

Volume 10

1983

Number 1

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction



Symposium on
the Media and the Arts

A CHALCEDON PUBLICATION

COPYRIGHT

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction

Volume 10 / Number 1
1983

Symposium on the Media and the Arts
Douglas F. Kelly, Editor

ISSN 0360-1420.

A CHALCEDON MINISTRY

Electronic Version 1.0 / April 26, 2007

Copyright © 1983. 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 952510-
U.S.A.

To contact via email and for other information:
www.chalcedon.edu

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

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

THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

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

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

The Marxists have been absolutely correct in their claim that theory must be united with practice, and for this reason they have been successful in their attempt to erode the foundations of the 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Copyright

List of Contributors

Editor's Introduction

An Introduction to the Essays by John (Quade) Saunders 9

1. SYMPOSIUM ON THE MEDIA AND THE ARTS

The Meaning and Greatness of Christian Art

R. J. Rushdoony 13

The Myth of Neutrality in the Media

Franky Schaeffer V 24

The Artist as Propagandist

Otto J. Scott 28

A Christian Theory of Music

Martin G. Selbrede 42

Christian-Based Communications

John W. Saunders III (aka John Quade) 53

Biblical Law and the Cunning Artificer

James H. Griffith, Attorney at Law 69

Ox for Hire

Joe Taylor 81

Film: Lost & Found

Roy H. Wagner 88

Making the Sale to Television

Richard E. Germaine 95

Art and Capitalism: A Peace Treaty

Paul Lyons 107

The Christian Theory of Drama

John W. Saunders III (aka John Quade) 122

Humanistic Art as the Opium of the Masses

R. J. Rushdoony 126

2. CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

The Limits to State Interference in the World of Enterprise

Dr. Herman Dooyeweerd 131

Copyright Protection of Typefaces

James Griffith, Martin G. Selbrede, Joe Taylor146

3. CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL TRENDS**Recent French Roman Catholic Thinking on the Present State of Science**

Jean-Marc Berthoud Lausanne, Switzerland153

On the Covenant of God with the Israelites

Jacques (James) Saurin (1677–1730)179

4. BOOK REVIEWS**John W. Whitehead, *The Second American Revolution*.**

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 197

Gordon Clark, *Behaviorism and Christianity*.

Reviewed by Bill Kellogg 199

Norman L. Geisler, *Decide for Yourself*.

Reviewed by Bill Kellogg 201

Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian World View*. Vol. 1: A Christian View of Philosophy and Culture. Vol. 2: A Christian View of the Bible as Truth. Vol. 3: A Christian View of Spirituality. Vol. 4: A Christian View of the Church. Vol. 5: A Christian View of the West.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 205

Carol Felsenthal, Phyllis Schlafly: *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority*.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 207

J. Kirby Anderson, *Genetic Engineering, Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives Series*.**Lane P. Lester, with James C. Hefley, *Cloning: Miracle or Menace?***

Both reviewed by Richard Green 210

Elgin Groseclose, *America's Money Machine: The Story of the Federal Reserve*.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 214

Melvin B. Krauss, *Development Without Aid: Growth, Poverty, and Government*.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 216

Gary DeMar, *God and Government: A Biblical and Historical Study, vol. 1*.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 219

Russell Kirk, John Randolph of Roanoke.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 223

Nicholas Miller and John Stott, eds., Crime and the Responsible Community.

Reviewed by Haven Bradford Gow, Literary Fellow, the Wilbur Foundation . . . 225

Richard B. McKenzie, ed., Plant Closings: Private or Public Choices.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 227

Ludwig Von Mises, Planning for Freedom, and Sixteen other Essays and Addresses.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers 228

Tom Sine, The Mustard Seed Conspiracy.

Reviewed by Howard Ahmanson 231

Franky Schaeffer V, A Time for Anger: The Myth of Neutrality.

Reviewed by Caroline Kelly 234

The Ministry of Chalcedon

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

R.J. Rushdoony, Ph.D., is the author of more than thirty books, and the founder and director of the Chalcedon Foundation in Vallecito, California.

Franky Schaeffer V is a filmmaker whose works include the very successful multipart film series, *How Shall We Then Live?*, *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* and the recently released *The Second American Revolution*. His books include, *Addicted to Mediocrity* and *A Time for Anger*.

Otto J. Scott, a Christian scholar and writer, is one of the leading biographers of the nation and an associate of Chalcedon. Among his numerous books are *The Secret Six*, *James I*, *Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue*, *The Professional: A Biography of J.B. Saunders*, and the soon to be published *The Other End of the Lifeboat*. He is also a corporate consultant and lives in Murphys, California.

Martin G. Selbrede is a Christian essayist from Southern California, a typographer and authority on the works of B.B. Warfield, a composer of symphonic music, and author of an upcoming book, *Christian Reconstruction of Music*.

John W. Saunders III (aka John Quade—stage name) is a Christian layman, a film and television actor of note, an award-winning film producer, director, and writer, a scholar in the field of media communications, and a trustee of the Chalcedon Foundation.

James H. Griffith is a graduate of the USC (B.S. Electrical Engineering) and of the UCLA School of Law (J.D.), who devotes considerable time to screenwriting, the study of Anglo-American legal history, and is working on a large-scale study of the American legal system's biblical roots.

Joe David Taylor is a commercial art director, painter, typeface designer, sculptor, musician, and founder and publisher of the *Watchman* newsletter, which reviews the events of contemporary American media.

Roy H. Wagner III is an award-winning film director of photography and video producer, and a film historian, and is currently working on a film which documents the work of film's great directors of photography for the American Society of Cinematographers. He lives in Simi Valley, California.

Richard E. Germaine has conducted major national surveys with Gallup, Princeton Religious Research Center, and others, and published the *Profile of the Christian in the Marketplace*. He currently lives in Florida, where he works as an independent consultant and media buyer to television producers.

Paul Lyons is a film producer, director, and writer, president of the American Business Media Council in Washington, DC, and the leading force in America in showing corporate sponsors of television the ways in which the media is being used against them.

Hermann Dooyeweerd is one of the most eminent of Calvinist philosophers of the twentieth century and a professor of jurisprudence at the Free University of Amsterdam under Abraham Kuyper.

Magnus Verbrugge is the son-in-law of Professor Hermann Dooyeweerd and a retired surgeon.

Jean-Marc Berthoud is secretary of the Association Vaudoise de Parents Chrétiens in Lausanne, Switzerland, a ministry dedicated to Christian reconstruction in all areas of life in Switzerland. In addition to his work with the AVPC, he carries on a “tent-making” ministry through work with the post office.

Tommy Rogers is an attorney in Jackson, Mississippi, who also has a Ph.D. in Sociology.

Bill Kellogg is a Christian leader with a ministry to young people in the San Francisco region.

Richard Douglas Green, B.S., is a Christian layman and scientist of Dublin, California, with a degree in Biochemistry and Biology from California Polytechnic State University, with graduate work at UCLA and UCSD, and currently does research for Fischer Scientific Company.

Howard Ahmanson is a Christian layman, a trustee of the Chalcedon Foundation, and a frequent writer in the *Chalcedon Report*. He is the director of a corporation in Newport Beach, California.

Caroline S. Kelly, M.A., B.D., is married and the mother of five children and is active in the work of Chalcedon. She currently lives in Jackson, Mississippi.

Haven B. Gow is a Literary Fellow at the Wilbur Foundation and lives in Arlington Heights, Illinois.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

An Introduction to the Essays by John (Quade) Saunders

Since this issue of the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* is being devoted to the Western Conference on the Media and Arts, meeting in Sacramento, California, on October 14th and 15th, I have asked my good friend and colleague, John (Quade) Saunders to contribute the editorial for this symposium, which he organized and is directing. This conference and this issue of the *Journal* may prove to be one of the most exciting and significant we have ever published.—D. F. Kelly

In the history of the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, this issue is a rather unique one for a number of reasons.

One, it is evident to all that the *Journal* has a “new look” with this month’s cover design by Joe David Taylor,¹ who is also the art director for the Western Conference and an essayist in this month’s *Journal*.

Two, for the first time in English we present, “The Limits of State Interference in the World of Enterprise,” by H. Dooyeweerd, from a translation by Dr. Magnus Verbrugge.

Three, as Dr. Kelly has already mentioned, this issue is based almost entirely on essays from the Western Conference on the Media and Arts. The Conference itself marks the first time Chalcedon has sponsored such an event, and it may be the first conference of its type in the American Christian community.

1. Painstaking care was taken in every aspect of the *Journal*’s new design. Joe Taylor has selected Gill Sans for the *Journal*’s new text typeface. In tests against other typefaces, Gill Sans has been shown to possess the highest memory retention factor, as well as an excellent readability factor and an extremely low eye strain factor. The tests, conducted by Dr. Christopher Poulton of the Applied Psychology Unit, Medical Research Council, Cambridge, England, in 1962, overturned the conventional wisdom that serif typefaces make the best text typefaces. Significantly, the test results have been largely ignored by artists and designers. For more on the artist’s rejection of practicality, see Dr. Rushdoony’s article in this issue.

The essays from the Conference span almost the entire range of endeavor in the Media and the Arts, the tone of which is well established by R. J. Rushdoony in, "The Meaning and Greatness of Christian Art." This finely cut gem matches well a second essay, "Humanistic Art as the Opium of the Masses." These essays could form the nucleus of a major work on art criticism.

"The Myth of Neutrality," by Franky Schaeffer V, "The Artist as Propagandist," by Otto J. Scott, "Christian-Based Communications," by John (Quade) Saunders, and "The Theory of Christian Music," by Martin G. Selbrede, are essays in criticism and theory. Those which come later are concerned with the consequences of ideas, the practical, as it were.

"Film: Lost and Found," by Roy H. Wagner III, "Biblical Law and the Artisan," by James H. Griffith, "Making the Sale to Television," by Richard E. Germaine, "Ox for Hire," by Joe David Taylor, and "Art and Capitalism: A Peace Treaty," by Paul Lyons, are examples of essays by writers who are appearing for the first time in the *Journal*. All these men actively work in the fields on which they speak.

Fourth, is an important sermon, "On the Covenant of God with the Israelites," by Jacques (James) Saurin. It speaks against and predicts the sad outcome of the pietism which dominates so much of Christendom today, and it was preached more than 200 years ago when the seeds of pietism first took root in Europe and America. Indeed, if we had listened then, there would be no need for a Conference on the Media and Arts which calls us back to the faith once given unto the Fathers. Fifth, from Lausanne, Switzerland, an article from Jean-Marc Berthoud, a Chalcedon representative, on the shift which has been taking place in the thinking of Roman Catholic scholars in the realm of science.

The *Journal*, therefore, not only focuses on the media and arts, but also looks ahead to issues on business and the theoretical sciences.

On behalf of myself and Dr. Kelly, I would not only like to thank each of our essayists, but also to express something of the joy I've had in being associated with them for a few brief days in Sacramento. With all the uniqueness of parts properly designed by the Sovereign Creator God, they have joined together in a common goal for the glory of God and His Kingdom. Working with these men is an honor I will not soon forget.

Last, a very special thanks to the Chalcedon women who gave so much to the Conference, including Caroline Kelly, Anna Scott, and my wife, Gwen. Without them, the Conference and this special issue would have been immensely difficult. {2}

1.
SYMPOSIUM ON
THE MEDIA AND
THE ARTS

THE MEANING AND GREATNESS OF CHRISTIAN ART

R. J. Rushdoony

A major American seminary issued a bulletin on the arts in the summer of 1983. Entitled “Christianity and the Arts,” the lead article, co-authored by the faculty adviser for the arts issue, dealt with “Meaning with the Arts: implications of Polanyi’s Epistemology for the Arts.” The article began thus:

In the perceptive moment, the selfhood of the beholder is reconstituted by the work of art: the artistic whole is a symbol which integrates the self as the perceiver surrenders to it. A part of Michael Polanyi’s contribution to aesthetics is his engaging discussion of the components of this dynamic.²

In other words, every viewing of a work of art is to be a humanistic born-again experience whereby the viewer of art surrenders his selfhood to the artist’s work to be reconstituted or remade by it. We are given a practical demonstration of what this means:

At a recent exhibition, “Perceptions of the Spirit in Twentieth Century Art,” we aided many persons to become newly informed by the art works....

First, each viewer is asked to set aside his or her name and to take for a name the colors (black or white) in the drawings. One may become a thin white line or a bulging black shape or a broken, thin black line or a black line that is distinct at the top and fades toward the bottom. Each person is then asked to make the sound that expresses the color in that shape. With the painting as the score, the viewers warm up as an orchestra, each person making a variety of sounds that may express his or her color in the one shape each has selected until each person hits the sound that best expresses that color and shape. Then the conductor of the tour becomes the conductor of the orchestra and walks

2. Doug Adams and Phil Mullins, “Meaning with the Arts: Implications of Polanyi’s Epistemology for the Arts,” *Christianity and the Arts* (Pacific School of Religion) 61, no. 2 (June 1983): 2.

in front of the painting and points to the different sections in the painting as the cue for those who have selected shapes in those sections to make their sounds. (The painting will sound differently depending on whether it is played from top to bottom or left to right or diagonally or spirally.) Then each person is asked to develop a physical movement to express the sound and shape and color he or she has become. After playing the painting again (with each person making his or her movement with the sound), there is a time of sharing for each person to point out the shape of the color he or she has become and to lead all in making the sound and movement it makes. This is a most informative period, for others may become aware of many shapes in the painting for the first time. Finally, each person may resume making the sound and movement of the shape originally selected and interact with others who are doing their different sounds and movements to discover patterns of interrelation.³

This method, we are told, alters “the tacit dimension of the viewer in order to realize explicit new integrations with more comprehensive entities.”⁴

What this pretentious language tells us is that we must submit ourselves totally and uncritically to a humanistic work of art and allow it to remake us and to integrate us into the world of the artist. Basic to this perspective, among other things, are two facts. First, the work of art is by an Artist, i.e., a religious prophet. We are to suspend judgment and enter into the work of art with a radical submission in order to be remade: “In the perceptive moment, the selfhood of the beholder is reconstituted by the work of art.” Not only is the artist viewed as a religious prophet but also as some kind of humanistic messiah to reconstitute or remake us.

This is a radical departure from an older and Christian view of the “artist” as an artisan. The older and basic definition of an artisan is a skilled and trained practitioner of a liberal art, i.e., a professional man in the field of the arts. With this perspective, artisans were men of the world, competent and able men in their fields, such as painting, architecture, literature, sculpture, and the like. This concept of the artisan was basic to the medieval era, and it lingered into the modern age. Thus, Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) could serve as a competent busi-

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*

ness man, maintaining an assembly line of trained assistants in his painting, and also distinguish himself as a diplomat. His keen mind, polished urbanity, and mastery of languages made him an outstanding diplomatist. At the same time, he was a highly moral man, a devoted husband and father, a religious man, and an international figure of note. He was, like Bach, very highly productive and everywhere respected. In the 1,200 paintings we have of Rubens, it is difficult to tell where his work ends and that of his staff begins, because Rubens so clearly shaped the perspective and workmanship of all. A very great gulf separates {4} Rubens from the Romantic and post-Romantic artists.

Second, basic to the modern perspective in the arts is a reduction of meaning to something purely subjective. Adams and Mullin, in asking viewers to imagine themselves as colors, shapes, and sounds in a “painting,” were thereby calling for a do-it-yourself meaning. In a meaningless world of brute factuality, only a subjective meaning can exist. Art then ceases to be communication and becomes a purely subjective expression to produce a purely subjective response. This means a rejection of the world of purpose and meaning in which most men live and work, so that art thereby separates itself from reality to become occult and esoteric. As against the disciplines of reality, art then glories in its rejection of discipline. The result is a drift of the artist away from the real world. Medieval art was intensely practical because it was Christian. It was by faith linked to the meaning of life and hence to the central acts of man’s life, his worship and his work. The artist as *avant garde* is a product of a divided culture, one in which the artist is going in a direction contrary to that of most men. As art became humanistic, it also became *avant garde*. The gap between the artist and his culture widened, because too many people failed to take the course of humanism adopted by a self-styled elite. However, even with its humanistic audience, the modern artist has had to maintain his *avant garde* status. If the world is brute factuality, and meaning is denied to the cosmos, it then follows that the artist has nothing to communicate. If he is logical, like Marcel Duchamp, he will abandon art, because the logic of meaninglessness renders all artistic endeavor meaningless. Suicide, however, is not too appealing! As a result, the modern artist seeks a continually new way of saying nothing.

Art is inescapably a religious activity. Man, in all his activities, manifests his faith. Henry Van Til, in *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (1959), defined culture as a religion externalized. Man expresses his faith in his daily life, in his art, music, work, and play. In every sphere, the comment of Cornelius Van Til holds true: “There is no alternative but that of theonomy and autonomy.”⁵

Each vocation often imagines itself to be a special province with its own special privileges which somehow exempt it from the rules which bind other (and ordinary) men. The clergy, civil authorities (especially judges), doctors, lawyers, and others see themselves as an area of specialized talents and hence special privileges in the sense of exemptions from responsibility. Artists are no exception to this belief. The biblical doctrine, however, is that the greater the privilege, the greater the responsibility and the {5} accountability. Our Lord says, “For unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more” (Luke 12:48). The responsibility of the artist-artisan is thus very great; it is a theological responsibility.

Cornelius Van Til has set this forth tellingly in his discussion of man’s *summum bonum*, man’s highest good:

...The ethical ideal that man, as originally created naturally had to set for himself was the ideal that God wanted him to set for himself. This is involved in the fact that man is a creature of God. God himself is naturally the end of all man’s activity. Man’s whole personality was to be a manifestation and revelation on a finite scale of the personality of God.

When we use the common expression that the world, and man especially, was created to glorify God, it is necessary to make a distinction between the religious and the ethical meaning of those words. In a most general way we may say that God is man’s *summum bonum*. Man must seek God’s glory in every act that he does ... Man’s ethics is not only founded upon a religious basis but is itself religious.⁶

The implications of this are far-reaching. The highest good is not sought by flight from the world. In Neoplatonism, the world is an alien realm from mind or spirit and a limiting and corrupting one. The life

5. Cornelius Van Til, *Christian Theistic Ethics* (Den Dulk Foundation, 1971), 134.

6. *Ibid.*, 41.

of the mind is the virtuous life because the realm of ideas or spirit is the higher and truer realm. In this perspective, holiness is not seen as separation from sin to the Lord but as separation from matter to mind. Paul says, however, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31). Where art is influenced by the Neoplatonic faith, it can only be religious when it depicts a cross or a religious scene. Instead of faith governing and informing the artisan's total perspective, it is ascribed only to certain subjects. In terms of this, the Holy Family is a religious subject, but a painting of contemporary families cannot be, unless a cross is introduced. In other words, Christianity becomes a limited sphere of life instead of being the total condition and framework of all things. Van Til says that "man's whole personality was to be a manifestation and revelation on a finite scale of the personality of God." This means that, to the degree that man grows in grace, to that degree he will manifest God's nature and power.

Van Til says further, "both ethics and religion deal with historical mankind as genuinely revelatory of God and as genuinely significant for the {6} development of God's purpose with the universe....We seek God in everything, if we look at the matter from the most ultimate point of view."⁷ Because all things were made by God, all things are revelational of God. When viewed and developed in terms of God's law-word, all things find their place in His purpose for creation. This means, Van Til tells us, that

The most important aspect of this program for man is surely that man should realize himself as God's vicegerent in history. Man was created God's vicegerent and he must realize himself as God's vicegerent. There is no contradiction between these two statements. Man was created a character and yet he had to make himself ever more a character. And so we may say that man was created a king in order that he might become more of a king than he was.... For the individual man the ethical ideal is that of self-realization.... That the ethical ideal for man should be self-realization follows from the central place given him in this universe. God made all things in this universe for himself, that is, for his own glory. But not all things can reflect his glory self-consciously. Yet it is self-conscious glorification that is the highest kind of glorification. Accordingly God put all things in the universe into covenant relation with one another. He made man the head of creation.

7. *Ibid.*, 43.

Accordingly the flowers of the field glorified God directly and unconsciously, but also indirectly and consciously through man. Man was to gather up into the prism of his self-conscious activity all the manifold manifestations of the glory of God in order to make one central self-conscious sacrifice of it all to God.

Now if man was to perform this, his God-given task, he must himself be a fit instrument for this work. He was made a fit instrument for this work but he must also make himself an ever better instrument for this work. He must will to develop his intellect in order to grasp more comprehensively the wealth of the manifestation of the glory of God in this world. He must will to develop his aesthetic capacity, that is, his capacity of appreciation; he must will to be an ever better priest than he already is. Finally he must will to will the will of God for the whole world; he must become an ever better king than he already is. For this reason then the primary ethical duty for man is self-realization. Through self-realization man makes himself the king of the earth, and if he is truly the king of the earth then God is truly king of the universe, since it is as God's creature, as God's vicegerent that man must seek to develop himself as king. When man becomes truly the king of the universe the kingdom of God is realized and when the kingdom of God is realized then God is glorified.⁸ {7}

The more a man grows in this Christian self-realization, the more both spontaneity and necessity operate in his life. This fact makes understandable Saint-Saëns's well-known remark, that he composed music the way a pear tree bore pears. Of Johann Sebastian Bach, who came of a musical family, Gurlitt has written:

...we ought to note carefully...that Bach's sense of pride (in his ancestors) stemmed from the feeling of having received a noble calling and a solemn obligation: moreover, that his pride was utterly removed from the individualistic, egotistical vaingloriousness found in many artists.

Bach viewed his own life as a repetition of the existence of his ancestors. For that reason mastery in his art appeared to him not so much as a gift but as an assignment and a demand; he felt that he was confronted by something in which he was to achieve proficiency, to acquire expertness, and which he was to put into action. "Occasionally he was asked what measures he had undertaken to reach so high a degree of skill in his art. He usually replied: 'I have had to be diligent. If

8. *Ibid.*, 44–45.

anyone will be equally diligent, he will be able to accomplish just as much.' He did not make much of, even as he did not depend on, his superior native endowments" (Forkel).⁹

Art is most certainly a form of communication. This is why the media and the arts belong together. My wife, Dorothy, once defined art in passing, in nine simple words: "Art is the right way to do a thing." No definition is more than an indication of the meaning of the thing defined, but, with this disclaimer in mind, let us examine this statement. I can, at a piano or organ, pick out notes to put together a crude tune; I can, with pencil, draw an even cruder echo of a picture. Neither effort is even remotely art because I lack both the technical skill and the thing to communicate. In both music and drawing, I have nothing to say, and I do not know how to say anything.

For modern artists, art is self-revelation; it is humanistic self-expression. Art has, as a result, lost its hold on the masses and become the esoteric cult of the self-elected elite. For these people, the manner rather than the content of the work is the essential element. Art in this sense can have neither a popular appeal nor a continuing appeal. Instead of being art, it becomes instead faddistic mannerisms.

As against this, Coomaraswamy reminds us, we have another and now forgotten view of art, {8}

which affirms that art is the making well, or properly arranging, of anything whatever that needs to be made or arranged, whether a statuette, or automobile, or garden. In the Western world, this is specifically the Catholic doctrine of art; from which doctrine the natural conclusion follows, in the words of St. Thomas, that "There can be no good use without art." It is rather obvious that if things are required for use, whether an intellectual or a physical use, or under normal conditions both, and are not properly made, they cannot be enjoyed, meaning by "enjoyed" something more than merely "liked." Badly prepared food for example, will disagree with us; and in the same way autobiographical or other sentimental exhibits necessarily weaken the morale of those who feed upon them. The healthy patron is no more interested in the artist's personality than he is in his tailor's private life; all that he needs of either is that they be in possession of their art.¹⁰

9. Wilibald Gurlitt, *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Master and His Work* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1957), 8.

In other words, Christian art stresses an objective frame of reference: communication, use, and the ablest possible expression. Modern art stresses self-expression, whereas Van Til's description of man's highest good has reference to self-realization. Between the two, there is a vast difference. Christian self-realization has reference to the objective world of God's creation and His law-word. The only alternatives, Van Til points out, are autonomy and theonomy. Humanistic self-expression has autonomy as its goal. Christian self-realization is set within the framework of theonomy. There is thus an objective reference, standard, and context.

Geoffrey Scott, in *The Architecture of Humanism*, called attention to humanism's worship of power.¹¹ This led very early to the imposing and monumental style. Whether in architecture, painting, music, or literature, the grandiose and the imposing was stressed. In this sense, art self-consciously sought greatness from the Renaissance on. With Romanticism, art became sensitive instead to things remote and different. We see this still in the quest of professional tourists for the untouched, remote, and out-of-the-way places. Romanticism, said Scott, "identifies beauty with strangeness."¹² In time, even beauty dropped out of the Romantic quest, which still dominates our era, and strangeness remains. Essential to avant garde art now is something new, a perpetual strangeness, a love of innovation for the sake of innovation.

This is a logical consequence of the emphasis of humanism on self-expression and autonomy. The universe and man are in effect re-created by each new school of art, because private experience is imperialistically presented {9} as an instrument of being. Remember that humanism worships power. As soon as the autonomous experience commands public attention, a new art experience is created, because autonomy cannot sustain a more than momentary expression of itself. Having no objective standard, it is incapable of maintaining one inter-

10. Anada K. Coomaraswamy, *Christian and Oriental Philosophy of Art* (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), 89–90.

11. Geoffrey Scott, *The Architecture of Humanism* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1954), 144ff.

12. *Ibid.*, 41.

nally or artistically. By its radical subjectivity, it denies communication in favor of expression and thus cannot maintain continuity.

Attention has been called to the relationship of art and the media: the concern of both is communication. Humanism in effect denies the need for communication. Its fundamental premise is Genesis 3:5, "Ye shall be as God [every man his own god], knowing [or determining for yourself] good and evil [every man as his own lawmaker and universe]." For a god to communicate is an act of grace; necessity is not a condition governing deity. The failure of humanistic art to communicate has led, over the past few centuries, to the withdrawal of art from the mainstream of life to a role as the means of enhancing the cultural pretensions of the self-styled elite. By becoming itself elitist and refusing to communicate, humanistic art has served to exalt the ego of the elite as the people who are "in the know."

The words communication and communion are essentially related. Without communion, there can be no communication. A common language is required. We have all heard of the amusing adventures of travelers abroad who have found themselves stranded suddenly among peoples who could not understand a word of English. Some years ago, one such person described to me the rather strange mishap he experienced in trying to tell people in an out-of-the-way place in Japan that his baggage had gone astray, and that he wanted to go to the toilet. No one understood him! The communication gap proved very trying.

Humanistic art has a communication problem. It has no common language for men, because autonomy is the essence of Babel, not Pentecost.

Basic to communication is communion, and the fact of a common language. This is another way of saying that there must be a common and governing faith. The word common is related to communication and communion; all three words come from the same Latin word. A biblical doctrine of communication must reckon with what Van Til has discussed with reference to common or creation grace. As Van Til points out,

the image of God in man consists of actual knowledge content. Man does not start on the course of history merely with a capacity for knowing God. On the contrary he begins his course with actual knowledge of God. Moreover {10} he cannot even eradicate this

knowledge of God. It is this fact that makes sin to be sin “against better knowledge.”¹³

Man’s activities are never performed in a vacuum: they are the actions of a being, however fallen, who is created in the image of God and whose being, in spite of himself, is revelational of God. As man separates himself by sin from God, he denies his Creator and himself as well, because he is God’s creature and image-bearer. Hence, Van Til says, “Either presuppose God and live, or presuppose yourself as ultimate and die. That is the alternative with which the Christian must challenge his fellow man.”¹⁴ “Taken properly, the idea of common grace...presupposes as it expresses the universal presence of the revelation of God.”¹⁵

This means that, whatever good men may accomplish in any area of life and thought, whether the arts or the sciences, for example, they must accomplish on borrowed premises. They must presuppose a world of one God and one common law and meaning. They assume a given order and truth. Marcel Duchamp recognized this and went from art to being an anti-artist; he embraced a logical autonomy as against theonomy. As a result, Duchamp found it “intolerable to put up with a world established once and for all.” According to him even gravity is a coincidence or a form of politeness since it is “by condescension that a weight is heavier when it descends than when it rises.” He set forth as a basic proposition of his humanism “to lose the possibility of recognizing, of identifying two similar things.” The common element would presuppose a given, God-ordained order and meaning. According to Robert Lebel, “In his statement that ‘right and left are obtained by letting drag behind you a tinge of persistence in the situation’ he advances still further toward deliberate disorder and disorientation.” Duchamp sought also to create a new alphabet and a new language “having no concrete references,” but he gave up this impossible idea.¹⁶

13. Cornelius Van Til, *A Letter on Common Grace* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Lewis J. Grotenhuis, 1953), 36.

14. *Ibid.*, 61

15. Cornelius Van Til, *Common Grace and the Gospel* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), 218.

16. Robert Lebel, *Marcel Duchamp* (New York: Grove Press, 1959), 29–30.

Duchamp sought to “desacralize” art.¹⁷ His logic led him to abandon art, because, however avant garde his work, it was still a witness to design, if not order, and thereby a witness to God. He abandoned sex, and refused to procreate, because to have anything in common with any other person was a denial of autonomy, and, given this perspective, the sexual act became “onanism for two”¹⁸ While still working at art, according to Lebel, “His work was meant for no one but himself, and he took every precaution to see that nothing of it should be intelligible to an outsider.”¹⁹ At times Duchamp departed from this premise.²⁰ It was, however, his essential position. For him, the common ground in art was replaced by the autonomous experiences of the artist and the artist’s audience.

In such a perspective, art denies the validity of communion and communication. The artist rejects the assumption of any necessary common element of experience, faith, or purpose. If a goal remains in art, it is to provide people with a prompting to autonomous experience and reactions.

In no other civilization than in the Christian world has art gained a higher status and function. The artisan has been a member of a communion, and his function therein has been to enable man better to attain self-realization in the framework of theonomy. It is the good use of things, the right way of doing something: it is communication, and it presupposes a communion in a common faith. Without the presuppositions of the God of Scripture, there can be no art. With that presupposition, every artisan in the arts has the function of bringing forth a common self-realization under God. He externalizes, develops, and gives voice to the growth and awareness in his day of God’s glory and grace as it is realized in and through man’s world and experience. Instead of being a lone outsider, he is the concert violinist in a great concerto, because he is the high realization of a common life and experience. This is the greatness of truly Christian art. It is a media of communication, communion, and an enhanced common life. {12}

17. *Ibid.*, 52–53.

18. *Ibid.*, 67–68.

19. *Ibid.*, 69.

20. *Ibid.*, 78.

THE MYTH OF NEUTRALITY IN THE MEDIA

Franky Schaeffer V

In the United States today, and indeed, in the whole world, one group more than any other forms public opinions: the media. The film industry, the television networks, newspapers, periodicals, and the people who run these enterprises have an immense amount of power, which is totally disproportionate to their numbers, and unhappily, to their moral perception and compassion.

Members of the media share a set of attitudes that can be characterized as “liberal” and “humanistic” in such overwhelming numbers that our sources of information have become utterly biased. In 1982, S. Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman conducted hour-long interviews with 240 journalists and broadcasters at the most influential media outlets, including the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Time* magazine, *U.S. News & World Report*, CBS, ABC, NBC, PBS, and major public broadcasting stations. The results of this survey are startling and confirm, even beyond one’s worst suspicions, the religious commitment of the media to secular humanism.

“Ideologically,” the author tells us, “a majority of leading journalists describe themselves as liberals. Fifty-four percent place themselves to the left of center, compared to only 19 percent who choose the right side of the spectrum.” Those interviewed also generally agreed with the left’s accusations about American foreign policy in the Third World.

Fifty-six percent agree that American economic exploitation has contributed to Third World poverty...by a 3-to-1 ratio, leading journalists to reject the counter argument that Third World nations would be even worse off without the assistance they’ve received from Western nations. {15}

When the questions concerned the social issues of the day, agreement among members became greater still.

In their attitudes toward sex and sex roles, members of the media elite are virtually unanimous in opposing the constraints of both government and tradition...90 percent agree a woman has the right to decide for herself whether to have an abortion. 79 percent agree strongly with this pro-choice position...54 percent do not regard adultery as wrong, and only 15 percent strongly agree that extramarital affairs are immoral.

The survey showed that members of the media know how powerful they are. When asked to rank seven leadership groups, including black leaders, feminists, consumer groups, intellectuals, labor unions, business leaders, and the news media, they put themselves in the penultimate position, second only in influence to business leaders. And then, when asked who ought to have the most influence, they put themselves first!

With such widespread agreement about basic issues, *which can only stem from the same philosophic outlook*, it hardly takes a conspiracy for the media machine to speak with one smothering voice. And these are those to whom we must look for unbiased “reporting”! Given the concentration of the media’s power in relatively few hands, and their shared values, it’s nearly impossible to avoid the conclusion that the media represent a monolithic, unelected force in public life: a self-assured, self-perpetuating elite that relishes its power and would have more.

The most devastating fact which emerges from the survey still remains. In a nation in which seven out of ten Americans say they are church members and 60 percent claim that their religious beliefs are very important, 50 percent of those surveyed in the media had no religious affiliation, and 86 percent *seldom* or *never* attend religious services. Little wonder that all things Christian in origin are routinely denigrated. In effect, the media have become the enemy of religious principle, and also, because of their vast unelected power, the rival of the constitutional process and of elected officials.

Granted, if the Christian is willing to stay in his little corner and do “religious activities” separated from the arts, industry, politics, science, law, economics, the media, or scholarship—in other words, all that really counts—then he is left to himself. As long as the Christian only sets out to convert souls, fine. But let him stand up and begin to challenge the dominant, humanistic forces and the press will make every

attempt to either ignore or ravage that individual. As the Rev. Rousas John Rushdoony rightly {16} says, “The evangelical impact on American politics in 1980 and 1981 stirs up daily wrath in the press and from politicians, because it reintroduces into politics a dimension which politicians largely have sought to avoid, moral confrontation. The hatred for all such evangelical groups is not because of their real or fancied blunders but because they have reintroduced biblical morality into politics” (from *Chalcedon Report*, no. 196 [December 1981]). The one thing the media abhor almost without exception is anyone who takes a firm stand on any issue out of religious principle, unless that stand happens to coincide with their expressed views.

Those of us who treasure religious liberty which is linked to freedom of speech, must begin to formulate a strategy in dealing with the consistent media bias against orthodox religion. To have freedom of religion is to have freedom of speech, and, because of the bias and the small-mindedness of the current media, many with Christian and religious ideals are denied access to freedom of expression through the media. Since most of the public gain their information about the world and form their impressions of it from the media, to be denied access or to be given consistently biased coverage (if any at all) by the media means that in essence religious people have become disenfranchised in terms of free speech.

I would make several practical suggestions in this regard.

1. That religious people interested in religious freedom continue to develop, propagate, and use their own means of communication.
2. That those interested in religious liberty, whenever possible, acquire already existing media outlets by either individually purchasing them or banding together with others with financial means to do so.
3. That we never be silent! That each outburst of media bias against religious people or ideas be met with heated protest.
4. That we begin to see the media as a “mission field.” That individuals with journalistic, editorial, or other media-related talents be encouraged to get into the media mainstream and push their own religious agenda, just as the secularist humanist pushes his. Thus, some of the imbalance could be righted if equally dedicated viewpoints were opposed to each other within the media.

5. That we not be naive about the treatment we will receive at the media's hands until things change and we become "as wise as foxes" in dealing with them.

There are other things that should be done, including continuing to inform ourselves about this issue. Several key books have been written in this regard: one by John Whitehead called *The Second American Revolution*, {17} published by David C. Cook. I have recently written a book dealing with this problem, *A Time for Anger*, published by Crossway Publishers, and Francis Schaeffer's recent book, *A Christian Manifesto*, published also by Crossway, deals with the root cause of these problems.

It is time to realize that the media in general is not the friend of religious liberty or free speech, at least in terms of orthodox religious opinion, being expressed freely through the press. {18}

THE ARTIST AS PROPAGANDIST

Otto J. Scott

In Greenwich Village twenty years ago, there was a small art store that opened just around the corner from Cornelia Street. It was stocked with plaster statuettes of famous Greek statuary, both male and female. The proprietors proceeded to paint them in lifelike colors. They painted the skin, eyes, nails, and pubes. The effect was startling: passersby would do a double take and then walk on hurriedly. Finally the police came by, decided the display was pornographic, and ordered the windows cleared. After that the experiment failed, and the shop closed.

But in ancient Greece, the statues were painted. That was how they appeared. They were so realistic that—long after his death—one of Alexander's former generals turned a corner in a palace corridor and came upon a life-sized statue of the conqueror—and fainted. Surfaces of solid white marble are all that remain after centuries of burial: the paint has long since been eaten away.

But there was more to ancient art than the visual, though that was impressive. Ancient plays and poems have been rediscovered, and every scrap is examined. These are unrivaled in their salaciousness and the explicitness of their descriptions—or were unrivaled until the Renaissance. It seems fairly obvious that the open sexuality of the Greek and Roman writers excited the admiration and interest of the Victorian scholars, who could satisfy prurience in the name of scholarship with impunity.

The Greeks had a view of life that appeals to the base. They were, for instance, people who believed the gods were cast in their images. In their view, this meant that the gods were motivated in the same way as Greeks. Thus, the Greeks held that the greatest and most dangerous of sins was *hubris*, or pride. Anyone who stood too tall could attract the envy of the gods. To the Greeks that was reasonable, for the Greeks were an envious people.

They did not exile criminals in Athens: they executed them or punished them in various ways. They did not exile rebels: these could be considered traitors. They exiled only the successful, whose attributes or attainments could evoke envy. {19}

The Greeks' religion mirrored themselves. Being notorious throughout the ancient world for their slyness, they credited their gods with similar methods. Oedipus was tricked into killing his father and sleeping with his mother by being removed from his parents as an infant, raised elsewhere, and told he was an orphan. The truth was disclosed to him only after it was too late. Only the Greeks would consider this heartless injustice clever.

In terms of literature and theater, the Greeks produced much that was witty and glamorous. I recall seeing Alfred Lunt and Lynne Fontanne on Broadway in a play called *Amphitryon* 38. It was based on a Greek legend, in which Zeus, desiring a man's wife, had the husband temporarily removed, assumed the husband's form, came to earth, and spent the night. In that manner, said the Greeks, Hercules was conceived. I had no idea why it appeared on Broadway in 1938, nor of the significance of a modern audience regaled anew by what the Greeks laughed at in the fifth century BC.

The greatest possible contrast to the elegant barbarism and cruelty of the Greeks that could be found in the ancient world was the Bible of the Hebrews. Where the Greeks and other ancient peoples dwelled on their kings, queens, and warriors, the Hebrews produced a sacred literature that revealed the sins and tribulations, as well as the triumphs and dreams, of an entire nation. That this work was divinely inspired appears obvious in the examination, for only God could see so deeply into the hearts and motives of people, and lay them so bare.

Time and again we see how the Hebrews rebelled, and turned toward other gods, and time and again were punished. As the rebellions continued, followed by punishments, one begins to wonder at the persistence of the rebels, and their inability to learn from experience—until we recall that every generation of man repeats the follies of its predecessors.

But we cannot regard the Bible as literature: it is far too awesome for that. But we can say that it entered the world stage, as distinct from the culture of a people, with the New Testament. In the Gospel according

to St. Mark, we watch Peter—after the arrest of Jesus—go furtively into the courtyard of the High Priest, and stand with the servants around a fire. One of the servant girls recognized him, and he denied his identity. He walked into the outer courtyard, and she followed him to accuse him again. This time his reply revealed his Galilean accent, but he managed to escape. Auerbach, in his remarkable book, *Mimesis*, took note of the realism of this scene—and especially of the low station of the *personae* in contrast to the great significance of Peter, who represented “the image of man in the deepest and most tragic sense.”²¹ {20}

But far more than the detail, the Bible reveals a view of the world at variance with all that appeared before—or since. The multiverse is in the hand of God, and those who find it falling short of their expectations argue that they could correct and edit the achievements of the Higher Power. This is not an uncommon view. There is resentment in our hearts since the Fall. But since the New Testament, there has been hope and understanding. During the Christian ages of faith, the artist—once a despised artisan—has been recognized as conducting an act of worship when he seriously practices his art.

But the world learned this with great difficulty, and recalls it only intermittently. The New Testament appeared at the time of Tacitus and Petronius. Both were men steeped in the world and its virtues and vices, for whom nothing existed beyond the event and its more immediate consequences. They were masters of an enameled art the New Testament rendered instantly obsolete.

But the essence of that obsolescence is difficult to convey. The examples are present, but politicians, for instance, do not seem aware of the example of Judas. Judas, remember, wanted to sell Mary Magdalene’s gift to Jesus, in order to distribute alms to the poor. We are now very familiar with this sort of posturing, in which the spiritual descendants of Judas seek to present themselves as better than God.

The overriding difference, however, between the Bible and all the literature of the past is that the Bible is divinely inspired and presents man from the viewpoint of God. To some extent this was not immediately reflected in Christian writing so much as in the Christian attitude toward history. History is a look at the lives of those who preceded us.

21. Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis* (New York: Doubleday, 1955).

We can, from the brief eminence upon which we stand in our lives in relation to the past, look back and see someone born, grow to maturity through various experiences, achieve or fail, and finally die. At the moment of death the purpose of that life becomes evident—and not before then. Before death, there is always the possibility that a life, or a person, may utterly change for better or worse. Death writes the last chapter. And suddenly the meaning of that life leaps plainly into view. For a moment we see that life over the shoulder of God, and we are allowed, in the light of that illumination, clear vision.

Through the ages of faith men sought to capture that vision and apply it to life. They did not always succeed, but they tried. They searched for instances of holiness, for lives of sanctity, and for evidences of divine intervention. For all the world was considered God's. He ruled, and men were {21} rewarded as they sought to obey, or to disobey, according to His grace and mercy and retribution.

In time, as we know, the structure began to sag. The art of gilding the lily grew commonplace. It was not enough to discover a saint: it was necessary to paint that saint as too holy to catch cold, too holy to spit or to have weaknesses, or to sin again, even against his own desires. And as these incredibilities mounted and the statues of the saints began to proliferate, second-rate art began to have its effect. That effect can be best assessed by regarding the modern works of Hollywood. There second-raters are distinguished by a peculiar and utterly mistaken sense of superiority. They write down, or paint down, or simplify. They do not trust the world to catch the point: they exaggerate to make the point clearer. Then they add a laugh track, so the people will know when to laugh—and what to laugh at. In the process, all credibility is destroyed, because truth is destroyed. But that's the final stage. The early stages are more seductive, like vice itself.

The first great early stage of decline reached the West in the form of the Renaissance. There seems to be a general belief that the Renaissance was limited to Italy, and that it lasted a relatively brief period. We might all be better off if that had been the case.

The fact is that the Renaissance in Italy lasted from the birth of Dante (in 1265) to the death of Michelangelo (in 1564). That's almost 300 years—or roughly the same span of time from John Milton to

James Joyce. In the course of those three centuries the influence of the Italian Renaissance seeped across all Europe.

The great commentator on the period was Jacob Burckhardt, a Swiss professor. He had the original intention of writing the history of the Christian period: the Ages of Faith. He wrote the first volume, *The Age of Constantine*. And he wrote the final volume, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy: An Essay*, in 1860.²² He never got around to the middle volumes, and all the world is poorer as a result.

Burckhardt never received an advance or any royalties from his work on the Renaissance. It took years for the first edition of 1,000 to sell out. Then the Swiss publisher sold the rights—without telling Burckhardt—to a German publisher who printed another 1,650 copies. It took five years to exhaust those, and before long a third edition appeared. But the book slowly made Burckhardt famous—though not rich. It shaped some of the ideas of many better-known individuals. But it suffered a peculiar fate at the hands of the scholars.

They first inserted a massive number of notes; sometimes as many as {22} twenty to a page, which made reading the book very tiresome. Then they wrote *about* the book—and in the process of writing about it, they misrepresented it. In the course of this misrepresentation they managed to distort Burckhardt in the general mind from a Christian historian into an art historian. Then they finally interred him from public appreciation by handing these misinterpretations over to educators—who rule the graveyards of truth.

All these efforts were made because the significance of Burckhardt's descriptions of the Renaissance was uncomfortably close to the weaknesses and trends of European society in the 1860s. Burckhardt foresaw the repetition of the rise of tyrants, the decline of liberty—and the looting of the Louvre. He predicted the appearance of what he called “terrible simplifiers” who would reduce learning to formulas and slogans.²³

This remarkably prescient forecast was based upon a long look backwards at what Burckhardt proves was a period of Christian decline and

22. Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy: An Essay* (CT: Phaidon Publishers, 1955).

23. Jacob Burckhardt, *Force and Freedom: Reflections on History* (New York: Random House, 1943).

decadence. Even Dante, acclaimed for his *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, used his gifts to place his personal enemies and critics in the deepest pits of Hell and had difficulty portraying the superiority of Heaven. That obsession with politics was part of a shift away from classic Christianity toward new gods. The Italians began to unearth statues from the dead empire of the Romans and to compete for the honor of being the birthplace of Cicero, or of other Roman celebrities. The visits to the shrines of the saints—once a popular feature of everyday life, declined in popularity. The very idea of a holy life began to fade, and was replaced by the old pagan idea of fame.

To become famous was to achieve a place in the memory of society; to become a historical figure was to be transformed into the equivalent of a god. Then legends would be created, to adorn the figure in the Pantheon. Thus the pagan empires rose again in the world of imagination. Italy became transformed into a commercial center where the discovery of double-entry bookkeeping was a marvelous step forward, where merchant bankers began to operate on an international level, and where demagogues arose to seize power.

Burckhardt has left us unforgettable portraits of the essence of a tyrant. He is not the unpleasant ogre of legend: he is Prince Charming. He is affable and friendly and walks in the midst of an adoring crowd. He knows the people—and he takes care of them. Men who do not want another man to take care of them are the only ones who do not find this situation attractive. The political situation of Italy was too complicated to describe: let it suffice to say that the persecutions of Christians by Emperor {23} Frederick II on one end and the papacy on the other created a situation where Italy could not be united. The states were in the hands of despots. These little courts, supported by taxation, were ruled by usurpers. The only means the despot had of achieving legitimacy was by surrounding himself with men of talent: poets and scholars, painters and musicians.

Petrarch, a favorite at such courts, advised these rulers to be the fathers of the people. The princes then proceeded to take charge of everything: “to restore buildings and churches, keep the police, drain marshes, watch the food supplies and the distribution of liquor, support the sick and helpless, protect distinguished scholars.”²⁴ Anyone

who protested against all this diligence and concern could be sure that those who felt benefited would lead the charge against them.

There were uncertainties in such regimes, however, and as time passed, conventional limits in the exercise of power began to fade even from memory. The possibility of attaining supreme power by a coup excited every range of imagination—like the possibility of becoming a Castro or a Mao Tse-tung or a Stalin or even a Hitler today excites the impressionable young.

Meanwhile every sort of crime spread from the top: murder, incest, rape, robbery, deceit, torture. Burckhardt described Lodovico Sforza, nicknamed the Moor because of his dark complexion, as “the most perfect type of despot of that age.” He surrounded himself with scholars, poets, artists, and musicians. Leonardo da Vinci worked for him and later served Cesare Borgia. They gilded the image of the court.

Art, in the Renaissance, played a crucial role. The ruler of Verona specialized in entertaining men of letters, who were expected to make him famous in return for lavish gifts. The list of these men and their patronage can be found in any art history of the period, but these are volumes that expurgate the dark side of that period.

Cesare Borgia prowled the streets at night, dagger in hand, surrounded by guards, murdering innocent pedestrians for the sheer pleasures of sadism. Lodovico Sforza was a mass murderer in the most personal sense, and also ruler of Milan. An earlier tyrant of Milan—Barnabo—kept hunting dogs he released upon people.

The list is nearly endless, and the corruption spread through all levels of Italy. Poison became popular, adultery commonplace, and murders were ordered even from the papal court. The mixture of splendor and misery was as striking as in the days of Imperial Rome in the times of Nero or Caligula; it was those times restored. {24}

In that period artists were commissioned to create wonderful works. The themes were, as before, taken from the Bible, but the artists were working from a different sort of social environment. It's no use saying that an artist can surmount his environment: the fact is that all men are shaped in large measure by the tides and forces of their time.

