explicit kingdom-building instructions:

All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. (Matt. 28:18–20)

If we, as ambassadors for Christ, are clearly to understand our kingdom-building assignment, then we must start with a clear view of what Christ's Kingdom is; we must envision *all* that His Kingdom encompasses, so that we may occupy it for Him till He returns in power and in glory.

Many in the Church of Christ view the Kingdom primarily as a future event that will be realized only at the second coming of Christ. To them, the church is just a small occupying force in a strange and foreign land. It will never conquer the land this side of heaven, so its greatest work is to preach the gospel in order to usher in new saints and to teach them how to live personal holy lives in the midst of evil. Christians, according to this view, are a salting (preserving) influence, but they are more in a “holding” role culturally than in a conquering role. Christ, according to this view, reigns over His *spiritual* kingdom, but

the remainder of the world in this sinful age belongs to Satan, and not much good can really be expected from it.

But, if we ponder Christ's statement and instructions, we soon come to realize that His Kingdom is all-encompassing. Jesus said that *all* power is given to Him in both heaven and in earth. Thus, Christ is indeed King of Kings and Lord over all (1 Tim. 6:15; Rev. 17:14). We *are* to go, therefore, {52} to all nations preaching the saving Gospel of Christ. And we *are* to teach all nations to observe whatsoever Christ has commanded. But this assignment entails much more than simply edifying the saints, so that they can live holy lives personally. Christ's instructions to teach them to observe *all* things whatsoever He has commanded must be seen, if indeed Christ is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, as a strong *cultural mandate*. Holy personal living isn't enough; nor is being a salting influence to those whom our personal lives touch. In addition to living holy lives personally, and being a salting (preserving) influence on earth, we are to *occupy* until our Lord returns (Luke 19:13). Our mandate is not simply a passive holding action, but it is rather an *active* and expanding dominion action. (Note that the two servants who increased the talents given to them were rewarded, but that the passive servant who did not increase his holdings was condemned.) As Christ-followers we are to establish dominion, we are to establish Christ's Kingdom, which is to consume all other kingdoms (Dan. 2:44; 7:18–27). In short, we who are Christians are boldly to declare the fact that Christ's suzerainty extends over *all* the creation and that *every* knee shall bow and *every* tongue shall swear to Him (Isa. 45:23; Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:10–11).

But, in practical terms, what does Christ's cultural mandate mean? Among other things, it means that *we must bring all man-made institutions into conformity with the mind of Christ*. We are to pull down the ungodly strongholds of this world, and we are to erect godly institutions in their place by bringing every thought into obedience to Christ (2 Cor. 10:4–5). We are to investigate carefully the social institutions of the family, the church, business, and civil government. We are to evaluate carefully the various processes of social interchange: education, care of the poor and needy, economic intercourse, economic growth, and care of the environment. In each instance, we must ask: "What ideal did God have in mind for man to follow when He created the universe

and established His moment-by-moment sustaining rule over creation? Is God neutral concerning how man is to engage in economic exchange, in political rule, and in other social activities? Or does God's Word provide us with a sure guide as to the ideal manner in which we are to engage in social relations?"

Recently, I gave a paper at a faculty forum at the college where I teach. The essence of the paper was that the voluntary free-market system is the *only* system of economic exchange that is in conformity with biblical precepts. One faculty member, a sincere Christian, strongly disagreed. He contended that God gives man freedom of choice concerning economic exchange. Thus, according to him, socialist/communist systems of exchange are just as inherently moral as free-market capitalism if the people involved choose by majority vote which system they are to live under.<sup>38</sup> To arrive at {53} such a conclusion, one would have to view such things as a person's right of property and one's personal responsibility to God for his actions as subject to being overruled by majority vote. The fallacy of such a position can be brought into sharp focus by posing a question in an area where it is perhaps easier to see black and white: Does God give man freedom of choice in marriage? Is it all right for man to institute "open marriage" or "group marriages" if the majority of people so vote? Clearly, no Christian would admit such gross immorality as being in accord with Scripture! But if God gives {54} man no choice concerning the commandment against *adultery*, why does not the same rule apply concerning the commandment against *stealing*? Can it be *against* God's law to share another man's wife by majority vote and *in accordance with* God's law to share his property against his will by majority vote?

The problem that develops in the area of economics is that wrong practices start out in very small ways: thus, their basic immoral essence tends to escape recognition until the practices have become solidly established socially. And, once a practice has become socially accepted and woven into the fabric of social custom, it becomes very difficult to eradicate, even though the practice may be producing some very deleterious effects. Most Christians can easily recognize collective adultery as immoral, even in the beginning stages (take, for example, Hitler's

---

38. See note 1 at end of this article.

statist program to develop a super Aryan race by mating ideal male and female types). But it takes a very discerning Christian to see the inherent immorality in such government-sponsored programs as social security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, welfare payments, aid to mothers with dependent children, tax-supported education, farm subsidies, business subsidies, etc. Each of these government programs entails the forcible taking of wealth from some citizens and distributing it to others. Each is a form of “legalized theft,” and the fact that such programs are imposed on citizens by popularly elected representatives or by direct majority vote (in the case of tax-supported education) does not change their essential character.

Let us investigate some current practices in these United States of America, and then attempt to discern the mind of Christ concerning them, for our cultural challenge as Christians is to build faithfully only those institutions which meet God’s approval. All others we are obliged to tear down and rebuild according to God’s plan.

Recently, a Reformed pastor in Tulsa told me of an instance which shows modern-day Christians’ lack of understanding concerning Christ’s mandate to build His Kingdom. The pastor received a phone call from a woman traveler who had had car trouble while driving through town with her two young children. Being a Christian, she sought help from local churches listed in the telephone directory. The pastor immediately went to her aid with a deacon. When they arrived where the woman was stranded, she said, “Praise the Lord you came! Do you know you are the fourteenth church I called? All the other pastors referred me to a government agency, but I want help from God’s people.”

The pastor and deacon arranged to have the woman’s car repaired and supplied food and lodging as well as some funds to help her on her way, but what about the other thirteen pastors? What kind of Kingdom-building vision do they have? What kind of Kingdom-building vision do Christians have who encourage people to turn to the State for charitable aid instead of {55} inviting them to turn to God’s own people?

Such a government-oriented attitude, if followed by Christians generally, would result in an ever-decreasing influence of Christ’s Church in society, and an ever-expanding role for civil government. Such an



attitude evidences a gross misunderstanding of what true charity is, as well as a misunderstanding of our Lord's command to love our neighbor as ourself (Lev. 19:18; Matt. 22:39; James 2:8). True charity necessarily involves both *voluntarism* in giving, as well as the giving of one's *own* property, two requirements which State aid is absolutely incapable of filling. It is technically impossible for the State to perform a charitable act because (1) the State always acts through force, and (2) the largess distributed by the State is not its own, but it is forcibly wrested from the taxpayers. Few Christians today seem to have taken these facts into consideration.

Let us consider some economic needs of men and how they are currently being met. Next, let us consider the (harmful) social effects which result from such handling. And, last, let us consider the implications of Christianity for meeting men's needs and the (beneficial) social effects which would result from a proper restructuring of society.

### 1. Education

The overwhelming majority of American children are now educated (perhaps miseducated would be a better term to use) in tax-supported schools. This was not always the case, for early education in America was both extensively private and universally Christian. It is not an overstatement to say that the early character of America, much of which still endures in our world-and-life view, was formed and molded by Christian education. But early in the history of our country, religious apostasy caused influential people to turn to statist education as a means of furthering their humanistic world-and-life views.

Professor Samuel L. Blumenfeld gives this picture of early American education.<sup>39</sup> Early in the Puritan Commonwealth, common schools were established as a means of insuring the transference of Calvinist Puritan religion from one generation to the next. These were our country's first public schools. Note that they were religiously oriented rather than secularly oriented. But privately operated schools sprang up to teach the more practical commercial subjects, and by 1720, Boston, the center of public education, had more private than public schools. And

---

39. Samuel L. Blumenfeld, "Why the Schools Went Public," *Reason*, March 1979, 18–23.

by the close of the American Revolution, many towns in Massachusetts had no public schools at all. At this time, Boston was the *only* town in the entire nation that had public schools. All else was private. But in 1805, the Unitarians took over Harvard College and expelled the Calvinists. {56}

The Unitarians rejected the Calvinist world-and-life view that was being promulgated in the majority of private Christian schools, so they pushed for a law to reinstitute the then-defunct public school sector, which they hoped to control in order to make public schools the vehicle for pushing their humanistic ideas. To quote from Blumenfeld:

Their [Unitarians] first organized effort was the campaign in 1818 to create primary public schools in Boston.

Why only public schools and not private or charity schools? Because private schools were run and controlled by individuals who might have entirely different views concerning the nature of man. Besides, private owners were forced by economic reality to concentrate on teaching skills rather than forming character. As for the church schools, they were too sectarian, and charity schools were usually run by Calvinists. Only the public schools, controlled in Boston by the affluent Unitarian establishment, could become that secular instrument of salvation.

Tax-supported education was furthered in the mid-1840s when Horace Mann became the first State Superintendent of Schools in Massachusetts. He fashioned schools in Massachusetts after the statist schools he had become enamored with during a trip to Germany. Gradually, every other state in the Union established a statist tax-supported school system after the pattern initiated by Mann. By the 1920s, tax-supported education had become a well-accepted social institution in America. It was about this time that the socialist educator John Dewey's influence was being strongly felt. He and his collectivistic associates at Columbia University in New York were instrumental in placing their protégés in key positions at various state teachers' colleges throughout America. And their success helps explain the socialistic drift of statist tax-supported education over the last half century.<sup>40</sup>

What has been the result of America's turning from voluntarily supported private education to statist tax-supported education? The resulting effects have been very harmful:

(1) *Parents have lost effective discretionary control over their children's education.* Parents have been emasculated, economically speaking, because they cannot cut off support for educational practices and policies they don't like. Each local public school system is a *government-created monopoly* which parents, as taxpayers, are forced to support financially, whether or not their own children use the public education services. Parents are, in effect, "captive consumers" who have no effective voice in what their children {57} are taught, the books their children are required to read, or the required courses they must take. Any parent who has had occasion, as I have had, to complain to local school authorities about not wanting his or her child to be exposed to immoral required-reading books or sex education programs, knows that I speak the truth. The tax-supported educational bureaucrats feel *no economic pressure to cater to the wishes of parents* because their taxing income is assured whether or not the parent is a satisfied customer. The attitude taken by the tax-supported educator is that he is the professional expert, so parents should peacefully acquiesce to his professional knowledge. Parents who complain are regarded as radicals and criticized as being un-American.

(2) *There has been a gradual drift of control in tax-supported education to the highest political level*—from the local school board (which started out years ago as being fairly democratic), to the State Board of Education, and finally to the U. S. Department of Education. With each successive step, parents have had less and less control as individuals, and public education has become more humanistic, more socialist oriented, and less godly. Economically, politically, and socially, the tenets and ideas of collectivism are inculcated in many insidious ways in young minds from kindergarten through graduate school. (This is done blindly, in the most part, for the teachers themselves are usually so indoctrinated that they seldom recognize the world-and-life views they hold.) Is it any wonder that our young people graduate from high school and college as budding collectivists? I have been teaching in pri-

---

40. For those who are interested in reading the frank statements of Dewey and his socialistic associates in their desire to remake America into a socialist nation, I recommend some hours spent reading the *Fabian Tracts* and publications of the League for Industrial Democracy of the 1940s. They are available at some of the larger metropolitan libraries.

vate Christian colleges for almost fifteen years and have worked closely with educational leaders for more years before, so I speak from first-hand experience when I say that *tax-supported schools turn out young collectivists* who have been unknowingly conditioned to mentally and emotionally accept the idea of a State-controlled society headed by a humanistic elite.

A few years ago, I was asked to speak at Texas Tech University, in Lubbock, Texas, at their annual Free-Enterprise Day sponsored by its College of Business Administration. The head of the Business-Education Department approached me after my presentation and asked, “How can we teach our students a consistent free-enterprise philosophy?”

The question was excellent, and the man’s motivation was sincere. He had favorably responded to the thesis I had presented that the free-market system was the practical outworking in society of men’s God-given freedom and self-responsibility. I asked if he wanted me to speak frankly, and he answered in the affirmative. This is what I told him: “It is highly improbable that you can teach a consistent philosophy of free enterprise for two reasons. First, your school is a tax-supported educational institution. As such, it is a perfect example of practical socialism in action—the State owns the means of production. How can you hope to teach consistent {58} free-enterprise ideals in an institution where the State owns and controls the means of producing educational services? Secondly, what world-and-life view does your institution hold? Does it not view man as a chance evolutionary happening rather than as a precious God-created individual? Since the whole ideal of free enterprise rests on the individual freedom and self-responsibility of man as a precious God-created being, and since your institution, holding an evolutionary view of man, denies this fact, it is again impossible to teach a consistent philosophy of free enterprise. To do so will eventually bring you into conflict with your institution’s humanistic world-and-life view.”

The man I spoke with was at first dismayed to hear what I had to say, but, after discussing the points in greater length, he agreed that what I said was correct. He indicated he would do the best he could, realizing his institutional limitations. I encouraged him to do what he could for as long as he could.

(3) Because parents have lost effective economic control over tax-supported education, *such education has grown increasingly expensive while becoming less and less effective*. (These results are characteristic of socialist enterprises generally.)

One of the gravest concerns of tax-supported educators themselves is the steadily deteriorating quality of their graduates' ability to read, write, and do math. Employers commonly complain that young people cannot read and write properly, and that young people have neither the needed skills nor work disciplines to make them profitable employees. College administrators have noted a steady drop in college-level entrance exam scores over the last fifteen years. For instance, the Educational Testing Service reports that SAT scores for college-bound high school seniors have dropped from 466 verbal and 492 mathematical in 1967, to 424 verbal and 466 mathematical in 1980, and this in spite of the fact that the median number of years spent in school has increased during the interval from 12.3 to 12.6.<sup>41</sup>

As for the exorbitant cost of tax-supported education, we see the effects in a number of ways: approximately 80 percent of people's local property tax bill goes toward support of the local public school monopoly. If we figure that the average homeowner pays about \$800 per year in local school taxes, and assume he pays this amount for each of his forty-year working life (but they really continue into retirement), the grand total reaches \$32,000. That's a lot of money (and it would buy approximately twice as much education if it were spent privately instead of publicly. I know, because I have worked in private educational institutions of high quality whose very existence depends on frugality coupled with quality.)

But the local property school tax is not the only cost of tax-supported {59} education to the public. The State also levies an education tax which falls directly on the taxpaying public. So does the Federal Government. And, finally, all three levels of government—local, state, and national—also levy educational taxes on business firms who must, if they are to stay in business, try to pass the cost on to consumers in the form of higher prices for the goods and services they sell. These taxes are, of course, hidden, but they are there nevertheless. Thus, once

---

41. National Report, College-Bound Seniors (Princeton, NJ: E.T.S., 1980), 5.

again the consumer pays. If all tax levies for education were eliminated, the over-all price of goods and services would drop commensurately. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that tax-supported education is exceedingly expensive.

(4) *Spiritually and intellectually the control of American education is largely in the hands of the humanist elite who wield political power at the local, state, and national levels.* Thus, American education naturally tends to build the kingdom of Satan rather than the Kingdom of God. And it will remain in such condition until the fast-growing private Christian school movement again overtakes the growingly ineffective statist schools, as they did back in the 1700s.

The Bible nowhere delegates responsibility for educating young people to the civil authority. Rather, the Bible places such responsibility with parents, for education is a covenant religious duty (Deut. 6:4–9). In short, we can confidently state that the education of our children is such an important Kingdom-building work that parents *dare not* leave it for the State to do, lest its godly intent be subverted into furthering the destructive work of Satan. The clear implication to Christians is that *our statist schools should be dismantled*, and that the control of education should be returned to the *individual* control of each family. This does *not* call for compromise solutions of giving parents tax credits or chits that can be spent where parents choose, for such compromise solutions retain a deadly element: they recognize (improperly) the State's unwarranted present role in financing education through taxes, and they must again succumb to statist control, for the State *will* control that which it finances.

## 2. Care of the Aged

There is a popular fiction that Social Security was started because Americans were taking inadequate care of the elderly. The truth is that *the Social Security program was started in order to induce older people to leave the job market* and thus vacate jobs for younger persons who were unemployed. This represents poor thinking economically because it was based on the presupposition that only a finite number of jobs exist, and that individuals must compete against each other for the fixed number of jobs available. But, since human wants are insatiable, so is the potential number of jobs.

It is appropriate at this point to dispel another popular myth: that the {60} financial crash of 1929 and the ensuing ten-year depression can rightfully be blamed on the system of free-market capitalism—specifically, that the crash was caused by stock market speculation and that the depression was the result of the business community's failure to do its "social duty" to provide needed jobs, thus the need for the government to step in and save the people.

The bold truth is simply this: from 1924 through 1928 the Federal Reserve Board followed an expansionary monetary policy in order to keep interest rates low in these United States with the intent of helping Britain stay on the Gold Reserve Standard which she returned to in 1924. (Lower interest rates here would induce people to keep their money in England, thus reducing the outflow of British gold.) Much of the excess money created by the Federal Reserve in attempting to keep interest rates low went into ostentatious expenditures and into speculative ventures (the stock market and Florida real estate deals are two examples). The point to keep in mind is that a country's central bank (the official monetary arm of the government) *can create* excess purchasing media, but it *cannot control* what people will do with the newly created money once they get it in their hands.

Federal Reserve officials had been concerned about the growing speculative fever since mid-1928, but they did not know how to deal with the problem their inflationary monetary policy had created. Finally, in May 1929, the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate by a large amount. (The discount rate is the rate the Federal Reserve Banks charge member banks when they secure short-term loans from the F. R.) The higher discount rate forced commercial banks that had loaned "call money" to stock market speculators to call their loans in. (When a commercial bank extends a loan to a customer, new money is created and the overall money supply is expanded. When the loans are repaid by the borrower, money is destroyed and the overall money supply is contracted.) The immediate result of this Federal Reserve action was a sharp reduction in the price of stocks because borrowing speculators had to sell their stocks in order to generate cash to pay off their call loans. This selling off of stocks culminated in a wave of panic selling in October 1929. Then, once the panic set in, Federal Reserve officials, instead of making needed reserves available to member banks with

liquidity problems (as good monetary policy would have dictated), began a *perverse* policy of restricting the money supply even more drastically by *refusing* to lend funds via accepting discounted notes. Thus, from 1929 to 1933 the money supply was contracted by about 35 percent, and the people of our country found themselves in the midst of the worst depression in history. (It is important to recognize that the chain of cause and effect concerning this matter: [1] The initial financial panic was set off in 1929 by official *government* action. And this happened *after* the same government had set the stage for a financial panic by following five years of inflationary monetary policy. [2] Once the financial panic occurred, official *government* action {61} acerbated the problem by *further* monetary mismanagement and pushed the country into the 1929–1932 depression. Anyone who does not grasp these two points has no chance of understanding what really happened in the decades of the 1920s and 1930s.)

Now comes the ironic part of this bit of financial history: the American public turned to the civil government to “solve” the depression problem. They turned to the very culprit that had *caused* the problem in the first place. The Roosevelt administration moved in with socialist/communist programs which had popular appeal, but which badly frightened the business community. Potential entrepreneurs became fearful about committing their funds to job-creating investments. This led the Roosevelt administration (which was heavily infiltrated by socialist/communist elements) to point the finger of blame at the business community and to claim the necessity for the Federal Government to move in to fill the void. It was against this dreary background that the Social Security program was spawned.

As first envisioned, Social Security was designed to be a government plan which forced people to save—they were to set aside funds during their working years and then draw down the funds after retirement. Each citizen was to have a “personal account” like an insurance policy. The personal account would have been fictitious, of course, for the money paid in by each Social Security participant would have been immediately spent on various government programs, and would have been backed up only by IOU’s (bonds) issued by the Federal Government. The only backing for the IOU’s would have been the general taxing power of the national government. The illusionary “personal



account” idea was dropped, for, when the Social Security program went into effect in 1937, it had already been changed to a “pay-as-you-go” plan. Under this arrangement, the national government taxed away some of the earnings of younger persons who were employed and transferred them to older persons who had retired. Thus the term “transfer payments,” which is a euphemism for something that really is not very nice: *a program of legalized theft directed by the government itself*—the government simply enacts a law which makes it legal to take wealth from one citizen and give it to another.

Once a person understands the economics of Social Security, it is easy to see that the program represents a clear breaking of the Eighth Commandment (Ex. 20:15), as well as the biblical rule that parents are to lay up for the children and not the children for the parents (2 Cor. 12:14).

The problem with such governmentally sponsored “transfer payment” programs is that they begin in such a small way that their inherent immorality tends to go unnoticed until the programs grow and begin to produce obviously harmful effects in society. When Social Security began in 1937, the maximum payment withheld from a worker’s paycheck was only 1 percent {62} of \$3,000 wages, or a maximum of \$30 per year. This was only a trifle, even according to depression standards. This \$30 was matched with a popularly tempting subterfuge—a “matching” \$30 to be paid by the employer. (Of course, the employer’s “matching contribution” is a wage cost, since the money could have gone to the wage earner instead of the State. Thus, the *whole* cost of Social Security comes out of the wage earner’s pocket.) In summary, the total maximum cost of Social Security per worker in 1937 was only \$60 per year, hardly enough to cause people to scrutinize the morality of the program very closely. Besides, who would be so bold as to speak out against a popular program designed to help old folks?!

But today the Social Security program has mushroomed into such a financial monster that its harmful economic effects can hardly escape notice by even the most undiscerning. The total tax base has grown from \$3,000 in 1937 to approximately \$30,000 today; and the combined employee-employer tax rate has increased from 2 percent to 13 percent. In short, total payments per worker have soared from \$60 annually to about \$3,900 annually. This sum is very adequate to moti-

vate people to reconsider the worthwhileness of Social Security economically, as well as to reevaluate its moral soundness.

In my economics classes, I teach students this principle: Good morals produce good economics. Thus, whenever you come across policies or practices which produce harmful economic effects, investigate the underlying morality of the policy or practice.

What are some of the harmful economic and social effects of Social Security?

(1) Social Security serves to pauperize our nation as a whole because it stimulates consumption *before* saving and investment takes place. Under a voluntary private retirement program, a person would gradually build up a retirement nest egg (life insurance, pension plans, etc.) all during his productive working life. During this forty to fifty year span, the saved funds would contribute considerably to building the productive capital base of our country. The efficiency of output would thus rise, and the production of even more wealth would be stimulated. This would in turn cause people's standard of living to rise generally. This is an example of free-market capitalism in action. *Elderly people would tend to be highly regarded in society because they would be owners of considerable capital funds over which they had discretionary control.* Wealth, in short, is a form of power.

But under the Social Security "wealth transfer" scheme, the situation is much different. Funds withheld from a worker's paycheck are *not* productively invested. Instead, they are almost immediately transferred to a retiree who spends the funds on consumable goods and services. This explains, for instance, the high percentage of elderly persons boarding and unboarding airplanes at airports all across the country. If we may make an analogy, we {63} may say that Social Security uses government coercion to force Farmer Brown to set aside seed corn, but that the government then takes the seed corn and gives it to Farmer Jones to eat. In short, Social Security sets in motion a vast government-sponsored program of *decapitalization* which leads assuredly towards national impoverishment.

Recently, a dear old lady in a Thanksgiving Day "thank service" got up and said, "I thank the Lord for Social Security! Without it I would have a hard time getting along." (This same dear soul is planning a trip to the Holy Land in order to *spend some excess savings*, so she can

*decrease her assets* in order to qualify for entering a *government-sponsored old folks home*.) If this dear saint understood the economics of the Social Security system, she would realize how sacrilegious it is to thank God for such an immoral monstrosity. In 1980, a staggering \$136.5 billion in Social Security “transfer payments” were siphoned off from workers and funneled into retirement benefits. In 1982 the amount will rise to an estimated \$183.9 billion.<sup>42</sup>

I might add at this point that Social Security is *only one* of various “wealth transfer” programs enforced by government edict. It is important to recognize the subtle threat of *force* that lies behind each such government scheme, for the strong arm of the law will be quickly used against anyone who decides not to put into the pot. It is truly a brutal business. Today, *almost half of the American population is in some way or another dependent on government handouts* in the form of pay, welfare, pensions, or business and farm subsidies.<sup>43</sup> The total amount of so-called “government transfer payments” (federal, state, and local) has mushroomed from \$5.6 billion in 1945 to \$283.9 billion in 1980.<sup>44</sup> If America can be accused of a national sin it is the massive and prolonged breaking of the Eighth and Tenth Commandments through an all-powerful, humanistic government.

These critical comments about the Social Security program are *not* directed at the millions of elderly people who are caught up in it, for they, by and large, are either ignorant participants or feel trapped into it by law. Rather, my comments are directed to Social Security as an institutional program. Most people are still under the *illusion* that any program enacted into law by their political leaders must be lawful from a *moral* standpoint. It is only during the last few years that growing numbers of the general public have begun to question the morality of governmental acts; and this is a healthy indication, for truly ungodly rulers lead the people astray in the rulers’ humanistic drive to build a Utopia on earth (Isa. 9:16; 28:10).

One further result of humanistically oriented wealth transfer programs like Social Security is to develop *powerful political blocs* which

---

42. *U.S. News & World Report*, January 26, 1981, 74.

43. *Ibid.*, March 9, 1981, 73.

44. *Ibid.*, March 2, 1981, 26.

become {64} monolithically unified in *single purpose goals*—that is, to protect the existing level of government-bestowed benefits and to work at increasing the benefits at the expense of all other competing blocs. The development of special interest blocs allows *political demagogues* to establish themselves in office by playing on the people's fears and larcenous hearts. We see evidence of this development in every election. People with good memories will be able to recall the series of ads on television during the 1964 Johnson-Goldwater campaigns which depicted elderly persons voicing the fear that Social Security benefits would be cut off if Barry Goldwater were elected president. The large number of votes cast by the elderly in response to these fears led to Goldwater's resounding defeat.

But, let us ask now: What would be a godly way of providing for the aged? If the present "American plan" is ungodly, what is God's alternative?

First, a godly plan would call for the civil authorities to follow a *non-inflationary monetary policy* which would protect the integrity of the monetary unit. This, in turn, would call for a *noninterventionist government* which would be limited to its biblical role of serving as a keeper of the peace (1 Tim. 2:1–2). A stable money supply would produce a healthy, *long-term, gradual decrease in the general price level* which would steadily increase the purchasing power of people's savings.

Over the last 100–150 years, productivity (i.e., the efficiency of economic output) has grown approximately 2.5 to 3 percent per year. If such a trend were to continue unaccompanied by monetary inflation, the result would be that a dollar saved today would buy \$1.03 worth of goods and services next year (in addition to whatever interest was earned). In ten years, the value of today's dollar (exclusive of interest) would then be \$1.34; in twenty years, \$1.80; in thirty years, \$2.42; and in forty years, \$3.26 (remember that these values apply only to the original dollar that was saved, and do not even include accrued interest). Instead of following our present inflationary policy which insidiously robs older people of their hard-earned savings, thus stimulating them to spend instead of to save, such a noninflationary policy would strongly motivate people to *accumulate savings* through efficiently run financial intermediaries like life insurance companies, savings banks, and pension funds which automatically appear in the free-market

economy. Another benefit of letting people arrange for their own accumulation of retirement funds is that there would be no need for the vast numbers of tax-supported Social Security personnel.

But what about those citizens who persist in being spendthrifts and who do not have the personal discipline to save consistently for retirement? And what about those frugal souls who do save, but who handle their funds unwisely and who end up old and destitute? This brings us to the second biblical point: such persons are proper cases for *charity*, which is the proper {65} realm of individuals, the church, and voluntary social aid organizations. *Nowhere does the Bible give the civil authority any responsibility for caring for the poor or aged.* Think of the Christian's responsibility for shedding forth the love of Christ through charitable outreach that is now being usurped by an aggressive and activist civil authority! To the extent the State taxes away citizens' wealth and income, each Christian's ability to support God's Kingdom-building work is weakened. God's plan calls for people to be individually responsible for providing for their declining years. Those who have failed to meet this responsibility, either by neglect or unforeseen events, must either continue to work or be dependent on charity bestowed by other individuals or organizations. Individual responsibility, of course, does not preclude acting voluntarily in concert with others (insurance, savings banks, etc.), but it definitely precludes coercive governmental wealth-transfer schemes.

### 3. Care of the Poor and Needy

The same line of argumentation that applied to Social Security can also be generally applied to the poor and needy. Great masses of people in our country have become institutionally poor because of various government programs which direct them towards *idleness* instead of motivating them towards job hunting and the acquisition of new skills. Man, by his very sin nature, will tend to seek the easiest short-term course, even though it may ultimately lead toward long-range economic impotency. How many individuals have we seen happy to receive government-bestowed "rocking chair money," instead of seriously looking for income-producing employment when laid off from work, for instance?

The *minimum wage law* also serves to disemploy persons who have only marginal skills. Thus, the minimum wage law inhibits low-skill persons from gaining worthwhile job-market experience which would lead to other employment opportunities at higher pay. As strange as it may seem, doing away with the minimum wage law would *help* the poor instead of hurting them. The absence of such a law would allow employers to pay low-skill people whatever they were worth in the marketplace. This would open up many jobs that are now closed because the legally required pay level is too high; but, more importantly, it would allow low-skill people *to learn new skills* and to develop the *required job disciplines* to qualify for higher paying jobs. In short, once again we can see how the civil authority has acerbated the problem of poverty instead of curing it. In addition, our civil authorities have created *large political blocs of people who are institutionally committed to idleness*—the minimum wage law destines them to long-term unemployment, so the civil authority steps in and provides government-bestowed wealth-transfer incomes.

Biblical charity, on the other hand, is both *voluntary* and *short-term*. It {66} motivates people to become self-supporting quickly because the voluntary donors have the power to cut off funds to the lazy and indolent. The biblical way of caring for the poor and needy would be, first, *not* to price them institutionally out of the market through a minimum wage law. Secondly, privately supplied self-help opportunities through work would help the poor and needy to remain socially useful rather than causing them to lose their own self-esteem (Ruth 2:15–23). For the civil authority to accept responsibility for caring for the poor and needy is for the civil authority to arrogate a power not given to it by God. It is to usurp the responsibility of individuals and the Church.

#### 4. The High Cost of Energy

The decade of the 1970s introduced a new problem to Americans in general and to many people the world over: the shortage of energy and its commensurate high cost. Two questions can be raised: Why are we suddenly faced with shortages and high cost? And how should the problem be met?

The second question can be answered by answering the first.

The cause of high priced energy in America is *not* greedy businessmen who wrench profits out of the misery of the poor and downtrodden. Rather, the problem has been caused by mismanagement in the area of civil government. To understand what has happened, we must go back to 1955, the year that Congress passed legislation to control prices in the oil and gas industry.

In 1955, there were about 20,000 wildcat drillers exploring for oil and gas in the continental United States. Even though our usage of oil and gas was increasing each year, the total known reserves of these energy resources were growing even faster. The faster-increasing supply relative to the slower increasing demand helped keep prices low. But, with the imposition of Federal price controls on interstate gas in 1955, much of the needed profit incentive to induce wildcat drillers to risk their capital in exploration disappeared. So, many of these risk-taking entrepreneurs turned to other activities. Soon oil and gas usage began to surpass the rate at which new reserves were being found. By 1971, the number of wildcat drillers had dropped to about 8,000, and the supply situation in our country had grown critical.

Leaders in the oil and gas industry repeatedly warned congressional committees and other high-placed politicians and bureaucrats about our dwindling reserves, but it was politically unpopular to return to a free market because the public is generally ignorant of supply-demand economics. The public wanted cheap energy *today*; let tomorrow take care of itself. The public wanted government-mandated capital consumption.

The inability to earn adequate returns on capital invested in a government-controlled price situation explains why leading oil companies {67} began to search for cheaper oil sources overseas. As we now know, these cheaper oil supplies were found in the Middle East. Thus, our country gradually became more and more dependent on foreign sources of energy. And when Congress began controlling oil prices in 1971, even more pressure was added to make our country dependent on foreign oil.

The Arab oil boycott which occurred in 1973 shocked Americans, for, somehow, America had passed from being a net exporter of oil to a net importer. Government officials pointed the finger of blame at profit-seeking oil companies, at the American public who were dubbed

“energy hogs,” and at the fact that the earth has only a finite amount of fossil fuels which were being depleted at too fast a rate.

Not one of these claims stands the test of reason.

Some years ago, in the very midst of the oil shortage problem, I publicly claimed (both in writing and in taped radio programs) that the world is awash in oil and gas. It is true that God created the universe with a finite amount of resources, but we must also recognize that our gracious Lord is the author of history. He not only foreknew the course of events in world history and the growth of world population, but He is the dynamic cause in bringing these events about. To accuse God of putting man on an earth which is inadequately supplied with the needed economic resources is equivalent to saying that our Creator and Father is stingy and niggardly. It is a gross denial of the scriptural truth that a gracious and loving God has abundantly supplied man with all his needs. Actually, the finite resources of the earth are so vast *relative to world population*, and also relative to the *time* given to mankind on earth, that, practically speaking, the earth's resources are almost limitless. The only factor that is lacking to tap the earth's almost limitless resources is the *incentive* to search for and develop them. And it is in this crucial aspect of incentive that the Federal government has erected innumerable barriers.

To continue our historical narrative, let us remember that the number of wildcat drillers dropped from 20,000 in 1955 to 8,000 in 1971. Thus, the 1973 Arab boycott caught us in a very tight supply situation—a government-created tight supply situation. It would not be unfair to say that the energy pricing policy followed by the Federal government created the very situation which both encouraged a boycott by the Arabs and guaranteed its success.

Happily, at the time of this writing (spring of 1981), our national government has seen some of the error of its way and has deregulated the oil and gas industry. The deregulation process started a few years ago by letting energy prices creep upward, and it has ended with the removal of all price regulation. And what has been the result? Well, already large advances are being made in rebuilding proven reserves. Why? Because some 15,000 wildcat drillers are out busily exploring and drilling for oil and gas. They {68} have been attracted by the higher profit potential allowed by the removal of price controls. Not only are



entrepreneurial wildcatters finding new fields, but they are using new technology to drill deeper to discover new finds in existing fields. New technology is also being used to squeeze out additional supplies from fields which were considered depleted at the lower prices which existed a few years ago.

As an economist, I am particularly fond of pointing out that the best cure for high prices and limited supplies is high prices. What do I mean? I simply mean that high prices produce a twofold effect: First, high prices motivate consumers to cut back on consumption. Latest data show that there has been a 15.4 percent decline in gasoline consumption in the United States since 1979.<sup>45</sup> Second, high prices stimulate profit-seeking competitors to enter lines of economic activity where prices are high. This explains why some 15,000 wildcat drillers are now working in the continental U.S.A. versus only 8,000 in 1973. And what has been the result? Gasoline supplies are currently so high in the U.S.A. that American oil refineries in March 1981 were cutting back to 68.7 percent of capacity, their lowest level of operation since the depression year of 1935.<sup>46</sup> Prices have already responded by trending downward, and I expect the downward price trend to continue in response to increasing supplies (if our governing authorities do not upset this happy situation by again intervening in the marketplace).

But before turning away from the currently improving energy supply situation, let us go back and see what other actions our national government took toacerbate the energy crises. During the 1960s, Congress passed additional legislation which loaded automobiles down with antipollution control devices. The result was that the average miles per gallon of gasoline dropped from about 15–16 mpg in 1963 to about 10 mpg in 1973. That amounts to an increase in consumption by about 33.3 percent! Then, in addition, Congress passed legislation which required new autos to use unleaded gasoline, which requires about 15 percent more crude oil and additional costs.

Now comes the crowning glory! Throughout this time that the national government was dampening the supply of oil and gas on one hand, and stimulating demand on the other hand (which helped exert

---

45. *U.S. News & World Report*, April 6, 1981, 7.

46. *Ibid.*

upward pressure on prices), vast new fields of oil and gas were discovered in Alaska. This seemed like God's answer to a sorely distressed nation, but what happened? Did our political leaders welcome this find as a boon to hard-pressed consumers and as an answer to the problem of our growing dependence on foreign oil? The answer is common knowledge. Congress became the pliant tool of politically powerful ecological interests which strove to preserve the pristine wilderness atmosphere of Alaska. These ecology buffs apparently {69} valued the wanderings of wild animals in Alaska more than the well-being of their poor neighbors in northern cities who were living in unheated homes because fuel oil was too expensive to buy.

The net result of the ecologists' political influence in Washington was more than a six-year delay in building the Alaskan pipeline plus multibillions of additional costs which hard-pressed consumers would eventually have to bear in higher priced fuel for their homes and autos.

Recently, I was invited to give a series of talks on the biblical basis of the free market at a large annual Christian conference. The executive director of a Christian outreach ministry to Negroes in a northeastern city approached me after my talks. He was against the idea of a free market because, in his opinion, greedy capitalists had jacked up the price of fuel in order to line their pockets at the expense of the poor people he was ministering to. His feeling of alienation had led him, without his realizing it, to accept the socialist/communist theory of exploitation, so he and his organization do all they can to help the subjects of ministry to get all the government handouts that are available. His attitude is not much different from that of many sincere Christians who turn to humanistically oriented civil government to solve alleged social evils when, in reality, they should be focusing on restructuring society along godly ways.

Let us consider the claim of this Christian missionary. Is it true that his clientele are the hapless victims of a greedy oil and gas industry? If it *is* true, then we might excuse his anticapitalist mentality, but the only answer we can give is a resounding *no*! For, as we can see from the historical account given above, it was misguided *governmental* action which drastically served to reduce our domestic supply of oil and gas after 1955 through the imposition of *price controls*. It was also misguided governmental action which drastically increased the demand

for gasoline by requiring gas-robbing *antipollution devices* on new autos. Misguided government action helped to acerbate a bad situation by requiring new autos to use *unleaded gasoline*, which costs about 15 percent more to produce than leaded gasoline. And, finally, misguided government action added delay upon delay *in completing the Alaska pipeline*. How can anyone who understands what really happened blame free-market capitalism for fuel shortages and high prices? This, of course, is a communications problem, for the news media take keen pleasure in making the business community the scapegoat of our social problems. The unthinking public, many Christians among them, easily fall prey to publicly disseminated misinformation, and this mentally conditions them to look to government as a solver of problems instead of the cause of them. This whole series of ill-begotten governmental interventions in the oil and gas and auto industries has been a tremendous disservice to Americans, but too few citizens understand what really happened. Our Christian brother who is the executive director of the inner-city mission to Negroes (as {70} well as our other Christian brethren who have fallen for anticapitalist propaganda) would be much better advised to place the high cost of fuel oil right where it belongs, on humanistically oriented civil government's intervention in economic affairs.

We would be well advised to make this statement even if we were ignorant of the misguided government actions cited above. Why? Because it is *not* characteristic of free-market activity to produce widespread social problems or to produce massive misallocations of economic resources. Free-market activity, because it takes place without coercion and is aimed to satisfy consumers needs on a one-to-one basis, does exactly the opposite—it tends to *solve* problems while they are still *small*. So, whenever such widespread problems as persistently rising price levels, widespread unemployment, or massive shortages or surpluses do appear, we must search for the underlying causative force. Almost always, the underlying cause will be found to be some kind of unwise governmental policy which has interfered with man's observed tendency to serve his neighbor's needs at a profit to all concerned. And here we must make a theological point: without exception, the unwise governmental interferences will be found to be the result of *fallen man's inherent rebellion against God and God's law system*. Fallen man

attempts to dethrone God and God's law and to set himself up as the ultimate authority in society in his attempt to build a secular Utopia on earth.

How can we summarize the points made in this paper, and what implications can we draw concerning how men are to go about serving the needs of each other? Especially, we might ask, what implication is there for Christians in how they are to deal with others?

A search of the Scripture fails to turn up any guideline that condones the use of force in economic transactions either by individuals or by the civil authority. Even when Samaria was under siege, there is not the slightest hint that the government had rightful authority to impose price controls, for instance (2 Kings 7). Neither does Scripture anywhere even hint that the civil authority has rightful power to direct and manipulate economic or social affairs in order to achieve desired national policies. Thus, it should be of no concern to the political authorities whether prices are high or low, whether employment is high or low, whether or not economic growth is taking place, or whether a country's balance of foreign payments is stable or not. The only biblical authority given to the civil ruler is that of *keeping the peace*, so that justice will reign and free men will be able to act self-responsibly before God, to whom they must answer.

Not enough Christians have seriously attempted to discern the mind of God concerning how they should comport themselves in economic and social affairs. Thus, many Christians have an unbiblical tendency to turn to an activist civil government in seeking quick solutions to alleged social problems. In doing so they err in two ways. First, they tend to unload onto {71} the civil authority what are really their own personal responsibilities or the responsibility of the corporate church. The unfailing result of this error is that *humanistically oriented civil government tends to grow at the expense of Christ's church*. Christ wants His followers actively to beat down the gates of hell, not to acquiesce passively in seeing Satan's secular sphere grow.

Second, Christians who encourage or condone the civil authority's providing "charity" to the needy are guilty of institutionally breaking the Eighth and Tenth Commandments through the collective agency we call government. Such sins, even though done collectively and ignorantly, cannot help escape God's notice and judgment. Many of our

social evils (cited above) can be traced to unwise and basically immoral government policies. But Christians are required by God's Word to live godly and lawful lives—lawful, not according to legally imposed man-made laws, but lawful according to God's Law. This requires a careful commitment to conform every action and thought to the heart and mind of Christ and a special care not to be enticed into social customs or politically imposed policies that are antinomian in essence. We as Christians must turn away from the inherently coercive (and immoral) wealth-transfer policies being promoted by our governmental leaders, and we must turn to voluntary private policies of helping others, which are condoned by the Bible. There is a seeming risk in turning from coercive collectivism to free-market voluntarism, for we cannot predict in advance just how people's needs will be met in the voluntary sphere, but this, in itself, calls for an act of faith—faith that God will work His plan in our lives individually and socially if we will but follow in Christ's footsteps. God's Word simply calls for us to offer the sacrifices of righteousness, and then to place our trust in God for the outcome (Ps. 4:5).

### *Note 1.*

The biblical argument favoring the decentralized system of voluntary exchange (which is characteristic of free-market capitalism) over centrally controlled collectivist systems (which deny man economic freedom) is simple and straightforward:

Man is created in the image and likeness of God and has been given a vice-regency dominion over the earth (Gen. 1:26–28). Accordingly, man (1) has a *right* to be free because he is an image-bearer of God, Who Himself is free. Since God is free by His very nature, man shares in this freedom aspect of God. As God is free to *impute value* into things and alternative choices (He set His love upon Israel), so is man.

The whole study of man as an economic being rests on his God-given ability to impute value and to act as a responsible rational being. (2) Man thus has a *duty* to remain free so he can act responsibly as God's vice-regent here on earth (Gen. 1:28) and so he can serve God (Ex. 8:1). This is an important aspect of freedom which is often overlooked. While it is true that man has a right to freedom based on his being created in the very image and likeness of God, man's duty to God

as vice-regent *requires* that he be free so he can stand as a free and self-responsible agent before his Creator. How else can man offer sacrifices of righteousness to God (Ps. 4:5)? Any political/economic system which subverts man's personal responsibility to God, as all socialist/communist systems of collectivism do, are clearly violations of biblical precepts because they attempt to break God's direct lordship over man. They forcibly relieve unwilling citizens from the control over property which their self-responsibility to God requires that they maintain.

The entire Law and Prophets generally supports the concept of personal responsibility that is inherent in the free-market system, and the Decalogue does so specifically. God declares it morally wrong to steal and to covet another's property because property is the physical means God has given man to offer spiritual sacrifices to Himself. And the civil authorities have no moral or legal right to set aside the protection afforded by the commandments against stealing and covetousness, any more than they have a right to set aside any other commandment. Nor can this be done rightly by majority vote either. Rather, the civic authority is bound to uphold and administer *all* of God's laws (Deut. 17:14–20), for the civil magistrate is not the source of law, but only the administrator of God's existing laws.

Paul clearly indicates that the proper role of civil government is simply that of a keeper-of-the-peace, and not that of an activist economic controller (Rom. 13:3–4; 1 Tim. 2:1–2). Nowhere in the Bible is the civil ruler given authority to engage in charitable works or economic intervention and regulation. God has not given civil government an open-ended power to invade any sphere of life it chooses, because only Christ has all power over every sphere. To give government such power is to set it up as an idol. One principle runs consistently throughout the Bible, and it is that *no social institution administered by sinful men is ever given anything but a very limited sphere power*. In this age of big government and expanding bureaucracy, Christians need to be aware of this principle; for, as the kingdom of power-seeking humanistic civil government expands, the effective working of Christians in building the Kingdom of God will be commensurately pushed back. God's cultural mandate to us calls for the reverse process to happen; we are to expand God's work, and the dominion of secular humanistic government is to recede.

# AN EPISTEMOLOGY FOR DOMINION

---

*Tommy W. Rogers*

Several years ago, Richard M. Weaver, a notable professor of English at the University of Chicago, wrote a book titled *Ideas Have Consequences*. The theme was that ideas—beliefs, values, notions as to the nature of man and his destiny—give rise to corresponding actions. Expressed another way, we may say that out of the heart proceedeth the issues of life. Such is a fundamental truth. It is true of individuals, for nations, and for eras of historical time.

Almost as long ago, when Robert Frost considered why American men and women swing their arms so freely (1957), he remarked: “There cannot be much to fear in a country where so many bright faces are going by. I keep asking myself where they all come from, and I keep thinking that God is making them up new around the corner.” The answer to Frost’s speculation is not complicated. The “right look” reflecting confidence and a free spirit is the result of dwelling in a land of brooks and water, of wheat and barley, a land of honey provisioned with all manner of store, wherein the citizenry has eaten bread without scarceness. It is because the Lord commanded blessing on the fruit of body, ground, basket, and store, making us plenteous in full garners of goods and opening the heaven to give rain in season. It is the result of covenantal blessing, the “why” of which is set forth unequivocally in Deuteronomy chapters 8 and 28.

Just as the covenant contains fact and promise of blessing for obedience, the curse, as fact and promise, is set forth with equal unequivallence: “And it shall be if thou do forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them... ye shall surely perish... Because ye would not be obedient” (Deut. 8:19–20). The peoples of America, and the entire Western world, appear to be becoming steadily impoverished, not only in spite of political gestures toward prosperity, but because of them. We seem to be becoming a proverb,

crumbling internally, externally assaulted, and effectively impotent, comparatively afflicted with prospects of botch, emerods, scab, madness, blindness, astonishment of heart, and sorrow of mind.

We are in a warfare of spiritual and temporal dimensions. Humanism is a {73} continuing expression of Satan's rebellion, of Adam's determination to substitute his own will as the determiner and arbiter of what is good and evil. Rebellious man thinks he has no need of a lawgiver other than himself, and elects to be his own arbiter of good and evil. Much of the educational, political, and preaching efforts of today are efforts which, rejecting grace, seek a City of Man without need of glory in a resuscitation of the Tower of Babel.

The heathen do rage, and the people do imagine a vain thing, saying, "Let us break His bands asunder and cast His cords from us" (Ps. 2:1–3). Romans 1:18–32 describes the reprobate mind which is the end of humanism. The final outcome of the war is predetermined. The eschatological result of humanism, the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, is graphically described in Revelation 19 (and Ps. 2). It is the defeat of the beast, the kings of the earth, and their armies gathered together to make war against the KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. This is done and certain, but for us it is in time future.

We are not today in the City (described in Rev. 21) where there is no death, no sorrow, no crying, and no need of sun or moon to shine in it, for the glory of God and the Lamb is the light thereof. We remain within the confines of human time, where the spirits of devils go forth unto the kings of the earth to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. We live in a time when it has been easy to say I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, and in scriptural diction, "knowest not thou are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked" (Rev. 4:17). We live in a time wherein we are admonished to buy gold tried in the fire ... and white raiment, that we may be clothed ... to be zealous, and repent, and overcome (Rev. 3:17ff).

Humanism changes the truth of God into a lie, worshiping the creature more than the creator. We remain within the confines of human time, within the temporal dimension of the continuing warfare whose etiology in human time is described in Genesis chapter 3. We *are* in battle against principalities and powers (of spiritual and temporal



dimensions), and against the idea of collectivism and its implementation in time and space.

### *Political Liberalism: Handmaiden of Humanism*

Western civilization is in trouble—financially, morally, economically, militarily, structurally—and threatened within and without. It is in trouble largely because of the prevalence of an idea. The idea, of which messianic liberalism is one expression, is that *man can, should, and must recognize his own potential*—the unfolding of his innate goodness and rationality—*by taking control of his destiny*. In so doing, he must remove, discard, destroy, and strip away, those hindrances—custom, tradition, culture, restraint, limits, morality—which function as restraints on attainment of this quest, and thus {74} have become evil in the perspective of humanistic man because they would deny man his chance to be as God.<sup>47</sup>

*Our crisis is a crisis of liberalism.* Liberalism, like Keynes's economics, has a long run. Unfortunately, we are now in the long run, reaping the fruition of decades of liberal dominance in pulpit, press, academic hall, and stateroom. We are in the long run of political implementation of the notion that man, being eminently rational and innately good and uncorrupted, needs only an environment free from religion and morality, plus benefit of the right sociopolitical programs, to achieve the City of Man.

