

Secular Humanism



**the Most Dangerous Religion in America
by Homer Duncan**

Introduction by Senator Jesse Helms

Humanism is the greatest threat the church, family or American has ever faced! Yet most Christians don't even know it is a fiendishly evil religion that damns not only the soul, but also the present life. Every minister and Christian who wants to be truly informed should read this book.

Dr. Tim LaHaye

I urge you to invest the necessary time in pondering this thought provoking analysis.

Senator Jesse Helms

This is the most important little book I have ever read.

H. Thorn Greenwood

This little book, *Secular Humanism*, is full of facts, quotations. Spiritual dynamite! By a long-time, trusted friend, it is scholarly, spiritual, convincing. Unusual! Read it!

Dr. John R. Rice

In this day of growing apostasy it is imperative that one find their directions strictly in the Word of God. Mr. Duncan's book, *Secular Humanism: The Most Dangerous Religion in America*, points out the consequences of the evolutionary hypothesis that has permeated our public school system. Mr. Duncan grew up in the home of a public educator and has spent many years researching this subject. Therefore, he does not write as a novice in this area, but speaks with conciseness and with clarity. One cannot read this book without being motivated to carefully investigate the system under which one's child is being taught and then to seriously contemplate a more vigorous support of the Christian School Movement.

Dr. Leslie Madison

This is a fact-filled book which should alert intelligent Americans concerning the cancer of secular humanism which is robbing our country of faith in God and faith in Jesus Christ. This book deals with the cause rather than the symptoms of moral decline today and should alert intelligent Christians to reaffirm their faith in Bible Christianity.

Dr. John F. Walvoord

SECULAR HUMANISM:
THE MOST DANGEROUS RELIGION IN AMERICA

by Homer Duncan

It is unbelievable but true, the American taxpayers are paying for
their own destruction.

Christians need to recognize the solemn fact that Humanism is not an ally in making the world a better place in which to live. It is a deadly enemy for it is a religion without God and without hope in this world or the next.

Dr. L. Nelson Bell

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Graduated from Texas Tech University in 1933.

Attended Moody Bible Institute and Dallas Theological Seminary 1934-36.

Pastored churches in Texas and New York 1937-1960.

Director of Missionary Crusader 1943 to present.

Mr. Duncan is the author of more than sixty books and booklets. His other books on Humanism are: Humanism in the Light of Holy Scripture; A Critical Review of the New Secular Humanist Declaration; Free-Thinkers Think with Me; Humanistic Sex Education in the Public Schools; and The Religion of Secular Humanism and the Public Schools.

The principal ministry of the MISSIONARY CRUSADER is publishing Gospel literature in foreign languages. Since 1943 we have published more than 85 books and booklets in more than 100 languages. We are now working in about 25 languages.

We are a tax-exempt, non-profit organization sustained primarily by the gifts of readers of THE MISSIONARY CRUSADER, our monthly magazine. All income received from the sale of this book, or from gifts for the support of this ministry will be used to produce, advertise and to distribute additional copies of this book.

Your prayerful cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

MY GRATITUDE . . .

Far more people have had a part in making this book a success than can be mentioned in these few words. The reader will readily recognize that the material has been gathered from many sources.

. . .from the article in the Texas Tech Law Review by John Whitehead and John Conlan.

. . .from the writings of Francis Schaeffer, Barbara Morris, Harry Conn, and others.

I express my appreciation —

.. .to Rosalind Kress Haley who left no stone unturned to assure this book would be ready to win at every court of debate.

. . .to Dr. Philip Isett for valuable editorial assistance, and for proofreading the manuscript.

. . .to Senator Jesse Helms, that great leader in the U.S. Senate and author of the introduction, who never fails to recognize the difference between right and wrong and has the integrity and determination to defend good and denounce evil and thus provides positive leadership for thinking Christians.

. . .But most of all my gratitude to you, the Reader, who is perhaps new to these subjects, but concerned enough to want to know what "Humanism" really is. If you have learned the answer, and will share it with your friends and neighbors, my time and efforts will have been well spent.

Homer Duncan

"I am so glad for your book on Humanism. I prayed for a long time that someone would write on Humanism in understandable language."

A Reader

"Secular Humanism is the most informative current study I have seen."

Lt. Col. Archibald E. Roberts

"If you would like to know where modern education in America is heading, read this book, Secular Humanism — the results are appalling."

Dr. W.A. Criswell

"Every Christian ought to have a copy of this timely warning. Since the religion of humanism is being taught in our public schools — in defiance to our constitution — every parent should read this book."

Evangelist Robert L. Sumner

"Thank you for your book. I think it's splendid. I wish every preacher would read it. I believe modernism and humanism have been born and bred in the pulpit and then in our religious schools."