24. Burckhardt, *Civilization*, 5–6.

Those who resist still reflect these fashions, modes, attitudes, and styles. Look at an old daguerreotype taken, for instance, in 1860. General Grant and his men, say, sitting or lounging around one of their camps. There are always trees, and only a few of the officers have anything to sit upon. Grant is leaning against a tree: like his senior men he is in shapeless clothes that reflect the heavily rural background of the period; his posture is careless because the United States had not yet achieved its enamel period where a public image had to be carefully fashioned and artfully projected. There is no mistaking the period of the daguerreotype, just as there is an eerie similarity in the men and women snapped by a photographer in the 1890s, or the 1920s—or today.

So the people of the Renaissance come to seem alike. They built cathedrals, and their artists painted so wonderfully that perspective and color and theme seem almost supernaturally blended. Some proof of their high quality can be seen by the fact that those remaining works that appear on the market are purchased for millions of dollars—sometimes by persons who sneer at history and the past, and Christianity, and the West.

Yet when we look at these artists and writers personally, we wonder at the strange mixture of talent and cowardice that we so often see. Da Vinci's first commissions were to design dresses for the ladies of the court of Florence; later he worked for Sforza, the "Moor," tyrant of Milan, whom he depicted in a gigantic statue. Raphael as a boy witnessed scenes of butchery in the public square of Perugia, and Burckhardt speculated that these memories may be responsible for the small, early pictures he painted of St. George and the dragon.

The atmosphere by which these great artists were surrounded is nearly beyond the powers of imagination to visualize. The Renaissance witnessed the rise of men like Werner von Urslingen, whose hauberk bore the inscription, "the enemy of God, of pity and mercy."

At a time when torture, witchcraft, devil-worship, divination, and sorcery reappeared, the masters of the visual arts portrayed celestial scenes of heavenly bliss; clouds harboring cherubs and angels; saints praying for the intercession of the Almighty. They became the propagandists of the Vatican and of the dukes and princes and despots of the city-states. A careful {25} observer might note, in this development,

that there came a subtle change in the graphic arts. In addition to discoveries in perspective and an increasing expertise in musculature and anatomy, came a far more earthy and sensual style of representation. The unworldly aspect of Christian art, once notable, became progressively less visible—and the world grew proportionately larger.

But painters and musicians deal in mediums that do not openly address people in languages understandable to everyone. That could not be said of poets and writers. These men called themselves “humanists.” They were the experts who could revive antiquity and its personalities and customs. They could create reputations—and they could destroy them. Their disputes, their scrambles for the favor of one or another prince, their vituperations, were bloodless but lethal.

On the surface they produced elegant productions; underneath the surface they created obscene poems and parodies, satires and vilifications. The printing press enlarged their arena, and extended their audiences. They led truly dreadful lives: uncertain, chancy, filled with receptions in palaces and private worries about money on which to live. They struggled for professorships, jobs as tutors in princely families, secretaryships. They enjoyed luxury and privation simultaneously, and attracted both admiration and boundless contempt. They had to move constantly from one court to another as people demanded new faces, new styles, new stories.

All this led to licentious excess and “a total indifference to the moral laws recognized by others.” “Such men,” Burckhardt observed, “can hardly be conceived to exist without an inordinate pride. They needed it, if only to keep their heads above water, and were confirmed in it by the admiration which alternated with hatred in the treatment they received from others. They are the most striking examples and victims of an unbridled subjectivity.”²⁵

Does this sound familiar? It should. Think of our professors, running alternately to Washington and to large corporations, telling the bureaucrats in each what they most want to hear; sandwiching in applications for foundation grants between books compiled by their graduate students, to which they affix their own names and demand royalties. Think of the television and Hollywood film writers, anxious

25. *Ibid.*, 164–65.

to share in coke parties at the homes of large producers, as willing to write pornography as a letter home. Think of Norman Lear, whose productions mock the family and all moral values, and who is outraged that Christians dare attempt to be heard on public issues—as though they had rights. Think of Lear and his many {26} contemporaries as described by Ben Stein in *The View from Sunset Boulevard*—and you have the humanists, updated—and riding for a fall.

For of course the Italian Renaissance fell. It had to fall. It was too rotten to stand. In 1527 the robbing, looting Spaniards of Charles V were allowed to sack Rome, and for the next nearly four hundred years the Italians lived under foreign domination. Those who do not understand what that means are fortunate; in the case of Italy it broke the back of the nation, seemingly forever. To this day it remains a region where people a mile apart in separate villages speak different dialects and hate each other. In Italy proper, nobody is from Italy. They are from Roma, or Genova, or Sicily, or some other town, city, or village; hardly ever from Italy.

This is the sort of punishment described in the Bible for those who abandon God. Nor can it be said that the ancient Hebrews were the only people upon whom such punishments fell, or can fall. Their history can serve as an illustration, but it is by no means the only one. The fall of the Italians—the most advanced in their day, the wealthiest, the possessors of the great villas and art treasures and banking houses and theaters and cathedrals and churches and schools and printing presses and all the other artifacts, services, and glories of civilization, sent a shudder through all western Europe.

The Reformation was advanced by the fall of Italy and the Sack of Rome; all the predictions of disaster for vice were verified in awesome fashion. The Vatican, in later years, conducted a reform of its own, and it not only rid itself of the loathsome practices that had so long darkened its pretensions, but it launched a great propaganda program to lure the protestants back to the Church. The Baroque period was one result.

More to the point is the belief of the Reformers of the North that beauty is a worldly snare and that art is an instrument of the Devil. That belief was not total, of course—the Dutch masters are proof that painting survived and flourished, and Germany is crammed with beau-

tiful works produced under Protestant regimes. Portrait painting, like many other novelties, moved north to England and France and enjoyed a high status.

Much the same can be said of music and literature and other aspects of the arts: they continued. But so, to a large extent, did the Renaissance outside Italy. Shakespeare can be counted as a Renaissance writer. The Tudor courts were renaissance in their conduct of popular tyranny, their executions of fallen favorites, their insouciance regarding Christian principles. But Henry VIII and Elizabeth I led the English monarchy toward the edge: so did James I. Charles I lost it to the Puritans and the Presbyterians: Reformers both. {27}

Since then, we have seen the cycle repeated several times in several places. France became the great glitterer after Rome, Florence, Milan, and the rest of Italy fell into the shade. Luxury mounted concurrently with vice. France's famous Enlightenment, however, seems to have had its seeds in England, in the period from 1660 to 1750. There, with the Restoration, a wave of ridicule was launched at religion with devastating effect.²⁶

It caught, with its wit and cruel exaggerations, a young Frenchman who later called himself Voltaire. He never forgot that impression, nor did he ever abandon that weapon. Of course, art flourished during the Enlightenment, but it was an art completely caught, like the Greeks', in a world where vice was held to be attractive and interesting, and virtue dull and stupid. Homosexuality—that Greek specialty of Plato and Company, emerged from the shadows to enjoy transvestite dances and masques. Pornography reappeared, and so did the prototypical “humanists”—the men of letters struggling desperately for a secure niche in the world, available to any who could pay the price. Peter Gay subtitled his book on the period, *The Rise of Modern Paganism*.

You know the results. I wrote a book about the French Revolution, and I can still recall my surprise and even fear when I realized that it is as contemporary as today's newspapers. Radical lawyers like Robespierre, revolutionary journalists, idealistic rich radicals, and radical intel-

26. John Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule and Religion: The Enlightenment in England, 1660–1750* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976).

lectuals socializing with pornographers and courtesans and dishonest politicians are familiar to us today.

Of course, the Terror took people aback. Terror, followed by a war that lasts twenty years, is not easy from which to recover. In the end France was broken. The largest nation in Europe. The richest. The most populous. The land with the greatest number of palaces and chateaux, of art treasures and newspapers, of learned doctors and men of letters—all crashed. To this day France is divided between those whose forbears suffered and those who think their forbears benefited. Its greatest treasures remain those left over from the *ancien* regime; it has never—and will never—have another time of glory.

But the lesson remained unlearned. The teaching of religion dropped downward; educators turned from the Bible to lesser productions to teach about life and the world, and the meaning of history. In that turning, those lessons dropped utterly from sight. People were left with propaganda, with slogans and stereotypes and doctored legends and falsified narratives.

A new Enlightenment, of sorts, appeared in the late Victorian period. It {28} was accompanied, in Britain, by the usual turning toward the ancient Greeks. I have two books in my library on the subject, and they make fascinating reading. The English modeled their boarding schools for boys on Sparta. Later the fashion switched to Athens, where there was less austerity and more sensuality, including homosexuality—which became known in Europe as the “English disease,” distinguished from flagellation.

When Kipling went to London as a rising young author, his reaction was like that of Luther to Rome. He was horrified by the fact that persons like Oscar Wilde were drawing-room rulers. That spurred a desperate sort of poetic effort to establish a different, more virile sort of Empire, but the slide was far too steep for even a great poet to stem.

The European equivalent of the Sack of Rome turned out to be World War I: mass suicide. The leaders of Europe had, by that time, retained the facade and lost the essence of a Christian civilization. Their fratricidal conflict proved the point beyond words.

After that came the rise of Burckhardt’s terrible simplifiers, and the new tyrants. Like their predecessors in the Renaissance, they offered great lures to artists. Royalties from massive printings, ovations in the

theater and crowds to welcome you at railroad stations, medals, interviews, and parties with the mighty—Paul Hollander describes these lures in his work, *Political Pilgrims*.²⁷

Hollander names a long list of western artists and journalists who succumbed to these lures. In his conclusions, he blames a loss of religious faith and a rise of belief in—of all things—a sort of magic. Nothing really dangerous can happen to us, say these modern humanists; nothing will ever really change. But, of course, it will.

Inevitably these illusions amid complete license, amid a collapse of traditional values, create their own reaction. Christians as appalled as Luther and armed with much more information, are actually appearing in public once again to argue their beliefs and to stand up. Norman Lear may not like it; the United States Supreme Court may not like it—but so what? Lear is simply another little man with a megaphone; the Court can rule, but it cannot determine beliefs or events.

Today I write with a computer. A software program called—believe it or not—Perfect Writer—enables me to type, correct, and print my own material. This is like bringing a printing press within the grasp of every individual. And that spells the end of the information monopoly; the media menace. The rule of those who allow only one side of every argument to be heard will end with this decade. {29}

As a Calvinist I do not believe in any ladder of earthly progress, and I will not ascribe these developments to any effort of men alone. But I recall doing an essay earlier this year on the way that Luther's protest was spread all over Europe. He pinned his arguments—or the points he wanted to make—to a church door because that was the way scholarly debates were then conducted. What happened next was that a printer received a copy—not from Luther, by the way—and tens of thousands of copies then began to alert all Christendom.

We can say, therefore, that God provides the instruments—including people—to accomplish His purposes. New instruments are now at hand, and the people are rising. The great examples before us, and the lessons we need to understand, can be found in our traditional Chris-

27. *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China and Cuba, 1928–1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).

tian literature, in our Bible, in our forbears, in our history, and in our hearts.

I am astonished, in looking at the history of France, of Italy, of the English empire, at how closely it follows the patterns explained in the Bible—at how repetitive these lessons are. Yet the seasons of man repeat, from infancy to old age; the seasons of the year recur and will continue to do so—and follies repeat themselves when the wisdom of the past is hidden from general view. If we were properly educated regarding the nature of this civilization, its origins and its experiences, it would, in my opinion, provide the same sort of mingled grandeur and meanness that the Bible illustrates. For the world remains essentially the same. Christians survived Rome, they survived the Renaissance, they survived the French and Russian Revolutions, and they survived global wars.

We did not survive by accident. Unlike the Greeks, we know that we do not live in a world of chance. In this world everything that happens shows the hand of God. And of all men, it is the artist who is blessed by the talent to convey that sense of purpose to others. The failed artist becomes a propagandist; the true artist serves God.

A CHRISTIAN THEORY OF MUSIC

Martin G. Selbrede

[This conference essay presents, in condensed form, material from the first three chapters of Mr. Selbrede's upcoming book, *Christian Reconstruction in Music*.]

Music, like religion, is a field subjected to intellectual abuse by modern man because the myth prevails that men are born with innate expertise in it. The underlying basis of this intellectual dislocation is defective presuppositionalism. Presuppositional diseases must be isolated and treated in the field of music before true reconstruction can begin. Any other basis for reconstruction would be tantamount to giving a sick man injections of bacteria in lieu of antibiotics.

Reconstruction in music therefore must resist the temptation to baptize musical humanism, and its inherent rebellion against God, and must seek to implement a biblical framework for restoring music to its proper place in His Kingdom.

The full implications of musical reconstruction, and the many humanistic myths which must be crushed in order to subject music to God, will be brought out clearly in the course of this study. The approach to be taken is quite simple, yet, because of our preconditioning, will seem radically new. Our point of departure will be Lutheran composer Johann Sebastian Bach, who composed music solely for the glory of God. Bach's music was a natural extension of his faith, and sets forth biblically sound musical categories: music that glorifies God, and music that does not. Godless music requires the vacuum of musical illiteracy in order to thrive, and it is this vacuum that we will address, first by noting how humanists have filled that vacuum, and second, by observing how God commands us properly to fill it.

Brief Survey of Humanistic Trends in Music

A representative listing of humanistic trends and ideas in music as represented by their exponents would including the following: {33}

- ☛ Boethius, the sixth-century Hellenist philosopher who defended the Greek theory of ethos against the biblical insistence on man's total culpability for his actions. Boethius divided music into three categories: *musica instrumentalis*, *musica humana*, *musica mundana*. The last category is a recrudescence of the Pythagorean "music of the spheres" idea later expanded by astronomer Johannes Kepler (*Harmonics Mundi*, 1619), who actually expressed planetary motion using musical notation. This three-part division of music conveniently explained music's influence on man's intellect and emotions while confirming music as a crucial aspect of non-biblical cosmology.
- ☛ Non-Western cultures, which have based music on non-biblical religious and philosophical foundations. Chinese music theory correlates with Yin-Yang metaphysics, utilizing the 2:3 ratio symbolizing these two elements of the Chinese cosmos. In Indian music, the fixed drone pitch symbolizes the *atman* (soul), while the *raga* melody moving over the drone is symbolic of life experiences in terms of the universal Brahman.
- ☛ Some western composers were unable to resist the riptide of messianic pretension. Russian composer Alexander Scriabin was born on Christmas Day, and regarded himself as the superior messiah, the one destined to transform the world through music. He regarded World War I as a rite of purification to prepare the world for the performance of his masterpiece, *Mysterium*, which begins with bells suspended in the clouds over the Himalayas, concluding seven days later with a general enlightenment of all mankind.
- ☛ Modern musical messianism even extends to the self-annihilation philosophy undergirding punk rock. The punk experience is embraced by our youth precisely because of its messianic import and physical power.
- ☛ Implicit messianism emphasizes the supposed spiritual transformation wrought in listeners by great music. Witness conductor Giulini's declaration "that what the world needs is Brahms." This messianic rhetoric abounds in musical humanism.

- A participant at the early Marlborough Music Festivals spoke freely about the pervasive “religious fervor” at Marlborough, where “Music is God.” The intense musical rituals were mitigated by an emotional release at meal time, when the cleansing ritual of food fights prepared musicians for the next bout of devotionals. Musical humanism is a unique religion.
- So-called “minimalist” music builds up a rhythmic fabric of sound, invoking a hypnotic effect to suspend conscious thought, surrounding man in an insulating blanket of transcendental sound. Like the eastern {34} meditational states they invoke, minimalist musical draperies are ultimately empty, and lead nowhere.
- Humanism finds pure expression in *statism*, thus affecting music through the vehicle of the totalitarian state. Totalitarian governments have traditionally taken steps to put music under statist control. Nazi propagandist Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels insisted on the “loyalty which creative artists owe the State.” Musicians out of step with Nazi doctrine were quickly ostracized, as in the case of composer Paul Hindemith. The Nazi media called Hindemith “a standard bearer of decadence, deeply rooted in the kind of spiritual and philosophical conceptions that National Socialism completely rejects. His work cannot be fruitful for our new musical culture, because his music lacks the Nazi philosophical outlook which Germany demands in its art, and thus has no place in the musical world of the Third Reich.”

Similarly, the Soviet Union under Stalin began issuing guidelines for composers, detailing what the State expected from them. Composer Dmitri Shostakovich fell out of grace twice, and many other composers behind the Iron Curtain have had compositions banned for not conforming to statist guidelines. Musical culture in the People’s Republic of China has been so thoroughly transformed by Marxism that large-scale compositions have been written by *committees* of musicians, to assure that the music is faithful to the principles of the cultural revolution.

Shattering the Myths

Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel, you shall become a plain. (Zech. 4:7)

Today, the mountain standing in the way of Christian reconstruction of music is a mountain of myths. This mountain is comprised of two major myths and their corollaries. These myths are universally

accepted as true, among Christians as well as the world at large, and they condition and shape the whole of our musical culture.

Academic support for these myths is overwhelming, or at least superficially impressive. Dr. Rushdoony warns that the humanist's "learning may be massive, his scholarship ponderous, but the net result may be futile if his governing principle is myth" (*Biblical Philosophy of History*, 11). Ponderous scholarship aside, the net result of humanism's takeover of music has been to segregate the "geniuses" from the allegedly untrainable masses, thus hurling music into a phase of anarchic irrelevance. Let us, then, consider and refute the great myths which humanism has forced on our thinking. {35}

The first myth is the myth of *elitism*. This myth is so fundamental to our thinking, it actually serves as a presupposition, assumed to be a necessary starting point prior to initiating serious discussion of musical matters. Music, in both its performance and its creative aspects, embraces the doctrine of elitism, which teaches that there are but a few great examples of musical talent, and all the rest of the world should be content to remain musically ignorant. Thus, we speak of the "great masters" and "geniuses" of the musical world, and thus mentally establish an arbitrary plateau of excellence which would be virtually impossible to supersede.

We thus assume that no one could ever exceed Beethoven's ability to compose music. What is worse, even in framing this thought, we again presuppose the myth of elitism, because we would be imagining a hypothetical *individual* who might supersede Beethoven, thus joining that particular elite of "great composers." Foreign to our thinking is the possibility that a multitude, specifically a great multitude, could conceivably achieve far more than Beethoven did, thus crushing the myth of musical elitism. (When one examines the incredibly complex musical exercises Bach created for his nine-year-old son, it is evident that such a level of achievement does in fact reside in man.)

The deadening myth of elitism bears miserable fruit. *Lowered expectations* inevitably follow in its wake. We are led to believe that only a few can ever expect to reach such-and-so a level of achievement. How devastating the elitist doctrine is: it has put a miserable cap of lowered expectations on top of God's Kingdom, and reroutes Kingdom

resources to serve and support the humanistic agenda for today's musical culture.

Look at another myth we all hold: in teaching the English language, we expect our students to read *and* write, but in *music*, we don't expect our students to write or be creative—they should only be expected to read music...if possible. How does this notion affect us? It commits us to the standing repertoire of music, the overwhelming majority of which is humanistic. Thus, again, we submit to humanism's standards by defaulting in the one area in which we could have offered an alternative.

Thus, musical literacy, which should be the common possession of all of God's people, *must* include the ability to *write as well as to read music*. True reconstruction in music will be accompanied by an avalanche of musical composition across the Kingdom of God, as it grows and conquers the world. Starting with such a radically new presupposition (that all students should be expected to compose music with facility), Christian schools can boldly challenge the public schools and destroy them entirely by exposing {36} how dry and shriveled is the fruit that grows on the humanistic vine, and how robust and rich the fruit of the True Vine. This is accomplished by exploding the myths of elitism and noncreativity that pervade modern musical education.

[A further repercussion, perhaps even more explosive than the victory in education, would be created by Christian reconstruction of music. Because humanism has built up an elitist system, it has created a *market* condition, with a scarce resource being distributed to the general public. This market condition has generated a multi-billion dollar industry that helps to pay humanism's way, and thus humanists have a vested interest in the very elitist doctrine we Christians would be overthrowing. Our success in raising musical literacy to the level Bach achieved with his children would destroy the music market by making a *scarce* resource an *abundant* one, thus further undermining humanism and its cultural monoliths at its most critical support pillar. Thus, the market aspect of music would die, and its Kingdom aspect would be restored as God's church pushed further into this yet unconquered territory!]

Elitism or Musical Universalism?

Musical elitism is an applied form of “remnant theology,” wherein the musical “elect” stand in isolation from the rest of the world. What is necessary to combat this serious deflection from “thinking God’s thoughts after Him” is to consider more fully the omnipotence of the Almighty.

Some Christians may object that “there is, after all, only so much spiritual power in the world; why dissipate it in a Quixotic endeavor to reach the core of the evil, and not rather expend it wisely and warily in correcting at least some of its more menacing fruits?” And this line of reasoning is precisely why most Christians are fighting border skirmishes against *backward masking* and other forms of blatant satanism and idolatry in secular rock music.

But Warfield said of this attitude that “it is an atheistic lie! The spiritual power in the world is the power of the omnipotent Jehovah. It does not waste with use; it does not recoil before the magnitude of any task!”

In contrast, today’s Church occupies a negative position, and has emptied the world of promise. But Warfield teaches us that when divine omnipotence is our foundation, we “may await, not only in hope, but in firm expectation, the fulfillment of the promises. And now, once occupying this position, how full the very air is of promise!”

Thus, we must never counsel men to look to themselves in evaluating {37} the prospect of victory in music reconstruction (or reconstruction of any field, for that matter). We must rather point men to the Almighty one, and proclaim loudly the mighty implications of the Power that properly operates in the sphere of what is humanly impossible.

Thus, the Scriptures openly command that everything that has breath must praise the Lord, and do so with cymbals, trumpets, and singing voice. The 150th Psalm forces the reader to conclude that God commands musical universalism, in the widest imaginable sense of the words. Further scriptural support for musical universalism is adduced by Calvin in his commentaries on the following verses from the Psalms:

(Ps. 96:1) The Psalmist is exhorting the whole world, and not the Israelites merely, to the exercise of devotion. Nor could this be done,

unless the gospel were universally diffused as the means of conveying the knowledge of God.

(Ps. 99:4–6) *Exult before Jehovah, all the earth; make a loud noise, and rejoice, and sing praise.* Here he repeats the exhortations with which he had begun, and by addressing it to the nations at large, he indicates that when God should break down the middle wall of partition all [nations] would be gathered to the common faith, and one Church formed throughout the whole world.

(Ps. 100:1) *Let all the earth make a joyful noise to Jehovah.* The Psalmist...invites the whole of the inhabitants of the earth indiscriminately to praise Jehovah.

(Ps. 150:6) [Up to this point] the Psalmist has addressed himself...to the people [then] under the Law. [N]ow he turns to men in general, tacitly intimating that a time was coming when the same songs [glorifying God], which were then only heard in Judea, would resound in every quarter of the globe.

Related Myths about Music

The Scriptures never speak of the Church as a silent army, that only sings in secret, “in the barracks,” so to speak. Dr. Rushdoony has observed that “the more faithful the Church, the greater its visibility, i.e., the more clearly it witnesses to the word and power of Christ in this world” (*Foundations of Social Order*, 181). We should include *audibility* as an aspect of the Church’s *visibility*, for an inaudible Church might just as well be invisible. How better to “declare God’s glory among the heathen” (Ps. 96:2) with music (Ps. 96:1) than in settings where men declare their own glory among themselves? Don’t fall into the trap Dr. Rushdoony warns us {38} against, to believe as the humanists do that the proper arena for Christianity is “the private life of the believer...[and that] *all social life must be humanistic*” (*Foundations*, 185). Says Dr. Rushdoony, “true religion is a total concern; *any area vacated by a religion is only occupied by another religion.*” Wherever Christians remain mute, the humanists will fill the Lord’s air with *their* music. If we do not repent and turn back to the Lord in obedience, the time may come when the Lord will refuse to hear *our* songs (Amos 5:23).

The vast majority of music is literally heathen, heathen in origin, conception, purpose, execution, and design. Consequently, the great

masters drew from humanism the elements of Pelagianism, which Rushdoony has shown will tend to “infect every sphere. The artist believes in the regenerating power of the aesthetic experience” (*Foundations*, 117). Thus, Christians must boldly rebuke the entire idea of secular communion with heathen composers through their music.

Professional musicianship has generated a market condition that encourages elitism. Fact: in the early 1970s, professors at a state university lamented the large enrollment figures in the school’s music program, citing oversaturation as their rationale (“there are more musicians than this area can economically support”). The professors hoped to discourage a large portion of the students from pursuing the study of music—turning them out of the ranks of the elite, so they might join the ranks of the masses who will subsidize the elite. Any scheme that encourages and reinforces elitism on this scale definitely defies the revealed purpose of God.

The desire to manipulate sound for monetary gain has characterized many musicians throughout history. Some even end up being subsidized by the state as national heroes (e.g., Edvard Grieg)—or are subsidized by the state in other ways (e.g. state-supported orchestras), or are just plain subsidized (i.e., on welfare). In any event, God’s language of praise is put on the auction block, and dollars exchange hands.

It may be objected that Bach was paid for writing music—but his work fell under the category of music that God intended the tithe to support. But tithes were never intended to support the Los Angeles Philharmonic, or to underwrite the electric bills for hard rock groups, etc. The legitimacy of Bach is scripturally established—but the appeal would have been meaningless in any event, since Bach was primarily an instructor and leader of worship via his music ministry. In fact, his was one of the few true music ministries ever administered in the last 500 years, for Bach both taught music, and then used that training to teach doctrine and devotion in the medium {39} of musical worship. By contrast, today’s so-called music ministries are Christian music groups playing concerts peppered with witnessing and testimony that conclude with an invitation to accept Christ. This modern phenomenon is really mediocre evangelism overlaid with sonic embroidery. The impact the music adds (an effect exploited by secular artists as well) is actually the sole justification for the music.

I sympathize with born-again musicians who then ask, “What shall we then do?” They receive no sound biblical counseling from the Church. They are rather encouraged to do their own thing...unto the Lord. Those three last words prove far too vague—they don’t fill the need for comprehensive doctrine to guide men according to the Lord’s statutes. Well-meaning Christian musicians are left in darkness, since the Church has seen fit to cut off the electricity for the “light unto their feet”—God’s Law.

Isn’t God’s Law Irrelevant to Music?

Far from it. Psalm 119:54 reads, *Thy statutes have been my songs*. Williams comments thus: “In the early ages, it was customary to versify the laws, that the people might learn them by heart, and sing them.” The biblical evidence teaches that God’s people will *set His Law to music* as an act of obedience to their Lord.

The extension of the Kingdom’s dominion over music will follow the extension of God’s Law as it reclaims its rightful place in God’s Kingdom. The setting of the Law to music, the biblically-ordained method of instruction, will cause much needed growth in both realms.

What Priority Do We Place On Music Education?

Christians schools, on the average, spend more than twice the amount of time in music instruction than do the public schools (see table, below), but this is still not enough. If money and additional instructors were available, Christian schools would gladly expand their music programs. But this would require that the *parents* and *churches* establish such a goal as an important *priority*. This requires vision on the part of parents and pastors combined. Let us show an example.

School Name	Time Allotted
First Presbyterian Church of Granada Hills	60 min/wk
West Valley Christian Academy	90 min/wk
Cornerstone Christian Church	30 min/wk + incidental study

West Valley Christian School	60 min/wk + incidental study
First Baptist Church of Van Nuys	90 min/wk
Faith Baptist Church of Canoga Park	Refused to release figures
First Baptist Church of Canoga Park	60 min/wk
Chalcedon School	60 min/wk
Grace Community Church School	60 min/wk
Liberty Canyon Christian School	60 min/wk + extracurricular study
Public Schools of Los Angeles*	25 min/wk

*Only 140,000 of the 250,000 students receive instruction. The rest receive no musical instruction of any kind.

If increased funding by parents enabled a school to double the amount of time spent teaching music (from one hour to two hours a week), from kindergarten through the sixth grade, the students entering the seventh grade will have had 560 hours of training in music. If such a program were pursued into secondary school, over 1,000 hours of training in music would be part of every graduate's background. That amount of study time, *in a {40} well-designed curriculum*, will bring forth a generation of Bachs, and will start shaking the very foundations of modern culture as predicted earlier. We can keep pouring money into "anti-rock music" ministries, or we can, over the long-term, utterly topple the whole industry by committing ourselves to making our children the most powerful weapon in God's hands.

What theoretical elements comprise a well-designed curriculum?

Calvin taught that nature is not God, but is the order prescribed by God. If there is a natural order to be found in musical tones and their interrelationships, it must be an order prescribed by God. The power of music does not rest in a composer's eloquence, but in its divine source. Whereas Bach extended a "full and unimpeded mastery over the entire tonal domain," it remained for twentieth-century composer Paul Hindemith to penetrate and fully explain the order God prescribed in

musical tones. In Calvin's words, Hindemith's theory gives us a deeper insight into the mysteries of the divine wisdom. A striking instance of God's revelation in music occurs in the process of building a scale out of the harmonic series {41} (Hindemith, *Craft of Musical Composition*, vol. 1, 24–43). A true scale can be constructed using overtones 1 through 6, but the 7th overtone cannot be used. The musical barrier that God establishes at overtone 7 forced Hindemith to observe that “in the world of tone... we must acknowledge the holy circle to be inaccessible” (38). We could hardly imagine a more powerful proof that music bears the impress of God's holy nature.

Our children need to learn firsthand how music is put together from its elemental building blocks, to be able to reason biblically from first principles, deriving for themselves the building blocks of music, a procedure which makes for mastery and dominion over the material. As yet, no effort has yet been made to teach music according to the Principle Approach, whereby every element in the theory is reasoned from Scripture and the divinely established laws of nature. Paul Hindemith's research fills this gap, but remains neglected by Christian and non-Christian alike. It is outside the scope of this presentation to set forth Hindemith's theory in its particulars; Christians are directed to obtain Hindemith's book and study it carefully, for without a thoroughly biblical grounding, music will remain a realm of artificial, man-made structures.

It takes more than a toothpick to dig the foundation for a building. It will take more than today's superficial music curriculum to transform musical culture to God's glory. Up till now, we have inadequately equipped our children for the tremendous task before them, and we can no longer deprive them of the opportunity to take musical culture captive to the obedience of Christ. What father among you, when your child asks for a loaf of bread, would give him a rock instead? And yet, in musical matters, Bach was the last father to give his posterity the Bread of Life. The time has come to cast out the lifeless rocks that crowd our musical pantry and restore a rigorously biblical musical perspective. This is our duty, and our Lord will hold us responsible for it.

{42}

CHRISTIAN-BASED COMMUNICATIONS

John W. Saunders III
(aka John Quade)

In this article we wish to provide:

- a. A brief introduction to the history of the philosophy of Christian presuppositionalism.
- b. An explanation, definition, and example of terms used in this philosophy.
- c. The consequences of this philosophy in formulating Christian-based communications.

We've selected these concepts to deal with, because:

1. The vast majority of Christians today, particularly artisans, are almost totally ignorant of the philosophy of Christian presuppositionalism.
2. It must be made crystal clear to all that in this essay, when we speak of a theology and philosophy of Christian-based communications, we mean that which follows and no other.
3. The steady growth of Christian presuppositional thought and the inability of the opposition, humanist or Christian, successfully to attack it, should tell anyone that it will be a major historical movement in the development of the Western world for many decades to come. For that reason alone it must be studied and dealt with.
4. The Christian artisan who seriously desires to work towards reconstruction in every area of life will have to take great pains to ignore the fact that the reconstruction, now in its initial stages, has, as its cutting edge, this system of theology and philosophy.

A Brief History of Presuppositionalism

It is said that Americans have made a philosophy out of not being philosophers. Except for a very few men, we have, in more than 350 years, done a remarkable job of living up to this maxim. We go to great

lengths to prove to the world that we're just basic-down-to-earth-simple-straight-forward-Buckskin-'n'-Bowie-knife-good-ole-boy-rugged-individualists, and to accuse the average Christian of being a theologian is seen by many as an {43} outright insult. There is no question that anti-intellectualism is rampant in American Christendom, which ends, of course, in a kind of fundamentalism. "Besides," they say, "we had frontiers to cross, rivers to ford, mountains to climb, roads and bridges to build, and space to conquer. Whose got time fer philosophy and theology with all that to do? Just gimme that ole time religion, that's good enough for me!"

This philosophy of not being philosophers came about in the second place due to a lack of theological maturity in the first place. Philosophers, of course, will deny that philosophy always depends, ultimately, on a prior existing religious motive. Instead of theoretical studies, Americans have substituted a "results"-oriented practicality. "Ferget all the fall-der-all, boy, just gimme the bottom line." This naive and simplistic mentality dovetails quite nicely with the trap of pragmatism a la John Dewey, and a whole host of other "isms."

I won't go into the reasons why this happened except to suggest that with the death of American Puritanism at the end of the seventeenth century and their emphasis on intellectual quality, the development of American theology and philosophy was effectively nipped in the bud. But, we should note a rather unique phenomena in Puritanism which has occurred again in this century. Whatever else they did, the Puritan transplanted a vine of thought from the depleted soil of Europe to the fertile land of America, and a better fruit was produced, even if only temporarily. Latent potential was realized more fully. Not perfectly, indeed, just more fully.

Transplanting has occurred again, from Europe to America, in the birth of what will be the single most important development in the history of American philosophy and in the future development of philosophy throughout the world.

Prior to the end of the nineteenth century, Abraham Kuyper of Amsterdam, came to an awakening with respect to the arrested development of Christian apologetics, which had declined so far in its power, that it was ignored as a serious challenge to nonbelief. The problem was, Christian apologetics had "assumed the validity of two

ultimate and mutually exclusive principles, the autonomy of natural man and the sovereignty of the self-contained God. Kuyper set out therefore to rid apologetics and Christian philosophy of these two mutually exclusive ultimates and to establish Christian thought on the firm basis of the ontological trinity.”²⁸

At the Free University of Amsterdam, which Kuyper founded, the idea saw further development in Vollenhoven, Dooyeweerd, Bavinck, and others. Their common idea being, that whether one admits it or not, all {44} thought is ultimately based on religious presuppositions. That Kuyper himself was inconsistent at points, is important as long as we remember the general direction of his thought. He never fully rid himself of certain ideas which today, we might call liberal. The point is, this school of thought sought “to bring human thinking to epistemological self-consciousness and to lay bare the religious presuppositions of all thought.”²⁹ And to do this in every area of life.

The transplanting of these ideas from Europe to America occurred in the thinking of Cornelius Van Til. He saw the same kinds of problems in American schools of apologetics, but, he was also a true conservative in the classical Calvinist sense. Due to this factor he was able to bring the seed in Kuyper to its most successful stage of growth—in apologetics and the philosophy of apologetics. In Van Til’s view, American apologetics,

... had as its assumption the belief that natural man was able to do two things:

- a. to work up a natural theology that would show theism to be more probably true than any other theory of reality, and
- b. to show that Christianity is more probably true than any other theory of sin and redemption. Behind this assumption lay two deadly presuppositions, first, the autonomy of natural man, who could act as judge over reality, and, second, the impartiality of the natural man, who was expected to assess honestly an interpretation he was in war against.

28. R. J. Rushdoony, *By What Standard? An Analysis of the Philosophy of Cornelius Van Til* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1974), 181.

29. *Ibid.*

To expect man, the covenant-breaker, to be impartial with regard to factuality is like expecting a thief to sit impartially as judge and jury over himself.³⁰

For almost half a century now, Van Til's presuppositionalism has grown in its influence. Today, though he would be the first to decline the honor, he is justifiably recognized as the father of American Presuppositional Philosophy. He is also one of the most "cussed" and discussed, least understood, and least studied men in American Christendom. But, in all the controversy which surrounds his work and presuppositionalism, the fact is, no serious challenge has ever been mounted against either his work or presuppositional philosophy. We note, however, that Van Til deliberately confined himself to apologetics, seeking only to develop, to the best of his ability, a sound, biblically based method of defending the faith. In maintaining this remarkable level of self-discipline, he has laid the foundation for the apologetics of the future, and, by implication, provided us with the tools necessary to attack the opposition in the very root of its ideas and while {45} defending the faith, to reconstruct the whole of Christian thought. Van Til has often been criticized for not writing theology, for publishing too slowly, and for a host of other reasons. In theology, for example, he simply refers people to Bavinck, and in so far as publishing too slowly, he has never been one to hurry something into print, in spite of the fact that one's academic career is almost totally dependent on it. He has always been far more concerned with getting it right the first time.

For the application of presuppositionalism to other areas of life in works by an American theologian, one must turn to the more than thirty works of R. J. Rushdoony,³¹ whose name is often linked with Van Til. In the popular mind, Rushdoony is known more for his stand on biblical law and postmillennial eschatology, which, until recently, kept him out of most churches and schools. Nevertheless, these three factors, presuppositionalism, biblical law, and postmillennialism, have given him such a comprehensive grasp of the contemporary world situation and how we got into this mess, that he is now one of the most "in

30. *Ibid.*, 180.

31. For a bibliography of Rushdoony's books, see John W. Saunders, *The Chalcedon View: Past, Present, and Future* (Chalcedon Foundation, 1983).

demand” Christians in America. The Chalcedon Foundation which he heads³² is seen as one of the most influential “think tanks” of its kind.³³ He is also the foremost court witness in the world on the history, philosophy, and theology of church and state issue. Be that as it may, the Chalcedon Foundation today, is the leading school of presuppositional thought in America.

Presuppositional Terminology

Part of the problem in the propagation of any idea is being able to define the words and terms one uses. For example, what is a presupposition?

Before he came across Van Til’s *The New Modernism*³⁴ in 1945, Rushdoony had been thinking in terms of “the given” since the 1930s.³⁵ The “given” and a “presupposition” are different words for the same thing. The “given” is that which lies behind, and is the foundation and motivation for a thought, word, act, or fact. In a slightly different sense “the given” can be thought of as the ultimate court of appeal, and it can be openly stated, implied, or suggested.

We’ve all been involved in situations where a particular act or word by one person, will evoke a remark by someone else which may be something like, “Hey, man, where you coming from?” Modern man is, without knowing it, seeking for the ultimate given or presuppositions behind all of reality, and he knows nothing of philosophy or presuppositionalism.

An example, in a scientific sense, might be illustrated by the following {46} statements.

1. *The earth is 5 billion years old.*

Or,

2. *The earth is only 10,000 years old.*

32. *Ibid.*

33. *Newsweek.*

34. For a bibliography of Van Til’s writings, see E.R. Geehan, ed., *Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussions on the Philosophy and Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980).

35. Saunders, *The Chalcedon View.*

In this case, the given is implied. If one holds to a 5-billion-year-old earth, he does so because he holds to an even more ultimate given, the hypothesis of evolution. The same for the Creationist. Both men have the same data in investigating the age of the earth, but, they come to different conclusions, not because of the data itself, but because of the influence of a more ultimate presupposition or given. The facts are what they are because of what the ultimate given or presupposition says about them.

Presuppositionalism recognizes that there are no such things as data or facts which speak for themselves. Van Til calls the idea that facts speak for themselves, the idea of “brute factuality.” The minute one perceives anything, he brings to that perception a worldview which determines his interpretation of the fact whether he will include the new found fact in his worldview as true or false. As Dooyeweerd might add, one differentiates between one fact and another, interprets them, then reintegrates the interpreted fact back into an already existing worldview, but the differentiation and reintegration are controlled by the presuppositions in the worldview. (One can easily sense a kind of predestination here.)

One can continue to delve deeper into a school of thought coming to more ultimate presuppositions and do an extended analysis of all schools of thought in the past 3,000 years,³⁶ but eventually one learns that all schools, no matter how they appear to differ on the surface, ultimately reduce to two points of view and two only. And these two worldviews are either the Christian or the humanistic one.

Behind the 5-billion-year-idea lies the presupposition of the hypothesis of evolution, and behind that lies the philosophy of “chance,” and

36. Th. D.H. Vollenhoven and Hermann Dooyeweerd have both written widely on the history of schools of philosophy. Unfortunately, Vollenhoven wrote in Dutch and little of his works have been translated. Dooyeweerd's *Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy* is now being translated into English by Dr. Magnus Verbrugge. But see, by Dooyeweerd, *The New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, trans. David H. Freeman and William S. Young, 4 vols. (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969); *In the Twilight of Western Thought*, University Series: Philosophical Studies (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1974); *The Christian Idea of the State*, trans. John Kraay, University Series: Historical Studies (Nutley, NJ: Craig Press, 1978); *The Secularization of Science* (Memphis, TN: Christian Studies Center, 1979).

still more ultimately, we come to the most basic presupposition of all in this school, the ultimacy or autonomy of human reason. The same process can be applied to the Creationist, and we would ultimately come to his most basic presupposition, the Creator God of Scripture.

Most importantly, man's most basic presuppositions are always ultimately religious where religion is defined as: the ultimate court of appeal in any system of thought. The humanist cannot live with this definition, of course. He's spent vast sums of money, time, and effort, on convincing the world that he alone is nonreligious, and therefore unbiased the way Christians are supposed to be. He alone is neutral in the ultimate category of religion. {47} Yet, if we examine the efforts of humanists in every area of life, from a presuppositional base, we can easily see that in all things, they have an ultimate court of appeal in the autonomy of human reason which manifests its own system of law, doctrine, and Bible (*Humanist Manifesto*, parts 1 and 2). Elsewhere I've pointed out³⁷ that at every point in the humanist frame, they put forth an opposite idea to Christian and biblical truth. Christians insist that salvation comes through Christ. Humanists insist that man must save himself. In his heart of hearts, the humanist knows the need for salvation just as the Christian does, and he knows of this need because God has placed it in the ground of his being. He cannot escape the knowledge of it. Christian and humanist may both use the same word (salvation), but, by virtue of their different religious starting points or presuppositions, they mean two entirely different things which have two entirely different sets of consequences.

In art, the consequences of one's presuppositions will determine the content, form, and method of execution used to bring the work into production provided the artist is conscious of what he is doing. All art schools teach some theory of light, for example. This is a crucial factor in all works of art which must be seen, visually. One's theory of music determines the way in which one composes, the way notes are juxtaposed, chord structures designed, and so on, provided one knows what one is doing consciously. This brings us to another term often used in presuppositional thought: "epistemological self-consciousness."

37. John W. Saunders III, "Christian Reconstruction in Film and Television," special issue, *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 9, nos. 1–2, (1982–1983): 304–37.

Epistemology simply means: the study of knowing. How do you know you know? What is the basis for the certainty of knowledge? Is there a dependable basis for knowing? Why do you do one thing and not another? In Christianity, the basis of knowing is in the nature and attributes of God found in the revelation of Himself in Scriptures and is also seen in the world about us. In humanism, the god of chance is ultimate, which means, if carried to its logical conclusion, that the humanist has no certain basis of knowing, would not know if he knew, and wouldn't be able to communicate to anyone else nor anyone else to him. If this were really true, all knowing would be a matter of sheer luck, and even then, one would have no way of knowing whether one had been lucky at knowing anything.

Self-consciousness means having knowledge of ourselves and our thinking, consciously. For the Christian, true knowledge of ourselves and our thought processes is possible only because the God of Scripture is Himself fully self-conscious and has given us true knowledge of ourselves and how we were created to function. {48}

Seeking epistemological self-consciousness means that we not only seek to know something, but why we know it as well, and to achieve the highest possible degree of certainty in what we know. This brings conviction with respect to the true statement of reality, and by implication, it also brings conviction with respect to that which is false.

In today's world we know a veritable plethora of "facts," but for most people, what those facts mean can only be known as the certain dictates of learned "opinion," which can, of course, change with the weather or the next regime that comes to power.

In Christian presuppositionalism we seek epistemological self-consciousness which is directed at knowing the precise way in which a fact has meaning and purpose in God's plan and purpose for that fact. By so doing, we not only know our own position on every fact, but, by implication, we know also the meaning and purpose of the same fact for the opposition. If our position is the true one, then by implication, the opposite one must be false. The opposition does not believe this because it believes a lie about God, man, and the universe.

The biblically consistent Christian thinker should be able to develop a theory of communications which is the true one, and, since it would conform to the way things really are, it would also be the most success-

ful theory of communications. The consistent humanist cannot develop a true theory of communications given his presuppositions. Only the Christian can develop the true theory of communications, and we can, as it were, know something which the opposition cannot know. In short, there is no good reason why the Christian theory of communications should not dominate the entire world of communications. And there is every good reason why the humanistic theory of communications should be the least successful in the world.

The question is, why is there no theory of Christian communications dominating the world? I won't go into this here except to say that for more than a century, Christian thinkers have relegated the Bible to the category of authority only in things spiritual and have excluded history, science, business, and all other categories of concrete expression to the category of things worldly. Suffice it to say, Christian thought from the alpha to the omega, has a potentially massive edge on the humanist if Christians would only exercise it.

This edge, for example, allows us to reduce humanism to an absurdity and point out the real consequences of its ideas as opposed to the pseudo-consequences of humanism. We point out in all we do, that true {49} knowledge and all facts can only be known as they relate to God's plan and purpose in Creation. Scripture not only provides a true statement of our own position, but it also provides a true statement of the oppositions position. As we seek to know these truths we bring every thought captive to the mind of Christ. Further, it demonstrates "literally," on earth, here and now, the truth of the prophecy when it says "that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear" (Isa. 45:23), that Jesus Christ is Lord.

No Christian will ever achieve full epistemological self-consciousness in this present state of existence, only in the hereafter. "For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known" (1 Cor. 13:12). It takes no great imagination to visualize the massive shock to epistemological self-consciousness on the Day of Judgement.

Before we pass on to the application of presuppositionalism a word or two should be said about correspondence and coherence.

According to Scripture, God has created the "universe," time, space, the "facts" of science, and the human mind, in which He has laid the

laws of thought according to which it is to operate. In the facts of science God has laid the laws of being according to which they function. In other words, the impress of God's plan is upon His whole creation. We may characterize this whole situation by saying that the creation of God is a revelation of God. God revealed Himself in nature, and God also revealed Himself in the mind of man. Thus it is impossible for the mind of man to function except in an atmosphere of revelation. And every thought of man, when it functioned normally in this atmosphere of revelation, would express the truth as laid in the creation by God. We may therefore call a Christian epistemology a revelational epistemology.³⁸

The key concept in the foundation of knowing, is the idea of a completely self-conscious God.

True human knowledge corresponds to the knowledge which God has of Himself and His world. Suppose that I am a scientist investigating the life and ways of a cow. What is this cow? I say it is an animal. But that only pushes the question back. What is an animal? To answer that question I must know what life is. But again, to know what life is I must know how it is related to the inorganic world. And so I may and must continue till I reach the borders of the universe. And even when I have reached the borders of the universe, I do not yet know what the cow is. Complete knowledge of what a cow is can be had only by an absolute intelligence, i.e., by one who has, so to speak, the blueprint of the whole universe. But it does not follow {50} from this that the knowledge of the cow that I have is not true as far as it goes. It is true if it corresponds to knowledge that God has of the cow.³⁹

When our knowledge of any fact, then, corresponds to God's knowledge of the same fact, we have achieved coherence. Further, as Van Til says,

It is our contention that only the Christian can obtain real coherence in his thinking. If all of our thoughts about the facts of the universe are in correspondence with God's ideas of these facts, there will naturally

38. Cornelius Van Til, *A Survey of Christian Epistemology*, vol. 2, class syllabus in the Defense of the Faith series (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1977), 1.

39. *Ibid.*

be coherence in our thinking because there is a complete coherence in God's thinking. If there is to be true coherence in our knowledge, there must be correspondence between our ideas of facts and God's ideas of these facts. Or rather we should say that our ideas must correspond to God's ideas.⁴⁰

There are, of course, many other terms used in Christian presuppositionalism, but for the time being, we leave these aside and illustrate why these concepts are important for art and how they impact on the production of a work of art in a Christian-based philosophy of communications.

Christian Presuppositionalism Applied

Since God has created all the facts of the universe with His meaning stamped upon them, it is evident that He is the original Creator and we are the derivative creation. Man is not and cannot be an original creator. Our goal is to think as God thinks, to bring every thought in our minds captive to the thinking of God. As Van Til would say, "to think God's thoughts after Him."