Liberalism means the loss of the American Dream and the great experiment in maximization of individual dignity. It means an end to the restriction of civil government by the rule of law<sup>48</sup> which has been the United States. The fruition of liberalism means loss of the opportunity to implement the scriptural injunction of living quiet lives in all

---

47. A particularly meritorious discussion of the idea, its implementation and effects, is presented in Clarence Carson, *The World in the Grip of an Idea* (Arlington House, 1979).

48. As Rose and Metcalf point out in *The Coming Victory* (Christian Studies Center, 1980), *civil* government is appropriately seen as a *dispenser of law* rather than as the source of law. Some authority of a civil nature is required to restrain man from acts of plunder, theft, coercion, and aggression. Civil magistrates are appointed ministers for the dispensing of justice (prevention of wrong actions against persons and punishment of those who do wrong by committing rightfully forbidden acts).

godliness and honesty, which opportunity is the objective of government structure toward which the Christian should direct his attention, and the reason which, Paul told Timothy, we should pray for kings and all that are in authority (1 Tim. 2:2).

Political liberalism is one dimension of the outworking of humanism. *Liberalism is a handmaiden of secular humanism.* Totalitarianism is their progeny, and their lineage is realized in warfare of the collectivist State against its own citizens.

Humanism, seeking the perfect humanist good, and having no standard of value but itself, resolves itself into the *arbitrary standards* of unredeemed men in rebellion working out their pride and greed in the political order. Man, stripped of any ultimate standard of judgment except the arbitrariness of unredeemed men, faces a “liberated” governmental structure, with its power to act on man’s soul, spirit, and life circumstances, unrestricted by the limitations imposed on it by divine truth. He becomes the chattel of the State, upon whom the collective may work its will apart from any restraints except those of its own expediency.

### *Civil Government’s Warfare Against Its Citizenry*

Government is the instrument in the humanistic quest for compulsive perfection because it is the repository of the force necessary for realization of the humanistic concept of *forced perfection*. As life becomes politicalized, {75} and every man’s existence and fortune becomes subject to the exigencies of political decisions, and as all seek “justice” in the political sphere (interpreted as desirable distribution of political spoils), interest in government is intensified, not because of concern for principles of good government, but for the *transcendental capital value* resulting from the use of, service to, and favor of civil government.

Government is in the grip of the idea of perfection by compulsion, force, and the destruction of Christian culture which hinders its accomplishment (including most tenets of traditional morality to the extent they are derived from Christian ethic). Eventually, such a messianic State will war against its own people in its quest for self-fulfillment. This truth is illustrated by Soviet Russia, which has the most admirable (humanistically) constitution draftable. Guaranteeing rights

of worship, for example, it is nevertheless a land of persecution, prosecution, and imprisonment for ideas and expression, and of torture for beliefs, because Soviet Russia is a land where government is not judged and limited by a power greater than human reason. It is therefore irrational.

Because the Russian system epitomizes faith in man's unhindered rationality and innate goodness, it is congenitally applauded by Western liberals, even if they do not condone its more crude expressions. For them, including the architects of American foreign policy, *collectivism is the hope of the world*. The excesses and human degradations wherever the hammer and sickle spread their influence are inevitably regarded as aberrations, as temporary flaws in an admirable and ultimately desirable quest. Liberal belief in the rationality and good intent of Communism is unimpeachable because Communism is based on the same view that gives rise to their social liberalism—man's perfection by his own efforts, his own knowledge, his own judgment of good and evil. No amount of empirical evidence, including the 100 million souls dispatched by purges, murders, imprisonment, famine and the like, shakes their faith in the rationality of mankind and his quest for humanistic perfection.

No quotation, promise, ridicule, assessment, testament, or assertion to the contrary by Communist theoreticians convinces the liberal that Communism is a worldwide, satanically motivated conspiracy, or even that it is a conspiracy at all. As Andrew Young saluted the Cubans in Africa as a "stabilizing force," so has Communist presence been welcomed throughout the world—from the captive nations of Europe to China, Algeria, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Panama—and covert if not overt opposition to rightist-leaning leaders, wherever possible, appears to have been an underlying theme of American policy. From accommodation to "Uncle" Joe Stalin, to technological aid to create a balance of power, to praise of Mao, Ho, and Castro, to efforts to create a one-world league through a merger with Communism—no empirical result will convince liberals that Communism is {76} evil. That humanists must be rational is an unshakable faith. *To criticize Communism, except to the extent that it may represent some unwise strategic efforts in obtaining an ultimately desirable end, is to criticize the etiological roots of the liberal ideology*. Anti-Communism is evil to the liberal mind set, a

heretical denial of the essence of their humanist faith. Liberals, soft as they may be on Communism, react with vehemence to anti-Communism. The reasons are obvious.

As soon as the Communists are equal with us, as soon as we lose our military dominance and establish a balance of power, we were told, Russian fears will be assuaged and conflict will be over. After all, Communists are humanists and rationalists. Nor were those who led China into Communism in the forties, Cuba in the fifties, and who are leading Panama and Nicaragua into Communism today, regarded as Communists by enlightened and progressive leaders. After all, to a large extent, their aim is to accomplish good things which liberals feel should be done.

A rightist may be hated, and rightfully exterminated, but a collegial member of the same family, even if a brat, is to be cuddled, coddled, nurtured, supported, guided, sought, caught, and catered to by grants and low-interest loans. Americans have been conned into support of socialism abroad as part of “fighting” Communism. Thus, American treasure has been poured down what Gary North has described as “the Devil’s fiscal rathole” in the form of “foreign aid.”

That humanistic civil government, born of the quest for perfection by the compulsive force of government power, will inevitably war against its own citizenry, is true not only in lands where totalitarianism is more open and brutal in expression, but also in the Western world, where its expression is still somewhat diluted and dispersed by the residue of Christian capital and a Biblically sanctioned normative structure. Humanistic government is conducting a war against its own citizenry even in the United States.

For example, government itself has become a significant force in *value determination*, an effective propaganda source for religious humanism and promotion of the ideology of “universal man” and collectivism. Second, *inflation* is caused by government. Inflation is theft by which the government finances its liberality. Government benefits from the inflationary crisis because opportunity for individual autonomy is destroyed and the public is made more dependent upon government. Third, government increases its revenue under inflation, even though the citizen’s real income may stay the same or even decrease.

*Taxation* itself is a technique of government warfare. Already, in the U.S., the government has assumed total dominance over the income of the citizenry, referring to that which it does not steal as an “exemption.” Implicit if not explicit in the government attitude is the notion that government owns everything, and permits allotment to be retained only by its grace. {77}

Jefferson pointed out in his first inaugural address (1801) that “a wise and frugal government shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned.” If government does not have bread, it will be limited in its ability to express the avarice which the founders sought to prevent from becoming attached to government activity.

*Education* is another arena of government warfare against personal responsibility. In state after state, battles are being fought with humanists of the government educational apparatus—not for control of the public schools—but for control over parental hegemony to direct the educational destiny of their children. Pastor Wisner in Ohio and Rev. Lester Roloff in Texas are but representative illustrations. To the humanists, the good State is the controlling State. To be uncontrolled is to be evil. Humanists seek to utilize the State to control mind, body, spirit, worldview, attitude, and outlook. To be *Christian* in these aspects of humanity is to be *evil*. Private and/or Christian education is the enemy of the controlling State. The humanistic State is seeking to punish the evil of educational independence and autonomy with a vengeance. It may be added, parenthetically, that *the overriding issue* with respect to education today is not to have “prayer” or creationism introduced into public education, but *to dismantle the system of public education*.

The compulsory military *draft* receives much homage from conservatives as long as women are not drafted.<sup>49</sup> As Congressman Ron Paul has stated succinctly: “The word of God forbids the draft, as does the Constitution and both military and economic considerations.” As the great American Presbyterian leader, John Gresham Machen, stated in arguing against American assumption of compulsory military service in 1917, enforced military service is “brutal and un-American in itself,

---

49. John Robbins, “The Bible and the Draft,” *Congressional Record* (May 29, 1980), E 2629.

and productive of a host of subsidiary evils.” *Limited civil government requires a government which does not have the power to conscript men or women into its service, regardless of the objectives which the Bilderbergers may seek to accomplish with persons brought into involuntary military servitude.*

On the legal front, the government has conducted a *warfare against the Constitution* as a necessity for its own growth and expansion. Even as militaristic governments seek to subject other peoples to their will and service, so does a humanist government seek the subjugation of the citizenry it comes to dominate. *To do ultimate good, government must have ultimate and unhindered powers of compulsion and coercion.* It has no limiting standard of comparison, but has only its own ends as a standard of evaluation. It does not wish to be judged by Biblical absolutes. Biblical wisdom is anathema because it is rightly recognized to be the opponent of totalitarian government. Biblically speaking, God, not civil government, is sovereign, {78} and Caesar is rightfully restricted to those prerogatives delegated to him. Where Scripture is preached, received, and applied, limited government is one of its consequences.

Biblical truth provides the basis for law wherein individual values may be exercised without leading to anarchical chaos. Application of scriptural truth brings about numerous perquisite benefits. As Schaeffer points out, “Wherever Biblical teaching has gone, it not only has told of open approach to God through the work of Christ, but also has brought peripheral results in society, including political institutions. Secondary results are produced by the preaching of the Gospel in both the arts and political affairs.”<sup>50</sup> God’s law-word of Scripture provides the tool of dominion as a manifestation of His grace and confirmation of His covenant. Although it is a war in which we win, realization of covenant blessing requires a progressive working out of covenant responsibilities in time and space. *God’s law is the tool of dominion.* It is our task to work out Biblical law-order in the various spheres of life. Separation *from* Satan and his works is to bring dominion *over* Satan and his works—in politics, economics, art, military affairs, medicine, science, and every other area of human action.<sup>51</sup>

50. Francis Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?* (Fleming H. Revell, 1976), 105.

51. Gary North, *Biblical Economics Today* (September 1980).

### *Requisites for Success*

1. *We must establish a philosophical base from which to make judgments and assessments.* A philosophical base from which to take mooring and direction, gain perspective, chart action, and judge social and political structures is an absolute necessity. Without benefit of a strong philosophical base, we do not have the firm footing from which we can build with consistency. Without a philosophical base, conservatism will be little more than a hit-and-run, rear-guard harassment, rather than an effective counterforce to humanism.

Greg Schuler, author of *The (Guilty) Conscience of a Conservative* (Arlington House, 1978), took several major issues of conservative-liberal controversy and traced them historically in terms of the *evolving positions* regarded as conservative and liberal, particularly since circa 1950. His conclusion was that “conservatism” is deficient in its establishment of a philosophical base. It is this philosophical base which should provide the foundation for determining the proper criteria for judging social and political affairs. Lacking such a base from which to take our moorings, conservatism, Schuler suggested, is largely *reactionary*. He concluded that the standard “conservative” position at a given point in time is just about the position liberals were taking fifteen years earlier. Schuler suggests that a more enduring standard is needed than “me to, but not so fast,” or, “I’m for the same {79} thing you are, but not as much.” From this perspective, the conservative alternative seems to be, “let’s not have too much of a good thing.”

We are to spoil, not to be spoiled by, the pagans. In order to exercise dominion, we must do better than occupy the dunghills left behind as the liberal sacred cows advance. If our standards are to be more than reactive, they must be judged by *standards other than the progress of liberalism*. We need to be on the offensive rather than primarily occupying ourselves with rearguard skirmishes.<sup>52</sup>

Without a philosophical base, conservatism, rather than a matter of principle, readily becomes a matter of *expediency*. Many political figures are “conservative” only out of expediency. Not infrequently, once in office, such “conservatives” do more damage to conservatism than

---

52. Archie Jones, “Spoil the Pagans,” *Occupy!* (August 1980).

avowed liberals could have accomplished. Once in office, they “rise above their principles.”

Without a philosophical base, it is likely that we will mistake prejudice, tradition, inertia, or convention for the timeless star of moral guidance. Such factors, frequently combined with envy, jealousy, resentment, and a desire to control the behavior of others, actually or symbolically, sometimes provide at least part of the impetus for some moral crusades, particularly those directed at other people’s behavior. *Moral voyeurism* is not godliness.

*If we are perpetually to fight only rearguard actions, we can be sure we will always lose.* We will always be defending lost causes because that’s all we’ve got. Instead of attacking, we limit ourselves to occupying the dunghills of liberalism. The liberal cow moves on, with conservatives continually moving from one pile to another. We should be plowing the pasture, planting the field, harvesting the crop, and milking the cow, rather than occupying the piles behind it.

Neither should we attempt to update ourselves by leap-frogging public opinion, which would be principleless cynicism. The need is for a solid philosophical base which will provide a plan of action for dominion, for an on-course conservatism, rather than a well-meaning but ineffective conservatism running about frantically, but without effective direction. We need to be the *invaders*, to storm the gates of the pagans, to be active rather than merely reactive, to conquer and exercise dominion.<sup>53</sup>

A philosophical base is necessary if we are to evaluate in terms of substance rather than slogan, if we are to be anything other than knee-jerk conservatives. Many people, whose actions were based on good intent, but temporary emotional fervor rather than substance, have engaged in campaigns against statements in textbooks or speakers with views they did not {80} like. These campaigns have brought ridicule. Furthermore, had those who worked themselves into a dither prevailed, their victory would have been symbolic rather than substantive.

---

53. Such an effort is set forth programmatically in Rose and Metcalf, *The Coming Victory*.



Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.<sup>54</sup> We must know our enemy, but we must have a solid base from which to evaluate our own position and to assess the enemy. We must learn, first, to direct our efforts at *substance* rather than symbol. It is not of particular importance to return “prayer” to public schools, or to pass bills requiring “creationism.” Why should we be satisfied with so-called “prayer” offered to an unknown god in a humanistically dominated establishment? The overriding issue is to dismantle the public schools, for the whole humanistic system seeks to avoid God. *The important issue is to create a legal structure which will allow those who desire to teach children the value system parents feel appropriate, to do so without state harassment, not whether the humanist schools serve our symbolic interests.*

Establishment of a sound and enduring base requires that we:

2. *Recognize the law-word of God and the principles derived from it as the standard of judgment.* This means more than a vague “back to God” movement without specifics. Everybody supports vague calls to godliness, as long as such calls are without specifics and are devoid of concrete guidelines to daily behavior. Tawney observed in an essay of Puritan origins that “no church has ever experienced any great difficulty preaching righteousness in general.”<sup>55</sup> For many people, godliness appears to mean minding someone else’s business in personal morality, symbol, or behavior, or compelling others to behave as we desire. We would do well to consider the admonition about the beam and the mote.

Our primary concern, rather than the behavior of our neighbors, should be the application of Scripture to our life, our business relationships, our relationships to the poor. Not only should we concern ourselves first with the mote in our own eye as a matter of priority, but in order for us to have the clear vision to be societally effective. The early Christians, it might be remembered, were not known for moral crusades, but for their love for the poor. At the same time, they were moral individually, and also in their relationship with the State. The Roman Christians faced the wrath of Caesar, not because they worshipped

---

54. Jones, “*Spoil the Pagans.*”

55. *Ibid.*

Jesus, but because they refused to worship Jesus *and* Caesar. Jesus only was Lord. There was no official objection to worship of Jesus as a god among gods. It was Jesus as Lord to whom the Christians gave strict allegiance, and which incurred the wrath of the State.

Modern churchianity, mixing civil religion with Christianity, does not appear to know the difference. Without a concept of Jesus as Lord, it is understandable {81} that *civil religion* as a syncretism between Christianity and humanism becomes dominant even among groups which have not become overtly apostate. Christianity is placed in danger of becoming a reaffirmation of the nation-state with religious symbols, and Christianity's mission, except for the designated religious sphere, one of support for whatever direction the nation-state is assuming. It makes it possible for a "born-again" cult to develop among persons who may endorse a brand of civil religion but who do not give evidence of a redeemed thought-form and lifestyle. To be a new creature, to be a redeemed man, *is* to be redeemed in thought-form and lifestyle. We need to be vigorously instructed by the whole counsel of God, and this counsel needs to be applied to every dimension of life.

3. A *third* overriding task which we must perform successfully to build, defend, maintain, and extend *a society of freedom* from the State, wherein it is possible to live godly in Christ Jesus without fear of official recrimination is this: *we must develop particulars and implement them*. We are *fighting* against something. It is our responsibility to develop strategies consistent with biblical reality. Conservatism must mean more than protecting vested privilege, more than taking the position that "I've got my pile and I'm sitting on it." Benign neglect may often be the best strategy, but that probably should be a positive determination. The recent avowedly Christian political activism is a very good sign. More than "ostrich conservatism" is required for dominion.

Within the above framework, the following particular steps are applicable.

### *Practical Steps for Dominion*

1. *Judge all of life in terms of Scriptural principle*. If we want truth, we must go to the source of truth. Scripture equips believers to all good works (2 Tim. 3:16–17), whether the arena is familial, economic, political, or jurisprudence. *We need to be aware of the intellectual and practi-*

cal destruction latent in all humanistic theories of knowledge. “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8).

Certain kinds of knowledge are forbidden by Scripture (secret knowledge, divination, necromancy). Theories of knowledge—the variant frameworks for making order of experience, for interpreting reality—are not forbidden. Archie Jones has observed that *anti-intellectualism* is one of the sins of today’s church. Scripture, as Jones observes, is more than a guide to heaven. Rather, it speaks to every concern of life. Neglect of the whole counsel of God, Jones suggests, drives many intellectual and sensitive people to humanism or modernism.

Jones advises that we should keep the Trojan Horse (pagan thought) {82} outside the city, but we should not turn our back on it. Turning our back on the horse, he advises, is the route to syncretism, intellectual schizophrenia, infiltration of the city, and opening of the gates to barbarian conquest. All of life should be judged by the plumbline of the word of God. We must be able to meet the pagans on their own ground and defeat them. We must not be blind to them: we must not act as if they did not exist. *We must operate from a sound base of sola scriptura as ultimate authority.*

2. *Recognize man’s capacity for self-determination.* This ingredient is desirable particularly in theories of political action. Man is more than environment and more than biology, important as these factors are. The distinguishing characteristic of man is his capacity for *moral choice*.<sup>56</sup>

Much contemporary education, and most sociopolitical programs, are based on the premises that: 1) man is primarily response to environment; 2) being malleable, and innately good, perfection can be attained through the correct sociopolitical programs; and 3) hindrances (like traditional personal morality) must be overcome through the educational process to achieve this liberation. In reality, the urban riots with the accompanying looting are due to individual sin, not to an absence of government donut-delivery programs. Scripture does rec-

---

56. For artful discussion of this issue, see Albert H. Hobbs, *Man is Moral Choice* (Arlington House, 1979).

ognize the importance of environment. Thus, wives are instructed to reverence their husbands, husbands to love their wives, fathers not to provoke their children to wrath, etc. However, no amount of donut-delivery programs will prevent the consequences which flow from man's condition in sin. Man must be *responsible* for his exercise of moral choice. The Christian position must be consistent with Scripture, which says, "chose you this day whom you will serve."

3. *Recognize and support those of like mind and interest.* Whitaker Chambers once observed that conservatives do not tend to their wounded. "Fighting fundamentalists" often appear to be more interested in fighting than in the fundamentals. Unfortunately, conservatism-fundamentalism seems to attract persons whose propensity for fighting is directed at everyone who does not agree with them in all particulars. It is wise to cooperate with others of similar objective, regardless of total doctrinal agreement.<sup>57</sup>

We do need the support of others who advocate a society of freedom. It is {83} my personal opinion that, in general, the rise of the libertarian perspective, for example, is to be welcomed.<sup>58</sup> Our overall objective should be a society wherein we can live lives in all godliness and honesty, not in using the structure of civil government to enforce our shibboleths against nonbelievers. Libertarians, for example, are advocates of a structure where believers can implement such a lifestyle. They are opponents of government theft and coercion, even though they may be opposed to the viewpoints of many conservatives with respect to criminalization of sin or automatic adulation of militarism. Libertarians are

---

57. Unfortunately, there is all too frequent tendency for Bible-thumping ignoramuses to be hyper-belligerent, frequently on substantively vacuous symbolic issues, to be raucous in spirit, to provoke well-justified ridicule which, by association, makes biblical influence evilly spoken of. There is an associated tendency of Bible-thumping ignoramuses to break into jail if the publicity payoff is sufficiently tempting. Those who would occupy do sometimes have a real problem with misguided friends, wherein the "who needs enemies...?" adage is too frequently applicable. We are not carnally to violate the scriptural injunction that our good should not be such as needlessly and accurately to cause it to be evilly spoken of.

58. A good statement of the general perspective which the libertarian movement may be expected to support may be found in Ed Clark, *A New Beginning* (Caroline House, 1980).

in accord with us to the extent we wish to be free from government domination. We should not necessarily write off their possible assistance.<sup>59</sup> Nor is there any necessity for Christians to adopt cantankerousness as a principle.

4. *React in terms of substance rather than buzz-words or slogans.* There is a tendency to reduce what is happening around us to a few emotionally charged buzz-words. Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, and all of us tend to define issues in a favorable or unfavorable light on the basis of *emotionally charged descriptors* which save us from independent assessment. “McCarthyism” is an example of such a buzz-word among liberals. Conservatives also have their “coterie” of buzz-words.

Many politicians are skilled in surrounding an issue so that everyone can find some buzz-word with which they can identify. Davidson has observed that “a Mussolini oration on forceful action to cut unemployment could well be delivered to a Democratic conclave in Massachusetts, and a Stalin attack upon the ‘sentimentalism’ of demands for material equality could warm the hearts of the richest monopolists on Wall Street” by changing a few names and dates.<sup>60</sup> Every political and economic term which matters is invested with emotional importance and is subject to manipulation.

Conservatives appear to react favorably and without critical assessment to everything which smacks of homage to militarism. Welfare boondoggles to persons who make military demands on the public is one of the sacrosanct wastelands of welfare in America today. Although conservatives (Cong. Ron Paul and a few others excepted) appear automatically to endorse a draft, we might well ask why Americans should be forced, against their choice, to be pawns on an international chess-board played by the CFR and the Trilateralists. Why should Americans be compelled to be chips in poker games played by the Bilderbergers?

5. *Recognize the inappropriateness of transcendental capital claims and {84} react accordingly.* “Transcendental capital” refers to *profit*

---

59. Conscientious expression of a Christian perspective within the context of an expressly libertarian identification may be found in the journal *Galatians Seven* (Box 218, Far Hills, NJ).

60. James Dale Davidson, *The Squeeze* (Summit Books, 1980).

*through control of the rules.* Davidson has observed that “the professions have so augmented their incomes through legislation, regulation, and litigation that the law itself has become the public enemy.” The medical and legal professions are examples of vocations which have managed to get the rules written in their own interest and to choke off potential competition.<sup>61</sup> While we hear a lot of wailing about the dangers of socialized medicine (which, I admit, will readily allow practitioners to fasten regal claims onto the public trough), we hear very little about the utilization of the political rules by private medicine (e.g., licensing) to shield itself against alternative modes of application of healing arts, ranging from efforts to ban practice by nonphysicians or by naturopathic, homeopathic, or chiropractic physicians to efforts to ban laetrile.<sup>62</sup>

6. *Be a political skeptic.* Beware of supporting government growth for whatever reason. Beware of government preemption of potential opposition though utilizing “free-enterprise” entities to effectuate government housing and rent-support programs, or food stamp programs. Disbelieve all claims leading to higher taxes and more civil government. *Support all causes which reduce taxes, take power away from politicians, and reduce the power of statist capital.*

7. *Abolish government pensions.* Davidson has observed that since 1965 the typical retiree from a government job has enjoyed pension increases of some 156 percent, while the cost-of-living has escalated by approximately 80 percent. He further observes that if the retirement income of bureaucrats is tied to *production* rather than to the power of the State to levy taxes and print money, their interests will more closely match those of the community as a whole.

---

61. Most public discussions of the issue of medical care cost and access imply that system failures are due to inherent weaknesses in the free market for medical care. However, he has persuasively argued that much of the blame must be placed on organized medicine which has sought and obtained special privileges from government. See John C. Goodman, *The Regulation of Medical Care: Is the Price Too High* (San Francisco: CATO Institute, Cato Public Policy Research Monograph no. 3, 1980), and *National Health Care in Great Britain: Lessons for the U.S.A.* (Dallas: The Fisher Institute, 1980).

62. See Davidson, *The Squeeze*, 29.

8. *Reduce taxes.* Reduced taxes will greatly limit the ability of the civil government to magnify itself. We should support political moves to reduce taxes across the board. Hidden taxes should be made public. Efforts should be made to reduce the rate of taxation, and the amount of taxes extracted, *not* just reduce the rate of *increase* of government spending.<sup>63</sup> Davidson advocates outright tax resistance as our forefathers resisted tyranny.<sup>64</sup>

Taxes are extracted by fear. Davidson argues that reduction of credibility {85} in collection of taxes fosters reductions rather than increases in taxes. Davidson advocates a guerilla warfare of tax avoidance. He states that this radical advice is derived from a close study of those radical gentlemen of the eighteenth century whose efforts did so much to establish a favorable climate in America for the evolution of a free society. Jefferson explicitly called attention to the advantages where government is reminded that the people preserve the spirit of resistance.

The foregoing suggests some applicable strategies for exercising dominion, for taking charge of the direction of our national social, economic, and cultural affairs, and some of the requisites for success. Professor Hans Sennholz, commenting on the effects of inflation, has observed that we are ever living for the future, but that we should make the best use of the present, and, with courage and dedication, fulfill our parts. Longfellow's words of a century ago, he observes, continue to be good advice.

Look not mournfully into the past  
It comes not back again.  
Wisely improve the present  
It is thine.  
Go forth to meet the shadowy future  
Without fear, and with a manly heart .<sup>65</sup>

As we go, we should realize that God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. And, irrespective

---

63. See the chapter "The Imperatives of Growth," in George Gilder, *Wealth and Poverty* (Basic Books, 1980), 217–32.

64. *The Squeeze*, 262–63.

65. Hans Sennholz, *Age of Inflation* (Western Islands, 1979), 178.

of what our millennial viewpoint may be (and as of indeterminate calculation as many feel Scripture sets forth times and dates), the command of Christ with regard to the responsibility of contemporary believers is set forth unequivocally in Luke 19:13 in the command to “Occupy till I come.” Let us occupy as He has commanded.



# THE IMPERATIVE OF CHRISTIAN ACTION: GETTING INVOLVED AS A BIBLICAL DUTY

---

*Archie P. Jones*

It should be manifest to Bible-believing Christians that we are involved in a war. It is *a spiritual war* between the forces of Satan and the forces of Christ, a war fought *within* man as well as *between* men. It is *a multi-faceted war, involving every dimension of life and thought, every sphere of human activity*. It is also an old and enduring war, extending from the Fall to the Last Judgment, and from the rebellion of Satan and his fallen angels to the smashing of the gates of Hell. As such, it is also *a protracted conflict*, extending from before our lives into the perhaps distant future. Hence it requires of us not only a commitment to pressing onward toward our heavenly home, but also *a commitment to weakening the armies of Satan and strengthening the army of Christ* in the present and for the future, in order that we may contribute all that we can to the glory of our Lord, by hearing, teaching, and doing His word.

Though the warfare is spiritual, however, it inevitably involves the external or physical dimension of man's life, and of men's institutions and actions. *Man is a spiritual being, but one created to live in the world, and to have dominion over God's creation, under His law* (Gen. 1:26). God, in His grace, also gave man His ordained institutions of the family, the church, and the state to serve different aspects of man's earthly needs, in terms of God's eternal plan and purposes for individuals and for history. *God's word, moreover, speaks infallibly to all areas of human thought and action*, and provides man with universally valid standards of thought and conduct for human action. *God's word provides spiritual standards for all areas of man's intellectual and practical activity*, and in His laws these spiritual standards extend beyond general principles to specifics, so that man can know objectively what God would have him do in certain situations.

In speaking infallibly to all areas of life and thought, in providing man with both general or universal principles and specifics (specific applications of His universal principles), God gives man *a set of spiritual standards* by which man should live his life—in his *physical body*, in the *physical world*. God thus gives man a set of spiritual standards that apply to all areas of man's activity, the transgression of which is nothing less than sinful. He {87} makes no distinction between the physical and the spiritual: *His word and law is the way to live spiritually in the world*. Man is to deal with all things in a spiritual manner, to do all things to the glory of God. To obey God's revealed word and law is to be spiritual; to disobey God's word and law is to sin; systematically to disobey God's word and law is to walk in the way of the world, the flesh, and the Devil, to be in spiritual rebellion against true spirituality.

*There are, fundamentally, only two ways for man to follow:* the way of God, as revealed to man in His enscriptured word, or the way of sinful rebellion, as formulated by the ethically rebellious attempts of men to be their own gods, knowing or determining good and evil on their own (Gen. 3:5). The first way is the way of godly obedience to the word of God; the second way is the way of ungodly disobedience to God. The first way is the way of godly humility and dependence; the second way is the way of attempted self-sufficiency or autonomy. The first way is the way of blessing and life; the second way is the way of God's cursing and death. The way of God is the narrow way, which leads to life; the way of man is the broad way, which leads to destruction.

These two ways apply to all of life, to all areas of thought and action. *There is no neutrality* between them, for one is based on God's word and law and the other is based on a denial of God's word and law; one is based on obedient service to God, and the other is based on the obedient service to false gods, which is disobedient rebellion against the true and living God. There is no neutrality between them, because God Himself, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, has told us that no man can serve two masters (Matt. 6:24), and because God's word repeatedly tells us that we must make every thought captive to Christ (2 Cor. 10:5; 1 Pet. 3:15).

The fact that there are only two fundamental ways, only two fundamental choices for individuals and societies, is often obscured by the great diversity of rebellious thought. The way of rebellion against

God and His word is a broad way, but it is an identifiable way nevertheless. It is a broad way because the underlying principle of original sin is the desire of each human being to be his or her own god, to overthrow the word and law of God and substitute instead his or her own word as law. From the sinful desire of each person to be his own god naturally follows a vast multiplicity of human words and pseudo-laws, as each attempts unsuccessfully to *legislate* for a universe he neither created nor sustains, nor has any ultimate control over. A multiplicity of “autonomous” pseudo-words and laws requires a broad way to encompass it. But the broad way which encompasses all these false words and laws is *a single way* precisely because its diverse words and “laws” are all united by their fundamental motivating principle, theoretical and practical problems, and end. Their motivating principle is the sinful desire of man to replace God’s word and law with man’s word and law: to be his own god. {88}

Their theoretical problems arise from the failure of any of these attempted autonomous systems to be able to account for man’s knowledge, moral or legal principles, explanations of the universe and world, and explanations of man’s nature and actions; from these result a host of practical problems. And from even this brief characterization, it is easy to see why the end of such false systems of thought and life is failure and death, in a universe created, ruled, and judged by a jealous God (Acts 17; Ex. 20:4–6; Deut. 8; 28; Judges).

### THE ATTACK ON TRUE SPIRITUALITY

America’s predominantly Christian civilization and culture has long shielded American Christians from the self-destructive consequences of spiritual apostasy and rebellion against God’s law and word. A potent combination of the “*progress*” of *modern humanistic thought* and the *retrogressions* of *Christian obedience* to God’s repeated commands to His believers to have dominion over the earth, and over His foes (Gen. 1:26–28; 9:1–4; Luke 19:13; Matt. 28:18–20), has, however, worked to make humanism, not Christianity, dominant in recent American culture. The theological and intellectual leadership of many American denominations has decayed (as the Bible indicates the visible church often does) from the top down. As a consequence, whole nominally Christian denominations and large portions of other Christian

denominations have abandoned God's way for *baptized versions of modern pagan thought*: the "Social Gospel," theological liberalism, neo-"orthodoxy" and "liberation theology"—all of which advocate, in effect, detente with the mainstream of modern humanistic thought and practice.<sup>66</sup> As a result, this century has seen massive and systematic collaboration, as well as effective cooperation, between "Christians" and avowed secularists—"liberals," socialists, Marxists, and even Communists and terrorists—an ideological and strategic as well as tactical collaboration that continues and promises to increase.<sup>67</sup> The result has been that we have seen *the steady march of socialism* and its growing social, economic, political, educational and religious controls—and snafus—at home, and our government's and many ostensibly Christian organizations' continuing effective support of socialism, Marxism, Communism, and terrorism {89} abroad—with all the diminution of liberty and geometrically increased human suffering that these humanistic governmental systems entail.<sup>68</sup>

Man was both *created for* dominion over the earth and *commanded to* exercise such dominion (Gen. 1:26–28; 9:1–4). The Fall, far from destroying man's created dominion motivation, and far from nullifying God's command to man, resulted in a perversion of man's dominion urge and a perverse rebellion of man against God's command to have dominion under His law. The response of man after the Fall has been to seek dominion apart from the saving, sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit in his individual and cultural life. Men have sought dominion in perverse, ultimately destructive ways, in ways forbidden and con-

---

66. See C. Gregg Singer, *A Theological Interpretation of American History* (Presbyterian & Reformed, 1964), and *The Unholy Alliance* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1975). See also Edgar C. Bundy, *Apostles of Deceit* (Wheaton, IL: Church League of America, 1966), and *St. Mark's Vestry Committee Report on the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America* (Shreveport, LA: St. Mark's Episcopal Church, 1961), and Edgar C. Bundy, *How the Communists Use Religion* (Wheaton, IL: Church League of America, 1962).

67. See Singer's works, cited above, and Allen C. Brownfeld, "The National Council of Churches: Advocate for the World's Militant Left," *Human Events*, February 7, 1981.

68. See Dr. Robert S. Rapp, "Communism in South Korea" (1979) and "The WCC—A 1981 Update" (Korea Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 1981); available from the author: 15 Country Side Lane, Leola, PA 17540.

demned by God. Whether he seeks dominion on the collective level, via *governmental* centralization, planning, and coercion, or on the *individual* level, by attempting to shrink the world to dimensions he feels that he can control, apostate and would-be-autonomous man, ancient and modern,<sup>69</sup> continues to seek dominion. This dominion, however, is a dominion opposed to God's word and law, and is thus *an attempted dominion over God* and His word and law; it is thus doomed to failure and God's providential judgment. Thus, the theoretical and practical failures that we see all around us are no surprise after a century of *collaboration* of professing Christians with the march of the humanists' army and its strategy and tactics.

But *humanism*, whether baptized or not, whether avowed or merely effective, remains a *religious faith*. As such, it is, in a very real way, the substance of things hoped for and the proof of things unseen. Thus, its manifold theoretical and practical failures, far from leading to its abandonment, have resulted in a *continuance*, and even an increase, of its anti-Christian policies.

Consequently, American Christians are threatened today with both a multiplicity of humanistically created crises—in economics, foreign policy, criminology, penology, and domestic affairs—and a multifaceted humanistic attack on the institutions, beliefs, and outworking of Christianity. The military, economic, and political aspects of this crisis are manifest even to the humanists. What is less well known is the nature of the humanists' attack on the Christian family, school, and church, via humanistically perverted civil governments. This *threefold attack* on Christian faith and practice is a product of the humanists' agenda for America, of course. But even more seriously, it is a product of the support, the inconsistency, or the {90} indifference of professing Christians. Consider and ponder, then, the following summary of the threefold attack of the humanists and their effective supporters on Christianity:

---

69. See Gerhardt Niemeyer, "The 'Autonomous' Man," *Intercollegiate Review* 9, no. 3 (Summer 1974): 131–38. Niemeyer's summary of "autonomous" thought is useful, especially if one remembers that pretended autonomy *is* ancient.

### A. *The Attack on the Family*

The assault on the biblical family is probably the best known and most lamented concern of most American Christians today, though most see only a part of the battle.

As could be shown in regard to school and church, the assault on the family has proceeded from a religious and philosophically based *redefinition of terms*, in which humanistic religious presuppositions have been used to redefine fundamental concepts, and these redefined concepts have in turn been used to change people's views of God, men, and things. Humanism is thoroughly Machiavellian, and Machiavelli, with the insight which is characteristic of all great and self-consciously radical thinkers, tells us that "the destruction of religion and language destroys the memory of all (old or traditional) things." Let us briefly consider the definitional impact of the major "disciplines"—as taught by humanists in "Christian" colleges and elsewhere—on the biblical family.

Anthropology and sociology are founded on evolutionary premises, and consequently they present the family as one of ultimately *accidental occurrence* and historically changing forms, not (Darwin forbid!) as an institution ordained in a particular form and with particular moral commandments supporting it by the unchanging Creator and Sustainer of the universe. Moreover, they present cultural and moral norms as diverse and relative to particular cultures and times, not as God-ordained absolutes.

Psychology is similarly evolutionary and morally relativistic in outlook.

Furthermore, it is not only morally relativistic but also seeks to understand the higher in man in terms of the lower in man, explaining all of man's activities in terms of animalistic "drives" or the passions, and even seeing man's freedom as the *liberation of the passions*. Thus, where it does see man as something capable of transcending sub-personal mechanistic responses (e. g., as capable of escaping from "Skinner boxes"), it sees "freedom" as having no higher purpose than the gratification of the desires, and man as having no higher purpose than to do what he wills—though in many political versions this may have to be achieved via totalitarian methods.

Political philosophy, being founded on the same godless presuppositions, teaches students, in its dominantly modern forms of “political science,” liberalism and Marxism or some other form of socialism, that man is an evolutionary product of his environment; that there are no fixed moral principles; that politics is merely a struggle among wills-to-power, in which men use force and deceit to effect their wills; that “freedom,” the ultimate purpose {91} of man’s life, is the ability to do whatever one wills (a point agreed upon by most individualistic humanists—libertarians and anarchists); and that man’s proper (notice I didn’t say “right”) ordering of the state (in terms of some form of socialistic collectivism, for most teachers; in terms of limited government and individualism, for the conservative or libertarian minority), not God’s providential blessing of man’s faithfulness and obedience, is the key to the solution of man’s social, economic, and political problems.

The “social sciences” as a whole, of course, reinforce and systematically preach these notions. In addition, they preach the myth of intellectual and moral *neutrality*, and foster the belief in intellectual and moral *relativism* by teaching evolutionism, historicism (the belief that man’s thought is merely and inescapably a product of the times in which a man thinks, and hence that there can be no universal moral principles), and pragmatism (the notion that since all things are changing, all “moral principles” must change, and so all laws and constitutions and societies must continually and fundamentally change). Despite their emphasis on change, their commitment to egalitarianism, socialism, and immorality remains the same.

These relativistic and radical notions, naturally, are but simplified and structured for public consumption in the teaching of education, English, and communications. Thus, even apart from the powerful economic self-interest generated by the educational bureaucracy in the government schools and the university and college departments of education, the radical leftism of the teachers’ unions is not surprising.

The dominance of humanistic assumptions among the faculty in the “hard sciences,” despite the recent resurgence of creationism, is so notorious as to require a mere mention. Here, too, presupposed evolutionism, materialism, “value-free” empiricism, and human autonomy

continue to take their toll on the theological and moral underpinnings of the family.

But what of religion? We have saved it for last because it is usually the last thing most students—having been subjected to twelve years of systematic secularism in the government schools and by the media—want to study, and because the local Department of Religion is, on most campuses, one of the last places one would look for orthodoxy, anyway. Even when religion professors do have some semblance of orthodox Christian commitment, they are frequently purveyors of some form of baptized old secular doctrine, anyway.

With such humanistic notions being systematically and pervasively pumped into students' heads by teachers of the arts and sciences over the course of a few generations, it is no wonder that humanistic redefinitions of theological, anthropological, political, psychological, moral, and legal concepts have produced a number of "legal" assaults on the biblical family. {92}

The most publicized attempt thus far has been the effort of Carter administration radicals *to redefine the biblical family as only one among many forms of "families"*—all of which, of course, are supposedly in need of government "aid" provided by "professional" bureaucrats.

The most serious assault, however, has been the pseudo-legal Supreme Court declaration in 1973's *Roe v. Wade* decision that *abortion* is "legal" and "constitutional," since the unborn child is not a person. That decision and its subsequent judicial, administrative, and legislative antinomian fiats have resulted in the murder of well over 8,000,000 unborn babies since 1973, and in the establishment of the dangerous principle that it may be decided by the political process that individuals who are considered by others to be undesirable, inadequate, or burdensome (and who, for one reason or another, come out on the short end of the vote) may legitimately be murdered. *This strikes at the very heart of the family, by making the existence of the child depend on the whims of the parents; by cheapening the value of human life from a blessing given by God, to an accidental and legitimately eradicable product of man's works and chance; and by making others' subjective feelings about one's worth ("viability," "quality of life") the criteria for determining one's existence.* Such blatant ungodliness as the "justifica-



tion” of abortion on grounds of “freedom of choice” violates every principle of God’s law, and of Christian ethics.<sup>70</sup>

The humanists and their allies have not neglected the preliminaries to abortion, however. Teaching the “naturalness” and “goodness” of sexual promiscuity and license, based on freedom as the gratification of one’s desires, they have fostered the very activity that leads to abortions. Teaching economic and social status and power as both the *means to freedom* and the desiderata as one’s *goals in life*, they have provided the motivation and justification for many abortions. Teaching sexual activity divorced from morality to government school students, humanists have stimulated the very playboy and playgirl mentality that is the source of the abortion problem—not to mention the dramatic rise in venereal disease. To deal with these consequences of their pagan ideas, the humanists and their allies have sought government-financing of contraceptive devices—not, Hugh Hefner forbid!, moral persuasion or the enforcement of God’s law—to be distributed to children.

When such distribution of contraceptives to minors without parental consent or information has been challenged by parents, *ungodly courts have been willing and able to provide decisions against parental authority* in these matters. Thus, the Supreme Court has declared—on the basis of a “right” {93} to privacy nowhere mentioned in the Constitution and only “discovered”/ invented by the Court in 1964—that parents have no authority to interfere with or prohibit either the distribution of contraceptives to their children or their children’s complicity in the murder of their unborn children. In effect, the Court has declared that “the rights of parents are subordinate to the rights of privacy of their children to have abortions and sex,” and that *the civil government, through its various agencies, and not the family, is now the basic institution for determining values for children*.<sup>71</sup> Such notions are

---

70. See John M. Frame’s excessively moderate essay, “Abortion from a Biblical Perspective,” *Thou Shalt Not Kill; The Christian Case Against Abortion* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1978), 43–75.

71. For case citations and further data and analysis, see prominent Christian defender John W. Whitehead’s important survey, “The Chickens’ Homecoming,” *Trinity Review*, no. 15 (September/October 1980), an essay which Mr. Whitehead is updating in light of recent legal developments.

but taken an additional step in recent attempts to create new “children’s rights” guaranteed by law and government bureaucracy.

Schools and education are another area of the assault on the family on which the humanists, with the cooperation of their allies, have concentrated. Here, too, parental choice has been replaced by humanistic governmental and “professional” fiat. The educational content of government schools’ curriculum and texts has been largely denuded of its early religious, philosophical, and moral content—and of course the aim of the founders of the “public school” movement was to remove the Christian content of existing education. Humanistic judges have been all too willing to further the secularists’ aims. A recent Supreme Court decision, *Stone v. Graham*, ruled that a state cannot require even the posting of privately purchased copies of the Ten Commandments in government school rooms, since the Court could discover no valid secular purpose in the promotion of moral values.<sup>72</sup> A starker admission of the sinful rebelliousness of humanistic autonomy, a clearer manifestation of the intellectual and moral bankruptcy of the Supreme Court, could scarcely be imagined.

As if this were not enough, the federal courts have systematically denied the right of parents to determine where their children will attend school within the state and local government school systems (via busing mandates), and *local, state, and federal agencies and courts have increasingly sought to deprive parents of their biblical duty and right* (Deut. 6; 18:9; Jer. 10:2; Prov. 22:6) *to educate their children in private schools of their choice or in their homes.*

Moreover, the biblical family has also been under increasing attack under the guise of child care and child abuse, as well as education. Parents who spank their children in public, parents who are deemed by a combination of a busybody neighbor and a government “social worker” to have neglected their children—even via something so trivial as leaving older children in {94} charge of younger ones while leaving home for twenty minutes<sup>73</sup>—are open to government attempts to take their children away from them. And the Supreme Court has just ruled that the right of an accused person to a lawyer to prevent his or her loss

72. Dave Haigler, *Legal Update* 1, no. 1:1.

73. This is no fanciful example: some of our friends in Texas were so threatened.

of physical labor is more important than the (“constitutionally” unprotected) right to legal counsel to protect parents from the loss of their children by state fiat.<sup>74</sup> Thus, while the State, in its omnipotent wisdom, seeks to foster the sexual immorality that leads to childbirth, and then to prevent parental interference in the murder of conceived children, thereby fostering the very attitudes that lead, via a disrespect for God’s blessing of children, to child abuse; it also seeks, on the other end, to take children who are in no way really abused from their parents. Having declared *unborn human life* unimportant, it then declares *born children’s feelings* to be all-important. Having declared parental conception and its duties unimportant, it then declares parental child-rearing and its biblical duties unimportant. Having replaced God’s law’s parental rights and duties with arbitrary governmental dictate, the State then demands control over the life that only God can create. Having declared God’s word’s authority over life null and void, the State then declares its authority over life to be absolute and total in scope. Consequently, it demands authority over the right to birth, the right to parental authority over the young, and the right to disposition of the lives of adolescent children, as in proposals for a compulsory draft<sup>75</sup> and compulsory national service for young people. Such claims are a direct and serious attack on the authority of God and His delegated authority to parents and the family.

The humanistic attack on the family is by no means limited to these more overt assaults. “Legally,” the Supreme Court’s continuing inability to distinguish obscenity and pornography from morally permissible speech, art, and entertainment amount to both *a continuation of the divorce of Christian morals from American government and public life and an assault on biblical morality in the populace*. The very week that the Court held that being deprived of one’s child was less important than being deprived of one’s physical liberty, the Court also ruled that a local ban on a nude dancing show amounts to an infringement on the First Amendment’s protection of free speech. Such decisions, frequently accompanied by the testimony of “expert” humanistic wit-

---

74. Ellie McGrath, “Incongruity at the High Court,” *Time*, June 15, 1981, 57.

75. See John W. Robbins, “The Bible and the Draft,” *Trinity Review* 13 (May/June 1980).

nesses to the intellectual and moral relativism upon which they are based, not only ignore “fundamental values that the Constitution ought to protect” but trivialize and demean the First Amendment, as Chief Justice Burger noted in his dissent.<sup>76</sup> *They weaken the family by {95} weakening the moral basis of the law and the moral fiber of the people*, as well as by trivializing sex and reducing woman, who after all is created in the image of God, to an object for man’s pleasure and self-gratification.

The humanists and their followers have also continued to attack the family by means of *economic weapons*. Much of the attack is self-conscious. Humanistic and baptized *egalitarianism* has sought, with no small success, to redistribute wealth from “rich” families (which inevitably includes middle income and many working lower income families) to “poor” families and to immoral individuals who have broken the marriage bond. Graduated income and inheritance taxes have been key weapons here; both just “happen” to be unbiblical. In addition, the attack, in theory and practice (via governmental regulations which give bureaucrats the essential attribute of ownership, control, over others’ property), on “property rights,” which is nothing other than an attempted legitimization and institutionalization of theft, has been an intended weapon of income redistribution used against the family’s ability to accumulate and preserve wealth for its members. Furthermore, egalitarian sociological tinkering and engineering, along racial, sexual, and other lines, has imposed economic as well as sociological and educational burdens on the family.<sup>77</sup>

The *perhaps* unintended consequences of other salvific policies of the messianic “welfare state” have also had deleterious effects on the family. The high and growing rates of *taxation*, derived from unbiblical kinds of taxation demanded by apostate majorities and minorities, have affected the economic well-being of families in a way that need only be mentioned to be understood. By *welfarism*, the government replaces the family (as well as the church, voluntary associations, and individuals) as the locus of welfare provision, and in an unbiblical way

76. McGrath, 57–58.

77. We shall resist the temptation to comment extensively on the E.R.A., and merely note the easy divorce laws passed in the wake of “liberalism.”

that is aimed at buying votes and creating permanent dependence on the State on the part of the recipients and of the bureaucrats who administer such programs. With many families now in their fourth generation as welfare recipients, and a massive and growing bureaucracy (especially including those not officially listed by the bureaucrats as being in the bureaucracy, though they are paid by the federal government), plus over forty years of successful elections to its discredit, it is easy to see both how successful such a politics has been and how destructive it has been to the families of welfare recipients as well as of taxpayers. What is worse, socialist “welfare state” propaganda and the delayed impact of its destructive policies have combined to encourage many to look to government to solve all “problems,” and certainly to “save” them from their specific ills. Despite the overwhelming repudiation of Carter and the liberal Democrats in the 1980 election, the overwhelming majority of Americans {96} reject merely *certain specific policies* which have manifestly failed, not the ungodly premises of the socialist “welfare state.”

The burden of government economic regulations is now finally beginning to be admitted even by TV newsmen. The burden of federal regulation in 1980 alone is generally admitted to have been at least \$100,000,000,000. That’s *billions*, not mere millions! Assume that the figure has been increasing since, say, 1932 (to take a conventional political landmark)—since government regulations have been geometrically increasing since then—and add up the fifty-year total, and you have a better idea of the magnitude of the loss to the economy and to the families that compose our nation. *The interventionist, regulatory State* inhibits economic efficiency, productivity, and upward economic mobility, penalizing most (especially when combined with welfarism) of those at the socioeconomic bottom of society. That, obviously, is no benefit to the family.