Evangelist Lester Roloff

"One of the great cancers eating away at the heart of our once great nation is Secular Humanism. Secular Humanism has dethroned God and enshrined man as the centerpiece of life. This challenging book, Secular Humanism: The Most Dangerous Religion in America, reveals the source and the strength of this Satanic philosophy. If Humanism is allowed to continue to permeate our society, it will bring about the end to any quality of life which mankind has ever known.

"I heartily recommend that every person in America, with a concern for morality and decency, read this book and learn from its pages the reality of what Secular Humanism is doing to our nation and our children."

Evangelist James Robison

INTRODUCTION

by U.S. Senator Jesse Helms

When the U.S. Supreme Court prohibited children from participating in voluntary prayers in public schools, the conclusion was inescapable that the Supreme Court not only violated the right of free exercise of religion for all Americans; it also established a national religion in the United States - the religion of secular humanism.

Since that time, our schools have been increasingly plagued with vandalism, crime, violence, drug abuse and promiscuity; and academic standards and achievements have been falling sharply year by year. Sad to say, our schools have reflected the disruption and discord of our society as a whole. As our nation faces the challenges of the 1980s, it is time to recognize the obvious: America has been ignoring its spiritual and moral heritage, and that is the road to disaster.

Secular Humanism: The Most Dangerous Religion in America provides an important examination of this trend in American society. The Rev. Mr. Homer Duncan's style is straightforward and to the point. I urge you to invest the necessary time in pondering his thought-provoking analysis.

As I travel throughout the United States, I sense a true spiritual awakening on the part of the American people. Americans believe in God. They are beginning to perceive an all-powerful federal government as a clear threat to the moral order, and they are willing to do something about it. This new message is getting through to the Congress.

There are indications that the tide is turning away from secular humanism. The Rev. Mr. Duncan's work suggests that there will be many more. I commend his thoughts to your earnest and prayerful consideration.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
1 Why Be Concerned About Secular Humanism?.....	1
2 What Is Secular Humanism?	5
3 The Religion of Secular Humanism.....	13
4 The Tenets of Secular Humanism.....	21
5 The Four Major Goals of Secular Humanism.....	29
6 Humanism and the Theory of Evolution	33
7 Humanism and Public Education.....	52
8 Humanism, Psychology and Sociology	63
9 Humanism and the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ	69
10 Humanism and the Courts of Law	77
11 The Wine of the Wrath of God	95
12 I Defend the Right of Every Man	99
13 What We Can Do and Must Do.....	105
Appendix A The Separation Illusion	115
Appendix B Agencies Promo ting Humanism.....	121
Appendix C Humanism and Communism	123
Documentation	127
Bibliography	134

Chapter One

Why Be Concerned About Secular Humanism?

Many Americans are concerned and perplexed about the events that are taking place in our country. The conditions that brought about the fall of the Roman Empire are being reenacted. The goals that the Communists have set for our destruction are being fulfilled. We witness in dismay the decline in moral values. Corruption in politics and business is the order of the day. Many sincerely believe that we have passed the point of no return. Some remind us that the Bible predicted all of these things to take place before the coming of the Lord, and therefore have an attitude of resignation to wait quietly for Christ's return. All over the country, people are making plans for the coming economic crash. It seems inevitable. We often wonder how much longer our country can hold together under present conditions.

Mr. Harry Conn, a noted engineer, has written, "It would appear that we are presently witnessing the dissolution of the West. This dissolution is political, indeed, but, in even more basic terms, it's moral deterioration."¹

Quaker philosopher Elton Trueblood has remarked, "Only by a terrific moral recovery are we going to keep the world from becoming a dark age."²

Harvard Law Professor Harold J. Berman has written, "Our whole culture seems to be facing the possibility of a kind of nervous breakdown."³

Dr. Francis Schaeffer writes:

We are on the verge of the largest revolution the world has ever seen — the control and shaping of men through genetic engineering and chemical and psychological conditioning. Will people accept it? I don't think they would accept it if they had not already been taught to accept the presuppositions

that lead to it and if they were not in such despair. But many have accepted the presuppositions and they are in despair. Many of our secular schools have consistently taught these presuppositions, and unhappily many of our Christian lower schools and colleges have taught the crucial subjects no differently than the secular schools.⁴

It is difficult to get the average American to believe what is actually taking place in this country. I confess that some of the things that are reported to me are difficult to believe, but after having studied the religion of Secular Humanism for the past five years I am now strongly convinced that the aim of Humanism is to completely destroy Biblical Christianity and to make the government America's god. In seeking to be free from the control of Almighty God, they are bringing themselves and those who follow them into the bondage of Satan. However, some Americans have been awakened and are now seeking to stem the tide of iniquity that is destroying the American nation.