The humanist, on the other hand, believes that he is an original creative thinker. This follows logically from his basic religious presupposition of autonomous reason. He knows that only a god can be a truly original creative genius because God has stamped the knowledge of this fact upon him. He thus creates out of the wellspring of his own autonomy. But, his creations are abstractions incapable of concrete verification or manifestation. His abstractions not only do not exist, but cannot exist.

The humanist is like the Jew of the first century who had conceived of God, monotheistically, as an abstract God, who did not, therefore, manifest Himself in the flesh. When Christ came and proclaimed Himself God, He was rejected because He did not fit their preconceived idea or presupposition of what God would be like. The point is, the conception of God in Judaism was and is an abstraction which not only does not exist, but cannot exist and will never exist.

It is evident, then, that abstractions are incoherent and do not correspond to the nature of things as God created them, or as God

40. *Ibid.*, 2.

intended {51} man to perceive and understand them. The humanist worldview, then, being bound up in abstractions, is incapable of being communicated. Though he may propagate it with great vigor and force, it will not be understood because it does not conform to the real nature of reality or the nature of man.

The question that immediately arises is: If this is so, how does the humanist ever achieve anything? How can the humanist ever make a film and sell it to anyone, if he is bound up in abstractions which his audience cannot understand?

The answer is, of course, he does it by theft. Since the humanist is, by nature, a creature of sin, a law- or covenant-breaker, he freely steals from God's view of reality by taking from God's universe those principles which God created, and redefines them in his own terms. As all heresy in Christian thought begins with a fundamental redefinition of the nature and attributes of God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, so also, in a philosophic sense, all falsity propagates itself and achieves a foothold in a culture, by redefining the nature of reality in terms it can live with.

For example, there are laws of chemistry which determine the way in which one may develop raw stock used in photographing a film. Break these laws and one ends up with a mass of useless acetate. The laws are there in the first place because God created reality to conform to certain laws, one subgroup of which are the laws of chemistry. The humanist, however, will claim that his reason brought order out of the chance-originated universe and discovered, also, the laws of chemistry. But, as we've seen, given humanistic presuppositions knowledge is impossible. The humanist, therefore, wouldn't know the laws of chemistry if they bit him. In denying God he expropriates (steals) the laws of God for his own purposes. He first presupposes God's existence in order to deny Him and His laws. He cannot think otherwise, because that's the way God created him.

Often I am reminded of the story about Einstein and his conversations with Max Planck. Einstein was a pantheist, and Planck knew, as did Einstein, that on the presupposition of pantheism, scientific method was irrational. Planck then asked Einstein how he could ever have developed the special and general theories of relativity on the presupposition of pantheism. Einstein replied that it was sometimes nec-

essary to consider the God of Scripture for the sake of his theory. Einstein, for all of his genius, was, nevertheless, a thief, and he knew it.

Now, as long as humanism is intimidated and kept underground by an active, vigorous, and highly visible manifestation of God's laws in Christian {52} works, the humanist will, in spite of his desire to the contrary, submit to Christian principles. In a culture dominated by Christianity, the humanist, in order to get along, conforms to that cultural worldview. He will seek self-justification for this "practical" approach, just as so many Christians justify looking the other way at the corruption in civil government on the basis of a misinterpretation of Romans 13. But, the abstract ideas in humanism always struggle to be manifest. When Christianity weakens, humanism takes heart and becomes bolder in the effort to corrupt the Kingdom of God. Eventually he comes to believe that he has power enough to drive the remnant of God's people from the face of the earth, hoping to drive the last vestige of God's witness out of his sight. The Christian never seems to learn that this can only happen with the willing cooperation of the Christian himself. Only when Christians retreat, can humanism advance to fill the vacuum.

When this phenomenon occurs, as it has in America in the last 150 years, the Christian becomes progressively dominated by humanism in his own mind and epistemological blindness sets in. He retreats to subjectivism, pietism, and abstractions of his own creation which only aggravate the situation. He continues to profess Christ, but the Christ is redefined to conform to the new situation. He resorts to "proof texting" in order to justify his retreat from the onslaught of humanism, which is nothing more than a retreat from himself and the corruption which lies within his own mind. Scripture is no longer self-interpretive as God is self-interpretive of Himself. It must be interpreted by the new abstract creations of his own reason. He develops, for example, the rapture fever mentality, which in many places parallels the ideas of the Jews in the first century.

Driven by despair and fear, the Christian fails to see that as the humanist gains power and seeks to manifest the dictates of his own reason, he pays a price. As humanism becomes dominated by the self-conscious abstractions which no man was created to understand, he faces a progressive inability to communicate and spread his message.

His art no longer just implies his religious beliefs, but becomes more explicit. Sex is no longer implied, but shown explicitly, as with violence and all other depravities. Further, this becomes manifest for all the world to see. Even the blind can see it.

The same principles of humanism in civil government lead to arbitrary law, the police state, and the elevation of the state to the status of godhood. In education it leads to a public school system which is incapable of teaching anyone anything and instead produces the dependent mentality.

All these ideas are self-destructive, which is only fair, since the only one the humanist is really interested in is himself. The self-contradiction in this {53} vicious circle of reasoning becomes progressively more difficult to mask or live with. In short, humanism, given enough rope, hangs itself.

In today's world of art this means a decline in his ability successfully to propagate a film or television show. The fact that humanism is failing in television is reflected in the loss of ratings points, which means a loss of funds to support humanistic religion in media. Further, the humanist himself knows that his view is failing in the present world. Evidence for this is seen in the recent "Symposium on the Proliferation of Pressure Groups in Prime Time" at Ojai, California, in 1981,⁴¹ the purpose of which was to try to figure out some way of dealing with the pressure from the so-called "New Right." Predictably, no one could agree on a method of dealing with the "Christian fanatics." On their presuppositions, it is a miracle that any of the participants even found the meeting hall. They admit they "have dirty hands" and that they are failing in their efforts to reach the American public. Being out of step with God brings failure as a predestined fact of life. They also know that their only real threat will come from within the Christian camp if it ever wakes up. And this they fear greatly, for God has put the fear of His people on all humanists.

The question is, if we assume that Christians return again to seek epistemological self-consciousness, to think God's thoughts after Him,

41. The news media were not allowed to attend this Symposium, but a summary of the participants views is published by the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences (Emmy), Hollywood, CA.

to seek the mind of Christ in all they do, what guarantee do we have that they will be successful in bringing about the reconstruction of the media and arts on a Christian-based philosophy?

In the first place, only God can guarantee the future. To ask for guarantees is asking the artisan to play God. A very simple example of Christians thinking like humanists is seen when the Christian artisan goes to a potential investor. The investor, thinking like a humanist, and incapable of reasoning from the Scripture to an assessment of the real value of a project, expects the artisan to act as God and provide the investor with a certain return on his money. The artisan, going along with this idea, goes to great lengths to provide all the facts, figures, and projections, to convince the investor that he has a winner. Both are engaged in deception on false presuppositions.

Now, we are not saying that the artisan has no need to display competence in executing the design of his work. Indeed, the epistemologically self-conscious artisan should have a far better grasp of the methods of art production and knowledge of conditions in the marketplace than any other. What we are saying is that the artisan should gather and organize all the facts he can, present them in the best way he can, and provide the best {54} possible biblical interpretation of the data that he can, and then get out of the way and let the Holy Spirit of God do the convincing. The data must not be gathered or used to convince the investor of a guaranteed future.

Does either party, for example, determine if the artisan's production company is founded and managed by biblical law? Can either analyze the characters in a film and determine if its drawn on God's view of man? Does the film cater to a new fad in the world, or does it speak to the real needs of the real man?

Usually, the investor seeks his pastor's opinion on the theological content of a work. The businessman also denies being a theologian or philosopher.

As they say in the film business, the bottom line is, the epistemologically self-conscious artisan who is consistent in the universal application of God's Law-Word to every facet of his work, will produce a work which will be coherent and correspond to the real nature of reality because it is based upon God's view of reality and not an abstraction. It will speak to the real needs of the real man, sin and all, in a real world,

and will speak to that man in the depths of his innermost being. If it meets these requirements it will have the greatest potential audience and marketplace possible. Whether it is successful or not will therefore depend not upon man, but upon God, who alone is the source of all success. The artisan who conforms his mind to the mind of Christ has a degree of certainty with respect to the correctness of his efforts which cannot be matched by any other set of presuppositions. He will know what he knows because his source of knowing is in the God who created him. He will, therefore, function in an environment which is progressively guilt-free, which in turn unleashes an even greater ability to think God's thought after Him. His re-creativity will spiral to heights undreamed of in communications history, and he will become daily born-again by the Spirit and fire of Jesus Christ. He alone will have the ability to reach the mind and heart of man in places where the humanist only wishes he could go, but cannot. This will give the Christian artisan an immense advantage in the marketplace, which will in turn produce greater profit in every sense of the word. It will become evident to all which type of art one should purchase, and if the public's money is spent on Christian-based art, this means that it is not being spent on humanism and we will defund the opposition who've been leaching off God's capital for far too long. The Kingdom of God will advance with every frame of film that goes through a projector, with every person who buys a ticket to a theater, with every stroke of the screenwriters typewriter, {55} with every tick of the clock, and men will say some day of these men, truly they were the sons and daughters of the King of kings and Lord of lords.

BIBLICAL LAW AND THE CUNNING ARTIFICER

James H. Griffith, Attorney at Law

W. G. T. Shedd offered the following paragraph in his discussion of the divine decrees:

The reason for the permission of sin was the manifestation of certain Divine attributes which could not have been manifested otherwise. These attributes are mercy and compassion, with their cognates. The suffering of God incarnate, and vicarious atonement, with all their manifestation of the divine glory, would be impossible in a sinless universe. The “intent” was, “that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God,” Eph. 3:10. The attributes of justice and holiness, also, though exhibited in natural religion, yet obtain a far more impressive display in the method of redemption.⁴²

Here are words that speak to a dramatist’s heart. Consider Dr. Shedd’s words in relation to Christian media involvement. He is speaking of the *manifestation of attributes* that wouldn’t otherwise be manifested. Certainly God’s nature would have remained the same whether or not He chose to create the universe. However, certain of the divine attributes might *not* have been manifested. Second, notice that these attributes were made manifest to certain specific beings called principalities and powers. We’ll return to this again in a moment, but let me suggest here that Dr. Shedd happens to be describing exactly what transpires when a *drama* is presented to an *audience*. Perhaps there’s something here of interest to us as artists and artificers.

Dr. Shedd, perhaps more than any modern English-speaking theologian, is noted for his felicity of expression. Another man noted for his use of the language, though with a somewhat different intention, is Ernest Hemingway. Marvelously gifted by God, though blinded by the prince of this world, Hemingway nevertheless at least once put his fin-

42. W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1980), 421.

ger precisely on point. {57} When asked what he understood his goal as a writer to be, he responded, simply, “To tell the truth.”

Let’s take another leap—this time to the justly revered Larger Catechism of 1648. According to the “Assembly of learned and godly Divines,” “Man’s chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him for ever.”⁴³

One last logical leap brings us to Exodus 25 and following. There Moses describes the Tabernacle and God’s call for materials to build it. In chapter 31 we learn that the Lord told Moses: “See, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah: And I have filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones, to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship” (Ex. 31:2–5).

Enough of piling up examples and quotations. Obviously I’ve been working toward some point or points. You’ll perhaps forgive a lawyer for first marshalling his case precedents, and only then expounding their meaning. A little trick which law professors use to drive their students crazy.

“To tell the truth,” “to glorify God,” “to devise cunning works”—what are these but goals that should touch the innermost being of any person who calls himself or herself a Christian and an artist.

We as sinners, saved by grace, have the inestimable privilege of personal relationship—an acceptance, a friendship—with the Lord who Himself is Truth. We have been given eyes to see and ears to hear the Word that is declared to be Truth. Yet we work in an environment peopled for the most part with those who live in the darkness of sin, who reject the Holy Scriptures, who worship gods made with hands. How are we to communicate with such people? What hath Jerusalem to do with Athens?

Professor Cornelius Van Til and Dr. R. J. Rushdoony—two giants of modern orthodoxy—have shown that the problem—for our purposes

43. Assembly of Divines at Westminster, *The Larger Catechism* (Publications Committee of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, [1648] 1976), answer to question 1.

here, let's call it the problem of communication—is *not* metaphysical. No, the problem is ethical. Both redeemed *and* unredeemed sinners are made in the image of God. The unregenerate may, as the Scriptures teach, have their understanding darkened by sin, but they are still men—and thus capable of communication with other men, though, of course, imperfectly.

Yet, what do the media powers (the princes of the power of the air?) offer the masses who watch, listen to, and read the various media? Better: what *can* they offer, since they are nothing but the blind leading the blind? Each one of us could easily take an hour to list the untruths promoted by {58} film, TV, and the press. Those of us who wrestle with these powers on a professional basis could probably spend *days*. That's not our purpose here.

Instead, let's take another tack and list some of the things that the Holy Spirit considers worth communicating. This might give us something to go on in our endeavors to “tell the truth” in the media. Galatians is a good place to start. The Apostle tells us that “the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance” (5:22–23). In Philippians, we learn that we are to think on “Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report” (4:8). In 1 Timothy, Paul tells his son in the faith to “follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness” (6:11). Turning to the Old Testament, we find the Psalmist exclaiming, “O how I love thy law! it is my meditation all the day” (Ps. 119:97), and encouraging the man of God to “depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it” (Ps. 34:14).

These things are all what the lawyers would call substantive issues...what the artist might call substance, as opposed to form. Substance is the firm foundation, but form is what gives beauty and integrity to a piece of work. And after all is said and done about substance, what artists usually discuss when they get together over coffee is *form*. The craft. Tricks of the trade. The creation of the illusion of reality. Polish in performance.

And, contrary to much of the world's wisdom, there *are* standards. All artists struggle with them. Even those, such as Andy Warhol, who

seek to deny them, in their own work affirm the reality of standards. Before Warhol can mock art and the world of God's creation, he must first be able to paint a soup can that his audience recognizes as a soup can. And this requires adherence to certain technical standards.

I'm going to let the foregoing example serve as my one bow to the visual arts. As a writer, literary art—particularly the drama—is what I know best. So most of the following comments will be in terms of my grasp of drama. Applications to other fields of artistic endeavor and craftsmanship should, I trust, be obvious.

Literary art involves the “cunning” manipulation of elements like plot, character, tension, emotion, resolution, diction, conflict, subordination, theme, movement, growth, discovery. To take one of these, resolution is much decried in modern drama. Writers strive for flat surfaces with the illusion of ever-continuing conflict. Think of Beckett, Hemingway (whose first stories were rejected as mere “sketches”), the New Yorker story. But {59} resolution is as important to drama as it is to human life, to history, to God's purposes for the ages. Let's be blunt: resolution is law.

Granting, then, that as artisans we function in a world of law, what does this mean to the way we conduct business and make a living?

It came as a revelation to me, after I had been a Christian for some time, but the fact of the matter is that the world of commerce is just as much a world of law as is the world of art. In more theological terms, we would say that there are many spheres in God's created universe, and that those of commerce and art have independent yet overlapping law structures. Artists and artisans live in both of these spheres at once. The bottom line is: if you want to survive as an artist, you'd better become as adept in the commercial sphere as you are in the artistic sphere.

Fortunately, by the grace and condescension of God, we have a book that provides the necessary business guidance. It's called the Bible. It says things like, “Thou shalt not steal.” Dishonest weights and measures are an abomination; the same law must be applied to “Israel” as to “strangers”; don't defraud; the laborer is worthy of his hire; and so on. Most of the rules are pretty simple. A child can understand them. We just don't like to apply them. Somehow those beautiful goals of telling

the truth, glorifying God, manifesting the fruit of the Spirit—tend to go by the boards when Christian artists enter into business deals.

This, of course, isn't always the case. But I would hazard the observation that there isn't one person hearing (or reading) my remarks who doesn't have at least one horror story about a so-called Christian who swindled his brother seemingly without a single pang of conscience. I've been a lawyer for ten years, and a serious writer for nearly that long—and I've seen and experienced many such instances. It's a stench in the nostrils of God. We cannot doubt that.

But we're come together to seek some positive answers, not just to gnash our teeth and rend our garments about the erring brothers and lying professors. So...to the law and the testimony.

Rev. Rushdoony gave one of his books a most insightful title. I'm referring to *By What Standard?* The question is precisely to the point here. Indeed, by what standard? By what standard do we judge our walk? By what standard do we develop our aesthetic criteria? By what standard do we judge our business practice?

The question answers itself: by no other standard than “the whole counsel of God.” “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in {60} righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:16–17).

I believe that a weak grasp of the doctrine of creation is behind many of the business problems felt by Christian artists. Creation is such a fundamental doctrine that its misapprehension affects many areas of our practice as well as our theological reasonings. In his book on history, R. J. Rushdoony put it this way:

This doctrine of creation has far-reaching implications.... *First*, the doctrine of creation asserts that the universe, time, history, man, and all things are the handiwork of a sovereign, omnipotent, omniscient, and triune God. *Second*, this means that the meaning of history and, we might say, all else, is to be understood primarily and essentially in terms of that God.⁴⁴

44. R.J. Rushdoony, *The Biblical Philosophy of History* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1977), 3.

Thus we see that creation implies God's sovereignty over all of creation. Unfortunately, many Christians have such a narrow view of the kingdom of God that they see it as virtually exhausted by the four walls of their local church building. The historical Manichaeus, as well as modern practicing dualists of less celebrity, seem content thus to separate their religion from the rest of their life.

For Manichaeism, the world is divided into two different and alien substances, spirit and matter. Each is equally ultimate, and both are self-sufficient and separate realms. To be spiritual in the Manichaean sense means to be disdainful about and unconcerned with material things, because they are alien and constitute a drag and drain on the spirit. Spirit is held to be good, and matter, bad.⁴⁵

For those Christians who evince Manichaean tendencies, Christianity becomes something one does on Sunday morning, and business something one does during the remainder of the week. The Bible is seen as providing, e.g., the form of the corporate worship, but as devoid of guidance regarding the proper treatment of hired labor.

But this opens up a Pandora's box of doctrinal error. If the Bible applies only to what we do in church, who or what is then going to supply the standards for our business activities? Various answers have been offered over the years. It is now a commonplace that godly business morality does not necessarily go hand in glove with public Christian profession. Indeed, one dedicated Christian attorney of the author's acquaintance has related {61} his despair at having to admit that his collection problems with Christian clients are many times greater than those with non-Christian clients. And in my own business dealings, the most blatant dishonesty has come at the hands of "Christian" filmmakers, not at the hands of "Hollywood" filmmakers.

In other words, many Christians have adopted the world's standards. This even though the Word clearly teaches that such standards are enmity against God (Rom. 8:7). In point of fact, some believers are using Satan's rulebook to govern their business.

Certain schools of dispensational theology also promote a subtle form of Manichaeism, in that the Mosaic law is taught to be entirely

45. R.J. Rushdoony, "Manichaeism, Law, and Economics," *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 11, no. 1 (Summer 1975): 7.

set aside in this age of grace. However, lest any who considers himself a dispensational theologian feel encouraged in such setting aside of Old Testament law, reference should be had to the words of the late Charles H. Welch, one of England's leading dispensational expositors, and a man considered by many to be *hyper*-dispensational. It is true that we

are now found under a new economy, that of grace. Under the dispensation of grace...the moral law will be kept as certainly as if our salvation depended on it. The dispensation of grace only sets the law aside as a means of salvation; when the law enunciates moral truth, this remains as true under grace as before.⁴⁶

The introduction into one's personal operating theology of the dualistic disjunction between "church duties" and "business duties" thus reflects the failure to grasp the relationship between God's act of creation and His determination of the rules by which that creation is to be governed. God is not merely the creator, He is also, necessarily, the *law-giver*. Since He created everything that is, His law governs all of creation. Stated more academically: the doctrine of God's total sovereignty is implicit in the orthodox doctrine of creation.

Then, too, many fail to grasp the essential nature of law as it is presented in the Bible.

In order to understand biblical law, it is necessary to understand also certain broad characteristics of that law. *First*, certain broad premises or principles are declared. These are declarations of basic law. The Ten Commandments give us such declarations. The Ten Commandments are not therefore laws among laws, but are the basic laws, of which the various laws are specific {62} examples....A *second* characteristic of biblical law is that the major portion of the law is *case law*, i.e., the illustration of the basic principles in terms of specific cases. These specific cases are often illustrations of the extent of the application of the law; that is, by citing a minimal type of case, the necessary jurisdictions of the law are revealed.... Without case law, God's law would soon be reduced to an extremely limited area of meaning.⁴⁷

Additionally, ignorance of the vast labors of the godly Puritans leaves many believers with a foreshortened, poverty-stricken view of God's

46. Charles H. Welch, *Just, and the Justifier* (London: Berean Publishing Trust, [n.d.] 1972), 164.

47. R.J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, vol. 1 (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), 10–12.

law. According to the Westminster Confession of Faith: “To [Israel] also, as a body politic, he gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the State of that people; not obliging any other now, further than the *general equity* thereof may require.”⁴⁸ The concept of “general equity,” or more simply, “equity,” is largely unfamiliar to modern ears. Academic theologian James Jordan explains the concept in these words:

The civil aspects of the unchanging moral law of God were phrased in case law, dealing with cases common and sometimes peculiar to the ancient, agrarian Israelite economy. Some, perhaps many, of these cases no longer exist in the modern world. Nonetheless, the basic principles contained in the case laws can and must be applied to modern civil order... [T]he English Puritans used the term “equity” to denote this phenomenon of basic principles and common cases still being binding in the New Testament era.⁴⁹

Earlier, I briefly adverted to the Christian concept of sphere law. Isn't that simply an esoteric name for a philosophical trifle? What does it mean to my work as an artisan and a businessperson?

A good place to start is the Scriptures of truth. You might want to look up Ezra 7:12–13, where we find that King Artaxerxes is making a decree “that all they of the people of Israel, and of his priests and Levites, in my realm, which are minded of their own free will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee.” In subsequent verses, various allowances are made for those who desire to return with Ezra to the land. But our concern here is with verses 24 and 25:

Also we certify you, that touching any of the priests and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinims, or minister of this house, it shall not be lawful to impose toll, tribute, or custom, upon them. And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, that is in thine hand, set magistrates and judges, which may judge all {63} the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy god; and teach ye them that know them not.

48. Emphasis supplied; quoted in James B. Jordan, “Calvinism and ‘The Judicial Law of Moses’: An Historical Survey,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 2 (Winter 1978–1979): 32.

49. *Ibid.*, 28.

Let us take careful note of what Artaxerxes's decree requires. First, no tax shall be imposed on those whom we would nowadays call the ordained ministers and the organized churches ("the priests and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinims, or minister of this house"). Second, Ezra, as a "priest, a scribe of the law of the God of Heaven" (7:12), is to *teach* the laws of God. Thus we have a tax exemption provided by a Gentile king for ministers of the true God, and, at least to some degree, for those involved in education.

But notice, too, what this implies in a negative sense. If King Artaxerxes is specifically exempting certain activities from taxation, must we not understand that other activities, not enumerated, *are* properly subject to taxation?

This isn't the place for an elaborate and exhaustive exposition of the Scriptures relating to taxation. My purpose, rather, is to demonstrate that differing spheres of human activity have different law structures. More simply: the profit-making businessman is properly taxed on his gains; the eleemosynary ministries of true religion and education are not to be taxed.

But back to cases. How does this affect a Christian artist? Simply on this wise: to the extent that the artisan is engaged in profit-making activities, he should expect to be treated as a businessman by the civil authorities. He should not seek to bring himself under the tax umbrella of the Christian ministry merely to gain a tax exemption, or to provide himself with a handy argument against paying his employees what they should be paid ("It's for the Lord, brother").

In the motion picture business, the so-called Christian producer often expects the screenwriter to work for a pittance in comparison with what Hollywood pays. There is, of course, a strong element of economic reality in this. But, interestingly, the same Christian producer is quite willing to pay non-Christian film labs and vendors their standard rates, the same rates MGM or Warner Brothers must pay. Thus, as John Quade has pointed out, the Christian writer is penalized for his faith, while the pagan lab owner is rewarded for his lack of faith.⁵⁰

50. This phenomenon is vigorously criticized in John W. Saunders III (John Quade), "Reconstruction in Film and Television," special issue, *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 9, nos. 1–2 (1982–1983): 321.

I have the strong suspicion that the Chalcedon folks invited me to participate in this conference in large part because of the “Attorney at Law” after my name. So perhaps a few comments drawn specifically from a lawyer’s perspective and experience are in order. {64} King Solomon tells us that “where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counselors there is safety” (Prov. 11:14). This same thought is repeated four or five times in the Proverbs, so it must be of some importance to the walk of the redeemed individual. However, over in Ezra, the Holy Spirit tells us that “the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counselors against them to frustrate their purpose...” (Ezra 4:4–5). I think most will readily admit that the latter quote sounds a lot more like the normal, present-day conception of the practicing lawyer: “counselors,” “hired,” “to frustrate their purpose,” to “trouble them in building,” to “weaken the hands of the people.”

No doubt Ezra had a point. But Solomon’s words might be too often, and too easily, ignored. It has always seemed strange to me that, as is so often the case, Christian artisans contemplating business dealings almost *immediately* exclude from their considerations the opinions of those most qualified to help them effectuate their business purposes—the lawyers—or, speaking by way of analogy, the counselors.

Not all lawyers are members of the ACLU, and hostile to God’s Word and the Christian religion. Not all lawyers are dishonest in their dealings with client funds. Not all lawyers bring lawsuits just to line their own pockets. There is truth enough in all of these beliefs. The bulk of the legal profession, as the bulk of humanity, is comprised of unregenerate men and women held captive by Satan. Thus they often act in ways that Satan approves and God dislikes.

But...even the most venal of lawyers can often give solid advice as to the construction of an instrument, the strengths and weaknesses of a possible lawsuit, the best ways to structure a business entity...even though they themselves are neither redeemed nor interested in observing God’s law in their own lives. At the least, we can truly say that lawyers spend most of their lives dealing with the intricacies of a complicated legal system, and thus they are certainly entitled to a hearing by anyone planning a business move of any substance at all.

So much for the prologue. I'd like to address two or three areas in which I think Christian artists could greatly benefit from legal advice. The first of these involves the importance of *written* agreements. The ramifications of a written agreement are several. It forces both parties—before they have joined themselves together in a long term relationship—to clearly and definitely think through their goals and expectations. It also provides an easily accessible standard by which to resolve later disputes, {65} and thus a written agreement may prevent the filing of many potential lawsuits. Further, a written agreement often provides the aggrieved party with more potent remedies in case of default.

A second recommendation I'd make to Christian artisans is that they seriously consider the inclusion in their written agreements of what's called a "Christian arbitration provision." For background, let's consider the words of the Apostle:

Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge the angels? how much more things that pertain to this life? If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church. I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother and that before the unbelievers! (1 Cor. 6:1–6)

The desire to be obedient to these words of the Lord through Paul has caused many Christians to take unnecessary financial beatings. Unnecessary because based on a false dichotomy: suffer from a breach of contract, or else yourself breach this commandment. However, in most contract situations, the written instrument can be so drawn that the dispute can be resolved without any necessity to go to law before the "unbelievers."

What I mean is this. A "Christian arbitration provision" is a contract term that, in essence, allows a Christian brother (usually but not necessarily an attorney) to render a final and binding decision—without the necessity of going to the civil law courts.

With such a provision in the agreement, there is a tremendous incentive for both parties to live up to their end of the agreement.

Much time can be saved—in Los Angeles Superior Court it often takes three years to get a trial date—and godly justice can be provided to the aggrieved party.

A third point I would make with regard to Christian artists and legal advice is a bit more difficult to state clearly. It relates to how one can most effectively use a lawyer's talents and knowledge. I believe the key to be this: when contemplating seeing an attorney about an upcoming business deal, spend the necessary time *yourself, first*, to search out the relevant portions of God's Word. Learn what God's standards for the particular {66} situation are through a prayerful study of the written Word, and counsel with knowledgeable, spiritually-minded brethren. Then—after you thoroughly understand the Scriptural parameters—visit your lawyer. His advice can then be measured against the standard of God's Word. Suggested courses of conduct can be eliminated, modified, or accepted—all in accordance with a clear understanding of God's requirements.

In other words, learn what Scripture requires, then help your lawyer find a way to effectuate your purpose through a biblically sound plan; if it can't be done, scrap the idea right now, and move on to the next project.

Allow me to highlight some of the preceding discussion. First, the world needs to hear the truth. The world's institutions are corrupt, the people are languishing in despair—they need to have the truth presented to them with all of the artistry and craftsmanship we can muster.

Second, God's glory demands that we set ourselves only the very highest standards as we seek to serve Him. Third, the Bible must be recognized as our only ultimate authority in the world of business, just as it is in respect to worship or standards of art or craftsmanship. And if we are to make it our standard, we must apply ourselves diligently to the study and practical application of doctrine.

Finally, let us not be like the evildoers described by the Apostle in Romans 1:18 who suppress the truth in unrighteousness. Let us broadcast God's truth through every medium the sovereign God places at our disposal!

OX FOR HIRE

Joe Taylor

Ask any Christian “OX” today if he feels he gets treated fairly on the “Christian” projects he’s been involved in, and you’ll get an almost unanimous “no!”

At the same time, ask anyone in Christian media if they are pleased with the quality of Christian art, and the same “no!” will be heard. What is the problem?

We should first define a Christian artist biblically. A freelance writer, painter, actor, etc., will find his counterpart in 1 Corinthians 9:9, “For it is written in the law of Moses: Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.” And in Luke 10:7, we read: “For the labourer is worthy of his hire.”

A clear understanding of just how we should view the artisan as compared to other laborers is essential.

The “Artist-God” Myth: The Wrong View

In the past 100 years, the artisan has come to be grossly overrated and has been given a godlike status.

This has caused the artist a number of problems, such as: inflated ego, becoming a neurotic eccentric, a hypocrite in pretending that everything he does has great meaning and value, and a revulsion against using his talent to create something simply as a beautiful decoration, or as a design for some common utensil, even something to instruct and entertain children. The artist falsely believes that to use his talent in such a manner (especially if it’s just for money) would be to prostitute himself. This false view has created intense dissatisfaction in those who believe they should become rich *simply* because they have talent and are, therefore, more special than others, which results in self-ish introspection and defeat. {69}

But perhaps worst of all is the poverty that results from thinking that, because they are special, money will simply pour into their pock-

ets. And just such crippling naiveté has characterized the past several decades of art school graduates.

Instead of regarding the striking of a good deal and the pursuit of prompt payment as part of the creative process, we have been taught to focus all our attention on the artwork itself. The writer, the painter, the actor, on being approached with a project, will immediately begin by thinking about the *end product* (the art) rather than putting first things first, counting the costs to make sure that the artwork conceived will pay the bills as well as satisfy the client.

But the artisan cannot be given all the blame, for, to continue with the scriptural analogy, we see that the ox is after all at the mercy of his owner, just as the servant is at the mercy of the integrity of his master.

Therefore, the master, that is, the Christian businessman, has the greater burden to deal fairly, and to look after the best interests of the artisan he employs.

But, in contrast, today's businessmen short-change their artistic brethren and justify themselves by citing that *it was, after all, their money that capitalized the artwork, making it possible*: therefore, they deserve the lion's share, even if it means the financial ruin and demoralization of the artist. The Scriptures speak to this injustice, for we read in Jeremiah 34:17 that God was wroth with the Jews for enslaving their own brethren.

Many are the scriptural examples of servants who, because of their exceptional abilities, were raised to positions of wealth and authority: Joseph, Baruch, Mordecai, the Ethiopian eunuch, etc. So likewise, the exceptional Christian artisan should be rewarded.

Any attempt to reduce or limit the artist to a set wage is socialistic and unbiblical. But a muzzling of the ox we have today! If businessmen tried farming with oxen the same way they deal with artists, they'd never harvest their first crop!

"But I plead ignorance!" the businessman protests.

True, not everyone may know how much another man's services are worth, but everyone knows that any man has to make enough to live on! Let me suggest these reasons for these deficiencies:

1. Anxiety, due to false doctrine.
2. "The Spirit told me to do it" mentality.
3. Pride and Phariseeism. {70}

Why have so many sincere pastors and leaders in Christian ministries approached me, driven by an urgency that compels them to wade boldly into the unknown waters of the media without any knowledge of the costs in treading it?

Reason #1: False motives due to false doctrine

If one believes that Jesus cannot return until the last person has had a chance to accept Him as personal saviour and at the same time sees the world in an accelerated decline, he will believe he must do everything he can to reach the maximum amount of people before it is too late. He feels somehow responsible for all those unreached souls dying and, in accordance with his beliefs, going to an everlasting burning hell.

With such a potent motivation, he will see the media as the obvious means to reach the world, and in earnest turns to the first media people he knows, with one driving thought: *get the message out!* This blinding compulsion will prevent him from studying the feasibility of his plan, from acquiring enough knowledge to implement it properly, and, most dangerous of all, his emotionally charged desire will infect the already sympathetic artisan. The artist will become convinced that he must use his talent in this project, being counseled that a person's talent must also be his ministry. The impending guilt for not using his talent for the Lord will, of course, force the artist to become involved in yet another financial disaster.

These motives, though sincere, are false; the Scriptures teach us that none of God's little children will go to hell because some mere men failed to reach them!

In John 10:27 Jesus says: "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them and they follow Me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of My hand. My father which gave them Me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand. I and the Father are One."

So why the big rush, in allegedly preventing some of God's little sheep from going to a burning hell, to turn out some quick, shoddy production, the main function of which is to propagandize the reader with the so-called four spiritual laws at its conclusion?

Instead of being driven by this false motive, how much better if men would obey the commandment of Christ, directed to those who would

truly follow Him, to count the costs, and persist diligently until the job is done right. Paraphrasing Luke 14:28, we may ask, what man starts to build {71} without an estimate of the costs, and the money to pay for it? What king goes to war who is not sure he can defend himself? What Christian filmmaker hires artists, writers, and actors to make a film without counting the costs before beginning production...? *Most of them!* In fact, today's defective methodology has led to the result predicted in Luke 14:29: "Lest haply after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him." For this reason the world mocks Christian contemporary art; not so much because of the message, but because of unartistic, ill-financed production!

Only when Christians use the arts properly, will it become clear that the truth is being received or rejected on its own merit.

I'm not saying that everything has to be a big-budget production—not at all. But, if we're going to make low-budget media productions, *let's make sure they are still well-wrought!*

A few secular examples will help illustrate the artistic potential in low-budget productions.

1. Nearly one-fourth of all album covers are printed in one color—who says we have to have full color?

2. The Cannes Film Festival is full of low-budget, highly acclaimed films. Christians could excel in the area of the film short.

3. Even the ungodly, anti-Christian, anti-American Beatles recorded their most highly regarded albums on 4-track tape, using technology modest by contemporary standards. Today, most Christian recording groups feel they must have 24-track recordings and budgets big enough to finance two or three Rolling Stones albums. I've spent time with the Rolling Stones' engineer, who told me that the famous rock group doesn't waste time (and money) on unnecessary elements when recording. As soon as it "sounds right," they move on to the next song, even though the recording isn't "perfect." And, certainly, no one can argue with their financial success. On the other hand, when the same engineer was hired to record an album for a contemporary Christian singer (Larry Norman), he became very frustrated at the endless hours (and money—this time *the Lord's money*) spent in unnecessary re-recording, going over and over a passage until it had completely lost its

spontaneity, and other frivolous modifications (e.g., a whole orchestra was dropped from one cut). I told Larry personally that I felt it was wrong for him to have spent enough money on his album to have recorded several other albums of Christian singers.

If there is a lack of money for Christian product—let’s become the masters of the low-budget medium! I call for a symposium on this. {72}

Reason #2: “The Spirit told me to do it” mentality

“The Spirit wants me to do this project, God told me so, and He wants *you* to help, and of course, you’ll have to work for free.”

Well! Who could resist that? Who could possibly tell *God* “no”?

I’d like to answer that presumptuous kind of thinking with a little story.

A few years ago, a friend of mine went to a Christian concert. Afterwards he went up to compliment the singer on his songs. The singer, with practiced sanctimonious tones, insisted that it was not he that wrote those songs, but that the Holy Spirit had written them for him. To that my friend quickly replied, “Well—they weren’t *that* good!”

Reason #3: Pride and Pharisaism

This third reason, the desire to be seen of men, motivates the modern Pharisee who will have all men to know how spiritual he is.

This type of a piranha will use almost any method to keep *glorie* to himself, but the manipulation of the media-arts is by far his favorite. Pity the poor media artist who falls prey to his guile. This type will misuse you to exalt himself to higher levels, giving us the assurance that *God needs him* to save the world.

What to do about these kinds? Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees—avoid them and warn others.

Tape and Film Piracy

All three of these approaches lead to piracy, plagiarism, and unauthorized reproduction, both because they all set God’s laws at variance with one another, and because they all believe that the end will justify the unlawful means. With ministers everywhere teaching us not to

obey the law, it is to be expected that Christians have come to feel free to copy things they shouldn't.

This issue needs to be seriously addressed at length—let me suggest a few examples that we could all begin to work from.

A Christian school in Los Angeles refuses to Xerox publications that they would otherwise buy.

The Mergenthaler type foundry, one of the largest companies of its kind, refuses to sell illegally made copies of type styles, and will go to the trouble to acquire licensing rights to use the designs of other foundries, even though their designs are continually being stolen and unethically (*illegally* is the Bible's word for it) reproduced.

How many choir directors will Xerox eighty copies of some new composition, {73} even though they have a budget sufficient to cover the costs of purchasing the set as the law requires, thus depriving the composer of his just royalty?

And of course, on the other hand, there are the numerous instances where copies are made of books, tapes, etc., that would not have been purchased at any rate.

Copyright infringement has become so flagrant that many artists become frustrated and quit creative production altogether. After some twenty-four designs, I personally quit designing new type styles due to consistent breeches of contract and nonpayment of royalties. This kind of theft is counterproductive and has left a creative void in the type design industry.

But we are Christians! We have a superior way to do things.

If we first set out to please God, our actions will set examples for other believers, and will finally influence the world.

Christian businessmen and artists should have such a reputation of fair treatment of each other that the world would desire to be treated in like manner.

Let's condemn false motives; let's not be second-rate copycats, blindly mimicking the world's system! Let the world have its stupid music, its lurid, depressing movies, its pornographic magazines and books, and its meaningless art! *We don't need it!*

And let's not limit our subject matter to a narrow-minded set of pictorial and verbal images, to pictures of a sweet and sappy Jesus, movies of Billy Graham crusades with a Christian girl dating a non-Christian

boy, who “sort of gets saved at the end,” and to publishers who continue to supply us with a never-ending stream of books on devotion!

Christian businessmen! Put some of your money into some serious artistic projects and quit choking us media people to death. California, as elsewhere, is teeming with serious Christian artisans who are burning to do something worthwhile with their talent, *but who also have to eat!* I can name dozens of talented men and women who have completed books and screenplays waiting to be produced, artists who have enough work to crowd a large gallery, filmmakers, actors, animators, and more, who are struggling to pursue their projects, but who have no money! And let’s face it, some of you DO! Can’t we get this talent and money together? Let’s join together and do something for the Lord.

We have the *highest* motivation to do all that we *do*—and all we *do* should be to *the glory of God*. {74}

FILM: LOST & FOUND

Roy H. Wagner

No motion picture studio in the world has ever made a great film! No technological breakthrough in this industry has ever produced a finished motion picture!

Directors, actors, writers, and production personnel are finally receiving recognition for their talent.

With the vast improvements in film stock and the advent of ultra-sophisticated equipment you would think that these tools would aid the filmmakers in their quest for bigger and better movies!

Why are the films of the “golden era” consistently better than the pictures available today?

Once Upon A Time:

In the infancy of this business, the audience came to the theatre for entertainment. There were few if any credits for anyone other than the studio head or a superstar producer. Public demand forced the studios to disclose the name of the “American Sweetheart,” Mary Pickford, or Lillian Gish.... Soon, businessmen had convinced stars and directors that they needed assistance in the “management” of their careers.

Humphrey Bogart was a bit player at Warner Brothers. He had been attempting to find his niche unsuccessfully for years. There was a picture floating around the lot that the big stars had been offered, but had turned down. Cagney, Edward G. Robinson, and George Raft were tired of playing bad guys, gangsters. The picture was *High Sierra*. It made Bogart a star. With his stardom came caution. Risks could no longer be taken. The “*image*” had to be protected. Of course there was no better protector than the all-knowing personal agent.

Clark Gable angrily protested his loan-out from prestigious Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer to poor little Columbia Pictures for an “insignificant” comedy entitled *It Happened One Night*. Gable, again grudgingly, was loaned out to Selznick to play Rhett Butler in *Gone With the Wind*.

The publicity departments, with the aid of the personal agents, created {75} the Star System. The distributor could more easily sell a star because “it” was packagable, a commodity that was more easily sold.

As the stars/agents became more powerful, they could dictate what projects were done, and could demand that all of the production elements (story locations, director, personnel, conditions) be directed in such a way as to protect the all-important *image*. In some cases, stories were so convoluted that what appeared to be a highly appealing idea on paper as scripted, was devastatingly bad as executed.

In the late 1950s when television was plundering the motion picture theatre, the old-guard motion picture studios and their executives lost their vision for the future of the entertainment business. A new era was ushered in. The Deal-Maker became king. With the studios boycott of the television industry, the networks turned to the star’s agents.

Properly Exposed:

It has been said by some that with the advent of acetate film stock, the luminous quality that old nitrate pictures have, died.

There was, if you have ever seen an original black and white nitrate print, a satin quality to the blacks, a purity to the whites, and nicely graduated grays.

In the silent era, film was developed in much the same way that a professional still photographer takes his negative to a professional photo finisher. At the end of each scene a given length of negative was run through the camera for use by the laboratory. Thus, each scene was tested for the best density and effect.

As the industry grew, and more film had to be run through the laboratory, costs rose. It became difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the quality control of the earlier era against the quantity demand of the new age.

Today’s laboratories are ultrasophisticated mass-production plants, grinding out millions of feet of film per day on high-speed developing and printing machines, much like Fotomat in the amateur still photographic world. Photochemical manipulation lessened at the expense of mass production.

The Technicolor three-strip process was the first color system of any validity. The colors reproduced more faithfully than any other process

at that time. Basically, the system used color black and white negatives. Each color was sensitive to one of the three primary colors. The color was later “imbibed” onto the black and white release prints, unlike the later Eastman color negative which was a photochemical process. Technicolor original {76} separations and their prints were not susceptible to color fading. The process was quite expensive. The break-even order was 500 prints.

In the mid-60s, the motion picture industry was groaning to a deafening halt. There were few features with print orders over 100. Technicolor was garnering a bad reputation for poor print quality. The matrix machines were aging and needed overhaul. With the cost break-even point at 500 prints, it was decided to disband the dye-transfer operation; thus, becoming a “color positive” lab. The machines were sold to Red China.

On April 17, 1978, an article appeared in the Hollywood trade papers. It warned any producer/distributor that held color matrix material at Technicolor to come and claim that material or it would be destroyed. To be fair, Technicolor had made masters of these three-strip originals. Unfortunately, these masters were not black and white but single-strip color negative, subject to color decomposition. In less than ten years, the motion picture industry discovered modern marketing techniques. The business was back on its feet! In today’s distribution scheme, there are few major studio releases that have print orders of less than 500 prints.

Last year Martin Scorsese, a prominent New Age filmmaker, headed a council of concerned modern production artists. They protested Eastman Kodak’s “inferior” color processing, yearning for the solidity of the dye-transfer system. The bugler sounded too late.

Lights, Camera, Action!

Early motion picture work on location resembled a gypsy caravan or a circus. The equipment was bulky. Large quantities of light were required due to the insensitivity of the film stock. A massive team of electricians, grips, carpenters, and cameramen was required to operate this “sophisticated” gear. The hours were terribly long. Six-day weeks, with Saturday’s work ending sometime early Sunday morning. Crew members grew together as a family due to the long and difficult work-

ing conditions. They worked together for years, knowing and anticipating each others needs, much like a military unit that starts in basic training as a group of individuals and goes to battle thinking and acting as one. In spite of their tools and the hardships, they made beautiful images, and constructed an ordered world within the motion picture frame.

In a more carefree era, the silent motion picture units would report to the studio in the morning. They could climb into a couple of automobiles and follow the director who sat in the lead car as he took them to some unknown location. The directors generally had an idea of what was {77} required for the script, but no idea of an appropriate location. A crew member might report for work one morning, expecting to return home that evening, returning days or weeks later. Stars and directors shared with crew members. After all, they were members of the same family—the same troupe of players. The goal was to accomplish the making of an entertaining motion picture in an economic manner for their employer.

Motion picture production is not really a very time-effective use of production personnel. Manpower must stand by for last minute adjustments that must be made in creating order from chaos. One would think that for those not immediately involved in the “creation” of a shot it could be a rather boring business. Not true. Instead, the set becomes a veritable playground for the practical joker. For years these crew members have not only polished their immediate technical crafts as filmmakers, but practiced the fine art of tricksterism.

An extra awaits a camera set-up for the next shot. She feels a slight twinge on the back of the leg. She turns around and looks at the affected area. Moments later the same sensation. She turns again. Nothing. She begins to suspect a practical joke. A dapper camera operator stands a short distance away but seems to be unaware of any ensuing foul deed. As a precaution, she moves to another location; after all, there is nothing more embarrassing than to be the subject of a practical joke. It reveals the uninitiated.

Again, the sting. She turns. There, again, that camera operator. He briefly glances at her and then away. The camera operator is a senior member of the production team. It would not be proper for her to accuse him. He might have a sense of humor, but then again....

Again, the sting. She turns angrily on the operator. He notices her anger. She remarks, in a nonthreatening manner, that she is being pinched. He smiles, knowingly, and asks if she has ever performed on this stage before. Of course she hasn't. In a brotherly fashion, he exposes the dreaded secret regarding Stage 5. When it was constructed it was not properly grounded. Most of the cast and crew have grown accustomed to the common electrical shocks, but for those who have never been on the particular stage, it can be bothersome. He asks her to follow him over to the grip box where he unrolls several feet of grip chain. She is instructed to drag the chain along the ground, thus alleviating the electrical shock.

The crew, en-mass, knows when a new initiate is being had, for one can hear a slight tinkling of a chain dragging somewhere amongst the players between takes. {78}

A director of photography is seen rubbing his hands together with an ointment. All crew members, especially script supervisors and makeup artists, are searching for "new cures" for anything that ails them. Soon, their curiosity demands that they find out just what the ointment is that the director of photography is using.

It is an age old remedy for dry and cracked skin. It diminishes wrinkles! That, of course, is the ultimate cure-all on any set. The interested party wishes to try a small amount. Well, it is very expensive, and it belongs to the makeup artist. Both go to him and ask if he would share a portion of the magic cream. It is a very expensive walrus oil, very difficult to come by, yet...a small portion is allocated. The curious party vigorously rubs it in. Moments pass. The curious party remarks that the magic elixir tends to get a bit sticky. The makeup artist offers a tissue to clean off the excess. Obviously, the greedy party used too much! The tissue begins to meld with skin, and elixir. All becoming one. It is discovered, much to the embarrassment of the makeup man, that he has inadvertently supplied the curious with spirit gum (a glue used to solidly paste fake moustaches and hair pieces to skin). He is terribly sorry. He aids the laborious removal of the vile substance.

If the makeup man and director of photography are old pros they can carry this rip one step further by offering the same person the actual walrus oil which, of course, results in the very same scenario. Generally, this is only done if it can be confirmed that the victim has

either an excellent sense of humor or that the two jokesters can outrun him. At a glance this would seem to be childish pranksterism, but it is absolutely necessary. Motion picture crews/military soldiers must relieve the tension of long hours under varying extremes in conditions. Granted, artistic expression is serious, but it must be accomplished in the same mood when they see the picture.