*Inflation and government borrowing on the capital markets* may be the most destructive long-run economic weapon in the hands of the humanists. Inflation is a direct *consequence of the redistributive theft and envy at the foundation of the socialist “welfare state.”* It is precisely the increase of the supply of “money” and credit by a regime that cannot raise adequate tax revenues in real money (i.e., something of historic value, such as gold or silver, or something of comparatively

greater value, such as gold, as compared to silver) to cover the promises its politicians have made to pay voters.<sup>78</sup> Because government cannot tax us enough to pay for all the welfare schemes cooked (kooked!) up by its ruling politicians, its only means of paying its political debts is to *inflate* the money supply or *borrow* money on the capital markets. Inflation is not only anti-biblical and immoral, but also destructive to the economy, the settled forms of civil government, and the entire social order. By creating a deteriorating economy, eroding savings, ruining insurance and retirement plans, and making economic calculation far more difficult, inflation fosters a *gambling mentality* and increasing *criminality*, as well as devastating the material well-being of those who are poor, middle class, or on fixed incomes.<sup>79</sup> By threatening the economy with collapse, and free government with revolution, as well as by its other disastrous results, inflation threatens the well-being of every family.

Like inflation, government borrowing on the capital markets is a product of the insatiable *lust* of “welfare state” socialist politicians and their {97} clientele for others’ money. Borrowing money on the capital markets defers the unpleasant task of raising taxes, as well as the necessity of immediately inflating the currency—though inflation and capital borrowing are usually as close as Siamese twins. But what is borrowed today must be repaid—with interest—tomorrow, so tomorrow must in turn bring increased taxation, inflation, or borrowing: all of which are economically destructive in the long run, and thus damaging to the family. Furthermore, *government borrowing on the capital markets removes financial resources from the productive sector of the economy*—resources which would have gone into research and development, expanded plant capacity, and new technology. Thus, government capital borrowing harms the family by retarding capital formation, increased productive capacity, future material well-being,

---

78. This definition may be seen by some as politically too narrow, since I have deliberately keyed it to popular governments—thereby excluding theft by other types of rulers. The choice, however, was made for the sake of relevance to American government, and, more broadly, to Western Civilization.

79. The best one-volume critique of inflation is the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction: Symposium on Inflation*, vol. 7, no. 1 (Summer 1980), which will also provide the reader with further bibliography.

and increased job opportunities, as well as by contributing to inflation's impact.

Humanistic "welfare state" policies have both weakened the biblical family and provided *excuses for further humanistic attacks on the family*. Astronomical government "welfare" spending, plus high and growing taxation and inflation, have forced many wives and mothers into the work force and away from child-rearing duties, as have easy divorce laws. Government welfarism has helped to *weaken family ties* by first creating the propagandized illusion that the government will provide social "security" for old folks, thereby encouraging many to believe that their parents would be adequately provided for by the State, and then creating a situation in which, due to the demographic and financial unsoundness of the "Social Security" plan (and to politicians' increasing giveaways), Social "Security" recipients become an increasingly manifest burden on the working-age population—a very visible, and therefore vulnerable, burden.

As humanistic policies have increasingly sundered the marriage bond and driven more women into the work force, humanistic feminists have sought to destroy the biblical family by means of *demographic and definitional deceit*. As Dr. Onalee McGraw explains:

The essence of this approach is to define "nuclear family" very narrowly, and then to place all of its variations, including families where women work or children are grown ("empty nest" families) into the "diverse family form" category.

... The effect is to isolate the nuclear family while at the same time placing all variations of it and all blood, marriage and adoptive forms on a "diverse" list. This list of diverse family forms also happens to include cohabiting and "caring" relationships of opposite and same sex persons for whom cultural and legal recognition is desired.<sup>80</sup>

Furthermore:

The demographic technique for dealing with the nuclear family is frequently {98} used along with a kind of pseudo-historical approach in which the family becomes a sociological construct whose "structure and functions" are mere by-products of ever-changing historical eras....

---

80. *The Family, Feminism, and the Therapeutic State* (Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation, 1980), 9–10.

The next step in the historical approach is to discuss the family form dominant since the late nineteenth century, the bourgeois family of father-breadwinner and mother-homemaker with children. This family form, upon which the American nuclear family is based, is now reported to be on the verge of extinction, largely because of the movement of women into the work force.<sup>81</sup>

The payoff, of course, is that:

The government is supposed to rectify the nuclear family's historical demise by adopting national family policies and support systems that will meet the needs of the "changing" American family.<sup>82</sup>

As was suggested earlier, humanistic radicals in the Supreme Court have been more than willing to aid the biblical family's historical demise. By utilizing the humanistic concept of "human rights,"<sup>83</sup> and following a positivistic and pragmatic philosophy of law and constitutional construction, they have formulated a series of Supreme Court decisions which have *redefined* "human rights" and the family in such a way that:

- (1) there can be no difference in the law between those who are unmarried and those who are married, thereby negating marriage as the foundation of the family;
- (2) the rights of parents exist at the delegation of the State, rights that the State can take away or confer at will; and
- (3) the denial of the God-given right and responsibility of parents for the physical and moral welfare of their own children.<sup>84</sup>

Together with its philosophically and legally arbitrary abolition of the most fundamental God-given right of unborn babies to life, the pattern of the Supreme Court's decisions on the family make it clear that:

the position of the *traditional family* can, under the Constitution, by no means be taken for granted and that unless a rather dramatic turn-around in the federal judiciary occurs, the future legal status of heterosexual marriage and parental rights is problematic indeed.<sup>85</sup>

---

81. *Ibid.*, 10–11.

82. *Ibid.*, 11.

83. See T. Robert Ingram, *What's Wrong with Human Rights* (Houston, TX: St. Thomas Press, 1978).

84. McGraw, 65–66.

85. McGraw, 67–68. Remember: by "traditional family," she means *biblical family*.



The attack on the biblical family is multifaceted and long-standing, as well as politically powerful and deceptive. It will only be repulsed and the battle won if Christians gird for battle and enter the fray.

### *B. The Attack on Christian Education*

The humanistic attack on the family extends beyond the family to the attack {99} on Christianity in education, for *humanism is a religion, and a militantly anti-Christian and intolerant religion at that*, and as such aims to extinguish God's truth in every sphere of thought and life. Since God has given the family both *authority* over education and the *duty* to educate children in terms of the fear of God and the knowledge of His word and law, as well as in terms of obedience to God's will and law, humanists seek both to defend humanism and to expunge Christianity by *seizing control of the minds of the young* at the crucial point of education, by usurping parents' God-given authority and right to educate their own children.

The whole concept and motivation of "free public education" since Horace Mann and James G. Carter has been fundamentally humanistic and radically anti-Christian. The movement for "free" government-controlled education in Massachusetts and New England was led by Mann and other Unitarians who sought to eliminate the previously dominant Christian influence on society and to eliminate all social problems via education.<sup>86</sup> The movement to impose state-controlled education on the states of the South after the "Civil War" was motivated by a similar philosophy, and was seen by perceptive Christian theologians as a continuation of the same "practical atheism" which had motivated abolitionism.<sup>87</sup> In fact, the philosophy of "public" (read: government-controlled) education in America has always been humanistic, messianic, and anti-Christian.<sup>88</sup>

---

86. Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education* (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1963), 18–32.

87. See the perceptive essays on government education by Robert L. Dabney, in his *Discussions*, vol. 4 (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1979 reprint of 1897 ed.).

88. Rushdoony massively demonstrates this in *The Messianic Character of American Education*.

*Both the philosophy and the form of “public education” are anti-Christian.* The philosophy is statist, in that education is to be used for the purposes of the State, or some subdivision thereof, not for the purposes of God or the parents. Ultimate control is in the hands of the State, via “legal” power, bureaucratic and legislative controls, textbook selection, and legislatively established “minimum standards” for school philosophy and performance, as well as other factors. From an early moral tone derived from the Christian cultural heritage, the government schools have followed the drift of modern humanistic thought into pronounced materialism, moral and intellectual relativism, secularism and statism, as well as abandoning previous qualitative standards. The current crisis of the government schools is clearly a product of applied humanistic religious philosophy.<sup>89</sup>

The form of “public education” is anti-Christian in several ways. First, {100} it is government-controlled, rather than parent-controlled. Second, it is not free, but coercive and compulsory. Third, it is not economically “free”—contrary to its clever, politically-established title—but extremely costly (far more costly, in fact, than most available superior Christian education). Moreover, it is financed by forced income transfers—an unbiblical concept and practice—not by contractual or voluntary payments, on the spurious theory that everyone derives benefits from government-controlled education.<sup>90</sup>

The *deliberate divorce of Christianity from education* in the government schools inherent in the philosophy of “public school” education has proceeded from government control in an increasingly humanistic society, organizational humanism in the bureaucracies and the teachers’ unions, and ever present humanistic judicial fiats. As R. L. Dabney noted long ago, the combination of the (misunderstood) doctrine of “separation of church and state” in America and the religious and anti-Christian views among our population results in “a practical atheism” taught, of practical necessity (non-Christians often resent the preach-

89. See, among others, Rushdoony, *ibid.*, and Donald R. Howard’s important work, *Rebirth of Our Nation* (Lewisville, TX: Accelerated Christian Education, 1979).

90. In the light of the abysmal performance of government schools, theologically, morally, and intellectually, honesty requires that this argument be adapted to the circumstances of today’s America: “public” school administrators and teachers should have to pay the taxpayers for the privilege of corrupting our children!

ing of Christianity) in government schools.<sup>91</sup> If religious and cultural diversity leads to a “lowest common denominator” *practical atheism*, then the militant humanism of the administrators’ and teachers’ organizations and unions (spawned in humanistic institutions of higher education), and their Deweyite commitment to using education as a weapon for “social change,” combine to make both teaching and texts vehicles for humanistic philosophy and propaganda for the destruction of the American way of life.<sup>92</sup>

What slanted textbooks and humanistically educated teachers have failed to transform, humanistic *legal organizations* and *judges* have sought to force into the new humanistic mold. Since at least the celebrated “Monkey Trial,” which was used by humanistic propagandists to promote their dogma of evolution and to attack a Christian law,<sup>93</sup> humanistic legal organizations like the antinomian American Civil Liberties Union have {101} utilized the courts and perverted readings of the Constitution to replace our basically Christian constitutional and legal order with a humanistic and morally relativistic one.<sup>94</sup> The results of the school prayer and Bible-reading decisions on the “public” schools are well known. Since these Supreme Court decisions in the early 1960s, as John Whitehead says, “*in one area after another the right of Christians to express themselves in public education has been challenged.*”<sup>95</sup> Though this trend seems to have been slowed by several recent decisions, the attacks have by no means been thwarted. Religious holidays, for example, having been challenged, may be observed

---

91. Dabney, *Discussions*, 176–247, provides a tremendously insightful discussion of this phenomenon, and of the historic and philosophical inner dynamic of government-controlled, secularized education. His essays, though penned a century ago, are so timely that they deserve a separate reprinting.

92. For ample evidence on this, see James D. Hefley’s *Textbooks on Trial: The informative report of Mel and Norma Gabler’s ongoing battle to oust objectionable textbooks from public schools—and to urge publishers to produce better ones* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1976).

93. See Richard M. Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., Gateway ed., 1953), 27–54, esp. 36–44.

94. See William H. McIlhenny II, *The ACLU on Trial* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1976).

95. Whitehead, “The Chickens’ Homecoming,” 4; emphasis added.

and religious themes presented in holiday programs, but only if such themes are presented in a “prudent and objective manner” and as a part of our traditional cultural heritage.<sup>96</sup> Obviously, what “prudent and objective” means will depend on who is administering the school or the program, so full freedom of expression for Christians is by no means protected by this decision. Furthermore, although attacks on the rights of Christian students to meet on state college and university campuses over the past decade seem to have been finally blunted, the Supreme Court has failed—because of spurious grounds of “separation of church and state” or “establishment of religion”—to recognize the similar rights of high school students to utilize state facilities to meet for the discussion of religious topics and for worship.<sup>97</sup> Such spurious distinctions are an historical joke and a perversion of the intentions of the men who wrote and ratified the First Amendment,<sup>98</sup> as well as of the historic practices of Americans. For example, at Texas A&M, a state college established in 1876, attendance at chapel was, for many years, required of students. In light of the recent outlawing of the mere posting of the Ten Commandments (purchased with private money) on the walls of “public” schools by the Court—on the grounds that there is no valid secular purpose for doing so!!!—John Whitehead’s comment on the Court’s effective restriction of the rights of Christians to prayer and Bible study are both moderate and telling:

It should follow as a matter of course that students, regardless of age, should have the right to voluntarily meet and discuss their religious beliefs. If this is denied, then the most important form of knowledge is denied. To deny this knowledge is to deny reality.<sup>99</sup>

As a movement of rebellion against God and His word and law, humanism {102} is centrally and fundamentally motivated by *an urge to deny and repeal reality*. This motive extends to an urge to thwart all those who, to one degree or another, affirm, practice, and teach reality;

---

96. *Ibid.*

97. *Ibid.*

98. See John W. Whitehead, *The Separation Illusion: A Lawyer Examines the First Amendment* (Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1977).

99. Whitehead, “The Chickens’ Homecoming,” 4.

hence the assault of the humanists on private, familial, or church-based Christian education.

The assault on private and Christian education is also financially motivated, in that state schools receive an average of between \$1200 and \$1500 per year—coerced from taxpayers—for each pupil enrolled, and consequently administrators see the public's flight from the “public” schools as a threat to jobs and material well-being. But it would be a mistake to see the bureaucratically enforced assaults of local, state, and federal government on Christian schools as merely economically motivated. First, there is the implicitly and explicitly anti-Christian philosophy of “public education,” a philosophy with a long tradition and an increasingly militant practice. Second, there is the recognition by professional “educators” and their thinkers that Christianity has antihumanistic social, economic, and political consequences, which is one of their main reasons for wanting to stamp out Christianity via “public” education.<sup>100</sup> Third, there is the manifest condemnation of “public” education in the tremendous growth of private—Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and secular—education over the past decade. Fourth, there is the offensive recognition by many Christian school proponents that “public” education is nothing less than *pagan education*—even though some schools have Christian teaching in them.

The assault on private schools in general and Christian schools in particular has been economic, as well as philosophic. Parents who choose to send their God-given children to Christian schools—to train them up in the way they *should* go, to prevent them from learning the way of the heathen—must suffer the penalty of *forced taxation* to pay for the pagan schools. Christian parents are taxed—heavily taxed—to pay for the miseducation of the children who attend the government schools, and then must pay more of their own money to send their own children to Christian schools where they will—hopefully<sup>101</sup>—be well-educated. Now, Christian schools usually provide a God-centered edu-

---

100. Lester Frank Ward and John Dewey and his disciples were particularly emphatic on this point. See Singer, *A Theological Interpretation of American History*, 112–21; and Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education*, 144–283.

101. Much work needs to be done in the writing of Christian school texts and curriculum materials. Many schools use state-provided books and materials which, of course, are humanistic. Many Christian texts are inadequate.

cation, a better education, and a lower-cost education<sup>102</sup> at no cost to the taxpayers; and by removing students from the government schools, lessen the “justifiable” tax burden of the “public {103} schools” on the taxpayers, while turning out better, more self-governing and responsible citizens. Yet Christian parents get no tax deduction for the monies they spend to achieve all these worthy public purposes. Thus, Christians are burdened by a double tax: a larger tax paid to finance anti-Christian and antinomian “public” education, and a smaller tax paid to finance good education. Far from recognizing the manifest public benefits of private Christian education, humanistic propagandists in the TV news networks have labeled even partial tuition tax credit bills as “welfare for the middle class.” Such is the nature of humanistic egalitarian “social justice”: coercive taxation for socially destructive purposes is “just”; removal of unjust and socially destructive double taxation is “unjust.”

The militantly anti-Christian, deceitful, and desperate nature of the humanist attacks on Christian schools is nowhere more clearly exposed than in the nature and extent of the devices used by humanistic bureaucrats in local, state, and federal governments to control or destroy Christian schools and education. This story is becoming increasingly known to Christians, and has been well told.<sup>103</sup> Since Christian education is not an option, but a moral imperative,<sup>104</sup> a cru-

---

102. The Geneva School, in Tyler, Texas, for example, teaches four year olds not only the “three R’s,” but also Greek, Hebrew, and the Catechism, among other things. Cost: \$85 per month (1980); compare state schools at \$1200-\$1500 per year!

103. In addition to Rushdoony’s *The Messianic Character of American Education*, which sets forth the religious and philosophical history of American humanistic educational thought, and Howard’s *Rebirth of Our Nation*, which sets forth the contemporary economic, political, social, educational, and legal crisis, see: Frank E. Fortkamp, *The Case Against Government Schools* (Westlake Village, CA: American Media, 1979) (a libertarian humanistic perspective); Connaught Coyne Marshner, *Blackboard Tyranny* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1978); Onalee McGraw, *Family Choice in Education: The New Imperative* (Heritage Foundation, 1978), and *Secular Humanism and the Schools: The Issue Whose Time Has Come* (Heritage Foundation, 1976); Alan N. Grover, *Ohio’s Trojan Horse; A Warning to Christian Schools Everywhere* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1977); and Kent Kelly, *State of North Carolina vs. Christian Liberty* (Southern Pines, NC: Calvary Press, n.d.), and *The Separation of Church and Freedom* (Calvary Press, 1980).

cial part of Christian social action must be both involvement in Christian education and involvement in the *defense* of Christian educational institutions, as well as involvement in spreading the good and bad news about Christian education to the American public. The good news is that Christian education is commanded by God as a means of godly child-rearing and of blessing (Deut. 6). The bad news is that the humanistic {104} education establishment has been relentless, ingenious, and unscrupulous in its attacks on Christian family, church, and school education.

The claim to the *right to license and accredit* Christian schools (and all schools) has been basic to the humanists' attack. But this claim is *a claim of the state to be over the family and church*, for the essence of licensure is that one higher in authority must grant permission to act to one lower, and the essence of accreditation is that the credo, or faith of the accrediting agency, is the standard for conformity by the lower agency. Thus, the claim of the state to the right to license and accredit Christian schools is *an assault on the authority of God, via an assault on the Christian family and church*.

This assault is made plainer by the claim of the state to have the right to impose and enforce some "*minimum standards*" on all schools existing within the state's boundaries. Even if the states' "minimum standards" were minimal—which they aren't<sup>105</sup>—they are humanistic and anti-Christian to the core, and amount to *the establishment of a state religion of secular humanism*.<sup>106</sup> "Minimum standards" have been used to establish a foundation for state dictation and controls that is equivalent to the imposition of humanism on Christian education.

But the humanists have not stopped with these fundamental assaults. They have tried *all manner of devious tactics* by which effectively to

---

104. See Cornelius Van Til, *Essays on Christian Education* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974); R. J. Rushdoony, *The Philosophy of the Christian Curriculum* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1981); David B. Cummings, ed., *The Purpose of a Christ-Centered Education* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1979); David J. Engelsma, *Reformed Education* (Federation of Protestant Reformed School Societies, 1977); and Paul A. Kienel, ed., *The Philosophy of Christian School Education* (Whittier, CA: Association of Christian Schools International, n.d.).

105. Grover, 18–27.

106. Grover, 28–80.

damage or destroy Christian education. Minimum wage, employee compensation, and unionization laws were attempted to impose on Christian schools, but have been defeated.<sup>107</sup> Building codes and zoning laws have been claimed as excuses for the denial of the right of churches to establish or continue the operation of Christian schools, and continue to be utilized.<sup>108</sup> The IRS tried to impose racial and ethnic quotas on Christian schools, during the Carter administration, and to deny tax exemption to schools that refused to comply with its “guidelines.” Now the IRS is abandoning the old way of going through the courts to attempt to impose its arbitrary rules on Christian schools and churches, and is threatening simply to deny tax exemption to churches and schools that refuse, on First Amendment grounds, *to surrender their records for an IRS “search and destroy” examination.*<sup>109</sup> The effect will be to impose all the legal fees on the affected churches and schools, with the IRS—or rather us, the taxpayers—only having to foot the legal bills in the event that they finally lose the legal battle. {105}

“Discrimination on the basis of creed” is another favorite ploy which, if the bureaucrats are successful in establishing its “validity,” could mean that Christian schools must hire *any* qualified person, regardless of his beliefs or practice, to teach our children. That would reduce Christian schools to the level of many “public” schools, and would eviscerate the whole Christian educational endeavor.<sup>110</sup>

Together with the issues of licensing and accreditation, the issue of “truancy” points up the fundamental claim of the state to be as God. For in prosecuting parents who educate their own children at home, or in nonaccredited private Christian schools, or in church-operated Christian schools, for truancy violations, *the state claims legal ownership of the child.* Bureaucrats and bureaucratic “laws” or “standards”

---

107. Whitehead, “The Chickens’ Homecoming,” 2.

108. *Ibid.* See also, for continuing reports on the legal situation, *The CLA Defender* (Christian Law Association).

109. The IRS has honored the Church of Christian Liberty, the parent church of the nationwide Christian Liberty Academy, as the first target of this new tactic.

110. Dr. David Gibbs, of the Christian Law Association, has excellent tapes on the legal situation. Gibbs and the C.L.A. are involved full time in the defense of Christian schools, families, and churches, and he speaks authoritatively and powerfully. The tapes are excellent for convincing people to get involved in the battle for Christian schools.



commonly refer to the children as “the children of the state,” or some such term. Thus, not God, the Creator of children, who gives them to parents as blessings, to be reared in terms of the fear and love of the Lord; not the natural parents of the children, who procreated them, love them, and care for them, and whose duty, under God it is to train them up in God’s way; but the state claims ownership and authority over children.

This is the fundamental issue: *Who is Lord? Christ, or Caesar? Christ, or the State? Christ, or the Bureaucrats?* Who is over the family: God, or the State?

### C. The Attack on the Church

As with the family *per se* and the family via the Christian school, the humanistic State claims authority over the church, again attempting to usurp the authority of God. Here, too, the attack is economic, as well as pseudo-legal.

*Economically*, the church is attacked *both indirectly and directly*. Indirectly, government assumption of the welfare function—a function *surrendered* by the church—is a direct usurpation of a scriptural function of the family, the church, and the individual. Government *welfarism*, among other things, means massive taxation and, as 1 Samuel 8 indicates, unbiblical kinds of taxation—on personal property, productive property, capital gains, inheritance, taxes for redistribution to political supporters, and others. The level of taxation also means *taxation by deceit*: deliberately hidden taxation, such as inflation, capital borrowing, and the withholding tax.

The net effect of ungodly economic policies, and of their related interventionist policies of government economic command and control regulations {106} and sociological manipulation, is to *attack the church morally, economically, and politically*. Morally, the claim to the duty and right to perform the welfare function by the State usurps the place of the church, and creates in churchmen an illusion of legitimacy—in the absence of sound biblical preaching in the church<sup>111</sup>—as well as a continuing disposition to surrender and forsake their biblical duties in regard to welfare and the poor. Morally, acceptance of the State’s claim to be the provider of welfare deceives churchmen into accepting theft, though forbidden by God’s law, as legitimate for groups

and government.<sup>112</sup> Economically, the cumulative effect of taxation, inflation, capital borrowing, and regulatory intervention directly attacks the church by leaving less money available to church members for giving, undermining the awareness of churchmen of the necessity of social financing by the church, damaging the efficiency, productivity and growth of the economy, and eventually threatening the economy with collapse due to the cumulative impact of ungodly policies. Politically, the failures of the “welfare state” create a demand for more taxes to repair the wreckage wrought by its policies, which in turn leads to a demand that the churches and all higher income individuals who have managed to escape confiscatory taxation be taxed to provide the “needed” funds. And ultimately the massive economic dislocations or outright economic collapses created by years of “welfare state” socialist policies threaten the church with social, economic, and political chaos, from which must emerge, unless the grace of God overwhelms the normal working of His laws in history, an authoritarian or totalitarian government.<sup>113</sup>

*Arbitrary authoritarian controls over the church* are precisely what the humanists are moving to establish, at all levels of government today. Attacks on church-operated Christian schools and children’s homes, as well as on Christian children’s homes such as the ones operated by Lester Roloff, are but the tip of the iceberg. In addition, local governments have attempted to use zoning laws to prevent the establishment of “too many” churches in the area of their jurisdiction; at least one suit has been made in California, attacking the right of a pastor to counsel his own parishioners; and the IRS has continued to demand access to information on churches, without having its “author-

---

111. It should be obvious to Bible-believing Christians that if we had been studying our Bibles, and hearing the whole Bible preached, and doing what we heard God’s word telling us to do we would not be in the current crisis which this paper briefly summarizes.

112. Widespread acceptance of such notions comes about not only through seeming personal convenience, but also through a sort of perverse conservative acceptance of established modes and orders, regardless of their departure from the Bible.

113. See the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Symposium on Inflation, cited above, and Robert Moss, *The Collapse of Democracy* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1975).

ity” to do so clearly delimited or fully checked by the courts.<sup>114</sup> And while the First Orthodox Presbyterian Church of San {107} Francisco has won its case against the claim by its homosexual organist, the movement to attack the Church via the doctrine of “discrimination on the basis of creed,” as we shall see, is by no means dead. Moreover, as Rev. R. J. Rushdoony reports:

In all fifty states, *child control plans* are being readied, to be introduced piece-meal in some cases, which undercut the family, the church, and the Christian School. The goal of these plans is religious, i.e., humanistic in faith: the purpose is to create a new generation. This new generation is not to be created through rebirth in Christ but by separation from the old corrupt generation and family, with its pollution of Biblical faith. In one state, “health” homes are proposed for all children, the implication being that the family is an unhealthy home.

This ties in with the recent insistence on giving recognition to the “voluntary” family, i.e., any group of lesbians, homosexuals, runaway youths, or a sexual commune.

The child control plan includes a two-year national service requirement of all youth, male and female, between the ages of 17 and 19.<sup>115</sup>

Such “national service” notions have already been proposed at the federal level. Nor are the federal bureaucrats detached from the movement. A December 30, 1980, *Report to the Congress of the United States* by the Comptroller General maintains that the *Guyana Tragedy Points to a Need for Better Care and Protection of Guardianship Children*—which means more federal controls over state guardianship programs for children.<sup>116</sup> If you think that means improved protection of children, you have been asleep the past twenty years.

Such plans also extend to *day-care centers* and *Sunday schools*. The Ohio Department of Public Welfare’s new “Proposed Rules Governing Licensure of Day Care Centers” propose, reports Rev. Rushdoony,

to license and control all church nurseries, Sunday Schools, Vacation Bible Schools, “church-operated” day cares, and “church-operated”

114. Whitehead, “The Chicken’s Homecoming” 2.

115. “The War Against Christ’s Kingdom,” A Special Chalcedon ALERT, no. 1 (Vallecito, CA: Chalcedon, n.d.); emphasis added.

116. United States General Accounting Office, HRD-81-7.

preschools. These rules would make the Welfare Department the governing board over all of these church activities.<sup>117</sup>

Nor is this scheme unique to Ohio:

Like plans are under way in other states. In one major state, a welfare department official has stated that all Sunday Schools will have to be licensed and controlled as child care facilities if even one child attended at any time without his or her parents. (The same rule would apply to a church service.)<sup>118</sup>

The battle has been extended to *church property*, as well as church *organizational authority and control*. The January 1979 assault of officials {108} and police of the State of California on the headquarters of the Worldwide Church of God—without any kind of prior notice or warning—was a forcible seizure and takeover by the state of the property, assets, ministries, offices, records, and control of the church. Whitehead summarizes:

The property and assets of the church and its related ministries were summarily taken over; the offices and records were seized and their contents rifled; cartons and files of records were taken and carried off (without receipt, inventory or accounting) by government officials. The church's administrator was replaced with the receiver and his deputies so that the State of California technically became the head over the church. The State's actions to date have been unsuccessfully contested in court by the church.<sup>119</sup>

This has occurred because *California has passed a law requiring churches to apply to the state for tax exemption*—for the right to worship God as an ecclesiastical body. As Alan Stang says, in his excellent study of today's persecution of Christians and the growing threat to freedom of religion in America,

California is licensing churches, which is unconstitutional, with the tax assessor given the authority to determine which churches are authentic and which are to be taxed to their knees.<sup>120</sup>

---

117. Rushdoony, "The War Against Christ's Kingdom."

118. *Ibid.*

119. Whitehead, "The Chickens' Homecoming," 2.

120. *Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods Before Me... Including the State* (San Marino, CA: American Opinion, 1980), 19. Stang's booklet deserves a wide circulation among Christians and friends of liberty.

The vehicle for this unconstitutional and unbiblical taxation of the Church is the doctrine that the church is a “*charitable trust*,” not a religious institution under God. Rushdoony’s analysis of this humanistic doctrine is telling:

The church is being reclassified steadily in the United States, as a part of this control, as a charitable, not a religious, trust. The position of the Internal Revenue Service, and, for example, of the California Franchise Tax Board, is that the Sixteenth (Income Tax) Amendment ended the First Amendment immunity of the church to taxation and control. There is thus, it is held, no longer a constitutional immunity from taxation, only a statutory one, revocable at will. Since the Sixteenth Amendment made no exemption for churches, an income tax can be assessed against them if the state so wills ....

As a charitable trust, the church would be required to drop all discrimination with respect to race, color, sex, sexual preference, or creed. The church, it was held, in the case against the Worldwide Church of God, belongs to all people, and its assets, funds, and properties must be used for all the people, not just the members or believers. This will mean integration: an equal number of men and women in the pulpit and church boards; it will mean the integration of lesbians and homosexuals into the church staff and pulpit. It will also {109} mean equal time for all creeds: the church will have to give equal time to humanism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, occultism, and more.<sup>121</sup>

Use of the doctrine of “charitable trust” by the state to claim *taxing power over churches* places the *tax assessor* in the position of determining whether or not the applicant for tax exemption holds the claimed religious belief in good faith and honesty. If one is judged to have claimed tax exemption merely for purposes of tax avoidance, then, on the arbitrary judgment of the tax assessor, the exemption may be denied. *The burden of proof is clearly placed on the church applying for tax exemption, while the tax assessor is miraculously transformed into a spiritual seer or clairvoyant, supposedly able to see into the hearts of applicants and determine the genuineness of their religious beliefs.* A form which churches must fill out to receive tax exemption is exactly the same as that used for charitable, educational, scientific, or literary organizations: the state recognizes no distinctions in terms of Scrip-

121. Rushdoony, “The War Against Christ’s Kingdom.”

tural or constitutional mandate. Churches that refuse, on biblical or constitutional grounds, to pay their property taxes simply have their *property confiscated by the state* or the county government and *sold*—sometimes without being notified until after the sale.<sup>122</sup> A number of Christian churches—not just the Worldwide Church of God—have already lost their property for their stand for their rights under God, the intentions of the framers of the Constitution and the First Amendment. But what do humanists, who have perverted history and the Constitution for decades, care about Scripture or the intentions of the authors and ratifiers of the First Amendment?

Tied to the doctrine of the “charitable trust” is the humanistic doctrine of “*public policy*.” Under this doctrine, derived from “liberal” humanists’ worship of majoritarian democracy (at least so long as the majority does what “liberals” like), *all groups must conform to majority will*, as expressed in the output of governmental policymakers; no group has any right to escape from obedience to majority will as “public policy,” *nor do tax-exempt groups have any right to oppose “public policy.”* Conversely, a group that opposes “public policy” has no right to tax exemption. A number of local and state agencies, as well as the IRS and other federal agencies, hold that:

Whatever is contrary to public policy is thereby not entitled to tax exemption, nor to a free exercise of its faith, i.e. to any legal existence. Thus, if abortion and homosexuality are held to be public policy, no group has any “right” to tax exemption, or to maintain its legal freedom to pursue and uphold its “discrimination,” but must assent to these policies. *No better blue-print for totalitarianism has been ever {110} devised than this public policy doctrine.* It is with us now. There is a law-suit to remove the tax-exempt status of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States for its stand against abortion.<sup>123</sup>

Under such doctrines, the humanists have launched a drive—manifest in the last political campaign and after—to *prevent Bible-believing churches from speaking out on the moral and political issues of our time.* Following the Neo-platonic and humanist myth of the restriction of “religion” to a mere corner of the universe, and the humanistic myth of neutrality,<sup>124</sup> the humanists have sought to transform the Jeffersonian

122. Stang, 15–20.

123. Rushdoony, “The War Against Christ’s Kingdom.”

myth of “separation of church and state,” discovered by “liberal” Supreme Court judges in the 1930s, into a prohibition on political utterances by the churches. Thus, California churches, for example, must report on their tax-exemption forms whether or not they have attempted to influence legislation, or whether they plan to advocate or oppose proposed legislation.<sup>125</sup>

Thus *tax exemption becomes a gift to the church by the grace of government*, not the grace and law of God, revocable by civil government’s representatives on the basis of their judgment. It thus is also an effective *weapon* to be used against the biblical duty of the church to speak to the people and the rulers on the moral issues affecting politics, a duty and right recognized by the framers and ratifiers of the First Amendment and Constitution. *The church, then, exists at the pleasure of government bureaucrats*, and its utterances are subject to continuous review and judgment by the higher authority—not God, but civil government. The *power to tax*, former Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall said, is the *power to destroy*. That truth has not been lost on humanists in government. *The power to tax, combined with the “public policy” doctrine and the “charitable trust” doctrine, make it “unconstitutional” and “illegal” for the church to resist movements opposed to Christianity and its way of life, to God and His law-word, and indeed even to oppose politically the political destruction of the Church via the destruction of its ministries, its property, its discipline, and its preaching and doing of the word of God.*

### THE WAR WE ARE IN

As a consequence of Christians’ abandonment of the study, preaching, hearing, and doing of the whole counsel of God, *we have neglected the scope of the spiritual warfare* between the army of Christ and that of Satan, neglected the subtlety of the Serpent, the Adversary, *and retreated from our created, reborn, and commanded purpose of dominion for Christ*, under {111} His lordship. Consequently, Christians today find themselves unmistakably embattled. Due to our neglect of God’s word, however, rather than being on the offensive and the attack,

124. See *Occupy!*, vol. 3, no. 2 (February 1981).

125. Stang, 16–17.

American Christians find themselves under attack by humanists in high places.

Like the enduring spiritual war of which it is a part, the attack of the humanists on Christian persons, institutions, and principles involves virtually all of life and thought. Far from being merely a confined “spiritual” attack, the spiritual evil of humanism’s attack manifests itself in fundamental religious philosophical principles and economic, social, and political theory and practice, as well as in the multifaceted attacks on the Christian family, school, and church.

We are under attack because *we have retreated from the fulness of our Lord’s authority, lordship, and command*. Instead of attacking humanism and other anti-Christian religious philosophies, we have pretended that they are neutral, or retreated from the conflict, surrendering the great majority of the battlefield to the Enemy. Many have reduced the concern of Christ’s church to personal internal life, the ecclesiastical church, and the family, or have seen the church as either being “raptured out” of the world before the Tribulation, or suffering earthly defeat but “spiritual” triumph in a coming tribulation. Such visions surrender the bulk of the life of the individual and the family, as well as the majority of the spheres of life affecting the individual, the family, and the church, to the control of devilish religious, social, economic, and political forces, and thus become literally *self-fulfilling prophecies of the irrelevance and defeat of Christ’s church on earth*.

All true Christians—as well as all lovers of the American tradition of religious and civil liberty—should be deeply concerned about the war of the humanists on the church. And it should be clear that *all areas of thought and life* affect the life of the Christian and the church. The Bible speaks authoritatively to society, economics, and politics, as well as to the individual, the family, and the ecclesiastical church. *If Christians neglect the application of God’s word to society, economics, and politics, men will not neglect the application of man’s word to the Christian family and church.*

If your view of Christ’s church is that it is concerned only with the life of personal piety, the family, and the ecclesiastical institution, then you need to recognize that *the person, the family, and the church are affected by the rest of the world “out there.”* You, your family, and your church are *under attack* by the forces of Satan. *If you neglect to use the*



godly means of defense of these institutions through involvement outside of them, you have in effect surrendered them—and with them the heart of the Christian enterprise—to the Enemy. We are in a full-scale war. But in this war we must not surrender, for our Captain did not surrender, and forbids us to surrender. Even if you believe in a coming Tribulation, as Tim LaHaye points out, there is no valid Christian reason for contributing, by your non {112} involvement, to the “Pre-tribulation Tribulation.”<sup>126</sup> The foe, as the great old hymn says, is nigh. It is high time to sound the battle cry!

### MORE THAN DEFENDERS

The humanistic war on Christianity of our times calls us to the defense of the Christian church, family, and school, as well as of biblical principles and practice in all areas of thought and life. Our Lord, in His enscriptured word, calls and commands us to be more than defenders of His church and its true spirituality in thought and life. He calls and commands us to be conquerors, to be more than conquerors for Him, by bringing every thought into captivity to Him (2 Cor. 10:5), and by being doers as well as hearers of His word (James 1:22–25). He calls and commands us to obedience, battle, and victorious living for Him, and promises that faith is the victory that overcomes the world, by manifesting the love of God in the keeping of His commandments (1 John 5:2–4). He calls and commands us to be living stones in His church, a church built by His own hand, the church against which the very gates of Hell shall not prevail (Matt. 16:18). He calls and commands us, then, not merely to defense, but also to *take the offensive* against His enemies.

Upon what authority do we base our *duty* of not merely *defensive action* but also *aggressive action against the forces of evil*? Upon the nature of God and the content of His commandments to us.

*God is the absolutely sovereign Creator and Sustainer of the universe*, who providentially rules and determines history in accordance with His eternal and righteous plan (Acts 17). Since He providentially upholds and directs all things by the word of His power (Heb. 1:3), and

---

126. Tim LaHaye, *The Battle for the Mind* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1980), 217–24.

since He is the *ex nihilo* Creator of all things, His word is all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-authoritative. His revealed word is both Truth and Law, for He alone can and does speak authoritatively and determinatively on all things. His word is both definitive and determinative. If He is for us, no one can stand against us.

This infinitely great God has created us for *dominion* over the creation and commanded us to have dominion over the earth, under His word and law (Gen. 1:26–28; 9:1–17). In the person of His Son, He commanded us to *occupy* for Him, till He returns (Luke 19:13), under and in terms of His law. He has told us that not one jot or tittle of His law shall pass away, until all be *fulfilled* (Matt. 5:17–19), and has repeatedly emphasized the binding validity of His law by stressing His identity and equivalence with the unchanging Father (Mal. 3:6; John 10:30), and by commanding those who love Him to fulfill the law, to keep His commandments (Deut. 10:12; 19:9; Ps. 119; John 14:15; 15:14). {113}

*God is a covenantal God, a God of blessing and cursing.* He both protects and richly blesses those who love Him, those who keep His commandments; and He visits His holy wrath, in the form of fearful and inevitable curses, upon those who do not love Him, those who depart from obedience to His law (Deut. 8; 28; Judges; etc.). God's blessings are *spiritual*: they are a spiritual reward for spiritually derived obedience to God's commandments. But His blessings are also manifest and manifold *material or physical blessings*: civilizational, agricultural, demographic, economic, military, and indeed all-encompassing (Deut. 28:1–14). Similarly, His *curses* on the lawless disobedient are spiritually derived and inevitable, even while they are manifestly material or physical also: civilizational, agricultural, demographic, psychological, health-related, climatological and weather-related, military and foreign policy-related, economic, liberty-losing, child-losing and destroying, moral, historical, reputational, and all-encompassing in their destruction (Deut. 28:15–68).

Because God is a *blessing and cursing* God, making His authoritative word to have inevitable *external* as well as *internal* impacts, we know that His word is truly authoritative in history, and have a manifold interest and motivation to fear Him and keep His commandments, in the knowledge that *He blesses those who love Him and keep His commandments, and curses those who hate Him and depart from His way.*

*Knowing that no man can be neutral, that no man can serve two masters, but that each man must choose whom he and his household will serve, how dare we stand against the law-word of such a God?* Social, economic, military, and civilizational blessings require individual and social obedience to God's law.

Whatever your view of the last things, *you are called and commanded by our Lord to have dominion over the earth, under Him, to occupy for Him till He comes.*<sup>127</sup> *You are to be a good servant, not a wicked servant of the Lord.* All of God's servants are commanded to occupy for Him. His good servants recognize His nature and authority and obey His command, using their God-given talents to produce an increase for Him, via obedience to His law. Wicked servants know the Lord, but disobey His command to occupy; they reject the Lord's word and law as their life's standard, and consequently are *passive*, not active, and produce no increase for the Lord. *The Lord judges His wicked servants*, taking from them the power, authority, and material rewards that He had given them. *He rewards His faithful servants*, when He returns, giving them *authority*, *rightful power*, and *material things*, consistent with His covenantal promises and dominion mandate (Luke 19). {114}

Christ's command to occupy for Him is a command to the Christian to do business: Christ's business. *The Christian is to be in unconditional surrender to his Lord*, and thus to live a life of obedient service to his King's word and law, in thought, word, and deed, *in all areas of life*: this is the essence of the Kingdom of God.<sup>128</sup> His command to occupy for Him extends especially to civil government, which is nothing less than a ministry ordained by God. *Active service is required of all citizens of Christ's Kingdom*, especially those favored with power and authority by the Lord, for He will require much of those to whom He has given much. Rulers, His ministers, are to obey the standard of His law, for

---

127. See the fine work by Tom Rose and Robert Metcalf, *The Coming Victory: Proposals on How to Overcome the Troubles That Plague Us* (Memphis, TN: Christian Studies Center, 1980), esp. 9–16, 30–33.

128. Gary North, *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory* (Tyler, TX: Geneva Press, 1981), is an excellent, systematic, and popular exposition of the teaching of the Bible on both systematic and applied theology, as well as on God's plan for victory through Christians' unconditional surrender to His word and law. It deserves a paperback reprinting and a wide distribution.

they are to be a terror to evil works, not to good ones (Rom. 13:1–14). We who have been providentially placed in a nation in which we can influence civil government have *a special responsibility to make the civil governments over us godly governments*, that are limited by, and conform to, His law. But this cannot be done, in the long run, unless Christians are exercising *dominion* in the family, the church, and all areas of life and thought within our culture.

### THE GREAT COMMISSION AND SOCIAL ACTION

The Christian calling and duty of social action is reiterated and summarized with great power in our Lord's Great Commission to His followers. Christians are commanded to go and "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19). That is important and foundational to our activist enterprise: *without evangelism, social action is, in the long run, futile, for "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it"* (Ps. 127:1).<sup>129</sup> Evangelism is the beginning of our human action for the Lord to occupy for Him, to have dominion over the earth under Him.

We are also commanded to *education* as godly occupation for Christ the King, for we are to teach all nations "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). *We are to educate the nations to train up children in the way they should go, not to have them learn the way of the heathen.* We in the United States got into the mess we are in largely by *letting the heathen educate everyone's children*—and by supporting the coercive laws that make humanistic statist education possible. *But we are commanded by our Lord to teach the nations to do all of His commandments, all of His laws, not just those that we subjectively decide to obey.* We are to call all nations to repentance and obedience to God's laws, baptizing them {115} and teaching them to observe *all of His commandments, teaching them to be not only hearers of the word, but also doers of God's law-word.*

We could have no firmer foundation, no more powerful motivation for working to carry out the terms of our Lord's Great Commission than the reasons that He Himself gives us: *all power is given unto Him*

---

129. See the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Symposium on Evangelism, vol. 7, no. 2 (Winter 1980–81).

*in heaven and in earth* (Matt. 28:18), and He is with us always, even unto the end of the world (Matt. 28:20). With all power in heaven and earth for us, who can stand against us? Victory over His enemies is His: “For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet” (1 Cor. 15:25). All things shall be subdued unto Him (1 Cor. 15:24–28). It is our duty, our Great Commission, to serve our Lord, despite our human weaknesses, with all the gifts that He has given us, to subdue the nations, under the power of the Holy Spirit, to obedience to Christ, our King.

## WEAPONS OF WAR: TOOLS OF THE GREAT COMMISSION

The war we are in requires that we put on the Gospel armor, and with prayerful supplication to the Lord of Battles who guarantees His church the victory, take the sword of the Lord in hand, join with other like-minded men, women, and children, and march forth to meet the enemy. This in turn requires that we know our enemies and allies, as well as our fellow Christian soldiers. What follows is a selected, introductory listing of *our friends and allies* in a number of key areas of the battle—organizations, sources of information, publications, and so forth. You, of course, must decide how to allot your time and resources among them, consulting Scripture and the nature of the times.

### 1. Information on Information and Organizations

*Family and Freedom Digest* (Family & Freedom Foundation, 100 Brooks Avenue, Rochester, NY 14619; \$12) provides a very good list of Christian and conservative organizations specializing in various aspects of the battle, including one-page descriptions of the functions of the organizations, pictures of leaders, addresses, etc. It also includes valuable suggestions for pro-family action in letter writing, dealing with news media and TV personalities, and Congress. *Your investment here will be well repaid* in information.

*Censored: Hard-to-Locate Sources of Information on Current Affairs*, by Bayliss Corbett (P. O. Box 1526, Bonita Springs, FL 33923; \$7; two for \$12 anywhere in North America; \$9 airmail worldwide) provides a much longer list of organizations and sources of information, with short descriptions of the functions and viewpoints of most organizations listed. The organizations listed are of a very wide variety of perspectives, a number of them humanistic and hostile to Christianity, but knowledge of such viewpoints can be helpful in the battle, too. Most

will want this publication for {116} its information on the “good guys,” however, and *I know of no better list available* (except the one that will be available in the next revised edition, listing Chalcedon, the Institute for Christian Economics, and other organizations I’ve sent them); the list is extensive.

The *Chalcedon Report* (Chalcedon, P.O. Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251; free for the asking; supported by tax-deductible donations) is the best Christian newsletter available (monthly). R. J. Rushdoony and a number of other knowledgeable and talented Christian writers appear in it, and often included with it are *Book Notices*, *Position Papers*, *Medical Reports*, and an occasional *Alert*. It has excellent information on books, publications, and organizations, though this information is not presented in a collected, systematic form (like that of the first two publications above). Must reading!

## 2. Biblical World and Life View

*Chalcedon* (listed above), Rev. Rousas John Rushdoony, President, is the best single source of the revival of a Biblical world and life view in America. It also has a tape ministry, a book club, and an associated publishing ministry (Ross House Books, P. O. Box 67, Vallecito, CA 95251), and supports Christian scholars for research, writing, and teaching, in addition to publishing *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*. Supported by tax-deductible contributions.

*The Institute for Christian Economics* (P. O. Box 8000, Tyler, TX 75711), Dr. Gary North, President, is on a par with Chalcedon as a source of Christian scholarship and analysis. It publishes books and newsletters—*Christian Reconstruction*, *Biblical Economics Today* (Dr. Gary North; bimonthly); *Biblical Educator* (Rev. David Chilton, et al.; monthly); and *Tentmakers* (Dr. Gary North; bi-monthly; for pastors and church officers only)—and is working on a videotape and tape ministry with the Geneva Divinity School. Supported by tax-deductible contributions.

*Christian Studies Center* (3887 Poplar Avenue, Suite 314, P. O. Box 11110, Memphis, TN 38111), Douglas W. Peterson, Executive Director, Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., Chairman, also conducts excellent Christian research, publishing, and educational work. It has established a network of Christian researchers, writers and speakers, publishes *Call* (a quarterly magazine) and *CSC Worldview* (a monthly newsletter) as well as excellent books, booklets, position papers, tracts, and bib-

liographies. It also sponsors conferences and seminars, and plans include college-level extension education. Supported by tax-deductible contributions.

The *Christian Inquirer* (Box 76, Ellicott Street, Buffalo, NY 14205), Rev. Ron Marr, ed., provides coverage of a wide range of subjects from a conservative biblical view, and is pro-family, pro-life, and pro-American. It {117} has a Canadian edition, as well as an American one, and provides both news on government intervention and information on how concretely to combat it. Toll-free phone: 1-800-828-5934; subscriptions \$7 one year; \$15 three years; \$20 five years.

*Geneva Divinity School* (708 Hamvassy Dr., Tyler, TX 75701), James B. Jordan, Administrator, in addition to providing an unsurpassed theological education, publishes books and *Calvin Speaks* (a newsletter containing contemporary English reprints of Calvin's sermons on Deuteronomy—the first since 1583), and is the locus of a tape ministry, and soon will have a videotape ministry covering a wide variety of biblical and biblically-related subjects.

*Dominion Tapes* (P. O. Box 8107, Tyler, TX 75711) has an excellent tape ministry, with series of tapes on a number of important subjects, including (among others) systematic theology, humanism, science, a Christian philosophy of education, American history, English history, the place of ethics in society, the purpose of history, and the legal threat to Christianity in America.

*The Mount Olive Tape Library* (P. O. Box 422, Mt. Olive, MS 39119) has a fabulous catalogue of reel-to-reel and cassette tapes, by a goodly number of Reformed scholars and pastors, for purchase or rent. Rental tapes may be duplicated, so long as you do not resell them. Theology and the application of biblical teaching to history, philosophy, politics, economics, psychology, and other subjects are covered in this 100+ page catalogue. Send them \$3.00 for the revised catalogue. No: send them a healthy donation to support this valuable ministry.