One of the big problems is that many true Christians do not recognize Humanism when they see it. They forget that Satan is the most subtle of all of God's creatures.⁵ Dozens (if not hundreds) of conservative organizations are seeking "to turn our country around."

We have anti-communist crusades, anti-inflation crusades, anti-abortion programs, societies for the prevention of cruelty to both animals and children. Almost every day we learn of a new organization to promote or preserve our welfare. Plain Talk, Inc. was started for the purpose of translating the gobbledygook of the bureaucrats into understandable English. Millions of dollars are spent hiring lobbyists to control legislation. Many of our politicians seem to think that all of our problems can be solved by appropriating millions of dollars for programs of various kinds. Bungling bureaucrats make life miserable for many people. Every thinking person knows that we are losing more and more of our freedom every day. The noose is being tightened around our neck.

Abraham Lincoln closed his famous Gettysburg Address with these words, "...that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." But now, a little over 100 years later, we have government of the bureaucrats, by the bureaucrats, and for the bureaucrats. The controllers think the American people do not have enough sense to take care of themselves, and that it is necessary for the bureaucrats to control every area of our lives. The May 1979 issue of the Reader's Digest had a good article, "Time To Control Runaway Regulations," pointing out in detail how bureaucracy has taken over our lives.

Many are eager to tell us the cause of our troubles and the remedies for the same. Bible-believing Christians know that our troubles started when Satan rebelled against God in the primal Garden of Eden. The troubles were transferred to the human race when Adam and Eve, of their own will, chose to believe the devil's lie rather than to believe the truth of God. Satan's lie is that man is sufficient in himself and that he does not need God. The theory of evolution, for instance, is based on this lie. This theory teaches that there is an inherent force in man and in nature which constantly lifts him to a higher plane.

The Bible says that man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward. Ever since the fall of man the human race has been plagued with wars, revolutions, natural calamities, sickness, sorrow, suffering and death.

Though the present distress that we are now in cannot be laid to any one factor, this book is being published to unmask a new and sinister religion of which most Americans are not aware. When I say "a new religion" I mean a religious philosophy of which most Americans were not aware. Actually this religion is so old it goes back to the fall of man. Now this new religion, Secular Humanism, is destroying the braking system, casting off all restraint. We were already on fire; Secular Humanism is throwing gasoline on the fire.

In the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I challenge you to examine the documented evidence that I present to

you. The purpose of this book is not only to inform, but to challenge to action. It is never too late to act when you are moving in the will of God.

Chapter Two

What Is Secular Humanism?

As would be expected, Christian writers and Humanistic writers define Humanism in different ways. First, we shall look at some definitions given by Humanists. The old standby given by Protagoras in Ancient Greece is that man is the measure of all things. Another definition is: "Humanism is faith in man, in science, in education."

Writing in the Spring (1982) issue of *Free Inquiry*, Nicholas Gier gives this definition. "On the basis of the Humanism of Erasmus and the founding fathers, we can now state the basic principles of Humanism. Humanists believe that human beings have intrinsic value and dignity. They believe that human beings are autonomous centers of value with free will and moral responsibility. They hold that all persons have inalienable rights, including those of free expression and inquiry. They also use reason, not divine revelation, as the guide for moral action and education."

Mrs. Bette Chambers, a director of the American Humanist Association, said, "Humanism holds that human beings shape their own destiny. Whether there are gods or not is not so important as the belief we should not expect God to solve errors humans make. Humans have an ability to improve the human condition."⁶

Encyclopedia Americana states: "Scientific Humanism aims to supplant religion and make scientific knowledge the instrument of freeing man and enhancing his life. To this end science and technology must be humanized and socialized, and man educated to respond positively to rapid change."

Encyclopedia Britannica states: "In recent years the term Humanism has often been used to refer to value systems that emphasize the personal worth of each

individual, but do not include a belief in God. ...A Humanist is one who believes that Christ was mere man; an anti-Trinitarian. One who holds that perfectibility of the human race is attainable without superhuman aid."

Dr. Ray Rucker gives this definition: "Humanism is an attempt to rediscover man, and make man important, after the church, for over 1,000 years, has tried to subjugate man to an all-powerful god and to degrade and downgrade life on earth. Today most of us aren't threatened by these admonitions."

David Ehrenfeld, professor of biology in Rutgers University, says that Humanism is a religion without God.⁷

John W. Whitehead says it is the religion which deifies man and seeks to dethrone God.⁸

Jimmy Wilson says it is a religion which makes gods out of men.

I have coined this definition: "Humanism is any religion or philosophy which leaves out the supernatural."

You will find that some dictionaries do not make a proper distinction between humanitarianism, humanities and humanism.