Advertisements in the trades seldom tout the talents of their production personnel, but their inventory of state-of-the-art computers and equipment. Studio management view production personnel as necessary evils, to be used then discarded. Production crews aren't laughing much anymore. The motion picture industry is a part-time employer.

This Is a Business, Not an Art Form

In the mid 1960s, as accountants, lawyers, and stars/writers/directors/managers began to have the power to impose their "theories" on the business of filmmaking, it was discovered that films could be made for less {79} money on location, outside the walls of the studios. The early pioneers had started this way. Studio heads had built empires, vast cities within the walls of those studios. It had become counterproductive, making pictures within the studios. The craft unions had made picture-making cost prohibitive in Hollywood. Industry wide, executives discussed the money to be made by selling off their vast real estate holdings.

Twentieth Century Fox sold their backlot, one of the largest in the industry. That piece of property is now Century City, a small city where major legal and monetary decisions are "discussed" in huge office complexes: offices overlooking the immediate area and the Los Angeles basin. Many independent motion picture producers (read lawyers and accountants—deal-makers) maintain offices here.

MGM sold its backlots. A condominium was built where the St. Louis street from *Meet Me in St. Louis* once stood. Soon after the sale of Lot 2 to a foreign conglomerate, MGM had to rent the space back so that Dino de Laurentis could build the walls for the new *King Kong*. The lot was consistently rented from the new landlords until the lot, where Gene Kelly sang in the rain and Andy Hardy grew up, was leveled. A housing development now resides on what was a historical monument to the fantasy of filmmaking.

Columbia sold its lot and moved into the Warner Brothers lot, now named The Burbank Studio. Production scheduling became so intense that the stages at the old lot had to be rented.

Large backlot plots at Paramount and the Burbank Studio have been destroyed to make way for larger office complexes, thus more room for a greater number of preproduction personnel to discuss the making of fewer films. The corporate thinking being...the fewer films to make decisions on, the lesser risk of funding a loser. Executives don't last long anymore; they don't want to shorten their term of employment any more than necessary. Thus, bet on sure moneymakers such as: *The Missouri Breaks* (Jack Nicholson), *Jonathan Livingston Seagull*, *Hello Dolly* (Barbara Streisand), and *Heaven's Gate* (Michael Cimino).

'Twas Ever Thus

Motion pictures, like any piece of art, must express ideas if they are to have any lasting value. If motion pictures are to reflect the passion of earlier films, they must be built on the foundation of truth. The film-makers must impose a morality in order for the characters to relate to each other and resolve the conflict in the story. Films must be made by people {80} prepared to risk everything to express valid ideas that have consequences. With these foundational truths, the film should motivate the audience into discussions, and hopefully, decisions.

The problem with any film without foundation is that it requires little. Its characters have little, if any, rock to stand upon, to make choices with, to resolve their "fate." That is a perfectly good definition of the character that drives the modern motion picture industry. There must be virtually no risk in order for the bankers, lawyers, and accountants to participate. Without risk there is no future. Certain death! {81}

MAKING THE SALE TO TELEVISION

Richard E. Germaine

There is no magic formula for getting your video or film project on television, in spite of the mystery that surrounds the system of distribution and/or sale to commercial TV. The mystery is simply that “many good programming ideas often are never seen, while mediocrity remains the stable of most TV programming.” Even though we are experiencing an explosion in communication through television, namely: satellite, cable, home video, and low-power community broadcast stations, there is no guarantee that your project will ever make it to television. You can know the right people (which helps), develop a well-written script; research your subject and audience; even bring proven credits to the project...with all this even the major studios and independent producers get turned down. So, where lies the key for seeing the results of your creative labors become a reality on commercial, educational, or “pay” TV? As mentioned earlier, there is no one, single formula that guarantees success; however, there are alternatives that must be considered, with some sacrifice, if we are to break the network hold on “Prime Time.” Prime time is that viewing period where the majority of viewers regularly spend their time.

Television’s Reach

The Facts

First, a summary of basic facts and statistics to remind us of just how important television is in the lives of Americans:

1. There are 83 million homes with television in the U.S.
2. Of those 83 million homes, 30 percent are also hooked to cable.
3. Division of broadcast and cable facilities is as follows: (a) 702 commercial stations; (b) 502 network/200 independent stations; (c) 3,000 cable systems (local); (d) 7 cable networks (via satellite).
4. The average viewer spends seven hours each day watching TV.

5. No single activity has been duplicated by so many people at one time than that of watching the Super Bowl, *Roots*, “Who Shot J.R.,” or the final episode of *M*A*S*H**. Television—the most powerful mass communications tool ever developed by man. The main source of TV programming is the network system. Second is the syndication of reruns or one-time specials. Third, the often small production shops and religious programmers provide {83} the remainder along with some imported products. The success or failure of these shows is almost entirely related to the “life and death” measurement of the audience—ratings.

Television Research

Ratings—Television’s Report Card.

The ratings are used by program executives to help them determine not only the size of the audience but also the best segment of the day in which a program should be positioned. They are used by advertising agencies to help find the best or biggest audiences for their clients’ commercial message. Ratings also help local and network television stations sales’ personnel adjust the rates by which they charge advertisers for the time. At best, ratings are only estimates based on scientific principles of probability which give a reasonable idea of the acceptability, or lack of same, to a particular program. Since ratings are a key ingredient to success, one must study and understand how to use them before venturing into the video jungle of competition for time. No matter how strongly we may feel about a concept for a video or film project, emotion has little to do with ratings. However, the emotional, physical, and spiritual well-being of the audience plays a very important role in bringing a concept to fruition both in the impact of its message and in the financial feasibility of a project.

Audience Research

People Make the Difference.

It has been said that if those who know and love you think you have a good idea, you may be overlooking something. That something is the fickle, biased, unpredictable, often disappointing nature of the audience coupled with what seems to be the often whimsical decision-making process of TV executives. Before a network program reaches the

tube, it has very likely gone through a maze of tests, rough cuts, re-do's, and more tests before it goes on the air. Audience research is vast and methods are plentiful. There are scan tests, concepts tests, TVQ's, minute-by-minute graphic tracking systems, next-day recall, close-circuit pretests, focus groups, telephone surveys, and public opinion polls to help determine the viability of a video or film project. These tests are important to the advertisers' level of confidence in your idea, to the networks expenditure of dollars for production, and to the production and writing staff's creative process. What can be tested? Almost every element of a project can be tested with reasonably reliable results—but again, it is only a measurement to help reduce the risk. Areas to be tested can include: {84}

1. Title of the show.
2. The characters of the show.
3. The name actors or actresses.
4. The setting.
5. The main story-line idea.
6. The staging or scenery.
7. The conflicts and resolutions.
8. The music and effects.
9. The level of interest by the viewer

From these tests, a project can be produced, edited, positioned, and promoted to try to maximize audience response and advertisers' support. This research process is, however, no panacea for failure. More often than not, one single ingredient makes the difference. I believe that the most common single ingredient contributing to success or failure is one less tangible than those listed above. The very foundation upon which the concept for a program is based and through which it is developed can be the determining factor. Because the network/Hollywood system sees the world through the dark glasses of man's sinful nature, the audience's "real needs" are often over-looked. Our research can help us in the creative process to address the questions people ask by using God's truth rather than perpetuating the "gloom and doom," flaunted irresponsibility, and lawlessness... of just plain humanistic thinking. The medium of television, although powerful, is only a tool for communication. What is communicated—the message itself—must

be founded on a biblical truth. The opportunities for expressing this message through the medium of television are developed further in the conclusion of this essay.

Distribution—Purchase, Barter, and Cash

At the network level, programming executives have the somewhat dubious luxury of selecting from a broad and abundant choice of new program ideas (or old ones with a new twist). One program vice president at ABC receives no less than thirty written submissions and more than 100 telephone calls per week. That adds up to 6,760 presentations from outside creative services per year. Don't forget this same executive only has 240 nights in a season to program.

Networks—Purchase of Programs

I am not saying it is impossible to get on a network with your idea, but the journey will be long and arduous. These basics may help you to prepare:

1. Remember, there are no “new” program ideas, just new twists.
2. Present your idea concisely and to the point.
3. Be prepared to wait!
4. Bring recognizable credits to the presentation.
5. Find out what is required for your presentation before you even get to the door.
6. Be flexible in your approach, but...
7. Stand firm on your “message.”
8. Most likely you will {85} need a known agent to be your advocate and ...
9. A good attorney, for obvious reasons.

The networks also have the luxury of spending money for development of future programming needs, usually with known producers and writers. They stockpile shows for changes in schedule line-ups, ratings battles, and cancellation. It is unlikely a newcomer will even get considered by a network. Chances increase, however, if you own the “rights” to a known entity such as a novel, an official biography, a successful play, or the remake of an old movie or show. If you can deliver one of

these with proof of production credits, you may have a chance to be heard. Purchasing the rights requires detailed legal advice and good research to determine its viability in the marketplace. PBS might be the best customer for this product.

Syndication—Network Reruns and First Runs

Reruns

As you may know, the FCC has a rule that prohibits network-owned shows from being distributed by the network itself. Years ago each network formed separate corporations to syndicate (distribute) their programs after five years of on-network airing. This allowed top-rated shows to be sold to independent stations for substantial fees. Though millions are made from syndication reruns, the networks would like to have control of these shows back, to distribute to their own affiliated stations, helping each local market bolster their other-than-prime-time viewing hours. At this writing, the FCC is considering repeal of this rule, which would give control back to the networks and start a mad scramble by the 200 independent stations for new sources of programming. The negative argument is that there would be too much control by the networks. On the positive side is a golden opportunity for new programs to fill their place. Think of the possibilities!!!

First Runs

First run syndication is simply the same process as rerun distribution. The main exception is that shows syndicated as first run (new) must be made for less money and strike “creative deals” with stations because they have no network ratings or track records to demand large fees per episode. To keep budgets in line, most first run shows fall into the typical and widely accepted formats of game shows, magazine-type (*PM Magazine*), talk shows, music/variety, informational, and some para-documentaries. If you are fortunate enough to have the risk capital to produce a pilot (sample show) and promote it heavily among the commercial TV stations with known credits on your résumé and top name talent in your show, you *may* be able to sell your show for cash to individual stations {86} across the country. If not, a cash sale to stations will be out of the question. It is exciting to think that stations want your show so badly they will pay you for it, but, this is rare! However, you could make an offer to be paid based upon performance, such as so

many dollars per ratings point you achieve for a station. In Los Angeles it could mean thousands of dollars, or in Chico-Redding it could mean one hundred dollars at best. There are no set rules...just be creative in your negotiations.

Barter—A Fair Trade.

The most commonly used form of distribution/ syndication is called “barter.” This method benefits all parties economically. It is a three-way deal involving the TV stations, the producer (or packager), and the sponsor. First, a general definition of barter will help this illustration. A program producer packages a program for distribution to individual stations at no cost to the station. The commercial time in the show is divided equally (more or less), with half the time available to the local station to sell to local or national advertisers, and the other half is sold by the producer to his own advertising contacts (usually national). The station keeps their commercial income and the producer keeps his. The commercial sponsor gets a new first run show in a decent time period at less cost usually than if he purchased the time separately. This method is the “bread and butter” of independent stations, individual producers, and many advertising clients seeking new audiences or programming most closely aligned with their marketing objectives. This idea is not new. Soap operas were originated by soap companies trying to reach women in daytime TV and early radio with advertising.

Barter—Some Basic Guidelines.

There are many variations to barter, in fact, too many to detail in this essay. However, a few guidelines to help you use barter are appropriate:

1. Depending on the production budget, a minimum of twenty markets (TV cities) should be signed before a major expenditure of dollars is made to enhance the show, promote it, or expand your program inventory with new shows.
2. The best and most successful barter shows are those which run five days a week. They solve program problems for stations and give the sponsors consistent audience coverage.
3. Before venturing into production, approach potential sponsors first to see if you can help meet a marketing need. They may even capitalize your idea. Many sponsors and ad agencies are in the business of producing their own shows. Sell them an idea. It's worth a try.

4. “Buy” some expert advice from an attorney, agent, or another independent producer. I say “buy” because there are many wolves in sheeps’ clothing who would love to steal your idea—if it’s good. Buying their time and advice will contractually obligate {87} them to help you be successful. Have them sign a nondisclosure agreement. Nothing is sacred in the “idea” business of television. “Trust” is almost extinct.
5. Copyrights, trademarks, title registration, music rights, commissions, royalties, licenses, and hold-harmless clauses are all specific and necessary ingredients to be included in your “idea” development process. Hire an attorney well-versed in television, broadcast, or entertainment law.
6. Be prepared for fifty “no’s,” five “maybe’s,” and one “yes”—if it can deliver a good audience. Otherwise, be diligent, be patient, be well-prepared, to face a tedious battle for time. Unlike magazines, which can add pages to accommodate more articles and advertising, television is limited by the clock.
7. The bottom line, unfortunately, is always profitability. A lean, economically produced show stands a better chance for survival than an extravagant production which doesn’t breed enough advertising support to pay for the cost.
8. If you can afford it, audience research will always help you present your case to stations and agencies (or sponsors). If nothing else, it will help you decide if your idea is worth producing.
9. Study the ratings of similar shows. They will help you determine what types are successful and what days and time slots might work best.
10. Develop a team around you who will believe with you, support you, and work with you.

Syndication—Using Cash, the Direct Approach

If, by now, you have a mental picture of just how difficult, intricate, and all-consuming television program distribution can be, then you will appreciate this final approach to getting on the air. This is a personal favorite because of its simplicity and directness for getting results you can see in a short period of time. The fastest way to gain access to the airwaves is *cash...buy the time!* This method is the foundation for many new concepts of non-network programming. Religious programs have done this for years. Political parties do it every four years. Often, fundraising telethons are the result of a complete buy-out of hours and

days of TV time. So, how do you make money? Again, there are a number of ways, some of which are highlighted below to help you brainstorm your own possibilities. Having done your homework, if you believe in your ideas, then, it is possible someone else will too. You will search first for the benevolence of an individual or group who will put up “seed” money to help you package your idea into a professionally written and/or rough visual presentation. Approach sponsors who lean toward or are sympathetic to your message. They will help you...if it benefits them. Look to sponsors who would like to sell a product over TV but cannot afford to buy a lot of time on their own. Package three or four of these into a show, buy the time together, and share in the profits (hopefully not losses). {88} This is called “direct response” advertising. Many large corporations have underwritten series, mini-series, and specials, not because of ratings, but because of the value of having their name identified with the message of the program. (That’s called public relations.) Stations receive these with open arms, especially PBS stations and their network. Finally, don’t overlook cable. One single hour may be purchased which can reach millions of homes for the cost of one thirty-second commercial in network prime time in a small city.

Start with an immense vision, achieve a single step, then, run the race for time.

A Practical Summary

Five steps to remember.

1. Avoid the Hollywood/network system. Instead, break the mold.
2. Be prepared to present your case.
3. Use sponsor clout to circumvent the competition for time.
4. Meet the viewers’ “real need” creatively.
5. Exercise and apply biblical principles without displaying “religiosity” in your content and business practices.

The Challenge—Setting a New Standard

Points 4 and 5 above warrant further discussion as it has been stated earlier in this essay that the audience’s “real need” has not been provided for by the Hollywood/network system’s worldview. There is a

need for individuals with a biblical worldview to work together in bringing about a television programming revolution—a reformation, as it were. You and I have been given the opportunity to provide our audiences with the message of God’s truth through the medium of television...through comedy, drama, music, variety, documentaries, talk-shows, and other approaches possibly not yet conceived, but soon to be. This message of God’s truth is the seed that must be sown. This can be done by hard-hitting, truthful documentaries; right relationships developed in comedy and drama; God’s law and justice displayed and upheld; absolute resolution to conflicts; inspiring, uplifting music; a determined triumph of good over evil; and finally, man’s destiny and the purpose for his existence expressed. A reformation in television must come if the “Good News” is to be presented to the masses. You and I have the challenge of working through and around existing systems. It can be done. Many talented Christians in Hollywood are waiting for the encouragement to lend their talents and experience to this end. The first project is the hardest, but it will pave the way for all who would like to see the applications of biblical principles to the whole man {89} through the medium of television. In setting a new standard for program content we must maintain and exceed quality production techniques; that is, emulate existing techniques, not the message. Recognize the benefits of free enterprise and use them to work for you in the development and realization of your ideas. Exercising “Kingdom” principles will bring about success in a project and have great impact on audiences. And, we must be as different in our business dealings as we are in our content.

Conclusion—Let Us Broadcast

Broadcasting is not just the communication of visual and audio images by electronic means. Rather, “it is the act or process of scattering seed,” as stated in the *New World Dictionary* of 1901. Does it not seem fitting, then, that we view our challenge today as one to scatter the seeds of truth to hungry minds and souls with seasoning provided by talented, dedicated people like you who have been called to be the “salt of the earth”? You and I have the greatest opportunity of using broadcasting through television to help usher in a renewed era where

biblical principles become, once again, the foundation for artistic and creative expression. Let us together broadcast the “Good News”

REFERENCES

Statistical references are made from the 1983 *Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook*. Methods of distribution and syndication are the result of the author’s experience. Selected works referenced are suggested as further reading.

Further Study in Television

The book descriptions in the following are by Christopher H. Sterling, Center for Telecommunications Studies, George Washington University. Prices and publication data are as of September, 1982.

Adler, Richard P., ed. *Understanding Television: Essays on Television as a Social and Cultural Force*. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1981. 439 pp., \$10.95 (paper). Original papers based on two Aspen conferences, this includes essays on specific programs and on program types, especially drama and news.

Blum, Eleanor. *Basic Books in Mass Media*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980. 427 pp., \$22.50. This is the best single bibliographical guide to the whole field, including, nearly 100 pages on broadcasting, covering both U.S. and world/international radio-television.

Bower, Robert. *Television and the Public*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973. 205 pp., \$7.95. Based on a national survey, this is an updating of the 1963 book by the late Gary A. Steiner, *The People Look at Television*. About a third of the questions used were the same for both surveys. The basic conclusion is that while people are watching more television, they are more critical of what they see. (The 1980 survey results will be published in 1982.)

Cantor, Muriel G. *The Hollywood TV Producer: His Work and His Audience*. New York: Basic Books, 1972. 264 pp., \$7.95. Only study of its kind based on scholarly survey of TV series producers, exploring their working conditions, views of the audience, and how these affect their product—TV entertainment.

Connors, Tracy Daniel. *Longman Dictionary of Mass Media and Communication*. New York: Longman, 1982. 255 pp., \$24.95/\$12.95. Some 7,000 terms clearly identified and defined with applications to specific media noted. One of several available glossaries, this is one of the most recent and inclusive.

Diamant, Lincoln, ed. *The Broadcast Communications Dictionary*, 2nd ed. New York: Hastings House, 1978, 201 pp., \$9.95. Another glossary of technical, business, programming, and production terms in radio and television, but this one is more

current and widely available. Arranged alphabetically, the definitions are brief and easy to understand. Some 4,000 terms are covered—twice the number of the first edition.

Fletcher, James E., ed. *Handbook of Radio and TV Broadcasting: Research Procedures in Audience, Program and Revenues*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1981. 336 pp., \$26.50. A “how-to-do-it cookbook” for stations (and students) including analysis of commercial ratings material, telephone surveys, different kinds of sampling, the ascertainment process, program testing, and the like—the first book of its kind.

Frank, Ronald E., and Marshall G. Greenberg. *The Public's Use of Television: Who Watches and Why*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980. 368 pp., \$20.00. Based on a national survey of over 2,400 persons. It attempts to answer the “whys” of television watching and use of other media. Profiles of different types of TV users are offered.

Goldsen, Rose K. *The Show and Tell Machine: How Television Works and Works You Over*. New York: Dial Press, 1971.

Heighton, Elizabeth J., and Don R. Cunningham. *Advertising in the Broadcast Media*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1976. 349 pp., \$12.95. The first broad book-length overview of this subject since 1959, with chapters on the development of broadcast advertising, structure of the industry, objectives and strategies, marketing research and media planning, talent, producing and evaluating commercial buying and selling time, and questions of social responsibility in advertising.

Levinson, Richard, and William Link. *Stay Tuned: An Inside Look at the Making of Prime-Time Television*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981. 252 pp., \$11.95. Two successful producers detail the finance, organization, personalities, and art of their craft, with many specific examples from recent network seasons.

Newcomb, Horace, ed. *Television: The Critical View*, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979. 557 pp., \$5.95. Twenty essays on particular shows, program genres, the role of television in our culture, and the aesthetics of television content.

On the Cable, *The Television of Abundance*. Report of the Sloan Commission on Cable Communications. McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Reed, Robert M., and Mazine K. Reed. *Career Opportunities in Television and Video*. New York: Facts on File, 1982. 231 pp., \$19.95. Detailed data on TV broadcasting (management, programming, production, news, engineering, advertising, technical), video and telecommunications (consumer electronics and home video, cable and pay TV, education, corporation video, government and health), with a well organized two-page spread on each of ninety-five specific jobs.

Shanks, Bob. *The Cool Fire—How to Make it in Television*. W. W. Norton and Company Inc., 1976.

Steinberg, Cobbett. *TV Facts*. New York: Facts on File, 1980. 550 pp., \$17.95. {91}
Collection of both tabular and narrative data on programs, viewers, ratings, advertisers, awards-polls-surveys, networks, and stations. Good index and useful reference. {92}

ART AND CAPITALISM: A PEACE TREATY

Paul Lyons

1. Developments in Communications

Since the creation of mankind, the most used, yet often least appreciated blessing that God has bestowed upon each individual is the faculty to receive mental impressions through the five senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. Not a moment passes in which man fails to use at least one of these in a major way.

Through the ages, every culture has used art as a method to stimulate these senses and communicate ideas and messages that in turn generate an action or reaction.

Art is usually thought of as something *present* to the eye and touch. It is a fact that a visible and tangible work of art is a kind of *persisting* event.⁵¹

From a primitive sketch, signs and symbols, the written word, sounds, and images, humans have been able to convey thoughts from one person to another in various forms of art.

Artists represent what they *conceive* to be real rather than what they *perceive*. They bring to the making of images conceptions that have been instilled in them by their cultures. They understand the visible world in certain unconscious, culturally agreed-upon ways, and thus bring to the artistic process ideas and meanings out of a common stock. They record not so much what they see as what they *know* or *mean*.⁵²

Communications earned its place as a serious art form at the inception of the printing press and primitive photographic processes. With the addition of the telegraph, radio, and telephone, people were able to

51. Helen Gardner, *Art Through the Ages*, 7th ed. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich, 1980), 2.

52. *Ibid.*, 16.

communicate messages over greater distances and to larger numbers of participants simultaneously. We all recall the portrayal of the War Between the States captured by Matthew Brady using the wet-plate collodion process to document {93} the battle. History records the use of radio as President Franklin Roosevelt's means to communicate with his famous "Fireside Chats"

With the chemical discovery of applying light-sensitive emulsion to a thin, flexible, transparent sheet of cellulose nitrate and later, acetate material, it became possible to introduce photographic reproductions of images as a form of art.

Through the combination of research, development, technology, and vested capital, we have witnessed the progression of still photographs to yet another form—the moving picture. With the addition of a sound track to the motion pictures, "talkies" gave a new dimension to communication arts.

Thus it became possible to entertain, inform, educate, and motivate greater masses of people at one time. Through these forms of advanced communication, it also was possible to transport the mind, through increased stimulation of the senses, to higher levels than ever before imagined by any artist.

In just the past fifty years, we have witnessed drastic changes in the art of communication. We are on the verge of even greater improvements and higher technology that will integrate the electronic recording of images and sounds with laser beams, computers, microprocessors, interactive video, and direct broadcast satellites. These will offer a limitless and instant influence of mass communications from one part of the globe to another as well as reach the eyes and ears of billions of persons simultaneously.

2. Entrepreneurship as a Catalyst

While it is not the intent of sponsors of this Western Conference on the Media and the Arts to delve in the philosophy of economics, it is essential to point out that none of these advances in the art of communications could have become a reality without a high degree of entrepreneurship. It was high-risk investment of capital that made it financially possible.

We Americans enjoy many benefits from the free-enterprise system—the very foundation that has made our country great. But, like our senses, free enterprise is all too often taken for granted until diminished by overregulation, taxation, or loss.

All of us are entrepreneurs in our own way. We assume a degree of risk when we “sell” ourselves to others, or when we purchase goods or services. Who among us, as a buyer, does not seek the best for the least? Yet, we have begun to witness a methodical digression in the media’s portrayal of business and free enterprise. {94}

3. *The Power of the Media*

A nation of well-informed men who have been taught to know and prize the rights which God has given them cannot be enslaved. It is in the region of ignorance that tyranny begins.—*Benjamin Franklin*⁵³

As a former television reporter, assignment editor, and newsfilm editor in the late fifties and early sixties, I was personally engaged in the news gathering when objective journalism was the order of business. When covering an issue, we obtained and presented facts from both sides as fairly and as accurately as possible.

The viewer was then left in a position where he could formulate his own opinions and attitudes.

Those were the days of half-hour network news programs that featured only one host and not an array of aspiring would-be actors and actresses. We enjoyed a simple, straightforward presentation of the facts without the razzle dazzle showmanship we are barraged by today.

Television network news now refuses to report both sides of an issue primarily because of the time restrictions of a twenty-two-minute format. Their rationale?—It is better to present a broad cross section of the day’s events and let the viewer refer to newspapers for details rather than focus in on only a few major stories. Idealistically—a nice thought, but in reality, it just is not happening.

Polls of the past ten years indicate that a majority of Americans depend more upon twenty-two minutes of TV network news as a

53. W. Cleon Skousen, *Miracle of America* (Salt Lake City, UT: Freeman Institute, 1981), cover page.

source of information for the day's events than newspapers. This is indeed unfortunate.

In his foreword to a study titled, *The Media Elite and American Values*, by S. Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman, President Earnest W. Lefever of the Ethics and Public Policy Center stated in April 1982, that, "We Americans live in an information-saturated society. We can receive and absorb only a tiny part of the daily barrage of facts and opinions that pours forth from a hundred sources. Consequently, we must depend upon the major media of communications to sift the information and decide what is worthy of being called news."⁵⁴

In his book *News from Nowhere*, published in 1973, Edward J. Epstein noted that news executives and editors "tend to receive very similar information" because they rely heavily on what he calls the "New York fulcrum." "Like it or not," Epstein quotes one news executive as saying, "the {95} [*New York Times*] is our Bible; it tells us what is likely to be considered important to others."⁵⁵ Those of us who have derived our Judeo-Christian values upon a Bible of higher authority and credibility, may recall the words of Paul in his letter to the Romans when he wrote,

Ever since God created the world, His invisible qualities, both His eternal power and His divine nature, have been clearly seen. Men can perceive them in the things that God has made. So they have no excuses at all! They know God, but they do not give Him the honor that belongs to Him, nor do they thank Him. Instead, their thoughts have become complete nonsense and their empty minds are filled with darkness. They say they are wise, but they are fools; instead of worshipping the immortal God, they worship images made to look like mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles.⁵⁶—Rom. 1:20–23.

In his final CBS commentary, Eric Sevareid stated, "We are no longer starvelings and we [journalists] sit above the salt. We have affected our times."⁵⁷ Columnist Joseph Kraft writes,

54. S. Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman, *The Media Elite and American Values* (Washington, DC: the Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1981.)

55. *Ibid.*

56. *Good News for Modern Man* (American Bible Society, 1966), 507.

57. Lichter and Rothman, *Media Elite*.

In the past two decades, those of us in the press have undergone a startling transformation. We are among the principal beneficiaries of American life. We have enjoyed a high rise in income, in status, and in power.... We have moved from the sidelines to the center of the action.⁵⁸

4. Study of the Media Elite

As part of their study of the media elite, Lichter and Rothman conducted hour-long interviews with 240 journalists and broadcasters at such influential media outlets as the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and the news departments of the three commercial networks as well as PBS. During this same period, 1979–1980, they also surveyed executives at several major corporations to gather comparisons with a more traditional leadership group.

With a 76 percent completion rate of the media elite and 96 percent from the business community, they focused their report on the media and, at appropriate points, compared their attitudes to those of the successful and influential leaders in the business world.

While space does not permit a complete reading of their six-page summary report that was first published in the October-November 1981 issue {96} of *Public Opinion* by the American Enterprise Institute, I would like to quote some interesting results, and urge you to read the entire work.

FACT: The Backgrounds of the Media Elite: 95 percent are white, 79 percent male, 68 percent from the Northeast or North Central States, 42 percent from metropolitan areas, 93 percent college graduates, 55 percent with some postgraduate studies, 54 percent political liberal, and 50 percent claimed no religious affiliation.

In summary,

Substantial numbers of the media elite grew up at some distance from the social and cultural traditions of small town “middle America.” Their parents tended to be well off, highly educated members of the upper middle class, especially the educated professions.

58. *Ibid.*

Ideologically, a majority of the leading journalists described themselves as liberals. 54 percent placed themselves as to the left of center, compared to 19 percent who choose the right side of the spectrum.⁵⁹

When asked to define the political leanings of their fellow workers, the results revealed “a margin of seven to one” being left. This fact was born out in the record of presidential voting of the media elite in the 1968, 1972, and 1976 elections in which more than 94 percent voted for Humphrey over Nixon, 81 percent for McGovern over Nixon, and 81 percent for Carter over Ford.

The study goes onto reveal,

These presidential choices are consistent with the media’s liberal views on a wide range of political and social issues. They reflect a strong preference for welfare capitalism, pressing for assistance to the poor in the form of income redistribution and guaranteed employment.⁶⁰

While few appear to be outright socialists, “they overwhelmingly reject the proposition that major corporations should be publicly owned.” Eighty-four percent strongly agree that government should not regulate sex, 97 percent strongly agree that a woman has a right to abortion, 45 percent strongly disagree that homosexuality is wrong, and 54 percent state that homosexuals should not be banned from teaching in the public schools.

The authors of the Media Elite study conclude that, “the crucial task that remains is to discover what relationship, if any, exists between how these {97} individuals view the world and how they present the world to the public.”⁶¹

5. *The Media Reacts*

If anybody can make television better, colleagues and industry watchers say Tinker’s the man.⁶²

With those credentials, we read with great interest an interview with Grant Tinker by the American Film Institute recently, in which he states,

59. *Public Opinion* (American Enterprise Institute), October-November 1981, 43.

60. *Ibid.*, 44.

61. *Ibid.*, 60.

62. *American Film*, September 1983, 23.

We in television have bored audiences and we have to wake them up. These days you have to hit them with a two-by-four. It is because all of us who have something to do with television programs have not done our jobs as well as we should have.

There was a period in television when just the very fact of having the picture in your living room was enough to make you pay attention. Now, the picture is there, but you're not necessarily looking at it.⁶³

Could it be that the new chairman of NBC is beginning to get the message—viewers are more sophisticated today and are selective in what they watch? Hopefully, Mr. Tinker and other commercial network executives will heed the recent study conducted by the National Association of Broadcasters that reports TV viewership is down.

Even the mighty *New York Times* recently ran a column entitled “Investigative Journalism is Found Shifting Goals.”

Journalists and critics warn that the change hurts the public, which expects the press to be its watchdog.

They say the press is as enthusiastic as ever in disclosing corruption and that the difference is the toughening of internal standards to assure fairness and accuracy.⁶⁴

If that were indeed the case, however, there would be no need for Reed Irvine and his organization—Accuracy in Media.

Jonathan Friendly's *Times* article further states,

Journalists and their critics said the shift could not be measured directly in terms of stories not pursued or articles not published, because reporters or {98} television news directors do not openly discuss the chances they do not take.

The increase in litigation has led to more internal policing. News organizations retain lawyers to check controversial articles and to warn of areas of possible trouble.

As a matter of philosophy, many news organizations have turned away from disclosures of individual corruption or exposés of private business and now focus on how such public agencies as prisons or mental hospitals are run.⁶⁵

63. *Ibid.*

64. Jonathon Friendly, “Investigative Journalism is Found Shifting Goals,” *The New York Times*, August 23, 1983.

65. *Ibid.*

If, and I repeat, if this reported concern is causing a change in the presentation of news by the print and electronic media, perhaps America will see a return to factually-reported, opinion-free news, editorials labeled as such and fair and balanced investigative journalism by local TV stations “I-TEAMS” and programs such as *60 Minutes*, *20/20*, and *First Camera*.

6. A Positive Trend in the Media

The American Business Media Council is pleased to note that we have observed at least one major change in the right direction by one of our own national advisors, Ted Turner. In late August of this year, “an innovative, uplifting and positively entertaining approach to the weekday news”⁶⁶ was broadcast over the Turner Broadcasting Systems’ Super Station WTBS.

Coincidentally, at least in the East, this half-hour newscast immediately follows the three major network evening news shows.

Named *The Good News*, its potential audience through WTBS exceeds 24 million households. These people are treated to items of interest gathered daily from the worldwide resources of the Turner network.

According to TBS Board Chairman, R.E. “Ted” Turner,

We have been getting requests for years for a news program that reports the good things going on in the world everyday. Our viewers think we’re the only network that would try to do it. I am proud they think that much of us, and I’m proud to offer them *The Good News*.⁶⁷

The commercially-advertised/supported thirty-minute program, featuring one anchor person, received rave reviews during its first week of airing. Viewers have already expressed their whole-hearted support as well as the desire to see the program continue in its professional course.

Advocacy ads featured by newspapers and television indicate another {99} positive trend in the media. “Op-ed” ads are becoming a means to respond to the negative media.

66. WTBS News Release, June 24, 1983.

67. *TBS Transmitter* (newsletter, Turner Broadcasting System Inc.), August 1983, 1.

An example of such advertising is “Myths,” a series being run in major newspapers by the Mobil Corporation. The first of the series—which ironically appeared as this paper was being edited—was titled, “The Myth of the Villainous Businessman.”

We quote from the summary which appeared in the *Washington Post* on August 21, 1983:

To be sure, businessmen make their share of mistakes. However, business is the direct source of livelihood for millions of Americans and the indirect benefactor of many millions more. It is the producer of virtually all of the goods we as a nation consume. And if free business is destroyed or threatened, all the institutions in society, including a free press and free mass communications network would be threatened.⁶⁸

7. Media's Antibusiness Bias

It is no secret that the media today has a pronounced antibusiness slant. From the evening newscasts to daily newspapers to weekly news magazines to entertainment on the silver screen and television tube, the message is invariably the same—businessmen are crooks, exploiters, polluters, and the like.

According to the Media Institute's investigation into the treatment of businessmen in television prime-time entertainment programs, researchers analyzed 200 episodes of the top fifty programs during the 1979–1980 season, with the results published in a study aptly titled, *Crooks, Conmen, and Clowns: Businessmen in TV Entertainment*.

“Foolish, greedy or criminal,” according to the Institute's study, is precisely how American businessmen are portrayed 66 percent of the time.

The major findings of this study are as follows:

Two out of three businessmen on television are portrayed as foolish, greedy, or criminal.

Almost half of all work activities performed by businessmen involve illegal acts.

The majority of characters who run big business are portrayed as criminals.

68. “The Myth of the Villainous Businessman,” Mobil Oil Corp., paid advertisement, *Washington Post*, August 21, 1983.

Television almost never portrays business as a socially useful or economically productive activity.

The study, edited by Leonard J. Theberge, president of the Media Institute, {100} points out,

The portrait of businessmen as “bad guys” on prime-time television varies but little on the three networks and on different types of programs. American business is slapped with an even worse image than are individual businessmen, with big business getting the blackest eye of all. Over half the owners or chief executives of large-scale businesses are shown engaging in criminal activities.⁶⁹

“So what?” was the retort of a radio talk show host during a recent interview with me as president of the American Business Media Council. He argued that, “we are all intellectual people who can recognize programs like *Dallas*, *Knots Landing*, *Archie Bunker*, *The Jeffersons*, yes, even *Alice* are only comedy and not real life.” Unfortunately, we are not a nation of intellectuals. Therefore, we must acknowledge the fact that many viewers are receiving and believing the subtle messages of television.

“Then,” asked Socrates in Plato’s *Republic*, “shall we simply allow our children to listen to any stories that anyone happens to make up, or so receive into their minds ideas often the very opposite of those we shall think they ought to have when they grow up?”⁷⁰

He is probably not the first to express such a concern; parents generally are wary of those who entertain or educate their children. Alas, the arrival and growth of the mass media has changed their concern. There was once a time when children were influenced by parents, clergy, and teachers. However, with the explosion of the media in print, radio, movies, and television right in the home, Plato’s expressed concern is even more profound today.

During the more than thirty-five years that we have permitted television to invade our homes, Congressional committees have held numerous hearings on its effect on children. Hundreds of studies have been conducted on the relationship between program content and TV view-

69. Leonard J. Theberge, ed., *Crooks, Conmen, and Clowns: Businessmen in TV Entertainment* (Washington, DC: The Media Institute, 1981).

70. George Gerbner et al., “The Demonstration of Power: Violence Profile No. 10,” *Journal of Communications* 29, no. 3 (Summer 1979): 177.

ers' reactions. But, for the sake of brevity, let us focus upon just one problem that is influencing young and mature viewers alike.

"Business is an integral part of American life and television entertainment, but television's portrayal of businessmen has not yet received the extensive attention accorded other groups such as women, blacks, Hispanics, and the elderly."⁷¹ {101}

Given the facts that American children spend more time watching television than in school, and that there are more TV sets in America than bathtubs, is it any wonder that a group of concerned corporate presidents and political leaders banded together and founded the American Business Media Council (ABMC) in the spring of 1982?

Working as a positive force with the business community, the Council records and monitors prime-time entertainment TV programs at its "in-house" facility. It has engaged a national reader service that reviews 1,730 daily, 8,200 weekly, and 727 Sunday newspapers, as well as 6,000 periodicals and trade publications in search of antibusiness themes.

Once detected, ABMC notifies the chairman of the board of companies whose advertising dollars actually paid for negative media messages. An educational conference is suggested in which the Council advises how to avoid this problem in the future. The question of quality of product association versus quantity of viewers or readers is one determination that must be made by the advertisers.

The council recently intensified its monitoring program for a three-month period. During this span, ABMC evaluates prejudice (i.e., the portrayal of businessmen as villains and malefactors, disparaging references to the free-enterprise system, etc.) in prime time entertainment television programs.

At the conclusion of this monitoring activity, a list of the twelve most antibusiness TV shows will be published in the *ABMC Report* with supportive facts and figures, as well as the commercial sponsors.

Through a series of coordinated news conferences, press events, and newspaper interviews, ABMC will do everything in its power to circulate this information as broadly as possible.

71. Linda Lichter, S. Robert Lichter, and Stanley Rothman, "How Show Business Shows Business," *Public Opinion*, October-November 1982, 10.

While the Council does not necessarily advocate boycotts of either programs or sponsors, it does believe it is high time the American public knew which television programs are consistently undermining our free-enterprise system. Once informed, viewers can determine whatever course of action they deem appropriate to make their displeasure known to sponsors and network officials.

Simultaneously, ABMC will begin targeting specific companies that regularly sponsor programs with a pronounced anti-free market bias. It will further seek out those companies who, despite repeated appeals from the Council, refuse even to consider altering their advertising policies.

We find it shameful that these corporations, which operate in and benefit from our marvelous free-enterprise system, subsidize the vicious {102} antibusiness diatribes which pollute the airwaves on a nightly basis.

8. Individuals Must Take Action

The majority of media's decision-makers are out of touch with the grassroots people of America. They dictate what they believe the people want. But perhaps it would be better to say they dictate what they want the people to believe. It is therefore up to concerned individuals to tell the media precisely what you want and what you believe.

What can you, as a private individual, do to help combat media bias against business?

1. Monitor your own local television programs and other media presentations. Make a mental or written balance sheet recording television news and entertainment shows, newspapers, magazines, etc., which portray antibusiness sentiments.
2. Write network officials, news directors, editors ,etc., informing them of your disapproval of the antibusiness bias they portray in media presentations.
3. Contact corporate sponsors and media executives and tell them of your concern about negative images of the businessman.
4. Suggest to corporations who subsidize antibusiness bias that they review their advertising policies and urge them to use their dollars to support only media that is fair and accurate in its portrayal of the free-market system.

5. Send letters of congratulations to media executives and firms when you observe balanced media and encourage them to continue this practice.
6. Support young people with high moral, ethical, and spiritual values to consider entering the field of communications.
7. Stay informed of possible changes in legislation that effects media and write your comments to members of Congress and the Federal Communications Commission.
8. Become an active member of such organizations as the American Business Media Council and support their efforts to correct the negative image of business that pervades the American media today.

In his often-quoted book, *The View From Sunset Boulevard*, syndicated columnist Ben Stein summarized the situation by observing, "...the murderous, duplicitous, cynical businessman is about the only kind of businessman there is on TV adventure shows and situation comedies."

Stein claims that based on interviews with Hollywood writers and producers, "the attitudes of the people who create television coincide almost {103} exactly with the picture on television."

Thus, it is the responsibility of every concerned American who believes in the free-enterprise system to take action now that will help swing the left-sided pendulum back to its center point before we lose our sixth sense—common sense!

Their idols are silver and gold, the work of man's hands.
 They have mouths, but they cannot speak;
 They have eyes, but they cannot see;
 They have ears, but they cannot hear;
 They have noses, but they cannot smell;
 They have feet, but they cannot walk;
 They can not make a sound with their throat.
 Those who make them will become like them.⁷²—Ps. 115: 4–18

Additional Suggested Reading

Cassata, Mary B. *Life on Daytime Television: Tuning-in American Serial Drama*. Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1983.

72. *New American Standard Bible*, 1973.

Media Institute. *Prime Time Crime*. January 1983.

“How Show Business Shows Business,” October-November 1982. “Hollywood and America: The Odd Couple,” December-January 1983. *Public Opinion* (American Enterprise Institute).

Newcomb, Horace, and Robert S. Alley. *The Producer’s Medium: Conversations with Creators of American TV*. Oxford University Press, 1983.

The SAGE Comm Text Series by Sage Publications, 1981.

Vol. 1. *Television in America*

Vol. 2. *Communication in History*

Vol. 3. *Prime Time Television: Content and Control*

Vol. 4. *Movies as Mass Communications*

Vol. 5. *Content Analysis*

Vol. 6. *Interpersonal Communications*

Vol. 7. *The Cartoon*

Vol. 8. *Advertising and Social Change*

Vol. 9. *Comparative Communication Research*

Vol. 10. *Media Analysis Techniques*

Mass Media and Social Change. Sage Publications—Studies in International Sociology 22, 1981.

Licensed to Serve: A Citizens’ Guide to the Regulation of Broadcasting Media. American Legal Foundation, 1981. {104}

Articles of Interest

“News Media in America.” *Wilson Quarterly* (Smithsonian Institute) 6, no. 5 (1982).

From the *Journal of Communication*:

“The Duty of Keeping Informed: News Exposure and Civic Obligation.” Vol. 33, no. 1 (Spring 1983).

“The Portrayal of Driving on Television.” Vol. 33, no. 1 (Spring 1983).

“Media Fantasies.” Vol. 33, no. 1 (Winter 1983).

“The Cancellation and Manipulation of Network Television Prime-Time Programs.” Vol. 33, no. 1 (Winter 1983).

“Learning About the Family from Television.” Vol. 32, no. 3 (Summer 1982).

- “Communication.” Vol. 32, no. 4 (Autumn 1982).
- “Glued to the Box? Patterns of TV Repeat-Viewing.” Vol. 32, no. 4 (Autumn 1982).
- “Measuring Media Influence.” Vol. 31, no. 1 (Winter 1981).
- “The Survival of Human Values.” Vol. 31, no. 1 (Winter 1981).
- “Update: Physically Intimate and Sexual Behavior on Prime Time Television.” Vol. 31, no. 1 (Winter 1981).
- “Satellite Broadcasting and Communication Policy.” Vol. 30, no. 2 (Spring 1980).
- “Growing Up with Television.” Vol. 29, no. 3 (Summer 1979).
- “Is Crime News Coverage Excessive?” Vol. 29, no. 3 (Summer 1979).
- “Can People Affect Television?” Vol. 28, no. 1 (Winter 1978).
- “Children’s Social Behavior in Three Towns with Different Television Experience.” Vol. 28, no. 1 (Winter 1978).
- “Fifty Years of Scholarship in Media Ethics.” Vol. 27, no. 4 (Autumn 1977).
- “TV News: Is That the Way It Is?” Vol. 27, no. 4 (Autumn 1977).
- “How TV Sells Children,” Vol. 27, no. 1 (Winter 1977).
- “Public Interest and FCC Policy Making.” Vol. 27, no. 1 (Winter 1977).
- “Where Citizens Go for Information.” Vol. 27, no. 1 (Winter 1977).

THE CHRISTIAN THEORY OF DRAMA

John W. Saunders III
(aka John Quade)

All of God's creation bears God's stamp, mark, and imprint. This includes not only the earth and the cosmos, but also the very nature and being of man, his thought patterns, wants, and needs. Further, man knows this, and is, as Paul has said, "without excuse."

All men know internally, in their heart of hearts, that they need salvation and redemption, that they need atonement for the sins they have committed, that they stand condemned, without justification and sanctification. These are the ultimate needs that man bends all his efforts toward satisfying, not only in his internal self, but in the external world of nature about him, as the whole of creation groans in pain about him.

The question is, by whom shall these things come? Where will we find satisfaction and fulfillment for these most ultimate needs? The Scripture says that all these needs are fully satisfied in the person and work of Christ, while the humanist says that man must discover and know these things by the exercise of autonomous reason.

The next question is, by what means shall man achieve the salvation, redemption, etc., of the external world of nature? Again, the Scripture says that these things come by the application of God's Law to every area of life, while the humanist asserts the law system dictated by the autonomous reason of man.

Clearly there is a stark contrast between the Christian and humanistic views at every point and on every question that is asked. In belief and practice, in internal and external realities, and in grace and nature, there is no point of agreement. And since no area of life can escape the consequences of these ideas, then he who engages in any act, including the production of art, will be forced to deal with them and live with the consequences.

In art generally, and in drama specifically, it is evident that the struggle between clearly defined polarizations of good and evil is the bedrock for all great drama. Great drama is founded on conflict over great truths. Drama which minimizes this struggle and conflict is its own worst enemy. He who minimizes the importance of this struggle not only denies biblical truth generally, but the doctrine of sin, specifically. But, without sin, there is no {107} drama, since, in a sinless realm there is only good without conflict. Minimizing the polarizations also reduces or limits the possible range of dynamic expression as distinctions are leveled. The artisan senses in the depths of his God-created being the necessity for a maximum degree of polarization, but if he lacks God's view of reality, he will be frustrated in his attempts at drama and try to force a meaning into the work which the work cannot sustain. If this process continues long enough, his drama will end in despair and death. In the meantime he must settle for contrivance, fakery, and shallowness as he wages war against himself and the truth.

In short, the quality of the dramatic effort suffers in direct proportion to the degree of departure from the biblical statement of reality.

Knowing, however, that sin is a true fact of life, is only the beginning. One must then create true characters in true situations which are directed toward a true conclusion or purpose. It must end as God's Word says it must end. The characters must have the same needs as real people (salvation, redemption, etc.) and must use ways consistent with their starting point (Scripture or reason) to achieve the fulfillment of those needs and goals.

Given his false starting point, the humanist cannot know the truth of his own position or anyone else's. If he deals with truly Christian ideas, he must misrepresent them or make his own position look ridiculous. At the end of his drama he cannot conclude things as they would really end for the same reasons. The humanist screams for unfettered freedom of artistic expression, but again, with his starting point, he denies his own liberty. The Christian can not only know his own position and its consequences truly, but also that of the humanist, and can therefore create drama with far greater potentiality of expression. The Christian, therefore, has the liberty of Christ, while the humanist has the slavery of the self.

Next, with God's Law, the Christian can guide his characters' footsteps in the paths of righteousness in the external world to bring salvation to the flesh as God's grace has given it to man's spirit (the internal realm of salvation). The humanist, on the other hand, must create characters which justify his own lawlessness, and therefore, his characters can quite legitimately act lawlessly in the external world of the flesh. And, true to his nature, at the drama's end the lawless anti-hero somehow manages to win, when he should have been put to death.