I cannot resist recommending in particular four books (in addition, of course, to the Bible) which should be part of every Christian's library for the foundation of Christian social action. Gary North's *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory* (Geneva Press, 708 Hamvassy, Tyler, TX 75701) is must reading, and is an excellent and popularly written book. (I'd recommend it even if Gary weren't editing this *Journal*!) Tom Rose and Robert Metcalf's *The Coming Victory* (Christian Studies Center, P. O. Box 11110, Memphis, TN 38111) is also a good introductory tool. Gordon H. Clark's *A Christian View of Men and Things* is also a very helpful introductory overview of the biblical world and life view; it has been



recently reprinted (The Trinity Foundation, P. O. Box 169, Jefferson, MD 21755). And no Christian's library would be complete without R. J. Rushdoony's seminal work, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (Fairfax Christian Bookstore, 11121 Pope's Head Road, Fairfax, VA 22030; the much shorter introduction to this volume is *Law and Liberty*, available from the same source.).

*The Trinity Foundation*, John W. Robbins, President, (see previous para {118} graph) offers a lively, timely, and wide-ranging newsletter, the *Trinity Review*, and a number of discount books (by Gordon H. Clark and John W. Robbins).

*The American Vision*, headed by Steve Schifman (P. O. Box 720515, Atlanta, GA 30328) offers a newsletter, the *American Vision Newsletter*, an excellent cassette-with-study guide, "The American Vision 360 Years Later," a list of readings on America's Christian history, and is developing a series of topical booklets on a Biblical world and life view, and a series of devotional literature. These materials have the virtue that they are intended to reach a wide, popular audience; we need more such materials, for there are millions of Christians today who lack the knowledge of how Scripture applies to all of life.

A new, family-oriented Christian magazine, *Christian Citizen* (Gescom Publishing Inc., 3151 East 191st Place, Lansing, IL 60438; monthly; \$1 per month; \$10.95 per year; \$18.95 per two years; \$24.95 for three years), ed. by Ann Bradley, is designed to make Christians aware of their responsibility in every sphere of life, and focuses on the family, government, national and international affairs, health, education, business, law, ethics, science, and pending legislation (featuring Jo Ann Gasper). Its perspective is conservative, and it is a welcome addition to our forces.

Tracts are an important and basic part of evangelism, missionary activity, and social and political action, for they enable us to present fundamental issues in a brief, hard-hitting fashion, to virtually anyone willing to spend a few minutes reading a short essay. No one in the Christian world produces better or wider ranging biblical tracts than Vic Lockman (P. O. Box 7268, Tyler, TX 75711). His tracts are excellent for evangelism and education, on everything from the doctrine of the existence of God to church government to current political issues. They are concise, clearly reasoned, powerful, and Biblical. They are illustrated by humorous appropriate cartoons, which add to their impact. A complete sampling and bulk rates are available, as well as single tracts.

Finally, several sources of *Christian books* must be mentioned as a means of edifying the body of Christ in regard to the biblical world and life view. The *Fairfax*



*Christian Bookstore* (11121 Pope's Head Road, Fairfax, VA 22030), David Thoburn, prop., provides an excellent selection of Christian books (discounts available), featuring works on and for education, politics, economics, and other subjects. *Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co.* (Box 817, Phillipsburg, NJ 08865) offers an excellent selection and discounts. *Puritan-Reformed Discount Book Service* (1319 Newport Gap Pike, Plaza 41, Wilmington, DE 19804) has the largest selection of discount Christian books, updated by monthly catalogues. Membership is \$5 per year; \$60 for a lifetime. Rev. Leonard Coppes (Box 55, Harrisville, PA 16038) offers a new work, helpful for evangelism and {119} introduction of church members to the Reformed faith: *Are Five Points Enough?: Ten Points of Calvinism* (\$4.40 postpaid). Loraine Boettner (Box 56, Rockport, MO 64482) offers five of his works, clothbound (*Reformed Doctrine of Predestination, Roman Catholicism, Studies in Theology, The Millennium, and Immortality*) for just \$12.50, postpaid—a great bargain—and *A Harmony of the Gospels* for \$1.50. The *Christian Reconstruction Book Club* (P. O. Box 8107, Tyler, TX 75711) offers a variety of fine Christian works on the subject of its title. Of course, the Christian activist and Christian school should have a complete set of *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* (P. O. Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251; \$5.00 per volume; any 3, \$13.00; any 6, \$25.00; all 15 volumes, \$55.00; \$9.00 per year) close at hand.

### 3. Education

The *Foundation for American Christian Education* (Box 27035, San Francisco, CA 94127), headed by Verna M. Hall and Rosalie J. Slater, those veritable geniuses of historical reconstruction via documentation, has printed a multi-volume *Christian History of the Constitution* which is must reading for Americans and Christians who would understand our past and rebuild our future. Rosalie J. Slater's *Teaching and Learning American's Christian History* is also valuable.

Rus Walton's *Plymouth Rock Foundation* (6 McKinley Circle, P. O. Box 425, Marlborough, NH 03455) offers the book/study course, *Fundamentals for American Christians*, for home, church, or school study. It also publishes the *Rock*, a quarterly journal on the biblical alternatives to humanism and socialism, and the monthly *Letter From Plymouth Rock*, and *Fact-Sheet*, which apply biblical principles to current issues. Supported by donations.

Dr. Robert L. Thoburn's *How To Establish and Operate a Successful Christian School* (available from Fairfax Christian Bookstore, 11121 Pope's Head Road,

Fairfax, VA 22030, for \$125—and well worth it) has been used to start over 500 Christian schools; it contains virtually all the information you will need to get involved in this basic aspect of Christian social action.

The *Christian Liberty Academy Home Studies Program* (Christian Liberty Academy, 203 E. McDonald Road, Prospect Heights, IL 60070), headed by Rev. Paul Lindstrom, is an extension of the ministry of the best Christian school in the Chicago area. Its hundreds of “satellite academies” meet in either private homes or rented buildings and churches. Its curriculum is high caliber, but designed to make education within the home possible for dedicated Christian parents, by making the education learner-centered, thereby enabling quality education with a minimum of parental supervision. The curriculum is traditional, Christian, and conservative, and {120} stresses Christian history, godly science, and free-enterprise economics.

*Accelerated Christian Education* (2600 Ace Lane, Lewisville, TX 75067), Dr. Donald R. Howard, President, is the largest supplier of curriculum materials to the burgeoning Christian school movement. It is involved in the founding of two out of the more than three Christian schools that are founded every day. Its curriculum is oriented toward individual study under supervision, toward self-instruction rather than teacher-instruction, and its program is designed primarily but not exclusively for church-based education. It is conservative, fundamentalist, patriotic, and free-market oriented, and it has excellent training seminars and conventions for its teachers and administrators.

The *American Association of Christian Schools* (1017 North School Street, Normal, IL 61761), Dr. Al Janney, President, helps to start and strengthen Christian schools, as well as to protect them, via monitoring legislation, aiding in teacher placement and the formation of state or regional associations, providing a directory of member schools, and providing a speakers’ bureau. It also certifies qualified Christian teachers and accredits Christian schools. (This is better than the state’s doing so, but it would be well to investigate the criteria used before approving/accrediting!—such certification and accreditation.)

The *Association of Christian Schools International* (Box 4097, Whittier, CA 90607), Dr. Paul Kienel, Executive Director, is a service organization which provides professional information, conventions and seminars for teachers and principals, school supplies, curriculum materials, and legislative and legal

protection for its member schools. It publishes *Christian School Comment* (monthly) and other materials.

*Pensacola Christian Correspondence School* (125 St. John Street, Pensacola, FL 32503), Miss Barbara Bradley, Principal, is the extension branch of Pensacola Christian School. It uses the A BEKA BOOK curriculum and texts, and provides courses from two to three year old nursery to twelfth grade, and is designed for either home or school use. Its program is conservative, fundamentalist, and patriotic.

Mel and Norma Gabler, *Educational Research Analysts* (Box 7518, Longview, TX 75607), are the best known Christian and conservative reviewers and critics of “public” school textbooks, and have the largest textbook review library in existence. They also are active in criticizing proposed texts before state review boards, and their reviews are mostly detailed and specific critiques of applied humanism.

*America’s Future* (542 Main Street, New Rochelle, NY 10801), Rudolf K. Scott, Chairman, provides *Textbook Evaluations* (free), a booklet, *Readings for Liberty* (including humanistic advocates of liberty), conservative pamphlets and booklets on a variety of subjects, and *America’s Future*, a biweekly newsletter on political and economic issues. {121}

*Education Update* is the educational policy letter of *The Heritage Foundation* (513 C Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002), edited by Dr. Onalee McGraw. It is timely and excellent, and includes information on other organizations and publications on the right side of the education and family-related issues.

*Save the Schools* (P. O. Box 301, Willamina, OR 97396), is an excellent newsletter published by Save the Schools Inc. (10 times per year, \$15.00), and edited by Lance J. Klass. Recent issues have included a perceptive analysis of the “Death Education” phenomenon in the government schools as a means of desensitizing children and society to death, in order to pave the way for control, and analyses of the various impacts of humanism on “public” education. It also provides a list of resources for safeguarding good education and protecting parental rights.

*The Institute for Creation Research* (2716 Madison Avenue, San Diego, CA 92116), Dr. Henry Morris, Director, sponsors and conducts research and education in the scientific basis of creationism. It conducts college level courses, lectures, seminars, workshops, debates, and a weekly nationwide radio broadcast. It publishes books, texts for both Christian and government schools, cassettes, filmstrips, and slides. It also seeks to reestablish the teaching of creationism as a

scientifically viable alternative to evolutionism in government schools (which is better than what we have now, but not so good as establishing biblical creationism as the only scripturally, intellectually, and morally viable option).

*Christian Schools International* (3350 East Paris Avenue, S.E., Grand Rapids, MI 49508), Dr. Michael T. Ruiter, Executive Director, is the Calvinistic educational service and curriculum organization (if you don't count Bob Thoburn's Fairfax Christian School). It supplies member and nonmember schools with texts, teachers' manuals, curriculum materials, assists in starting Christian schools, and publishes *Christian Home and School* magazine (\$4.25 per year). It also administers pension plans, trust funds, insurance programs and annuities, and provides liaison with government agencies (how much liaison and what kind of liaison I don't know). It favors tax credit and tax deduction for the money we spend to educate our children.

The *Intercollegiate Studies Institute* (14 South Bryn Mawr Avenue, Bryn Mawr, PA 19010), E. Victor Milione, President, Robert A. Schadler, Executive Director, is a prestigious conservative intellectual organization aimed at college students and teachers. It is broadly representative of the conservative intellectual spectrum, with an emphasis on "natural law" doctrines. It publishes the *Intercollegiate Review* and *Modern Age*, two wide-ranging scholarly journals (the former is sent free to college students and teachers) which occasionally have articles dealing with Christianity and various aspects of economics and society, though seldom {122} (recently) from anything like a *sola scriptura* viewpoint. Still, these are most helpful publications, when their biases are kept in mind. The I.S.I. also sponsors excellent summer schools and lectures, and awards prestigious Richard M. Weaver Fellowships annually to a small number of college students. In addition, it sponsors seminars on the role of business in society, and offers great discounts on selected conservative books.

*Valley Christian University* (Box 73, Clovis, CA 93613), Dr. Murray Norris, President, offers Bachelor, Master, and Doctorate degrees to both resident students and students who study at home and meet with supervising professors each week. It is one of a very few institutions of higher learning that is Christian in fact as well as in name. The Chalcedon Foundation handles the Political Science Department. Catalogue and periodical publication samples \$1.00.

#### 4. Law and Legal Defense

The *Christian Law Association* (6929 West 130th Street, Suite 600, Cleveland, OH 44130; Phone: 216-888-5575), Dr. David C. Gibbs Jr., President, is probably the

leading organization for the defense of Christian schools and institutions, under the First Amendment and our scriptural obligations. Its monthly magazine, the *CLA Defender* (sent to those who contribute \$5.00 or more monthly) provides an excellent, popular account of current legal battles for family, children, church, and various ministries. It also sends a monthly *Teacher's Forum* newsletter to private and Christian schools that support its ministry. In addition, it has excellent tapes—many taken from its lawyers' and pastors' speeches at its biblical legal seminars or Christian school conventions (\$4.50 each, postpaid). David Gibbs's tapes are especially powerful, and are excellent for introducing people to the duty of Christian education, as well as to the legal issues involved in the totalitarian humanist attack on Christian schools and institutions.

*The Center for Law and Religious Freedom* (P. O. Box 2069, Oak Park, IL 60303; Phone: 312-848-7735), Mr. Lynn R. Buzzard, Executive Director, similarly seeks to defend and enhance Christians' rights to the free exercise of religion under the First Amendment, across a broad spectrum of government devices to restrain Christian activities. This is also the address of the long-needed *Christian Legal Society* (Phone: 312-848-6335), which publishes the *Christian Legal Society Quarterly*. The Center has a lay division for nonlawyers who want to receive its publications (\$15.00 per year). It publishes the *Advocate*, a quarterly newsletter on church-state issues, as well as issues papers on selected topics; it also sells a set of tapes on "Public Education and Christian Freedom," and one on "Private Education and Christian Freedom."

*Citizens for Decency Through Law Inc.* (450 Leader Building, Cleveland, OH 44114; Phone: 216-241-0084), founded by Charles Keating Jr., {123} both encourages the production and dissemination of literature and media content which is truly socially valuable (as opposed to humanistic courts' moral relativism) and fosters public awareness of, and law enforcement and prosecution of, obscene, lewd, lascivious, and pornographic mass communications works. It offers information and assistance to those who oppose the spread of obscenity, and publishes the bimonthly *National Decency Reporter*, which reports on the obscenity issue in general and also on particular prosecutions.

The *National Federation for Decency* (Box 1398, Tupelo, MS 38801), Rev. Donald Wildmon, Executive Director, seeks to use consumer pressure, rather than law-making, to persuade television sponsors to cease attacking the biblical ethic in regard to sex, blasphemy, and violence. It surveys TV programming and rates

programs, sponsors, and networks; its *NFD Newsletter* (\$10.00 per year) provides specifics.

The *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy* (233 Langdall Hall, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA 02138) offers, believe it or not, a conservative view of these subjects, and has printed some important articles (e.g., by Dr. Wendell R. Bird) on the First Amendment and religious freedom. Its low subscription price (\$4.00 yearly) makes it well worthwhile.

The *Washington Legal Foundation* (1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006; Phone: 202-857-0240), Dan Poppeo, General Counsel, is a nonprofit, tax-exempt legal foundation which fights for the public interest against government bureaucrats and their left-wing, activist, Naderite “public interest” radical law firms. The Washington Legal Foundation works with the pro-family movement, and with others seeking to defend our traditional religious freedoms, and in general to defeat government policies and programs which encroach upon our traditional freedoms.

Happily, they are not alone in the battle. Other conservative public interest law firms, such as those listed below, serve a similar purpose in their regions: *Pacific Legal Foundation* (Suite 465, 455 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814); *Mid-America Legal Foundation* (20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60600); *Mid-Atlantic Legal Foundation* (1521 Locust Street, Suite 600, Philadelphia, PA 19102). (See CENSORED, page 29 for further listings of law-oriented organizations.)

## 5. Pro-Life

The *Christian Action Council* (788 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20045; Phone: 202-638-5441), Dr. Harold O. J. Brown, Founder and Chairman, Curtis J. Young, Executive Director, is the largest national Protestant pro-life organization; it is committed to the passage of a national Human Life Amendment to effectively stop abortion on demand in this country. It works with and through local Christian Action Councils in {124} education and action projects, and helps local churches to set up Crisis Pregnancy Centers to give women with “problem pregnancies” real alternatives to abortion. It distributes free pamphlets opposing abortion from a biblical perspective, and a free newsletter, *Action Line*, which reports on current events and the abortion fight.

*Alternatives to Abortion International* (Hillcrest Hotel, Suite 511, Madison & 16th Street, Toledo, OH 43624), Dr. John F. Hillabrand, Co-Founder, Mrs. Lore

Maier, Co-Founder and Executive Director, is a nonprofit, tax-exempt service organization that seeks to contact everyone with a problem pregnancy, and to lead them to protect the unborn life that they carry through providing and establishing contact with pro-life emergency service centers, as well as convincing them to live more moral “lifestyles.” It helps set up pregnancy crisis centers, and provides information to those who counsel pregnant women.

The *National Right to Life Committee Inc.* (Suite 341, National Press Building, 529 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20045), Carolyn F. Gerster, M.D., President, seeks to protect human life through an amendment to the Constitution, and to restore respect for the sanctity of all human life, from conception to natural death. It works with millions of grassroots American citizens, and does legislative research and lobbying to help grassroots citizens promote specific legislation before Congress. It acts as a liaison between state organizations and a resource base for pro-life educational materials. It publishes the *National Right to Life News* (monthly), a bimonthly educational mailing to chapters throughout the U.S. and overseas, *Legislative Alert* (when necessary), and *Legislative Update* (to provide background information), in addition to maintaining a speakers’ bureau.

The *Foundation for Life* (4901 Richmond, #101, Houston, TX 77027) publishes an excellent monthly newspaper, the *Life Advocate*, edited by Mrs. Margaret Hotze, as well as engaging in a wide variety of pro-life activities. The perspective of the *Life Advocate* is Roman Catholic, but Protestants can agree with most of what is advocated; it should be on your monthly reading list.

The *National Pro-Life Political Action Committee* (4848 North Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60640, and 101 Park Washington Court, Falls Church, VA 22024), Fr. Charles Fiore, O.P., Chairman, is the much needed other half of the pro-life movement. Its purpose is to elect antiabortion candidates to Congress and to vote the pro-murder turkeys out. It helps fund pro-life candidates and supplies information and educational material on candidates and their positions on the abortion issues, and publishes the monthly *Pro-Life Political Reporter* (\$10.00 per year), which reports on the political and legislative status of the pro-life movement and our candidates, as well as on education and legislation regarding abortion. {125}

*American Life Lobby Inc.* (Box 490, Stafford, VA 22554), Mrs. Judie Brown, President, seeks to divert state and federal money from pro-promiscuity, pro-abortion organizations like Planned Parenthood to local and community-based alternatives to abortion, seeks to expose the anti-life work of Planned Parent-



hood, and works for the adoption of a Human Life Amendment to the Constitution (life begins at conception). It opposes abortion as the tip of the humanistic iceberg, and seeks to defend Christianity and the Ten Commandments. It publishes *A.L.L. About Issues*, a monthly newsletter, a brochure on *Planned Parenthood and the Christian Family*, and other literature.

The *Human Life Review* (150 East 35th Street, Room #540, New York, NY 10016) is a popularly written quarterly, with some scholarly articles. It is excellent.

*Hiltz and Hayes Publishing Co.* (6304 Hamilton Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45224) is the source of a number of important pro-life books and publications.

The *Life Amendment Political Action Committee* (Box 14263, Washington, D.C. 20004), Paul A. Brown, Executive Director, has been very active and successful in the political struggle for life. It helps fund pro-life candidates, provides literature for distribution, targets key races, puts full-time experts into states where there are key races, and holds regional seminars to train pro-life people in the skills of politics.

*Baptists for Life* (2113 Alamo National Building, San Antonio, TX 78205), Rev. Robert Holbrook, Coordinator, concerns itself with all human life, unborn, aged, or handicapped, and distributes literature and participates in workshops and seminars to this end. It aims, as its title indicates, particularly at Baptists, and publishes the *Bulletin* monthly (\$5.00 per year) to help achieve this end.

*Libertarians for Life* (13424 Hathaway Drive, #12, Wheaton, MD 20906) provides useful information to give to libertarians who are not Christians, and are thus not disposed to listen to biblical arguments. (A Christian libertarian friend of mine, upon going to the Libertarian Party National Convention in 1972 and hearing the libertarian arguments for abortion, decided that he was *against* it.)

(For more organizations for life, see CENSORED, 31.)

## 6. Pro-Family

The *American Family Institute* (114 Fifth Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003), Carl A. Anderson, President, does research, distributes important publications (e.g., *Federal Spending and the Family*, by Donald Lambro; *Is the Family Constitutional?*, by John T. Noonan Jr.; *Family Freedom in Education*, by distinguished



constitutional lawyer and Christian institution defender William Ball), and holds seminars and conferences on the family. {126}

*Christian Family Renewal* (Box 73, Clovis, CA 93613), Dr. Murray Norris, President, is a long-standing pro-family organization. It distributes letters and publications—from a comic booklet series on homosexuality, abortion and euthanasia, adoption, and pornography to their *Monthly Pro-Life Newspaper* (\$5.00 per year) to books (*Weep for Your Children* [\$1.00], *Pro-Life Media Handbook* [\$1.00]). It also conducts seminars and “Family Renewal Rallies” featuring prominent Christian speakers.

*Christian Family Life* (1709 Paisley Blue Court, Vienna, VA 22180), Don Meredith, President (no, he’s not the football player!), ministers to members of Congress and their staffs and families, holds seminars on marriage, singleness, and parent-child relationships. It also distributes a *Newsletter* on its activities, with information on family issues (free), and a seminar on marriage recorded on cassettes.

*Pro-Family Forum* (Box 14701, Ft. Worth, TX 76117), Mrs. Lottie Beth Hobbs, President, is a nationwide organization dedicated to promoting and defending the family. It has therefore opposed the E.R.A., the International Women’s Year, the International Year of the Child, and the White House Conference on Families, as well as involving itself in textbook evaluation. It sees the family unit as basic to the nation and our freedom, and distributes books and literature against humanism and in defense of the family. It publishes *Pro-Family Forum Newsletter* (\$8.00 per year; free to members, who pay \$10.00 per year), and has a large stock of pro-family literature.

*The Right Woman* (410 First Street, S.E., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20003), written and edited by Mrs. JoAnn Gasper (\$28.00 per year), provides monthly information on issues and legislation in Congress affecting women and the family. It is very well informed.

*Family America* (499 South Capitol Street, Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20003), Louise Ropog, Director, is a division of the *Moral Majority*. It has an impressive list of founders from the Evangelical community, and acts as a clearinghouse for pro-family organizations, a liaison for organization, action, and information. It emphasizes the biblical family as the basic unit of society, the duty of parents,

not the State, to rear children, and the duty of Christians to influence their government.

*Eagle Forum* (P. O. Box 618, Alton, IL 62002), Phyllis Schlafly, President, is another well-known, Bible-based pro-family organization. It—and Mrs. Schlafly—has been especially prominent in opposing the unbiblical E.R.A. The *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, a monthly newsletter, analyzes and urges action on matters affecting women, the family, education, and national defense.

## 7. Political Action

*Christian Voice Inc.* (Box 415, Pacific Grove, CA 93950), {127} Rev. Richard Zone, Executive Director, is a large political lobby with considerable success in mobilizing Christian laymen and ministers for a biblical moral viewpoint and a conservative political impact “to turn the tide of battle against Satan’s forces” on all issues. It has a number of congressional members who bolster its speakers bureau and appear in its media productions on a number of subjects. It also publishes a *Monthly Newsletter* (free to contributors), which promotes special projects.

The *Christian Voters’ Victory Fund* (418 C. Street, N.E., Suite 1, Washington, D.C. 20002), Rev. Dale Silvers, Chairman, provides financial and other assistance to pro-family, pro-individual liberty, and pro-life candidates who stand for righteousness (tax credits may be taken on individual contributions of \$50.00 or joint-filing \$100.00 contributions). It also informs Christians of how their representatives vote on issues vital to Christians, through periodic voting indexes, such as the excellent *Family Issues Voting Index*.

The *Moral Majority* (499 South Capitol Street, Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20003), Dr. Jerry Falwell, President, has been so successful that it hardly needs mentioning. An organization that has all the humanists and theological “liberals” foaming at the mouth must be doing plenty right. Though led by Christians, the Moral Majority’s stands for our traditional values and freedoms are meant to appeal also to non-Christians who share these values. Its monthly newspaper, the *Moral Majority Report*, focuses on Washington from a Christian perspective.

The *National Association of Evangelicals* (1430 K Street, N. W., Suite 900), Rev. Robert Dugan Jr., Director, provides ministers and churches with information on legislation of concern to them, and supports or opposes legislation. Its

monthly newsletter, *Washington Insight* (\$15.00 per year; free with \$20.00 membership) informs Christians of matters of interest generated by the feds.

The *National Christian Action Coalition* (418 C Street, N.E., Suite 1, Washington, D.C. 20002), William Billings, Executive Director, like the Moral Majority and its brother organization, the Christian Voters' Victory Fund, has the humanists and their allies mad at it. The NCAC works closely with congressmen, senators, and their staffs, monitoring pertinent legislation. It encourages Christian participation in government via the monthly newsletter, the *Alert* (\$10.00 per year), on family and freedom issues, the *Family Issues Voting Index*, and the distribution of selected books, such as Mr. Billings's excellent *Christian's Political Action Manual* (\$6.00, postpaid). Its *Christian Research and Educational Foundation* establishes and works with Teen Political Action Clubs (TEEN-PAC) in Christian high schools.

*The Roundtable* (1500 Wilson Blvd., Suite 502, Arlington, VA 22209), Edward E. McAteer, President, is a coalition of national Christian {128} leaders (big names in the Evangelical community) seeking a moral rebirth of America, and involving a wide range of moral issues. It holds seminars six times yearly in Washington, for its leader-members, and designs leadership training or informational seminars for any location. It also distributes informational literature.

The *American Conservative Union* (316 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Washington D.C. 20003) is a prestigious conservative political organization of long-standing (and long-suffering) status in Washington. It has a national membership, and publishes a monthly newsletter, *Battle Line*. Its brother organization, the *ACU Education and Research Institute* (600 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Suite 207, Washington, D.C. 20003), chaired by Christian scholar M. Stanton Evans, does *Policy Studies* on a wide variety of current topics, and *Issues in Brief* on a similar diversity of topics.

*The Conservative Caucus Inc.* (422 Maple Avenue, East, Vienna, VA 22180), Howard Phillips, National Director, seeks to influence federal policy through a network of congressional district-level, nonpartisan organizations which seek to center the debate in each district around conservative issues and to influence the ideas of each congressman. It also produces television films and fights for conservative principles on specific issues. It publishes *Member's Report* quarterly

(\$10 contribution), *Grass Roots* (\$15), on leadership, and *Senate Report* (\$20; quarterly).

*The Heritage Foundation* (513 C Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002) is perhaps the most influential conservative think tank in America today. It publishes numerous books, monographs, and shorter policy studies, all of which are high quality, though not thoroughly biblical in their principles. However, Christians should consult these studies for their information and also for much of their analysis.

Two organizations dealing with Blacks need to be mentioned:

*The Lincoln Institute for Research and Education* (1735 DeSales Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036), J. A. Parker, President, publishes an important quarterly journal, the *Lincoln Review* (\$3 per copy; \$12 per year; \$22 for two years; \$30 for three years), edited by J. A. Parker, and aimed at clarifying the impact of public policy on Blacks. It is one-of-a-kind, and well worth reading, since it goes against the tide of media-popularized conventional pseudo-wisdom in its field.

*The Black Silent Majority Committee of the U.S.A.* (Box 5519, 2714 West Avenue, San Antonio, TX 78201), Clay Claiborn, National Director, seeks to organize Blacks who do not want to be associated with the “leadership” of the radical leftist “spokesmen” who usually get all the media coverage. It works to better race relations by stressing our traditional Bible-based virtues, and to enunciate a conservative viewpoint on political issues. It publishes a quarterly *Crusader Newspaper* and several brochures and booklets. {129}

Finally, we must note the work of two libertarian organizations with which Christians can substantially agree (at least as to programs) on the excessive burden of taxation. The *National Taxpayers Union* (325 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003) keeps us aware of the actual burden of taxes and the interest on the government debt, and works to reduce taxes. The *Local Government Center* (221 West Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101), headed by Robert W. Poole Jr., works for tax limitation and increased individual liberty by distributing excellent books and literature showing how local governments can cut costs without reducing essential services. Its suggestions are not only theo-

retically sound but also practically proven, at the local level, by numerous, though neglected, private and governmental experiences.

### 8. Anti-Communist Organizations

Our most effective anti-Communist organization is the *Christian Anti-Communist Crusade* (Box 890, Long Beach, CA 90801), presided over by Dr. Fred C. Schwarz. The CACC is a thoroughly reliable and well-informed organization, with operations that extend beyond the American battlefield to the battlefields on foreign soil. Its *Crusade Newsletter* (free; biweekly) provides both analysis and reprints from Communist publications. It conducts excellent seminars for diverse groups on the nature and tactics of Communism, distributes millions of pieces of good anti-Communist literature—including Dr. Schwarz’s *You Can Trust the Communists (To Be Communists)*—and films and cassette tapes, makes speakers, films, and literature available for churches and other organizations, supports orphans, supports anti-Communist projects overseas, and attempts to educate and inform members of Congress about the nature of the Communist threat. The CACC is supported by tax-deductible donations, and should be supported by you. Its latest project is a multimillion dollar propaganda counter-offensive against the Communists throughout the world.

The *Church League of America* (422 North Prospect Street, Wheaton, IL 60187), Major Edgar C. Bundy, Executive Secretary, is another long-standing and effective anti-Communist and anti-“Liberation Theology” organization. It does extensive research on the Communist Party and leftist radical subversive activity in the United States, and provides educational books, booklets, and other materials on these things. It publishes *News & Views* (\$10 per year), a monthly review of current leftist subversive activities, and *National Laymen’s Digest*, a biweekly newsletter (\$15 per year); it also does special reports on various leftist organizations, publications, individuals, and movements.

Dr. Robert S. Rapp, President of the *Korea Presbyterian Theological Seminary* (Nam Seoul P. O. Box 11, Seoul, Korea) combines missionary {130} outreach and the education of Koreans to run their own institutions with a strong anti-Communist and anti-“Liberation Theology” stand. His studies on Communism and the World Council of Churches as “a vehicle for anti-Christian, Marxist, and pro-Communist programs and propaganda” are excellent, and deserve a wider

circulation. These studies are available from Dr. Rapp at 15 Country Side Lane, Leola, PA 17540.

*Stockholders for World Freedom* (P. O. Box 140, Woodland Hills, CA 91365), headed by Carl Olson, seeks to “promote free enterprise in a Free World,” by using stockholder or stockholder proxy resolutions to educate fellow stockholders and corporate executives about the moral and practical evils of trading with the Communist bloc countries and supporting schools with Marxist or Communist faculty members or faculties. Typical resolutions urge that a given corporation stop Communist trade, report on Communist or Soviet Bloc trade, cease donations to schools with Communist or Marxist faculties, or sponsor free-enterprise ads.

### 9. Publications

*Temple Times* (Calvary Temple, 2560 Sylvan Road, East Point, GA 30344), edited by Rev. Robert McCurry, is one of the best newsletters around. It is well-informed about government’s latest interventions, partly because the bureaucrats seem to want to silence his ministry. *Temple Times* is free, though worthy of a good donation.

The *Conservative Digest* (7777 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22043; subscriptions 631 Independence Avenue, Marion, OH 43302; \$15 per year), Richard Viguerie, Publisher, is a hard-line conservative, pro-Christian popular magazine which covers a broad range of issues and personalities on the national and world scene. It is well-written and researched, and is well worth the subscription price.

*Human Events* (422 First Street, S.E., Washington; D.C. 20003; various rates), edited by Alan Ryskind, is the best weekly conservative newspaper; it reports on both national and state politics, with sallies into local politics of national significance. It is an excellent and respected source of information and mainstream, but staunch, conservative views of current events and recent trends.

*Policy Review* (The Heritage Foundation, 513 C Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002), Robert L. Schuettinger, ed., is an excellent, well-researched journal on public policy, in which the big names of conservative and quasi-conservative politics and political scholarship regularly appear. It is one of the policy “movers and shakers” on the conservative side of the Washington scene, though (as one

must suspect of purely conservative organizations and publications) not a *sola scriptura* publication.

For Christians interested in economic, political, financial, and survival advice, three newsletters stand out: Gary North's *Remnant Review* (P. O. {131} Box 39800, Phoenix, AZ 85069; 22 issues per year, \$95), is, of course, Christian and free-market in its perspective; it also offers selected books and booklets on investing, economics, the military situation and other matters. R. E. McMaster Jr.'s the *Reaper* (P. O. Box 39026, Phoenix, AZ 85069; 47 issues per year, \$25 for a five issue trial, \$225 for one year) specializes in commodity advice as well as in social, political, and economic analysis. Thomas H. Shiffler's the *American Sentry Report* (P. O. Box 653, Ashland, OH 44805; monthly; 6 months, \$16; one year, \$29; two years, \$49) specializes in financial advice for the "little guy," as well as in socioeconomic-political analysis.

Finally, if you have gotten the message of the introduction to this list of sources, you know that all things affect Christians and their loved ones and institutions, that humanism in its various and virulent forms is waging a war of destruction on Christianity, and that we must become socially and politically involved to defend God's authority and His principles of righteousness embodied in our lives and institutions. You also know that our great and sovereign Lord has commanded His church to affect all things, to occupy all spheres of life for Him, under His word and law, to have dominion over the earth under Him. Thus, you should be interested in the *Christian Reconstruction Report* (Sovereign Grace Reformed Church, P. O. Box 658, Ashland, OH 44805), edited by Paul Ferroni. This free quarterly newsletter seeks to act as a clearing house of information for those committed to reconstructing all things for Christ, under His law.

### Conclusion

We have a calling, a commandment, and a commission from the Lord of heaven and earth both to defend His word and institutions and to conquer for Him, under His matchless law and word. If He is for us, none can stand against us! We are not alone: He is with us, and has raised up thousands more who are committed to the fullness of His Great Commission. Let the army of Christ then use the talents and resources He has given us, and march onward to victory!

# THE CASE OF THE MISSING BLUEPRINTS

---

*David H. Chilton*

## *A Parable. . .*

The community of Anomia was in an uproar. Everyone insisted, “Something must be done!” The trouble was, nobody was really sure about just *what* to do. You see, they were all gathered together to build a City, but all agreed that there were no blueprints. True, the Architect *had* laid out the blueprints, long ago—most everyone conceded *that* point. And everyone even had a copy in his own language. They read this book—*The Builder’s Manual*—every day. But that’s where all agreement ended, and the building program had come to a halt.

Some said the *Manual* was outdated—after all, this was to be a modern City, and the *Manual* had been written in the days before freeways; surely it could be of no contemporary usefulness. Moreover, they insisted, even when it was first written, it had a lot of structural errors. (This point was amply demonstrated by referring to the fact that many of the specific instructions contained provisions which all Anomians of every party absolutely opposed.) “The *Manual* is wrong,” they declared. “Nobody in his right mind wants the City to look like *that*!”

But others were not so bold. “After all,” they countered, “those blueprints may have worked in ages past. But we are in a New Age. Surely, if we were to build the City according to those old blueprints, we would have nothing less than an Architectocracy! And nobody wants that. Not here in Anomia.”

An offshoot of this group took the argument even further: “Therefore, the City cannot be built! There are no blueprints; there is no plan to which we are all agreed. We are wasting our time trying to build one. If the Architect wants a City, let him come back and build it himself!” And they dropped their tools to the ground. They did not, however, abandon the project entirely. They began holding weekly conferences to chart what would happen when the Architect returned someday,



mapping out the beauties of the future City—plus a few minor alterations of their own—and singing their theme song: “There’s A City In My Heart.” Whenever a passing stranger would point out that the Architect had commanded them to build the City *before* he returned, they would immediately dismiss him as a raving “Manualist” or an “Architectocrat.” {133}

Finally, some younger Anomians put forth some new, refreshing ideas. “We agree with you all about the blueprints,” they said. “It is indeed surprising that in a supposedly all-encompassing *Manual* such as ours, with 1,189 chapters, that there are no blueprints at all. But there are none—of that we may be sure. On the other hand, we really should build a City. The Architect says so.” And they quoted stirring passages from the *Manual* to prove it.

“But we still have no blueprints,” someone complained. “How can we build a City without blueprints?”

“I’m so glad you asked,” replied an authoritative-sounding voice. A hush fell over the crowd as the speaker was recognized. It was none other than Dr. DeMand Side, a distinguished professor at the School of *Manual Arts*, an expert in Blueprint Theory. (He was also known by his associates as an avid collector of Candy Canes and old German Marks, but he had never publicly admitted to being either a Canesian or a Marksist.) Dr. Side informed the audience that the reason for their dilemma was that everyone had ignored the *Supplement* to the *Manual*—that the missing blueprints had been in there all the time. “The *Supplement*,” he went on, “was composed by some junior architects around 1848, and it has since proved very useful in building Cities.”

“Wait a minute!” cried an old man. “I know what you’re talking about! That’s no ‘supplement’ at all. Those architects wrote that in order to *replace* the *Manual*. They had no intention of supplementing it!”

Dr. Side sighed heavily. Some of his followers (called the Other Siders) moved menacingly in the old man’s direction with clubs, but Dr. Side stopped them. “*Now* is not the time for violence,” he whispered. “*Now* is the time for the Gentle Nudge.” And so, as the Other Siders gently nudged the old man to the edge of the crowd, Dr. Side graciously answered his objection. “Yes, it’s true. The men who wrote the *Supplement* hated the *Manual*, and wanted to replace it. They were very

wrong, and I certainly do not mean to condone any of their actions. Nevertheless, their practical programs harmonize very nicely with the *Manual* itself, especially if we disregard the outdated parts. Has any Anomian come up with a better plan? And what alternative is there? Surely, none among us would choose to implement the actual instructions in the *Manual*! That would be barbaric!”

Everyone nodded. The professor certainly had a point there. Sensing his advantage, Dr. Side held up a copy of his recent book, *City Builders in an Age of Cave Dwellers*, and proclaimed: “The answers are all in this book! The blueprints are no longer missing!”

The crowd went mad. At last, here were answers! Here was a way to build the City without going by the *Manual*—and without seeming to reject the *Manual*, either. Thousands of Dr. Side’s books were sold. And while it didn’t quite live up to its reputation (*it* didn’t actually have detailed {134} blueprints either—just a general theme in terms of the 1848 *Supplement*), it accomplished a lot. It made the Anomians feel guilty for the way they had been building in the past. It showed how those parts of the City that had been built should be torn down. It demonstrated that the City had been built at the expense of the Cave Dwellers (well... it didn’t exactly *demonstrate* that point, but it repeated it so many times that everyone believed it). *And, from the Anomian point of view, it was irrefutable.*

The people of Anomia gladly gave Dr. Side and the Other Siders the power to do whatever they wanted. And he, in turn, provided everyone with a lifetime supply of Candy Canes and German Marks. Some began complaining that the Canes didn’t digest well, and that the Marks had no exchange value; but troublemakers were quickly silenced. More people began reading the *Supplement*; and the *Manual* (if it was read at all) was reserved for reading at funerals, where people talked of the City in the Sky. And there were many funerals, more than in the old days; but the Other Siders explained that it was only because they were not destroying the City quickly enough. “Besides,” Dr. Side would say,—quoting one of his mentors—“you can’t make an omelette without breaking a few eggs.”

So the work went on, as the clouds gathered over their heads. The work went on, as thunder began to roll. The work went on, until the storm finally broke; until the rain descended, and the floods came, and

the winds blew, and beat upon Anomia; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. And the Anomians hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains (for by now they were *all* Cave Dwellers); and said to the mountains and rocks, “Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Architect; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?”

But there was one final surprise in store for the Anomians. It came after the End, when Dr. Side removed his mask.

### *... And the Interpretation Thereof*

The Revolution is here. It is waging war against biblical Christianity on all fronts: denying the inerrancy of Scripture, proclaiming homosexuality as freedom, declaring the slaughter of the unborn to be a woman’s right, calling for statist domination, advocating theft, championing the cause of insurrection, funding terrorist activities ... but something doesn’t make sense. Many in the vanguard of the Revolution are self-proclaimed evangelical Christians who claim to stand for “justice rooted in discipleship,” as one slogan puts it. How is this possible? Can a committed Christian really be a dedicated Marxist?

While some would shrink from such a bold (and honest) statement of their position, many of these evangelicals would answer *yes*. Others would mouth pious-sounding gobbledygook like: “Christianity is not an ideology. {135} Christianity involves us in mystical union with the transcendent Other, in order that we may then develop critical insights through interaction with the humanness of our cultural environment. Out of this profound faith we can find commonality with those non-Christian visionaries who are nonetheless achieving solidarity with Christ by seeking to humanize our existence. The beatific ideal of the New Jerusalem must become contextualized within the mortal experience through fellowshiping under the Cross with the poor and oppressed. And that, of course, begins with sticking it to the capitalists, as our Lord reminds us: Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, Capitalist roaders, bourgeois running dogs....” Here too, their answer is yes, Christians can be Marxists.

Not all the “social action” evangelicals would support each plank in the platform. Some are concerned more about environmental pollution than about revolution in El Salvador; some agitate for “the simple life,”

while others are occupied with subsidizing obsolete railroads. Certain pacifists claim to have grave doubts about the acceptability of violence, while others defend it for the “oppressed.” But the theme uniting them all is socialism. By *socialism* I do not necessarily mean the Soviet flavor. Ever since Solzhenitsyn’s first *Gulag* volume, the USSR has received a fairly bad press, and socialists often claim the Soviets have been “unfaithful” to true Marxism. “True” Marxism could *never* produce the horrors of the Gulag. The cudgel of Liberation passed to Red China for a while, but since the fall of “the Gang of Four,” many have felt that the “People’s Republic” has sold out to the West. So the hopeful have turned to Cuba and the “Third World” to discover new directions for socialism. Still others would not dare to call their reform programs by the name *socialism*, since that might drive away their middle-class audience. But the *policies* they advocate are identical to those of admitted socialists. The only difference is in the name.

Turning from generalities to specifics, let us take a look at some of the various groups which compose the “Christian” socialist movement. One of the most active of these is the Evangelicals for Social Action (ESA), “a national membership organization committed to the preaching and practice of biblical justice and peace,” according to one of its publications. The ESA grew out of a meeting of 40 evangelical leaders in Chicago, which produced the *Chicago Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern* (November 25, 1973). The *Chicago Declaration* complains of “the maldistribution of the nation’s wealth and services,” and calls for “a more just acquisition and distribution of the world’s resources.” It also claims to “endorse no political ideology or party.”<sup>130</sup> The president of this nonideological outfit is Dr. Ronald J. Sider, professor of theology at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. He has authored several books, most notably {136} *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*,<sup>131</sup> which was the main target of my recent book, *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators*.<sup>132</sup>

130. “ESA” (pamphlet), Evangelicals for Social Action (Philadelphia), 4–5.

131. Ronald J. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1977); cited below as *Rich Christians*.

132. David Chilton, *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1981).

Sider's book explains the ESA philosophy in the same detail; and while it is vague about specific policies, it is probably the best source for understanding their general position.

Two related groups are Jubilee Fellowship in Philadelphia and Sojourners Fellowship in Washington, D.C. Jubilee Fellowship (founded by Sider) imports Jubilee Crafts ("Third-World" products), administers the Jubilee Fund, and publishes *theOtherSide* magazine, all sharing the same address with ESA. Sojourners Fellowship is a commune in which individual decisions regarding practically everything are outlawed:

Where we work; how much income is earned; how much is spent on rent, food, clothing, long-distance calls; where and how one goes on vacation; how much spending money one has and so on are all "submitted decisions," not strictly up to the individual.<sup>133</sup>

Thus, in this budding paradise, all income is pooled into a central account—"with a couple of exceptions for administrative reasons"<sup>134</sup> (isn't that how the Kremlin puts it too?)—and it is disbursed on a strict schedule: "Each adult receives \$15.00 spending money per month; clothing expenses are under \$5.00 per person per month," etc.<sup>135</sup> Everything is shared—"our gifts, vocation, ministry, relationships, marriage and singleness."<sup>136</sup> I am not sure just how one shares his marriage, and I am not at all sure I want to find out; but then I am a greedy, possessive capitalist, so I probably would not understand. Anyway, Sojourners Fellowship publishes *Sojourners* magazine, which, like *theOtherSide*, is largely dedicated to "Christian" socialist concerns. It began as the *Post-American* at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Chicago) in the early 1970s. Both magazines are forums for presenting the views of lesser-known activist groups, such as the Association for Public Justice, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, Christians for Justice in Development, Liberty to the Captives, and so on. While

---

133. Joe Roos, "Sojourners Fellowship," in Ronald J. Sider, ed., *Living More Simply: Biblical Principles & Practical Models* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 117.

134. *Ibid.*, 118.

135. *Ibid.*, 119.

136. *Ibid.*, 117.

there are differences in style and emphasis, these groups have several principles in common: the rejection of biblical standards; socialism; violence (yes, *violence*); guilt-manipulation rooted in envy; and the goal of {137} enslaving Christians to the whims of an omnipotent State.

### *Rejection of Biblical Standards*

On the surface, the charge that the “Christian” socialists reject the Bible seems completely untrue. Their books and articles quote the Scriptures constantly. Their claim to be “radically biblical” is so incessant that even the term *biblical* is often associated with them.<sup>137</sup> Consider these very commendable statements from Ronald Sider:

According to biblical faith, Yahweh is Lord of all things. He is the sovereign Lord of history. Economics is not a neutral, secular sphere independent of his lordship. Economic activity, like every other area of life, should be subject to his will and revelation.<sup>138</sup>

Following biblical principles on justice in society is the only way to lasting peace and social harmony for all societies.<sup>139</sup>

Notice what the methodological essence of theological liberalism is—it is allowing our thinking and living to be shaped by the surrounding society’s views and values rather than by biblical revelation.<sup>140</sup>

Scripture, as always, is the norm.<sup>141</sup>

These excellent statements would be all the more admirable if they were sincerely followed by Sider and his associates. But, alas, they are not. For Sider goes on to state that “God did not arbitrarily dictate social norms for his people,”<sup>142</sup> and that, when we ask specific questions about God’s will for the economic sphere, “the Bible does not directly answer these questions. *We do not find a comprehensive blueprint for a new economic order in Scripture.*”<sup>143</sup>

137. For an example, see Chilton, 169ff.

138. Sider, *Rich Christians*, 115.

139. *Ibid.*, 206.

140. Sider, “Resurrection and Liberation,” in Robert Rankin, ed., *The Recovery of Spirit in Higher Education* (New York: Seabury Press, 1980), 164.

141. Sider, *Rich Christians*, 210.

142. *Ibid.*, 205–6.

143. *Ibid.*, 205. Italics added.

Thus—even though God is the sovereign Lord of economics; even though economics should be subject to His revelation; even though biblical economic principles will provide lasting peace and social harmony; even though Scripture is the norm—*there are no norms!* God, who has promised all these wonderful blessings to those who obey Him, has abandoned us without leaving so much as a blueprint! Where shall we turn? As Eve discovered, if we declare that God’s blueprints are “missing,” we will find others who will be happy to accommodate us with *forged blueprints* of their own. The evangelical socialists have departed from God’s word, allowing their “thinking {138} and living to be shaped by the surrounding society’s views and values,” as Sider phrases it so well. For the question is not, and never has been, one of “blueprint or no blueprint.” The question will always be: “*Whose blueprint?*” As my introductory parable points out, there is always an Architect. Sider is merely applying for what he claims is a vacant job.

Since, according to the evangelical socialists, the “blueprint” is gone, they are busily drafting another. It would be instructive for us to compare certain aspects of their version to the Original. While the following points are not usually thought of as “economic,” they do provide an interesting clue to just how biblical these “biblically radical” evangelicals are.

### 1. Homosexuality.

As far as I know, Ronald Sider has not yet made a positive statement on behalf of “Christian” homosexuals. The most he has done is to contradict Leviticus 20:10,13: “I don’t want to have secular penalties exercised by the state for people who commit adultery or homosexual sins. People need to be free to make choices in that area...”<sup>144</sup> Sider’s associates in Jubilee Fellowship have gone further. The most blatant example is their June 1978 issue of *theOtherSide*, which was almost entirely given over to the topic of “Christian” homosexuality (its title is “The Gay Person’s Lonely Search for Answers”). Coeditor John Alexander’s column headlines his position that the answer is “not that clear,” and he argues that the biblical laws condemning homosexuality may be merely “ceremonial.”<sup>145</sup> The next article, by Mark Olson, complains that what

144. Interview, the *Wittenburg Door*, October/November 1979, 16.

145. *theOtherSide*, June 1978 (reprint issue), 8ff.

“conservative, Bible-believing Christians have done to gay brothers and sisters is appalling,” and he goes on to list the sins heterosexuals have committed against “Christian” homosexuals—such as *refusing to hug them*<sup>146</sup> (and 1 Cor. 5:11 joins the ever-growing category of “missing blueprints”). Following this is a lengthy section composed of an interview with a pro-homosexual group called “Evangelicals Concerned,”<sup>147</sup> interspersed by six “personal testimonies.” (An example: “It’s important to me that any partner I have be both gay and Christian. I pray constantly about this.” See Proverbs 28:9.) Then Wayne Holcomb equates the acceptance of homosexual “Christians” with the early church’s struggle to accept Gentile believers. “God’s call equalizes us,” he fervently reminds his readers.<sup>148</sup> Marty Hansen provides eleven pointers on how to “Love a gay.”<sup>149</sup> And the final gob of slime comes from theologian Lewis Smedes, who encourages homosexuals to “develop permanent associations” within their sex lives, as an alternative to “sexual {139} chaos.”<sup>150</sup> (Motto for a modern theologian: “I may not be biblical, but I’m relevant.”)