Dr. Francis Schaeffer makes a clear distinction among these three words. He writes:

It is imperative that we define what we mean by Humanism. Christians sometimes pick up this word "Humanism" and use it as a buzz word without really thinking it through.

We must make a distinction between three words which sound the same but which are exceedingly different in meaning. The first word is humanitarianism. Humanitarianism means being kind to people, and Christians certainly should be the most humanitarian of people.

The second word that sounds somewhat alike is the word, the humanities. The humanities means an interest in and study of and concern for human creativity. It often is related to classical studies back to the Greeks and the Romans, but actually

the word humanities is much broader than that: it is the study of all human creativity. And there are Christians who get confused between standing against humanism and deprecating the humanities. This is a serious mistake, because we are the ones who know why all human beings are creative. The materialist has no idea why human beings are creative, though all human beings are creative. You cannot go into any culture, no matter how high or how primitive, no matter how far back into history, nor how close to us that you do not find that human beings are creative. This is one of the big distinctions between humanity and the animals. All human beings are creative. Why? We know why, it is because human beings are made in the image of the Creator, that is why. That is what human beings are — they are those who are distinctive in being made in the image of God, and God is the great Creator and therefore creativity is a mark of men and women, of all people . . .

So we should be humanitarian and we should be interested in the humanities. But we must not be humanist.

Now what is humanism in contrast to humanitar-ianism and the humanities? It is rooted back in something behind "humanism" and that is, what is the view we hold of final reality? There are two positions here that are very different. One is the position that the final reality is an infinite personal God to whom not all things are the same — this, for example, distinguishes Him from the gods of the Hindus and the Buddhists. Not all things are the same to Him and He has created all else. The other concept of the final reality is that which dominates today in our culture. That is the final reality is material or energy which has existed forever in some form and has its present form only by pure chance.

Each of these final realities brings forth mathematically and inevitably certain results and these results are completely contrary in the area of

values, or a basis for law, or a view of the intrinsic, or lack of view of intrinsic, value of human life. So, therefore, the basic issue is what is the final reality!⁹

Dr. Renald E. Showers, professor of Bible at the Philadelphia College of Bible, writes:

This is a time of humanism, instability, war and false prophets and Christs. The rejection of God's rule which started for man in the Garden of Eden seems to be reaching a frenzied pitch. Man is determined to prove that he can rule the world in an orderly, meaningful way without God. He asserts that the ultimate purpose of everything is the glory and exaltation of man. His man-centered mania not only makes him refuse to submit to the rule of God but also renders him incapable of submitting.¹⁰

Because man rejects the rule of God, his pride drives him to do things opposite to what God has ordained. God ordained capital punishment for murderers, but man tries to abolish it. God regards human life as being valuable because He created it in His image, but man destroys it by the millions through abortion. God instituted marriage and ordained that it be permanent, but man divorces and suggests that marriage be abolished. God demands justice in society with the protection of the innocent and the punishment of the criminal, but man pampers the criminal at the expense of the innocent. God ordained the family as the nurturing place of future generations, but man proposes that government replace the family. God declares that the fear of the Lord is the starting point of wisdom, but man forbids any reference to God in the classroom. God instituted moral absolutes to govern man, but man says that Utopia can come only through the rejection of those absolutes. God ordained distinctive appearances and roles for the sexes, but man tries to

obliterate those distinctions. God instituted sex to be used within the bonds of male-female marriage, but man perverts sex through pornography, fornication, adultery and homosexuality. God made man to have true meaning and purpose of life only in Him, but man tries to find true meaning in drugs, alcohol, the occult, materialism, philosophy, astrology, cults, transcendental meditation, fame and power.

Man has his false prophets and Christs to encourage him in his rebellious attempt at self-rule. These deceivers tell man that he is good and perfectible by nature. They teach that through the process of evolution man is moving toward divinity. Some so-called theologians declare that in order to have Utopia man must acclaim himself the great humanity divine. Others state that the true gospel is the good news that man is deified. Having willfully rejected the truth about God, man is worshiping and serving himself rather than his Creator.

Ironically, the more man tries to establish Utopia through self-rule the more his situation worsens. Instead of ruling the world in an orderly, meaningful way, he brings disorder, instability and chaos. Man pollutes his environment. His world is shaken by wars and threats of war. His streets are filled with violence and crime. His economy becomes uncontrollable. He is gripped with the fear of total annihilation by his own doomsday weapons. He bruises the very institutions which have given society stability, order and direction. He is haunted by the prospect of death and the fear that life has no ultimate purpose or meaning.