We may illustrate the above ideas on sin, doctrine, and law, in the popular science fiction film, *Star Wars*. Here, George Lucas and company have created a film trilogy which is one continuous series of contradictions after {108} another, particularly when we note that Lucas is an avowed pantheist in his religion. Other than the special effects (mere manipulation of form) there is nothing unusual about the films, though some have noted that the clear contrast between good and evil is the real reason why the films are so successful.

Question: How can a pantheist make a film about good and evil *when no such thing exists in pantheistic thought?*

Lucas denies the doctrine of sin. Man is not to blame for his condition; no, it's the fault of the "force," an impersonal power which apparently lacks directing intelligence. It is a power which man can have if only he makes the right choice and gives himself up to it. In other words, there is no higher intelligence upon which man can draw for leadership. Man is left to his own willpower for salvation.

In *Return of the Jedi*, Luke Skywalker finally has his great confrontation with the evil Emperor and his father, Darth Vader. In this most crucial scene, the whole of Luke's conflict is built on the idea that during the confrontation he must not allow himself the luxury of anger or else he will become possessed by the "dark side" of the force. To Lucas, righteous anger is wrong. To the Christian, it is right and justifiable (e.g., Christ driving the money changers from the temple). Thus, the foundation for the most important scene in the film is a false one. True dramatic conflict is dissipated, with the result that the scene ends as one massive contrivance. One very strongly suspects that the man in the actor who played Luke knew in his heart of hearts the real truth, sensed the contrivance, and had great difficulty in playing the scene.

Finally, true to pantheistic doctrine, there was no justice at the film's climax. Darth Vader, after murdering hundreds of thousands of people, manages to find salvation and receive his glorified body, merely by doing one good deed (intervening in the battle between Luke and the evil Emperor, thus forfeiting his life). *How pathetic!* To Lucas, it's more important to have a happy ending than to have justice reign by allowing Darth Vader to get what he's got coming.

The Christian version of these films would have been far more powerful since the maximization of the polarization between good and evil would have given a far greater range of dynamic expression. The internal conflicts in the characters would have been far deeper and richer, since both the good guys and the bad guys would have had to deal with sin in themselves in addition to confronting it in others. The highest possible set of principles would have been at stake, in contrast to those of the puny and impotent {109} worldview of the pantheist. Characters needn't have been contrived, nor emotions faked. The true picture of man would have struck far deeper into the minds and hearts of the millions who saw these films. And finally, true justice would have triumphed, because Darth Vader would have ended his days in the pits of Hell. Thus be it ever to tyrants. {110}

HUMANISTIC ART AS THE OPIUM OF THE MASSES

R. J. Rushdoony

The historian Friedrich Heer, in the course of his comments on Ludwig Tieck (1773–1853), makes a very important observation in passing:

Tieck was an “engineer of the soul,” not altogether in the manner that Stalin wanted authors to be, but with the requisite technical and artistic expertise. Art is the opium of the people, although Marx said that it was religion. Everyone, but particularly those members of the lower classes whose life is mere drudgery, need art for their entertainment, to fill their daydreams. In the nineteenth century art became the successful rival of religion as an opium for the people and, as producer of Kitsch, emotional rubbish and sentimentality, its associate. There was a fundamental link between Kitsch, the “sensitive” long short story and the deluge of “devotional” trinkets and cheap religious literature that flooded the popular market in the nineteenth century.⁷³

As I have pointed out previously, the will to fiction is basic to modern art.⁷⁴ Art as such is not of necessity a will to fiction nor opium for the masses; it has become such in the modern era, as indeed much sentimental and pious religiosity has also.

The more popular the art, the higher its narcotic nature in the modern world. Fiction, in short stories, novels, films, and television, and fiction in song, painting, sculpture, music, and all the arts, denies very commonly the real world in favor of an imaginary world. That imaginary world can be a fairy tale realm to satisfy some, or it can be a world of horrors to satisfy the needs of others for justification, but, in either case, it is a willful flight from reality. It is a form of opium, a preference for a dream world to justify irresponsibility and immorality in the real

73. Friederich Heer, *Europe: Mother of Revolutions*, English trans. (New York: Praeger, [1962] 1972), 55–56.

74. See R. J. Rushdoony, *The Politics of Pornography* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1974), 104–9; and R.J. Rushdoony, *The Word of Flux* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1975), 94–96.

world. There is thus a necessary relationship between the increasingly narcotic nature of art in the modern world, and the actual use of narcotics. There is, moreover, a pioneering in the use of narcotics by artists, especially avant garde artists, who led the way in the flight from reality. Not surprisingly, youth in the 1960s and 1970s, having been reared on fiction, the opium of television, has been in rebellion against reality. Its attitude has not been the reaction of health to an evil world, a desire to regenerate and to reform, but rather a horror of reality and a desire to smash it. Many of the supposedly revolutionary youth of the 1960s have wandered into other forms of escapism since then, narcotics, Eastern religions, and pseudo-Christianity.

The rise of modern art coincides with the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. We can understand something of the problems it created for itself by examining briefly the outlook of the Enlightenment leaders, the philosophes, who were very vocal in their principles. Their notable modern champion, Peter Gay, writes: "The *philosophes* had two enemies: the institution of Christianity and the idea of hierarchy. And they had two problems: God and the masses."⁷⁵ Their views implied an empty universe and the fearful question, "If God is dead, what is permitted?" and also what is not permitted freely now?⁷⁶ All things being equal, all things are equally meaningless in an empty universe. Against this, man has rebelled, and he has used art to justify his rebellion. Fiction in art means a dream world, either a fairy world or a demonic world. Both are means of escapism. The fairy world provides magical answers; the demonic world excuses all flight from responsible action because it denies all value and meaning to responsible action. Both kinds of dream worlds foster inactivity to all sound activity because their basic attitude towards reality is impotence and rage.

An "underground" novel from the Soviet Union, a bitter attack on the Marxist world of Russia, gives us vivid glimpses into the impotent rage therein and the motives of flight. The author, "Abram Tertz," describes a notable Marxist official who cannot sleep, although a relatively young man, because of the haunting thought of death:

75. Peter Gay, *The Party of Humanity: Essays in the French Enlightenment* (New York: Knopf, 1964), 124.

76. *Ibid.*, 126.

It was not the coffin or the grave that frightened him. Chiefly it was the thought that after death there would be absolutely nothing ever, ever more. He would not have minded hell as much: let them fry him in a frying pan. That at least would mean some sort of self-awareness.... Why had they deprived people of faith? How could you replace personal survival by Communism? How could a thinking man have any purpose other than himself?⁷⁷

Having no purpose in life, even as a sinful man, this official sees no purpose in society. His “philosophy” denies justice: “One man’s justice is another man’s injustice.”⁷⁸ His “only way out” is “self-deception.” He plays at {112} being in love and tries to seduce a very beautiful woman, the wife of an associate.⁷⁹ This is to be his bulwark against death, for by playing God he will feed his ego and forestall death. At the moment of triumph, however, he finds that emptiness is not exorcised by his self-deception, and the deception of Marina, but rather that impotence and a loss of desire confront him.⁸⁰ But Tertz, while depicting the facade of fiction which governs Marxist life, cannot go beyond it: he sees a judgment coming against it, but nothing more.

Not surprisingly, thus, “culture” as “art” is a very important factor in Marxist life in the Soviet Union. Opera houses, concert halls, subsidized ballet, art, literature, and music are basic to Communism. The masses must be narcotized, and such art gives the illusion of culture and growth while promoting the radical narcotization of man.

Moreover, in the Western democracies, the more statist and radical the political or nonpolitical figure, the more emphatic their dedication to the state support or subsidization of the arts. This is affirmed in the name of furthering the arts. It is rather the degradation of the arts and their enslavement to the ends of statism and to the narcotic purposes required of them.

Biblical religion can and does provide meaning and direction to life; it does declare salvation, and it is a book and a faith which provides a plan of action to victory. Divorced from that faith, art must finally proclaim an ultimate meaninglessness. Divorced from religion, art

77. Abram Tertz: *The Trial Begins*, trans. Max Hayward (New York, n.d.), 37.

78. *Ibid.*, 17.

79. *Ibid.*, 38.

80. *Ibid.*, 117–18.

becomes the handmaiden of the state, and then its prostitute. Art has lost its self-respect increasingly; it has become, more and more, the realm of the poseur and the fraud, and it lacks adequate standards to judge and expel them. Having become the “dope peddler” to the masses, the artist narcotizes himself first in order to find life tolerable. The pretentious poses of the modern artist are a sorry facade masking a lost calling.

Art has become opium, because politics is itself no more than the mass propagation of narcotics for the masses, who are deluded into believing that the clankings of their political chains are the first notes of the liberty bell.

Modern man wants narcotics, because he does not want the truth, Jesus Christ. The state of the arts is a reflection of the failure of modern man.

2.
CHRISTIAN
RECONSTRUCTION

THE LIMITS TO STATE INTERFERENCE IN THE WORLD OF ENTERPRISE

As Seen from a Biblical Perspective

Dr. Herman Dooyeweerd

[Editor's note: The *Journal* is very pleased to publish for the first time in English, a speech given by Professor Herman Dooyeweerd on April 17, 1931, to *Patrimonium*, in Amsterdam. The speech was translated by Professor Dooyeweerd's son-in-law, Dr. Magnus Verbrugge, who, along with other members of the Dooyeweerd family, has incorporated the Herman Dooyeweerd Foundation. He plans to publish the entire trilogy of Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy. We rejoice at this new development in Dooyeweerd studies.—D. F. K.]

All our reflections about the character of the state and the limits set for the task of the state are determined historically. This appears in a striking manner from the development which the theories about the state have undergone in the course of the past century.

This development shows two opposite poles. On the one hand we see the old liberal law-state, an idea from the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. In its sharpest form it is embodied in the attempt by Wilhelm von Humboldt to determine the limits for the activity of the state. On the other hand we see the modern political theories of fascism and bolshevism.

The first theory drew the boundaries for state power as narrow as possible and did not assign any competence to the state other than the maintenance of order and safety in the protection of the life and property of its subjects.

The second—fascism and bolshevism—have realized a picture of the state before our very eyes in which the state, like the legendary Leviathan, has drawn all the vital juices of a free society towards itself and recognizes no independent right for any other area of life besides itself.

Unquestionably the center of gravity of the growing interference of the {115} state is located in its involvement in economic life.

The state has established absolute supremacy in the processes of production, distribution, and consumption of economic goods. In doing so, a political ideal is embodied that stands in the most stringent opposition possible to the old liberal idea of the *law-state*. This is the ideal of the modern *welfare state*.

It is thought that one can make the evolution from the law-state—in the sense of abstinence from interference with economic life—into the modern welfare state—in the sense of absorbing economic life—plausible as the consequence of historical necessity.

The French Revolution was borne of an individualistic philosophy. It untied all bonds that restricted the free play of the social forces in enterprise. It swept away the long-outdated remnants of the guild system and introduced the period of free competition. Individual self-interest was the sole guide in which entrepreneur and employee freely entered into a contract under the fiction of equality before the law. The stronger could thus suppress the weaker and exploit him under protection of the authority of the state.

Government abstained from economic life. It viewed labor and capital as individual parties that could enter into joint contracts, formally as equals. In the final analysis the task of government could only entail enforcement of what these parties had agreed upon in complete individualistic freedom. This was a law-state, indeed, but a law-state which applied a purely formal yardstick of law in economic matters. In the name of the law it sanctioned what the economically strongest party dictated to the economically weakest in the form of the contract.

The state could not maintain this policy of abstinence, of “laissez-faire, laissez-aller,” in the face of the immense development of the economy without imperiling to the utmost the conditions for the survival of the state itself.

The system of unfettered competition leads to ever more serious economic crises that ravage all of society like an illness and cause unemployment and impoverishment. And it hits the state indirectly in its position of financial and military power. Already for this reason the state could never maintain the role of a passive onlooker where it concerns the economy. To this must be added the growing power of the

workers, who began to have a militant organization at their disposal in their labor unions after the abolition of the law against organizing. As it turned out, this organization often turned out to be a power, on a par with the organization of capital in the {116} struggle for better labor conditions. It ended the individual freedom of contract in the area of labor relations and exerted a strong political pressure upon the state to abandon its formal juridical standpoint of abstaining from interference with the economy.

Then subsequently the second phase in the modern relation between the state and the economy is ushered in. It is the phase in which government attempts to introduce material justice in the enterprise through social legislation. This took the place of its earlier policy of sanctioning the exploitation of the weak by the strong through a purely formal maintaining of the labor contract. But again with this the process of development did not come to a halt.

The form of enterprise in the free economy underwent a fundamental change under the pressure of circumstances. The limited company more and more replaced the figure of the individual entrepreneur. The large enterprises were formed nationally and internationally in order to escape the murderous consequences of unfettered competition. They formed trusts, cartels, and corporations through which they gained a position of power that vied with that of the state. Would the state not have to try to bring those centers of power in the free economy under its supremacy in its own vital interest? Did not this entire development, in which the ownership of the means of production became more and more impersonal, point in the direction of the socialized community enterprise? Would the state, as the organization of power and the guardian of the general interest, not have to take the supreme leadership of the future process of production in its own hands? Long before the onset of the First World War, the vital interests of hygiene, the armed forces, and communications had forced the state itself, in its executive organs, to run various enterprises in a monopolistic fashion. Under a socialistic regime the city-state of Vienna in the postwar period managed to gain supremacy in sixty-six important independent economic enterprises, not counting the state enterprises which she herself runs. The question was asked whether this course of action did not have to be carried through in the entire process of production and

whether the state did not have to expand its organization of its executive with flexible organs for management in order to be able to carry out its new economic task in a proper fashion. In this way the state would in the long run gain control of pricing policy. It would be able to regulate distribution and consumption in a rational manner, and with its coercive power it would be able to bring to an end the conflicts of power between capital and labor. {117}

Through all of Europe the tendencies point in this direction of government interference in the economy. It was realized in dictatorial fashion in fascistic Italy and Bolshevik Russia. These tendencies ushered in a *third phase* in the relation between the state and the economy. It involves the direct interference in the structure of the economy itself in a gradual absorption of private initiative into the coercive activity of the state.

It need not surprise us that this course of events frightens all those who reject a complete absorption of the free social forces by the Leviathan of the state. It makes them exclaim in fear, "Show me the boundaries before which the state interference must come to a halt."

Liberalism was clearly struck a most painful blow by this course of events. Steeped in individualism, it saw its old political ideals of freedom and equality of individuals threatened by the welfare state and a power state that respected no legal boundaries. The old liberal idea of the law-state had given a firm footing. It limited the task of the state to an individualistic, albeit somewhat crude, view of law: protection of the inalienable subjective rights of the citizens to life and property. But this idea of the law-state itself had undergone a radical inner change on the basis of historical developments which had finally caused it to lose all material content. The first step was taken when justice, whose maintenance was earlier on seen as the only task of the state, was no longer taken to be the aim and purpose of the state. It was now seen as a form in which the state had to put its activity in the area of culture and welfare of the population for the sake of the security of its rights. And this activity of the state has essentially no limits. The material subjective rights to life and property were no longer the sheet-anchor of civil liberty and equality. Instead it was the formal law, and that could take on any content. The watchword of this new formal idea of the law-state was that the administration, the executive power, must be subject to

the legislature and the judiciary. Whoever saw a true protection of liberty in this, however, and a real limit to government interference, was bound to end up being fooled. Social democracy kept as steadily growing as the political power in parliaments. Under its influence, formal legislation placed itself at the service of the new ideal of the welfare state and power state, which recognized no material boundaries to government interference. The revolutions in Russia and in Italy established the dictatorship of the minority. And the law merely became the form in which the will of the dictatorial power of the executive was embodied.

On March 23rd, 1919, the socialization of industry was proclaimed in revolutionary Germany by law. It may be true that this law has never really {118} been executed. Article 156 of the constitution of Weimar continued to build upon this law as a foundation. It gave the state authority to transfer private enterprises, that were felt to be suitable for socialization, to state property. It gave the state authority to participate in the management of enterprises or conglomerates of enterprises via government of the state, provinces, or municipalities. It included authority to interfere in the regulation of prices and in stopping an enterprise from functioning. On February 4th, 1920, a law on industrial councils came into effect in which the state could brush aside the internal structure of the economy and interfere in the authority as organized in the enterprise. On April 3rd, 1926, fascistic Italy issued its Carta del Lavoro in the form of a law in which the state was given authority to set the wages for labor when all attempts at a peaceful solution to wage disputes had failed. Prior to this the state had proclaimed the entire industrial apparatus to be under its power in compulsory corporations.

In Bolshevistic Russia, all private rights to real estate were abolished forever by means of law. This put into effect the program of socialization of all means of production by the state. The third phase in the development of the idea of the law-state was the identification of justice with the will of the state. This was the case with the theory of the so-called rights sovereignty of Kelsen, who at the same time proclaimed this thesis: Every attempt to deduce a minimum or maximum in the competence of the state from its essence is fruitless. To try to

prove that an absolute limit to the expansion of the state at the expense of the individual can be found anywhere is a wasted effort.

This emasculation of the idea of the law-state has now caused the theoreticians of liberalism to take up arms. F. R. Darmstadter recently issued a remarkable book entitled, *Die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Rechtsstaates* (The Limits to the Activity of the Law-State). Once more an attempt is made here to revive the old liberal idea of the law-state under expressed reference to the idea of Wilhelm von Humboldt. Once more he tries to find the essence of justice in the limitations to the task of the state in the maintenance of natural freedom and equality *behind the purely legal freedom and equality*. This natural freedom and equality was to consist of this: no matter in what area the state may be active, it may only do so for the purpose to make a free social community of the people, as the source of all culture and prosperity, possible in mutual dependency. The modern liberal idea of the law-state was to be distinguished from the idea of the welfare state and the power state in the direction and *purpose* of the {119} task of the state, not in the *size* of its task. The state is not to bring prosperity and culture, but it is to remove the impediments to the development of these material and spiritual goods from the free society. Through its legal order it is to encourage its citizens to devote themselves ever more to a free communal life in the process of giving and receiving.

In spite of the somewhat obscure manner in which it is formulated, this neoliberal idea is not unfamiliar. It is rooted in the humanistic idea of the absolute value of the free, autonomous personality. In this trend of thought society is nothing but the exchange between these free and equal individuals. By imprinting a humanistic stamp on public education, the state was to fan the true community spirit and foster a mentality which does not see man as a dependent part of the state organism that encompasses all areas of life. Instead, this mentality is to see man as a free “autonomous” being, and the activity of the state itself is only the means for the enfolding of the individual.

The neoliberal concept of the law-state has not arisen from the Christian religious root of the absolute sovereignty of God but from the humanistic ideal of personality. History has issued its judgement against this theory. Liberalism has never been more impotent than today. The fascistic ideal of the rational corporative power state, nur-

tured by the ancient Roman tradition, and the idea of the dictatorship of the vanguard of the proletariat, kindled the flame of enthusiasm in millions of hearts. In contrast, the neoliberal slogan of the humanitarian community of man in which the value of the autonomous, free personality is nurtured as a religious ideal, has had its day. It sounds like the language of the wrinkled old-timer who no longer understands this period of the times and with a shaking head revels in his memories of the past.

The struggle against the modern state Leviathan can only be carried on if we stand on the unshakable foundation of the Christian view of life and the cosmos, of which the recognition of God's sovereignty is the alpha and the omega. But in order to do this we must take the consequences of this view on life and the cosmos very seriously. We must not impair the power of the Christian religion again through a compromise with the spirit of humanism. I wish to show you the significance of the Christian view on life and cosmos as the purest application of the basic Christian idea and its consequences for our view concerning the boundaries of state interference in the area of the enterprise.

In order to do so, I have to formulate the problem more sharply for you. We must see the question concerning the limits to the task of {120} government as a *question of right* in the full sense of the word. We cannot take it as a question of what is politically desirable. This is the question: Can the state establish the boundaries of its own competence in a manner that is binding? Or conversely, is the state bound by material juridical boundaries in its competence because of its own internal structure as founded in divine ordinance? In the latter case transgression of such boundaries would end the juridical duties to obey. In the first instance the powerful will of the state decides whether it has the right to violate the inner sovereignty of the area of economics and to destroy it. In that case there are indeed no fundamental limitations to state interference. State power simply decides, or rather the powerful will of any political current which has managed to become master of the power organization of the state. As it is expressed in the idea of the formal law-state: the law is and remains the ultimate source of validity for all positive law. There is no area of law independent of the state.

Such is the dominant positivistic view of justice. It has undermined the divine foundations of justice, and, in order to gloss this over, it is

willing to speak of a higher, ideal justice, besides positive law that depends strictly upon the arbitrariness of the state. But this ideal justice has no real validity, and the state legislator is only bound by it in his conscience. When asked on what basis its theory concerning the formal omnipotence of the legislator rests, this view turns out to have no juridical foundation for its theory. And indeed, the law itself can hardly be the legal basis for its own juridical omnipotence.

The positivistic theory concerning the juridical omnipotence of the state legislator does indeed not rest upon positive law. Much rather, it is founded in a subjective, deeply un-Christian political philosophy, commonly called the theory of the unlimited sovereignty of the state. This theory concerning the doctrine of justice is nourished equally from two directions. One source is rationalistic individualism, that construed the state from a contract, made by all individuals who thereby transferred all their natural power and freedom to the state with the exception of a few natural and unalienable basic rights. This theory sees the state fundamentally as the only absolute and sovereign legal community. The state only deals with individuals who themselves by contract have empowered the state legislature to give shape to all right. It was the idea of the state of the French Revolution which even subjected the church to the state. This idea also worked its way into the liberal theory of the state in the previous century.

On the other side we have the doctrine of unlimited state sovereignty as {121} embodied in the doctrine of the juridical omnipotence of the law, nurtured by the philosophy of Hegel. While it is true that it did not construct the state out of the individual, it saw the state as the all-encompassing and therefore absolutely sovereign organic bond, of which all other bonds, such as family, the association, the church, and the enterprise, were merely organic parts.

This political philosophy infected German political science with its idolatry of the state. It is also the foundation for the modern, fascistic idea of the state, the idea of the *stato corporativo* as elaborated in the writings of Giovanni Gentile, Rocco et al., and has been realized in the fascistic corporate state. The political idea of the law-state could obviously no longer be a serious adversary for this theory of the juridical omnipotence of the state, which was also confessed by liberalism. It adapted itself to the theory of state sovereignty, and, as a purely politi-

cal confession of neoliberalism, it was a harmless armchair ideal that had lost its grip on reality.

The Christian view of the world, on the other hand, possesses a fundamental doctrine that is deadly serious when dealing with the limits of state competence. And it strikes at the heart of the modern idea of the power state by attacking it on juridical grounds. The doctrine of the formal juridical omnipotence of the will of the state collapses like a house of cards when confronted with the Christian theory of justice and the state. The catchword of sphere sovereignty or internal sovereignty has taken on wings through the mighty influence of Dr. A. Kuyper. Today even the liberal likes to use it in order to give a striking expression to his political views. However, this internal sovereignty in its real meaning is fundamental for the entire Christian view of life and the cosmos. It is not a more or less vague political ideal that anyone can adhere to who does not wish to sacrifice individual freedom entirely to state absolutism. It is an organic religious doctrine that is carried through in the entire order of creation and is founded in the deeply religious confession of the absolute sovereignty of God as Creator.

Only he who does not seek the absolute within but above this world can accept internal sovereignty as the basic law for the entire temporal, perishable, order of creation. If we wish to establish boundaries for the competence of the state with its interference in the activities of economic life in the context of God's unbreakable ordinance, we must give an account of the structure of the state and the structure of enterprise in our temporal world order. And what is that temporal world order in which the state and enterprise each possess their own structure, bound by fixed laws? {122} All perishable things and we ourselves in our perishable side are fitted into temporal reality, which shows an immense diversity of aspects or functions. They, in turn, each possess their own sphere of divine ordinances. The fullness of temporal reality has a numerical function, a spatial function, a mechanical function, an organic, or biotic function, a psychic, a logical, an historical function, a linguistic function, a social function of human intercourse, an economic function, an aesthetic function, a juridical function, a moral function, and a function of faith. Each of these functions or aspects of full organic reality has its own divine meaning and is fitted into its own sphere of ordinances or laws, in a law sphere of its own.

In this temporal world order there are as many law spheres as reality has aspects of meaning. But how must we see the relation between all these law spheres? Scripture teaches us in this respect.

This entire temporal world has its supra-temporal unity in the imperishable religious root of the human race, in its submission to the law of God in its eternal, imperishable meaning: the service of God. And all law spheres find their deeper unity in this imperishable, supra-temporal religious root of creation. Just as sunlight is broken up by the prism into the seven colors of the rainbow, the absolute religious meaning is broken through the prism of time into a multitude of functions of meaning, each of which is located in its own law sphere. Just as none of the colors is the same as the unbroken light, and just as all the colors of the rainbow reflect the relation to all the other colors, each law sphere reflects its own meaning in the organism of the law spheres.

Temporal reality, in this fashion ordered within an organism of functions, is given to us in the structure of individual things. There are natural and spiritual things. A tree is a natural thing. A state, a church, an enterprise, are spiritual things.

The structure of a natural thing teaches many things about the structure of spiritual relationships. The tree as a natural thing is a complex of real functions. It has a numerical aspect, a spatial aspect, etc. The leading function of the tree is the organic, the vital function. This function leads the numerical, the spatial, and the kinetic function of the tree while strictly maintaining sphere sovereignty. The leading function of the tree limits its activity in the world order. Now what can we say about the structure of the state and the enterprise? Both depend upon historical development in origin and evolution. They are not permanent like the structures of the family and kinship. In primitive times the large communities of family and tribe fulfilled all of the functions of human social life. We can only begin to {123} speak of a state when a power is organized within a certain territory over subjects into an encompassing relationship of justice. The juridical function is tied to an historical function of power with a special character.

The juridical leading function of the state is a civil-juridical function of government which controls the sword of retribution. It does so primarily for maintaining government authority over the subjects in order to keep intact the internal organization of the state whose main charac-

teristic is that of public justice and is founded upon historical development.

In its internal structure the state has other functions as well, including the economical function. But all these other functions exist under the leadership of that government function of public justice. As soon as another function, let us say the economical or the moral function, would take over the leadership in the activity of the state, the structure of the state would be broken. For this reason we need not be surprised that Marx and Lenin, who initially wished to use the state in order to bring property and management of the means of production under the control of society by force, no longer have room for the state after this aim has been accomplished. As Marx already taught, the state will wither away. The management of things will replace government of persons.

Let us now turn to the structure of the enterprise. Human relations in the enterprise as a special organization in economic life has a variable foundation in historical development. During the period of primitive *Hauswirtschaft*⁹ (home industry), the natural relationship in the home also fulfills the economic function for satisfying the needs with the least possible sacrifice. The relationship of the enterprise is only born when capital gains a powerful position of its own, during historical development, and when economic life begins to organize itself independently.

The organization of an enterprise is as much an internal unit as the state. It is a true community with authority and subordination, albeit not of the same kind as those in the case of government authority and its subjects.

Just as the state, the entrepreneurial organization has its internal juridical function. In this case, however, it is tied to the *economic leading function*. This reveals itself already in the structure of the authority in the enterprise. By virtue of the internal structure of the enterprise, its juridical authority rests with those natural persons or juridical persons who bear the risk of enterprise and possess its means of production. This holds equally for a capitalistic and a communal business. The business organization can no more arbitrarily alter its structure than the organization of the state assume the character of the state, a philanthropic association, or a church {124} organization. Its leading func-

tion restricts and directs its activity. Internal corporate law is tied to the economic destination of the enterprise and has its source of validity, which is sovereign within its own sphere in the structure of the enterprise itself. Internal corporate law derives its juridical validity as little from state law as does internal church law and internal family law. The limits of competence for the state are determined by its own internal structure as well as by the structure of the other, non-state organizations.

Government arbitrariness is embodied in the form of law in the German law concerning industrial councils, which violates the internal structure of authority in the business corporation. It follows from the foregoing that such government arbitrariness is of no value whatsoever. In addition, it has never reached practical application. Conditions can be such in an economic enterprise that representatives of labor are given codetermination. But the source for validity of this delegated authority can never be located in a state law, but only in the internal law of the enterprise itself. There is another point of current interest also in our country since the law of December 24th, 1927, has declared collective labor agreements binding. It concerns the relation between collective labor agreements as an internal law of industry and government which declares it binding. From the standpoint that I defend, it follows that declaring it binding is subject to the collective agreement, and not the other way around. Consequently, it can no longer have any validity when the internal organs of industry themselves change internal industrial law (see Dr. Meissinger and partly Oertmann).

The highest authority in an industrial organization does not only have the right but also the duty to maintain the sphere sovereignty of the internal industrial order against unlawful state interference. This follows from the fact that the internal authority of an enterprise is based on direct divine delegation as much as the internal authority of the state. The state can never use coercion in the internal authority of the enterprise as its subject in the manner it can force its subjects into military service or to pay taxes. As long as the state does not expropriate, as is done in revolutionary Russia, and in that way incorporate the enterprise into the state, the internal authority of the enterprise retains the right of passive resistance against every attempt on the part of the state to brush aside the divine ordinance for the structure of industrial

relations. Undoubtedly you will ask me: "Is this not preaching revolution?" My reply is: "In no way." The principle of revolution finds its origin in the satanic revolt against the divine ordinances. Revolutionary is that government representative who violates those ordinances. {125} Revolutionary is the theory of the juridical omnipotence of the will of the state since it assigns a power to the state which only belongs to the Lord. Does not the church, which clings to the ordinances of God's word in its church order, take the same position against transgression of the competence of the state? Or does the Christian family head view parental authority as delegated by the state? Let us remember that the so-called formal-juridical doctrine concerning the omnipotence of the legislator is not based upon positive law, but upon a nonbinding revolutionary theory and is nothing but a mask of the principle of the revolution. Let us remember that God has only given a peculiar authority to state government just as He has placed an independent authority in every human organization.

If the internal structure of the enterprise is sovereign within its own sphere vis-a-vis the state, that sovereignty ceases to exist outside of its internal boundaries. In a certain respect the business enterprise, as much as the church organization and all other non-state associations, is the subject of state government. The relationship in an enterprise is *human* relationship, and the state does no more to absorb all of man than the enterprise or the church. The state is the all-encompassing community of *justice* for all particular associations, and it has received the task from God to guide the internal structure of the juridical community in all its functions through justice. This does not mean that the state may wipe out the structural differences between the organizations and interfere with their internal juridical structures. Instead, it means that the state must see to it that the economic sphere does not smother and absorb man as a juridical subject. In the days when the Manchester school issued its pernicious slogan of "laissez-faire, laissez-aller," the state abstained from any interference with economic life. The laborers as much as the employers were viewed as "homo economicus," as people who were altogether absorbed in the economic function. When the state acted through its social legislation, it did not interfere with the internal rights of the enterprise but operated in the area where the

enterprise itself is its subject. It maintained the material balance of rights between members of the same state organization.

The state also does not transgress the boundaries of state activity when it tries to guide in the direction of justice through measures such as the protection of industries in distress, the execution of public works, or the regulation of emigration. The state does not transgress the boundaries of its competence when it exploits an enterprise that is vital for the entire internal organization of the state. In that case the state operates on economic territory in its economic functions, but it lets its economic activity {126} be guided by its juridical task in the area of the internal structure of the state. But a juridical basis for such public enterprise must always be present, which is different in the case of private enterprise.

When the state moves into the area of economic enterprise without such a juridical basis it abandons its structure as a state and operates as an ordinary private entrepreneur side by side with others.

One can strongly denounce such activity of the state from a political point of view, but the juridical question only enters the stage when, as happened in Russia, the state begins to operate in the area of economics without a juridical basis and not as an ordinary private enterprise but in its internal structure as a government institution. In this case it abuses its position of government in order to subjugate or exterminate the enterprise of private life.

It is a separate question whether the state has the factual power for this. The example of the altruistic policy of reform in the first years of the republic of labor councils shows how little power bayonets have in forcing economic life to conform to a revolutionary theory. But under no circumstances can we assign compelling power of justice to revolutionary rules that try to push through such a forced socialization. Private enterprise can indeed be murdered just as a human foot can trample a living plant. But to create a right for the state outside of the boundaries set to the state by the Divine Sovereign in His ordinances, escapes the power of the state.

The historical development of the area of enterprise clearly points in the direction of increasing organization and socialization of the position of the enterprise and capital. The state can guide this development

through its government function in the area of civil law, but it cannot rule it as an economic despot.

Economic life follows its own divine ordinances and never lets itself be put into a mold through the power of a decree of the state legislator.

In modern times, we must carry on a struggle against erasing the boundaries between the structure of the state and the economic structure of the enterprise. But this struggle would have no value if its deepest motive were the greed of a private profit-maker. Nor would it have value for the Christian if its deepest mainspring was the liberal slogan of the sovereignty of the free personality. {127}

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION OF TYPEFACES

*James Griffith,
Martin G. Selbrede, Joe Taylor*

Property: The exclusive right of possessing, enjoying and disposing of a thing; ownership. In the beginning of the world, the Creator gave to man dominion over the earth, over the fish of the sea and the fowls of the air; and over every living thing. This is the foundation of man's property in the earth and in all its productions.... The labor of inventing, making or producing any thing constitutes one of the highest and most indefeasible titles to *property*.—Noah Webster, *An American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828)

Thou shalt not steal.—Ex. 20:15

“Framing mischief by a law” (Ps. 94:20), as Otto Scott notes, is among the most aggravated tactics humanism employs in its defiance of the Almighty. The state, as our new god, institutionalizes injustice in order to make the hard and narrow road easier to travel, providing its citizens with a wider, straighter road. (This concept informs the warning of Revelation 22:18–19 against tampering with Scripture, precisely because man's purpose in doing so could only be to make the narrow road a wide one.) The messianic state insists that its law is the only law; in its view, the *law of the land* rightly supplants the unrealistic strictures of the Decalogue. In other words, the state interposes its sovereignty between the people and the Creator and true Law-Giver.

God has raised up the Church's prophetic voice to speak to these issues, to expose the wickedness and corruption of the age. The authors of this essay stand agreed that there is a clearly defined area in which the Church can quickly and easily direct a fatal blow against institutionalized injustice, in the area of copyright eligibility standards. (We hasten to add that this issue, of necessity, is of secondary importance compared to the Church's first priority: to stop the slaughter of the unborn. Nonetheless, the solution we propose for resolving the copy-

right dilemma is simple enough that it will {129} not divert time or resources away from the abortion battle.)

The Problem Illustrated by Parable

Mr. Smith, an American graphic artist, designs a new typeface, a project that has taken nine months of his labor. It is a handsome typeface, similar to the one you are now reading. Mr. Smith attempts to market the typeface to the typesetting community, selling it to typesetters for \$100 per *font* (technical term for the full complement of letters, numbers, accents, and punctuation in a typeface). But Mr. Jones, a shrewd American businessman, takes note of Mr. Smith's successful design, buys the typeface for \$100, and makes photographic copies of it at \$6 per copy. Mr. Jones then sells his copies of Mr. Smith's typeface on the market at \$50, and these counterfeits compete with the genuine typeface on the open market. Since the counterfeits are half the price of the original, yet indistinguishable from the genuine article, they sell like hotcakes. Mr. Smith feels his property rights have been violated; his design was stolen, and his originals cannot compete in price against the cheaper copies. Mr. Smith receives very little American money for his nine months of work, and goes broke. Mr. Jones, on the other hand, can now afford a fleet of American Cadillacs.

Mr. Smith decides to go to court. Imagine his surprise when he is thrown out on his American ear. The United States does not recognize typefaces as property, and neither the Copyright Office nor the Patent Office will lift a finger to protect Mr. Smith's rights—since he has no rights. By articulating this opinion, the American justice system has clearly stated that it is actually *Mr. Jones, the thief*, who had every right to duplicate and counterfeit Mr. Smith's design. Thus, Mr. Jones's right to steal is accorded official sanction by the United States of America.

The Parable Expanded

The theft of typefaces is a *multimillion dollar industry*. Mergenthaler Linotype Company (Melville, New York), owing to its ownership of several famous type foundries, is perhaps the most victimized of the many companies that produce type. Mergenthaler is the victim of continuous large-scale theft, yet the company refuses to return evil for evil,

and will not steal the typefaces of its competitors. Its competitors, on the other hand, have felt no ethical compulsion against ransacking the Mergenthaler type library for successful designs, since the law of the land plainly asserts that in so doing, they are innocent of any wrongdoing. To keep this blessed state of affairs secure, expert witnesses and attorneys are on tap whenever the {130} victims of such theft succeed in bringing the case to court. In such an event, the legal resources of the thieves ensure favorable verdicts that keep the industry rolling in more stolen typefaces.

Christians must take two crucial steps to dislodge the institutionalized theft from our American system: (1) voluntarily comply with biblical law and stop dealing and trafficking in stolen goods, and (2) work towards legislation that recognizes the property rights of type designers. We shall discuss these two steps in reverse order.

Property Rights

The primary reason the fictional Mr. Jones could steal Mr. Smith's design was because the government does not regard Mr. Smith's design as property. If the item stolen by Mr. Jones is not property, then no crime has been committed: case dismissed. In other words, the definition of property operative in our American system of justice is inadequate. The crime of theft is defined in terms of property, and property is defined humanistically. It is noteworthy that the Bible takes the exact opposite approach: *property* is defined by the concept of *theft*: if a thing can be stolen, *it is property*. We thus would say that "Thou shalt not steal" defines property *negatively*. This all-embracing definition is excellent because the commandment is given in a judicial, or forensic, context, precisely the sense required in our present legal dilemma.

It is clear that such an all-embracing definition of property is implied (if not actually stated explicitly) by Noah Webster in the quotation from his 1828 dictionary that opened this article. By teaching that "the labor of inventing, making or producing any thing constitutes one of the highest and most indefeasible titles to property," Webster made it possible to render justice fully in terms of God's commandment. That such was Webster's intention is clear from his preceding context, which defines the concept of property *theologically*. The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; this is the biblical foundation for the property

rights of man, who is given *stewardship* and *dominion* over the Lord's earth. We suspect that the gradual draining of theological content from subsequent American dictionaries paved the road to disaster, since the word *property*, as bandied about by attorneys in our courts, has virtually lost all meaning.

[Note: While Webster indicates that any product of labor constitutes property, this does not support the so-called “labor theory of value,” last espoused by Karl Marx. The value of a typeface is determined by the marketplace; if Mr. Smith's face had been ugly or useless, his nine months spent {131} designing it will have been wasted, which is the risk inherent in all entrepreneurship. But his design should have the opportunity to compete on its own merit without fear of theft. It is bad enough that “moth and rust destroy” (Matt. 6:19) without having the federal government subsidize and become partners in the ransacking of the individual designer—after all, the government does profit from typeface theft, since the revenues the thieves bring in are taxed and brought into the state's storehouses.]

Christians must therefore take this issue to court. Similarly, write a letter to Congress. Congressman Paul Kastenmeir is chairman of the House of Representatives committee dealing with copyright law—address your letters to him.

Yet, it might possibly take years before such efforts bear fruit. There is an easier, more direct way for Christians to make a big difference *right now*.

Voluntary Compliance with God's Commandment

Christian, have nothing to do with stolen goods! Do not buy them, do not use them, do not traffic in them. If Christians, who represent one-fourth of the population of our country, refuse to deal in stolen typefaces, the companies that traffic in stolen typefaces will take immediate notice: theft will become extremely unprofitable. It is not wrong to boycott stolen goods! Typeface manufacturers who engage in theft will either collapse (if they refuse to repent), or will put their business on a more biblical footing as a concession to the Christians who spoke out with their pocketbooks. The industry as it presently stands cannot tolerate a 25 percent drop in business: you can see how potent the Church can be, simply through obedience to God's law.

How can a Christian detect a stolen typeface? If a Christian plans to purchase some typesetting, he should ask his vendor to produce the font. The *names* of many typefaces are trademarked; therefore, a counterfeit typeface has an *alternate name*. For example, Helvetica™ is a trademark of Mergenthaler, but the copies are given a wide variety of other names. Don't take the vendor's word for it that you are buying true Helvetica. Insist on seeing the actual typeface (which could be in the form of a fontstrip, or an appropriately labeled floppy disk for the newer digital typefaces). If the vendor uses Mergenthaler equipment, at least at this date (May 11, 1983), the typefaces used are genuine and properly licensed. If other equipment is in use, inspection is warranted.

What are your options if your vendor's version of the typeface you want is stolen? You can select another typeface (many thousands are in the public {132} domain), or seek another vendor.

Vendors will do well to put pressure on their font suppliers to "go straight" so that they won't end up in bankruptcy court. Such pressure will quickly force all the companies involved in typeface copying to voluntarily comply with God's law, just as Mergenthaler has opted to do. The reinstilling of godly justice and righteousness in our land is within the grasp of our Church, and it is clear that this issue is no minor matter (remember, the profitability of theft in the type industry runs well into the millions of dollars). It is altogether certain that Christians can turn the world upside down, simply by obeying the commandment of God. The authors of this essay have provided the vision; God's people are called to obey. "Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve." May it one day be said of each one of us, as it was written of King Josiah, that we "did that which was right *in the sight of the Lord*" (2 Chron. 34:2).

Christians: The Significant Minority

In the preceding *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Otto Scott reported some rather impressive publication figures for Christian books (cf. his article, "Christian Literature in Modern America," 289–91). As always, the Bible sells in enormous quantities. According to Otto Scott, "...Year after year, the Bible outsells all the 'best-sellers' listed since the practice was started in 1895." Clearly, a Bible represents a sizeable amount of typesetting. We hope no Bibles are being typeset

using stolen typefaces, but the publishers would do well to verify this fact. Some Bible publishers (e.g., Nelson) are starting to take a close hard look at the fact that their Bibles are being printed on the same presses that produce *Playboy*. But these concerns are secondary compared to the overriding issue of stolen typefaces. Christian publishers should attack the important problem first (actual violation of the eighth commandment) before addressing secondary issues, some of which may prove to be merely moralistic.

Christians, once made aware of the situation, must take action. They cannot assume that their Christianity somehow will “sanctify” a book printed in a stolen typeface. But obedience to the eighth commandment embraces far more than just typefaces: sadly, Christians, as a class, are probably more guilty of copyright infringement than any other sector of our society. Churches continually photocopy music and other copyrighted material “to save the Lord’s money,” which is theft in the name of God. Is it any wonder the name of Christ is blasphemed among the Gentiles? (Rare is the church that restricts photocopying for the sake of conformity to {133} biblical law. Thousand Oaks Baptist Church, California, refuses to photocopy any copyrighted music or literature, preferring to purchase extra copies as needed. Mr. Brock, principal, states the case quite clearly: “God prefers obedience.” Ironically, it appears that the richest churches, those with money to spare, are most deeply involved in the illegal photocopying of copyrighted material.)

Hence, Christians must take the beam out of their own eye (where applicable) before attempting to reconstruct society at large. Nonetheless, the potential for a tremendous Christian victory is in reach. With such a victory under our belt, God’s Church will be encouraged to conquer in other areas, including the battles against abortion, unjust American currency, etc., “taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ” (2 Cor. 10:5). {134}

3.
CONTEMPORARY
THEOLOGICAL TRENDS

RECENT FRENCH ROMAN CATHOLIC THINKING ON THE PRESENT STATE OF SCIENCE

The Contribution of R-L. Bruckberger and Father Georges De Nantes

Jean-Marc Berthoud
Lausanne, Switzerland

Many have been the French thinkers who have given their attention to the problem of the significance of modern scientific enterprise. Blaise Pascal, Claude Bernard, Louis de Broglie, Alexandre Koyre, to name but a few. Our own time has not been lacking in efforts in this direction. The French contribution from a Protestant perspective has been far from insignificant. The political scientist Jacques Ellul,⁸¹ the historian Pierre Chaunu,⁸² the philosopher Jean Brun,⁸³ and especially the reformed theologian Pierre-Charles Marcel,⁸⁴ have all furnished important contributions in this field of Christian philosophy, but, in this paper I wish to draw your attention to another field of French Christian thinking from which I think we have much to learn: that of traditionalist Thomist Roman Catholics. Earlier in this century this school produced some very remarkable thinkers in the field of Christian philosophy of science. Amongst them we must name the epistemological writings of Jacques Maritain,⁸⁵ Etienne Gilson,⁸⁶ the

81. Jacques Ellul, *La Technique ou l'enjeu du siecle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1954); *Le Systeme Technicien* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1977).

82. Pierre Chaunu, *Historie et foi: Deux Mille ans de Plaidoyer pour la foi* (Paris: France-Empire, 1980).

83. Jean Brun, *Les conquêtes de l'homme et la séparation ontologique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961); *Le retour de Dionysos* (Paris: Desclée et Cie, 1969).

84. Pierre-Charles Marcel, "Calvin et Copernic: La légende ou les faits? La science et l'astronomie chez Calvin," *La Revue Réformée* (Saint-Germain-en-Laye) no. 121 (1980).

Belgian philosopher Marcel de Corte,⁸⁷ and, last but not least, Louis Jugnet (1913–1973),⁸⁸ the little-known professor of philosophy at Toulouse, but without doubt, one of the most balanced, informed, and thorough thinkers of our time. All these were laymen and professional philosophers, and much profit could no doubt be drawn from a critical examination of their contribution on this question. For those of you who read French, I can strongly recommend Maritain's earlier epistemological writings, his delightful and devastating contemporary examination of the philosophical implications of Einstein's theories, or his fascinating study of the spiritual, and even demonic, background to Descartes's universal mathematization of God's diverse and so rich creation. In his later years Gilson abandoned his field of predilection, medieval philosophy, to examine philosophical questions related to linguistics, biology, education, and mass culture. Marcel de Corte, throughout {135} his long career, paid particular attention to the significance of the disintegration of modern thought and in particular to the catastrophic consequences of the imperialism of the mathematical sciences on metaphysics. Finally, Louis Jugnet was particularly attentive as to the mutual relations between philosophy and the sciences. It would be of great interest to follow up a suggestion made by Pierre Courthial, in a review article on a book dealing with the intellectual and spiritual implications of the introduction of the new maths in French Schools,⁸⁹ as to the resemblances and differences between the

85. Jacques Maritain, *Distinguer pour unir ou Les degrés du savoir* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952); *Le songe de Descartes* (Paris: Buchet Castel, n.d.); "De la métaphysique des physiciens ou de la simultanéité selon Einstein," *Reflexions sur l'intelligence* (Paris, 1924).

86. Etienne Gilson, *Christianisme et philosophie* (Paris: Vrin, [1949] 1981); *Linguistique et philosophie* (Paris: Vrin, 1969); *D'Aristotle à Darwin et retour* (Paris: Vrin, 1969); *La société de masse et sa culture* (Paris: Vrin, 1967); *Pour un ordre catholique* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1934).

87. Marcel de Corte, *L'intelligence en péril de mort* (Paris: Club de la culture française, 1969); *Essai sur la fin d'une civilisation* (Paris: Librairie de Médicis, 1949); *Incarnation de l'homme* (Paris: Librairie de Médicis, 1942).

88. Louis Jugnet, *Problèmes et grands courants de la philosophie* Diffusion de la Pensée Française, F. 86190 (Vouille, 1974). Cahiers, *Tomes I à VI, D.P.* (Vouillé, 1975–1981).

philosophy of Herman Dooyeweerd and his school and this important contemporary Thomist tradition. The following brief quotation from Louis Jugnet could be a clear indication in this direction:

Human knowledge has as its foundation our common fundamental experience, dividing, interpreting, and sometimes—particularly on the scientific level—correcting it. But there are various ways of interesting oneself in the world around us. There are different methods of approach, depending on whether one considers the universe from the point of view of various disciplines, philosophy or science, art, politics, or religion. Each of these has its own methods of investigation, its particular centers of preoccupation, and its style of thought. This plurality implies a complementarity, allowing for the freedom of expression of each discipline and the refusal of the dictatorial tyranny of one mode of apprehension of reality over another. A very serious source of error consists in placing our entire intellectual confidence in a single discipline and in eliminating or diminishing the importance of others.⁹⁰

But in this paper I would like briefly to draw your attention to some recent work in the important field of relations between science, philosophy, and Christian Orthodox theology, undertaken by two very remarkable French Roman Catholic theologians, R.P. R-L. Bruckberger and Father Georges de Nantes.