## 2. Feminism.

Here too, the message of *theOtherSide* is radical, but not particularly biblical. Rosemary Reuther writes of Jesus’s mother as a paradigm for revolution, urging us to cultivate a “Liberation Mariology.” Mary’s seeming submission to God’s will was actually a “radical, autonomous decision.” We must “liberate ourselves from the false male-headship model of Christ and church” (whatever happened to Ephesians 5? Oh, yeah—the “missing blueprints” again). Mary, in this Anomian theology, becomes “a model of messianic empowerment”—in fact, she is nothing less than “the head of the church.”<sup>151</sup> Naturally, the Bible does not quite fit into this feminist ideal; *ergo*, the Bible must be changed. So

---

146. *Ibid.*, 17ff. (I didn’t make that up. Olson said it quite seriously, and at some length.)

147. *Ibid.*, 25ff.

148. *Ibid.*, 41ff.

149. *Ibid.*, 48ff.

150. *Ibid.*, 65ff.

151. Rosemary Reuther, “She’s a Sign of God’s Liberating Power,” *theOtherSide*, May 1980, 17ff.



Virginia Mollenkott gets out the scissors, paste, and crayon for the task. We should see the Lord as the “Mother-God” rather than as the Father, she says; we should bear in mind that the Bible was written in a day of “patriarchal cultures,” so they didn’t know any better. Mollenkott does not suggest a *total* revolution yet—and so she generously allows us to keep praying to “Our Father.” But she also suggests “praying to ‘Our Mother’ on alternate weeks ....” Where other changes in the actual biblical text are required, she advises a nonsexist approach such as substituting “the Child of Humanity” for “the Son of Man.” Moreover, “the word *God* can be repeated rather than using a pronoun. ‘God gave himself’ can become ‘God gave God’s self.’”<sup>152</sup> (It may be appropriate to inform my readers that Mollenkott is an English professor, and that I am not. In my ignorance—compounded no doubt by my chauvinistic predilections—the phrase *God gave God’s self* sounds really awkward. But, again, *she’s* the professor—and it is *grammatically* correct. I just wonder how she would grade a paper that abounded in expressions like *John gave John’s self*. Or do English scores depend on ideology?) Even the Narnia Chronicles by C. S. Lewis come in for their fair share of scourging. John Alexander tells us that “*Lewis’s social views are gross*. His books are full of racism, classism, sexism, and violence—especially sexism and violence.”<sup>153</sup> And John Scanzoni issues a solemn warning to Phyllis Schlafly and her ilk: feminism “is a wave of the future that is permeating all social classes and cannot be stopped.”<sup>154</sup>

### 3. Abortion.

In June 1980, *theOtherSide* devoted an issue to “The Agony of Abortion.” The title is misleading. It does not refer to the agony {140} of the *aborted*—the unheard screams and cries of children for whom the once-protective womb has become a chamber of horrors—the little bodies being mangled, chopped, suctioned, choked, and poisoned—the final, futile reaching out to a mother who has turned murderer. No—it is the “agony” suffered by parents who have made the hard,

152. Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, “The Bible & Linguistic Change,” *theOtherSide*, June 1981, 14ff.

153. John Alexander, “What is Narnia Teaching My Kids?” *theOtherSide*, July 1977, 39.

154. John Scanzoni, “Feminism & the Poor,” *theOtherSide*, January 1978, 53.

costly (but liberating?) decision to butcher their babies. The articles are too filthy for me to attempt an analysis. I will mention only one, entitled “How I Faced Reality,” the story of an understandably anonymous woman who chose to sacrifice her child on the altar of convenience. “Instead of going on to new challenges in my work, I would be trapped at home with a baby.”<sup>155</sup> Naturally, as are most baby-killers, she was very concerned about the fate of her child should he grow to full term: “The twin possibilities of messing up an innocent child’s life and seeing our own lives permanently altered—for the worse—by something we hadn’t planned on, made abortion seem the only logical alternative.”<sup>156</sup> So, rather than “mess up” the child’s life, she compassionately snuffed it out. The self-justification that follows (because of the *agony*, don’t y’know) would be laughable were it not coming from a murderer:

What would have happened if I had not had the abortion? My husband maintains that I would have miscarried from the sheer weight of emotional stress. I maintain that the two of us would no longer be together, that our relationship would have cracked under the strain. Of course, only God knows what might have been. But I like to think that our decision was one in favor of dominion, a decision based on responsibility and discipleship.<sup>157</sup>

A letter-writer sent in a congratulatory note for such a “splendid” series of articles, but he had one complaint:

One point no one mentioned, however, is that every child born is a new polluter and user of the world’s resources and human services. And of all these new-born users and polluters, American babies are the worst.

In the effort to get zero population growth, perhaps abortion is not as unthinkable as it otherwise would be. Life must feed on life. And there are limits to the amount of human life our planet can sustain.<sup>158</sup>

While it is painful for me to pore through this garbage, from one point of view writing about it is easy: merely to quote these people is sufficient refutation. It is clear that for all their pretensions to biblical

---

155. *theOtherSide*, June 1980, 48.

156. *Ibid.*

157. *Ibid.* I must admit: I’ve never even thought of massacring children as an application of the Dominion Mandate (Gen. 1:26).

158. *theOtherSide*, September 1980, 2.

religion, the evangelical socialists have nothing but disdain for the actual standards of the Bible. At the same time, we should carefully note that *theOtherSide* does not claim to be *for* either homosexuality or abortion. On both issues {141} the editors have taken an official position of “ambiguity.” I mention this for two reasons: first, to be fair to them; and second, because “ambiguity” is actually an important tactic in their strategy—a tactic which we shall consider later on. Before we do, we should evaluate their less ambiguous stand on economic and political issues.

### Socialism

To virtually every question raised by Sider, the ESA, *theOtherSide*, and *Sojourners*, the answer they promise is socialistic—the state playing Robin Hood, robbing from the rich and giving to the poor. Sider has called for a state-mandated food policy,<sup>159</sup> a guaranteed national income,<sup>160</sup> a system of international taxation (with a one-world government run by the United Nations),<sup>161</sup> “land reform” (i.e., expropriation of lands from the rich),<sup>162</sup> “just prices” set by the state,<sup>163</sup> a national health-care plan,<sup>164</sup> population control,<sup>165</sup> and the right of developing nations to confiscate property owned by foreign investors.<sup>166</sup> All of these are possible only by theft of one sort or another. And that is the essence of socialism: it is legalized theft. It is burglary committed by a government against its citizens. Socialists are fond of saying they want *governments* to fund all the programs, but where do governments get the money? There are only two ways: taxation and inflation. Thus, when Stan Mooneyham tells us that foreign aid “must be the task of governments,”<sup>167</sup> and when Ronald Sider demands that “governments pay the price,”<sup>168</sup> they are really demanding that their

---

159. Sider, *Rich Christians*, 214.

160. *Ibid.*, 212.

161. *Ibid.*, 220.

162. *Ibid.*, 160, 218.

163. *Ibid.*, 165, 211–12.

164. *Ibid.*, 212, 218.

165. *Ibid.*, 214, 218.

166. *Ibid.*, 145.

neighbors “pay the price,” involuntarily, through legalized theft. Inflation is always theft, as is all taxation not allowed by the Bible.<sup>169</sup> The goal of socialism is to plunder those who own property. We must not be misled by the plea that these theft-funded programs are for the sake of the poor. The plight of the poor may be very real. But it is wrong to try to alleviate their hardships by stealing from others. Yes, the Bible tells us to care for the poor. But if we are to care for them in terms of Scripture, we must remember that the same Bible commands: “Thou shalt not steal.” Socialism is theft. {142}

It has been shown, again and again, that *socialism does not work*.<sup>170</sup> It does not—and cannot—achieve its official objective of caring for the poor (although it may be successful, for a limited time, in achieving its *actual* goal: enslaving citizens). But the important question is this: *why* doesn’t socialism work? And the answer is that it is a violation of God’s commands. The world works in terms of God’s law, and we invite disaster whenever we depart from His standards. Socialism and all forms of unbiblical state intervention wreak havoc on a culture because they substitute humanism in place of the law of God.

This does not mean we should neglect the poor. God commands us to care for them.<sup>171</sup> But God’s charity laws are *personal*, not statist. Charity is to be on the basis of personal, face-to-face contact. It is not the state’s place to regulate it or enforce it. It is not the state’s business to punish those who refuse to help the poor. That is God’s business, and He has promised to do it (Ex. 22:21–27). For us to hand the controls over to the state is to make the state our god.

### *Socialism and Violence*

Ronald Sider does not claim to be a socialist. He never uses the term in his writings (this point too will be examined in the “Ambiguity” section below). But his proposals are completely in line with the doctrines

---

167. W. Stanley Mooneyham, *What Do You Say to a Hungry World?* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1975), 261.

168. Sider, *Rich Christians*, 213.

169. See Chilton, 35.

170. *Ibid.*, 145ff.; see also my bibliography, 225ff.

171. *Ibid.*, 39ff.

of socialism. He wants government control over every area of economic activity. This is to be expected. Every socialist or interventionist program *must* seek complete dominance over all areas of human activity. You cannot really control *any* factor in an economy unless you control *all* the factors. There is only enough room for one god, one agent of economic planning.

In view of this, it is amusing—almost—to read Sider’s pleas for “non-violence.”<sup>172</sup> He even sounds sincere at times. But his policies of comprehensive statist planning require all sorts of violent intrusions upon liberty. They require armed men to enforce the expropriation of property. They must lead to bloodshed, or at least the threat of it. To claim pacifism, while working for tyranny, is simply a lie. It is just barely conceivable that Sider does not know what he is really saying. I doubt it.

But regardless of the mental gyrations Sider may be going through in order to camouflage his socialism, his comrades in Jubilee Fellowship are (again) more direct. During the brutal and bloody Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, the Jubilee Fund sent money to Sandinista (Marxist) guerrillas<sup>173</sup>—and the nonviolent Dr. Sider, a founding member, just maybe didn’t notice. Their magazine, *theOtherSide*, represented the revolution as a {143} “struggle for justice” between evangelicals and an oppressive dictatorship;<sup>174</sup> and one of its writers—obviously tickled at the opportunity to interview two Sandinista leaders—posted tough, radically biblical questions, such as: “What makes a good poet?”<sup>175</sup> When the revolution was over, this important publication on the cutting-edge of social justice gushed, “Spring has come to Nicaragua.”<sup>176</sup> Those who were murdered and raped with the help of the Jubilee Fund might have phrased it differently, of course. But they probably didn’t understand the issues. Marxism’s victims never do, right?

---

172. See *ibid.*, 62, 156 for citations.

173. *theOtherSide*, September 1979, 41.

174. *Ibid.*, 30ff.

175. *Ibid.*, 40.

176. W. Dayton Roberts, “Challenge and Hope in Nicaragua,” *theOtherSide*, May 1980, 35.

Then came El Salvador (not that there's any substance to the Domino Theory, mind you), and again *theOtherSide* was there to help the Ministry of Propaganda. One writer admitted that "El Salvador *does* have some armed organizations which are Marxist in character." He claimed, however, that the Marxists "have accommodated their efforts and their program to the will of the people."<sup>177</sup> Naturally. But, as Chairman Mao said, "We must first be clear on what is meant by 'the people' .... [T]he classes, strata and social groups which favor, support, and work for the cause of socialist construction all come within the category of *the people*, while the social forces and groups which resist the socialist revolution and are hostile to or sabotage socialist construction are all *enemies of the people*."<sup>178</sup> It is not difficult at all for Communists to accommodate their program to the people, because *they decide who "the people" are*. Those who oppose socialism just aren't people.

The above writer for *theOtherSide* went on to warn his readers never to use the word *terrorism* when describing the actions of the revolutionaries, because they are "resistance forces"; so whatever they do, it isn't terror.<sup>179</sup> A Presbyterian minister argued similarly in *Sojourners*:

Violence in the Scriptures is not what someone does to try to defend the oppressed-poor from the injustices that threaten their lives. Rather, violence in the Bible refers to what the oppressed-poor suffer at the hands of their wealthy oppressors.<sup>180</sup>

This may provide a clue about what Sider means when he says he's against "violence." Violence is only what the upper classes do to the lower classes. What the lower classes do may be *violent*, but it's not *violence*. (If this {144} sounds confusing to you, you probably haven't been to seminary. Seminaries often teach Greek and Hebrew, but the common tongue is Doublespeak. Example: "The Bible is *infallible*, but not *inerrant*." The achieving of a full professorship is usually a mark of exceptional fluency in this language. Its use keeps the money coming in

---

177. Blase Bonpane, "Seven Myths (And a Few Damned Lies) About El Salvador," *theOtherSide*, October 1980, 40.

178. *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1966), 45–46. Italics added.

179. Bonpane, 40.

180. Tom Hanks, "Why People Are Poor," *Sojourners*, January 1981, 21.

from *the enemies of the people*, in order to fund the activities of the seminary on behalf of *the people*.)

In an interview with Orlando Costas, staff members of *theOtherSide* asked how to go about attacking capitalism without losing their audience. Costas answered:

I think we are just going to have to start talking about socialism. People's reaction to socialism is more emotional than anything. But if people experience the Lord anew, they will be able to deal with socialism.... I see no other option but socialism.... The only alternative I know to capitalism is to reverse the whole thing and begin a proper distribution of the wealth.<sup>181</sup>

Costas continued:

Cuba has a lot to teach us, but Americans have too much emotional involvement to look at it. That is too bad. Cuba has a lot to teach in health, vocation, and social welfare. Just to give an illustration, *Cuba may be the one place in the world which is solving the housing problem*.<sup>182</sup>

I figured you would enjoy that one. Later on, when Costas mentioned "Christianity is not an ideology," and denied that Christianity provides "political and economic principles,"<sup>183</sup> an interviewer asked him if he meant that "the Bible doesn't have a blueprint." Costas replied:

Perhaps, but what you have just said seems to start from principles. The Christian faith is not based on principles but on the experience of Jesus Christ, our ultimate encounter with the mystery of life. You don't start from principles and apply them: rather you interact with your situation out of your understanding of this mysterious element. And you work out of that deep relationship. The issue at stake when I dialogue with Marxists is the category of mystery.<sup>184</sup>

Even the interviewer admitted that the above statement had him stumped, so you are not alone this time. He asked for a more precise explanation, and this is what he got:

---

181. "Socialism and the Christian Witness," *theOtherSide*, January-February 1976, 29-30.

182. *Ibid.*, 39. Italics added.

183. *Ibid.*, 41-42.

184. *Ibid.*, 43.

We who follow the Lord are led to a continuity with the poor, to a discontinuity with the powerful, to a vision of the cross in our situation, and that leads to socialism.... But socialism is not a final, ultimate {145} option; it is for our particular situation. You opt for it out of the most profound conviction of your faith in Christ.<sup>185</sup>

With a Sider already on the campus, it seems strange that the string-pullers at Eastern Baptist Seminary felt they needed a Costas as well. Nevertheless, in February 1980, Orlando Costas joined the faculty as Professor of Missiology and Director of Hispanic Studies. Was it something he said?

(By the way, I don't mean to give a false impression. I would not want my readers to assume that *theOtherSide* spends *all* its time plumping for socialism. Other, more mundane forms of theft are advocated as well—as in a recent article explaining how to ride on freight trains without the bother of buying tickets.<sup>186</sup> And, yes, a Bible verse was quoted in defense of stealing train rides: “Be not conformed to this world.”)

In terms of their socialist goals, one of the greatest hoaxes perpetrated by Sider and his friends is the notion of “the simple life,” the idea that one should live on a bare-subsistence income in order to help the poor. The concept is most fully developed—if one may call it that—in *Living More Simply*, a collection of papers presented at Sider's U.S. Consultation on Simple Lifestyle (1979). While Sider himself has always been careful to guard his statements, many of the contributors to the symposium were not so circumspect. It is a reviewer's nightmare. Virtually every page abounds with statements ranging from the depths of ignorance to the heights of nonsense—all of them informed by envy and statism. (If you think I've forgotten that we're supposed to be on the subject of *violence*, keep reading. We're getting there. This symposium on “Simple Lifestyle” is related to it.)

Here are some examples from this storehouse of simple living and simplistic thinking. William Pannell (a seminary professor) cites Exxon's profit margin and angrily asks: “Is that not an ethical issue?”<sup>187</sup>

---

185. *Ibid.*

186. Dan Stern, “Hopping and Hitching,” *theOtherSide*, May 1981, 20ff.

187. *Living More Simply*, 23.



Sure it is—as long as your ethics comes from somewhere other than Scripture. Peter H. Davids (another seminary professor) extends the argument: “Those who keep their money, no matter how honestly it is earned, are condemned by Jesus.”<sup>188</sup> Elaine Amerson (a university professor this time) longs for a “global society in which each person has full access to the needed resources for their [sic] physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual growth.”<sup>189</sup> For her, the “principle” of the Jubilee law (Lev. 25) is that “one does not own the land in perpetuity.”<sup>190</sup> {146}

Going further, the Mennonite Central Committee comes up with a “starter action list” of socialist and statist proposals such as “land-use legislation” and “government food policies,”<sup>191</sup> and Sider comments: “These thirty-nine items represent the accumulated wisdom of the Mennonite Central Committee.”<sup>192</sup> Unfortunately for the Mennonites, he is probably correct. In the same barren vein, Walter and Virginia Hearn (who have chosen a lifestyle of voluntary poverty, foraging for food in garbage cans, etc.) urge us to “think little”<sup>193</sup>—and the intellectual depth of essays in this volume clearly demonstrates that their fellow believers indeed followed their advice. Even what little thought remains in the book is positively Solomonic when compared to that of Joe Roos (Sojourners Fellowship), who declares that there is “a fundamental contradiction” between gathering wealth and worshipping God.<sup>194</sup> It is a pity no one told God about it before He went to the trouble of putting Deuteronomy 8:18 in the Bible: “The Lord thy God... giveth thee the power to make wealth.”

The trouble with wealth from the biblical viewpoint is not the wealth itself, but the fact (as all of Deut. 8 stresses) that wealth can be accompanied by forgetfulness of covenantal obligations. But the professional

---

188. *Ibid.*, 44.

189. *Ibid.*, 60ff. Use that line next time you rob a bank. It should explain everything.

190. *Ibid.*, 62. That is *not* the “Jubilee principle.” See Chilton, 127–32.

191. *Ibid.*, 68ff.

192. *Ibid.*, 73.

193. *Ibid.*, 77.

194. *Ibid.*, 116.

envier is blind to what the Bible says about sin's originating in men's hearts. All he sees is *money*.

Although the "love communism" of the Simple Lifers is unbiblical, they should be allowed to practice it. But they do not limit it to voluntarism. Voluntarism is a facade. The Simple Life—which is supposed to mean a purely voluntary way of sharing with others—is a hoax. Sider and his cadre have no intention of keeping it voluntary. They want it to be only a temporary, "visible model" of what the government should enforce.<sup>195</sup> In fact, Ronald Sider has expressed his contempt for private, personal charity. He does not want voluntary sharing, although a superficial reading of his books would seem to indicate otherwise. But, for Sider, personal giving is only a necessary first step in encouraging the government to coerce everyone into living "simply." Theft-financed government programs are, he says, "morally better" than the personal, compassionate charity commanded in the Bible.<sup>196</sup> Sider wants the state to enforce his perverse concept of equality upon all. And note well: *this cannot be done without the use of force*. That means guns, handcuffs, prisons, firing squads, and all the rest.

*Socialism is inseparable from violence*. Regardless of all their professions of peaceful intent, socialists everywhere have had to resort to the use of {147} violence to bring about their goals. They cannot do otherwise. The very nature of socialism—that the state shall be empowered to regulate and confiscate property—demands violent activity. The success of any socialistic "land reform" program depends on only one thing: which side has more firepower.

If Sider truly wished for a "nonviolent revolution," he would limit himself to exhorting wealthy citizens to give away their possessions—leaving it up to their own discretion as to how fully they will comply with his requests. But he has not so limited himself. He has called repeatedly for *legislation* of his demands. That brings in the state. And the only reason for bringing in the state is that the state has a legal monopoly on coercion and violence. The state has more firepower. Sider's program of the Gentle Nudge<sup>197</sup> is merely a temporary expedi-

195. See Sider, *Rich Christians*, 205; and Chilton, 139ff.

196. Sider, "Ambulance Drivers or Tunnel Builders" (Philadelphia: ESA, n.d.), 4.

197. See Chilton, 140.

ent. His goal, inescapably, is armed force. It is thus no accident, no oversight, that Sider's associates in the Jubilee Fund are using charity money to finance bloodthirsty terrorists.

Ronald Sider knows his history. He has identified his goals with those of terrorists in the past. Writing of Charles Finney (the nineteenth-century Pelagian heretic<sup>198</sup> and evangelical abolitionist who helped raise millions to finance terrorists gangs invading Kansas<sup>199</sup>), Sider gurgles: "I dream of that kind of movement in the church today...."<sup>200</sup> Otto Scott has written about the way the abolitionist campaign—which began with men who were committed to pacifism—eventually developed into wholesale slaughter:

The new religion had started with arguments against such relatively harmless sins as smoking and drinking, had then grown to crusades denouncing and forbidding even commerce with persons whose morals were held to be invidious; it had expanded into antislavery as the answer to every ill of humanity; and it had finally come to full flower in the belief that killing anyone—innocent or guilty—was an act of righteousness for a new morality.<sup>201</sup>

If you have not read Scott's book, *The Secret Six* (1979), you should. But there is another book you should read as well. It was written by Ronald Sider's brother-in-law, Donald W. Dayton, entitled *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*.<sup>202</sup> (It first appeared as a series of articles in the *Post-American*, which later became *Sojourners*.) The fascinating thing about {148} Dayton's book is that it reads like the flip side of *The Secret Six*, with the cast of characters presented as heroes. (Dayton also goes further, unearthing what he calls the "evangelical roots of feminism.") The book's thesis is that the theology and practice of Finney and his followers represent genuine evangelicalism, and that we should return

198. See Benjamin B. Warfield, *Perfectionism* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1958), 125–215.

199. See Chilton, 61–62.

200. Sider, "Words and Deeds," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* (December 1979): 318.

201. Otto Scott, *The Secret Six: John Brown and the Abolitionist Movement* (New York: Times Books, 1979), 295–96.

202. Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976).

to our “heritage” as soon as possible. Dayton’s explanation of the violence of his spiritual forebears amounts to a mere shrug: “They discovered that the world was more complicated than they thought.”<sup>203</sup> That is all he says in criticism of violence. How committed are the Sojourners to pacifism?

The evangelical socialists are aware of their violent, terrorist heritage. Their pacifism is a mask for their actual intent, and it is as successful a ploy today—and as lucrative—as it was in the last century. Do not be deceived: these men are Fools, but they are not stupid. They know exactly what they are doing.

### *Deliberate Ambiguity*

Again, these men are not stupid. They know who is funding the seminaries that hire them. They know that to make any overt moves toward totalitarianism would be disastrous. By and large, they are attempting to speak to middle-class American Christians, in order to gain wide support for their statist programs. If they were scrupulously honest, they would undoubtedly lose much of their audience. So they have chosen a deliberate ambiguity. It works like this: They drop hints. They imply. They ask leading questions. They quote other people who have taken positions similar to their own—but, naturally, they cannot be held responsible for *everything* in the quotes. And only rarely do they make a concrete statement of their standards and objectives.

For example, remember *theOtherSide’s* issues on homosexuality and abortion? The editors specifically disclaimed responsibility for what appeared in their magazine. They stated that they did not *endorse* either one of these abominations. As Mark Olson explained, “We took a firm position, calling abortion a question of moral ambiguity, requiring serious, honest, cautious struggle. That is not the lack of a position. We wish that were more widely understood.”<sup>204</sup> Thus, they are able to present evil under the guise of a forum for discussion. They do not officially endorse the material in their own publications. They are serving as propagandists, as efficiently as any official advocate could do; but they can hide behind their “moral ambiguity” while they do it. And, as

203. *Ibid.*, 124.

204. *the Other Side*, December 1980, 46.

Olson says, ambiguity is *not* the lack of a position. It may not be calling darkness *light*, but it is saying that darkness is not necessarily *dark*. It is the ancient, effective tactic of Satan: “Hath God {149} said...?” Sad to say, this tactic works.

One of the most difficult parts about writing my book was finding precise, pithy quotes from Sider to serve as introductions to each chapter. I kept finding good statements of his position that were unusable—they were either phrased as questions or else they were quotations from somebody else. One brazen example occurs on page 72 of *Rich Christians*, where Sider asks, in bold letters, IS GOD A MARXIST?—and then follows it up with six pages about how “the God of the Bible wreaks horrendous havoc on the rich.”<sup>205</sup> Does he ever *answer* the question? *No*. Can he be accused of *saying* God is a Marxist? *No*. But has he planted the seed of an idea that God is a Marxist? *Yes*.

And that is how the whole book runs. Sider is clever. He covers himself well. He almost never states any specific standard or goal. He never really provides a blueprint—“just a general theme in terms of the 1848 *Supplement*” (if I may indulge in a bit of obscurity myself). The same sort of ambiguity is evident in *Cry Justice*,<sup>206</sup> Sider’s annotated anthology of Bible quotations on poverty. I have no quarrel with the Scripture in the book (although the *translations* are occasionally sloppy). But Sider’s notes and the “tough, weighty” study questions at the back of the book are masterpieces of innuendo and insinuation. Little is actually *said*—but by sneaking in through the basement, Sider manages to say quite a lot. The following paragraph from my chapter about Sider’s objective, “Preparing the Church for Slavery,” sums it up:

Sider states himself somewhat vaguely with respect to the specific political programs he prefers, the means employed to enforce them, and the limits of state power. He is vague about just how much personal wealth constitutes immoral wealth. But he is clear enough: we need more compulsory wealth redistribution. We have too much wealth. Vague standards of righteousness, coupled with emotional generalities, can produce a lot of guilt. That, of course, is the whole point.<sup>207</sup>

205. Sider, *Rich Christians*, 77.

206. Sider, ed., *Cry Justice: The Bible Speaks on Hunger and Poverty* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980).

### *Guilt-Manipulation*

Guilt is one of the most important weapons in the arsenal of modern socialism. It is not the biblical concept of guilt—the objective condition of having broken God’s law—but rather the psychological *feeling* of being guilty. In a crude form, it might go like this: “Look at you: stuffing your fat face with a Big Mac, grease dripping off your pimply chin—while children in India are going hungry!” Now, the object of such an attack *may* be guilty (*truly* guilty) of gluttony; which, though wrong, is not a *crime* as such {150} in terms of Scripture.<sup>208</sup> But the accuser has implied that eating a hamburger, in and of itself, is *causing* Indian children to starve. There is no logical or historical *connection* between our hamburgers and hungry Indians, but the manipulative device can be effective when used by an expert.

And Sider is an expert. He is much too sophisticated to use the example above, but his logic is exactly the same. His doctrine is that *Western prosperity* does not come from God’s blessing, but from our *exploitation of the poor* instead. We are guilty of starving the “Third World,” he says, because we eat meat, use fertilizer, drink wine and coffee, make profits, have extra clothes in the closet, and so on.<sup>209</sup> We are even guilty for living in North America: “It is impossible to live in North America and not be involved in unjust social structures.”<sup>210</sup> Just how this is true Sider does not say. He never demonstrates his major premise—that wealth causes poverty. In fact, as George Gilder observes, wherever such a premise is popular, poverty becomes much more severe. “Rather than wealth causing poverty, it is far more true to say that *what causes poverty is the widespread belief that wealth does.*”<sup>211</sup>

The evangelical socialists apparently are willing to go to any lengths to induce guilt. For example, here is a cheery bit of fluff from *theOther-Side*:

---

207. Chilton, 174.

208. In the Bible, all crimes are sins, but not all sins are crimes. See *ibid.*, 21.

209. *Ibid.*, 122–23, 171–72.

210. Sider, *Rich Christians*, 148.

211. George Gilder, *Wealth and Poverty* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 99. Italics added.

Whereas American mothers preserve, often in bronze, their children's first shoes—celebrating freedom and independence—a Japanese mother carefully preserves a small part of her child's umbilical cord—celebrating dependence and loyalty.<sup>212</sup>

If you missed your chance with the umbilical cord, you may perhaps redeem yourself by having a soiled diaper bronzed. Better yet, keep the kid in diapers. Keep him loyal and dependent. And while we are on such a delicate subject, we might glean a few droppings of wisdom from a *Sojourners* writer who visited India and learned some profound things through her study of cow dung:

God has been known to appear in many forms. I saw God in holy cows, dozens of them, trailing through the kaleidoscopic streets of India.... and leaving their deposits behind them....

Talk of incarnation: Meditate on a dung hill. No sanitary pooper scoopers in India. Folks there do it with their hands .... I never saw the women and children who gathered the manure in baskets, carried it home on their heads, patted it into thin discs, and plastered it on walls and the ground to dry for fuel—I never saw them turn up their noses. Maybe the non-verbal cues get lost in the translation, but they {151} seemed to almost enjoy it.

.... I must confess that I am moved by the ritual of taking into one's hands what the world considers filth and using it to cook food and sustain life. Despite the health hazards, even the open-air latrines and children squatting on the sidewalks in early morning speak a refreshing, pungent wisdom: Bodies and even their wastes are good. The earth is holy. Who are we to count unclean what God counts clean?<sup>213</sup>

Obviously, when the Apostle Paul counted all his former Pharisaical works as “dung” (Phil. 3:8), he *really* meant that they were *holy*. (By the way, if you want to consult the “blueprint” on dung, sanitation, latrines, and pooper-scoopers, see Lev. 16:27–28; Deut. 23:12–14.) Anyway, you get the idea. If it is pagan or socialist, it is good; if it's Western or capitalist, it is bad, and you should feel guilty for it.

The root of this kind of guilt is *envy*: the evil, misanthropic feeling that someone else's having something is to blame for the fact that you do not have it. Simple covetousness is the desire to take for oneself

212. Stephen Franklin, “Bonding,” *theOtherSide*, December 1980, 17.

213. Mary Jo Bowman, “God in Mud and Majesty,” *Sojourners*, March 1981, 23.

what belongs to others; envy is the desire to *destroy* it. The *socialist motive* is not so much to feed the poor with the stolen goods of the rich—that’s only a smokescreen; it is rather to *plunder the rich because they have the goods in the first place*. The socialist seeks to incite us to envy by pointing at the wealth of those above us. He wants us to fret and brood over their possessions. He encourages the feeling that life has cheated us. He stimulates and excites the lust that dwells in your heart and mine to tear down the man whose blessings seem to exceed ours. He tells us that our lack is due neither to God’s providence nor to our own slothfulness, but to *the injustice of the rich*.

And the socialist is working with fertile soil. Ask yourself: have you *ever* lost a job, received a poor grade, blown a business deal, been jilted by a sweetheart—when there was not at least the seed of a feeling that your misfortune was caused by injustice? I don’t mean those rare occasions when it happened to be *true*. I mean *every time* you have suffered a setback. Even a stubbed toe can bring bubbling to the surface the attitude that the world is unfair, the deck of life is stacked—and that if my toe hurts, so should yours. No matter what happens to us we are ready at a moment’s notice to blame someone else. Envy focuses that wrath and hatred upon those who have what we feel we’ve been denied.

All men want to play God. We are resentful against people who own more wealth, exercise more power, enjoy more privileges, possess more talent, or have more beauty than we; and our resentment against them is really *resentment against God*. We resent Him, not just because He gave others more, but because He is God. We know that all things move in terms of Him, and we want the world to spin around *us*. In order to lash out at Him—{152} feeling that an injustice has been committed because *we* are not God—we seek to destroy those whom He has blessed.

That is why the socialist argument is so appealing. For *socialism is institutionalized envy*. It is misanthropy elevated as the official policy of state. And where envy is prevalent, the society is doomed. Any progress or achievement will be viewed with suspicion. Anyone who makes any progress whatever—anyone who is perceived as being somehow “above” his peers—will be considered an “enemy of the people.” Fear of being envied will inhibit men from working and saving toward the



future. Stagnation will become the ideal (and the reality). A culture dominated by envy has a malignant rot at its foundations.

But there is more. The phenomenon we are witnessing in the activity of the evangelical socialists is even more deadly than the usual form of envy. Sider and his friends have taken it a step further. They have used the old socialist trick of envy-manipulation and turned it inside out. Instead of merely inciting the poor against the rich, they have incited the rich to feel envious against themselves! *That* is the essence of the guilt Sider is feeding and nurturing. *It is inverted envy.* It is the feeling that I have sinned because I have something that others don't. It is the conviction that if I am a rich Christian in an age of hunger, my riches are to blame for the hunger. Sider is not merely saying that the rich have a God-given duty to assist the poor. He would get no argument from me on that score. No—the point of his polemic is that it is *sinful* to be a rich Christian in an age of hunger. That is envy. And when it is believed by Sider's audience, it turns into massive guilt—a guilt-complex so powerful that (in what I *hope* is an isolated case) it caused a young father to feel guilty that his firstborn son was born safely. He was unable to thank God for the blessing of a healthy baby, because he was agonized and tormented over the possibility that such a blessing might have a causal relationship to world poverty.<sup>214</sup> He fell for the demonic gospel of the latest evangelical cult: Salvation by suicide.

### Slavery

The *purpose* of guilt-manipulation is to *paralyze its object*. Whenever you feel guilty—deservedly so or not—you become weak, indecisive, impotent, and most importantly, *easily controlled by others*. That aspect of Sider's message, at least, is sufficiently clear: you are guilty; you are responsible for world hunger; you can do nothing to absolve the guilt without state intervention; let the state save you from your sins.<sup>215</sup>

The goal is *slavery to the omnipotent state*. Socialism is theft; it is violence; it is the creation of false guilt; it is the destruction of all values, {153} relationships, and of culture itself. But the purpose of all is *the deification of man in the form of the state*.

214. See Chilton, 121–22, 125.

215. See, e.g., *ibid.*, 172.

The socialists know that the only way to achieve totalitarianism in America is by enslaving the church. It is not difficult to enslave unbelievers, for they are already slaves to Satan. All heathen cultures have been totalitarian, from Babel to the present. But Christians are not slaves to Satan. We have been freed in Christ. A Christian culture is therefore the only real threat to statism; and *the only way for Satan to achieve dominance is to delude believers into imagining that they are powerless*. Satan tells us that the Bible has no blueprints for social reconstruction, and at the same time quotes Bible verses in support of his own, counterfeit blueprint (Matt. 4:6). He seeks to distract us from building the City of God, and attempts to make us feel guilty because we have received blessings that God has withheld from the heathen.

Make no mistake—there is just enough truth in the devil’s message to get to us. For we know that pride is a sin; that it is wrong to harden one’s heart toward a poor brother; that greed and covetousness are abominable before God. And we know that we have all committed these sins. But the answer is not to be found in the envy and destructionism of the socialist program, for that too is a sin—the substitution of man’s autonomous standard for God’s inerrant word. Are you guilty—really guilty? Then confess your sins, be forgiven, and get busy obeying God’s word. The City *can* be built. We *do* have the blueprints; God *has* given us the tools; and He *will* grant us the time to do it. But if we rebel against His law, if we do not stand up and fight and build and rule, we will be destroyed. The City will be built; that has been promised. But others will build it, and we will be outcasts.

Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. (Matt. 5:13)

Will we transform the culture? Or will the humanists trample us under their feet? That will depend on whether we have any savor left; and I hope the following story is not indicative of the situation of the American church as a whole. If it is, it is only a small portent of things to come.

Ronald Sider has said that “Billy Graham should do evangelism, and Mark Hatfield should do politics.”<sup>216</sup> I will reserve comment about

216. Interview, *Wittenburg Door*, October /November 1979, 15.

Graham's activities, but—in light of Sider's statement—Mark Hatfield (the “born-again” Senator who is on ESA's Board of Directors) merits a closer look. For he has performed special services of his own in the cause of statist slavery:

Last year [1979—D.H.C.] the Reverend Pat Robertson, host of the “700 Club,” a televised Christian variety show with a huge national {154} audience, and Bill Bright, director of the Campus Crusade for Christ, chaired a Washington for Jesus rally. Organized by One Nation Under God, directed by the Reverend John Gimenez, it attracted the largest crowd ever to assemble at the Washington Monument. Afterwards, the group stayed together, and in January 1980 it issued a declaration condemning the government for mandating the teaching in public schools of unbridled sexuality and secular humanism. The declaration called on legislators to “frame laws, statutes and ordinances that are in harmony with God's word.”

In response, “Liberal” Senator Mark Hatfield (R.—Oregon) threatened to get the Internal Revenue Service to revoke One Nation Under God's tax-exempt status. The group apparently did not know how to resist such pressure and began to fall apart. Another organization has arisen from its remnants. It is Americans for Jesus, which, according to one of its spokesmen, John Gilman, will strictly avoid any mention of “political” issues ....<sup>217</sup>

*So the work went on, as the clouds gathered over their heads....*

---

217. John Rees in the *Review of the News*, October 22, 1980, 45, 47.

# A BIBLICAL BASIS FOR SURVIVAL PREPARATION

---

*Michael R. Gilstrap*

In the last ten years, the survival industry has boomed into a multi-million dollar a year business. Individuals and families all across the country and around the world are storing food, water, medicine, clothing, and other necessities which would disappear in the event of a major crisis. Survivalists are doing a great deal of research into “alternative technology,” that is, technology that has been lost to us due to this century’s rapid modernization. Many have given up high paying jobs in the major metropolitan areas in order to move to rural environments where they will not be so dependent on civilization.

In fact, most survivalists are seeking to become totally self-sufficient. They arrange for several different energy sources (sun, oil or gas, coal, wood) to power their homes in case any one of them should fail. A water supply and water cleansing system is either developed or installed in order to insure adequate water supply. One to five years worth of food is stored to avert famine. Hunting, fishing, gardening, and food-collecting skills are mastered in the event of the complete collapse of civilization as we know it. In other words, a survivalist seeks to acquire all of the means and skills necessary in order to provide his family with adequate food, clothing, water, shelter, and protection should the conventional means of supply ever break down.

The “average survivalist” cannot be lumped into any one category, whether it be political, religious, racial, or sociological (educational background, particular cultural mores, financial status). About the only thing they have in common is the belief that something disastrous is about to happen, and a strong conviction that each person is responsible for himself to make preparation.

Now the question arises for the Christian: Is all of this doom-and-gloom preoccupation with the evils of our age really necessary? Isn’t it enough to know that God loves us? Doesn’t Paul say that nothing can

separate us from the love of Christ—not even the Trilateralists or the Commies? Just exactly what is all the fuss about? If God loves me (and He does), then He will see me through; all that I have to do is ready my Bible, pray, and seek the Kingdom of God—all those other things will be added unto me. God clothes the daisies, He'll clothe me no matter what—right? {156} WRONG. A Christian, of all people, *should* be a survivalist. The intent of this paper is to give a biblical basis for survival preparation. We must see from biblical history and biblical law that survival preparation is not an option. It is not a new fad for the rich. It is not simply the practice of the doom-and-gloomer. *It is a matter of faith.*

### *Noah—The First Survivalist*

Everyone is familiar with the story of Noah and the Flood. But only rarely, if ever, is Noah considered a survivalist!

The story begins in Genesis 6 and runs through Genesis 9. Our main concern, however, is in chapter 6. In verse 5, Moses records that God “saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And the Lord was sorry that He had made man.” Man had become so perverted and depraved, so wicked and evil, that it not only made God sorrowful and grief-stricken, but it drove Him to destroy every living thing upon the earth! “And the Lord said, ‘I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky; for I am sorry that I have made them.’ But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord” (Gen. 6:7–8).

Just exactly what did this “grace” consist of? Most people project their own gracious experience back into the history of Noah. The grace then becomes some nebulous concept devoid of meaning. In most cases Noah’s “grace” is defined in terms of his “getting saved” or “believing in the true God.” These types of explanations don’t really give us anything concrete. They only rephrase the question. The simple fact of the matter is that *God gave to Noah His word*. He told Noah of the coming judgment by flood. He explained to him that the end of all flesh was near, and He told Noah what he must do in order for him and his family to survive. Noah must build an ark of gopher wood, which will float on top of the water (vv. 14–17). In other words, he must build

an *expedient shelter*. A large amount of *food* must be stockpiled to feed Noah and the animals during the duration of the flood (v. 21). Animals must be gathered from the face of the earth so that the world will be repopulated after the flood. There must be future-food as well as flood-food. God told Noah that if he would do all of that, he and his family would survive. “Thus Noah did; according to all that God had commanded him, so he did” (Gen. 6:22). And as we all know, our great-great-great... grandfather Noah survived, along with his family.

Several elements of the history of Noah bear special discussion. First of all, we note that there is a contrast between Noah, the Christian survivalist, and the rest of the world. As in the remainder of the Bible, there is always a contrast between the righteous and the wicked. The righteous are the ones who obey God’s Word, while the wicked are disobedient. In this case, the {157} contrast is even more pronounced, in that the consequences of wicked disobedience are immediate physical and spiritual death. Secondly, and very importantly, we find an example of the “Divine Pattern for Survival.” Step one: God *warns* Noah of the flood to come. Step two: God *gives instructions* on how to prepare. Step three: A *believing response* by Noah to steps one and two. This pattern occurs over and over in the Bible. In each case we find the Word of God and then man’s response to that Word.

### Joseph

Joseph is another very important survivalist in biblical literature. In Genesis 41, we enter into the middle of the history of Joseph. Joseph is in prison. He has been placed there on a trumped-up charge by Potiphar’s wife. Two of his cell mates just happen to be the ex-chief cupbearer and ex-chief baker of Pharaoh. Both of them have had dreams which troubled them greatly. Joseph interprets their dreams for them, and what their dreams prophesied comes to pass. The baker is hanged by Pharaoh, and the cupbearer is restored to his former position. The cupbearer promises to remember Joseph before Pharaoh and relate the injustice done to Joseph, but as verse 23 of chapter 40 relates, “Yet the chief cupbearer did not remember Joseph, but forgot him.”

Two years later Pharaoh has *two* dreams, each depicting the same event with different imagery. He does not understand the dreams, and his magicians are stumped to give an interpretation. Then the cup-

bearer remembers Joseph, and the rest is history. Joseph interprets Pharaoh's dreams to predict seven years of prosperity for Egypt followed by seven years of widespread famine. Joseph tells Pharaoh that preparations must be made in the years of abundance in order to survive the years of famine. The land will be ravaged; the famine will be very severe. The reason that the message was repeated to Pharaoh by means of two different dreams was to reinforce by the testimony of two witnesses the fact that the seven years of prosperity followed by seven years of severe famine had been determined by God, and God would bring them to pass quickly. Joseph even directs Pharaoh as to what domestic policy he must follow in order to prepare adequately. Twenty percent of the gross national product of Egypt must be set aside in the seven years of abundance and stored as a reserve for the land to use during the seven years of famine. If this were not done, Egypt would perish. Pharaoh then made Joseph a ruler subject only to him. He instructed Joseph to carry out the plan to save Egypt. Famine was averted through foresight and careful planning, and the people of God (Jacob and his family) were saved from starvation.

The same "Divine Pattern of Survival" is found here as was in the history of Noah. God told Joseph what was to happen—a severe famine of seven years length. Joseph had a word from God as to what to do. Egypt must be {158} *future-oriented*. The people had to be willing to give up present luxuries for future necessities. Joseph instructed the Egyptians to set aside 20 percent of the gross national product in order to prepare for the lean years. The response, even of this pagan king and nation, was one of faith. Pharaoh believed what Joseph told them, and the Egyptians did what Joseph commanded.

### *Children of Israel and the Passover*

In Exodus 12, a very interesting and much neglected survivalist story takes place. Moses and Aaron have gone to Pharaoh (a later Pharaoh than Joseph's) many times, commanding him to let the children of Israel go that they may worship God. Time and time again Pharaoh has refused, and God has poured out plague after plague. He has turned the Nile into blood, locusts have swarmed the land, frogs have been sent to infest and disease everyone and everything, and now is the final

confrontation. The evil and wicked designs of Pharaoh and all Egypt must bow to the omnipotence of God.

God comes to Moses and tells him of an impending crisis—an event more awe-inspiring than all the previous plagues combined. Moses is told that God “will go through the land of Egypt on that night, and will strike down all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments—I am the Lord” (Ex. 12:12). The only way for the people of Israel to avert this same judgment is for them to do *exactly* as God tells them. They are to take a lamb without blemish on the fourteenth day of the month and slay it. With a branch of hyssop (a very leafy tree) they are to apply some of the blood to the lintel and two door posts. Then they are to enter their homes and remain there the rest of the night. The lamb is to be roasted with fire and eaten with bitter herbs and unleavened bread. In this way—and this way alone—will the death angel be satisfied and not enter the house.

As is obvious, the “Divine Pattern of Survival” is repeated again here. God tells the people of the curse; He explains to them exactly what they must do to avoid the curse; and the people respond in faith. They believe God, and do what He has said. The wicked (those who do not believe) are destroyed, and the righteous (the faithful) are saved.

### *The Children of Israel Leaving Egypt*

The final “Biblical Survivalist” example should be obvious to all. When two to four million people get ready to take a forty-year hike into the wilderness, survival preparation to some extent goes without saying.

Though they didn’t know exactly when they were going to be released from the evil bondage of Egypt, they did know *that* they would be released sometime soon. The children of Israel were as prepared as God wished them to be. Exodus 12:35 explains that “the sons of Israel had done according to {159} the word of Moses, for they had requested from the Egyptians articles of silver and articles of gold, and clothing.” They had prepared, but they were not fully prepared, as verse 39 tells us.

The same “Divine Pattern for Survival” is here, though not quite as clear. God told the people what was to happen, and what they were to



do. It was God's decision for the people not to prepare completely—there was no lack of diligent preparation on Israel's part. They responded in faith to the Word of God—all the Word that they had. As the narrative goes on to relate, God Himself made up for their lack of preparation. He directly supplied them with food, water, and clothing.

In summary, we have seen that in each of the four cases there are two key elements in the divine pattern:

1. God's Word is *declared*. The crisis is announced, and the necessary preparations are outlined by God.
2. There is a *response* to that Word. In this case faithfulness translates into preparing for the crisis—and surviving.

In all four cases, God gave the Word and the survivalists obeyed. That was all that was required of them. If there was a further need, as in the case of the Israelites' leaving Egypt, God provided for them miraculously. It is as simple as that. A "Divine Pattern of Survival" has been found. Now let us broaden the applications to meet the needs of twentieth-century Christian survivalists.

### *Differences Between Christian and Non-Christian Survivalists*

First of all, by Christian I do not mean a non-Jewish American. That definition simply is not accurate, though it is accepted by much of our populace. A Christian is someone who has pledged his whole person unconditionally to Jesus Christ. He is one who recognizes his need for redemption from sin and seeks that in Christ. The Word of God is his book of law which governs his life and all decisions which he makes in life. To the Christian, the world is not something which belongs to the devil, but which belongs to God. He takes seriously God's command to subdue the earth to the glory of God, and believes God's promises that one day the "knowledge of the Lord will fill the earth as the waters cover the sea." He does not shrink from conflict or tribulation, for the Lord is on his right hand, and he shall not be moved. In other words, the Christian is first, last, and always *God's man*.

The first difference between a Christian survivalist and all others is that the *Christian's hope is in the Lord and not in his survival preparation*. He does not *believe* or *trust* his *preparation* to see him through.

His hope is in the Lord, not in himself or other men. If God so willed, the most elaborate preparations could be reduced to rubbish overnight. Leaks could develop in {160} the grain buckets, and bugs could move in. The milk and fruit could become rancid, ammunition wet, and the guns rusted beyond repair. A fire might hit the storage locker, whether it is in the home or at a retreat, and destroy everything. During the first days of a crisis, when preparations are beginning to be used, someone else might break in, kill everyone in sight, and steal the hard-to-come-by provisions. Many things can and will happen if we trust in our survival preparations. Our trust must be in the Lord, and not in ourselves.

A Christian survivalist, secondly, is *preparing for the judgment of God*, and not for some real or imagined conspiracy of Trilateralists, or Communists, or both together. *The devil is not in control of this world!* God is running all events according to the counsel of His own will. He has told us in the Law, especially Deuteronomy 28, what will happen if a nation disobeys Him. It will be the sword of the Lord that draws the blood of Americans. The Lord's Angel of Death will be the one that ravages this land. He may use some Philistine organization like the Trilateralists or Communists as His puppets, but behind it all will be the Lord God. America and western civilization will fall because of our sin, and for no other reason.

Hence, third, survival preparation is a *matter of faith in God*. We may say that we believe the Word of God. We may say that we believe the wages of sin is death. We may say that if God is true to Himself, the curses of Deuteronomy 28 must fall on America, but if we do not act upon that belief, and prepare, *then we do not really believe at all*. It is hard to imagine a person who actually believes that an entire nation will be castrated and cut off by God not preparing for that judgment. If we *truly* believe, then we will prepare. It's that simple. Remember what happened to the faithless in the four histories: they were destroyed!