Man reels from one crisis to another. The more he insists on going his own way, the more he batters and bloodies himself. However, instead of admitting that his rebellion against God is the cause of his problem, man stubbornly stands unbowed before the Lord of the universe. The more intense

his predicament, the more entrenched is man's determination to prove that he can rule the world without God. Such firm resolve together with the worsening world situation makes man susceptible to the claims of an ultimate man — a man who opposes God, who seems to have the ability necessary to solve the world's problems and to rule the world well without God, a man who claims to have attained deity and has supernatural powers which appear to support that claim, a man who eventually demands total devotion from the human race and is the ultimate expression of absolute dictatorship and ruthless self-rule.

Man is enslaved already by his man-centered mania, but his acceptance of the claims and rule of an ultimate man will trap him in the pinnacle of slavery. Ironically, man's greatest effort to rid himself of the rule of God will not produce the freedom that he desires. Instead it will enslave him in the most fiendish, oppressive form of bondage. Rather than moving toward Utopia, man is hurtling toward the most horrible time of tribulation in world history. In light of the worsening world situation and man's growing susceptibility to the slavery of an ultimate man, there is an urgency about the present time. Man desperately needs to change his course by recognizing the root of his predicament — his rejection of the rule of God in favor of self-rule. If there were ever a time when man needed to be confronted with the sovereign rule of God and the serious consequences of rejecting that rule, the time is now.¹¹

CHRISTIAN HUMANISM

In my book *Satan's Strategy* I show that for everything that God has that is genuine, Satan has a counterfeit. Part of Satan's strategy is to cause confusion among the people of God. One of the reasons why Satan has such great success in doing this is that many of God's people are not rooted and grounded in the great

truths of the Word of God. Many good Christians think that all Humanists are atheists. What percent are atheists I do not know. I believe I would be correct in saying that all atheists are Humanists. But there are Humanists who very piously call themselves "Christian Humanists." I have met a number of these people, and they certainly are not Bible-believing Christians or they would not use the word "humanists" to describe themselves. They are "Christian" in the same way as are liberal theologians or modernistic pastors and preachers. They reject all of the cardinal doctrines of the Bible; they do not believe the Bible is an inerrant Book; they reject what the Bible teaches about the fall of man, the sinfulness of man, and the depravity of man. They have a so-called social gospel, but deny the glorious gospel of the grace of God. They deny the atoning, substitutionary death of Christ and the literal bodily resurrection of Christ. Why they want to use the name "Christian" and yet identify themselves with the enemies of God, I do not know, but I warn you not to be deceived by them.

Chapter Three

The Religion of Secular Humanism

Three questions will be answered in this chapter: First, is Secular Humanism a religion? Second, why is it a dangerous religion? Third, what difference does it make?

Is Secular Humanism a Religion?

The answer to the first question depends on the way "religion" is defined. If we should limit ourselves to the primary definition of religion, as given by Webster, that religion is "the service and worship of God or the supernatural," then Humanism is not a religion. Several years ago I coined this definition: "Religion is the effort on the part of man to make himself acceptable to God." If we were to use my definition, Humanism would not be a religion.

However, at the present time, the use of the word "religion" has been greatly expanded. In 1965 the Supreme Court, in the case of the United States vs. Seeger, broadened the definition of the word "religion." The Court called on liberal theologian, Paul Tillich to help them properly define religion. Tillich came up with the definition of "ultimate concern." We commonly think of Buddhism as being one of the world's leading religions, but Buddhists do not believe in a supreme being. In my book *The Religion of Secular Humanism and The Public Schools* I give an extensive quote from Dr. Paul Kurtz, who shows that Communism is a religion.

Educators make light of the fact that the Supreme Court has recognized Humanism as a religion.

In his book *Censors in the Classroom*, Dr. Edward B. Jenkinson writes, "To advance their argument that Secular Humanism is a religion taught in the public

schools, the organizations opposed to it point to Humanist Manifesto I, issued in 1933, and to Humanist Manifesto II, issued in 1973. The opponents of Secular Humanism point out that John Dewey signed the first document and B.F. Skinner signed the second. According to the organizations opposed to the religion, it holds, therefore that the public schools must be Secular Humanistic since two prominent educators signed the Manifestos and since all schools and school teachers allegedly follow the teachings of those two men."¹²

Dr. Jenkinson has missed the point that anti-humanists are making. No one makes the claim that Humanism is being taught in the schools simply because Dewey and Skinner signed the Humanist Manifestos. We do make the claim that the doctrines promulgated in Humanist Manifestos I and II are now being taught in the public schools.