*R-L. Bruckberger*⁹¹

Of Austrian origin, R-L. Bruckberger, a Dominican priest, has been, since before the Second World War, prominent as an outspoken apologist of the Christian faith in France. In a period where many are tempted by the siren song of modernism, he has been a clear defender of the Scriptures. He is a personal friend of Catholic novelist and polemicist Georges Bernanos, whose influence on his thinking has been important, and a follower and friend of Jacques Maritain, and much indebted to the philosopher {136} Etienne Gilson. He worked closely with Maritain before the war as secretary of the *Revue Thomiste*

89. Article in *Tant Qu'il Fait Jour* on the special number of the very important Roman Catholic monthly, *Itinéraires*, 4, rue Garancière, F. 75006, Paris. Pierre Courthal is dean of the Free Reformed Faculty of Theology in Aix-en-Provence in France.

90. Jugnet, *Problèmes et grands courants de la philosophie*, 23.

directed by Maritain, but was little influenced by Maritain's personalist humanism which has had such an important (and disastrous) influence on the thinking of the Catholic Church since Vatican II. The Bible has had a profound influence on his thinking, without his identifying the Scriptures with the poisons of critical misinterpretation as has unfortunately been the case with so much of the contemporary Catholic biblical revival. To enter without further delay into the heart of our subject let me quote a brief commentary by Bruckberger on the refusal by our Lord to accomplish a miracle for the satisfaction of the Pharisees.

How does our modern intelligence react to the miracles in the Gospels?—Either these miracles are true: then they represent a means of intimidation, a way of forcing our agreement, quite unworthy of what Christ pretends to be, and even more unworthy of such beings as ourselves and of our spiritual autonomy. Why should Christ want to force our hand—Or these miracles of the Gospels are simply not true, and Christ had some conjuring tricks and the accounts which concern him are just idle tales, and the Christ is one more fraud.

But this is not the last word as to our more than reticent, indeed hostile, attitude to the miracles in the Gospels. Our attitude comes to this: modern men that we are, we believe in miracles. In fact we believe in nothing else. But we believe that we alone are capable of accomplishing miracles, and anyhow the miracles of the Gospels are laughable if we compare them with the miracles accomplished every day by our Science and our Technology.

We heal the sick, we restore sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, a voice to the dumb, we deliver the insane of their inner demons. Our

91. Born in 1907, R-L. Bruckberger is author of the following works which deal in one way or another with the subject under consideration. *Tu finiras sur l'échafaud* (Flammarion, 1978), his autobiography; *Lettre ouverte à Jésus-christ* (Albin Michel, 1973); *L'âne et le boeuf* (Plon, 1976); *L'histoire de Jésus-Christ* (Grasset, 1965), a confrontation of the Gospels with modern thought and civilization; and *L'Évangile* (Albin Michel, 1976), a wonderful translation of the Gospels by one of the great masters of French prose. This is perhaps Bruckberger's most important book. The text of the Gospels is accompanied by a commentary: astonishing demolition of the idols of our time. Bruckberger was a student of the great biblical scholar, R.P. M-J. Lagrange of the Bible School of Jerusalem. See also *Ce que je crois* (Grasset, 1981), a confrontation of modern apostasy with the God of creation and revelation. Bruckberger is also a filmmaker.

aesthetic surgeons give hags the face of a madonna. Our cosmonauts travel amongst the stars, we visit the depths of the ocean, we extract from the depths of the earth its treasures, we believe we are on the verge of solving the mystery of life, we force death to recede....

And if, as tradition maintains, the miracles of Christ and of his dominion over nature are but evident signs of his divinity? Miracles, proof of divinity?—What next? Well, cheers! Man is god!

That is how the argument of the old apologetics is turned inside out like a glove in our favour. Inside out this glove fits us very well: we cannot stop admiring our hands and the work of our hands. How can you imagine that the miracles of Christ can still impress us? We can do so much better than him!⁹²

Here we see {37} how, from a close examination of modern man's attitude to science and technology, we rejoin the teachings of biblical prophecy. Is this incredible power, unleashed on this earth by our knowledge of nature's secrets, really a creational power? Was it in fact included in the creation mandate? Or has man somehow gone beyond the limits of God's order for his dominion of Creation and fallen prey to the lures of Satan? Would the legend of Marlowe's Faust have more truth than our efforts to justify the tremendous growth of human power as being the result of a Christian demythologizing of the natural realm? And the miracles of Antichrist, are they simply of a spiritual nature, or do Satan's "miracles, signs, and wonders" (2 Thess. 2:9), and the miraculous signs of the beast in Revelation 13, have something to do with the wonders of our profane technology? Such are the questions which Bruckberger's brief remarks leave in our minds. But it is not my purpose here to advance on such a dangerous and controversial terrain. It is not my intention to be hoisted on my own petard!

I would like, first, to examine with you the opening chapter of one of his most recent books, *Ce que je crois* ([Grasset, 1981]; 288pp.). In this confession of faith, Bruckberger, in my opinion, rightly begins with an examination of the fundamental modern problem of the revelation of God by His Creation, the creature manifesting the glory of its Creator. It is an astonishing characteristic of our scientifically oriented culture that our cultural contemporaries have an immense difficulty in understanding the simple argument that the existence of the creature implies

92. Bruckberger, *L'Evangile*, 117–18.

a Creator. This is particular to our modern civilization. The problem of the so-called underdeveloped societies is that of special revelation. We are faced with a blindness peculiar to our technologically developed culture as to the general revelation of God. In his first chapter, “L’univers et son sens” (The Universe and Its Meaning), Bruckberger begins with an examination of the relation between the natural order and God. He asks himself: what is the cause of this apparently unbridgeable chasm which separates science on the one hand and metaphysics and religion on the other? He writes:

Is it indeed not strange that scientists should have such a panic-stricken fear of metaphysics and theology? They do not have the slightest curiosity with regard to these disciplines. They seem to take it for granted that all metaphysical and theological discourse can only be incoherent and is, for them, entirely lacking in any kind of meaning. They believe—I insist *they believe*—for they have never even bothered to look into the matter, and here they {138} are singularly lacking in courage. They believe that modern scientific knowledge is totally incompatible with any kind of metaphysics or theology and with all religions.⁹³

For Bruckberger, the belief that modern scientific research constitutes an unbridgeable obstacle, cutting off men of science from the Christian faith, is one of the most tenacious prejudices of our time. He observes that in our civilization it is science which inevitably has the final say in the public intellectual debate.

In the final resort it is modern science which defines the rules of the intellectual game. Science qualifies or disqualifies the partners in the debate. To express this in unambiguous and traditional terms: modern science defines the basic orthodoxy. Outside this orthodoxy no legitimate intellectual activity can exist and anyone who ignores this consensus is disqualified from the start.⁹⁴

In any kind of investigation clear criteria are absolutely essential. How are these criteria to be defined? One of the interesting—if debatable—points in Bruckberger’s apologetic is that, in accordance with classical Thomism, he begins by accepting the legitimacy of science’s

93. Bruckberger, *Ce que je crois*, 18.

94. *Ibid.*, 20–21.

own criteria. He sees these criteria as defined by the nineteenth-century French anatomist, Claude Bernard.⁹⁵

How is one to define these criteria, this fundamental orthodoxy which sets the limits to the exercise of modern science? In two words it is to be found in the *sovereignty* of experience, in the sense given to the expression by Claude Bernard: an artificially provoked observation whose aim is to produce a thought, or to bring together ideas sometimes far removed from one another.⁹⁶

He goes on:

It is again Claude Bernard who wrote: *a fact is nothing in itself; it is only valuable because of the idea to which it is related or for the proof it brings.* The experimental method begins with the observation of facts, but this is a critical observation so as to avoid wrong, or too rapidly drawn, conclusions. The facts themselves are perceived by the sense only; these communicate the information perceived to the intelligence which reacts by analyzing the facts, {139} organizing them, establishing hypotheses and a coherent system of knowledge. But this system must always remain open, always be prepared to be demolished and reconstructed, so as to conform itself to what the facts show us, to what reality reveals.⁹⁷

Such is, according to Bruckberger, the basic orthodoxy established by modern science. He accepts this orthodoxy without the least reservation. And he demands that those who refuse it, and its rules, be entirely excluded from all say in the intellectual debate of our time.

This leads him to an abrasive criticism of Western philosophy since Descartes. He defines the refusal of external, objective, created reality by the idealist philosophy spawned by the Cogito as the very opposite of the scientific method. He writes:

Let Descartes speak for himself. In the triumphant opening of his “Third Meditation” which proposes to speak to us of God and to prove His existence, we read: *I shall now close my eyes, block my ears, shut off all my senses. I shall even efface from my thoughts every image of material things. But as this can hardly be done, I shall regard them as vain*

95. Claude Bernard, *Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale* (Paris: Flammarion, [1864] 1952). See also Daniel Vernet, *L'homme face à ses origines: La croisade du Livre Chrétien* (La Bégude de Mazenc, 1980), 89–102.

96. Bruckberger, *Ce que je crois*, 21.

97. *Ibid.*, 22.

and false. Remaining thus in conversation with myself, and examining what is within me.

Good luck to you! And the worst, of course, is that Descartes dragged off with him all the so-called “modern” philosophers in perfect imitation of Bruegel the Elder’s painting of a blind man leading a troop of blind beggars into a ditch!

If you imagine that this utter contempt for meaning and sense-perception will provoke difficulties for Descartes’s understanding of the universe, you’re not with it! Read, in addition, the sixth section of the *Discourse on Method*:

First, I have endeavored to discover in a general way, the principles, or first causes, of all that exists, or could exist, in this world without considering anything else but God who created it, and drawing them solely from those seeds of truth naturally present in our souls. Next, I examined the immediate, or most usual, consequences the mind could deduce from these causes. And by this method, it would seem to me, I discovered the heavens, the stars, an earth, and on this earth water, air, and fire, minerals, and a few similar objects, amongst those most common and easiest to know.⁹⁸ {140}

Bruckberger comments:

I don’t know what can be the effect of such quotations on a free and experimental intelligence; and they could be easily multiplied. For me they point in a direction exactly contrary to that of authentic knowledge. Descartes has completely walled in the mind on itself. The appalling truth is that the mind remains prisoner of itself, continually turning on itself like a squirrel in a cage. And one must clearly see that “philosophizing,” for the last three centuries, has been nothing else than this. “Modern” philosophy from Heidegger to Sartre is nothing less than an internment, an imprisonment. Sartre’s strange words, “le monde est de trop” (the universe is an intruder) are, when one meditates on their meaning, an astounding definition of the modern philosophical enterprise since Descartes. It is a perfect case of schizophrenia.⁹⁹

We have here in concentrated form one of the strongest refutations of modern idealist philosophy. Thus it becomes crystal clear that the

98. *Ibid.*, 27–28.

99. *Ibid.*, 28–29. See also R.J. Rushdoony, *Intellectual Schizophrenia* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1961).

epistemological gap does not lie between biblical Christianity and the experimental sciences, but between self-centered, subjectivistic philosophy—and theology—on one hand, and true experimental science and biblical Christianity on the other. The quarrel is not between science and the Bible, as is generally maintained,¹⁰⁰ but between the subjective imaginings of men who wish to be autonomous from God, from His law, and from the created universe (which in its every aspect proclaims God's glory) and God's World and His Creation. Limited and fallible as it is, experimental science points to the same reality as does the infallible revelation of God, the Scriptures. As a result of man's created limitations, his spiritual, moral and intellectual corruption, and due to the vanity to which Creation is subjected, the Thomist apologetic is clearly insufficient. Our knowledge of nature must be corrected by special revelation. But the Thomistic apologetic goes in the right direction, for all Creation is of God, and reflects His invisible attributes, His power, and the stable order established by Him from creation (Rom. 1:20). The intellectual and moral condition of the idealistic philosopher is worse than that of his pre-idealistic predecessors who had, in spite of all their errors, some respect for reality. Without a shadow of doubt, Aristotle, for example, because of his attentiveness to nature, is far less dangerous to Christian thought than the subjective philosophy of the idealist tradition. Aquinas's synthesis of Aristotle and the Bible—wrong as it was—was less damaging to the thought of Christianity than Kierkegaard's {141} unconscious marriage of Christianity to Kant, or Barth's assimilation of Kantian dialectics into theology. Though the Confessions of the Reformation and that of the Council of Trent differ profoundly in content, they do not differ as to their epistemological base, in the use of logic objectively to oppose error and truth, both being intellectually definable. That is why it is possible for a Calvinist like R. J. Rushdoony to recommend so strongly the book of the Thomist philosopher Thomas Molnar, *God and the Knowledge of Reality*,¹⁰¹ which

100. See, for example, the classical treatment of this error by A.D. White, *Histoire de la lutte entre la science et las théologie* (Paris: Guillaumin, 1899).

101. Thomas Molnar, *God and the Knowledge of Reality* (BNew York: Basic Books, 1973). Molnar's books are very influential in France, being rapidly translated into French.

deals with the questions under consideration. It is indeed very interesting to note that starting from the theocentric philosophy of Cornelius Van Til, Rushdoony comes to much the same conclusions as Bruckberger in his refutation of Idealism in his *Word of Flux*. He writes of this idealist tradition:

What did possess men to begin, as Descartes did, and then pursue a line of reasoning that led to Kant? For the Christian theist, who begins with the Sovereign and Triune God and who makes the God of Scriptures foundational to all things as the principle of meaning and interpretation, the road taken by modern philosophy is an impossibility. The man, however, who begins with a defective doctrine of God, or who begins with man as ultimate, man as his own God, does have a serious problem. Either God is the source of all possibility, or He is not. If God is the source of all possibility, then God is the source of all knowledge, and He has established the possibility of knowledge and also its validity. However, if God is not the source of all possibility, then knowledge is an extremely difficult problem. How do we know that what we know is valid knowledge, or that valid knowledge exists? Without knowledge, man is helpless; a man's inability to cope with life is in ratio to his ignorance. While knowledge is not salvation, it is still inseparable from it. If man is suddenly blinded and then placed in an unfamiliar place and world, he is indeed helpless. His helplessness is even greater if we assume that, with his blinding, all previous knowledge is also eliminated from his mind. Without the ability to know and the assurance of the validity of what he knows, man is helpless beyond imagination.¹⁰²

This is indeed, as we have seen, the position of willful blindness adopted by self-centered idealist philosophy. In opposition to the prevalent idealism, and in contradiction with his atheism, the unbelieving scientist nonetheless,

does have valid knowledge because he does not think consistently in terms of his premises. He assumes a uniformity and order in nature; he proceeds {142} on the presupposition that reality is not total irrationality but does in fact have a pattern which is rational and comprehensible. As a result, he does gain knowledge by assuming that the world is what God made it to be, while at the same time denying God and creation.¹⁰³

102. R. J. Rushdoony, *The Word of Flux: Modern Man and the Problem of Knowledge* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1975), 3–4.

It is from the very existence of the universe, and from the order the scientist inevitably discovers in it, that Bruckberger attacks the inconsistency of those who deny the truth that literally stares them in the face: that knowledge implies an intelligible order and an intelligible Orderer. God has set two limits to our vain imaginations: on the one hand, His infallible Word; on the other, His ordered creation. Idealistic philosophy has freed itself from both the control of nature and that of the Bible; following this folly the theologians have done the same. Is it a wonder that our world is incapable of finding a way out of the absurdities into which its refusal of God's meaning has led it? In refusing to follow the order they observe, to the Orderer who makes Himself known to all men through His creation, many contemporary scientists have abandoned themselves to the vain imaginings of their impious minds, and foisted on science the cult of lying myths in order to refuse the Creator the glory that is His due.

We shall now turn to our second Roman Catholic thinker, l'abbé Georges de Nantes, whose apologetic aggressively attacks (with energy and competence) these lying scientific myths with which the knowledge of our time is so thoroughly infected.

For God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.¹⁰⁴

Preferring this subjective philosophy to the Truth manifest in Creation and in Scripture—knowing God, and being thus inexcusable—

[T]hey glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imagination, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.¹⁰⁵

*L'Abbé Georges De Nantes*¹⁰⁶

Born in 1924, l'abbé de Nantes is one of the most controversial figures in the French Catholic Church. Together with Jean Madiran¹⁰⁷ and Monseigneur Marcel Lefebvre,¹⁰⁸ he is, with R.P. Noël Barbara,¹⁰⁹ one of the most {143} pugnacious and perspicuous adversaries of the

103. *Ibid.*, 24–25.

104. 2 Thess. 2:11–12.

105. Rom. 1:21–22.

humanism and the existentialist modernism which has become the dominant doctrine and spirituality of the Roman Church—under the guise of a more biblical faith—since Vatican II. His *Liber Accusationis in Paulum Sextum*, accusing Paul VI of heresy, schism, and scandal, is without doubt one of the most important Church documents of the last quarter century. Georges de Nantes is the leader of the important lay movement, the Ligue de Contre-Réforme Catholique au XXe siècle, whose sentiments are far from being sympathetic to any kind of Protestantism. But the Apostle Paul exhorts us to “prove all things; hold fast that which is good,”¹¹⁰ and in this fiercely antimodernist thinker there

106. Georges de Nantes publishes a monthly entitled *La Contre-Réforme Catholique au XXè siècle*, which has a circulation of 38,000 copies and can be obtained on demand from: Maison Saint-Joseph, 10260 St. Parres les Vaudes, France. Bound copies of the journal can be obtained at a modest price. The English edition can be obtained from Mr. D. Boyce, 38 Greenwood Close, Morden, Surrey, England. The Dutch from Fr. Geerts, Wilgenlaan 9, 2140 Westmalle, Belgium. His most important work is his *Liber Accusationis in Paulum Sextum*, which is available in English translation at the price of one pound or \$3. A study of his political thought is: Elasabeth Nouar, *Doctrine d'une contre-révolution catholique: La pensée de l'abbé Georges de Nantes* (Saint-Parres-les-Vaudes: Renaissance Catholique, 1981).

107. Jean Madiran is the author of numerous books, amongst which one must note his masterly, *La vieillesse du monde: Essai sur le communisme* (Paris: Dominique Martin Morin, 1975); *Les Deux démocraties* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1977); *Réclamation au Saint-Père* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1974); *L'hérésie du XXè siècle* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1968). His masterpiece is the monument of twenty-five years' publication of the monthly review *Itinéraires* already mentioned. With a few friends he has recently launched an antirevolutionary daily newspaper, *Present*, 5, rue d'Amboise, 75002, Paris. This is truly an astonishing venture, undertaken with the sole financial backing of pre-subscriptions.

108. Mgr. Marcel Lefebvre is the founder-director of the Fraternité Saint Pie X at Ecône in the Valais. His initiative has led to the foundation of numerous dissident traditionalist parishes all over the world. His publications include: *J'accuse le Concile* (Martigny: Editions Saint-Gabriel, 1976); *Un Evêque parle* (Paris: Dominique Martin Morin, 1974). See also Roland Gaucher, *Monseigneur Lefebvre* (Paris: Editions Albatros, 1976).

109. Noël Barbara, a priest, is the editor of the review *Forts dans la Foi* (B.P. 2824–37028, Tours, France), which has published the most clear-sighted analysis of John Paul's personalist-humanist deformation of the Christian faith.

110. 2 Thess. 5:21.

is much that can be gleaned for the discernment of the Church in this hour of confusion and doctrinal chaos. But it is not this aspect of George de Nantes's work that I wish to examine here. De Nantes is truly an encyclopedic mind. Not only is he a theologian and mystic, but also a remarkable specialist in such astonishingly diverse fields as philosophy, politics, and military strategy, as well as in a wide range of scientific disciplines. Fundamentally a follower of Thomas Aquinas, he nevertheless does not hesitate to criticise the "angelic doctor's" excessive dependence on Aristotle. Between October 1980 and August 1981 he published his *Contre-Réforme*, a remarkable series of monthly lectures given in the Mutualité Hall in Paris, developing a consistent Catholic examination of different scientific disciplines. It is obviously impossible to give a detailed account here of these lectures, but it can be affirmed that here we have the example of a fine mind at work, a mind extraordinarily well-informed as to the present state of scientific research, showing us a clear path through the labyrinth of myth and truth which modern science offers us. To give you an idea of the scope of such an undertaking, let me quote the titles of the subjects examined.

"Scientific Myths and the Christian Faith" (#158, Oct. 1980); "Cosmogony: The Expanding Universe...and God? To make an end of Galileo" (#159, Nov. 1980); "Cosmology: Matter, Energy...and Spirit. To make an end of Einstein" (#161, Jan. 1981); "Biology: Living Mechanism and the Problems of the Soul. To make an end of Monod" (#162, Feb. 1981); "Biogenics: Evolution and Creation. To make an end of Darwin" (#163, Mar. 1981); "Ethology: Animal Instincts and Human Society. To make an end of Konrad Lorenz" (#164, April 1981); "Anthropogenesis: The Origin of Man. To finish with Teilhard" (#165, May 1981); "Anthropology: What is Man? To finish with Freud" (#166, June 1981); "Anthropology: What is Man? To finish with Marx" (#167, July 1981); "Science, Philosophy, and Religion" (#168, Aug. 1981). {144}

It is, of course, impossible in a few remarks to make any kind of adequate estimation of the strengths and weaknesses of such an immense enterprise. I will try to give you some idea of Georges de Nantes's scientific apologetic by quoting him on a number of important issues.

He begins by examining the present temptation of scientists to transform their discipline into a new Gnostic religion. A number of Chris-

tian apologists see this renewed interest by scientists in religion and in the irrational as a sign of an opening of our civilization to the supernatural and of the definitive disappearance of the anti-Christian positivism and scientism of the nineteenth century. Georges de Nantes is not fooled by such illusions.

If on the other side of the Atlantic this Gnosis may appear ambiguous, here it shows itself clearly for what it is: strictly atheistic, but in the form of animism, pantheism, and monism. Whatever the name by which we may be tempted to define it, this Gnosis replaces the transcendence of God the Creator by the immanence of a spirit, a “logos”; a universal word or reason, or even of a mathematical “tensor,” a reality beyond the phenomena. This is what the old Aristotle called “matter,” but this Gnosis attributes every quality to it considering it the mother of all the forms and laws of the universe, a reality comparable to the “fire of Zeus” of the Stoics.

A revelation of this nature obviously excludes every kind of true religion. It bases itself on a thorough knowledge of the structure and evolution of the universe. Thus, in explicit opposition to our religion, which is that of the Incarnation of God within the universe and the transformation of history, this new Gnosticism purports to attain the Cosmic Being, a freedom, a consciousness, a subjectivity from which all spirit would proceed and to which it would infallibly return....

Nothing shows more clearly than this, the urgency of a new incursion of Catholic Apologetics into the spheres of activity of modern science, so as to force out into the open its mystifications and frauds, to purify true science from imitations, and to liberate the intelligence of men from the stupefying and foolish influence of these superbly esoteric elitist hoaxes. Without doubt an important and difficult enterprise.¹¹¹

Georges de Nantes sees the origin of this scientific and Gnostic pseudo-religion in the idealism of the philosophy of Kant.¹¹² With Kant,¹¹³

...it is no longer human thought which seeks to inform itself as to the nature of the universe and its laws—of which the mind is, as it were, only a modest {145} and remote province. Now it is the universe which reflects the ideas and categories of man’s reason and the feelings of this sensibility, man being now its center. This represents an immense revolution! It is a fantastic inversion of the acquisition of human knowledge. Man becomes thus the measure of all things.

111. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 158, 5–6.

And he goes on:

European science before Kant accepted instinctively the basic principle of Scholasticism, according to which man draws all his ideas, and in consequence, all his judgments and his science, from his knowledge of the perceptible universe. *Nothing is found in the mind that has not previously passed through the senses....* Man's science proceeds from his empirical observation by means of a series of rational abstractions; it is wholly ordered by the lessons objects teach. As to the explanation of the amazing intelligibility, or accessibility, of the material world to a spiritual intelligence, metaphysics discovered it in God, superior principle of all beings, cause of the universe and light of our intelligence.¹¹⁴

As Rushdoony clearly shows, only a theocentric view of Creation justifies the possibility of the universe being intelligible. Because man is an intelligent being created in God's image he can understand a cosmos intelligently ordered by an intelligent Creator. Idealism since Kant—and in fact since Descartes—is based on what de Nantes calls,

the prejudice that man's science reflects man's own intelligence and not the intelligibility of things...and the intelligence of God.¹¹⁵

The intelligibility of God's creation for man becomes thus incomprehensible. Thus we have, on the one hand, an immense effort to understand God's creation through a more and more systematic application to the study of nature of the methods of experimental

112. The philosophy of idealism has been usefully criticized by: Pius X, *Les Doctrines Modernes* (Paris: Editions La Nouvelle Aurore, 1976); R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu: Son existence et sa nature* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1920); *Le sens commun, la philosophie de l'être et les formules dogmatiques* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1922); Jules Meinvielle, *De Lammenais à Maritain* (Paris: Club du Livre Civique, 1956); Michel Creuset, *Le libéralisme* (Paris: C.L.C., n.d.); *Tolérance et libéralisme* (C.L.C., 1976). See also the very instructive history of modern philosophy by Roger Vernaux, *Histoire de la philosophie moderne* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1957); Roger Vernaux, *Histoire de la philosophie contemporaine* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1960).

113. On Kant see: Roger Vernaux, *Kant: Critique de la critique de la raison pure* (Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1972); J. de Tonquedec, *Critique de la connaissance* (Paris: Beauchesne, n.d.); R. Jolivet, *Traité de Métaphysique* (Paris: Vitte, n.d.); and Louis Jugnet, *Pour connaître la pensée de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: Bordas, n.d.), 34–39.

114. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 158, 7.

115. *Ibid.*, 7.

science, and, on the other, a subjective philosophy which cuts man off from all reality outside his intellectual fantasies. These vain imaginings are limited—neither by God’s Creation, nor by God’s Word. There being no proper metaphysical or Christian justification of the scientific enterprise, the field is left wide open for the proliferation of the pseudo-scientific subjective mythologies of scientists in search of a philosophical and religious explanation of the origin and meaning of the universe. Georges de Nantes puts forward a number of {146} examples which show the physicist abandoning the legitimate use of mathematics in physics for the pretention that the very development of mathematical theories in themselves can provide a complete apprehension of the object. The mathematical formulae take on an incantatory magical force. The path is thus left open for the construction of mathematical animistic mythologies where the mathematical formulae, from being means of defining relations between the objects studied, are transformed into forces acting on the subjects. As Magnus Verbrugge so ably puts it, words or formula are given a quasi magical power.¹¹⁶

Georges de Nantes then begins an examination of the different fields of scientific research which, in his opinion, suffer from this mythologizing. We will briefly examine a few of the questions he raises.

1. In “The Expanding Universe . . . and God” he examines the implications for the universally accepted big bang hypothesis of the important scientific discussion as to the reliability of the red-shift, as a means of measuring the recession of galaxies, which came to light at the Congress of the International Union of Astronomy held in Paris in 1976. The result of the dogmas of an expanding universe and of an original big bang are shown to be what they are in fact, mere conjectures based upon human speculations.¹¹⁷ It is very interesting to find our Roman Catholic apologist here again rejoining, quite independently, the biblical positions defended by able Reformed scientists like Dr. A. J. Monty-White¹¹⁸ and Paul M. Steidl,¹¹⁹ who for essentially scientific reasons demonstrate the fragility of the hypotheses advanced by modern cos-

116. See Magnus Verbrugge, “Animism in Science,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 8, no. 2 (Winter 1982).

117. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 159 (November 1980).

mogonists and cosmologists as to the nature, origin, and history of the universe.

2. In “Matter, Energy...and Spirit” de Nantes attacks scientific dogmas even more firmly established, apparently, than the big bang hypothesis. He examines critically, the scientific legitimacy of Max Planck’s theory of quanta (1900), Einstein’s theory of relativity (1905), and Heisenberg’s theory of indeterminism (1925). It is, of course, evident that I am not in a position to estimate the value of these criticisms addressed to the very foundations of modern physics, but, insofar as they are based on intelligible arguments, they merit our close attention. He bases his arguments on refutations of Michelson’s experiment of 1881. This is a supposed proof that the speed of light is constant in all directions whatever the speed of the movement of the observer. This was refuted experimentally by Miller in 1921 and more recently by the French physicist, Charles Nahon. De Nantes accepts the conclusions Nahon draws from his experiments: namely, that the theory of relativity is, “theoretically erroneous, contradictory, {147} fraudulent and entirely fanciful.”¹²⁰ It is striking that here again de Nantes and Nahon reach very similar conclusions to those established by the American inventor and scientist, Charles Edison Arno, in his fundamental criticism of the theory of relativity.¹²¹ It is, of course, quite understandable that such basic criticism of the very foundation of so-called “modern physics” should be subject to an almost complete blackout by the scientific establishment. Proof, no doubt, of Thomas H. Kuhn’s thesis as to the obstacles that must be surmounted in order to establish new and more adequate hypothesis in scientific research. De Nantes, with Fritjof Capra,¹²² comes to the conclusion that the irrationality of modern

118. A. J. Monty-White, *What about Origins?* (Newton Abbot, Devon, England: Dunestone Printers Limited, 1978).

119. Paul M. Steidl, *The Earth, the Stars and the Bible* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1979).

120. Charles Nahon, *L'imposture de la relativité* (Chez l’auteur, 28, rue Suffren, 13006 Marseille), 545. See also: Maurice Ollivier, *Physique moderne et réalité* (Paris: Le Cèdre, 1962); Louis de Broglié, *Continu et discontinu en physique moderne* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1941); and *Recherches d’un demi-siècle* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1976).

121. Walter Edison Arno, *This Dark Age of Science* (Metro Graphics Inc., Los Angeles, CA: 1975).

physics, “rejoins thus far-eastern cosmic mysticisms where everything disappears in confusion and nothingness.”¹²³ And he sees, in opposition to many Christian thinkers who imagine that modern science is more open to Christian revelation because of its basic irrationality, this refusal of commonsense reason as the sign of the invasion of occultism into the scientific enterprise, the divinization of matter, and the appearance of an atheistic anti-Christian cosmic pantheism.¹²⁴

3. De Nantes sees the same desire to charge scientific theories with what would amount to a creative power in the exaggerated importance attributed to the DNA molecule in the organization of the cell. DNA cannot be considered as THE organizing principle of living beings. He first notes the impossibility of a simple *chemical leap* from dead matter to living forms:

[L]iving forms, even if they do manifest an evident continuity with the phenomena of physics and chemistry and seem to be materially formed of the same elements and subject to the same laws, nevertheless appear, by certain other particularities, to be of an absolutely original nature....Living phenomena contradict the law of degradation of energy. Instead of degenerating, and tending to *entropy*, they are subject to a constant regeneration according to the law of *negative entropy*, a law which contradicts that principle which holds sway over inert matter.¹²⁵

He nevertheless affirms, in agreement with the great French biologists Claude Bernard and Pierre-Paul Grassé:¹²⁶

We are determinists in our study of the physical and chemical sciences that study minerals. Let it be at once clear, we remain determinist in our study of the biological sciences.¹²⁷ {148}

122. Fritjof Capra, *The Tao of Physics*.

123. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 161 (January 1981): 14.

124. Viz. M. Verbrugge, “Animism in Science.”

125. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 162 (February 1981): 5.

126. P-P. Grassé, *L'évolution du vivant* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1971); *L'homme ce petit dieu* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1971); *L'homme en accusation* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1980). In Louis Agassiz, J-H. Fabre, Louis Vialleton, Louis Bounoure, and Georges Salet, amongst others, a powerful antirevolutionary tradition has manifested itself amongst French scientists since Darwin.

127. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 162, 5.

De Nantes goes on to add:

On no account do we want a God who would merely be a *stop-gap* to our ignorance and our laziness. Nor do we want a God who, with a flick of his finger, would have set the universe in motion. We know that God exists, and that he has allowed us to discover by the exclusive use of our reason, all the mechanical subtleties of the mineral, vegetable, and animal realms of which he is the Supreme Mechanic.¹²⁸

But just as biological reality, chemical and physical as it inevitably is, cannot be reduced to these sole properties, so a discovery as astonishing as the DNA molecule cannot be charged with the power of ordering the totality of the living organism. Modern science has too often ignored the prudence of Claude Bernard who was accustomed to remind his students that science could only analyze the chemical and physical properties of dead bodies, but was incapable of defining the causes of life in organisms. In the same tradition, Georges de Nantes affirms:

After the analysis let us undertake the synthesis of our observations, forgetting nothing and avoiding mutilating the living beings on which our experiments have been carried out. Within the strict limits of their individuality, living beings manifest all at once *highly improbable* physico-chemical determinisms—nonetheless, strictly defined and consistent—and related to these, clearly *finalized functions*, differentiated from one another but nevertheless converging. LIFE is that, all that, and nothing but that. It is not an indefinite *force*, it is not a *form* or an *information* stocked somewhere, it is not the particular *function* of a *dominant organism*. It is the living form which animates, gathers together and sweeps along billions and billions of chemical molecules providing them with their elementary organization and functions, and associating them all together in the strictly ordered community of their specific individuality. This is their vegetable and animal soul, to use Aristotle's ancient expression.¹²⁹

Conclusion

We'll not follow de Nantes in his exploration of modern scientific mythology as he goes from Darwin to Konrad Lorenz, from Teilhard de Chardin to Freud and Marx. Here, his refusal to accept the norma-

128. *Ibid.*, 9.

129. *Ibid.*, 12.

tive value of Scripture in its affirmations with regard to the Creation of the universe {149} leads de Nantes to give way, quite unnecessarily, to the evolutionary myth. He adopts, as a result, a type of evolutionary theism which he affirms to be simply a personal opinion and which he refuses to impose on the more traditional and more biblical Creationism of many of his followers. It is here that we see the greater strength of a more biblical apologetic which bases itself on the veracity of the Scriptures in all that they affirm, science and history included. Nevertheless, in spite of this necessary reservation, I would like to conclude this study by showing how close is the thought of the ultra-Catholic French philosopher, scientist, and theologian, to that of the Reformed presuppositionalist tradition. De Nantes draws his own conclusion from a recent book by Gerard Jorland on the thought of the Russian-French historian and philosopher of science, Alexandre Koyré:

“If the idea of the Creator, God omnipresent, omnipotent, and immutable sustained the classical representation of the physical universe, it is in turn the absence of God which explains the contemporary representation of the Cosmos.” “. . . I take the liberty [says de Nantes] of drawing your attention to this fundamental declaration of a Jewish philosopher of Russian origin who was not, as far as I know, in any way dependent on traditional Roman Catholic teaching. As is well known the ideas behind classical Physics were those of its time, and these happened to be of a clerical nature. But modern physics is just as dependent on ideas. In this case they happen to be anti-clerical. The atheism of our century is the base of our modern physics, without our modern physics ever, either admitting, or showing us their secret.” “The indeterminism of science,” says Jorland, “could very well be nothing else but the consequence of God’s absence: a consequence of the refusal to admit any kind of finality in science.”

“...We cannot establish a unitary formula defining the behavior of elementary particles; it is impossible to define these particles according to a single type; it is impossible to realize a strict determinism or an absolute predictability; it is impossible to apply the same concepts to the small and to the large; to the microscopic and to the macroscopic,” so much so “that physics has to be satisfied with probability and with a purely statistical determinism.” This implies, says Jorland, that without “the hypothesis God” the cosmos can no longer be Newtonian. This rejection of “the hypothesis God” is not the result of the disciplined effort of science, but the inevitable consequence of a new repre-

sentation of the universe, and because God did not fit into this new representation, He was rejected.”¹³⁰ {150}

To this de Nantes adds:

It is not I who affirms this. It is the great Jewish philosopher, Alexandre Koyré. Against Einstein, Heisenberg, and Bohr...against Darwin, but also against Monod, against Lorenz and Wilson, and finally, against Marx and against Freud. It is because they are atheists that their science has gone crazy, and inevitably crazy.¹³¹ We reject their science because it has gone mad—as I hope you will no doubt recognize—and not in the first place because this science is atheistic. Modern science is not pure, neither is it free. It is not as candid as it pretends to be. And it is not as a result of its sensational discoveries, audacious theories, and Copernican revolutions that science has thrown out God as a useless notion. It is rather the negation of God which has done violence to the proper use of reason, disturbed the observation of the phenomena, and forced scientific thinking to abandon the normality of its concepts. This atheism has led science astray, leading it to elaborate countless fantastic constructions devoid of all common sense. Why? In order to ignore the invisible realm. It is of God that science is deficient, not God who is impoverished by being deprived of science.¹³²

Christ, being the sustainer of His whole Creation, all creatures at all times holding their very being from Him, it is evident foolishness, real folly, for any science to deprive itself of God’s wisdom. But de Nantes concludes on a note of Christian victory:

Our metaphysics had freed us of all anxiety with regard to ultimate questions. Our religion establishes as a basic principle that “The truth will set you free.”¹³³ The truth of the sciences free us to acquiesce to the divine revelation. This revelation makes us free—beyond all consideration of any Inquisition—to accept with enthusiasm the great discoveries of our time. But our inner peace must not deceive us as to the state of mind of our contemporaries. As long as they have not found a solution to their philosophical and religious problems, science will not leave them in peace. It can but be a source of anxiety to them. Scien-

130. Gérard Jorland, *Recherches épistémologiques d’Alexandre Koyré* (Paris: Gallimard, 1981), 369. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 168 (August 1981): 7.

131. Rom. 1:21–22; Ps. 53.

132. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 168, 7.

133. John 8:32.

tific research is not a featherbed for men. Neither is it a platform where common agreement can be reached beyond the bounds of ideologies and religions. As Koyré affirms, science is always “committed,” always “committing,” always oriented towards metaphysical questions by the polarization of its object, whatever the object may be. Woe to any scientist whose research should be polarized in any other direction! “Life is not neutral, it consists in taking sides boldly.”¹³⁴ Neither is science itself neutral. It {151} obliges the scientist to side with truth, and he who refuses to do so will force science to lie....When science leads to philosophical or religious conclusions which we refuse to accept, what must we do? That is the question!...For, sooner or later, all science leads to metaphysical certitudes, embarrassing because of their vital and moral consequences.¹³⁵

It is on this appeal for the intellectual, moral, and spiritual conversion of the scientist that I leave this quite extraordinary, you will no doubt admit, twentieth-century Christian scientific apologetic.

APPENDIX:

REFUTATION OF DESCARTES’S ERROR FROM A BIBLICAL AND THEOCENTRIC POINT OF VIEW (CLAUDE BROUSSON) AND FROM A SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENTATION (DR. L. CHAUVOIS).

The Reformed apologetic did not happily have to wait for development of the presuppositionalist school of philosophy to see the manifestation of a thoroughly biblical refutation of Descartes’s errors. Dooyeweerd and Van Til had a predecessor in their criticism of Idealism in the person of the French Reformed lawyer, pastor, and martyr, Claude Brousson. Brousson, like Pascal, had clearly perceived the immense danger to the Faith represented by the philosophy of Descartes. In his letter to the clergy of the French Reformed Church, exiled by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he undertakes to refute the errors of Descartes which had already largely infiltrated the thinking of the Reformed Church. His words still ring true:

From all time, Philosophy, which is human and carnal wisdom, has caused prejudice to true religion. Nevertheless a number of our ministers do not hesitate to seek popularity by following such philosophies. But of what nature is this philosophy which attracts them? It is a phi-

134. Philippe Pétain.

135. *Contre-Réforme Catholique*, no. 168, 8–9.

losophy whose principles are clearly dangerous and perverse. Though the principles established by these new philosophers are, in fact, probably further removed from common sense, straight reason, and truth, than those of any previous philosophical sect, these gentlemen nevertheless imagine that they, at last, have come to a better understanding of the secrets of nature than all who before them made profession of wisdom. Their presumption, in consequence, knows no bounds. They have a thorough contempt for the rest of mankind. At the same time they imagine that nothing is beyond the scope of their intelligence. This would be of no great importance if they were content to affirm that we must question what the Ancients have taught us, or that we must {152} scrutinize anew all past knowledge. But they go on to pretend that man's mind is naturally so enlightened that, when he applies himself with care to the discovery of some truth which he is sure to have perceived in a clear and distinct manner, he can know no error. Nevertheless, we see every day that those, who imagine that they have thoroughly examined the facts and have properly understood them, reaching as a result a clear and distinct representation of the matter in question, are those most often engaged in error. But this does not suffice for them to cease from their error. Nevertheless, these gentlemen imagine that when they have clearly and distinctly thought out some question their solution is infallible. They thus reject all that happens to be opposed to their views as being totally erroneous. This would be of no great matter if this false method of thought was merely applied to indifferent matters. But as soon as man develops a good opinion of his intellect no object will escape the appetite of his reason.

Indeed, my respected brethren, one cannot observe without pain, that these New Philosophers, whether they be Ministers or not, when they discover that the Scriptures do not conform themselves to their clear and distinct ideas, undertake to twist the Word of God in a shameless manner so as to accommodate it to their notions. They affirm that the aim of the Scriptures is not to make of us philosophers or scientists, and that in diverse passages we see that Scripture speaks of reality, not as it exists in truth, but as it appears to the common observation of mankind. For this reason they do not hesitate to oppose themselves to the witness of Scripture whenever it contradicts their vain reasonings. It is indeed true that habitually the Spirit of God, in order to condescend to our weakness, uses expressions which we are accustomed to hear. These being familiar expressions we have no difficulty in understanding them, either according to the common usage, or according to the meaning which the Scriptures themselves give them. Thus we do them no violence. This cannot be considered a sufficient reason for such a violent attack by these new Philosophers on the Word of God,

which they do not hesitate to scandalously twist according to their vain and superficial ideas.

If, for example, they imagine that they have clearly and distinctly understood that animals have neither feeling nor knowledge, that they are machines, that they move and utter sounds by the motion of inner springs as they are diversely manipulated from without as one would draw sounds out of a lute or guitar. In this they do not hesitate shamelessly to contradict numerous passages of Scripture which speak: (a) *of the feeling and knowledge* of animals (Job 35:11, 39:4–6, Proverbs 6:6–8, Isaiah 1:3, Jeremiah 8:7, etc.), {153} (b) compares animals to men (Ecclesiastes 3:18–19), (c) no distinction from men as to their physical and sensitive life (Gen. 8:21, 9:3, 10, 12, 15, 16), (d) that animals, like men, are *living creatures* (Gen. 8:21, 9:3, 10, 12, 15, 16, Lev. 1:46), (e) that like men they have been made *living souls* (Gen. 1:20, 30), (f) that similarly to men animals have received a *spirit of life* (Gen. 7:15, 22, 6:17, etc.).... In this manner these gentlemen do not consider, in their explanation of Scripture, the exact force of the expression chosen by the Spirit of God and those which men are accustomed to use. Rather they set up their clear and distinct ideas as the rule by which to judge the meaning of the Word of God. In this way they set up their feeble reason above the Holy Word for they manifestly corrupt its meaning so as to accomodate and subject it to their vain philosophy.¹³⁶

In each period God raises up defenders of the Faith. Here in a period of ecclesiastical and theological defeat, where the clergy were in complete confusion, God raised up Claude Brousson to attack the errors of his time. It is interesting to note that similar errors as to the nature of animals exist in our time. From a scientific point of view men like F.J.J. Buytendijk and Jean-Claude Filloux¹³⁷ restore a more biblical and, of course, more scientific view of God's living creatures. With regard to Descartes's specific errors on this point it is useful to note how the scientific refutation of his errors rejoins Brousson's biblical position. Dr. L. Chauvois, in a recent book, shows up clearly Descartes physiological ineptitude. He writes:

136. Claude Brousson, "Lettres aux pasteurs de France réfugiés dans les Etats protestants," *Lettres et opuscules de feu Mr. Brousson* (Utrecht: Guillaume vande Water, 1701), 9–12.

137. F.J.J. Buytendijk, *L'homme et l'animal: Essai de psychologie comparée* (Paris: Gallimard, 1965); Jean-Claude Filloux, *Psychologie des animaux* (Paris: P.U.F., 1970).

We find here the famous theory of animals who, according to Descartes, are distinct from men in that, lacking a soul they are mere automats, pure machines. This theory arrives at the following conclusions: "...and this proves not only that animals have less reason than men, but that they have none at all...and that it is nature which acts in them according to how their organs are placed, as is the case with a clock which is only composed of wheels and springs and can number the hours and measure time more exactly than men with all their wisdom." How La Fontaine with his good sense ridiculed this extravagant theory of the inexistence of sensibility and intelligence in animals in his fable entitled "Les deux Rats, le Renard et l'Oeuf."

Descartes va plus loin, et soutient nettement
 Quelle (la bête) ne pense nullement.
 Vous n'êtes pas embarrassée
 De le croire, ni moi. Cependant, quant aux bois, {154}
 Le bruit des cors, celui des voix...
 N'a donné nul relâche a la fuyante proié,....

Thus Descartes's whole synthesis of animal life, in fact his whole *Treatise on Physiology*, comes to be nothing else than a wretched simplification of the profoundly complex problems of biology, reducing such questions as those of the sensibility, irritability, motility, etc., of animals to the dimensions of pure mechanics and inert matter. These simplifications, when confronted with the wonderful discoveries of modern physiology and neurology, seem elementary childishness to us today. This is due to Descartes's imprudent, and unconscious, exercise of his "imagination." In consequence of "insufficiently complete numberings and observations," in other words, due to the inadequate information of his time, he rashly took the risk of a premature synthesis which appears puerile to us today. But this is a temptation common to all epochs. Such an effort to elaborate a synthesis of all the information available at a given time is in fact very necessary. The errors and imperfections of such syntheses, when recognized, stimulate new research and in fact encourage the progress of science. But wisdom then calls one not to be more positive in one's affirmations than is warranted by the facts. Here one should imitate the admirable prudence of the great Harvey—too little frequented by Descartes—in his discovery of the circulation of the blood. Particularly worthy of admiration is the *provi-*

sional interpretation he proposes of this phenomenon, applying this passage of a comedy of Terence to his own researches:

No one will ever live with a reason so perfect that things, years, and events, will not teach him something new. One ends up by discovering that one ignored what one thought one knew and experience leads one to reject opinions formerly held.

And, adds the immortal Harvey,

Perhaps the same thing will happen to the “De motu cordis”; perhaps, some at least, more gifted and taking advantage of the path opened, will seize the opportunity to study the problem more thoroughly and to undertake new researches.¹³⁸

This scientific modesty is a true parent of Christian humility and an indispensable element in the discovery of truth, for in science, as in all the {155} aspects of life, the beginning of wisdom is always the fear of the Lord, and the respect for His Creation is another name for charity.

138. L Chauvois, *Descartes, sa méthode et ses erreurs en physiologie* (Paris: Editions du Cèdre, 1966), 64–67.

ON THE COVENANT OF GOD WITH THE ISRAELITES

Jacques (James) Saurin (1677–1730)

[From: *Select Sermons on Important Subjects*, 1803.
Sermon 8, pp. 210–30.]

Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of wood, unto the drawer of thy water: that thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day: that he may establish thee today for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath been unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath; but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord your God, and also with him that is not here this day; (for ye know that we have dwelt in the land of Egypt, and how we came through the nations which ye passed by. And ye have seen their abominations, and their idols, wood and stone, silver and gold, which were among them,) lest there should be among you man or woman, or family, or tribe, whose heart turneth away this day from the Lord your God, to go and serve the gods of these nations; lest there should be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood, and it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imaginations of mine heart.—Deut. 29:10–19.

My brethren, this Sabbath is a covenant-day between God and us. This is the design of our sacraments; and the particular design of the holy supper we have celebrated in the morning service. So our catechists teach; so our children understand; and among the less instructed of this assembly there is scarcely one, if we should ask him what is a sacrament, but he would answer, “It is a symbol of the covenant between God and Christians.” {161}

This being understood, we cannot observe without astonishment the slight attention, most men pay to an institution; of which they seem to entertain such exalted notions. The tendency would not be happy in conciliating your attention to this discourse, were I to commence by a humiliating portrait of the manners of the age; in which some of you would have occasion to recognize your own character. But the fact is certain, and I attest it to your consciences. Do we take the same precaution in contracting a covenant with God in the Eucharist; which is exercised in a treaty on which the prosperity of the state, or domestic happiness depends: When the latter is in question, we confer with experienced men, we weigh the terms, and investigate with all possible sagacity, what we stipulate, and what is stipulated in return. But when we come to renew the high covenant, in which the immortal God condescends to be our God, and in which we devote ourselves to Him, we deem the slightest examination every way of caution, to ask, "What are you going to do? What engagements are you going to form? What calamities are you about to bring on yourselves?"