The fourth difference between Christian survivalists and all others is that *we have a reason to survive*. Of all people, we are *obligated* to survive. This is God's world, not the devil's. We are not just another speck of dust in this vast universe, but part of the body of Christ—the new humanity. That is why the *sons of Noah* were introduced in Genesis 6. Noah's sons were the hope of the world. They were the seed in whom the Seed, Jesus Christ, would come. Before there can ever be regenera-

tion, there must be death. The judgment to come is that death. The Dark Angel of the Lord will bring death to western civilization. But if Christians do not survive, then someone or something else will gain temporary dominion in this world, and we will have to begin all over again. Just as Noah's sons went on to help shape the future history of the world, we must survive so that our children can help shape the future for God. *No one else will do it.* It is not only our privilege to survive if God wills, but in a sense it is our *duty* to survive so that our children *will* survive. We *must* survive—for the Lord.

The last difference then is that *our focus is not on the crisis primarily, but {161} on the postcrash world.* Granted the crisis must be faced squarely and dealt with head-on. But, as in each of the examples, our foresightedness must extend not only to the crisis, but to the world on the other side of the crisis. Hopefully, in our case, to a world under God's Law.

### ***Contrast: Righteous vs. Wicked***

If we think back to the case of Noah, a contrast between the righteous and wicked immediately confronts us. In Genesis 6:7, God says that He is going to destroy man from the face of the earth, but in verse 8 it says that “Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.” As noted earlier, the wicked are always presented in the Bible as those who refuse to obey God. That is the reason for the terrible judgments. They are breaking His law. The righteous, on the other hand, are characterized by lawfulness and uprightness. The wicked are to suffer and die for their own sins in the darkness they love so dearly, while the righteous are told of the wrath to come and what to do to avoid it. It may seem strange to some, but *the only ones who survive in the Bible are the faithful.* That is what judgment is all about. It is a separation of the sheep from the goats, the tares from the wheat, the Christians from the rest of the world.

### ***Preparation by the Book***

Another thing that we learn from the biblical survivalist histories is that *preparation must be made according to the revelation of God.* It must be tailored to meet the impending crisis. Noah did not dig a hole

and build a nuclear war survival shelter in order to survive the flood. Nor did Joseph build an ark to sustain a famine. God instructed His people in each case to prepare to meet the crisis at hand. Likewise, God gives clear instructions on what we can expect. I challenge you. Take your Bible and read the Ten Commandments. How many of those laws do we as a people practice breaking? The people of the United States flagrantly violate every law written there. Now turn in your Bible to Deuteronomy 28. Read the whole chapter, but especially note the many curses pronounced against a lawless nation. *That* is what we may expect, and that is what we must prepare for. Famine, drought, wars, plagues, pestilences, the raping of our sons and daughters, slavery, extreme poverty, and worse. That is what is going to happen. Not what *may* happen—not a choice between several bad scenarios—not a possible occurrence—but what *will* happen to us for our sin.

### *Deliberate and Disciplined Preparations*

Survival preparation is no different from any other savings program. For it to be successful it must be both *self-consciously deliberate* and *disciplined*. Consider the case of Joseph in Egypt. He could have set up any number of different programs to accomplish his goal—survival in a severe {162} famine. But his program was both *specific and regular*. There was no question as to how much of the increase went to storage—20 percent every time. *The priority in the history of Joseph is clearly on storage for a famine as opposed to present needs*. Joseph disciplined Egypt into being *future-oriented*. He showed them that they had to be willing to set aside present luxuries in order to acquire future necessities. Their preparation was well-planned. They did not haphazardly do things. Every action was governed by an overarching plan. In other words, their preparation was deliberate. What they were doing and why they were doing it was consciously known. The Egyptians were not only deliberate, but they were disciplined. Care was taken to be sure that not a harvest went by but that 20 percent of that harvest was stored. Why were they so careful? *They knew that their lives depended on it*. A Christian's survival preparation must be done with the same care and discipline.

We live in an age which will one day be known as the dying years of western civilization. Collapse is certain. We cannot go on in our sin

much longer before God says, “thus far, and no more.” *Global war* is more of a possibility now than it has been since World War II. We may live to see the first battles fought on American soil since the Civil War (that is, if you don’t count the riots on university campuses during the late ‘60s). Worldwide *famine* is another very real possibility. Right now the world uses as much grain as it produces in any given year, which means that all it would take would be one bad year to trigger a famine. Plagues and fatal *diseases* of epidemic proportions are also dangers. Granted we are protected now by immigration laws, but what of the time when no one is around to enforce those laws? During a famine, or after a crash, where will people *try* to come? Where the food is—right? In most of the world’s mind that just happens to be America. What are we going to do when all kinds of people begin to immigrate to escape a terrible situation elsewhere? What will we do with their diseases? Let’s face it—our culture is dying. We must prepare for it.

Just as Joseph did, we must either continue with or begin a disciplined and deliberate survival preparation program for our families. Joseph set aside 20 percent of the Egyptian gross national product; 10 percent was a tithe to Jehovah, and 10 percent for the years of famine. Therefore, I recommend that we do the same. You should begin to set aside *at least* 10 percent of your income specifically for survival preparation, after you tithe 10 percent to the Lord. Begin with the necessities—food, clothing, shelter, water. Then go on to other needs. If you are to be successful, you must deduct 20 percent every time you get paid. Haphazard preparation will not cut it. If you are to have enough to live on when times get rough, then you must begin now. Be deliberate. Be disciplined. Your children will thank you for it later.

### *Covenantal Duty*

Contrary to what most libertarian survivalists may think, no one is going {163} to make it alone. No one can be completely self-sufficient, no matter how hard one tries. The problem is, whom can we trust? The last thing that I want to happen is to get knifed in the back by a “trusted friend.” What are we to do? Christians have been singularly blessed by God. We have a built-in survival community: the local church. In a local church, unlike most similar organizations, Christians are found in covenant both to God and to their fellow church members. When you

join a church, you make an agreement to love God with all your heart, soul, and mind, and your neighbor as yourself. We know that men will be men. There is no place on earth where *complete* trust can ever be given to an entire group of people. But one thing is certain: if a survival community can be formed successfully in any place, then that place will be the local church.

This covenantal duty applies not only to the local church, but also to individual families. When Noah prepared, he did not do so alone. His sons and their families pitched in and helped. In the same way, it is not simply the father's duty to prepare, but the wife and children must lend a hand also. To be successful and effective, survival preparation must be a family effort.

### *Dominion*

A question that is always asked in any discussion of the death of a culture is, "Who will the leaders be in the new civilization?" One way to answer that question is to decide why some men are leaders today and others are not. A complex of variables enter in to make a good leader, but one of the most important is that *a leader is a man who can best take advantage of existing opportunities for the betterment and well-being of himself and others*. Why was Joseph chosen to be the second-in-command? Because he was best able to take advantage of the opportunities and save Egypt from destruction. In a postcrash society, who would *you* look to—someone who is grubbing among the ruins for food to feed himself and his starving family? Or would you instead go to the man or group of men who have been foresightful enough to store food, water, and clothing for just such a time? The thinking of the sluggard (i.e., one who does not prepare: see Proverbs 6:6–9; 13:4; 15:19; 19:24; 20:4; 21:25; 24:30; 26:13–16) after the crash will be to go to the ones who have prepared in order to sue for mercy (read "mercy" as "something to eat and drink"). Authority and dominion are always given to the wise—never to the sluggard. Survival preparation is a means to dominion in a postcrash society.

There is an interesting story in 1 Kings 17. God has caused a severe drought due to the prayers of Elijah. A certain widow, of the city of Zarephath, is at the end of her rope. She is almost out of flour and oil, without which she will starve to death. Odds are, she and her son will

become two more statistics for the bureau of records unless someone intervenes. {164} Someone does intervene. God sends Elijah to the widow and tells him that the widow has been commanded to take care of Elijah! Elijah comes to her, discovers her situation, and tells her to fear not, “For thus says the Lord God of Israel, ‘The bowl of flour shall not be exhausted, nor shall the jar of oil be empty, until the day that the Lord sends rain on the face of the earth.’” God took care of the widow. *He made up the difference.* The widow had prepared as well as possible, but her provisions were short. God then stepped in and provided her every need.

The children of Israel leaving Egypt is another example of God “making up the difference.” They were not prepared for a forty-year trek in the desert. Food, water, and clothing were scarce in the camp of the Israelites. If God had not directly intervened, they would have perished after the first few weeks. God provided the necessities to get His people through.

In the same way, if God’s people today will only do all that they possibly can given their individual resources, they will not do without. Preparations made—God’s Word obeyed—but still a need remains; God will provide. We must trust in the Lord, and not our preparations.

### Summary

We have learned from the four histories that *God does tell His people of a crisis.* The *first* step in the “Divine Pattern of Survival” is that the Word is given to warn the righteous of impending judgment. He told Noah, Joseph, and the children of Israel *of* what to expect. Our God is the same today as He was in that day. We have been told what to expect. Read Deuteronomy 28—it’s all there.

The *second* step in the “Divine Pattern” is the instructions given as to how to prepare. We are to tailor our preparation to meet the need of the crisis. Our response to the Word is the final step. God expects the best preparation possible. Joseph put aside 20 percent. *We must put aside at least as much.* Remember, *survival preparation is a matter of faith.* It is not an option to be exercised or not at your discretion. If you truly believe what God has said in His Word, you will prepare. If you don’t prepare, it simply means that you really don’t believe.

The problem that immediately confronts us is *what must we do with those who refuse to prepare?* Note that I didn't say the ill-prepared, or the destitute, but those people who *refuse* to prepare (elsewhere referred to as "sluggards"). This is a very tough question. We are talking about a fellow covenant member, not some Philistine. Two biblical examples bear directly on this question.

The first is the parable of the ten virgins. Five of the virgins prepared for the coming of the bridegroom by keeping their lamps full of oil. The other five were not prepared, though they had the same means available. It is very clear from the parable that the five *foolish* virgins must do without because {165} there was not enough for all. Just as clear is the fact that the five "wise" virgins were not in the least obligated to share their oil with their sisters if it meant risk to themselves. Likewise, in a postcrash society the wise man who has prepared is not obligated to place either himself or his family in danger in order to provide for a sluggard who has refused to prepare. In fact, whatever surplus remains will be needed to provide for the orphan and widow. The sluggard will be left out in the cold (Prov. 6:6–11).

The second example we have already examined. During the Passover night in Egypt, what would have happened to the Israelite family who shut its ears to the Word of the Lord and refused to prepare? Would the Death Angel have entered their home and killed the firstborn? Yes, He would have. *Failure to prepare brings death.*

It seems as plain as the nose on one's face that failure to prepare is an act of faithlessness. Faithlessness brings suffering and death. Those who *choose* not to prepare must suffer the consequences that God has determined for them. As Paul says in 1 Timothy 5:8, "But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."



# FAITH AND FREEDOM: THE STORY OF THE ENGLISH ABOLITION MOVEMENT

---

*Edward P. Coleson*

At last the burden of oppression became more than human beings could endure, and the slaves revolted. The scene was a labor camp in the north of the Soviet Union where four and a half thousand prisoners had just gone on strike. A Moscow general had driven up to quell the disturbance, and a meeting with all the slaves had been arranged. They had been told that they could speak freely without fear of reprisal. While the prisoners did not believe the promises of their captors, they took this opportunity to present their grievances; after all, the time eventually comes when a person will speak his mind even if he knows he will be shot for doing so. Among the protesters was a former professor of history from the University of Leningrad; he had made a special study of the history of slavery from pre-Pharaoh times to the slave trade on the African coast, and he used this background as the basis of his speech. He concluded: "But never in the story of man has working slavery been so extensive or so cruelly exploited as here in the Soviet Union—the 'liberator' of the working class!"<sup>218</sup>—This scene, as described by John Noble, is one of the paradoxes of our time. Back in the 1890s, in the late Victorian era, it was commonly believed that slavery and oppression had been well-nigh banished from the earth, and that democracy was becoming the norm everywhere. At last mankind was free! What has happened to change this golden dream to our present nightmare? Perhaps it would be more appropriate to ask how we attained that measure of freedom in the first place. If we knew that, maybe the answer to the question of why we human beings are again being enslaved would be obvious.

---

218. John Noble, *I Was a Slave in Russia* (New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1958), 156–57.

### *The Foundation of Freedom*

We Americans, including most Christians, have long taken our liberty for granted and have never probed into this aspect of our history. This is amazing, at least for us Christians, in view of the close relationship of our faith and our freedom. We should know this story, even if the secular humanists don't, because it is so much a part of our own heritage and is one of our {167} great contributions to civilization. The indifference of contemporary Christians to their own history is a frightening development. As Emil Brunner has pointed out, "history is not at all the focus of attention" of the majority of religions. The Hebrew faith and Christianity are almost unique in this respect. "The mystical religions of the East are indifferent to history because for them the world of becoming—hence history—is of no ultimate significance."<sup>219</sup> Is Christianity well on its way to becoming just another fatalistic Eastern religion, going nowhere and indifferent to its past?

It is significant also that most religions lack any philosophical foundation for freedom. As Herbert J. Muller<sup>220</sup> pointed out, it is "a commonplace of Western thought that man has a natural passion for freedom, and that his whole history has been an endless cry for justice and freedom." He quotes Charles Beard as saying that this quest is the epitome of history, but then, by contrast, cites the view of Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor, who said that "for the great masses of men... freedom is an intolerable burden." Dostoyevsky, you recall, had Christ return to the Spain of the Inquisition some four hundred years ago. He appeared before the great cathedral of Seville just as the funeral procession of the little daughter of a prominent citizen was going in. The people recognized Jesus, too, and asked Him to raise her from the dead. He touched her and she sat up among the flowers on the bier. Dostoyevsky<sup>221</sup> then has the Grand Inquisitor arrest the Master and throw Him into a dungeon; no one protested. In the night, the Inquisitor visited Christ in His cell and told Him that this freedom which He

219. Emil Brunner, *Eternal Hope* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 31–34.

220. Robert E. Dewey and James A. Gould, eds., *Freedom: Its History, Nature and Varieties* (London: Macmillan Co., 1970), 15.

221. Fyodor Dostoyevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, n.d.), 270–89.

sought to confer on mankind was no blessing, but that what they sought was “miracle, mystery and authority.” The story is fictional, of course, but Muller thinks that history would seem to support the proposition that this view of the nature of man is closer to the truth than the romantic American notions about our yearning for freedom. This, as he tells us, is the basis of Oriental despotism, a system of government where there is no appeal to a higher law, where we hear of no Magna Cartas, and where the king is god, the ultimate authority. “It was not necessarily harsh, but often benevolent .... It kept Egypt going for almost three thousand years—a record approached only by China under its imperial ‘Son of Heaven.’” How different was the history of Israel; “even Solomon in all his glory” was not Jehovah, as his subjects well knew. This may seem like a minor quibble to modern man, as it would have seemed to the ancients also. After all, “At its best, the sacred monarchy gave them ample bread and beer, gave them {168} psychological security, gave them the spiritual comforts of ‘miracle, mystery and authority’; but it never gave them political freedom.”<sup>222</sup> They never thought of wanting it, just as our contemporaries are content as long as the welfare state supplies their every need.

Needless to say, a nation of slaves will not be much concerned over the institution of slavery, but unfortunately, even those who knew better often did not raise their voices against it either. The Greeks, whom we revere as the fathers of our freedom, were not very consistent: Greek society was founded on slavery, and even its greatest philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle,<sup>223</sup> accepted it as part of the natural order of things. Slaves formed a high percentage of the population of the Roman world in New Testament times some four centuries later, and the Early Church had more than its share of them. This made a great problem, since Saint Paul, for instance, was not prepared to preach a Marxist-type revolution. Still, those who have attempted to use the writings of Paul to justify slavery would do well to read his Epistle to Philemon again. Paul admonishes this Christian slave holder to accept back his erring servant “as a brother beloved” (Philemon, v.

---

222. Dewey and Gould, *Freedom*, 17.

223. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966), 69–70.

16). Now anyone who understands the “peculiar institution” will know that you cannot treat a slave as a brother, and over the centuries slavery “disappeared from most parts of Europe.”<sup>224</sup> However, Christianity failed to develop an unambiguous position on slavery, and was used to bolster that ancient evil when it had its spectacular revival with the Age of Discovery. Indeed, it is said that Christians even fostered this resurgence, rather than discouraging it. Perhaps the most famous of these apologists for servitude was Bartolomé de Las Casas,<sup>225</sup> who is said to have urged the use of Negroes in place of Indians in the New World. There are those who insist that Las Casas was not implicated in this crime against the black race, but the evidence is not conclusive. Those who say he encouraged the use of Africans instead of Indians say he repented and even wondered if he could be forgiven.<sup>226</sup> Whatever the truth, slavery came back with a vengeance with the discovery of America and continued more than two and a half centuries as a thriving business before a small beginning was made to suppress it. Why did it happen even then?

Although the facts are about as well established as any in history, there has been much disagreement as to why freedom for the slaves came when it did. Let us begin with the facts. The resurgence of slavery had not gone {169} unnoticed or without protest. George Fox and his Quakers were against it; John Locke denounced it in his first *Treatise on Civil Government* in 1689; and a number of others had assailed the ancient evil. Yet, as all of us know, abuses have continued over the ages in spite of the efforts of another Amos or Jeremiah to right the wrongs of the world. A genuine breakthrough for the abolitionists was achieved in 1772 from quite unexpected sources, and it seemed to come easily and quickly; in 1765 an unknown Englishman met a wounded slave on a London street one morning, and seven years later all the slaves in England were freed. The hero of the story was Granville Sharp<sup>227</sup> and the ailing African was Jonathan Strong, a poor fellow who

---

224. *Ibid.*, 91.

225. *Ibid.*, 169.

226. Bartolomé de Las Casas, *Tears of the Indians*; and Arthur Helps, *The Life of Las Casas* (Williamstown, MA: John Lilburne Co., 1970), 292 of *The Life of Las Casas* (a reprint of two classics bound together with a recent introduction by Lewis Hanke).

had been beaten almost to death by his master and then turned out into the street to die. Granville's brother was a doctor, and his office was close by. The two of them nursed the slave back to health and strength, found him a job, and got him started on his life of freedom. This might have been the end of the story, except that his ex-master found him on the street one day and decided to recover his property. Granville came to his rescue and a complicated legal battle ensued. Strong was eventually released on a technicality, but Sharp soon found himself involved in other slave cases. In the meantime, he had shifted his approach from a Good-Samaritan, let's-be-kind-to-the-needy position, to an obsessive desire to change society, to abolish the institution of slavery. This was rank presumption on the part of a man with little formal education and no influence with the rich and powerful. He was a small man and had never been particularly successful in life, but he had already demonstrated a remarkable persistence in whatever he set out to do. This "stubborn gnome," as J. C. Furnas<sup>228</sup> called him, had taken on a big job. He set out to make himself an authority on one aspect of the English legal system—slave law—and spent all his spare time on this project. Having informed himself, he then set out to enlighten the legal profession and the judges. Another slave case gave him his opportunity, and in 1772 Lord Mansfield, the Chief Justice of the British Supreme Court (the "King's Bench"), passed down the verdict that the defendant and all other slaves in the country were free. There were only ten or fifteen thousand slaves in England at the time, but it did show what could be done, and the abolitionists were encouraged by Sharp's success. Victory in the cause of righteousness was possible. Men could be set free!

To understand the basis of Judge Mansfield's decision, it is very necessary to know something of the legal philosophy of the time. In fact, Sharp had found that his study of English law was not that helpful, since previous legal decisions were contradictory: one said that residence in England made {170} a slave free, while another opinion stated that it didn't make any difference. Lawyers had urged Sharp to give up

---

227. O. A. Sherrard, *Freedom from Fear: The Slave and His Emancipation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959), 102–11.

228. J. C. Fumas, *The Road to Harpers Ferry* (New York: William Sloane Associates, 1959), 247.

the fight, but he “could not believe that the law of England was really so injurious to natural right as so many great lawyers for political reasons had been pleased to assert.”<sup>229</sup> He was, of course, resting his case on the proposition that there were rights to which men were heir, because they were created in the image of God, and that true law was based on the law of God. This philosophy of law was derived from Scripture, but enlightened Greeks and Romans held similar views. Basic to Magna Carta in 1215 was the belief that “the king is also under God and under the law,” to cite a precedent from their own history. Nor was this all ancient history. By a strange coincidence, England’s great legal authority of that time, Sir William Blackstone, began publication of his famous *Commentaries on the Laws of England* in 1765, the year Sharp became interested in the slave question. It is interesting to note that Blackstone had asserted in the Preface to his *Commentaries*<sup>230</sup> that the “law of nature, ... dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other.... no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this....” Still, Blackstone failed to support Sharp, although he had provided the philosophical foundation for Judge Mansfield’s decision. However, this was not an unusual view back then. John Wesley, the popular preacher of that era, also said: “Notwithstanding ten thousand laws, right is right and wrong is wrong still.”<sup>231</sup> Our freedom is a gift of God, and with the decline of our faith, the world is again being enslaved.

### *Abolition Becomes a Movement*

If their first attempt to free their fellow men was crowned with immediate success, the continuing efforts of the abolitionists led to endless delays and frustration. Sharp’s easy victory was due to the fact that he could achieve this through a court decision; further progress in the fight for freedom involved getting enough votes in Parliament to

---

229. C. W. W. Greenidge, *Slavery* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1958), 129–31.

230. William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (Philadelphia: Rees Welsh and Co., Lewis ed., 1902), vol. 1, 31.

231. John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House), vol. 11, 70.

pass appropriate laws, and for a long time this was impossible. Still, they *were* making progress. It would have been easy for the reformers to forget the whole business right then, since there were no more slaves in England; they had done their duty and their consciences were clear, so why worry about it further? But their nation was still guilty of this great crime against humanity, although this was not too obvious to the average Englishman anymore. British ships were doing a thriving business transporting slaves to the Americas, and the {171} sugar-producing islands of the Caribbean were teeming with slaves. The *slave trade* and *plantation slavery* therefore became the new targets of the abolitionists, and they slowly got organized to continue the struggle. A Quaker committee was formed, and soon others, such as Granville Sharp, were included in their numbers. A couple of the most notable additions to this select fellowship were Thomas Clarkson, a young Cambridge graduate, and William Wilberforce, a youthful member of Parliament. Both had an interesting introduction to the problem of slavery. The stories are well worth repeating.

Thomas Clarkson began his study of slavery as an academic exercise, but ended up devoting a long life to the abolition cause. Cambridge University had announced a Latin essay contest for 1785, and Thomas chose to compete. He really knew nothing about the subject, but Anthony Benezet's *Historical Account of Guinea* met his need. Benezet was a Huguenot, a Protestant refugee from France who finally settled in Philadelphia and joined the Quakers. He became deeply interested in slavery, and "his writings on this subject were numerous: besides several smaller tracts, ... he published, in the year 1762, the *Account*."<sup>232</sup> The abolitionists were developing a literature of protest, and it was being read. "In this precious book," said Clarkson, "I found almost all I wanted."<sup>233</sup> He won the contest, too, but as Emerson observed: "... he wrote too well for his own peace."<sup>234</sup> On his way back from Cambridge

---

232. Anthony Benezet, *Some Historical Account of Guinea* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1771; reprinted 1968), x.

233. Earl Leslie Griggs, *Thomas Clarkson, the Friend of Slaves* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1936; reprinted by Negro Universities Press, 1970), 25.

234. Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Complete Essays and Other Writings* (New York: Random House, Modern Library ed., 1950), 834–35.

to London, he dismounted from his horse, overwhelmed by the eloquence of his own composition. He concluded: "... if the contents of the Essay were true, it was time some person should see the calamities to their end." He became that person.

At first he didn't know where to start, but thought he would get his essay printed up in English. He would need a publisher, and a friend sent him to a Quaker printer. This got him acquainted with the abolition committee. He had found his life's work and was soon busy at the task. He had some special talents, too, including one that the growing movement sorely needed just then. They needed someone to gather evidence, to collect statistics on the slave trade and slavery in general, and Thomas Clarkson was just the man for the job. William Wilberforce was quite a different sort of person, but he would be very useful too. He was a clever politician and eloquent also, just the man they would need in Parliament. The quiet Quakers had laid the foundation; now it was time to push aggressively the battle against slavery. {172}

### *The Freetown Colony*

Just as the abolition committee was getting organized to present their case to the nation, the ex-slaves in England came in for further attention, too. After their liberation in 1772, they had experienced difficulties in adjusting to their new freedom. They had trouble finding jobs and doing the other things that free men must do to survive. Perhaps they were discriminated against, or maybe they thought work was slavery and was to be avoided. In any case, many of them had become a chronic social problem, supported by an inadequate charity. Something had to be done about their sad plight. In this crisis, Granville Sharp came to their rescue once more. He conceived the idea of sending them back to their homeland, back to Africa and away from the fog and chill of London, back to the sunny southland. There they could be with their own people. Sharp had a friend who had been in West Africa and who thought the idea was an exceedingly good one. He told Sharp, "Such are the mildness and fertility of the climate and country, that a man... may soon place himself in an easy and comfortable situation."<sup>235</sup>

---

235. F. A. J. Utting, *The Story of Sierra Leone* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1931), 80.



The scheme caught on, and soon everyone was promoting the effort. The government offered to furnish ships to transport the colonists back to Africa and promised six months' provisions. Several thousand pounds were raised by subscription, and about three hundred fifty Negroes were chosen from some seven hundred who had applied. The spot selected for the settlement was a choice one too, a mountainous peninsula extending out into the Atlantic which was known as Sierra Leone. Just north of the peninsula was an excellent seaport also, a rarity on the African coast. The mountains were a familiar landmark for sailors, and the harbor had been a choice haven for ships since the days of Prince Henry and his Portuguese explorers more than three centuries earlier. The colony seemed to be off to an auspicious beginning.

The party sailed from Portsmouth in 1787. Everything went wrong from the very beginning. The voyage was long and stormy, and eighty-five died along the way. Two hundred more were sick in their bunks when the ships finally arrived in the harbor in Sierra Leone. They were not welcome either; the natives were hostile. If this were not enough, the rainy season was just beginning and they had no homes. Furthermore, according to the West African calendar, it was time to plant crops, but they were not farmers and did not understand tropical agriculture anyway. The former slaves had been personal servants of retired sugar planters from the Caribbean and were unsuited to the new life. Culturally they were not Africans any more, but black Englishmen. The Englishmen who had come along to manage the new {173} colony knew nothing about life in Africa either, so it was the old case of the blind leading the blind. Little wonder that the settlers continued to die. The high mortality in the colony in those early years earned it the nickname of the "White Man's Grave," but the blacks suffered severely from fever and malnutrition also. There were attacks from the neighbors, and even a raid by some Frenchmen in 1794, a minor incident in the French Revolution, but a disaster for Sierra Leone. It looked for a while as if the settlement would never survive.

Perhaps the colony would not have continued either had it not been reinforced by other refugees. During the American Revolution, the British had encouraged the slaves in our South to join them and, when they lost the war, they transported the blacks to Nova Scotia, much as they also did with English Loyalists. The Negroes did not like the cli-

mate or the conditions in Canada, so one of their number contrived to get to London to plead their cause. They were invited to migrate to Sierra Leone! The British government offered to help, and Lieutenant Clarkson, brother of Thomas Clarkson, volunteered to supervise the venture. He succeeded in gathering together nearly twelve hundred blacks in Canada and managed to land them in Sierra Leone in 1792. The new settlers came to be known as the Nova Scotians and they founded a new village which was called Freetown, which was to become the capital of a much larger Sierra Leone. Lieutenant Clarkson became the governor and worked heroically to bring order out of chaos. These were difficult days. Another group of refugees came from Nova Scotia in 1800 also. They were ex-slaves from Jamaica who had been sent to Canada after they had revolted and had been subdued by British troops. They did not like Nova Scotia either, so they were taken to Sierra Leone. In this way, the struggling colony managed to survive.<sup>236</sup>

### *The Slave Trade Outlawed in 1807*

As Freetown in West Africa was slowly growing into a little town, events in England would soon supply Sierra Leone with an abundance of new settlers. As has been mentioned already, the abolitionists had decided to force British ships out of the slave trade. They now had William Wilberforce as their spokesman in Parliament. He was a small man like Sharp, and the sort who could give his life for a cause, but those were about the only similarities. Wealthy and privileged, he had gone to Cambridge, and at the tender age of twenty-one had been elected to Parliament, along with the Younger Pitt, in 1780. These two young men were the same age, were good friends, and were the youthful wonder of English politics. Pitt, in fact, became prime minister when he was twenty-four, with Wilberforce as his loyal supporter. The latter was soon to become the little “David” who {174} would take on the “Goliath” of slavery. And a formidable foe the slavers would find him.

Reginald Coupland<sup>237</sup> begins his biography of Wilberforce with a scene from the early days of the great statesman. It is a stormy day in

---

236. *Ibid.*, 88–107.

late March of 1784, and an outdoor meeting is in progress at York. The speeches have continued all day and the people, having wearied of the cold and sleet, were about ready to go home. Then Wilberforce climbed up on the table. The wind was so strong they thought he would surely be blown away, but he kept his feet and held them spellbound to the end of his oration. James Boswell was there and remarked: "I saw what seemed a mere shrimp mount upon the table; but, as I listened, he grew and grew until the shrimp became a whale." Another member of the crowd said, "He spoke like an angel!" Unfortunately, it would seem, this brilliant young politician soon would be thinking of giving up his career in government. During the next year he went through a profound spiritual struggle and, under the guidance of John Newton and others, became a Christian. He then decided that politics was too "dirty" a business for a Christian, but his friends prevailed upon him to stay in Parliament. They urged him to head up the fight against slavery. Newton, an ex-slaver himself and author of "Amazing Grace," could tell him how bad it really was, and Pitt used his influence, too. It was the Lord's will. He had found his work.

While Wilberforce has rightly received much credit and praise for his part in the outlawing of the slave trade in 1807, one must remember that he was only the leader of the reform movement. Behind the scenes was Thomas Clarkson collecting data on the mortality of English sailors and the slaves. This was a tedious and hazardous business, since the slavers did not cooperate with him and even tried to kill him. In addition to Clarkson's assistance, he was also ably supported by the members of his church; he and they lived in a quiet country village three miles from the seat of government at Westminster in London. This little town was known as Clapham Common, so their political enemies dubbed them the "Clapham Sect" or the "Saints." This fellowship included wealthy, prominent, and benevolent evangelicals who had considerable influence and political power. It was this group who now set out to get British ships out of the business of transporting slaves to the New World. On May 12, 1789, in a three-and-one-half-hour speech in Parliament, William Wilberforce condemned slavery and made a

---

237. Reginald Coupland, *Wilberforce, a Narrative* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968; reprint of 1923 Clarendon Press pub.), 1–4.

motion that the trade should be abolished. Of course, his motion was defeated, as everyone expected it to be, but it was a good start. They could not know that it would take nearly twenty years to accomplish their purpose. {175}

It is an interesting coincidence that two months after Wilberforce gave that address, France exploded with the French Revolution. The “enlightened” among the English population believed that “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” would be a great step forward for mankind; “Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,” as Wordsworth phrased it. To the abolitionists, this meant liberty for everybody in the not too distant future, including those slaves they were so concerned about. Indeed, Clarkson<sup>238</sup> was sent to Paris to promote the cause. He was even warmly welcomed by the right people, but in the end the revolutionary government was not prepared to liberate the slaves in Haiti or the other French colonies. In fact, the “French connection” became a serious embarrassment to the English reformers as the Revolution continued to grow more radical. Then Wilberforce and his supporters settled into the tedious business of continuing the fight without much encouragement from anybody. For years, his annual anti-slave-trade oration, given as he introduced another abolition bill in Parliament, was as regular as the traditional “Speech from the Throne” and was much more interesting. But his law never passed. Wesley<sup>239</sup> wrote his last letter (February 24, 1791) to encourage Wilberforce. He needed it. As the French Revolution became another general European war, most people lost interest in reform, but ultimately the Napoleonic Wars provided the abolitionists with the psychological moment for the next great step in the fight for freedom. But this day was long in coming. In fact, it did not come until 1807, when England was fighting for her very life against Napoleon. English evangelicals felt that in that hour of crisis they could not ask for the Lord’s help as long as the blood of Africa was on their hands, and many Englishmen agreed. At last the law was passed. As Clarkson<sup>240</sup> wrote in the hour of triumph, “... we have been

238. Fumas, *The Road to Harper’s Ferry*, 261–64.

239. Earle E. Cairns, *Saints and Society* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1960), 60.

240. Fumas, *The Road to Harper’s Ferry*, 267.

freed ... from a load of guilt ... ready to sink us to perdition.” The victory against the slave trade was won.

### *Enforcing the Law: the Naval Patrol out of Freetown*

In spite of all the pious rejoicing, this was certainly a Pyrrhic victory: the fight was just beginning. As we sometimes forget, passing a law often is easier than enforcing it. This was so true in this case, the long struggle to get it passed notwithstanding. In the first place, there was a war on, and it was taking all of England's energy to combat Napoleon. Furthermore, the Atlantic was big, and the African coast was long. If this were not enough, it was exceedingly simple to sail under other flags, and they often did. It seemed at first that they were only turning a lucrative business over to their competitors. Those of us who have never known anything but an easygoing {176} Christianity will not understand their courage and perseverance until we begin to understand their thinking. As Iain H. Murray has said, “Christian leaders such as Wilberforce viewed the world not so much as a wreck from which individual souls must escape, but rather as the property of Christ....”<sup>241</sup> They believed it was their Christian duty to press the battle against the foe, and in this case this is no figure of speech. When the British Navy finally got around to the task of arresting the slavers on the high seas, they found the criminals were prepared to fight back. They tended to be desperadoes, about on the level with pirates, and not nice people to deal with.

One might assume that the culprits were hanged forthwith from the yardarms of the capturing ships, but no—they must have a proper trial with lawyers to defend them. A Vice-Admiralty Court<sup>242</sup> was established at Freetown in March of 1808 to perform this function. In fact, at first the penalty was light: the owner lost his ship and its contents, the slaves. Of course, the naval patrol was based on the excellent harbor at Freetown, but not much happened until after Napoleon was defeated. When the war was over, the abolitionists were quick to seize the opportunity to write an antislavery clause into the treaty of peace. At the

---

241. Iain H. Murray, *The Puritan Hope* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1971), xxii.

242. Utting, *The Story of Sierra Leone*, 120.

Congress of Vienna, eight nations went on record as seeking "... to put an end to a scourge which desolates Africa, degrades Europe, and afflicts humanity."<sup>243</sup> While certainly most of them were not very sincere in their resolve, at least it was a step in the right direction. In this spirit of international cooperation, a Mixed Commission Court was established at Freetown in 1819, with judges from other nations hearing the cases along with the English. Unfortunately, these other judges often seemed to favor the slave traders, so their presence on the bench was not always appreciated by the abolitionists. But slowly England was pressuring and bribing the other Europeans into complying, and progress was being made. In the twenty years from 1819 to 1839, the British only captured three hundred and thirty three ships, but in the next decade they got nearly seven hundred and fifty.<sup>244</sup> However, we must not forget that the effort was costly in men, ships, and money. But for the constant prodding of the English evangelicals, the battle would never have been won. They continued the fight.

A fascinating consequence of the activities of the naval patrol and of the court was a multitude of liberated Africans. These could not be returned to their homes; the task of repatriating them to their villages somewhere in the {177} bush would have been colossal and they would surely have been captured by another slave trader on the way. The evangelicals and the British government took on the task of educating and Christianizing these refugees and settling them in villages among the hills near Freetown. This was no easy assignment, but the English missionary societies made a tremendous effort and at a frightful cost. "During the first twenty-five years of its work in Sierra Leone the Church Missionary Society alone lost a hundred and nine of its European missionaries."<sup>245</sup> Still, they continued to send out more workers to minister to the multitudes rescued from the holds of slave ships. More than fifty-seven thousand Africans were liberated by the Mixed Commission Court<sup>246</sup> in the years from its founding in 1819 to our Civil

---

243. F. George Kay, *The Shameful Trade* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969), 81–84.

244. Utting, *The Story of Sierra Leone*, 124.

245. *Ibid.*, 159.

246. *Ibid.*, 121.

War. These assorted tribesmen from the west coast of Africa are said to have spoken a hundred languages.<sup>247</sup> This certainly complicated the situation, but may have been an advantage, too; since there was no common denominator in speech or culture, it may have been easier to impose English and Christianity. Certainly the missionaries tried. The product of this vast effort, however, was not a Christian colony, created in the image of Victorian England, but something that was neither English or African. A new language evolved called *Creole*, and the culture was a hybrid, too.

### *Emancipation in the British Colonies in 1834*

While Freetown was suffering from growing pains, and the Royal Navy was busy policing the African coast, the abolitionists were plotting to free all the slaves in the British Empire. This did not come quickly or easily either. William Wilberforce had grown old in the fight, and his place had been taken by others. Still, the battle continued. They realized, of course, that if all demand ceased, the supply would dry up of itself; if no one was buying slaves, the slave trade would stop. Emancipating the slaves in their own colonies would help, and they set out to do this. In May of 1833, the Colonial Secretary introduced a bill into Parliament to accomplish this objective, and the war against slavery entered its final phase. Wilberforce lay dying as the law was being debated, but he lived long enough to know it would pass. The British government had committed itself to reimbursing the slaveholders for a substantial share of their loss, and Wilberforce, before he died, thanked the Lord that he was to be permitted to see the day in which England would voluntarily pay out “... twenty millions sterling for the abolition of slavery.”<sup>248</sup> The bill finally made its way through Parliament and was signed by the king. The right had triumphed. {178}

The Emancipation Law was to go into effect on August 1, 1834, and the sugar planters in the British West Indies were frightened. They had had slave rebellions in the past, and they well knew what had happened in Haiti<sup>249</sup> more than forty years before. Slave owners never forgot that

---

247. Roy Lewis, *Sierra Leone* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954), 187.

248. Reginald Coupland, *The British Anti-slavery Movement* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1964), 138–42.

story. When France was convulsed with the French Revolution in 1789, the slaves in Haiti expected that freedom would also be theirs. When it was not forthcoming, they revolted a couple of years later, and well-nigh destroyed everything on the island. They massacred their masters, too. British sugar planters believed that liberating their slaves would lead to a similar bloodbath, so military reinforcements were sent to maintain order. None were needed, as Ralph Waldo Emerson so eloquently tells us:

On the night of the thirty first of July, they met everywhere at their churches and chapels, and at midnight, when the clock struck twelve, on their knees, the silent, weeping assembly became men; they rose and embraced each other; they cried, they sang, they prayed, they were wild with joy, but there was no riot .... The first of August came on Friday, and a release was proclaimed from all work until the next Monday. The day was chiefly spent by the great mass of the Negroes in the churches and chapels. The clergy and missionaries throughout the island were actively engaged, seizing the opportunity to enlighten the people on all the duties and responsibilities of their new relation, and urging them to the attainment of that higher liberty with which Christ maketh His children free.<sup>250</sup>

The Emerson quotation is even more interesting because it was part of an address given at the Courthouse in Concord on August 1, 1844, just ten years later.<sup>251</sup> The people of the town were said to have been reluctant to have such a controversial subject discussed there, but Thoreau arranged the meeting and rang the bell. Others in the United States were also impressed with this achievement. At Oberlin College,<sup>252</sup> that hotbed of revival and abolition activity, the folks decided to ignore the Fourth of July, since it was freedom for whites only, and celebrate the first of August instead. A book, *The Right Way, the Only Way*,<sup>253</sup> was even written to prove that the West Indian experience could provide a guide to us in solving our slavery problem.

---

249. Milton Meltzer, *Slavery II: From the Renaissance to Today* (Chicago: Cowles Book Co. Inc., 1972), 117–18.

250. Emerson, *Complete Essays*, 839–40.

251. *Ibid.*, 829.

252. Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 40.



It is a tragedy that we did not try this approach; according to official U.S. statistics, released shortly after the Civil War, that conflict cost “... three times {179} as much as the slave property of the country was ever worth.”<sup>254</sup> These monetary calculations, of course, take no account of the “blood, sweat, and tears,” or the permanent damage done to the United States. Unfortunately, we failed to follow the British example.

### *When Good Men Do Nothing*

At the present time in America, many evangelicals believe that social reform, achieved at least in part by political means, is not the responsibility of us Christians. This is a complete reversal of the English view of two centuries ago. In addition to those who think that the Church should not get involved in the practical affairs of life are many who think it does not do any good. Indeed, there is a large literature which seeks to prove that the story I have just related misses the essential point. These writers believe that slavery was abolished when it had outlived its usefulness, that it would soon have “withered away”—as the Soviet government is supposed to do—and without the sacrificial efforts of Sharp, Wilberforce, Clarkson, and a multitude of other devoted Christians. Those who are unaware of this point of view and want a concise statement of at least the facts about the controversy would do well to read J. D. Fage’s introduction to the reprint of Reginald Coupland’s book, *The British Anti-slavery Movement*, long the standard work on the subject.<sup>255</sup> Here one is made acquainted with Eric Williams, later to become Prime Minister of his native Trinidad. His research, done in Coupland’s own university (Oxford), was published as *Capitalism and Slavery*. Fage speaks of Williams’s work as a “savage attack on Coupland,” and Coupland’s view of the English abolitionists as benevolent, self-sacrificing Christians who, against overwhelming odds, finally brought freedom to the blacks. However, it

---

253. L. Maria Child, *The Right Way, the Safe Way: Proved by Emancipation in the British West Indies, and Elsewhere* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969 reprint of a book published in 1862).

254. Harold Underwood Faulkner, *American Economic History* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), 508.

255. Coupland, *The British Anti-slavery Movement*, xvii–xxi.

would be only fair to remember that even Williams speaks favorably of Clarkson as "... one of those friends of whom the Negro race has had unfortunately only too few."<sup>256</sup> While I don't agree with economic determinists such as Williams, I am willing to concede that economic considerations no doubt did have a bearing on the story. The book is worth reading and does throw additional light on the subject. It is only one of many such studies in recent years, and a balanced treatment of the subject would call for an essay longer than the present one to do justice to both sides of the controversy. This is really just the old argument between those who believe men make history and those who think impersonal forces—the industrial system, geography, and the like—"determine" us. It is worth mentioning as some important economic evidence in favor of {180} Coupland's position that J. C. Furnas, certainly no fundamentalist, stresses the fact that smuggling slaves into our South was highly profitable right up to our Civil War.<sup>257</sup> This hardly supports the view that slavery was withering away. This controversy, however, does not speak to the larger question of whether Christians should have given their lives to the abolition effort, whatever they may have achieved by so doing. Is this what the Lord wants us to spend our time doing?

Many contemporary Christians would be surprised at the very great involvement of their fathers in politics and reform, if they should ever happen to learn what they did. There is actually much more to the story than simply the abolition of slavery, as great as this accomplishment was. Shortly after emancipation in the colonies came the "free trade" movement in England. This I have discussed in "The Coming of Christian Capitalism."<sup>258</sup> The revival and the continuing effort to apply Christian principles to every aspect of life put England on a sound course which set the stage for British greatness during the Victorian era. Many changes over the years have undermined that greatness and Christian civilization, too. Not the least of these changes was the growing conviction that the saints should not involve themselves in the

256. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1944), 179.

257. Fumas, *The Road to Harper's Ferry*, 161–62.

258. Edward Coleson, "The Coming of Christian Capitalism," *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 2, no. 1 (Summer 1976): 115–25.

practical affairs of this present world. The man who did much to get the Church out of politics and reform was John Nelson Darby,<sup>259</sup> who called for a retreat in the very moment of victory. In 1840 he told an audience in Geneva, the city where John Calvin had preached four hundred years earlier, that “instead of permitting ourselves to hope for a continued progress of good, we must expect a progress of evil.... Truly Christendom has become completely corrupted ....” This view, widely accepted, soon became a self-fulfilling prophecy. If a tree may be judged by its fruits, this doctrine of despair has been disastrous. Darby’s teaching was also a denial of the Lord’s command: “Occupy till I come!” (Luke 19:13). Too many Christians became what Carl F. H. Henry called “enlightened spectators,”<sup>260</sup> watching with their Bibles in their hands while civilization disintegrates. In the light of the last century and a half of our history, one is reminded of that oft-repeated saying of Edmund Burke: “All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.”

---

259. Murray, *The Puritan Hope*, xxii.

260. Carl F. H. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947), 50.

# “THE GREAT REVERSAL”

---

*George M. Marsden*

From *Fundamentalism And American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925*, by George M. Marsden. Copyright © 1980 by Oxford University Press. Published by arrangement with Oxford University Press, New York.

The evangelicals’ interest in social concerns, which lasted into the early years of the twentieth century, has been something of a puzzle to historians of fundamentalism. The chief question is the rather dramatic disappearance of this interest—or at least its severe curtailment—by the 1920s. In recent years many evangelical interpreters have commented on this “Great Reversal” in evangelical social views, although they have not always been clear on precisely what was lost.<sup>261</sup> Non-evangelical interpreters have tended to see a less sudden transition. Some have seemed to discount late nineteenth-century evangelical social efforts because they were motivated primarily by a desire to “save souls.”<sup>262</sup> Others have concluded that, at least since the Civil War, an emphasis on the “private” implications of the Gospel has almost invariably been a feature of the revivalist tradition, especially the premillennialist wing. This private Christianity, looking toward the next world and individual salvation, was contrasted with the “public party” of the Social Gospel of

---

261. David Moberg, *The Great Reversal: Evangelism versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia, 1972); Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York, 1976); Richard V. Pierard, *The Unequal Yoke* (Philadelphia, 1970). All these discuss the subject at some length and give evidence for severe subordination of social concern about 1930. An account especially ambiguous as to what was lost is George M. Marsden, “The Gospel of Wealth, the Social Gospel, and the Salvation of Souls in Nineteenth-century America,” *Fides et Historia* 5 (Fall 1972 and Spring 1973): 10–21.

262. William G. McLoughlin, ed., *The American Evangelicals, 1800–1900: An Anthology* (New York, 1968), introduction, 13, although otherwise helpful, seems to have this implication.

the early twentieth century, which was associated exclusively with the theologically liberal wing of the church.<sup>263</sup>

In order to clarify matters, and to distinguish two quite distinct stages of the "Great Reversal," it is important to note first that social concern may emphasize one or both of the following: (1) political means to promote the {182} welfare of society, especially of the poor and the oppressed, and (2) reliance on private charity to meet such needs. Although before the Civil War many evangelicals displayed neither type of social concern, many others emphasized both. The ensuing transition came in two stages. From 1865 to about 1900 interest in political action diminished, though it did not disappear, among revivalist evangelicals. As we have just seen, however, the revivalist evangelicalism of this era still included vigorous champions of social concern, especially in the form of private charity. The lessening of political concern, then, did not in itself signify a "Great Reversal" in social concern, even though it shifted the focus and prepared the way for what followed. The "Great Reversal" took place from about 1900 to about 1930, when all progressive social concern, whether political or private, became suspect among revivalist evangelicals and was relegated to a very minor role.

The preparatory stage, from 1865 to 1900, can be described in a number of ways. Using the terms broadly, we may call it a transition from a basically "Calvinistic" tradition, which saw politics as a significant means to advance the kingdom, to a "pietistic" view of political action as no more than a means to restrain evil.<sup>264</sup> This change can be seen as a move from Old Testament to New Testament models for understanding politics. It corresponds also, as is often noted, to change from postmillennial to premillennial views of the relation of the king-

---

263. Jean P. Miller, "Souls of the Social Order: Polemic in American Protestantism," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1969; Martin E. Marty, *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America* (New York, 1970).

264. To call the one of these more "Calvinistic" and the other more "pietistic" is to set up a typology to which there are many exceptions. Some Calvinists have held "pietistic" positions and *vice versa*. Yet on the whole, one can say that the Calvinist heritage has been more prone to positively transforming culture, while pietists have been more prone to seeing Christians as living in essential tension with culture. See, for instance, H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York, 1951).

dom to the present social and political order. In America it was also related to the rise of the holiness movement.

From the time of the Puritans until about the middle of the nineteenth century, American evangelicalism was dominated by a Calvinistic vision of a Christian culture. Old Testament Israel, a nation committed to God's law, was the model for political institutions. Hence the Christian ideal was to introduce God's kingdom—a New Israel—not only in the lives of the regenerate elect, but also by means of civil laws that would both restrain evil and comprehensively transform culture according to God's will. Charles Finney expressed this ideal when he declared that “the Christian church was designed to take aggressive movements in every direction—to lift up her voice and put forth her energies against iniquity in high and low places—to reform individuals, communities, and government, and never rest until the kingdom... shall be given to the people...—until every form of iniquity shall be driven from the earth.” Jonathan Blanchard similarly spoke of the “perfect state of society,” meaning that “the Law of God is the {183} Law of the Land.”<sup>265</sup>

Holiness teaching spread from the pietist Methodist tradition into the culturally influential Calvinist camp of American evangelicalism within the context of these assumptions concerning the role of God's law for people and society. At first the Reformed teachers of holiness simply fused the two ideals. Both Charles Finney and Asa Mahan, for instance, when they first defined Oberlin “perfectionism” in the late 1830s, described the standards for “holiness” in terms of God's law revealed in the Old Testament covenant. “Whatever the old covenant, or moral law, *requires of the creature*,” wrote Mahan in a typical statement, “the new covenant... *promises to the believer*.”<sup>266</sup> Such formulations, echoing and amplifying themes sounded by the Puritans, did not abrogate the Old Testament law, but kept it functioning as a most important guide.