Many legal experts, both Christian and non-Christian, fail to agree with Dr. Jenkinson's viewpoint. Two distinguished lawyers, John Whitehead and John Con-Ian discuss the matter at length in the article: "The Establishment of the Religion of Secular Humanism and Its First Amendment Implications." They write:

At one time in American society, the genesis of moral values was that of traditional theism. This theistic basis, however, has dwindled in the twentieth century and has been replaced by another source of moral ethics. This new source has been referred to by some as "religion without God." The Supreme Court has recognized this new religion as the "religion of secularism."¹³

The Supreme Court's definition of religion as belief is not innovative; rather it has initiated a return to a system of religious exercise that existed in antiquity. We are, so to speak, back on the road to Rome.¹⁴

Yale graduate William R. Bird, writing in the January issue of the Yale Law Journal, and in Vol. 2 of the issue of the Harvard Journal of Law and Public

policy agrees with the position taken by Whitehead and Conlan.¹⁵

Humanist Leo Pfeffer, a noted attorney in church-state affairs, also differs with Professor Jenkinson. In discussing the *Torcaso v. Watkins* case, he writes, "(this decision) made a religion out of secular humanism."¹⁶

Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart was the only dissenter in the *Schempp* decision. Stewart recognized rather astutely what has taken place: "A refusal to permit religious exercises ... is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism."¹⁷

The Humanist Manifestos speak of religious Humanism and the religious Humanist. They speak of Humanism as being a vital, fearless, and frank religion. They state that to establish such a religion is a vital necessity.

David Ehrenfeld calls Humanism a religion without God. He recognizes it as being one of the vital religions; he says that it is the dominant religion of our times. He says: "If Humanism is not a religion it certainly does act like one. Its adherents eat, sleep, work, and play according to its central doctrine, they recite the rosary of humanism as they make their important plans, and they receive the last rites of Humanism as they try to avoid dying. All public communications media are permeated with humanistic preachings all of the time. Business, economic theory, politics, and technology accept the teachings of humanism, entire. Its assumptions are incorporated in communism and capitalism alike."¹⁸

Julian Huxley wrote the book *Religion Without Revelation*, Norman Geisler writes concerning Huxley's book:

Huxley was strongly opposed to any belief in God but in favor of religion. He believed that we quite assuredly at present know nothing beyond this world and natural experience.

The basis for belief in God, Huxley held, is purely psychological.

Huxley believed that as a result of modern scientific understanding the concept of God was becoming obsolete. He wrote that "God can no longer be considered as the controller of the universe in any but a pickwickian sense. The god hypothesis is no longer of any pragmatic value." As far as having any effect on the world is concerned, "God is beginning to resemble not a ruler; but the last fading smile of a cosmic Cheshire Cat." In fact, Huxley believed that it would soon be as impossible for an intelligent person to believe in a god as it is now to believe that the earth is flat.

Huxley's disbelief in God brought him great relief. "For my own part," he concluded, "the sense of spiritual relief which comes from rejecting the idea of God as a supernatural being is enormous." He passionately hoped others would join him in his belief (and relief); for if they would, the insufferable arrogance of those who claim to be in sole possession of religious truth would happily disappear. Along with this would go bigotry, religious war, religious persecution, the horrors of the Inquisition, and attempts to suppress knowledge and learning; social and moral change would quickly take place upon the removal of these evils.

Despite his strong disbelief in God, Huxley was a deeply religious person. Why? "I believe," said Huxley, "that it is necessary to believe something. Complete scepticism does not work." But one cannot believe just anything. "The method which has proved effective, as a matter of actual fact, in providing a firm foundation for belief ... is usually called the scientific method." So Huxley believed that the scientific method is the only method which in the long run will provide a satisfactory foundation for beliefs.¹⁹

Howard Grimes, professor of Christian Education at SMU states, "Educators sought to provide a sort of neutral kind of value ed. Among those concerned was

John Dewey, but Dewey had his biases as much as orthodox Christians and Jews have and the humanistic view he advocated became for him a religion."²⁰

Dewey wrote *A Common Faith* using the word faith in a religious sense.

In 1930 Charles Francis Potter, a liberal clergyman, wrote the book *Humanism: A New Religion*, and stated "Every American public school is a school of humanism."²¹

Why Is It a Dangerous Religion?

Second, why should Humanism be called a "dangerous religion?" It is commonly believed that all religions are good, and that we should seek to take the best from all religions and incorporate these principles into our own lives. If I wished to be popular, I would say, "All religions are like windows which let in the light of God." However, since I am a servant of God, I shall tell you that ALL religions and cults, including the religion of Secular Humanism, are based on deception. We commonly think of Christianity as being a religion, but it is far more than a religion; it is more than "a way of life." Since Christianity is infinitely higher than any and all other religions, it is a very dangerous thing to attempt to supplant it with any other religion. Why do I say this? Christianity is not one of many ways to God; it is the only way. The Lord Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."²²

The Apostle Paul said, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."²³

These statements are true because:

Only Jesus is the virgin-born Son of God — "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."²⁴

Christ alone died an atoning death for the sins of men — "but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."²⁵

He is the only mediator — "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."²⁶

He alone has conquered death — "He shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs";²⁷ "and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead";²⁸ "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forever more, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death."²⁹

Therefore;

1. Secular Humanism is dangerous because one of its primary goals is to completely destroy the Christian faith. Humanists hate with a passion the above statements that Christianity is the only true religion.