One grand cause of this defect, proceeds, it is presumed, from our having, for the most part, inadequate notions of what is called contracting, or renewing our covenant with God. We commonly confound the terms, by vague or confused notions: hence one of the best remedies we can apply to an evil so general is, to explain their import with precision. Having searched from Genesis to Revelation, for the happiest text affording a system complete and clear on the subject, I have fixed on the words you have heard. They are part of the discourse Moses addressed to the Israelites, when he arrived on the frontiers of the promised land, and was about to give an account of the most important ministry God had ever entrusted to any mortal.

I enter now upon the subject. And after having again implored the aid of Heaven; after having conjured you, by the compassion of God, who this day pours upon us such an abundance of favors, to give so important a subject the consideration it deserves; I lay down at once a principle generally received among Christians. The legal, and the evangelical covenant. The covenant of God contracted with the Israelites by the ministry of Moses, and the covenant He has contracted this morning with you, differ only in circumstances, being in substance the same. Properly speaking, God has contracted but one covenant with man

since the Fall, the covenant of grace upon Mount Sinai; whose terrific glory induced the Israelites to say, "Let not God speak with us, lest we die," Ex. 20:19. Amid so much lightnings {162} and thunders, devouring fire, darkness, and tempest; and notwithstanding this prohibition, which apparently precluded all intercourse between God and sinful man, Take heed...go not up into the Mount, or touch the border of it: there shall not an hand touch it, but it shall surely be stoned, or shot through; upon this mountain, I say, in this barren wilderness, were instituted the tenderest ties God ever formed with His creature: amid the awful punishments which we see so frequently fall upon those rebellious men; amid fiery serpents which exhaled against them a pestilential breath, God shed upon them the same grace He so abundantly pours on our assemblies. The Israelites, to whom Moses addresses the words of my text, had the same sacraments, they were all baptized in the cloud, they did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ (1 Cor. 10:2-3). The same appellations; it was said to them as to you, "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people, for all the earth is mine." Ex. 19:5. The same promises, for "they saw the promises afar off, and embraced them." Heb. 11:13.

On the other hand, amid the consolatory objects which God displays before us at this period, in distinguished lustre; and notwithstanding these gracious words which resound in this church, Grace, grace unto it. Notwithstanding this engaging voice, "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden"; and amid the abundant mercy we have seen displayed this morning at the Lord's table; if we should violate the covenant he has established with us, you have the same cause of fear as the Jews. We have the same Judge, equally awful now, as at that period; for our God is a consuming fire. (Heb. 12:29). We have the same judgments to apprehend. With many of them, God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were for our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolators as some of them. Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and fell in one day twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of the serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of

them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer (1 Cor. 10:5–10). You know the language of St. Paul.

Further still, whatever superiority our condition may have over the Jews; in whatever more attracting manner He may have now revealed Himself to us; whatever more tender hands, and gracious cords of love God may have employed, to use an expression of a prophet, will serve only to augment our misery, if we prove unfaithful. For if the word spoken by {163} angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? (Heb. 2:2–3). For ye are not come unto the mountain that might not be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words, which voice they that heard, entreated that the word should not be spoken to them anymore. But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel. See that ye refuse not Him that speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused Him that spake on earth, much more shall we not escape, if we turn away from Him that speaketh from heaven. (Heb. 12:18–25).

Hence the principle respecting the legal, and evangelical covenant is indisputable. The covenant God formerly contracted with the Israelites by the ministry of Moses, and the covenant He has made with us this morning in the sacrament of the holy supper are in substance the same. And what the legislator said of the first, in the words of my text, we may say of the second, in the explication we shall give. Now, my brethren, this faithful servant of God required the Israelites to consider five things in the covenant they contracted with their Maker.

1. The sanctity of the place: Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord; that is, before His ark, the most august symbol of His presence.
2. The universality of the contract: Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord, the captains of your tribes, your elders, your officers, and all the men of Israel: your little ones, your wives, and the stranger

- who is in the midst of your camp, from the hewer of wood to the drawer of water.
3. Its mutual obligation: That He may, on the one hand, establish thee today for a people unto Himself; and on the other, that He may be unto thee a God.
 4. The extent of the engagement: an engagement with reserve. God covenants to give Himself to the Israelites as He had sworn to their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The Israelites covenant to give themselves to God, and abjure not only gross, but refined idolatry. Take heed, “lest there should be among you man or woman, or family, or tribe, whose heart turneth away this day from the Lord your God, to go and serve the gods of these nations; lest there should be among you a root that beareth gall {164} and wormwood.”
 5. The oath of the covenant: Thou enterest into the covenant and the execration by an oath.

1. The sanctity of the place

Moses required the Israelites to consider the sanctity of the place in which the covenant was contracted with God. It was consecrated by the divine presence. “Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord.” Not only in the vague sense in which we say of all our words and actions—God sees me; God hears me: all things are naked and open to Him in whose presence I stand; but in a sense more confined.... The most high dwelleth not in human temples.... “What is the house ye build to me, and where is the place of my rest? Behold the heaven, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, much less the house that I have built.” He chose, however, the tabernacle for His habitation, and the Ark for His throne. There He delivered His oracles: there He issued His supreme commands. Moses assembled the Israelites, it is presumed, near to this majestic pavilion of the Deity, when he addressed to them the words of my text; at least I think I can prove, from correspondent passages of Scripture, that this is the true acceptance of the expression, “Before the Lord.”

The Christians having more enlightened notions of the Divinity than the Jews, have the less need to be apprised that God is the Omnipresent Being, and unconfined by local residence. We have been taught by Jesus Christ, that the true worshippers restrict not their devotion to

Mount Zion, nor Mount Gerisim: they worship God in spirit and truth. But let us be cautious, lest, under a pretence of removing some superstitious notions, we refine too far. God presides in a peculiar manner in our temples, and in a peculiar manner even where two or three are met together in His name: more especially in a house consecrated to His glory; more especially in places in which a whole nation come to pay their devotion. The more august and solemn our worship, the more is God intimately near. And what part of the worship we render to God, can be more august than that we have celebrated this morning? In what situation can the thought, "I am seen and heard of God"; in what situation can it impress our hearts if it have not impressed them this morning?

God, in contracting this covenant with the Israelites on Sinai, which Moses induced them to renew in the words of my text, apprised them that He would be found upon that holy hill. He said to Moses, "Lo, I am come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever. Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third {165} day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people, upon Mount Sinai" (Ex. 19:9). It is said expressly, that Nadab and Abihu, and the seventy elders, should ascend the hill, and contract the covenant with God in the name of the whole congregation; they saw evident marks of the Divine presence; "a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness"; an emblem which God chose perhaps, because sapphire was among the Egyptians an emblem of royalty; as is apparent in the writings of those, who have preserved the hieroglyphics of that nation.

The eyes of your understanding, were not they also enlightened this morning? God was present in this house; He was seated here on a throne, more luminous than the brightest sapphire, and amid the myriads of His host. It was before the presence of the Lord descended in this temple as on Sinai in holiness, that we appeared this morning; when, by the august symbols of the body and blood of the Redeemer of mankind, we came again to take the oath of fidelity we have so often uttered, and so often broken. It was in the presence of God that thou didst appear, contrite of heart! Penitent sinner! He discerned thy sorrows, He collected thy tears, He attested thy repentance. It was in the

presence of the Lord thy God that thou didst appear, hypocrite! He unmasked thy countenance, He pierced the specious veils which covered thy wretched heart. It was in the presence of the Lord thy God that thou didst appear, wicked man! Thou, who in the very act of seeming to celebrate this sacrament of love, which should have united thee to thy brother as the soul of Jonathan was knit to David, wouldst have crushed him under thy feet. What a motive to attention, to recollection! What a motive to banish all vain thoughts; which so frequently interrupt our most sacred exercises! What a motive to exclaim as the patriarch Jacob; “How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.”

2. The universality of the contract

Moses required the Israelites in renewing their covenant with God, to consider the universality of the contract. “Ye stand all of you before the Lord.” The Hebrew by descent, and the strangers; that is, the proselytes, the heads of houses, and the hewers of wood, and drawers of water; those who filled the most distinguished offices, and those who performed the meanest services in the commonwealth of Israel; the women and children; in a word, the whole without exception of those who belonged to the people of God. It is worthy of remark, my brethren, that God on prescribing the principal ceremonies of the law, required every soul who refused submission to be cut off; that is, to sustain an awful anathema. He hereby {166} signified, that no one should claim the privileges of an Israelite, without conformity to all the institutions He had prescribed. So persuaded were the people of this truth, that they would have regarded as a monster, and punished as a delinquent, any man, whether an Israelite by choice, or descent; who had refused conformity to the passions, and attendance on the solemn festivals.

Would to God that Christians entertained the same sentiments! Would to God, that your preachers could say, on sacramental occasions, as Moses said to the Jews in the memorable discourse we apply to you; “Ye stand all of you this day before the Lord your God; the captains of your tribes, your elders, your officers, your wives, your little ones, from the hewer of wood to the drawer of water.” But alas! How defective are our assemblies on those solemn occasions! But alas!

Where were you, temporizers, Nicodemuses, timorous souls? Where have you been, it is now a fortnight since you appeared before the Lord your God, to renew your covenant with Him. Ah! Degenerate men, worthy of the most pointed and mortifying reproof, such as that which Deborah addressed to Reuben; “Why didst thou stay among the sheep-folds, to hear the bleating of the flocks?” (Judges 5:16) You were with your gold, with your silver, sordid objects, to which you pay in this nation the homage, which God peculiarly requires in climates so happy. You were perhaps in the temple of superstition; while we were assembled in the house of the Most High. You were in Egypt, preferring the garlic and onions to the milk and honey of Canaan; while we were on the borders of the promised land, to which God was about to give us admission.

Poor children of those unhappy fathers! Where were you, while we devoted our offspring to God who gave them; while we led those for admission to His table, who were adequately instructed; while we prayed for the future admission of those who are yet deprived by reason of their tender age? Ah! you were victims to the indifference, the cares, and avarice of those who gave you birth! You were associated by them with those who are enemies to the reformed name; who, unable to convince the fathers, hope, at least, to convince the children, and to extinguish in their hearts the minutest sparks of truth! O God! If thy justice have already cut off those unworthy fathers, spare, at least, according to thy clemency, these unoffending creatures, who know not yet their right hand from their left; whom they would detach from thy communion, before they are acquainted with its purity!

Would to God that this was all the cause of our complaint! Oh! where {167} were you, while we celebrated the sacrament of the Lord’s supper? You, inhabitants of these provinces, born of reformed families, professors of the reformation! You, who are married, who are engaged in business, who have attained the age of forty or fifty years, without ever participating of the holy Eucharist! There was time, my brethren, among the Jews, when a man who should have had the assurance to neglect the rites which constituted the essence of the law, would have been cut off from the people. This law has varied in regard to circumstances; but in essence it still subsists, and in all its force. Let him apply this observation, to whom it peculiarly belongs.

3. Its mutual obligation

Moses required the Israelites, in renewing their covenant with God, to consider what constituted its essence: which, according to the views of the Lawgiver, was the reciprocal engagement. Be attentive to this term reciprocal; it is the soul of my definition. What constitutes the essence of a covenant, is the reciprocal engagements of the contracting parties. This is obvious from the words of my text; “that thou shouldest [stipulate or] enter.” Here we distinctly find mutual conditions; here we distinctly find that God engaged with the Israelites to be their God; and they engaged to be His people. We proved, at the commencement of the discourse, that the covenant of God with the Israelites, was in substance the same as that contracted with Christians. This being considered, what idea ought we to form of those Christians, (if we may give that name to men who can entertain such singular notions of Christianity,) who ventured to affirm, that the ideas of conditions, and reciprocal engagements, are dangerous expressions, when applied to the evangelical covenant; that what distinguishes the Jews from Christians is, that God then promised and required; whereas now He promises but requires nothing. My brethren, had I devoted my studies to compose a history of the eccentricities of the human mind, I should have deemed it my duty to have bestowed several years in reading the books, in which those systems are contained; that I might have marked to posterity the precise degrees to which men are capable of carrying such odious opinions. But having diverted them to other pursuits, little, it is confessed, have I read of this sort of works; and all I know of the subject may nearly be reduced to this, that there are persons in these provinces who both read and believe them.

Without attacking by a long course of causes and consequences, a system so destructive of itself, we will content our selves with a single text. Let them produce a single passage from Scriptures, in which God requires the acquisition of knowledge, and engages to bestow it, without the lest fatigue {168} of reading, study, and reflection. Let them produce a passage, in which God requires us to possess certain virtues, and engages to communicate them, without enjoining us to subdue our senses, our temperance, our passions, our inclination, in order that we may attain them. Let them produce one passage from the Scriptures to prove, that God requires us to be saved by the merits of Jesus Christ,

and engages to do it, without the slightest sorrow for our past sins, without the least reparation of our crimes ...without precautionary measures to avoid them...without the qualifying dispositions to participate the fruits of his passion. What am I saying! Let them produce a text which overturns the hundred, and the hundred more passages which we oppose to this gross antinomian system, and with which we are ever ready to confront its advocates.

We have said, my brethren, that this system destroys itself. Hence it was less with a view to attack it, that we destined this article, than to apprise some among you of having adopted it, at the very moment you dream that you reject and abhor it. We often fall into the error of the ancient Israelites, frequently forming an erroneous notion of the covenant God has contracted with us, as they did of that He had contracted with them. This people had violated the stipulations in a manner the most notorious in the world, God did not fulfill His engagements with them, because they refused to fulfill their engagements to Him. He resumed the blessings He had so abundantly poured upon them; and, instead of ascribing the cause to themselves, they had the assurance to ascribe it to Him. They said, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord" (Jer. 7:4). We are the children of Abraham; forget not thy covenant.... And how often have not similar sentiments been cherished in our hearts? How often has not the same language been heard proceeding from our lips? How often at the moment we violate our baptismal vows; at the moment, we are so far depraved as to falsify the oath of fidelity we have taken in the holy sacrament; how often, in short, does it not happen, that at the moment we break our covenant with God, we require Him to be faithful by alleging ... the cross ... the satisfaction ... the blood of Jesus Christ. Ah! wretched man! Fulfill thou the conditions to which thou hast subscribed; and God will fulfill those He has imposed on Himself. Be thou mindful of thy engagements; and God will not be forgetful of His. Hence, what constitutes the essence of a covenant is, the mutual stipulations of the contracting parties. This is what we engaged to prove.

4. The extent of the engagement

Moses required the Israelites to consider, in renewing their covenant with God, the extent of the engagement; "That thou shouldest enter

into {169} covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath; that he may establish thee today for a people unto himself; and that he may be unto thee a God." This engagement of God with the Jews implies, that He would be their God; or, to comprehend the whole in a single word, that He would procure them a happiness correspondent to the eminence of His perfection. Cases occur, in which the attributes of God are at variance with the happiness of men. It implies, for instance, an inconsistency with the divine perfections, not only that the wicked should be happy, but also that the righteous should have perfect felicity, while their purity is incomplete. There are miseries inseparable from our imperfections in holiness; and, imperfections being coeval with life, our happiness will be incomplete till after death. On the removal of this obstruction, by virtue of the covenant, God engaged to be our God, we shall attain supreme felicity. Hence our Savior proved by this argument, that Abraham should rise from the dead, the Lord having said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham; God is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Matt. 22:32). This assertion, I am the God of Abraham, proceeding from the mouth of the Supreme Being, was equivalent to a promise of making Abraham perfectly happy. Now he could not be perfectly happy, so long as the body to which nature had united him, was the victim of corruption. Therefore, Abraham must rise from the dead.

When God engaged with the Israelites, the Israelites engaged with God. Their covenant implies, that they should be His people; that is, that they should obey His precepts so far as human frailty would admit. By virtue of this clause, they engaged not only to abstain from gross idolatry, but also to eradicate the principle. Keep this distinction in view; it is clearly expressed in my text. "Ye have seen their abominations, and their idols, wood and stone, silver and gold. Take heed, lest there should be among you man or woman, or family, or tribe, whose heart turneth away from the Lord, to go and serve the gods of these nations." Here is the gross act of idolatry. "Lest there should be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood." Here is the principle. I would not enter into a critical illustration of the original terms, which our versions render "gall and wormwood." They include a metaphor taken from a man, who, finding in his field weeds pernicious to his

grain, should crop the strongest, but neglecting to eradicate the plant, incurs the inconvenience he wishes to avoid.

The metaphor is pertinent. In every crime we consider both the plant, and the root productive of gall and wormwood; or, if you please, the crime itself, and the principle which produced it. It is not enough to crop, we {170} must eradicate. It is not enough to be exempt from crimes, we must exterminate the principle. For example, in theft, there is both the root, and the plant productive of wormwood and gall. There is theft gross and refined: the act theft, and the principle of theft. To steal the goods of a neighbor is the act, the gross act of theft: but to indulge an exorbitant wish for the acquisition of wealth... to make enormous charges...to resist the solicitations of a creditor for payment... to be indelicate as to the means of gaining money... to reject the mortifying claims of restitution, is refined fraud; or, if you please, the principle of fraud productive of wormwood and gall. It is the same. With regard to impurity, there is the act and the principle. The direct violation of the command, "thou shalt not commit adultery," is the gross act. But to form intimate connections with persons habituated to the vice, to read licentious novels, to sing immodest songs, to indulge wanton airs, is that refined impurity, that principle of the gross act, that root which speedily produces wormwood and gall.

5. The oath of the covenant

Moses lastly required the Israelites to consider the oath and execration with which their acceptance of the covenant was attended: "that thou shouldest enter into covenant," and into "this oath" What is meant by their entering into the oath of execration? That they pledged themselves by oath, to fulfill every clause of the covenant; and in case of violation, to subject themselves to all the curses God had denounced against those who should be guilty of so perfidious a crime.

And, if you would have an adequate idea of those curses, read the awful chapter preceding that from which we have taken our text, "If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and do all his commandments and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field; in the fruit of thy body, in the fruit of thy land, in the increase of thy cattle. Cursed shalt

thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing and vexation, in all thou settest thine hand for to do, until thou be destroyed; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. And thy heaven that is over thy head, shall be brass; and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies, thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them; and thou shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth. And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness. Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given unto another people. Thine eyes shall see it; because thou servedst not the Lord thy God with {171} joyfulness, and gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things. Therefore thou shalt serve thine enemies which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger, nakedness, and want. The Lord shall bring against thee a nation swift as the eagle; a nation of fierce countenance. He shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst. And thou shalt eat the fruit of thy own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters, in the siege, and in the straitness. So that the man that is tender among you, and very delicate, his eye shall be evil towards his brother, and towards the wife of his bosom; so that he will not give to any of them of the flesh of his children whom he shall eat” (Deut. 28:15, etc.).

These are but part of the execrations which the infractors of the covenant were to draw upon themselves. And to convince them that they must determine, either not to contract the covenant or subject themselves to all its execrations, God caused it to be ratified by the awful ceremony which is recorded in the chapter immediately preceding the quotations I have made. He commanded one part of the Levites to ascend Mount Ebal, and pronounce the curses, and the people to say, Amen. By virtue of this command, the Levites said, “cursed be he that setteth light by his father or his mother, and all the people said, Amen. Cursed be he that perverteth the judgement of the stranger, the fatherless, and widow; and all the people said, Amen. Cursed be he that smiteth his neighbor secretly, and all the people said, Amen. Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them; and the people said, Amen” (Deut. 27:16–26).

The words which we render "That thou shouldst enter into covenant," have a peculiar energy in the original, and signify, "that thou shouldst pass into covenant." The interpreters of whom I speak, think they refer to a ceremony formerly practised, in contracting covenants, of which we have spoken on other occasions. On immolating the victims, they divided the flesh into two parts, placing one opposite to the other. The contracting parties passed in the open space between the two, thereby testifying their consent to be slaughtered as those victims, if they did not religiously confirm the covenant contracted in so mysterious a manner.

The sacred writings afford examples of this custom. In the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, Abraham by the divine command, took a heifer of three years old, and a ram of the same age, and dividing them in the midst, he placed the parts opposite each other: and "behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp passed between those pieces." This was a symbol that the Lord entered into an engagement with the patriarch, according to the {172} existing custom: hence it is said, that "the Lord made a covenant with Abraham." In the thirty fourth chapter of the prophecies of Jeremiah, we find a correspondent passage. "I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant, that they made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts, the princes of Judah... I will even give them into the hands of their enemies." If we do not find the whole of these ceremonies observed, when God contracted the covenant on Sinai, we should mark what occurs in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus: "Moses sent the young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offering, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar; and the other half he sprinkled on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said, we will do, and be obedient." What is the import of this ceremony, if it is not the same which is expressed in my text, that the Israelites, in contracting the covenant with God, enter into the execration-oath; subjecting themselves, if ever they should presume deliberately to violate the stipulations, to be treated as the victims

immolated on Sinai, and as those which Moses probably offered, when it was renewed, on the confines of Palestine.

Perhaps one of my hearers may say to himself, that the terrific circumstances of this ceremony regarded the Israelites alone, whom God addressed in lightnings and thunders from the top of Sinai. What! was there then not a victim immolated, when God contracted His covenant with us? Does not St. Paul expressly say, that “without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins?” (Heb. 9:22). And what were the lightnings, what were the thunders of Sinai? What were all the execrations, and all the curses of the law? They were the just punishments every sinner shall suffer, who neglects an entrance into favor with God. Now, these lightnings, these thunders, these execrations, these curses, did they not all unite against the slaughtered victim, when God contracted His covenant with us... I would say, against the head of Jesus Christ? O my God! what revolting sentiments did not such complicated calamities excite in the soul of the Savior! The idea alone, when presented to this mind, a little before His death, constrained Him to say, “Now is my soul troubled” (John 12:27). And on approaching the hour: “My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death. {173} O my Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me” (Matt. 26:38–39). And on the cross: “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!” (Matt. 27:46)... Sinner! here is the victim immolated on the contracting covenant with God! Here are the sufferings thou didst subject thyself to endure, if ever thou shouldst perfidiously violate it! Thou has entered, thou hast passed into covenant, and into the oath of execration which God has required.

Application

My brethren, no man should presume to disguise the nature of his engagements, and the high character of the Gospel. Because, on the solemn festival day, when we appear in presence of the Lord our God...when we enter into covenant with Him; and after the engagement, when we come to ratify it in the holy sacrament...we not only enter, but we also pass into covenant, according to the idea attached to the term: we pass between the parts of the victim divided in sacrifice; we pass between the body and blood of Christ, divided from each other to represent the Savior’s Death. We then say, “Lord! I consent, if I

should violate the stipulations of thy covenant, and if after the violation I do not recover by repentance, I consent, that thou shouldest treat me as thou hast treated thy own Son, in the Garden of Gethsemane, and on Calvary. Lord! I consent that thou shouldest shoot at me all the thunderbolts and arrows which were shot against Him. I agree, that thou shouldest unite against me all the calamities which were united against Him. And, as it implies a contradiction, that so weak a mortal as I, should sustain so tremendous a punishment, I agree, that the duration of my punishment should compensate for the defects of its degree; that I should suffer eternally in the abyss of hell, the punishments I could not have borne in the limited duration of time.”

Do not take this proposition for an hyperbole, or a rhetorical figure. To enter into covenant with God is to accept the Gospel precisely as it was delivered by Jesus Christ, and to submit to all its stipulations. This Gospel expressly declares, that “fornicators, that liars, that drunkards, and the covetous, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” On accepting the Gospel, we accept this clause. Therefore, on accepting the Gospel, we submit to be excluded the kingdom of God, if we are either drunkards, or liars, or covetous, or fornicators: and if after the commission of any of these crimes, we do not recover by repentance. And what is submission to this clause, if it is not to enter into the execration of oath, which God requires of us, on the ratification of his covenant?

Ah! my brethren, woe unto us should we pronounce against ourselves so {174} dreadful an oath, without taking the precautions suggested by the Gospel to avert these awful consequences. Ah! my brethren, if we are not sincerely resolved to be faithful to God, let us make a solemn vow before we leave this temple, never to communicate, never to approach the Lord’s table.

What! never approach this table! never communicate! Disdain not to enter into the covenant which God does not disdain to make with sinners! What a decision! Great God, what an awful decision! And should this be the effect of my discourse! Alas! my brethren, without this covenant, without this table, without this oath, we are utterly lost! It is true, we shall not be punished as violators of vows we never made: but we shall be punished as madmen; who, being actually in the abyss of perdition, reject the Redeemer, whose hand is extended to draw us thence. Let us seek that hand, let us enter into this covenant with God.

The engagements, without which the covenant cannot be confirmed, have, I grant, something awfully solemn. The oath, the oath of execration which God tenders, is, I further allow, very intimidating. But what constitutes the fear, constitutes also the delight and consolation. For what end does God require these engagements? For what end does He require this oath? Because it is His pleasure, that we should unite ourselves to Him in the same close, constant, and indissoluble manner, as He unites Himself to us.

Let us be sincere, and He will give us power to be faithful. Let us ask His aid, and He will not withhold the grace destined to lead us to this noble end. Let us say to Him, “Lord, I do enter into this oath of execrations; but I do it with trembling. Establish my wavering soul; confirm my feeble knees; give me the victory; make me more than conqueror in all the conflicts, by which the enemy of my salvation comes to separate me from thee. Pardon all the faults into which I may be drawn by human frailty. Grant, if they should suspend the sentiments of fidelity I vow to thee, that they may never be able to eradicate them.” These are the prayers which God loves, these are the prayers which He hears. May He grant us to experience them! Amen. {175}

4. BOOK REVIEWS

BOOK REVIEWS

John W. Whitehead, *The Second American Revolution.*

Elgin, IL: David C. Cook Publishing Co., 1982. 253 pp., \$10.95.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

John W. Whitehead is a practicing lawyer domiciled in Manassas, Virginia. He received the first degree in law from the University of Arkansas. He specializes in constitutional law. He is also an avowed and committed Christian concerned about the effect on American culture and institutions, particularly law, the state, and the political system, of what he regards as a shift in the basic foundations of American life from a biblical to a humanistic base. He is also concerned about what he regards as a threatening moral and professional decline of lawyers. Whitehead is also troubled about the passage of authority to a centralized federal bureaucracy. He feels that the state, rather than the law protecting the individual, has become supreme and that self-government in the United States has literally been wrested from the people by a legislating judiciary. The Supreme Court has become a legis-court, practicing sociological jurisprudence. Consequently, it now serves as a catalyst for social change with the judges acting as planners. Whitehead finds the fact that the Supreme Court as well as lower federal courts make legislation particularly disturbing since the Constitution gives the authority to enact laws only to the legislature. Key to constitutional government, he asserts, is that the people supposedly possess a written document to which an appeal can be made against state interference. A written constitution is itself restriction and limitation on the state. If the constitution can be “interpreted” to fit the social desires of a particular judge or an *en banc* conclave of judges, the value of a constitution is greatly diminished, and the power of the state is increased.

In Whitehead’s view, the Ten Commandments embody the basic principles upon which laws to keep peace and order can be structured. Common law is said to be essentially an age-old doctrine that developed by way of court decision that applied the principles of the Bible to everyday institutions. While not all issues that should be covered by the

law are areas of black and white, law in the true sense is bibliocentric, i.e., concerned with justice in terms of the Creator's revelation. In contemporary society, it is coming to be assumed that the state grants rights to the citizen. This is evaluated as dangerous thinking. Government, as Whitehead views it, is not god. Its proper function is not to create rights, but rather to be God's minister to protect rights God has given to man.

The author suggests that the Internal Revenue Service may best serve as an example of the new jurisprudential view of government. He documents his contention with case examples of self-serving IRS violence, crime, and fraud. It is argued that several congressmen, including former Senators Edward V. Long and Joseph Montoya, who recognized IRS abuses and attempted to curb its power, have had their political careers ruined by that agency. *U.S. v. Euge* is cited as an {177} example of the degree to which the Supreme Court has sanctioned the tax bureaucracy's use of naked power against the citizenry. Whitehead is explicit in the conviction that the goal of the modern humanistic state, rather than the achievement of good government, seeks self-perpetuation at all costs. Judicial relativism deposits "raw power" in the hands of state institutions and, in particular, the courts. Courts then become free to establish law and effectuate control as they see fit. Modern paganism's religious hope has been placed in politics because pagan ideology posits the state as the ultimate order. The possibility of an imposed order becoming a reality in the modern state is felt to be imminent.

Whitehead, however, is not a prophet of doom. He does believe that the humanistic foundation that undergirds the West is crumbling because the current political and social order cannot stand the tensions of contemporary society. To him, it is a Second Revolution, founded upon the Bible and its totality, that holds hope for the future. Whitehead recommends immediate objectives for individual, law student, lawyer, and church. These include breaking down the power of the federal government to its constitutional limit, eliminating massive federal bureaucratic agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service, and other suggestions. Ultimately, the people, as individuals and as members of states, towns, and communities, must take control of their own affairs and refuse assistance from and control by the federal government.

Christians, he asserts, must unite to reenter the whole of a society in all walks of life, especially law and government.

Gordon Clark, *Behaviorism and Christianity*.

Jefferson: Trinity Foundation, 1982.

Reviewed by Bill Kellogg

This latest book by Dr. Clark is one of the most interesting and entertaining studies I have read of late. Anyone who has read Clark's writings before has learned to look for the incisive and witty analysis that one associates with the philosophically trained mind. This work is both an incisive and witty critique of behaviorism, so that you are not only treated to a good and readable analysis of this brand of psychology, but you find yourself chuckling along the way. For instance, on page 58, Clark notes the difficulty that Skinner has in explaining how humans perceive the world, "A person, could not, of course capture and possess the real world." Then follows Clark's comment on this statement by Skinner: "Presumably this means that a physical tree cannot transplant itself from the lawn into our hands." There is another witticism of this kind at the bottom of the same page, and many more scattered throughout the book.

Throughout the book, Clark notes the chief characteristic of behaviorism to reduce everything that is human to "physicalism." By this he means the tendency of behaviorism to see only the most external material aspects of man (53). Why is it that Skinner, Watson, and Ryle follow this reductionist method? As Clark points out in Skinner's thought especially, it's their desire to control. This is especially evident in Skinner's taste for "scientific totalitarianism," and his hatred for individualism, which he sees as leading the world to starvation and overpopulation (74ff.). As Clark points out elsewhere, this reductionist method leads them into all {178} sorts of contradictions. Skinner wants nothing to do with an abstract or conceptual thought because he doesn't believe that there is such a thing, but then, as Clark notes, he turns around and uses such abstract notions as "color" in his discussion of perception, and throughout, Skinner uses the abstract ideas of "rein-

forcement,” and “contingencies” (64ff.). Another difficulty in Skinner’s thought lies in the fact that by denying any sort of mental capacity or state to man, he sees man as totally passive, and man’s environment as active (52). But, as Clark notes at a number of places in his study, Skinner endows the psychological researcher with activity and intelligence (52, 65–66).

Clark finishes his study of behaviorism by critiquing a singularly inane book by Donald MacKay, *The Clock Work Image* (Inter-Varsity Press, 1974). As Clark notes, this book is an attempt to harmonize behaviorism and Christianity. In so doing, MacKay demonstrates that he understands neither modern science nor Christianity. On the one hand, MacKay wants to defend some idea of human freedom as a Christian (86), but on other pages he clearly holds to the mechanistic view of the universe that is the foundation of behaviorism (83ff.). Clark does an excellent job of setting forth the inconsistencies of MacKay’s attempt to harmonize two utterly opposed worlds.

At the beginning of this review I noted that Clark’s work is entertaining as well as interesting and informative. Part of the entertainment of this book lies in the fact that we see the two poles of the Greek mind set forth in as clear relief as one can find anywhere. Dr. Clark clearly sets forth the rabid materialism of behaviorism, and all of the inconsistencies that this leads to. Indeed, materialism as a form of reductionism fails to appreciate the richness of God’s creation, and so leads to absurdities. The ancient Greeks saw the world consisting of two kinds of ultimate reality, mind and matter. The behaviorists focus on matter and deny any such thing as mind. On the other hand, Dr. Clark emphasizes mind to the exclusion of matter. On the last page of his study, Dr. Clark makes the following remarkable statement: “Thinking is not a function of brains” (106). And if you didn’t read John Robbins introduction to the work, then you missed an even more remarkable statement: “Today, Christians are largely materialists in the popular sense of the word. Many do not wish their personal peace and affluence to be disturbed or diminished. Most have been so influenced by mechanism and naturalism that they actually believe that brains think. Stomachs digest, livers secrete, lungs breathe, and brains think [*sic*].” Are Dr. Clark and Mr. Robbins thinking of joining the Church of Christ Scientists? One would think from the above passage by Mr. Robbins that he

is studying to be a practitioner. Clark gets himself into these absurdities, because he has taken the opposite pole of the Greek mind. Skinner would read these statements by Clark and Robbins with a knowing smile. Dr. Clark, brains do think, and stomachs do digest, and so on. Brains are not divinely intended as acoustical insulation so our heads don't sound like timpani, but they were intended to think with. Because I will think when I die, though my body is in the grave, in the presence of the Lord and the martyrs, yet that does not demonstrate that brains have nothing to do with thinking. As Christians we affirm that man is body and {179} spirit, as well as mind, soul, heart, etc. God made us a multifaceted creation, not a one- or two-layered Greek pastry. Dr. Clark's own special brand of reductionism aside, this book by him is a good analysis of the behaviorist mind or lack thereof.

Norman L. Geisler, *Decide for Yourself*.

Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982.

Reviewed by Bill Kellogg

In this work Dr. Geisler seeks to lay before the reader representative passages from various sources beginning with the appropriate biblical citations through the Reformers and culminating with quotes from some of Jack Roger's works as a representative neo-evangelical. From the title, one gets the impression that the book will give him a base for making his own informed decision on the nature of the Bible. However, the author presents the book as a starting point for the reader's investigations. He does not claim to offer anywhere near an exhaustive, or even a determinative body of passages from either the relevant biblical passages or from other sources.

This is, after all, a discover-for-yourself book that has as its primary aim to provide the reader with basic materials to use as the starting point in making an intelligent decision as to the origin and nature of the Bible. (9)

Given this limitation, Dr. Geisler's book does its job acceptably: it is a good starting point for entering the fray over the veracity of the Bible. Given that it is a small book (115 pages), Dr. Geisler could hardly be

expected to accomplish more than he has. But the important question to ask about this book has to do with the historical context that it enters. If those who hold to a more plastic view of the authority and inspiration of Scripture had published nothing more than Jack Rogers compendium *Biblical Authority*, Dr. Geisler's current offering would be quite good for the situation at hand. But Rogers and McKim published *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible* (San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, 1979). Though Professor Woodbridge of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School has written an excellent, and devastating review of Rogers and McKim's book in the *Trinity Journal*, yet it is not easily accessible to the larger reading public. Perhaps Dr. Geisler felt that the Rogers and McKim work was so bad that it did not deserve any comment at all. It would have been helpful if Dr. Geisler had given a brief comment on the Rogers and McKim work in an appendix. Many of the people who would see Dr. Geisler's work on the shelf in their local Christian bookstore would be likely to see the Rogers and McKim work as well. Anyone who read both of these works together would be confused by the experience at best, and if they were untrained in the methods of research and documentation, as most people are, they would find the Rogers and McKim work more compelling than Geisler's.

The main threat of the Rogers and McKim study is their presentation of Calvin's statements concerning bibliology. Geisler presents what are representative passages of Calvin's view of Scripture. There is little question as to what Calvin believed in the main about the nature of Scripture. {180}

So long as your mind entertains any misgivings as to the certainty of the word of God, its authority will be weak and dubious, or rather will have no authority at all. Nor is it sufficient to believe that God is true, and cannot lie or deceive, unless you feel firmly persuaded that every word which proceeds from him is sacred, inviolable truth. (*Institutes*, 3.2.6, quoted in *Decide for Yourself*, 47).

Though this is an excellent quote, and is worthy to be memorized, yet it fits right into Rogers and McKim's contention that Calvin, as well as the other great scholars of the faith up to Francis Turretin and Old Princeton Seminary (Alexander, the Hodges, Warfield, etc.), allowed for mistakes in the Bible but not deliberate deceit. Old Princeton, of

course, gets a lot of abuse from Rogers and McKim for bringing the dangerous idea that the Bible is free from all kinds of error. However, Calvin does make a number of comments which seem to fly in the face of the inerrantist position. Perhaps the most famous problematic utterance by Calvin is his comment on Matthew 27:9, which both Geisler and Rogers and McKim deal with. Geisler gives the following reproduction of the comment without any explanation other than a heading, and brackets in the body of the quote.

Copyist Errors. How the name of Jeremiah crept in [the manuscript of Matt. 27:9] I confess that I do not know, nor do I give myself much trouble to inquire. The passage itself plainly shows that the name of Jeremiah has been put down by mistake, instead of Zechariah. (Calvin's *Commentaries*, Matt 27:9, in *Decide for Yourself*, 47).

Rogers and McKim cite this passage from Calvin as well, but they make no attempt to clear up the ambiguity of Calvin, as Geisler does, and in the opening line of the paragraph we get the implication that error lies with Matthew rather than a copyist:

The divine character of the biblical message was absolutely unaffected for Calvin the believer when Calvin the scholar discerned technical inaccuracies in the humanly written text. (Rogers and McKim, 110)

The confusion that the average reader might have over this one rather minor problem in the text of Matthew after reading Geisler's rendering, and then Rogers and McKim is nothing compared to what he might feel after reading Rogers and McKim on Calvin's comment on the problem in Acts 7:16. In that text Stephen says that the patriarchs were buried in Abraham's tomb. The following is what Rogers and McKim have to say about Calvin's comment:

In his commentary on Acts 7:16, Calvin declared that Luke had "made a manifest error" as comparison with the text of Genesis 23:9 showed. (Rogers and McKim, 110) {181}

This reviewer looked at the text of Calvin's commentary on this passage and found the wording substantially different than that given in the above quote from Rogers and McKim. They probably got the wording "made a manifest error" from a free rendering in one of the many secondary and tertiary works that their book is built on. This kind of shoddy documentation can be replicated time and time again from their work, as Woodbridge has shown with a number of samples. And

it is, no doubt, why Dr. Geisler felt there was no point in commenting on their work in this present book. But Calvin does say in a circuitous way that Luke erred in the statement of Acts 7:16, and it would have been a great help if Dr. Geisler had especially dealt with Calvin's problematic comment on the problematic passage from Acts. If nothing else, he could have said that it is through the fires of controversy that the church has refined her understanding of divine revelation, and as the inspiration and veracity of the Scriptures were not an issue in Calvin's day, we do not expect him to have all the refinement in his doctrine of Scripture that has been gained in the four successive centuries since his day.

Perhaps the most glaring weakness in Geisler's work appears in his selection of quotes from Augustine. The selection comes from letter 28, which Augustine wrote to Jerome. Augustine chides Jerome for presenting Paul as lying deliberately in the Galatian controversy with Peter. The following portion of the text is given by Rogers and McKim:

It is one question whether it may be at any time the duty of a good man to deceive; but it is another question whether it can have been the duty of a writer of Holy Scripture to deceive; nay, it is not another question—it is no question at all. For if you once admit into such a high sanctuary of authority one false statement as made in the way of duty, there will not be left a single sentence of those books which, if appearing to any one difficult in practice or hard to believe, may not by the same fatal rule be explained away, as a statement in which, intentionally, and under a sense of duty, the author declared what was not true. (Augustine, in Rogers and McKim, 31)

As noted above, it is the position of Rogers and McKim that Augustine allows for error in Scripture as inadvertent error, in areas such as science and history, but will not tolerate error in the sense of deliberate falsehood. The quote above is the chief piece of evidence from the Augustine corpus which they use to support this contention of theirs. Geisler includes the same quote with a portion of the text omitted by Rogers and McKim:

For it seems to me that most disastrous consequences must follow upon our believing that anything false is found in the sacred books, that is to say, that the men by whom the Scripture has been given to us and committed to writing, did put down in these books anything

false....For if you once admit into such a high sanctuary, etc. (Geisler, 36) {182}

Obviously both Rogers and McKim and Geisler thought to help their readers to understand Augustine's true intent by eliminating portions of the text that confused the issue. Professor Woodbridge quotes the same edited version of the text as Geisler in his otherwise superior review in the *Trinity Journal*. Neither Dr. Woodbridge nor Dr. Geisler needed to indulge in this kind of editorial activity, as the portion left out by Rogers and McKim argues against their reductionist interpretation of Augustine.

Dr. Geisler's book, *Decide for Yourself*, could have been much stronger with just a few more pages added, but, as it is, it is a readable starting point for studying the inspiration and authority of the Bible.

Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian World View.*
Vol. 1: A Christian View of Philosophy and Culture.
Vol. 2: A Christian View of the Bible as Truth.
Vol. 3: A Christian View of Spirituality.
Vol. 4: A Christian View of the Church.
Vol. 5: A Christian View of the West.

Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1982. 2,115 pp. \$75.00 set.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

This comprehensive set of the works of Dr. Francis Schaeffer is a reprint of twenty-one of the eminent doctor's books written between 1968 and 1981 collected into an attractive five-volume compendium. These are the same books as originally published, primarily in the 1970s, updated and clarified where pertinent. Dr. Schaeffer, in his preface to volumes 1–5, expresses the opinion that the books are even more timely for the 1980s than when first published.

Dr. Schaeffer is a philosopher par excellence. The sage of L'Abri has established himself as one of the most influential spokesman for the universal application and influence of revealed truth in all dimensions of thought and activity. History, to a large degree, is the outworking of ideas by which men live. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that

men's values, beliefs, and view of truth, their concept of the nature of man and of God, and of the relationships of men among themselves and to God, be based on a firm foundation. As Dr. Schaeffer artfully sets forth in varying contexts, it is the revealed truth of Scripture which provides the only ultimate base for values. As Dr. Schaeffer expressed in "No Little People" (reissued in vol. 3 of his *Complete Works*): "Men's thirsting can only be satisfied within the framework that answers two questions: what is the meaning of man, and why is he in the dilemma he is in." The alternatives are: meaninglessness and bottomlessness, totalitarianism or anarchy, on the one hand, or the revealed truth of reality in the finished work of Christ and the application of eternal truth to the continuing conflict of the age on the other. Dr. Schaeffer's *Complete Works* are major markers and illuminations of man's status and hope for remedy of his cultural and spiritual decadence. His own words expressed in "To Eat, To Breathe" set forth the influence and effectual calling of Dr. Schaeffer's works: {183}

To eat, to breathe
 to beget
 Is this all there is
 Chance configuration of atom against atom
 of god against god
 I cannot believe it.
 Come, Christian triune God who lives,
 Here am I
 Shake the world again.

The Reformation shook the earth. Its basis was the enlightenment flowing from conscious effort of applying the Word of Truth, the Christian world and life view, to the totality of existence. It is to renaescent application of the truth of Scripture to the totality of experience toward which Dr. Schaeffer's thought is pointed, and it is to this end that the collection of his books into a single volume is especially valuable. One hopes that Crossway Books will see fit to go beyond the five volumes provided here by adding the collected writings of Mrs. Edith Schaeffer in concert with those of her distinguished companion. Their works are eminently valuable for the Christian and non-Christian, but,

for the Christian, they are works in which one may intellectually and spiritually revel.

**Carol Felsenthal, *Phyllis Schlafly:
The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority.***

Alton, IL: Marquette Press, n.d. \$14.95 (hardback). Chicago, IL:
Regnery Gateway, \$3.95 (paper).

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly, articulate, educated, energetic, confident, organized, successful, controversial, is in some ways the epitome of the liberated woman. Mother of six, homemaker, author of nine books, Radcliffe master's graduate in political science who declined a fellowship to become a doctor (and doubtless a brilliant academic career had she so chosen), political activist, a devout Catholic who looks to the Scriptures as an irrefutable moral code, Mrs. Schlafly is a sterling representative of the attributes of the virtuous woman set forth in Proverbs 31:10–31.

The author, Carol Felsenthal, approached her subject with such deep-down suspiciousness of Mrs. Schlafly that, fulminating on “the Norman Rockwell scene” after spending a Christmas with the Schlafly family, she was tempted to believe that the six children had been rented for the occasion. Mrs. Felsenthal has produced a well-researched, professionally crafted biographical documentary which is neither unduly patronizing nor is it the hatchet job which likely would have enhanced reception and sales.¹³⁹ For a writer of Mrs. Felsenthal's ability, and the disciplined objectivity which she was able to bring to this task, Mrs. Schlafly is indeed a fascinating and worthy topic whose life story is fascinating and worthy reading.

139. Dr. Onalee McGraw, in “Who is Censoring Books: The Debate Continues,” *Education Update* (513 C. St., N.E., Washington, DC, 20002, 6, no. 4 (October 1982)), suggests that *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority* has been effectively censored because of antipathy to the subject and the failure of the author to present Mrs. Schlafly in an opprobrious light.

The notoriety of this intelligent, time-redeeming, disciplined, glorious woman is such that contemplation of her influence brings forth shrieks of anguish and squeals of horror and disgust as to make her something of a feminine counterpart to Jerry Falwell for disdain among the elite and for opprobrium of most of the media. For {184} many of the opinion molding set, neither Schlafly nor Falwell are any more admirable than Hitler. Mrs. Schlafly, as Mrs. Felsenthal sets forth in her introduction, is the No. 1 enemy of women's liberation, and may be the one contemporary woman who has truly changed the course of history.

After commenting on the significance and influence of and the reaction to Mrs. Schlafly, the author structures her narrative as an event-by-event chronology of Mrs. Schlafly's life. One needs only a few paragraphs to recognize, as the author herself shortly points out and expresses it, that "Phyllis Schlafly today is a supremely confident woman; the product, obviously, of a secure and a happy childhood" (11). It was not a luxuriant childhood, but the family imparted the value of self-discipline. Women, Mrs. Schlafly feels, are special. Phyllis was nurtured in a family where, as her sister expressed it, "My father believed my mother was special—and he treated her as such." Incongruous, the author asks, considering that the fortunes of the Depression were such that Phyllis's father made the rounds daily looking for work that was not to be found, and Phyllis's mother

...was forced off the pedestal and into the bleak, cruel Depression-era job market. No, Schlafly replied, for to her the pedestal is not a perch for lounging around downing bonbons and receiving insipid callers. Women are special because they bear and raise children, make breakfast, keep the hearth burning, scrub the bathroom floor, nurse a sick child through the night—and also, perhaps, work a full-time job. (27)

Mrs. Schlafly, the media-designated "first lady of anti-feminism," as Mrs. Felsenthal's chronology makes clear, was "liberated" decades before the phrase became hackneyed. She gives us Phyllis as a high school girl, the college student working her way through college as a gunner and ballistics technician, and the graduate student at Radcliffe. Graduating from Radcliffe in 1945, Phyllis declined opportunities for law school and Ph.D. studies, entered the world of work, of romance and marriage, and as incrementally renowned public figure. Felsenthal

tells it all with stylistic and informative grace. One learns who Mrs. Schlafly is, and what she believes, with her statements, perspectives, and viewpoints presented throughout the book.

Mrs. Schlafly, easily conquering lawyers in debate, nevertheless found herself repetitively asked “are you a lawyer” as defensive mechanism. Mrs. Schlafly squelched this by entering law school after age fifty and is now a member of the Illinois bar. Notwithstanding her notable accomplishments, she has raised six children. Two sons are doctors (a Ph.D. who is on the mathematics faculty of the University of Chicago and one who is a physician), one son is a lawyer, one daughter is a law student daughter, and one son and daughter, at the time of the writing, had not completed their undergraduate education. Love her or hate her, Mrs. Felsenthal opines, Mrs. Schlafly is a power to be reckoned with, a woman whose inevitable impact on the eighties dismays her foes almost as much as it delights her fans. Mrs. Schlafly, as is most obvious from the account of her life, is a dominion-exercising {185} woman. She exerts leadership and a godly, conservative influence with boldness and success. She is greatly to be admired. The book on her life by Mrs. Felsenthal is one which can be profitably and enjoyably read by adults and children. *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority* is a good book, reflecting the wholesomeness of Mrs. Schlafly, who is herself a blessing by example. This item is worthy of very high recommendation and very wide circulation.