This stress on the law had definite political implications. Finney included a section on “Human Government” in his *Systematic Theol-*

---

265. Finney, quoted from “Letters on Revivals—No. 23,” *Oberlin Evangelist* (n. d.), in Dayton, *Evangelical Heritage*, 21. Dayton points out that this letter is left out of modern editions of these letters.

ogy. A government's aim should be to promote holiness or "the great law of benevolence." Toward this goal of benevolence "or universal good-willing," Christians "are bound to exert their influence to secure a legislation that is in accordance with the law of God." Finney did not allow that such political activity would divert from saving souls. On the contrary, he insisted that "the promotion of public and private order and happiness is one of the indispensable means of doing good and saving souls."<sup>267</sup>

The growing emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit, however, almost demanded some sort of dispensationalism that would draw a clear line between the Old Testament dispensation of law and the New Testament dispensation of the Holy Spirit. In 1839, Charles Finney was already declaring that the day of Pentecost marked "the commencement of a new dispensation," {184} in which the new covenant replaced the old.<sup>268</sup> The distinction between the two covenants was not new, but the central place given to Pentecost and the Holy Spirit soon pushed interpretation in a new direction. In the new dispensation, those who had received the anointing with the power of the Holy Spirit were radically different from professing Christians who were still in bondage to the law. Moreover, the freeing and empowering work of the Spirit was

---

266. Mahan, *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection*, 4th ed. (Boston, [1839] 1840), 82. Cf. 71, "the doctrine of holiness, as here maintained, is perfect obedience to the precepts of the law." Cf. 79–85 and 192–93. Mahan argues against antinomian perfectionism, such as taught by John Humphrey Noyes, which says that the Ten Commandments are abrogated by the law of love. Timothy L. Smith's valuable article, "Doctrine of the Sanctifying Spirit: Charles G. Finney's Synthesis of Wesleyan and Covenant Theology," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (Spring 1978): 92–113, points out Finney's emphasis on the covenant. See also Barbara Brown Zikmund, "Asa Mahan and Oberlin Perfectionism," Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1969, which points out the importance of law, e.g., 147–48.

267. Finney, *Lectures on Systematic Theology*, ed. James H. Fairchild (New York, [1846] 1878), 214–18. Cf. Mahan, *Abstract of a Course of Lectures on Mental and Moral Philosophy* (Oberlin, 1840), 235–36, and *Science of Moral Philosophy* (Oberlin, 1848), 198, for similar positive assessments of government's role. On wider explication of their view of the law see David Weddle, "The Law and the Revival: A New Divinity for the Settlements," *Church History* 47 (June 1978): 196–214.

268. Finney, *Oberlin Evangelist* 1 (August 28, 1839): 147, quoted in T. Smith, "Doctrine," 103.

known experientially, not by laboriously conforming to codes of law and order. Accordingly, in the thirty years after Finney and Mahan first adopted their holiness views, the place of the law was drastically reduced in the writings of Reformed advocates of holiness. After 1870, when they spoke of the dispensation begun at Pentecost, they stressed the personal experience of being filled by the Spirit and the resulting positive personal power for service. By this time it was rare to find holiness teachers of any sort stressing the Old Testament law as the secret to a happy Christian life. The mood of the revivalist evangelicalism of the day was suggested by Philip Bliss's verse, "Free from the law, oh happy condition...."<sup>269</sup>

The Spirit-oriented holiness teaching, spreading quickly in this period, encouraged a clear distinction between law and Spirit, Old Testament and New Testament, and seems to have been a major factor paving the way for the acceptance of a more definite dispensationalism in the later nineteenth century. By the 1870s, when the dispensationalist movement began to take hold in America, holiness teachers already commonly spoke of "the Dispensation of the SPIRIT."<sup>270</sup> This and similar phrases became commonplace within the premillennial movement,<sup>271</sup> with the age of the Spirit sharply separated from the age of law. C. I. Scofield in his classic formulation called these two dispensations "Law" and "Grace." He did not make Pentecost itself the turning point, but he did argue that the special characteristic of the age of grace

---

269. "Once for All" (ca. 1870), *Gospel Hymns Nos. 1 to 6*, ed. Ira D. Sankey et al. (New York, 1894), no. 13. Verse 3 contains the holiness line "Surely His grace will keep us from falling." I am indebted to Donald Dayton for pointing out the change that took place in holiness teaching at this time. See his article, "From Christian Perfection to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost,'" *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, Vinson Synan ed. (Plainfield, NJ, 1975), 39–54.

270. Mahan, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost* (Noblesville, IN, [1870] 1972), iv, from introduction written after 1870. Donald Dayton, with Methodistic Holiness groups in mind, observes that "the shift to 'Pentecostal' formulations of holiness teaching usually antedated the adoption of premillennialism by a decade or so." "The Doctrine of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit: Its Emergence and Significance," *Wesleyan Theological Review* 13: 124.

271. E.g., A. J. Gordon, *The Ministry of the Spirit* (Philadelphia, 1894), 15–16.



was the presence of the Holy Spirit in every believer and the necessity for repeated "fillings" with the Spirit.<sup>272</sup> {185}

The contrast between the present New Testament age of the Spirit and the previous Old Testament age of law did involve a shift toward a more "private" view of Christianity. The Holy Spirit worked in the hearts of individuals and was known primarily through personal experience. Social action, still an important concern, was more in the province of private agencies. The kingdom was no longer viewed as a kingdom of laws; hence civil law would not help its advance. The transition from postmillennial to premillennial views was the most explicit expression of this change. Politics became much less important.

Few premillennial-holiness evangelists, however, carried the implications of their position to the conclusion—more often found in the Anabaptist tradition—that since Satan ruled this age and its governments, Christians should avoid all political action, even voting.<sup>273</sup> Far more characteristic was a position—typical of the pietist tradition—that saw governments as ordained by God to restrain evil, so that politics in this respect was a means to do good. What they gave up—at least in theory—was the Calvinist-Puritan Old Testament covenantal view of the identity of the people of God with the advance of a religious-political kingdom. Even this idea was not abandoned totally or consistently. Sabbath legislation—despite its Old Testament origins and intention to promote both Christianity and human welfare—continued to be an interest of many. Likewise, prohibition, which was both an attack on a demonic vice and a progressive reform for improving civic life, received support from almost all evangelical quarters.

In any case, at the turn of the century, even while many premillennial-holiness leaders continued to urge private charity, they were also ready, at least on occasion, to urge quite progressive political reform. A. C. Dixon encouraged Christians to promote, and even organize, political parties "for the carrying forward of any great reform." He based his

272. *Plain Papers on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (New York, 1899), esp. 39–69.

273. A. C. Dixon, *Lights and Shadows of American Life* (New York, 1894), 103, mentions two associates who took such a position. See also Chapter XV [of *Fundamentalism and American Culture*] on the variety of views on "Christianity and culture."

argument simply on the duty to “do good to all men.”<sup>274</sup> Similarly, Charles Blanchard, although a convert to premillennial and holiness views, had not yet abandoned—as he eventually would—progressive reform ideals, or even the idea of “Christian civilization,” inherited from his father. “Christian men should lead,” he urged in 1897, in fighting such injustices as unequal taxation, benefits to favored railroads and other corporations, delays in justice in the courts, justice denied to the poor because of excessive legal expenses, and pardons for corrupt officials while poor immigrants served out jail terms. “If Christian ministers and members will not take pains to perform their civil duties,” asked Blanchard, “how are we to expect those others will?”<sup>275</sup> {186}

More consistently pietistic and premillennial, yet just as progressive, was the position taken by James M. Gray in a sermon preached around 1900. Gray’s case is particularly striking, since later, when he served as President of Moody Bible Institute, his political views became rigidly conservative.<sup>276</sup> In 1900 he explained that he was “not expecting the millennium to be brought about by moral and political reforms.” Moreover, he warned that Christians should not allow their money to go “into the pockets of speculators, and boodlers, and loafers and incompetents who feed at the public crib.” Nevertheless, he saw many areas where Christians could use the government to fulfill their social duties toward their neighbors. What is involved, he asked, in my duty to love my neighbor? “I shall feed him if he is hungry, clothe him if naked, visit him if sick, and especially seek to win his soul if lost.” Christians should not hesitate to use other means to show this love, even to the unbeliever. “Is it consistent with the spirit and the mind of Christian [*sic*] that we shall have no interest to ameliorate their material and physical condition, or make it better than it is because they are not following with us?” Gray’s answer was unmistakably progressive:

---

274. Dixon, *ibid.*, 104–8.

275. “‘Christian Citizenship’ being the notes of an address given by President Blanchard of Wheaton College in Willard Hall October 1897,” manuscript, Wheaton College archives. Cf. his remark on “Christian civilization” in “The American College: an Address on the Day of Prayer for Colleges,” pamphlet (n. d., after 1903), 12.

276. Similarly dramatic changes took place in fundamentalist leaders William Bell Riley and John Roach Straton.

There are crowded tenements in our cities where hundreds of souls are herded together through greed of grasping landlords under conditions inferior to those of the cattle in the stockyards; in some of these tenements are sweat-shops where clothing is made at starvation wages and disease bred and scattered wherever their products go; there are dram-shops, brothels and gambling dens open in multiplying variety for the allurements of our young men and women; if our newspapers are to be believed, law is defied continually by municipal and state officers to the demoralization of both public and private standards of right and wrong; Sunday is desecrated; and life is imperiled by the iniquity of those in authority, when it is in the power of the members of the Christian church<sup>277</sup> in almost every community to overawe and remove that official iniquity as Christ Himself drove the traders and money-changers from the temple.<sup>278</sup> {187}

Gray went on specifically to recommend breaking up the American Ice Trust, reputedly in unholy alliance with Tammany Hall. Because the trust raised ice prices "During the terrible heat of the early part of this summer, it was practically impossible for the suffering and dying poor to alleviate their miseries...." He also endorsed the standard causes of the prohibition movement, the banning of gambling, and Sabbath legislation, as other important ways of helping the poor. He even went so far as to cite very favorably the example of Glasgow, where the gas, telephone, and transportation systems were owned by the government and the government was run by Christians. But even if we could work for such good, he cautioned, we must not expect any more than to limit the reign of evil until Christ returns. The rallying cry of Christians in public life should be, "Hold the fort, I'm coming."

---

277. Gray's note here is: "The preacher in such references to the Church is not considering her as acting in a collective or corporate capacity. He believes absolutely in the separation of Church and State, and has in mind merely the duty of Christians as individual citizens" (7). As this remark indicates, the point at issue at the time was not primarily that of separation of church and state. Most Baptists, Old School Presbyterians, and premillennial-holiness evangelicals—the principals in organized fundamentalism—held that the church as such should stay out of politics. This principle, of course, limited the types of social action they would endorse. Nevertheless, as in Gray's statement here, there was lots of room for political action by individuals or groups.

278. James M. Gray, "Relation of the Christian Church to Civil Government," 2nd ed., pamphlet (Chicago, n. d.), 3–10.

We return then to the question of the “Great Reversal,” or what happened to evangelical social concerns. Clearly the earlier stage, the shift from a more Calvinistic to a more pietistic view of politics after the Civil War, was not in itself sufficient to eliminate a sometimes strong emphasis on social aspects of the Gospel. Neither premillennialism nor holiness teachings, both associated with this earlier stage, were sufficient causes either. In fact the holiness views seem to have provided an important impulse for continuing social concerns. Some evangelists, Moody in particular, did use the priority of evangelism, together with premillennialism, as an excuse to avoid saying much on social issues.<sup>279</sup> Most of his constituency was apparently Republican and conservative,<sup>280</sup> as were most Protestants at that time. Yet in {188} 1900 strong social concerns were still commonly expressed by some of Moody’s prominent admirers, both through evangelistically oriented private charity and by advocacy of some political means aimed at the public good.

---

279. An important distinction, common by 1900, was that often those who were saying (in reaction to the Social Gospel) that social action should not come first, before evangelism, nevertheless thought (as Moody apparently did) it important that social benefits would naturally result from evangelism. Robert Speer, a product of the Student Volunteer Movement, sometimes a Keswick speaker and later the leading Presbyterian missionary spokesman, in 1900 distinguished between the “aim” of foreign missions and the “results.” The aim is strictly “a spiritual and religious work,” which missionaries should stick to. The results, however, will touch the body and involve social progress. “The Supreme and Determining Aim,” *Ecumenical Missionary Conference New York, 1900*, vol. 1 (New York, 1900), 74–75. The importance of these results for Speer is indicated in his essay, “Foreign Missions of World-Wide Evangelism,” *The Fundamentals: A Testimony*, vol. 12 (Chicago, ca. 1915), 73. Arthur Johnson, *The Battle for World Evangelism* (Wheaton, IL, 1978), 32–33, uses Speer’s 1900 remarks in a recent evangelical argument against the Social Gospel.

280. This social characterization is made, among other places, in Sandra Sizer, *Gospel Hymns and Social Religion* (Philadelphia, 1978), 139. Sizer argues that the revivals were a response to the political and social crises of the times. Although there likely is something to this argument, it is difficult to substantiate, since every era has a political and social crisis but not all have revivals. Sizer is correct, however, in pointing out that even the apolitical revivals had political implications, especially in that they were seen as the necessary counteraction to the moral disease that was regarded as the basis of political and social ills, esp. 138–59.

The "Great Reversal" (although not as great at the popular levels as sometimes suggested) appears really to date from the second stage, which extended from 1900 to 1930, when social concerns dramatically disappeared or were at least subordinated to others. Though it carries us ahead of our story, we may look briefly at this time period. During this second period the members of the group in question, associated with the Bible institute movement, did not generally alter their theories on premillennialism or holiness. Neither did they abandon politics or become entirely "private" in their outlook. If anything, as will be seen, after World War I they showed increased interest in relating Christianity to the welfare of the entire society, as the antievolution campaign and growing anticommunism demonstrated.<sup>281</sup> Sometimes they did use premillennialism or personal holiness to argue that Christians should not become much involved in work for the public welfare. Moreover, they abandoned the view of Finney and the other mid-nineteenth-century moral philosophers that the kingdom would be positively advanced by good laws. This helped to prevent them from developing any positive or progressive political views of their own. In fact, however, they applied their reservations regarding political action quite selectively, disregarding them when they themselves became concerned with a public issue.

It seems, then, that the basic causes of the "Great Reversal" must be broader than simply the rise of the new dispensationalist or holiness views. At times these theories certainly augmented trends toward more private Christianity. When the occasion arose, these doctrines were readily available to provide rationales for rejecting social reform. So they were contributing causes of the "reversal." Other factors, however, seem to have determined which aspects of social action and reform were avoided.

Social factors contributed to the transformation also; but clear evidence for most of these is lacking or very difficult to assess. From the time of Moody through the fundamentalist controversies of the 1920s, the constituency of these revivalist evangelical movements appears to have been the predominantly white, aspiring middle class of Protestant

---

281. Fundamentalist social and political views, before and after World War I, are discussed in chaps. 11 and 23 [of *Fundamentalism and American Culture*].

heritage. Often they had, like Moody himself, grown up in rural communities and moved to cities.<sup>282</sup> No doubt the tensions inherent in this experience increased with the {189} accelerating urbanization and pluralization of the nation during this whole period.<sup>283</sup> These tensions, however, were doubtless mixed with so many others for those who responded to the Gospel that the weight of the social factors, while no doubt of great importance, is impossible to measure. World War I, more than any other general social experience, intensified conservative reaction of every sort.<sup>284</sup> Yet even such social factors do not fully account for the fundamentalists' rejection or endorsement of social causes. Too many non-fundamentalists, including some liberal and moderate Protestants,<sup>285</sup> had similar social experiences for these alone to offer an adequate explanation.

The factor crucial to understanding the "Great Reversal," and especially in explaining its timing and exact shape, is the fundamentalist reaction to the liberal Social Gospel after 1900. Until about 1920 the rise of the Social Gospel and the decline of revivalist social concerns correlate very closely. By the time of World War I, "social Christianity" was becoming thoroughly identified with liberalism and was viewed with great suspicion by many conservative evangelicals. The Federal Council of Churches tried to maintain some unity in 1912 by instituting a commission on evangelism to counterbalance its well-known

---

282. Sizer, *Gospel Hymns*, 139. Cf. James F. Finday Jr., *Dwight L. Moody* (Chicago, 1969), 262–302. Walter Edmund Warren Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Baptists in North America, 1895–1914," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1974, shows from four local studies that fundamentalists tended to be relatively younger and somewhat lower middle-class than their non-fundamentalist Protestant counterparts, who were more settled. Probably one can assume that middle-class church growth is more likely to occur among the relatively less settled. On Ellis, see [*Fundamentalism and American Culture*], chap. 22.

283. Dayton, *Evangelical Heritage*, 121–35, Moberg, *Great Reversal*, 34–38, and Pierard, *Unequal Yoke*, 29–33, all suggest some social factors in addition to new doctrines and antimodernism. Dayton emphasizes rising affluence, which probably applies more to Holiness groups than to the more strictly fundamentalist types, who generally were not drawn originally from as far down the social scale.

284. See [*Fundamentalism and American Culture*], especially chaps. 16 and 17.

285. Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors," for instance, finds considerable overlap, even though he shows significant overall differences between the two groups.

social activism. By this time the balance was precarious, and the issue of evangelism as opposed to social service was widely debated.<sup>286</sup> World War I exacerbated the growing conflict. When fundamentalists began using their heavy artillery against liberal theology, the Social Gospel was among the prime targets. In the barrage against the Social Gospel it was perhaps inevitable that the vestiges of their own progressive social attitudes would also become casualties.<sup>287</sup> {190}

To understand the fundamentalists' strong reaction against anything that even looked like the Social Gospel, it is necessary to distinguish the liberal Social Gospel from the kinds of evangelical social concern that we have been discussing. It was absolutely essential to the earlier evangelical support of public or private social programs that they be understood as complementary outgrowths of the regenerating work of Christ which saved souls for all eternity. The evangelicals' theological stance theoretically in no way should have been threatened by a commitment to social action per se. The necessary first step in the Christian's life was repentance for sin and total dependence on God's grace. Good works should follow. The only question was what form these should take—individual or public, private or political.

The Social Gospel, however, put almost all the weight on the second half of the equation. Following the lead of philosophical pragmatism, proponents of the Social Gospel held that the only test of truth was action. "Religious morality," said Walter Rauschenbusch, is "the only thing God cares about."<sup>288</sup> The implication was that theological doctrine and affirmation of faith in Christ and His deeds were irrelevant, except as an inspiration to moral action, more specifically social action. The Social Gospel, at least in its classic form as represented by Rauschenbusch, did not deny outright the validity of specific beliefs, but

---

286. These conflicts are suggested, for instance, in William G. McLoughlin Jr., *Modern Revivalism* (New York, 1959), 393–99, who claims that Billy Sunday's rise to his greatest prominence after 1912 was on the crest of reaction to the Social Gospel.

287. The two clear exceptions to this are William Jennings Bryan, whose progressivism was too integral a part of his identity to be abandoned; and fundamentalist support for prohibition, which was too sacred and ancient among their causes to be forsaken simply because liberal Protestants supported it also.

288. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, ed. Robert D. Cross (New York, [1907] 1964), 6.

took the pragmatist position that we cannot know anything about their validity until we see what they do.<sup>289</sup> In sharp contrast, conservative evangelicals held that truth could be known directly and not only by pragmatic test. Moreover, in their view God cared as much about our beliefs as about our actions, although the two were never seen as entirely separable.

The threat that conservative evangelicals perceived in the Social Gospel was not that it endorsed social concern—evangelicals themselves often made similar endorsements. It was rather that the Social Gospel emphasized social concern in an exclusivistic way which seemed to undercut the {191} relevance of the message of eternal salvation through trust in Christ's atoning work. In the nineteenth century some revivalists, and some confessionally oriented conservatives, had already warned against putting too much emphasis on social concerns. Now, however, the question was not simply one of balance. Traditional Christian belief seemed to be at stake. The Social Gospel was presented, or was thought to be presented, as equivalent to the Gospel itself.

Those evangelicals and conservatives who had warned that social interests would inevitably undermine concern for right belief and salvation of souls, now appeared to have confirmation for their claim. Prominent exponents of the Social Gospel emphasis on the kingdom of God as realized in the progress of civilization was readily contrasted with premillennialist eschatological hopes. The dichotomy between the

---

289. There is some debate on the degree of the antipathy of the classic Social Gospel to traditional evangelical Christianity. There are, of course, varieties of the Social Gospel and shades that might blend more into compatibility with traditional belief. Yet in Rauschenbusch, at least, the prevailing tendency is to follow William James and John Dewey in regarding ideas as plans of action rather than as mirrors of reality. Traditional theological categories will not fare well in such an approach. James Ward Smith, "Religion and Science in American Philosophy," *The Shaping of American Religion*, ed. Smith and A. Leland Jamison (Princeton, 1961), 429–30, quotes a long passage from Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, and then comments: "There you have it—the metaphysical heritage of the Christian West shrugged off as 'pagan superstition and Greek intellectualism!' What could Dewey say that would shock a clergy accustomed to this?" To my mind, the test of a genuine example of the Social Gospel is whether other aspects of Christianity are subordinate to, and in effect incidental to, its social aspects.



Social Gospel and the revivalist Gospel became difficult to ignore. As the attacks on liberalism heated up, the position that one could have *both* revivalism and social action became increasingly cumbersome to defend.<sup>290</sup> In any case this attempt at balance declined in proportion to the increase of strident antimodernism.<sup>291</sup>

By the 1920s the one really unifying factor in fundamentalist political and social thought was the overwhelming predominance of political conservatism. Whether they spoke as pietists who would use government merely to restrain evil, or as Calvinists preserving Christian civilization, or {192} even when they sounded like radical Anabaptists opposing all Christian involvement in politics, they were (with few exceptions) antiliberal. In part this was simply part of the wider social expression of middle-class desire for normalcy. But among fundamentalists these tendencies were reinforced by the close relationship

---

290. The impact of fear of liberalism on social questions is suggested in two answers from *Dr. C. I. Scofield's Question Box*, compiled by Ella A. Pohle (Chicago, n.d. [ca. 1920]), from Moody Bible Institute's *Record of Christian Work* in the preceding decades. In answer to a general question on "the relation of the believer to the present world system and politics," Scofield mentioned that Jesus healed the sick and fed the hungry and that love toward neighbors demanded that "whatever we can do to benefit them or to keep them from harm, we should gladly do." This might include political action, although Scofield (not himself a great champion of social action) mentioned only saving neighbors from "the open bar-room." When a similar question suggested a limited Social Gospel ("Is it not part of the mission of the church to correct the social evils of our day?") Scofield was entirely negative. Christ's only response to slavery, intemperance, prostitution, unequal distribution of wealth, and oppression of the weak was to preach regeneration through the Holy Spirit. "The best help a pastor can bring to the social problems of the community is to humble himself before God, forsake his sins, receive the filling with the Holy Spirit, and preach a pure gospel of tender love," 35–36.

291. Both trends seem to accelerate dramatically after World War I. One good example is John Horsch, *Modern Religious Liberalism: The Destructiveness and Irrationality of Modernist Theology* (Scottsdale, PA, [1920], 1924). This second edition is introduced by James M. Gray. Horsch characterizes the Social Gospel as teaching that "education and sanitation take place of personal regeneration and the Holy Spirit. True spiritual Christianity is denied." The most that Horsch has to say in favor of social concern is that "social betterment is excellent as the outgrowth of Christianity..." meaning out of personal regeneration. Social reform is the business of government, he says, not the church. The rest of his account is entirely negative, 127–39.

between the Social Gospel and the progressive movement in politics. Rejecting the one seemed to demand rejecting the other.

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, revivalist Protestants in America reflected fairly closely the patterns and shifts of the political thought of the times, often providing their own Christian versions of prevailing trends. Sometime around 1900 this parallel development was interrupted. To employ a psychological analogy, it was as though a series of shocks had arrested an aspect of personality development. The shocks were religious, intellectual, and social, sharpened by the disruption of World War I. The result was almost as if the positive aspects of the progressive political era had not only been rejected but even obliterated from memory. To continue the analogy, fundamentalists emerged from the experience not so much without social or political views as fixated on a set of views that had been characteristic of middle-class Americans in the last years before the crisis occurred. Their social views were frozen at a point that had been the prevailing American political opinion around 1890, save that the fundamentalists of the 1920s had forgotten the degree to which their predecessors—and even they themselves—had earlier espoused rather progressive social concerns.<sup>292</sup>

---

292. To the extent they did modify these conservative views, as discussed in chap. 23 [of *Fundamentalism and American Culture*], they accentuated them by adopting extremist versions of them, such as extreme anticommunism.

## 2. CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

# GOD VERSUS CAESAR: TAKING STEPS TO PROTECT CHURCH SCHOOLS

---

*John W. Whitehead*

The main issue in any true church-state confrontation will concern the *headship* of Christ. Ephesians 1:22 and related verses clearly posit the principle that Christ, not the state, is the head over the church. Any exercise of control by the state over the church is an assertion by the state that it is the head over God's ministries. It matters not whether the issue is taxation or licensing. In the end it is God versus Caesar.

## *The Separation of Church and State*

Much of Christianity has adopted the humanistic principle of the inherent goodness of man. This is illustrated by the readiness of the Christian community to submit to most of the demands of the state. Modern humanistic government, however, must be seen through the lens of Jeremiah 17:9. Humanistic civil government, therefore, does not exist to perpetuate good but to commit evil. It is irresistibly drawn to evil.

Whether the state is godly or not is beside the issue when discussing church autonomy. biblically, in any instance, the church is autonomous from state control (and vice versa). Scripture mandates that the *institutions* of the church and the state be separate. This does not mean that Christianity is not to be the basis of civil government. What it does mean is that the Christian church in the biblical sense is to operate without interference by the state and is to be protected by the civil government. Historically, it was the purpose of the first amendment to guarantee a separation of church and state in order to keep the church free from state control. The biblical concept of the separation doctrine, however, has no real relationship to the modern pagan concept of separation which asserts that the state must be atheistic.

Where there is a separation of the institutions of church and state, and the state operates from a Christian base, freedom reigns. The obvious example is early nineteenth-century America. If, however, Christianity does not substantially influence civil government, then, as we see today, {194} totalitarianism results. God is the only source of freedom, and once a nation denies God, the ultimate result will be the loss of freedom.

Statist attempts to restrict freedom are illustrated by the recent attacks on Christian schools. The issues are varied and range from legal battles concerning zoning laws to attempts by the state to license Christian schools. There is no sign that the church's struggle with the state in the matter of Christian schools is going to subside—especially in light of three recent but adverse decisions concerning licensure of Christian schools in North Dakota, Nebraska, and Ohio, as well as the Bob Jones University decision.

### *Practical Considerations*

In light of the continuing battle, the church must take practical steps to protect its Christian schools. Two basic considerations, however, are essential in implementing any such steps.

The *first* basic consideration on any matter in the church, including the Christian school, is: *what does the Bible say?* Anything that remotely conflicts with Scripture must be eliminated or, like a cancer, it will contaminate everything done, no matter how godly.

The *second* basic consideration is *consistency*. In the Christian school context, this means that the church must treat the Christian school the same way the other ministries of the church are treated. A clever state prosecutor will attempt in every way to distinguish the Christian school from other ministries of the church. Be consistent!

The following are ways to maintain both religious conviction and consistency in protecting the Christian school from legal attack. They are not to be taken as absolutes but as suggestions and should be adapted to each situation.

1. *The Christian school should never be separately incorporated from the church.* Separate incorporation is an indication that the day school is somehow different from the other ministries of the church. Surely the Sunday school is not separately incorporated from the church.

Avoid using business terminology in church incorporation papers. For example, the incorporation papers of the church should read: “The address of this church is” instead of “The address of this *business* is.”

The concept of incorporation itself is now raising serious questions. Built into many incorporation statutes is the doctrine that all church assets are held in trust for the people of the particular state involved. This type of provision in California law was the root cause of the recent conflict between state authorities and the Worldwide Church of God. Biblically, *all assets in the true church are held in trust or stewardship for the Lord Jesus Christ*. Thus, the trust doctrine is a usurpation of Christ’s authority.

2. *The financial statements of the day school should show the day school as a ministry on the same level as other ministries of the church.* Moreover, {195} the church accountant should be advised not to use the terminology of a commercial enterprise when preparing financial statements. In other words, the financial statements of the church should not make it look as if the church were IT&T.

3. *The church treasurer should write the checks and control the funds that flow in and out of all ministries of the church (including the day school).* Also, all bank accounts should be denominated in a consistent manner. For example, the Sunday school account should not be treated any differently from the day school account.

4. If at all possible, it is advisable that *all ministries use the same physical plant facilities*. Of course, many times the day school ministry will outgrow the other ministries and will have to be moved to another building. In this instance, the separate location of the day school ministry should be as physically close to the church building as possible.

5. *Church constitutions* are becoming increasingly more important as they provide written evidence of a church’s biblical stand on particular issues. If a church holds to a particular belief that is liable to be contested by the state, then it should be codified with supporting Scripture in the church constitution. This will make it easier to rebut the state’s argument that a particular religious belief is merely the preference of the pastor or board of deacons. As written in the church constitution, it is a stated religious conviction of the church itself.

6. *The school name should be virtually the same as the church name and should include the doctrine, if possible, taught in the church.* For

example, the day school ministry of Grace Baptist Church should be Grace Baptist School. This means that there should be one statement of faith for both the church and the school. Moreover, all printed materials (stationery, brochures, etc.) should indicate that the day school is a ministry of the church along with the other ministries.

7. *The governing board of the church should govern all ministries, including the day school.* If a separate school board is deemed desirable, it is advisable that the school board be made up of the parents of the children in the school. Although such a separate school board would be ultimately responsible to the governing board of the church, the fact that the school board is composed of parents places the school on a solid biblical footing since education is the primary responsibility of the parents.

8. *All fund-raising for the day school should be done through the school's parent organization.* This should insulate the church from any allegations or charges concerning activities unbecoming a tax-exempt organization.

9. Many churches are questioning whether or not they should charge *tuition* for their day schools since they charge no fee or tuition for attendance at their other ministries. Whatever the belief in this area, it is important to {196} note that this has been indirectly tested in the courts. Basically, it has been held that contributions to a church by parents with children in a day school ministry are deductible only to the extent that the contribution exceeds the actual cost of the education. (See *Haak v. U.S.*, 451 F. Supp. 1087 [W. D. Mich. 1978].)

10. *Teacher contracts* present a unique problem. If the church treats the day school teacher as a minister of the gospel, then it may be inconsistent to have the teacher under contract. This is especially so if the pastor, associate pastor, and others serving in a ministerial capacity are not under contract. Obviously, this would mean that teachers would have to be very carefully screened before being hired.

11. There is a problem with *church leaders who have their children in the public schools*. It comes into clear focus if the church's position is that it is a sin to place children in the public schools. This is one area where a written standard should be spelled out in the church constitution.

12. It is important to realize that *churches are automatically exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue Code*. A church, therefore, does not have to apply to the IRS in order to be a valid tax-exempt organization. A church can apply for a recognition letter from the IRS. The problem with applying for a recognition letter, however, is that it informs the IRS of the church's location as well as other information concerning the church. It can thus lead to IRS involvement with a church. Moreover, once a church submits to the IRS through application for recognition of exemption, it implies that the church is voluntarily giving the IRS authority to determine whether or not that church is indeed exempt. This may make it more difficult later to argue that the church is not subject to IRS regulations.

13. *Churches must beware of all laws, federal or state, that differentiate between churches and their day schools*. Such statutes in effect separate the school ministry from the church, either explicitly or by implication. These laws, therefore, divide the church into compartments. For example, the Internal Revenue Code does not recognize the school as an integral part of the church. The IRS views the school as a separate entity. Thus, a church which operates a day school is faced with a serious problem once it comes under the authority of the Internal Revenue Code; that is, the church is submitting to a set of laws that repudiate the church's basic religious claim.

14. The issue that is very often raised today is that of the *state's alleged power to tax the church and its ministries*. Volumes could be written on this subject. Suffice it to say here that the tithe belongs to God. Any form of taxation that draws from the tithe is the state taxing God. Clearly, such a taxation would be unbiblical. Moreover, the United States Supreme Court in the early nineteenth century stated that the power of taxation is the power to destroy. It cannot be summarized any better. {197}

### *The Believer And God's Law*

Amidst the humanistic onslaught the church must stand firm on the Bible in protecting its autonomy from state control. It is emphasized that God has given no power to the state which is inconsistent with Scripture. Although the civil government is legitimate, not everything it does is legitimate. Therefore, when the state commits illegitimate



acts, Christians must stand as the apostle Peter did in Acts 5:29. This stand is not a matter of personal choice. It is a matter of obeying God, no matter the price.

# 3. DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH

# ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN: A LESSON IN PREPARATION UNDER THE HAND OF GOD

---

*Rickey Cotton*

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has become known in this country in recent years as a man who proclaims the truth. His Harvard address of 1978 was a powerful challenge to the United States to reverse its course away from materialism, weakness, and decay. He is clearly a man of great depth and intensity. What makes him able to bear the words of truth with such dignity and speak them with such strength and directness? This capacity did not come to him easily; harsh events and deep suffering prepared him for his role. God's hand can be plainly seen in his formation: Solzhenitsyn himself acknowledged that God led him down a path of hopelessness and suffering so that he could come to a place where he would be able to show forth something of God's nature. The path was indeed tortuous: among other harsh events, it took him through World War II, communist prison camps, and a battle with cancer. In these three areas particularly God's hand of preparation can be clearly viewed.<sup>293</sup>

Solzhenitsyn was twenty-three years old when he was conscripted for service in the war against the Germans. He had been married for a little over a year. War is well known for its brutality; perhaps it was especially so for a man of artistic sensitivity like Solzhenitsyn. He served some months as a common soldier doing the work of a stable boy for a transport unit. Then he won a place in a school for artillery officers. He graduated after four months and served continuously at the front until 1945. His service was distinguished; he won two high decorations and rose to the rank of captain.

---

293. The factual information presented above was drawn largely from *Solzhenitsyn: A Biography*, by David Burg and George Feifer (Stein and Day, 1972). The quoted prayer is found on page 190 in this book.

Solzhenitsyn was arrested for “anti-Soviet” thought in early 1945. He was still engaged in active combat on the front and had no opportunity to be with or notify his wife and mother; he was transported directly to Moscow. The “anti-Soviet” crimes consisted of critical references to Stalin in personal letters written to a close friend. The friend was arrested as well. Found guilty, Solzhenitsyn was sentenced to eight years in prison labor camps; his friend’s sentence was ten years. These sentences were to be followed by perpetual exile in a remote province. Solzhenitsyn’s wife learned of his arrest months after it occurred—months spent with no word from him. Under these circumstances, learning that he was imprisoned was actually good news: it meant that he was alive and not dead at the front. {199}

During the first part of his imprisonment, the better part of a year, it seemed certain that Solzhenitsyn would die. He was an intellectual not accustomed to the very hard labor, and the living conditions were very difficult in the prison camp. However, reprieve came: because of his college training as a mathematician and physicist, Solzhenitsyn was assigned to a prison research institute to assist in scientific research. Here life was not only easier, which allowed Solzhenitsyn to survive physically, but he was in the company of many great intellectuals, and it has been said that his education was completed here. The men serving at this research institute, Marfino, were left free to converse; it seems that the authorities were reluctant to disturb the mental set of the prisoners lest it interfere with the valuable research they were doing. So, in effect, these prisoners were more free than citizens on the streets of Moscow. Because they lived with each other twenty-four hours a day, they knew each other well, knew the ones they could trust. So these men could discuss issues freely among themselves and argue different sides passionately. Solzhenitsyn readily absorbed all that was available to him here; he lived, learned, and wrote in this environment for four years.

It was largely his own responsibility that Solzhenitsyn was dismissed from the Marfino prison research institute. There seem to be several reasons for this. One, he was being pressed to accept a promotion to a position where the responsibilities would have demanded the time that he wanted to give to writing and thinking. Another reason appears to be that he was concerned in conscience about the products of some of

the research work done in Marfino. At least part of the research went toward constructing devices used by the secret police to apprehend political prisoners. This knowledge may well have become unbearable to Solzhenitsyn. Also, he apparently had a desire to experience what the common political prisoners had to suffer; he may have felt the need to understand and identify with them so that he could better record their experience. He was transported (a long, severe, and often fatal process) to various labor camps in Kazakhstan; here he worked as a bricklayer and in a machine shop. Before transport, he had to destroy all that he had written while in Marfino; had it been discovered, he would have been resentenced.

Solzhenitsyn had three years to go on his imprisonment. He survived almost two without incident. Then, with hardly a year remaining to serve, he developed stomach cancer. In the primitive camps there was no regular doctor to treat him; a surgeon who was also a fellow prisoner was scheduled to operate. However, the surgeon was deported to another prison on the night before the operation. Days were lost finding another surgeon. One was finally found, he completed the operation, and then he too was transferred. But the tumor was out. The purpose of the surgery was to take out the tumor and to analyze its nature. A slice of it had to be sent eight {200} hundred miles to the nearest laboratory. The specimen carried neither Solzhenitsyn's name nor his camp. This was not due to carelessness: it was official policy that concentration camps did not exist. So the specimen carried the address of a local city hospital and no name. Analysis of the tumor showed that it had been caused by one of the most malignant forms of cancer; immediate X-ray treatment was prescribed to prevent it from spreading. This was to be followed by a second very extensive operation. However, when the analysis was returned to the camp, no one bothered to locate the anonymous patient. He had healed from the incisions and was performing general duties. He was doing useful work and not occupying a clean bed. Why bother?

The cancer, however, for some reason did not spread. The tumor was somehow retarded, perhaps by the operation. It would not recur for a year and a half; not be treated again for almost two years. Meanwhile, Solzhenitsyn did not know the nature of his illness. He had healed of

the surgery, and, though he was occasionally uncomfortable, assumed that he had made a complete recovery.

In March 1953, Solzhenitsyn's eight-year prison term expired. He was now condemned to *perpetual exile* and delivered to the remote Kazakh settlement of Kol Terek. He obtained a position teaching physics and astronomy. This was an important time for Solzhenitsyn—he was making the transition from prisoner to citizen, albeit one in exile. The transition was difficult; the common details of life were not common to him. He has written movingly of a former prisoner trying to buy a shirt who goes into a panic because he cannot grasp how people remember the size of their collars. This transition time was cut short; the cancer returned. Solzhenitsyn had been a free man for only five to six months.

The remote settlement where Solzhenitsyn was exiled did not have the facilities to treat intestinal cancer. Nor could he simply travel to a city that did. To leave his place of exile without official permission would bring instant return to a prison camp for twenty more years. Obtaining official permission to travel was not simple or quick. The Communist bureaucrats were reluctant to take responsibility for allowing exiles to move around. It was months before permission was granted. Meanwhile, the cancer was spreading. Months later, in early 1954, Solzhenitsyn arrived at the Tashkent Hospital for cancer treatment. “I was dying,” he has written. Later he wrote that “I felt like a corpse. That’s what I’d come here for—to die.”

Yet, stunningly, he did not die. He emerged three months later almost as physically sound as he would ever be again. The cancer was stabilized. While Solzhenitsyn has had periodic treatments over the years, the tumor has not interfered with his life again.

One cannot help but ask what made Solzhenitsyn's treatment so successful. The skill of the doctors seems to be a factor—Solzhenitsyn has written {201} very highly of them. Perhaps more importantly, a close friend has written that he believes that Solzhenitsyn somehow ordered the cancer to retreat, and that it obeyed. Solzhenitsyn has never denied that something like this was involved.

With the conquering of cancer, a deepened sense of purpose and calling dominated Solzhenitsyn. The next several years were full of important events. Russia began to experience some hints of freedom

after Stalin's death; Khrushchev came to power, ushering in a brief period of liberalization from certain oppressive Stalinist policies. In 1957, Solzhenitsyn was "rehabilitated." Rehabilitation meant that the former prisoner's conviction and imprisonment were errors; they were erased from official records. It was apparently hoped they would be erased from the former prisoner's memory as well. By far the most important occurrence for Solzhenitsyn, however, was that he was writing.

He did not write for publication or fame, but simply because he felt that he was supposed to. He did not seek publication; yet, through a series of intriguing events, in 1962 Khrushchev himself decided that the book, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, should be published. When it was, Solzhenitsyn was the recipient of immediate worldwide acclaim. The whole literary world knew that a major writer had arrived.

Solzhenitsyn's response to the acclaim was the crowning touch of a life of preparation. All that Solzhenitsyn was feeling found expression in a prayer. The prayer was not a literary device; Solzhenitsyn's spiritual life is one of the most closely guarded aspects of his highly valued privacy. In fact, it is not known when he came to have his faith. So this prayer is a deeply felt statement of Solzhenitsyn's mission and purpose. It is his own confirmation of his calling and formation. It sets forth the purpose of his life and his commitment to that purpose.

How easy it is for me to live with Thee, Lord! How easy to believe in Thee! When my thoughts pull back in puzzlement or go soft, when the brightest people see no farther than this evening and know not what to do tomorrow, Thou sendest down to me clear confidence that Thou art, and wilt make sure that not all the ways of the good are closed.

On this ridge of earthly fame, I look back in wonder at the road which I would never have been able to divine alone—that wondrous path through hopelessness to this ridge from which I too have been able to radiate among men a reflection of Thy rays. And Thou wilt grant me to continue reflecting them as long as need be. And that which I cannot complete will mean that Thou hast allotted it to others.

Other periods of Solzhenitsyn's life are of great importance. Indeed, the whole of anyone's life is actually one piece. But in these three periods of Solzhenitsyn's life, World War II, Communist prison camps, and

the battle {202} with cancer, a crucible of suffering can be seen in which key aspects of this vessel of God were formed. Beholding this man's life should enable us to better endure the process of being molded by God for His purposes.



# **4.**

## **BOOK REVIEWS**

# BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of  
Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925,*  
by George M. Marsden

---

**Reviewed by James M. Peters**

The period from 1870 to 1925 was a time of monumental historical change often described by historians as the emergence of modernity. In *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, George M. Marsden speaks of it as a “paradigm shift” in which the intellectual leadership of America began self-consciously to abandon the essentially orthodox beliefs of its Christian heritage in exchange for what J. Gresham Machen described as “Another Religion.” The ensuing struggle between these two faiths is the focal point of the book, in which both changing theological beliefs and events such as World War I are presented as having consequences upon one another in forming the essential characteristics of twentieth-century fundamentalism.

As a Christian historian, Dr. Marsden sees his task as identifying the “formative cultural elements that have either properly shaped or distorted our understanding of God and his revelation,” in which “the historian may refrain from explicit judgments on what is properly Christian while he concentrates on observable cultural forces” (230). It is a way of doing history which is akin to the formalist art critic whose goal is to describe the significant visual elements which make up the entire image, while leaving value judgments pertaining to its meaning to others considered more suited to the task, either through attitude or by formal training. At this point—giving Dr. Marsden the benefit of a methodological doubt—let me briefly survey what he sees as being formative in shaping American fundamentalism.

## *The Baconian Method*

Fundamentalism was part of a large coalition of evangelical Protestants which confidently dominated nineteenth-century American culture in terms of an eighteenth-century faith in natural law, common

sense, and the Baconian ideal. Marsden draws heavily on the work of Theodore D. Bozeman's *Protestants in an Age of Science* to demonstrate the pervasive influence of Scottish commonsense realism and the scientific method of Francis Bacon upon the leadership of nineteenth-century Christianity. Joseph Butler's *Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed* (1736), and William Paley's *Natural Theology* (1802), were standard texts used throughout the century. God's creation was a unified whole in which the facts of nature and reason were considered common to all men. It was believed that a Baconian science which carefully collected and categorized the facts would inevitably confirm revelation at every point. Reasonable men could no more reject such an array of truth than they could reject the physical laws of the universe discovered by Newton. Even amidst the increasingly obvious antinomies of late nineteenth-century thought, orthodox Christians understood life and defended their faith in terms of eighteenth-century concepts, as indicated by Warfield's introduction to Francis R. Beattie's *Apologetics: Or the Rational Vindication of Christianity* (1903).

Christianity makes its appeal to right reason, and stands out among all religions, therefore, as distinctively "the Apologetic religion." It {204} is solely by reasoning that it has come thus far on its way to its kingship. And it is solely by reasoning that it will put all its enemies under its feet. (115)

It is aptly pointed out in *Fundamentalism and American Culture* that such an apologetic approach, which stressed the common ground of reason among all men, entailed an essentially optimistic view of human nature. Although consistent with America's Jeffersonian love of democracy, it was a significant departure from an earlier Reformed heritage which understood the human intellect to be pervasively darkened by sin and in rebellion against the truth. As an explanation for the inadequacies and inevitable failures of reasoning independent of God, Marsden points out that although this more "venerable" apologetic approach had been revived by Herman Bavinck and Abraham Kuyper, their defense of the faith remained an enigma to most American theologians. Generally, Americans were so thoroughly committed to an eighteenth-century view of science and common sense that they would not clearly see what the Dutch Calvinists were

trying to say. Warfield described their apologetic approach as a “standing matter of surprise.”

Marsden believes that the influential Baconian method was also a significant factor in the development and popularity of dispensational theology. The taxinomial procedure of gathering and classifying facts was employed increasingly as a tool of biblical interpretation. The result of a literal classification of similar styles, phrases, and words used in Scripture was the purported discovery of fundamental laws or economies by which God governed specific periods or dispensations of history. Nathaniel West, a leading interpreter of Bible prophecy in the late nineteenth century, considered the seven dispensations (later canonized in the *Scofield Reference Bible*) to be as permanent and binding as the laws of astronomy discovered by Kepler and Newton. C. I. Scofield considered dispensationalism the only scientific method of biblical interpretation, and saw it as fulfilling the command to divide the word of truth rightly. Marsden goes on to say that dispensationalism was in certain ways typical of the many developmental and dialectic theories of history promoted throughout the century. Dialectical systems claimed scientific authority, dividing history into distinct periods which were dominated by a prevailing principle that finally ends in conflict, and the apocalyptic introduction of a new era.

### *A New Eschatology*

The growing preoccupation in the nineteenth century with the subject of historical progress, and the importation of German higher criticism, focused the attention of the church at large on the nature of the Kingdom and the Christian's ethical relation to a modern civilization which increasingly defined itself in an anti-biblical way. The two most influential, and conflicting, eschatologies of this period are described in general terms reminiscent of Richard Niebuhr's and Ernest Lee Tuveson's works on millenarian movements. Postmillennialism, by far the most commonly held belief during this time, is described as culturally transforming. The Kingdom would arrive as the result of progressive social reform. Premillennialism, on the other hand, is seen as a culture-denying faith, which waits upon the utter failure of society and hopes in the apocalyptic creation of the Kingdom by the return of Christ.

Marsden further describes the postmillennialism of mid nineteenth-century America as a partially “secularized” aspect of an emerging “civil religion.” The outcome of the Civil War was seen as God’s endorsement of the leadership of the northeastern religious establishment, which had been by then strongly {205} influenced by Unitarianism. The Kingdom was to be a kind of classical golden age—the result of the cumulative effect of popular reform efforts to end slavery, oppression, and war. Marsden never really develops in any detail the tremendous difference between the postmillennialism of the early Puritans and what later came to be called by the same name. Although he does point out that nineteenth-century “evangelicals generally regarded almost any sort of progress as evidence of the advance of the kingdom,” a clear line is never really drawn between the Puritan’s Kingdom, defined in terms of the application of biblical law to society, and late nineteenth-century postmillennialism, which could be understood as the extension of Victorian pietism to cosmic proportions.

Premillennialism grew in popularity as many of the problems confronting Christians at the end of the 1800s appeared to be resolved, or at least explained, by the new dispensational approach. The apparent anomalies presented by liberal higher critics—ironically using the same basic hermeneutical method as dispensationalists—between Israel and the church, or between the teachings of Jesus as compared to those of Paul, were resolved by carefully referring them to the proper dispensational context. Christians were also assured that the growing humanistic secularization of western culture was consistent with biblical prophecy and indicated that the era was rapidly drawing to an end. Finally, the dispensational wedge that was driven between the Old Testament and the New—Law and Grace—seemed more in line with the new style of evangelism and pietistic teachings which, according to Marsden, were essentially an Arminian and antinomian departure from America’s Calvinistic heritage.

### *From Reform to Revival*

The transition from a Reformed to a more consistently Arminian and premillennial gospel resulted in what Marsden considers the subordination of individual and social reform to a religious experience of personal revival, and withdrawal from any serious cultural mandate.

Such a change can be seen in the influential lives of Jonathan and Charles Blanchard, who successively guided Wheaton College through this formative time in history. For all practical purposes Jonathan Blanchard was a committed postmillennialist in the nineteenth-century sense of the term. In 1839, giving the commencement address at Oberlin College, he spoke confidently of perfecting society by making “the Law of God the Law of the land.” Blanchard spent most of his life trying to accomplish that very task through the National Christian Association, an organization which attempted to implement various reforms, from increasing Sabbath laws to an amendment of the Constitution which would clearly define America as a Christian nation. Jonathan’s son Charles attempted to carry on the tradition, but with a difference. Charles often preached at Moody Bible Institute, where Miss Emma Dryer convinced him of the truth of dispensational premillennialism. The results were rather predictable and indicate the essential difference between nineteenth-century evangelicalism and emerging fundamentalism.