2. Secular Humanism is dangerous because it is based on deception. Like Satan, the source from which it springs, Humanism is very subtle.³⁰

3. Secular Humanism is dangerous because of its tenets. These tenets are discussed in Chapter Four.

4. Secular Humanism is dangerous because of its aims. These aims are discussed in Chapter Five.

5. Secular Humanism is dangerous because of the means by which it is propagated: (a) through public education from the kindergarten through the university, (b) through the media (radio, TV and the press), (c) through the courts, and (d) through other governmental agencies.

While I consider Islam to be the most dangerous of the world's religions, I strongly believe Secular Humanism is the most dangerous religion in America. Many people are distressed about the four major cults, others are concerned about one of the more than 2,000 new cults we have in America, but all of these are peanuts when compared with Secular Humanism.

What Difference Does It Make?

The third question is: "What difference does it make whether or not Secular Humanism is a religion?" Our courts have ruled that religion cannot be taught in the

public schools. If it is wrong and unconstitutional to teach the Christian religion in the public schools, it is wrong and unconstitutional to teach the religion of Secular Humanism in the public schools. If it is wrong to teach values based on the Judeo-Christian ethic in the public schools, it is wrong to teach values based on Secular Humanism in the schools.

In one sense it is immaterial as to whether or not we call Humanism a religion. Call it a philosophy if you will. If it is wrong to teach Christian philosophy, it is wrong to teach Humanistic philosophy.

No doubt my broadminded, tolerant critics will reply, "Nothing is said in the Constitution about teaching philosophy, but the Constitution does forbid the teaching of religion." I reply, "Unmitigated hogwash!" The Constitution and the Bill of Rights teach exactly the opposite from the present-day Humanistic court rulings. We got along wonderfully well for nearly 200 years under the old system, but now under the Humanistic philosophy the whole country is going to pot.

In my third book on Humanism, *The Religion of Secular Humanism and the Public Schools*, I give 30 pages of evidence to show Humanism is a religion.

Chapter Four

The Tenets of Secular Humanism

The tenets of Secular Humanism are clearly set forth in Humanist Manifesto I and II, and in the Secular Humanist Declaration. My request to publish these documents has been denied. It is not that the Humanists are ashamed of what they believe, but they get a good income by selling these documents in book form to Bible-believing Christians. Each of these documents could easily be printed and mailed for \$1.00 a copy, but when printed in book form they sell for \$1.95 a copy, plus \$1.25 for postage and handling!

Mrs. Bette Chambers, a director of the American Humanist Association reminds us that "three Humanists could come up with five definitions of Humanism. We are dogmatically anti-dogmatic."³¹ That is one reason why Humanists are called "Free Thinkers," and why one of their leading magazines is called Free Inquiry. But, be that as it may, there are certain basic doctrines and principles upon which all Humanists are agreed. In order to present the tenets of Secular Humanism to you, I can do no better than to quote from the article by John W. Whitehead and John Conlan, "The Establishment of The Religion of Secular Humanism and Its First Amendment Implications."

Whitehead and Conlan write:

Certain common elements of Secular Humanism establish Secular Humanism as a doctrinal "faith." These common elements will be termed "tenets" since they apply universally to adherents of the religion of Secular Humanism.

A. The Irrelevance of Deity

The first tenet of Secular Humanism denies the relevance of Deity or supernatural agencies. In place of traditional theism's worship and prayer to God, the Secular Humanist finds his religion expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a cooperative effort to promote social well-being. If God is irrelevant, or even dead, it follows that there has been no revelation from God to Man. As a consequence, the Secular Humanist does not accept traditional theism's belief in the Bible as the divinely inspired word of God.

B. The Supremacy of "Human Reasoning"

The second tenet of Secular Humanism is the belief in the supremacy of "human reason." The phrase "human reason" encompasses the belief that man can begin from himself and on the basis of the utilization of his mental faculties alone "think out the answers to the great questions which confront mankind."³²

Humanists base their thinking on "human reason." Of course, Christians also use "human reason." We do not claim to be unreasonable creatures! But the bottom line is that we base our thinking on the Bible.

Just as there are many different kinds of Christians, there are many different kinds of Humanists. However, without exception, you will not be able to find a single Humanist who believes that the Bible is the verbally inspired, infallible Word of the only true and living God. The Bible is the watershed that divides Biblical Christianity from Humanism.