**J. Kirby Anderson, *Genetic Engineering,*
Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives Series.**

Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982. 135 pp.

**Lane P. Lester, with James C. Hefley,
*Cloning: Miracle or Menace?***

Wheaton, IL: Tybdale House Publishers, 1980. 153 pp. \$4.95.

Both reviewed by Richard Green

The term “genetic engineering” is used to describe research into the manipulation of the genetic code. It means that the molecules that carry the codes, the blueprints, for the construction of proteins and other substances in each of the cells of our bodies may be engineered—redesigned and constructed to be more efficient. This carries with it the hope that the process of evolution can be speeded up as man gains control over the laws of nature. As scientists explore the nature of our physical being, as they uncover what makes us tick, they are inevitably drawn to tinker with the design, to improve it. This is a perverse fulfillment of God’s command given to Adam in the Garden of Eden: to be steward over the Earth and its inhabitants. Man, ill content to live with God’s revelation of Himself, or within God’s Law, strives to discover things for himself. Once uncovered, such things as the hidden laws of nature are placed at man’s disposal.

The idea that certain of the laws which govern the Creation should be uncovered does indeed fall under the purview of the dominion mandate. But man, in his fallen state, denying the place of God in relation to His Creation, does not view the hidden laws as being from God and built into the structure of Creation. He regards them as neutral: of no moral value, as simply descriptive. Thus, he escapes (temporarily) the requirement that God puts upon him to see the evidence of God in His Creation. He also then escapes having to answer to a Being greater than himself.

After seizing freedom from God and His Law, man believes he can be his own god, arbiter of all things, the new maker of law. But, in the

realm of Creation, man runs up against the tangible and solid wall of physical reality (not to say that spiritual laws are any less real—they simply are not apprehended through the five senses upon which all science depends). The laws cannot be changed. Certain laws may be circumvented (for awhile), such as when airplanes take advantage of certain laws to fly, in spite of the law of gravity. Gravity is thus never overthrown or {186} avoided, it is only temporarily set aside.

In the same way, man discovered that he can circumvent certain laws of genetics—namely, the inheritance of physical characteristics—by manipulating the genetic code in a living organism. This is done via the combination, or recombination, of strands of genetic material, removed from one organism, and implanted in the genetic matrix of another—even if of a different species. Such an altered organism can pass on its newly acquired characteristics to the next generation. This is, indeed, the dream of many, to control inheritance, to control the process of evolution.

While most people don't mind manipulating the characteristics of plants, animals, or bacteria, they do mind any tampering with the make-up of human beings. But, as both Anderson and Lester ably point out in these books, methods such as artificial insemination and "in vitro" fertilization (which is fertilization of a human ovum in a petri dish, "ex vivo," rather than in a mother's womb) are really manipulation and control of the inheritance of genetic material, even though they seem far removed from the sterile environment in which recombinant DNA research is performed.

How does that series of messages which dictates the design of the substances which makes us up get passed on from generation to generation? The monk Gregor Mendel, whom popular science textbooks describe as the father of modern genetics, made fundamental observations on the results of plant breeding and noted how physical characteristics were passed on from "parents" to "children." These observations were made on what is called the phenotype of the genotype—the genetic mixture which codes for the structure of the organism.

Over the last decades, scientists (particularly biochemists and molecular biologists) have been studying the only things that matter to most of them, the genetic code and its physical expression as dictated

by the molecules DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) and RNA (ribonucleic acid). They work to uncover how the code dictates the physical expression. Strictly speaking, genes consisting of molecules of DNA carry the code, and RNA assists in the process of decoding it, and in the construction of the molecules of proteins, such as enzymes, coded for in the DNA (indeed, some scientists might maintain that the DNA is itself the code). DNA, along with some protective proteins and other substances, makes up the chromosomes that reside in each cell of each organism in Creation. The DNA molecules which make up the genes are set in a sequence which dictates the structure of proteins, which are vital to the survival of the cell. Without the correct proteins made in just the correct way, cells could not carry out their normal functions. Many diseases have been traced to defects in the coding sequences for important proteins. It is thought that if sequences can be repaired, then molecules might be made aright, and the cells affected (and the organism in which they reside) could work satisfactorily again.

This idea, that the codes can be decoded, and perhaps repaired if found defective in a given organism, is central to the belief that genetic engineering holds a bright future for mankind. It is seen as the tool by which man can reach a millennium {187} of prosperity, with food for all and a populace free of disease—cured or ameliorated by genetic tinkering with the organism or by drugs produced by bacteria.

The premise of each of these books is that there are very possible, very real dangers associated with genetic engineering as it is currently practiced, and that Christians must take the opportunity afforded them to speak out on these issues. The dangers are not only physical, but spiritual, as man increasingly takes ethical judgment away from God and His Word, and gives it to those scientists entrusted with the secrets of nature. The problem with such a trust is that we will always be betrayed by such men. Scandals in research are common news nowadays, and it is evident, as Lester show us well, that men of science are no better arbiters of ethics and morality than laymen. Neither wishes to be subject to the Law of God, however, so judgment is given over to those with arcane knowledge.

Each author approaches the subject of genetic engineering in a markedly different way. Anderson describes the entire range of research that may be regarded as falling into the realm of genetic engi-

neering, from constructing new microorganisms to artificial insemination to cloning of human beings. His audience is those evangelicals who like to think about current issues, who have probably read Francis Schaeffer and John White. In trying to reach these, however, he attempts to cover all sides of an issue, with the result that his writing is equivocal. An example is this last phrase in his chapter on “in vitro” fertilization.

There are options other than IVF (in vitro fertilization) for infertile couples; therefore IVF seems an inappropriate technology for medical science at this time. (73)

Oddly enough, in his chapter on “in vitro” fertilization, he offers his best treatment of the overuse of technology.

Christians must raise questions about the means by which these ends are achieved. Motivated by a technological imperative that in effect argues that if we can do it we should do it, many in the scientific and medical communities are willing to proceed without asking ethical questions. (67)

Genetic Engineering is very informative; however it may not stir people to action. Dr. Lester, in his book on cloning, covers similar ground in giving background to the question of genetic engineering through growing clones. He addresses a different group of readers from Anderson. His style is more popularized, less technical, and a bit more inflammatory (his style may be attributable to his collaboration with Mr. Hefley). Although his major topic is human cloning and its implications, he covers “in vitro” fertilization as well. A good example of his writing is the very last statement in the book:

Man’s knowledge is a precious resource. When he uses it to protect and enhance the dignity and sanctity of human life, God will bless it. But let him tamper with God’s {188} order of life for his own ends, and man places himself in grave danger. The day of reckoning will come. (153)

Lester’s book, because of its style and audience, may well provoke more people to action.

The question is whether or not man is subverting God’s Law in his current use of genetic engineering techniques. Where do we draw the line? Unfortunately, neither book suggests that God has absolute and concrete answers, nor that the Law can help us in these decisions. The

Christian is told that he must participate in the decision-making process, but is not advised to see what God may have already said about such things. Anderson and Lester alike seem to feel that the only issues against which there is a strong biblical mandate are abortion and the destruction of embryos used in experimentation. This is very unfortunate. Both these books are recommended for the curious reader, whether layman or not. They are highly readable (with the proviso mentioned above), and both give an excellent introduction to the topics of genetic engineering and cloning. Both books contribute to the cause of reconstruction in that they seek to inform the Christian reader and attempt to provoke him to action under God.

**Elgin Groseclose, *America's Money Machine:
The Story of the Federal Reserve.***

Norwalk, CT: Arlington House, 1980.
286 pp., \$14.95 (paper).

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

Dr. Groseclose is founder-director of the Institute for Monetary Research Inc., and is the head of a financial and investment consulting firm. *America's Money Machine* is a detailed account of the background, origin, and formation of the Federal Reserve. The author narrates the events and explores the issues leading to its enactment and the subsequent modification of its form and structure. The history of the Federal Reserve and the uses to which it has been put are traced from the Panic of 1907. Personalities and events, the Aldrich-Vreeland Bill or the Emergency Currency Act of 1908, the National Monetary Commission, Theodore Roosevelt, Paul Warburg, the influential theorist of central banking, Elihu Root, and William Jennings Bryan, important in the initiation of the Federal Reserve, are set in historical and influential perspective.

The Federal Reserve, Groseclose states, was initially designed to serve the domestic needs of the nation. World War I, he states, did to the Federal Reserve what battle does to man; it revealed the institution's frailties and imperfections, changed its character, wounded its vital

parts. The war was the incubator which hastened exposure of the misconceptions of the framers of the Federal Reserve as to the realities of the business world the system was designed to serve.

Whereas the Federal Reserve is said to have been initially designed to assist commerce and business by attention to money and credit supply, in the 1920s attention was directed toward “maintenance of a stable price structure.” Changes in the monetary system introduced by the Federal Reserve Act provided leverage for the greatest credit boom in modern times. By 1929 the United States was {189} overwhelmed by a flood of credit. The efforts of the Hoover administration to arrest the spreading business and social disintegration following the stock market collapse are likened to the stand of the Spartans at Thermopylae. Though the issue was never clear-cut, “the failure of these efforts marked in a sense the rout of individualism in American life, and the acceptance of the theories of statism, authoritarianism, government planning, and group responsibility.”

Groseclose discusses the theory and fallacies, and the influence of John Maynard Keynes’s economic necromancy. And the New Deal:

One point may be made clear at once: without the Federal Reserve the New Deal would not have been possible. The Federal Reserve provided the mechanism by which money was managed. It also was the veil by which these manipulations were concealed and given the illusion of normal fiscal operations in the traditional convention....By filtering its activities through the monetary fabric, government retained the appearance of functioning within the historic private enterprise system. Thus, government was never compelled to requisition or sequester property for its needs; it could always acquire by purchase, since its means were unlimited.

The author discusses the post-World War II entanglements of the Federal Reserve with the State Department as the government embarked on a foreign policy of worldwide military alliances and cultivation of world opinion and support through a massive expenditure under a program of “assistance” to other nations. The last three chapters are “The Chute” (the accelerating drop in the purchasing power of the currency), “Into the Pit” (depreciating currency and monetary expansion), and “Out of the Pit.”

The last chapter looks at specific reforms required to restore integrity to the monetary system. Certain false gods of economic doctrine

must be exorcised, including the misconceptions that prices should rise, that “fine tuning for political ends is desirable, and that money supply in the form of debt can be controlled.” Other misconceptions noted are that the Constitution grants to the government of the United States a right to manage the economy (rather, only to coin money and regulate its value), that monetary systems can be erected on other than a transferable substance of market value, and that the banking system is sound and solvent and depositors are protected by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In closing, Dr. Groseclose expresses a caveat to the notion that “sovereign majesty is sufficient to gull a public into complacency over its hypocrisies, sophistries, and outright fraud.... Eventually a defrauded people will turn against their government as they did in France in 1789 and in Iran in 1979” To Groseclose, government actions such as enactment of a monetary system that permitted issuance of paper currency redeemable as gold to an extent two-and-one-half times the amount of gold held to redeem the paper, expropriation of privately held gold (1933), and repudiation of the obligation to maintain the convertibility of the dollar (1971), are official immoralities. {190}

The hope of reform requires fruition of seed drilled rather than broadcast. “There remain always a Remnant,” he writes in the finale (as the Lord informed Elijah when he complained that the people had forsaken the Covenant), “who are bearers of the word and doers of the deed. If the message is sent to them in simplicity and sincerity, it will not return empty.”

**Melvin B. Krauss, *Development Without Aid:
Growth, Poverty, and Government.***

New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1983. 208 pp., \$17.95.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

The author maintains that European social democrats and American liberals have damaged Third World countries by exporting social-democratic ideology to them. Ruinous tax and government spending programs are said to be a primary problem of many less-developed

countries (LDC's). These policies often have been foisted upon the poorer nations by international organizations and academic gurus whose thinking has been much influenced by social-democratic ideology.

Krauss labels the heritage of European social democrats and American liberals on LDC development strategy as "northern social-democratic ideology." This economic and political miasma has been translated into economic policies in southern hemisphere countries through three primary routes. One has been northern education of Third World students, thereby indoctrinating impressionable leaders with Keynesian social-democratic ideas. The influence of social-democratic professors was reinforced by their role as advisors to Third World countries, often under the patronage of the United Nations, the Ford Foundation, and similar organizations. Finally, social-democratic policies have been forced upon Third World countries by international organizations and national governments as a precondition for foreign aid.

Destructive themes of the social-democratic or left-liberal tradition of development finance include the notions that high taxation and massive government spending are requisite for LDC economic growth, maximization of governmental intrusion for equitable redistribution through the advantage of socialism, "human capital" investment through public education and public health, and other expansions of the "public sector." He argues that high taxation and big government have been ruinous for Third World countries.

The influence of Professor Walter Heller of the University of Minnesota has been particularly detrimental to LDC's. Krauss notes that it is bad enough when economists give out wrong advice because the theories on which that advice is based are faulty. It is even worse, he states, when the bad advice results from the misuse of scientific authority to impose one's personal biases on others under the guise of scientific factual accuracy. Krauss writes that Heller's 1964 statement, that the income distribution patterns of many LDC's "constitute a compelling case for redistributive government finance," would be dismissed as pure bunk if the speaker were not wrapped in scientific robes. Many naïve persons accepted Heller's dictum as scientific truth simply because Heller had a considerable scientific reputation.

Although the ostensible moral appeal of economic equality through a welfare {191} state may be captivating to some, embracement of the welfare state ethic in LDC's "often has resulted in economic chaos, political violence and eventual military dictatorships." While LDC's are often characterized by relatively feudal-like economies in which a few control a great deal of the national wealth, remedial efforts have too often taken the form of a zero-sum redistributionist program. The American financed land reform in El Salvador, rather than distributing land to the landless, resulted in collectivization. Title is held, not by individuals, nor even by individual collectives, but by the Institute for Agrarian Transformation. Land reform not only reduces the productivity of the land upon which the standard of living of the peasants ultimately depends, thereby depriving peasants of a higher standard of living, but it also leads to decapitalization of the land the peasants inherit. It is sometimes argued by proponents of land reform that "land reform" is "feared" by "the Left." Land reform, Krauss argues, "is a bad joke played on those who can least afford to laugh." It is the peasants who lose the most from land reform.

Zero-sum redistributionist methods to ameliorate poverty are destructive and counterproductive. Preoccupation of a country with income distribution, wherein one group can obtain a larger share of a stale economic pie only at the expense of another group, "is to condemn it to a kind of Tanzanian tango of poverty and repression, redistributing an exceedingly small economic pie for an exceedingly long time to come."

The author shows how "protectionist self-sufficiency" policies in LDC's goes against the law of comparative advantage and promotes stagnation by taxing the efficient sectors of the economy to subsidize the inefficient ones. He demonstrates how foreign aid hurts, not helps. With respect to the attempt to expand the World Bank to further promote international income and wealth transfers and destruction of the private sector, Krauss observes that "the World Bank has become an important vehicle by which the public sector has replaced the private one in much of the Third World. The simple truth is that several international banks...want U.S. and other taxpayers to bail them out from their past imprudent investments in the Third World and Eastern Europe by bailing out the borrowers from impending bankruptcy

through the World Bank.” Krauss feels there is no justifiable reason for taxpayers to assume the consequence of the mistakes of bankers.

Development Without Aid is a tremendous statement on the effect of the Welfare State as an enemy of the living standards and the opportunity for the masses to enjoy the hope for prosperity. Big government is destructive of the economy in numerous ways. Economic development without aid is posited as “an essential condition for economic development.” This book demonstrates that the international marketplace is a much more potent antidote to poverty in the LDC’s than is the international transfer of income. {192}

**Gary DeMar, *God and Government:
A Biblical and Historical Study, vol. 1.***

Atlanta, GA: American Vision Press, 1982. \$8.95.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

The author has prepared a tremendously significant instrument for study and teaching. To restrict biblical truth to spiritual and/or ecclesiastical matters is to deny the sovereignty of God and reject the Lordship of Christ. It is Scripture that reveals the basic fundamental grant of government and authority. It is the ultimate standard by which all things are to be judged, whether personal, familial, economic, ecclesiastical, or relating to civil government. Scripture does not specifically spell out the form and structure of all things; it does provide the light with which to view all things and by which to measure and judge the form and structure of all things. *In all spheres and arenas of activity, the Christian has the duty to follow the one true King and the Commandments of His Kingdom.*

The author has a solid grasp of the meaning and source of *government*, and the distinction between that term in its generic ordination and the limited sphere of the state (civil government). *God and Government* is addressed in a fundamental way to the overriding issue of our time: who has jurisdiction over every aspect of American society, Jesus Christ or the State? DeMar recognizes that the denouement of the battle over the question of “Who is the Lord of all life to whom man must

give his total allegiance, Christ or Caesar?" is the difference between liberty and slavery, between justice and tyranny. Further, DeMar draws the requirements of faithfulness in unequivocal fashion.

God and Government is arranged in ten lessons styled as "Self-, Family, and Educational Governments," "Church, Local, and Central Governments," "The Origin and Development of Civil Government," "The Purpose and Function of Civil Government," "The Biblical Form of Civil Government," "Jesus and Civil Government," "The Christian History of the United States," "Purpose of the United States Constitution," "The Relationship of Church and State in the Bible," and "The Relationship of Church and State in the First Amendment." Each lesson emphasizes the Bible as the "Great Political Textbook" and is premised on the belief that no government institution (familial, self, ecclesiastical, or civil) can govern properly apart from the commands of God's Word as set forth in both Testaments. Each lesson has questions for discussion and pertinent Scripture references from which answers may be obtained, and instruction, guidance, and standards of evaluation and operational principles may be derived.

The author recognizes that *government*, as ordained by God, is much broader than the state. In fact, it is only by atrophy of meaning that we have come to identify government with the state rather than recognizing that the state embodies only one form or dimension of government, which is *civil* government. *The state is properly viewed as only one government among many.* It is only by departure from the American Christian heritage which was formulated upon biblical principles that the civil government has in practice and popular concept assumed responsibility to be the government.

Teaching in this book is sound truth in which the citizenry needs to be educationally, spiritually, morally, and conceptually grounded. It is good for class, seminar study, scholarly groups, groups of children, family groups, church groups, and for {193} individual servants seeking light. The book is glorious. It is substantive history, informative political economy, and rightly divided theology. The illustrations, signing of the Mayflower Compact, scenes of hearth and labor, study and worship, the course of life (and a most notable "allegorical family record" once distributed by Moline Plow Company) and civil and political events, are apt, graceful, and command attention.

The author demonstrates biblical opposition to centralism, and the threat to centralized powers (Roman or U.S. civil governments) posed by the Church of Jesus Christ. The origin and development of civil government, its purpose, duties, and limits, are presented. Bible principles are set forth for measuring the various forms of civil government, and for judging individual responsibilities to civil government. Of necessity for comprehensive coverage, the requirements of *civil disobedience* are discussed. In fact, this requirement is the janus balance of obedience. Either may be required by obedience to Scripture.

The Christian history of the United States is set forth, and the purpose sought to be achieved by the American constitutional compact is discussed. The author clarifies confusion prevailing today on the relationship between church and state. He gives the real meaning of the First Amendment and dispels the mistaken notion that biblical principles should not be brought to bear on social and political issues.

The purpose of *God and Government* is to give Christians an overview of what the Bible says about government, especially civil government. It is geared to produce, raise up, inspire, arm, and equip sons of Issachar (“And the sons of Issachar [were] men who understood the times with knowledge of what Israel should do...” 1 Chron. 12:32). Those who would do right must have a solid theological base, and a firm theological foundation from which to put their shoulder to the grindstone, so to speak, and get on with the task of occupying till He comes. We have here a stone of firm footing which is an occasion for Christians to rejoice.

The work is one of Reformational principle and understanding. It, along with others of similar nature, and other movements and ministries, illustrates that a standard is being raised against an enemy that has come in like a flood. The voice of Samuel Rutherford is being heard against the claims of the Divine State. Pat Brooks, in a book of like title, has called for the *Return of the Puritan*. The need for revival is a revival of the Lordship of and obedience to the Lord of Lords. An elemental requirement is an understanding of what this Lordship and obedience means. *The need is for renaissance of the Reformation*.

This task requires evangelical conversion, of course, but also an understanding that conversion is more than a “decision” to live happily, or a mere affirmation of having been “born-again”—a plastic phrase

which has degenerated to the effect of having become devoid of substantive meaning in recent years. Pilate may have been “born-again” in the sense of his adoption of the prevailing civil religion, but he did not have a renewed mind. The redeemed man has changed kingdom and loyalty, becoming a servant and soldier, not of Babylon, mammon, and humanist rebellion, but of the heavenly kingdom. This gives the redeemed man earthly responsibilities by virtue of his premier citizenship and adoption into familial identification. Even if {194} his knowledge is incomplete, his intuition, because of his renewed mind, gives evidence that to be a redeemed man, *inter alia*, is to be redeemed in thought, form, and lifestyle. Godly teaching in home, church, and school (under delegated parental, communal auspices, and hegemony, not of state imposition) should fleshen out the task of dominion and equip the redeemed man to perform his callings with “head, heart, and hand.”¹⁴⁰

God and Government: A Biblical and Historical Study is exactly what its title implies. It is an excellent disciplining tool. The American Republic was made possible in the form and structure which gave it shape and historical uniqueness only because of the influence of the applied Word of God. As that moral capital dissipated under humanist preemption, moral and structural underpinnings have eroded with predictable and very practical results (such as the rise of “sociological law”). There are signs of renaissance, including the pulpit (i.e., Dr.

140. To borrow a phrase of Professor Lawrence Jones, founder of the Piney Woods Country Life School near Star, Mississippi. Dr. Jones came to Mississippi and the Piney Woods as a young black college graduate. He noted that blacks were deficient in the most elemental of survival skills—a woman attempting to cut out a dress with a butcher knife, using the worst leftovers for seed corn, using alum for snakebite, lack of sanitation knowledge, and illiteracy. He began a teaching ministry of survival skills—how to iron, whitewash a cabin, read, good work attitudes, of, as Booker T. Washington put it, “letting down your bucket where you are.” Dr. Jones was a man who understood self-government. Therefore, he was a man under authority. There was no civil disobedience to government directions which did not require violation of a command of God. Jones was a great man. The lives of great black men need to be called forth—and plain everyday black men and women, not athletes and political figures or persons with less than shoe-level morals who may be given national prominence if not sanctification in the humanistically oriented cultural ethos—and presented as the godly contrasting role models to which their character merits.

Charles Stanley and Dr. D. James Kennedy, to cite two nationally prominent ministries), which may well have come from the pulpit of John Witherspoon. Let us strive for similar societal results. This is a worthy contribution toward that end.

Russell Kirk, *John Randolph of Roanoke*.

Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Press, n.d.
588 pp. \$9.00 (hardback), \$3.50 (paper).

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

This study in American politics, a history of the life of John Randolph of Roanoke, with selected speeches and letters, first appeared in 1951. For this edition, the sage of Mecosta (Dr. Russell Kirk, the well-known organicist, social philosopher, columnist, and teacher) has made a “modest improvement, and a considerable enlargement” by adding appendices containing several of Randolph’s more important speeches and representative letters ensuing from “the lively mind of a radical man who became the most eloquent of American conservatives.”

Randolph, born into an aristocratic Virginia family three years before the Declaration {195} of Independence, died during the great Nullification Controversy. Kirk states that “no man’s life displays more clearly the chain of events which linked the proclamations of 1776 and of 1832,” and Kirk draws out the chain and describes the links with consummate skill and provides a literary window into the time and age. In Randolph, Kirk deals with a kindred spirit whose “course of life was as fantastic as any romantic novel” and whose “great merit of...political utterance is its merciless realism.” After an introductory chapter on Randolph’s times, course of political fortune, and critics, in “Randolph and This Age,” Kirk follows with “The Education of a Republican,” “The Basis of Authority,” “The Division of Power,” “The Planter-Statesman,” “The Cancer” (on the attitudes of Randolph and other Virginians to slavery and Randolph’s relationship with and attitude toward his servants), and “Change in Reform,” followed by selected speeches and letters. Randolph, Kirk advises, was the sort of

statesman who points out the natural boundaries of the state rather than the sort of statesman who is determined to enlarge those frontiers. Randolph was thoroughly organicist, and greatly influenced by Edmund Burke. He denied that rights exist in the abstract or that profound problems can be settled by the application of positive law. Kirk finds it no exaggeration to label Randolph “the American Burke.”

Although Burke and Randolph might denounce the natural-right theories of Rousseau...they were not men to deny that laws of nature exist—laws, that is, derived from the spiritual character of man and demonstrated in the pages of history. Liberty was no absolute and abstract “Right of Man,” immutable and imprescriptible; but it was a privilege conferred upon men who obeyed the intent of God by placing a check upon will and appetite....No “right,” however natural it may seem, can exist unqualified in society. A man may have a right to self-defense; therefore, he may have a right to a sword; but if he is mad or wicked, and intends to do his neighbors harm, every dictate of prudence will tell us to disarm him. Rights have no being independent of circumstances and expediency.

None of the Virginians were social radicals. The Revolution in America was essentially a struggle for the preservation of old American ways, or traditional rights of Englishmen. While the Virginians might be described as “aristocratic Libertarians,” they did not hold aristocratic views in any strict sense. Their opposition to an established nobility—that is, to a small and special class maintained by law in the possession of exclusive economic and political privilege—was unrelenting. They did not seek preservation of an agrarian society of freeholders, freeholders whom Randolph, like the more optimistic and more liberal Jefferson, considered the strength of the commonwealth. Randolph’s “ideal of inviolate state powers was doomed; and the agrarian society he loved has withered,” Kirk writes, but “in this time when the United States no longer can avoid hard and irrevocable decisions, the imaginative candor of John Randolph of Roanoke deserves rescue from obscurity.” {196}

...[A]lthough Randolph’s sovereign states have been beaten down at one time and bribed into submission at another; although every economic measure he denounced has been made a permanent policy of our national government; although the plantation is desolate and the city triumphant—still, Randolph’s system of thought has its adherents. He has helped to insure us against reckless consolidation and arbitrary

power. His love of personal and local liberties, his hatred of privilege, his perception of realities behind political metaphysics, his voice lifted against the god Whirl—these things endure.

**Nicholas Miller and John Stott, eds.,
*Crime and the Responsible Community.***

Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, n.d. 191 pp., \$5.95 (paper).

**Reviewed by Haven Bradford Gow,
Literary Fellow, the Wilbur Foundation**

The FBI recently reported that, in the United States in 1980, a murder occurred every twenty-three minutes and that robberies took place at a rate of one a minute as crime in this country rose 9 percent. According to the FBI, 13 million serious crimes were reported in 1980 in this nation of 227 million, a level 55 percent higher than just a decade ago. The FBI also pointed out that, compared to 1979 figures, murders in America increased 7 percent, forcible rapes 8 percent, robberies 18 percent, and aggravated assault 7 percent. Moreover, burglaries increased by 14 percent, larcenies and thefts by 8 percent, and vehicle thefts by 2 percent.

Clearly, criminals in our society have been waging war against those of us who seek to live quiet, lawful, and peaceful lives. This alarming fact in part motivates the publication of *Crime and the Responsible Community*, edited by British scholars, John Stott and Nicholas Miller.

As Miller points out in his discussion of crime and its causes, many students of crime sharply disagree on whether “society” or the criminal himself is to blame for crime. Some would like to blame criminal conduct on, say, a bad environment, poor family life, or poverty. Others, however, maintain that the individual is almost always and solely to blame for his crimes, pointing out that even people with wealth and good social and educational backgrounds engage in criminal behavior, and that human beings possess free will and therefore are and must be morally and legally responsible for their deeds (good and bad).

Miller explains that our views of human nature influence how we view crime and try to cope with it. He observes:

A strongly individualistic view will result...in the recruitment of more police, more court appearances and more stringent penalties. Conversely, the focus on the wider social circumstances and their impact on individual decision-making will suggest a greater commitment to such responses as community development, initiatives in education and employment and seeking a more just income distribution.

In his disappointing contribution to this anthology, British scholar Norman Anderson discusses the appropriate penalties and punishment for crimes. It is {197} disappointing because he moves away from an earlier position he had taken on capital punishment (*Issues of Life and Death*, by N. Anderson [Inter-Varsity Press]). Previously, he believed that the death penalty should be permissible for certain crimes; today, however, he thinks that capital punishment is “cruel and unusual punishment,” that all civilized countries must do away with it, and that capital punishment is contrary to religious and humanitarian principles. In my view, however, when a person has raped and murdered a child, that person has relinquished his right to live. Capital punishment in such a case is restitution and demonstrates that a society and legal system are genuinely dedicated to preserving and protecting the rights and safety of the people. Charity, in other words, must also be displayed towards the victims of crimes and their families.

Moreover, there is a biblical basis for capital punishment; indeed, the Mosaic Law provides for the imposition of the death penalty for a number of offenses.

Clearly, if society has the moral right and obligation to act in collective self-defense against aggression emanating from without (e.g., against Nazi and Communist assaults on freedom and human rights), then society likewise has the moral right and obligation to defend itself against aggression emanating from within (e.g., against people who rape and murder children).

Richard B. McKenzie, ed.,
Plant Closings: Private or Public Choices.
Washington, DC: CATO Institute, 164 pp., \$5.00.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

Recently there has been legislative activity at the federal and state levels in an effort to restrict the right to close or relocate industrial plants. This volume critically evaluates the claims of those proposing restrictions on plant closings. The essays indicate that restricting the investment decisions of firms is undesirable from both a theoretical and empirical perspective, in spite of their strong emotional appeal. The case against restrictive legislation is not a case against workers/unions, but a pro-labor argument. The essays support the view that preventing firms from taking advantage of changing economic conditions by restricting plant relocations will not serve the interests of workers. Their effect will be to discourage new business starts in the areas of restriction.

Economic conditions in any dynamic economy are constantly changing, and businesses must be allowed flexibility to fit their location to those conditions. Restrictions on business closings will, over the long run, lead to higher costs of production, higher prices on consumer goods, and lower real incomes—and not just in the regions in which they are imposed: They are, in the long run, necessarily detrimental to all regions.

McKenzie feels that restrictions on business mobility will reduce the efficiency with which resources are allocated on an inter- and intraregional basis, increase the bargaining power of unions, tend to reduce competition among businesses, and foster local monopoly among existing businesses. Since business firms will be {198} unable to “vote with their feet” as easily as they would in the absence of relocation rules, the monopoly power of local and state governments will be enhanced. Relocation rules will likely lead to higher taxes and lower-quality services in many jurisdictions. Restricting plant closings and relocation would not reduce national and regional income levels, in McKenzie’s opinion. It would limit the ability of the economy to respond to changes in people’s taste, changes in technology, in the

availability of resources, and in the mix and demand for particular goods and services. They represent a bad bargain all around—for the communities and for workers. After the political rhetoric is peeled away and the emotions of individual employment losses are set aside, restrictions on business mobility, this book concludes, have very little to recommend them. Legislative restriction on plant closings is seen as an idea whose time should not come.

**Ludwig Von Mises, *Planning for Freedom,
and Sixteen other Essays and Addresses.***

South Holland, IL: Libertarian Press, 1980. 280 pp.

Reviewed by Tommy Rogers

This volume by Libertarian Press, the 4th edition of Dr. Mises *Planning for Freedom*, contains sixteen addresses and essays of the eminent economist and, as stated in a *Wall Street Journal* editorial titled “An Honor for a Philosopher,” June 17, 1963, “champion not merely of an economic philosophy but of the potential of man.” In addition to these and the above editorial, the volume contains an article entitled “The Essential Von Mises,” by Dr. Murray N. Rothbard, which discusses the Austrian School of Economics, Mises and “Austrian Economics,” Mises’s theory of money and credit, Mises’s interpretation of business cycles, his views on the methodology of economics, his theory of human action, his view of the impossibility of economic calculation under socialism, and his experience in America.

“Planning for Freedom” (address to the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1945) discusses the ineptness and inadequacy of interventionism, Mises’s term for a society or political economy where means of production are left in the nominal hands of owners and proprietors but where the collective intervenes to make the system work more “equitably” through price controls, restraints, and similar coercive features which take decisioning away from consumers and place it within the bureaucracy through the political process. Interventionism, Mises argued, was a cause of depression, which is the aftermath of credit expansion; mass unemployment prolonged year after

year is the inextricable effect of attempts to keep wage rates above the level the unhampered market would have fixed. All those evils which progressives interpret as evidence of the failure of capitalism are the necessary outcome of allegedly social interference with the market...many authors who advocated these measures and many statesmen and politicians who executed them had good intentions and wanted to make people more prosperous. But the means chosen for the attainment of the ends aimed at were inappropriate. However good intentions may be, they can never render unsuitable means more suitable.

Other points made by Mises in this seminal essay are that minimum wage rates {199} bring about mass unemployment, and that union policies are harmful to workers in general to whatever extent they are able to use coercion to prevent the unemployed from underbidding union rates. Such policy, Mises asserted, splits the whole potential labor force into two classes: the employed who earn wages higher than those they would have earned on an unhampered labor market, and the unemployed who do not earn anything at all. The union officers, he states, do not care about the fate of nonmembers and especially not about that of beginners eager to enter their industry. "Union rates are fixed at a level at which a considerable part of available manpower remains unemployed. Mass unemployment is not proof of the failure of capitalism, but the proof of the failure of traditional union methods."

In "Middle-of-the-Road Policy Leads to Socialism" (address to University Club, New York, April 1950), he discusses the inevitability of interventionism's leading to socialism (even if its promoters believe and avow they are against socialism). Socialism, Marx notwithstanding, is not an inevitable wave. Society is the result of ideas.

What can prevent the coming of totalitarian socialism is only a thorough change in ideologies. What we need is neither anti-socialism nor anti-communism but an open positive endorsement of that system to which we owe all wealth that distinguishes our age from the comparatively straitened conditions of ages gone by.

"Stones Into Bread: The Keynesian Miracle" (on the religious fervor of true believers in salvation through spending and credit expansion), "Lord Keynes and Say's Law," "Economic Aspects of the Pension Problem," "Economic Teaching at the Universities," and "My Contributions to Economic Theory" are other essays in this volume. Mises recognized

that comparatively little is done to preserve free or private enterprise. Even in the United States, where there is enjoyed the highest standard of living ever attained. Public opinion condemns the system of natural liberty.

...[T]housands of books have been published to indict capitalism and to advocate radical interventionism, the welfare state and socialism. The few books which tried to explain adequately the working of the free market economy were hardly noticed...while authors such as Veblen, Commons, John Dewey, and Laski, were exuberantly praised...the legitimate stage as well as the Hollywood industry are not less radically critical of free enterprise....There are in this country many periodicals which in every issue furiously attack economic freedom. There is hardly any magazine of opinion that would plead for the system that supplied the immense majority of people with good food and shelter, with cars...and other things which the subjects of other countries call luxuries.

Mises felt the choice was between laissez-faire or dictatorship. He was not a social Darwinist (a philosophy which he flatly rejected and condemned). He emphasized {200} social cooperation, the act of will which made society possible. The doctor was a liberal in the classical sense, advocating natural liberty as against the claims of the state to exercise coercion and control. The market was the only social planner, democratic in method, supplying the most and best at the least cost, greatly benefiting and uplifting mankind because of the laws by which reality works and exists. He set forth the sound philosophical basis, from principles of a liberal political economy, by which to put one's shoulder to the grindstone, to find the firm footing, so to speak, for opposition to the command society and the destruction of the social component of existence. Without the firm footing, the "middle-of-the-rovers" who think they have been successful when they have delayed for some time a ruinous measure are "always in retreat.... They put up today with measures which only ten or twenty years ago they would have considered as undiscussable. They will in a few years, acquiesce in other measures which they today consider as simply out of the question."

Mises's voice is one which needs to be heard. He is denied his rightful place as a social theorist (this author has never witnessed a text on social thought, or social theory, which even recognized the existence of

Mises). The reason is partially explained in “Economic Teaching at the Universities,” the remedy of which, in Mises’s opinion, was to give proponents of natural liberty “the same opportunity in our faculties which only the advocates of socialism and interventionism enjoy today.” Surely, he wrote, this is not too much to ask “as long as this country has not yet gone totalitarian.”

“Trends Can Change,” he argued in an essay of like title, but the trend toward the servile state will not be reversed “if nobody has the courage to attack its underlying dogmas.” Mises was a lucid and analytical critic of the politics of rapine and spoilage, and of vested interest political interventionism. To put it very mildly, Mises’s voice needs to be heard abroad throughout the land.

Tom Sine, *The Mustard Seed Conspiracy*.

Waco, TX: Word Inc., 1981.

Reviewed by Howard Ahmanson

The same audiences that have greeted Ron Sider and his book are now greeting a new personality and his book. The new personality is Tom Sine, from Seattle. Unlike Sider, Sine does not teach in a seminary or claim to be a biblical expert. Rather, he is a hands-on man, an executive with World Concern/Christian Ministries, and an occasional commentator on *The 700 Club*. Specifically, he is a futurist, by profession, one who looks into the future to anticipate economic and social changes and prepare people to respond to them. For that reason alone, then, we should look carefully at what he has to say, because too often the church has been caught off guard and has had to respond to a “crisis” that didn’t have to be. “The Party is Over!” he proclaims in a heading (30). Cheap oil is no more: there is only so much farmland: there is only so much earth, period. Unfortunately, he shares the same socialist bias as Sider and his followers: that the consumption of the rich is the cause of the poverty of the poor.

“Few of us stop to think that we are consuming much more than our fair share {201} of global resources to maintain our RV, neon-lit culture, and that our high consumption is driving up the cost of energy

and other resources for the poorer nations.” As a result of our lifestyles, we are a primary cause of global poverty today (26). Not a whole lot of biblical data, of course, as to what our fair share is supposed to be, and he didn’t put any moral ration coupons in the back of the book. “We are only 5 percent of the world’s population, and yet we consume over 40 percent of the world’s resources” (31). Yes, and we produce over 40 percent too. “But where did we get the land from?” Light bulbs begin to click on, and someone replies, “The Indians” (30). Yes, and they took it from other Indians before them and didn’t have a “consumer party.” It is quite true that *this* consumer party is over, but we should not rush to the conclusions that there will never be any kind of party ever again. Sine does say, “To attempt to return to high growth and ever increasing levels of consumption can only cause increased deprivation for the planetary poor” (46). If he is talking about traditional inflationary-Keynesian panaceas for high growth, which many are clamoring for us to return to, he is quite right! But I am not sure he means precisely that. I wish he did!

He says on pages 71–72,

Christ never called his followers to be survivors. If he had been a survivor he would have found a way to avoid the cross. As his followers, we must be prepared as he was to lay down our lives for others—if we have enough extra resources to sock away food reserves, we are mandated by God’s Word [no verse given!—H.F.A.] to use that money to help the world’s poor avert the apocalypse which is for them only moments away, and to trust our personal future to the Father’s care.

True enough, the excesses of the survivalist movements have taught people worry (a sin, Matt. 6:25–34) and imposed on them laborious burdens in time and finances. But the rhetoric that Sine uses does not just question survivalism, but all saving and capital formation as long as there are needy in the world now. I call this sort of thinking “as-long-as-ism.” Would Sine perhaps insist on an exclusively spiritualized interpretation of Proverbs 13:22, “A good man leaves an inheritance for his children’s children, but a sinner’s wealth is stored up for the righteous”? And money, or food, saved or stored is still available for future giving! Sine does work with the poor at Voice of Calvary, Jackson, Mississippi. I hope that he’s not giving them this same message, and that they are

not reading that paragraph, or they will never be able to go into business or build capital for themselves.

After all this, there are some excellent parts to the book too. The best chapter is probably 7, “Seeking First the Future of God through Creative Vocation.” Unfortunately, he implies that only Christian work in health care, education, and social work constitute “service.” I was reminded a bit of C.S. Lewis’s essay, “Good Works and Good Works,” where Lewis declared that Christians should look for work in areas that have social value in themselves apart from the money they bring. But the sort of professions he criticized were prostitution, certain forms of advertising, salesmanship, and other such favorites. But, he would never have {202} thought that the butcher and the baker and the candlestick maker performed less of a valid social function than the doctor or the teacher or the preacher. And doctor’s and nurses and teachers and preachers are quite as capable of greed as those in any other trade! If anyone has any doubts about the full equality of economic callings with “spiritual” callings, let him read Genesis 1:28, 2:15, etc.

But Sine is on much better ground when he says,

What would happen if we stood this whole business of seeking the will of God on its head? Instead of beginning with the question, “What do I want?” I think we would have a better chance of discovering God’s will by asking, “What does God want, and how does He want me to be a part of what He is doing?...” The answer to that question for each of us is our ministry calling—our Christian vocation, and it comes before any specific decisions as to job, spouse, or lifestyle. (140)

Sine’s errors may be common among some sections of the evangelical body, but in my own circles, many of us tend to a quite different error. We accept faith in Jesus Christ as the backdrop and biblical morality (at least New Testament morality) as the rules of the game, but the object of the game remains what Francis Schaeffer calls the “two horrible values of personal peace and affluence.” He also rightly questions an assumption that Americans have held—namely, that the choice to take a second job or to put the wife to work is always above moral questions regardless of the effects on children or on one’s ability to serve. On the other hand, he stands with such people as the rightist Gary North, and the very apolitical Chuck Miller, in emphasizing that time is never neutral and opposing excessive recreation or amusement.

Some of this applies to my own personal life. I would like to live in a different environment than that of Orange County, California, where I live now: but I am convinced that I should move only if the move does not diminish my opportunities for service. Similarly, the house I live in should be big enough for hospitality but should be furnished and decorated in a modest but comfortable way. Much of the book is a catalogue of specific examples of things that Christians have done in various places. It must be said that while Sine seems to want a heavy regulatory hand of government, as to prices and land distribution and the like, he does not seem to want too much government that actually operates industry or even the welfare programs (53–54). He is talking to us, the church.

It is very important to note that we do not have to agree with Sine's economic assumptions to make use of specific ideas. Any Christian who desires to tithe, or eliminate the bondage of debt, can adopt some "simple living" suggestions. He errs in saying that "Jesus is uniquely incarnated in the lives of the poor and forgotten ones," and he does have a tendency to make human need the norm. God does have a sort of special concern for the poor, and a little more concern on our part wouldn't hurt the evangelical church. It's too bad that it has to be people like Sine and Ronald Sider who write effective books urging Christians to stewardship and service. Can't we do better? {203}

**Franky Schaeffer V, *A Time for Anger:
The Myth of Neutrality.***

Crossway Books, 1982. \$5.95.

Reviewed by Caroline Kelly

Secular humanism studiously avoids having anything to do with Scripture with the exception of one passage, the Sermon on the Mount, and in particular the phrase: "Turn the other cheek." Those who are to follow this injunction (but no others) are, of course, the Christians. They must allow all kinds of views to be held, however evil, never so much as suggesting the application of Christian morality. And the most

un-Christian reaction to the confusion, disaster, and death occurring in America today, is anger....

Franky Schaeffer's new book is thus aptly named. It is a plea to Christians to refuse to go along with the current "put-downs" of the media and humanistic elite. Instead he offers an exposé of their tactics, documents case after case of disgracefully unjust treatment of any who espouse Christian truth or morality, and urges reaction rather than mouselike compliance. We are at a crossroads in history, too many cheeks have been turned, and the biblical injunction now most applicable, he says, is: "We must obey God rather than man."

The means that has been used to silence any opposition to the new morality (or rather lack of it) is what Schaeffer calls "the myth of neutrality." By this is meant that the humanist claims an objective perspective, untrammelled by "religious bias." Thus, the humanist alone can be trusted to be fair to all, since he does not try to impose divine constraints on society. After all, the humanist holds, man, relying on modern science, is the measure of all things.... The catch, of course, is that humanism itself is a tenaciously held and militant religion. As Schaeffer points out:

Everyone has some moral bias, even if his "morality" is expressed in immorality or his faith is faith in not having faith at all. That those who do not hold traditional religious or moral positions are somehow operating from a more "neutral" and open-minded stance is illogical and preposterous, especially when seen in the light of the religious fervor with which they propagate their secularist position.... The person of religious convictions is no more biased than anyone else. He has the right to worship as he chooses, and he has the right, as does every other citizen, to engage in political and other human activities like everyone else, on the basis and because of his principles and moral convictions. He has the right to speak out, vote, and agitate for change as a Christian just as the secular humanist has the right to speak out as a humanist. (24-25)

To validate his thesis that the time for anger is indeed now, he deals with areas in society where the push for the eradication of traditional American values is most blatant. He reminds us that the commonly held view of "separation of church and state" is a travesty of our founding fathers intentions, and that religion certainly did then and should now, inform legal and political decisions. The first "villains" are the

powerful media elite, whose ranks are made up, by and large, of self-confessed liberals, quite unrepresentative of mainstream American life. They will tolerate {204} anything but a firm stand on religious principle. Then they bring out their weaponry: name-calling, half-truths, and deceit, or worst of all, censorship of all reference to views differing from their own.

He then reviews the alarming shift away from Judeo-Christian principles in law, politics, medicine, science, education, the arts, and family life. He unmasks the liberal rationale—or rather irrationality—and exposes their “tricks of the trade” by giving numerous examples of how the liberal, anti-Christian worldview is being hammered home in all spheres. We see how grossly they distort reality, all in the name of scientific objectivity and “neutrality.” To avoid admitting error, they unapologetically change the rules in midstream. They have produced a generation that is “morally neutered” and that relies on a vague belief in a formless benevolence to help them muddle through. Though many instances could be cited, most of the examples he gives are to do with abortion and euthanasia. This is due to his personal involvement in this field and extensive work in writing and filming with Dr. C. Everett Koop, noted children’s surgeon, and now the U.S. Surgeon General. Indeed, the attitude toward the value of human life certainly is an appropriate indicator of the state of a culture, so that the evidence he presents from this perspective amply illustrates the rot pervading society. Of particular value are the accounts of court cases, quotes from articles, and illustrations from recent events (since 1980). For instance, he includes as an appendix, the entire text of an article published in the *Philadelphia Enquirer* in August 1981, which offers solid evidence of infanticide when late abortion results in live births. Though carefully researched, this shocking article never received the attention from the media it deserved. We need to be aware not only of the trends, but also of the how things actually stand. They are not going to go away.

The fashionable way today to end all argument is to appeal to the diminished resource argument—claiming scientific objectivity which forces “helpless” man to take drastic steps to reduce the population. Schaeffer will not be taken in by such rationalization of power-hungry selfishness. Instead, he counters:

When all questions are decided on the basis of economics alone, when man can no longer appeal to God, or even transcendent ideals, but is subject to the absolute control of the state, life is and will become more and more barbarous and bleak. It is no longer a question of where things will go. We are there now. (120)

If the book does nothing else but wake up an anesthetized church to the mortal danger she is in, it will be of tremendous value. It is a powerful indication that the truth can only be seen and confronted from a Christian perspective. It forces our heads out of the sand and advocates, as the solution, the active and aggressive application of the Gospel and biblical law. Christians cannot sit on the sidelines any longer. Further, it is a biblical mandate to uncover and confront evil. Schaeffer is secure enough in his Christian beliefs and worldview, to call evil, however fashionable or scientific, by its real name. And he does not underestimate the cost to God's people that must be counted, and suffered if need be, to reclaim our {205} culture.

His somewhat journalistic style is easy to read, though the content does not make for speedy or enjoyable reading. He gives many personal illustrations—a testimony to his own skirmishes on the front lines. The articles in this edition of the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* (including one by Schaeffer himself) are surely evidence of a beachhead into the humanist jungle. *Time for Anger* provides us with an assessment of “enemy views and tactics,” along with our plan of action. {206}

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” (Prov. 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