...[N]o longer was the goal to build a ‘perfect society’; at best it was to restrain evil until the Lord returns.... one side of American evangelicalism was becoming a movement of the disinherited. In 1915 Charles Blanchard wrote that the true disciples of Christ usually would be found in ‘smaller, poorer churches.’ So also had the Blanchard ethical rigor subtly shifted away from efforts to transform the culture toward symbols of separation from it. (31–32)

In *Fundamentalism and American {206} Culture*, D. L. Moody is presented as a transitional figure, the progenitor of fundamentalism, who “helped to fuse the spirit of middle class Victorian America with evangelical Christianity.” Theologically ambiguous, Moody stressed the love of God while omitting reference to judgment. Sin was spoken of not in terms of transgression of God’s law but in terms of the prevailing temptations of the Victorian Age. In every respect, he seemed to be pragmatic and liked what appeared to work best at his revival meetings. Although not understanding dispensationalism in any great detail, he liked premillennialism because its pessimistic view of society gave strong impetus to his evangelistic message of love and mercy in Jesus. It was a message that went well with evangelical pietism, which

increasingly stressed the victory of a higher Christian life: a life of inner personal consecration to Christ in a dispensational age of the Spirit.

In an intriguing analysis of the nineteenth-century Holiness movement, Marsden points out that under the influence of dispensationalism, the early teachings of Finney and the Oberlin school shifted from the detail of Old Testament law to general principles of the New Testament as the basic model for Christian living. Personal sanctification shifted from the ethical to the experiential; it became a private, mystical matter of the heart, which tended to diminish serious Christian involvement in political activities over the years. Marsden indicates that such a shift toward a *passive view of sanctification* was reflected in the most influential hymns of the time in which the prevailing metaphor often seemed to be a spiritualized sexual surrender, especially among the songs of Fanny J. Crosby. By the turn of the century this view of the righteous Christian life could be seen in Charles Trumbull's popular slogan "Let go and let God," a sanctified cliché which has survived to our own day. Generally, evangelicals were unwilling to take premillennialism to its logical conclusion and abandon political activities entirely, but by the first decade of the twentieth century, a growing number of evangelicals saw their cultural responsibilities in terms of defending a besieged fortress until the Lord returned with His angels.

### *Babylon or the New Israel?*

The stage is now set for the focal point of the book, which deals with the creation of fundamentalism as a distinct group, in what is described as "an elaborate litany of crisis," during the first few decades of the twentieth century. The growing struggle was expressed most concretely by the events surrounding World War I, and in 1925 by the well publicized Scopes trial. These conflicts pushed the broad evangelical association beyond its limits. The coalition was forced to become theologically more specific in taking a stand amidst the turmoil, and was pulled apart under the strain. What emerged out of this dissolution was fundamentalism, a denominationally extended group of Christians, bound by their hope in a premillennial eschatology and their ethical confusion about their proper relation to modern culture. As Marsden points out so well, they were never quite sure whether America was "Babylon or the New Israel."

Prior to America's entrance into World War I, most evangelical Christians considered the war the business of no one but the Europeans. In particular, those who were more self-consciously premillennial promoted the Christian virtues of nonintervention and the command to love the enemy. Arno C. Gaebelein, editor of *Our Hope*, a dispensational journal relating prophecy to current events, told those present at the 1914 Prophetic Bible Conference, "God's greatest call is separation." Less consistently anticultural in its premillennialism was the publication {207} *The King's Business*, under the guidance of R. A. Torrey. In 1916, Torrey recommended opposition to Teddy Roosevelt's presidential efforts and quoted the liberal Bertrand Russell at length in support of the antiwar issue. As the war grew in scope many liberal Protestants thought of it as a godly struggle for democratic civilization and considered Torrey's lack of patriotism a threat to national security. Shirley Jackson Case, in the series "The Premillennial Menace," said, "The principles of premillennialism lend themselves to the purposes of World War I propaganda...." Eventually there were even liberal charges that premillennial publications were being financed by a German conspiracy.

By 1918, after a year of Americans fighting in Europe, fundamentalists had made a complete reversal of their previous position, and the German conspiracy was seen from a different perspective. Between Nietzsche, higher criticism, and reported atrocities on the battle field, fighting the good fight came to mean a Christian struggle against modernism. The premillennialist Howard W. Kellogg made the important connection when he said, "loud are the cries against German Kultur... let this now be identified with evolution, and the truth begins to be told." Modernism was now seen (with some degree of consistency) as a paganistic humanism responsible for such aberrations as the "German Monster" which threatened to engulf all of Western Civilization. Marsden points out that

By the end of the war their strongest line of attack on modernism committed them to a position which put forward the survival of civilization as a principal concern. This position accentuated the long-standing paradox in the thinking of American premillennialists. As premillennialists they had to say that there was no hope for culture, but at the same time they were traditional American evangelicals who urged a return to Christian principles as the only cultural hope. (149)



Within this context of desperate urgency, the Scopes trial had a tremendous impact on shaping American fundamentalism, both as a symbol and an event. Symbolically it represented the decline of a powerful American tradition. William Jennings Bryan, the self-appointed prosecuting attorney in the Tennessee monkey trial, epitomized old-line nineteenth-century evangelicalism, with its faith in Christian piety, progress, and American democracy. Although Bryan won the case (later reversed on a technicality), as a Christian apologist he lost the battle. At every point Clarence Darrow, the big city lawyer, demonstrated Bryan's ignorance of the most basic issues between Christianity and modern thought. Throughout the trial Darrow and the liberal press presented Bryan, and fundamentalists in general, as unthinking, intolerant bigots. It was a charge which was often true enough, and created an image which tended to stick hard and fast. The strain seems to have been too great for Bryan, and the Sunday after the trial ended, he died. In an anti-eulogy, laughing at Bryan's "baroque theology" and his "alpaca pantaloons," H. L. Mencken said the country saint had "lived too long and descended too deeply into the mud to be taken seriously hereafter by fully literate men, even of the kind who write school books" (187). The dramatic events of the Scopes trial focused America's attention on a specific issue and helped solidify many fundamentalist groups into more specific organizations across the country. Although by 1928 most of the popular interest in the antievolution issue had subsided, Marsden points out that an extended subculture had emerged, being loosely organized around the creedal statements of dispensational {208} premillennial theology, and schools such as Wheaton College, Dallas Theological Seminary, and Bob Jones University.

### *Methods and Ethics*

There is little doubt that *Fundamentalism and American Culture* is a significant historiographical achievement. It is obvious that Dr. Marsden has spent years carefully collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the historical information surrounding the development of fundamentalism. The work does much to dispel some of the errors of earlier attempts in this area. The many "consensus" interpretations developed by liberal historians, from Steward Cole's *History of Fundamentalism* (1931) to

Richard Hofstadter's *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (1963), are shown to be one dimensional in their attempt to see fundamentalism as primarily a phenomenon of social readjustment. The common paradigm which understood fundamentalism in terms of a rural-city conflict, just does not fit. As many revivals demonstrate, the movement drew some of its strongest support from large metropolitan areas. Expanding on Ernest Sandeen's formative work, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, Marsden not only shows the importance of creedal statements in affecting historical change, but also the varied cultural influences on the development of the theological doctrines themselves. In this regard, seeing dispensational premillennialism as an uneasy synthesis between two essentially contradictory theological traditions—Calvinism and Arminianism—helps explain many of the incongruities surrounding the fundamentalist faith in American history.

And speaking of incongruities, as a Christian historian, Marsden's desire to separate historical methodology from the necessity of making ethical judgments seem to place him in the middle of that same contradictory tradition. It involves an essential paradox which is reflected in the acknowledgment of the main influence on Marsden's intellectual life.

My sympathies may be described most succinctly by saying that I greatly admire two American scholar-theologians, Jonathan Edwards and Reinhold Niebuhr. In the theology of Edwards—especially his sense of the overwhelming love, and beauty of God revealed in Christ, in Scripture, and consistently communicated through all creation—I see a starting point for the attempt to comprehend reality and to see our place in it. In the ethics of Niebuhr, I find a way of understanding the pretensions, limits and folly of even the most admirable human behavior. Particularly, his analysis reveals the inevitable ambiguities in Christians' relations to their culture. (vii)

How one is able to combine the Sovereign God of Jonathan Edwards with the relativistic ethics of Reinhold Niebuhr is a matter of the "sleight of hand," or in this case sleight of mind, indicative of modern dialectics. Marsden's own book chronicles the subtle but relentless shift of Christian ethical standards from those based on the revealed law-word of a Sovereign God to the confused antinomianism of nineteenth-century evangelicals. What essentially amounts to epistemological doubt is often camouflaged in the many corridors of

ethically ambiguous statements. In an attempt to maintain the appearance of some kind of neutral objectivity, in an age of ethical relativism, many conservative scholars have become masters at describing life's many ambiguities. *Fundamentalism and American Culture* is marred by such ambiguities. One is never quite sure what the "cultural forces" are that have "properly shaped" our understanding of God and His revelation. In this Marsden seems to have succumbed {209} to his own warning and failed to achieve his stated task when he says,

The danger is that our culturally defined loves, allegiances, and understandings will overwhelm and take precedence over our faithfulness to God. So the identification of cultural forces, such as those with which this book is concerned, is essentially a constructive enterprise, with the positive purpose of finding the gold among the dross. (230)

---

***Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators,*  
by David Chilton.**

Institute for Christian Economics, P. O. Box 8000,  
Tyler, TX 75711; 242 pp., \$4.95 (paper)

---

**Reviewed by Tommy W. Rogers**

One of the premier spokesmen for "liberation theology" is Ronald Sider (author of *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*). Although Sider utilizes Bible citations and uses terminology of Christian desideratum (community, justice, compassion), so that his thesis *feels* biblical on the surface, the mark of a Christian movement, as Chilton points out, is not wishes, "rights," wants, or needs, but willingness to be subject to the authority of the Word. The *antinomian* (antinomianism is defined by Chilton as "anti-law-ism, the belief and practice of rejecting God's law as the standard for every area of life"), Chilton asserts, is opposed to the authority of God in human affairs. While he may cloak his humanism in a garb of extreme religiosity (as did the Pharisees) or "radical Christianity," his primary goal is abolition rather than implementation of God's law. Revolt against God's eternal standards—rhetoric of liberty, fraternity, equality, justice, notwithstanding—produces the "liberation" achieved by Eve, which was subjection and slavery to sin/Satan.

Chilton believes that Scripture is the appropriate standard for every aspect of life. Scripture tells us a great deal about social processes and institutions. It also tells us that God's law alone is the standard of right and wrong, of justice and injustice (104). Chilton is willing to be subject to biblical law. He reasons on the basis of biblical wisdom, command, and presupposition. For him, the Bible is not to be used as a ventriloquist's dummy. His book is a devastating critique of Siderian theology from the perspective of biblical law.

Chilton's assessment of Sider is that "in the name of 'liberation' he is calling for class war. The exodus provided the Israelites with both *liberty* and *law*. Sider's liberationist 'exodus' is merely lawlessness, and leads back to slavery" (62). Sider's implementive blueprint, according to Chilton's analysis, "calls for socialistic distribution of wealth and government intervention—a blueprint not countenanced in Scripture" (17). *Biblical*, as Chilton maintains he employs it, "means *ruled* by the laws of God's word. As Ronald Sider uses it, it means statism" (205). Statism is defined as "... the applied theology of Ronald Sider and the 'Christian' socialists. For the answer to practically every problem in life, they do not look to God and the law-order He provides. They look instead to the all-powerful state" (220–21).

Notwithstanding his seeming concern for the poor, Chilton asserts, Sider's "liberationist theology" is geared toward theft and plunder rather than the biblical means of overcoming poverty (capital accumulation and growth of real wealth). Sider, in Chilton's judgment, "... has no intention of submitting to biblical standards of justice. He uses the Bible to mask his real intentions with a superficial Christian flavor, but what he wants is *socialistic redistribution {210} of capital*" (131). Socialism, in Chilton's perspective, rather than a method of liberation, "... exalts a malignant, misanthropic disposition into an article of political economy, a machine for tyranny" (118).

Chilton advises that in evaluating Siderian theology, "we must not look merely at alleged ideals—that the poor should have enough to eat, that we all should be healthy... but we must look closely at how he intends to accomplish these things. He wants to see the state empowered to enforce his goals in every area of life" (155). Careful attention must be paid to the real focus of his thought, which, in Chilton's assessment, "is too often in opposition to his claims... a casual reading might

cause us to swallow the unbiblical ideas which he tends to fuse with the teachings of Scripture” (135). Even if advocated and promoted in ignorance rather than evil intent, Chilton writes, “comprehensive statist planning means nothing other than the concentration of power.” This concentration, Chilton contends, forbidden by the law of God, is therefore doomed to failure. “It cannot increase resources, capital, or productivity. It cannot ultimately do anything for the poor. The only thing statism will ever produce is the judgment of a jealous God upon its presumption. Sider’s appeal for state controls will result only in tyranny and destruction” (156).

Socialism, Chilton posits, “*is a religious faith... the religion of Man. It is the product of humanism.... Rejecting God’s word, the socialist has a vision of reality completely determined by his adoration of the omnipotent state. He is hypnotized by power*” (155).

Chilton’s book is both an analytical critique and a substantive statement in its own right. Chilton sets forth biblical principles with respect to property, work and dominion, exchange, money (28–36), the Jubilee (39–55, 127–132), and the exodus (57–62). He also discusses overpopulation (95–101), profits (103–8), advertising (111ff.) equality (135–52), the role of the state (26–28, 145–56), the message of the prophets (159–66), and the basis for economic growth and overcoming poverty (179–201).

Chilton provides notable discussion of *guilt* and *envy* as social processes. Chilton opines that “Sider’s message creates guilt feelings in people by directing envy toward them and encouraging them to feel somehow responsible for the envy of others.” Such guilt, he adds, is a false guilt, the manipulation of which “is an important weapon in the arsenal of modern socialism” (212). The guilt, Chilton asserts, “is not objective, moral guilt [which we should feel on breaking God’s commands], but the psychological, sociological feeling of guilt because of transgressing some man-made law.... Sociological guilt is used as a manipulative device to prepare us for socialism. The Sider ‘guilt trip’ is unbiblical” (7–8).

Chilton evaluates envy as a cultural bone rot (Prov. 27:4), and the politics of guilt and envy as “nothing other than *class hatred and war.... And that, assuredly, is the sociology of Satan.*” It is, Chilton states, “a blight on the soul, a rottenness eating at the foundations of culture. No

society can long survive it: the nation that fails to overcome it through faith and obedience will fall" (125).

The reason for Western prosperity, rather than fortuitous, is the outgrowth of the "Puritan ethic" (diligent labor, savings, investment, the philosophy of free enterprise). The route for external blessings, in Chilton's view, is external obedience, not demanding a "fair share" of resources owned by others or by using government coercion for redistributionary theft. He further feels that the religious basis for culture always bears fruit in the economic sphere. Culture, he says, is produced by religion but to some degree lags behind {211} it. (This is why, Chilton writes, some ex-heathens were prohibited from exercising full civil status in Israel for up to ten generations.) When the religious basis of a culture is transformed, it does take time for that change to work itself out in the cultural life. Neither the basic economic structure for a productive nonsubsistence or non-poverty society, nor the Christian framework of freedom within law, can simply be imposed upon heathen society in *ipso presto facto* fashion.

While the poor do need free enterprise, capital investment, and rising productivity as necessary ingredients for attainment of better living standards, the fundamental issue is not poverty and hunger, but *faith and ethics*. The present-oriented slave (i.e., Banfield's description of the lower class) cannot be regenerated into lasting change either by capitalist moralizing or by handouts which reinforce moral deficits. What the poor need most cannot be reached by mere capital, and, while socialism cannot sustain higher living standards among the poor, neither can an amoral capitalism of itself provide an appreciable change in the poor. Apart from the deep penetration of God's word into the basic ethos of society, nothing lasting can be done.

Chilton contends that "if we are *genuinely charitable*, we must give much more than money and food, and our charity must not be focused on mere money and food. And, particularly," Chilton advises, "we must not do what Ronald Sider does in his book. Banfield warns against the use of rhetoric which tends 'to encourage the individual to think that "society" (e.g., white racism), not he, is responsible for his ills.'" The poor need the biblical gospel of Christ as Savior and Lord. Personally, and by our giving, Chilton writes, we must bring the gospel (not the "cheap" evangelism of the antinomian, but the full-orbed demands of

the covenant in penetration and permeation of every area of life) to the poor. “The poor must learn the relationship of salvation to family life, work, debt, responsibility, thrift, savings, and everything else.” Christian schools “that are centered firmly in the application of God’s laws to the various disciplines, including the learning of trades,” are said to be in order.

Also,

... we do need to support *political action* in order to change the truly unjust structures that hurt the poor. We must seek to *abolish*: the minimum wage, fractional reserve banking, the government monopoly of the mint, compulsory education laws, rent controls, zoning restrictions, tariffs, price supports, price ceilings, closed-shop union laws, taxation of property and inheritance.... We need to do everything we can to increase the productivity of God’s world.... (184)

Syncretism of truth and error has resulted in the widespread marketing and acceptance of pagan doctrines under a Christian facade. All cultural activity is essentially an outgrowth or expression of man’s religion. The avowed revolutionary, who often is more self-conscious than most, is often thereby more observedly and/or avowedly religious than his fellow men. The tendency to fuse Christian language with revolutionary concepts—from John Brown to Karl Marx to Adolph Hitler—has repetitively manifested itself in history. Nevertheless, *the defining feature of the Revolution*, Chilton suggests, *is hatred for the gospel*. In some quarters, rank Marxism is given Christian dressing and regarded as on a par with, or as superior to, Scripture.

Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. However, he remained uncorrupted by pagan thought. He retained the ability to recognize pagan thought and pagan presuppositions {212} for what they were. Marxism, “Christian socialism,” “liberation theology,” etc., must be understood for what they *are*, and judged accordingly. Chilton’s book is valuable in maintaining this distinction. In my judgment, Chilton artfully, definitively, and unequivocally demonstrates Siderian theology to be antinomian humanism (lawlessness) in Christian veneer. Irrespective of whether one agrees with him on all interpretations, definitions, and positions taken (as I disagree regarding the position expressed relative to immigration), persons to whom Jesus is Lord (and which status of necessity involves intent to subjugate thought on

matters social and political and all of life to the living Word set forth in Scripture) must recognize and appreciate the presuppositions on which Chilton's presentation is based. His work thereby deserves our serious reflection and evaluation with all the prayerful, studious, open-hearted solemnity by which spiritual issues are appropriately tried (1 John 4:1). This consideration is appropriately apt for believers (redeemed persons whose thought-form and lifestyle partakes of the new creaturehood and renewed mind of Jesus's liberation) in a discipline whose ethos and imagination is a concatenation of humanism. Chilton's book merits the consideration of persons interested in the interrelationship of the Word and societal organization and the implications of Scripture for "doing" sociology.

---

***Wealth and Poverty*, by George Gilder.**

Basic Books, New York, NY, 1981; 306 pp., \$16.95

---

**Reviewed by Tommy W. Rogers**

The central theme of *Wealth and Poverty* is the need to extend to the poor the freedoms and opportunities, the values of family and faith, that are indispensable to wealth and progress. Though such objective is said by Gilder to be a central theme of American liberalism, it is one wherein today, he feels, "in a great historic irony, Phyllis Schlafly, Connie Marshner, Edwin Feulner, Jack Kemp, and others on the 'New Right' have become the best friends of the poor in America, while Liberalism administers new forms of bondage and new fashions of moral corruption to poor families."

Many friends of capitalism, though eloquent in their critique of collectivism and realistic in their understanding that freedom is both good in itself and that it also makes us rich, while the outworking of collectivism compounds bondage with poverty, nevertheless have seen no reason to give capitalism a *theology* which assigns to its results the assurance of justice or demonstrates that capitalism is successful precisely because it provides leeway for the creativity of leadership. Departing from the friends of capitalism who respect its vigorous historic thrust but predict its decline and fall, as well as from the foes of



capitalism who see both practical and moral failure in its results, Gilder holds forth as a *blatantly evangelical capitalist* speaking outrightly for its high adventure and redemptive morality.

Gilder sees kinship by default if not intent in the convergence of the themes of criticism in American life voiced by the pro-freedom spokesmen who feel that the very successes of capitalism predispose its atrophy, and the spokesmen of the left who bow before and worship the exalted state. Such diverse personages as Robert Heilbroner, Daniel Bell, Irving Kristol, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, and Tom Hayden have more in common than they suppose, Gilder asserts. "Most crucially, they assume that capitalism is an edifice without an inherent foundation in {213} morality and religion, and that therefore it engenders a shallow and dubious order of human life. None of these men, it would seem, could have done much better than the dumbfounded President Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was confronted with Nikita Khrushchev's charge that our system is immoral because it is based on greed."

Gilder presents capitalism as the only appropriate system for a world in which all certainty is sham. Human needs and numbers annually increase; science and technology provide their continuing surprises. The exigency, complexity, and multiplicity of life on earth becomes yearly more unfathomable to any tyrant or planner. No nation can grow and adapt to change except to the extent that its productive wealth is diversely controlled and can be freely risked in new causes, flexibly applied to new purposes, steadily transformed into new shapes and systems.

The reason capitalism succeeds, Gilder contends, is that its laws accord with the *laws of mind*. Because economies are governed by thoughts, they reflect not laws of matter but the laws of mind. A crucial facet of the law of mind is the role of problems. Problems, dilemmas, and paradoxes, Gilder asserts, rather than sources of discouragement and frustration, are necessary spurs of new knowledge and creativity. The secular rationalist mentality, however, sees problems, hardships, and paradoxes as obstacles to achievement and truth. One can see in many fields of modern life, from the Department of Energy to the theory of economic development, the elaboration of multifarious answers, piling up in greater and greater complexity, which collectively constitute the essential problem of the secular rationalist age.

Ideas become increasingly rigid and complex, covering ever wider expanses of knowledge in an ever less satisfactory way. If a new idea seems to contradict the old, one dismisses the new idea. Thus the dynamics of growth—a largely spontaneous and mostly unpredictable flow of increasing diversity and differentiation and new products and new modes of production—is contravened. *The entire range of current government programs* are interpretable as a far-reaching and resourceful *defense of the status quo against all emerging competitors*. Economic policy focuses on stimulating aggregate demand for *existing* products rather than on fostering the supply of new ones. Our taxation and subsidy systems excessively cushion failure (of businesses, individuals, and local governments), reward the creativity and resourcefulness of corporate lawyers and accountants, and wait hungrily in ambush for all unexpected, and thus unsheltered, business success.

The most general and important effect of government attempts to shield itself and its clients from uncertainty and risk is to place the entire system in peril. Employment policies, which are increasingly based on new forms of tenure and entitlement rather than on expanding opportunities and new kinds of jobs, are to some degree designed to shield the poor and vulnerable from the costs. However, Gilder feels that irrespective of the cosmetics of egalitarian policies, their chief effect is to deny to the lower classes the benefits of a progressing economy. And, as Gilder sets forth,

The phenomenon of government support for mismanagement, inefficiency, and reaction reaches far beyond business. Comfortable failure will always and inevitably turn to politics to protect it from change. Just as declining businesses turn to the state, people and groups that shun the burdens of productive work and family will proclaim themselves a social crisis and a national responsibility—and sure enough, they become one. The more federal aid that is rendered to the unemployed, the {214} divorced, the deviant, and the prodigal, the more common will their ills become, the more alarming the graphs of social breakdown. A government preoccupied with the statistics of crisis will often find itself subsidizing problems, shoring up essentially morbid forms of economic and social activity, creating incentives for unemployment, inflation, family disorder, housing decay, and municipal deficits, making problems worse by making them profitable. As government grows, there all too quickly comes a time when solutions are less profitable than problems.

A *managed economy*, the author asserts, is almost by definition a *barren one* which can progress only by borrowing or stealing from abroad. *The crucial and definitive economic conflict*, rather than a split between capitalists and workers, government and business, or whatever dichotomy (liberals/conservatives, rich/poor, haves/have nots) that is descriptively employed, is reducible to deeper conflict of which the above are distorted reflections: the *struggle between past and future*, “between established factories, technologies, formations of capital, and the ventures that may soon make them worthless—ventures that today may not even exist ... but which, in time, in a progressing economy, must rise up if growth is to occur.”

Governments everywhere are torn between the clamor of *troubled obsolescence* and the claims of *unmet opportunity*; between enterprises shrinking from competition or asking subsidies for their errors and companies seeking human and capital resources to create new products and new markets for them. As capitalist governments weave themselves ever more deeply into the economic fabric, capitalist and democratic political systems enlist themselves on the side of stagnation and against creative growth.

Gilder points out that one reason for government resistance to change is that the process of creative destruction can attack not only an existing industry, but also the regulatory apparatus that subsists on it; and *it is much more difficult to retrench a bureaucracy than it is to bankrupt a company*. A regulatory apparatus is a parasite that can grow larger than its host industry and become in turn a host itself, with the industry reduced to parasitism, dependent on the subsidies and protections of the very government and society it once amply fed. Bureaucracies often are closely aligned with the industries they regulate, particularly when the regulation—along with excessive taxation—so damages the industry that, like the American railroad and utility corporations, they finally fall helplessly into the arms of the state. The result is the commitment of the entire social order to rigid bureaucratic and administrative systems which respond to the worsening crunch by raising taxes and increasing controls. Every new measure of desperation by the prevailing powers raises still higher the obstacles to innovation and progress, and makes the final disaster still more ineluctable.

Gilder feels that *our central problem arises from a deep conflict between the processes of material progress and the ideals of “progressive” government and culture.* The values of bureaucratic rationality, predictability, sexual liberation, political “populism,” the replacement of faith with hedonism, are said to be “quite simply inconsistent with the disciplines and investments of economic and technical advance. The result is that all modern governments pretend to promote economic growth but in practice doggedly obstruct it.” If we tell the poor that the system is corrupt, racist, and partly ruled by violence and can be beaten only through the attainment of college degrees and civil-service credentials, we give them a false and crippling view of society. Hatred of wealth producers, {215} Gilder asserts, has become the racism of the intelligentsia.

The author feels that the goal of welfare should be to help people out of dire but temporary problems, not to treat temporary problems as if they were permanent ones, and thus make them so. Welfare is said by the author to erode work and family and thus keep poor people poor. Accompanying welfare “is an ideology—sustaining a whole system of federal and state bureaucracies—that also operates to destroy their faith. The ideology takes the form of false theories of discrimination and spurious claims of racism and sexism as the dominant forces in the lives of the poor. The bureaucracies are devoted to ‘equal opportunity’ and ‘affirmative action.’ Together they compete with welfare in their pernicious influence on the poor—most especially those who happen to be black.” Gilder is persuaded that the demoralizing blandishments of the War on Poverty and the explosion of welfare explain more about the current condition of blacks in the United States than does past racism.

Noting that liberals appear to display a strange nostalgia for bigotry and to cherish the idea of racism, Gilder observes that the doctrine of “racism” or “sexism” as causal or explanatory doctrine serves a symbiotic purpose, for, “if racism is dead, blacks and their political patrons will not much longer be allowed to run the bureaucracies—or subsist intellectually on the rationales—of civil rights, affirmative action, busing, Equal Employment Opportunity suits, expanded welfare, and compensatory employment programs.” He observes that as fact, racism has evaporated, although the rhetoric continues, albeit parodied and

trivialized in charades like “subliminal racism,” “contraceptive genocide,” and judicial figments like “de facto segregation.”

In his discussion of the negative impact of government on blacks, Gilder points out that some 25 percent of all black doctors (excluding doctors in medical disciplines) work for government bureaucracies. He suggests the orientation of the Ph.D. leadership among blacks toward Washington as the source of all progress, toward discrimination as the root of all evil, and toward secure billets in bureaucracy as the source of wealth, is a questionable favor to blacks. And, he states, it is even more certain that Washington is damaging the prospects of the black poor by cultivating a pervasive expectation of bias, an air of ambivalent pugnacity, and a posture of resentment and appeals for rights rather than upward movement and self-reliance. At a time when it is hard to find discrimination anywhere, blacks are being induced to see it everywhere. Gilder feels discrimination is not the problem of the American poor, but, to the extent they think it is, they will be unable to read the signals of the real world in which they live. Gilder further points out the manner in which equal-rights campaigns discriminate in favor of the established classes over the poor through credentials that can be purchased and/or derived from politics and patronage rather than the hard work and the drive to get ahead that are said to be the chief assets of the classes below.

The antidiscrimination drive can only reap a harvest of demoralization, workforce withdrawal, and family breakdown, and a decay in the spirit of work, family, and faith on which enduring upward mobility depends. Although his approach to welfare admittedly will not likely draw plaudits from welfare-rights organizations, nor from politicians who enjoy the power of granting excessive benefits to some and cracking down ritualistically on others, Gilder is convinced that a disciplined combination of emergency aid and austere in-kind benefits well below the return levels of hard work offers the best that any welfare system can hope to achieve—some promise of relieving poverty {216} without a welfare culture that perpetuates it. The crucial goal of all antipoverty policy must be to lift the incomes of males providing for families and to release the current poor from the honeyed snares of government jobs and subsidies, policies which, unfortunately, are the opposite of ones most favored by government and the academy.

Gilder is equally adamant in his arguments for dramatic tax cuts even without a cut in government spending (as desirable as that also is recognized to be). Taxation overkill is seen in “the increasing tendency, quite novel in our history, for citizens at all levels of income to speak exclusively of *real earnings* or *take-home pay*.” By raising taxes on real income to confiscatory levels, inflation now heavily promotes the growth of tax-exempt or sheltered parts of the economy at the expense of the taxable parts. Above-ground effects include managerial diversion of its cash flow from profitable investments to martini lunches, fees for celebrity consultants, prestige advertising, country club memberships, support of sports events, and trips to management conferences at desirable places, not to mention the canny legions of superfluous money intermediators, lawyers, accountants, and other financial finaglers whose manipulations are of considerable value to their clients but contribute little to the long-run growth of the economy.

Gilder suggests that the most fundamental damage inflicted by the seventies’ inflation comes from a disorientation of the economy away from productive activities toward diversionary or tax-evasive ones. Much of the damage of “taxflation” can be mitigated by or overcome by tax cuts. While admitting that the case against governmental deficits is extremely plausible and telling, Gilder recognizes the fact that, in an economy with an overweening public sector, public spending may well increase even if the gargantuan waste and perversity of leftist giveaways decline. Even deficit spending is said to be preferable to failure to provide drastic cuts in taxation.

...In the 1980s the United States must remove the tax burdens and paralyzing protections and subsidies from the private sector, and release its energies, even in the face of demonstrations by the most eminent conservative economists.... The fact is that tax cuts provide the only desirable way of either balancing the budget or supporting new spending for defense.

As Gilder well notes, if we continue subsidizing the dying parts of the economy and the deadening growth of bureaucracy, inflation and torpor will persist, regardless of all the heroic discipline of debt and money.

---

***The New Right: We're Ready To Lead,*  
by Richard A. Viguerie.**

Viguerie Company, 7777 Leesburg Pike,  
Falls Church, VA 22043, 1981; 191 pp., \$8.95.

---

**Reviewed by Vern Crisler**

When I was halfway through this book, President Reagan nominated a pro-abortionist, pro-ERA Appeals Court Justice from Arizona to the Supreme Court. This nominee was praised by Senator Teddy Kennedy and various factions of the extreme left. House Speaker Tip O'Neill said it was the best thing that the President had done since he'd been in office. About this same time, I came across a presidential document that said: "Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, I determine that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank of the United {217} States to extend a credit in the amount of \$120,742,500 to the Socialist Republic of Romania in connection with its purchase of two nuclear steam turbine generators and related services and spare parts. On my behalf, please transmit this determination to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. This determination shall be published in the Federal Register. Signed Ronald Reagan, The White House, Washington, May 20, 1981."

My immediate response to all this was to write a nasty letter to the President advising him that I no longer valued his services as the leader of nascent conservatism. I eventually "spiked" the letter and sent another one to the Senate Judiciary Committee recommending that they had better do something to stop the appointment of the new Supreme Court nominee. My efforts, I am sure, will have been to no avail by the time this *Journal* is published; perhaps Mrs. O'Connor will surprise us and take a more conservative stance than she did in the Arizona state senate. But in the meantime, New Right conservatives and pro-lifers feel betrayed; President Reagan has left them open to ridicule, mockery, and derision from loudmouthed feminists and stuffy liberals. So I was a little skeptical about the title of Richard Viguerie's book. Is the New Right ready to lead? Consider these statements by Viguerie, page 176:

Today, there is not one outspoken born again Christian in the Reagan Cabinet.

Why does it seem we're being ignored and over-looked by President Reagan?

Most every conservative I've talked to since President Reagan started to put together his White House team has told me they are disappointed.

The majority of policy making positions in the Reagan Administration have gone to the moderates and liberals.

One thing is clear; the New Right is *not* leading. As Gary North has pointed out, the New Right is ready to win votes, but *not* ready to lead—not yet, anyway. The problem now seems to be that President Reagan is more interested in pleasing liberals and feminists than in pleasing New Right or pro-life groups. He is being “Nixonized”; he has surrounded himself with Nixon-Ford retreads; he has already shown a tendency to put politics over principle. Basically, we are seeing a return to the old Jerry Ford gray-sludge policies of political compromise. (In case any of you may have missed what Gary North means by his often repeated description of political compromise—gray sludge—go take a look and see what's in your nearest septic tank.)

So what are we going to do about this? *First*, we have to put pressure on our elected officials. *Second*, we have to start thinking long-term. As Viguerie points out, we must “believe that we will govern America” (180). We must have an *eschatology of victory*. Viguerie gives us a kind of New Right political version of postmillennial eschatology:

When Martin Luther nailed his 95 theses to the church door, he didn't know he was launching the biggest revolution in the history of Europe. Like everyone else in his time, he assumed that there would always be one all-inclusive Church. But within a few years the entire face of the continent was changed. I believe that something similar, on a smaller scale, is now happening in America. Like Luther, American conservatives didn't set out to make radical changes—just to restore some basic principles. But we've found that the ancient truths require new actions. Our new reality has been achieved—though only partially so far—in the New Right, a network nearly as vast and complex as all the new Reformed {218} churches that sprang up in Europe in Luther's time. If the Reformation could occur so swiftly in the age of the printing press and the horse-drawn carriage, think of how fast America can change in the age of television, computers, and jet



planes! ... But our final triumph won't happen automatically. All the conditions are favorable. But we still have to make it happen, just as much as when we set out, many years ago, to fight our first lonely battles. (180–83)

According to Viguerie, the most important factor in gaining political power is leadership: “The basic ingredient now is *leadership*. That’s what the New Right has to offer. But we can’t get too much of it. There has never been a leadership surplus” (184). Leadership, of course, means hard work and a lot of foot-washing (John 13:13–17); and Viguerie’s career as a foot-washer began in 1952 working for Dwight Eisenhower. He spent some time working with John Tower’s Senate election campaign (which was successful). He later answered a *National Review* ad, wound up as the account executive for Young Americans for Freedom, and saved the financially strapped organization from bankruptcy. Because he was shy, Viguerie found it hard to ask for money directly, so he wrote letters—fund-raising letters, *New Guard* subscriptions, YAF memberships—everything, he says. This was the beginning of his direct mail experience. In 1965 he invested \$400 and started his own direct mail business, Richard A. Viguerie Company Inc. He was able to build up a list of 12,500 contributors by going down to the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives; there he hand-copied the names and addresses of those who gave \$50 or more to the Goldwater campaign. Since photocopying was not allowed, Viguerie hired several women to take over and this helped speed things up. This early list became the basis of his now famous New Right mailing list.

Viguerie says that the New Right came about because the Republican and Democratic parties were not sensitive to the feelings and beliefs of rank and file conservatives. Paul Weyrich, Howard Phillips, and Terry Dolan agreed with Viguerie, and they began to organize and develop their respective groups; they had four things in common:

1. A developing technical ability—in direct mail, in mass media, in practical politics.
2. A willingness to work together for the common good.
3. A commitment to put philosophy before political party.
4. An optimism and a conviction that they had the ability to win and to lead America.

As Viguerie points out: “The more we talked and worked and planned together, the more we realized we could make things, important things, happen. We learned together and we helped educate each other about movement building” (53). The investment paid off. In 1980, several leading liberals were sent packing: George McGovern, Frank Church, John Culver, Birch Bayh. It was a rout.

It isn’t hard to see how the New Right groups could gain so much political power. Their success, Viguerie says, is built on four elements—single-issue groups, multi-issue groups, coalition politics, and direct mail (78). Notwithstanding liberal claims that *single-issue politics* is a perversion of the American political tradition, New Right activists have built up an amazing constituency of single issue groups—pro-life, pro-defense, pro-family—and all packing tremendous political power. Liberals, of course, cannot cast stones; they’ve been slouching around in left-wing single-issue groups for years. The genius of these New Right single-issue groups is that by narrowing down their {219} political goals to one or two issues, they can increase their numbers several times over. For instance, a pro-defense voter may not be a pro-lifer. A multi-issue group that contained these two positions under its wings would have a hard time attracting this voter (and potential contributor). The single-issue group, however, could target that pro-defense voter for his pro-defense position alone. By this method, the New Right can mobilize a vast number of people even though they may have diverse opinions. Multi-issue groups (political parties, unions, etc.) cannot find millions of contributors and voters who agree on twenty different issues; so the number of people who support multi-issue groups is limited. But the single-issue groups can find millions of contributors because of their limited political agendas. What we are speaking about here is called a *division of labor*. Viguerie notes, however, that it is a sign of conservative strength that many *conservative multi-issue groups* have done quite well in gathering supporters and contributors. (Multi-issue groups seem to provide most of the intellectual ideas for the single-issue groups. Some of these multi-issue groups are the Conservative Caucus, the American Conservative Union, and the Heritage Foundation.)

*Coalition politics* is also one of the keys to the New Right’s political success, Viguerie says. Antiabortion, anti-ERA, anti-gun control, and

antitax groups have come together and given liberal politicians a collective headache. Coalition politics allows conservatives to work outside the party system (a fact that Republican National Chairman Richard Richards doesn't like at all: he is a member of the gray sludge fraternity).

Probably the most important factors in the New Right's success is *direct mail*. "Frankly," Viguerie says, "the conservative movement is where it is today because of direct mail. Without direct mail, there would be no effective counterforce to liberalism, and certainly there would be no New Right" (90). The conservatives' basic means of communication is the U.S. mail: "We sell our magazines, our books, and our candidates through the mail. We fight our legislative battles through the mail. We alert our supporters to upcoming battles through the mail. We find new recruits for the conservative movement through the mail. Without the mail, most conservative activities would wither and die" (91). Unquestionably, then, *direct mail is necessary for any successful political program*. Viguerie would be doing his readers a great service by writing a book on the mechanics of direct mail alone. Churches can have a field day with their evangelism programs by using direct mail. Those who go door-to-door can take along a questionnaire, find out what people believe on certain issues, and then feed the information into a TRS-80 computer. All you have to do then is push a few buttons, wait for the info on just who believes what, let the computer give you their names and addresses, send out your literature (more questionnaires, a fund-raising letter, schedules for biblical seminars, etc.), and then wait for the response. If Viguerie is correct about direct mail paying for itself, then your cash-flow will soon pay for the computer, and other things as well. The potential of computer technology and direct mail wizardry cannot be overstated. Larry Pratt, a Virginia State Legislature Delegate, by using direct mail and his computer, stopped the State Board of Health's plan to allow public funding of abortions. As Gary North explains: "Pratt went down into his basement, cranked out 7,500 labels, sent a letter telling people to organize their local pro-life groups to protest in writing to the Governor. About 2,000 letters hit the Governor's office, plus thousands of names on petitions, probably four times the number from the abortionist organizations. The Governor vetoed the {220} Board of Health's decision." For a

cassette tape describing how this was done, write: Political Data Systems, 101 S. Whiting St., Suite 112, Alexandria, VA 22304.

Viguerie tells how direct mail helped defeat the common situs bill that President Ford was about to sign. The National Right to Work Committee mailed over 4 million letters to people who were likely to agree with them on this issue. The result was a flood of 720,000 letters and postcards to the White House urging a Presidential veto (92). Also, as pointed out, Viguerie says that direct mail can pay for itself: "It is a unique form of advertising. If done properly, it pays for itself which is something almost no other form of advertising can do for conservatives" (93). Ironically, it was George McGovern who first popularized the use of direct mail. He was able to become the Democratic presidential candidate by targeting 250,000 supporters to finance his race. Viguerie also believes that John Anderson would not have become a serious Presidential candidate if it were not for his direct mail experts (94).

Direct mail, then, is one bit of Western technology that Christians cannot ignore; to do so would be a disaster.

Viguerie devotes one chapter to the leadership of the New Right, another one to the need for American military superiority vis-a-vis the Soviets, and some others chapters to the tax revolt, the pro-family movement, and cultivating blue-collar and minority support for conservative causes.

One of the most interesting chapters is on the emerging influence and power of fundamentalist political groups. In 1976, Jimmy Carter made "born-again Christians" a national political force (123). In 1980, they turned against him *en masse*. They never expected a fellow fundamentalist to allow the IRS to run roughshod over Christian schools, or to state publicly that he would veto a bill allowing voluntary prayer in public schools. The National Affairs Briefing Conference, held in August 1980, was by far the most important event in the history of fundamentalism. Crowds ranged from 7,000 to 15,000 at the Dallas meeting; a major presidential candidate, Ronald Reagan, addressed the crowd and stated flatly that the theory of evolution had "great flaws" in it, and that creationism should be taught in public schools along with the evolutionism. There was no apparent concern by the majority of fundamentalists who spoke at or attended the meeting, that their newly

discovered political activism was a denial of fifty years of dispensational, pietistic preaching. Nor were they bothered by the criticisms of left-wing clergymen like William Sloane Coffin Jr. (You remember, the same one who said that the Bible was like a mirror: “If an ass peers in, you can’t expect an apostle to peer out.” Mr. Coffin was speaking from personal experience.) Even Mr. Billy Graham found himself at odds with the whole affair: “You don’t hear much [from the fundamentalists] about the hungry masses, the inner-city ghettos or the nuclear arms race,” he said. The only apparent exception at the meeting was “God doesn’t hear the prayers of the Jew” Bailey Smith, head of the Southern Baptist Convention. He was joined by a few holdouts from the old pietistic tradition (the ones reporters always, always looked for and quoted. Reporters do this *first*, because contrast makes for good copy, and *second*, because the old-time fundamentalist position best reflects their own Kantian premises—“Religion has to stay within its own proper area”; “Jesus cannot be captured in any political or economic point of view”; “God is not a right-winger,” etc.).

Viguerie believes that the fundamentalist groups of the so-called Religious Right gave President Reagan his margin of victory. He quotes an ABC News–Lou Harris poll {221} that says: “Ronald Reagan won his stunning victory last week not because the country as a whole went conservative, but because the conservatives—particularly the white moral majority—gave him such massive support.... The white followers of the TV evangelical preachers gave Ronald Reagan two thirds of his 10 point margin in the election” (128). Clearly, then, fundamentalists are losing their old Manichean dualism between the saving of souls and the saving of nations.

Viguerie supports the rise of fundamentalists as a political force. He even calls for a national day of prayer and fasting, explaining that “many of our personal and material problems have developed because we have forgotten to thank God for our blessings, our opportunities, our freedoms and our great country” (136). It is somewhat annoying, therefore, to find that Viguerie helped the cult leader “Reverend” Sun Myung Moon to raise over a million dollars in 1977 (cf. Alan Crawford’s *Thunder on the Right: The “New Right” and the Politics of Resentment* [Pantheon Books, 1980], 62). This shows us in microcosm what is basically wrong with New Right leaders—they are more interested in

conservatism than in Christianity. While there is nothing wrong with coalition politics involving widespread agreement on issues like abortion, military defense, and so on, still, Christians will have to make it clear that their political cooperation is only temporary. Viguerie may oppose left-wing liberal ecumenism, but he shows no similar antipathy to right-wing *conservative* ecumenism (Viguerie, 131ff.). On the other hand, Crawford says that Howard Phillips, head of the Conservative Caucus, told him that the only answer for America was “to resort to Biblical law” (*Thunder*, 271). Maybe the New Right will turn out to be a plus for the Christian reconstructionists; but, obviously, heavy doses of Van Tillian epistemological self-consciousness would help.

Viguerie includes a chapter in his book on various attacks made upon the New Right and quickly disposes of them. Unfortunately, because the New Right is growing larger and more diverse, there will be a tendency by many in the news media to take one group’s failings and, by using the fallacy of composition, tag the whole movement with the same. But just because certain groups in the New Right get caught publishing inaccuracies, it doesn’t mean the whole New Right does it. Such an argument is ridiculous—and will therefore be used by most of the news media.

Viguerie’s book is well written. In an appendix, he gives the names and addresses of several conservative publications and organizations. This doubles the value of the book; those interested in joining the battle ought to be given the location of their own supply depot. The New Right will be written about; it may even gain some respectability. But there’s still a long way to go. The New Right has the machinery to lead—and the votes. It will take longer, however, to infiltrate the bureaucracy. Viguerie’s book tells us how to do it. And who knows; maybe we will.

## PUBLICATION SCHEDULE VOLUME IX

---

Volume 9 (1982) of the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* will deal with “The Specific and Immediate Application of Christian Reconstruction.” In this issue we are concerned with the practicalities of current reconstruction now going on in specific situations, institutions, and disciplines: how are local churches going about Christian reconstruction? what is being done in the law profession? in agriculture? in prisons? how are Christian schools bringing about Christian reconstruction? what are believers doing to change various political structures? Anyone wishing to submit a manuscript for consideration would be wise to clear the topic in advance with the editor. Manuscripts should be between 20 and 40 pages in length, typewritten, and double-spaced. The University of Chicago’s Manual of Style is preferred, though not mandatory. If accepted, the *Journal* will pay the author \$75 upon publication. Shorter manuscripts (under 15 pages) receive \$35. Book reviews (5–10 pages) receive \$10; books dealing with the symposium’s topic are preferred. Suggestions concerning the reprinting of important documents or published articles, if accepted, are worth \$20, if accompanied by a clear photocopy of the recommended piece.

Manuscripts suitable for publication in the sections on “Christian Reconstruction” and “Defenders of the Faith” are always given careful consideration, as are suggestion for reprinting. Again, it is wise to clear the topic in advance with the editor. Summaries of dissertations are acceptable.

### ***Deadline:***

March 15, 1982

### ***Contact:***

Douglas F. Kelly  
P.O. Box 1285  
Murphys, CA 95247  
(209) 728–2538

# THE MINISTRY OF CHALCEDON

---

[Pr. 29:18]

Chalcedon [kalSEEdon] is a Christian educational organization devoted exclusively to research, publishing, and cogent communication of a distinctly Christian scholarship to the world at large. It makes available a variety of services and programs, all geared to the needs of interested laymen who understand the propositions that Jesus Christ speaks to the mind as well as the heart, and that His claims extend beyond the narrow confines of the various institutional churches. We exist in order to support the efforts of all orthodox denominations and churches.

Chalcedon derives its name from the great ecclesiastical Council of Chalcedon (AD 451), which produced the crucial christological definition: "Therefore, following the holy Fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man...." This formula challenges directly every false claim of divinity by any human institution: state, church, cult, school, or human assembly. Christ alone is both God and man, the unique link between heaven and earth. All human power is therefore derivative; Christ alone can announce that "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matthew 28:18). Historically, the Chalcedonian creed is therefore the foundation of Western liberty, for it sets limits on all authoritarian human institutions by acknowledging the validity of the claims of the one who is the source of true human freedom (Galatians 5:1).

Christians have generally given up two crucial features of theology that in the past led to the creation of what we know as Western civilization. They no longer have any real optimism concerning the possibility of an earthly victory of Christian principles and Christian institutions, and they have also abandoned the means of such a victory in external human affairs: a distinctly biblical concept of law. The testimony of the Bible and Western history should be clear: when God's people have been confident about the ultimate earthly success of their religion and committed socially to God's revealed system of external law, they have been victorious. When either aspect of their faith has declined, they have lost ground. Without optimism, they lose their zeal to exercise dominion over God's creation



(Genesis 1:28); without revealed law, they are left without guidance and drift along with the standards of their day.

Once Christians invented the university; now they retreat into little Bible colleges or sports factories. Once they built hospitals throughout Europe and America; now the civil governments have taken them over. Once Christians were inspired by “Onward, Christian Soldiers”; now they see themselves as “poor wayfaring strangers” with “joy, joy, joy, joy down in their hearts” only on Sundays and perhaps Wednesday evenings. They are, in a word, pathetic. Unquestionably, they have become culturally impotent.

Chalcedon is committed to the idea of Christian reconstruction. It is premised on the belief that ideas have consequences. It takes seriously the words of Professor F. A. Hayek: “It may well be true that we as scholars tend to overestimate the influence which we can exercise on contemporary affairs. But I doubt whether it is possible to overestimate the influence which ideas have in the long run.” If Christians are to reconquer lost ground in preparation for ultimate victory (Isaiah 2, 65, 66), they must rediscover their intellectual heritage. They must come to grips with the Bible’s warning and its promise: “Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he” (Proverbs 29:18). Chalcedon’s resources are being used to remind Christians of this basic truth: what men believe makes a difference. Therefore, men should not believe lies, for it is the truth that sets them free (John 8:32).

*Finis*