C. The Inevitability of Progress

The third tenet of Secular Humanism is the belief in the inevitability of progress. The belief in progress is perpetuated through the evolutionary

theory and its cultural application (Social Darwinism). Evolution has produced the mechanistic belief that nature is moving inevitably to higher and higher forms of life. This optimistic view of progress has been rebutted by developments of the last 40 to 50 years, however, so that now it is not seriously advanced.

As Secular Humanism takes a more pessimistic outlook toward man's progress, humanists look more to the State to assume a guiding hand in shaping man's future. In recent years the State has heeded the humanists' call and taken on a more humanistic character. In this respect education is viewed by Secular Humanism as the fulfillment of the State's role as a "saving institution," and thus, the State has become more intimately involved in education and now controls all public education. Therefore, a logical conclusion of Secular Humanism's statist emphasis is the establishment of the State's role as a "saving institution" through a domination of the education system. Because Man is either not progressing as rapidly as the Secular Humanist would desire, or because Man does not seem to be progressing in the evolutionary sense, many Secular Humanists have opted for forced progress and manipulative environment control. Totalitarianism, therefore, could very well be the end result of Secular Humanism.

D. Science, Guide to Progress

A fourth tenet of Secular Humanism is the belief in science as the guide to human progress and the ultimate provider of an alternative to both religion and morals. Therefore, science itself assumes a religious character, and the tenet of science-as-provider can pose an equally frightening threat of totalitarianism. The scientist has faith that the universe is potentially knowable. It has been said of Francis Crick, Nobel Prize winning scientist and signer of Humanist Manifesto II: "His scientific

enterprise is governed by a basic religious stance. And while he recognizes that the particular stance he takes is anti-religious in conventional terms, 'it is a religious attitude because it's concerned with religious problems.' He is absolutely right. What Crick and other scientists are doing is bringing forth a religion based science." Secular Humanism has developed a "scientific theology" that has evolved from a description of concrete objects and events to a study of relationships observable in complex systems. As science takes on a more pessimistic humanism, it will grow impatient with natural development and progress, and as pessimism expands, State technology will become more closely aligned with science and its goals. To encourage Man's progress toward a humanistic society, many scientists have suggested that State technology and money be used to genetically manipulate the citizenry.

E. The Autonomy and Centrality of Man

The fifth tenet of the religion of Secular Humanism is the belief in the self-sufficiency and centrality of Man. This tenet encompasses the assertion of the autonomy and independence of Man apart from Deity of any kind, thereby supposedly releasing Man from all obligations to Deity. Along with the evolutionary theory, the centrality and autonomy of Man are the most prominent features of Secular Humanism. Because Man is autonomous, Secular Humanism posits that man, contrary to traditional theism, is inherently good and in no need of salvation or theological redemption to correct or redeem what traditional theism designates as Man's fallen nature. This tenet of Secular Humanism, therefore, promulgates the idea that Man's future and salvation are in Man's hands. Thus, the tenet of the autonomous Man postulates that Man, not God, controls the destiny of the human race.

If God is non-existent, then there is no revealed word of God from which Man can assert absolutes. If Man is the master of his own destiny, he can create his own system of absolutes apart from divine revelation. Therefore, to the humanist, the monstrosities perpetrated upon mankind by Hitler and Stalin, both autonomous men, cannot logically be criticized. Why? If there are no transcendent absolutes, then each individual is absolute and the sole judge of his own actions. Any condemnation of these autonomous men's actions by Secular Humanists would deny Man's absolute autonomy and impose an absolute standard upon the actions of Man from a source outside of himself. To the humanist, such condemnation would be hypocrisy. However, pessimism is beginning to mar the belief in the tenet of centrality, too.³³

The sixth tenet of Secular Humanism, the belief in the absolute of evolution, is discussed in Chapter VI.

Dr. L. Nelson Bell, father-in-law of Dr. Billy Graham has made this comment on Humanism:

The Great Counterfeit

Many years ago I saw one of the world's greatest magicians perform some amazing feats of legerdemain. If we in the audience had not known we were being deceived, we would all have believed he had supernatural powers. Through his swiftness of hand, practiced diverting of the audience's attention, and use of prepared props and equipment, the magician gave us a good show, both amusing and instructive.

Today, within the bounds of the Church, we are witnessing a Satanic work of deception and substitution that is intended to deceive even the very elect. This giant hoax is the substitution of humanism for Christianity.

The welfare of man is a worthy objective. But when that welfare becomes an end in itself, with no

reference to man's eternal soul, it is high time for Christians to take a look.

Humanism's concern is for material values, but Christianity places spiritual values above all else.

Humanism is concerned with now, with time and all that occurs in the present. Christianity's eyes are set on eternity, on the city made without hands, eternal in the heavens.

For the humanist, the "gospel" had to do with man's reconciliation to man; but Christianity's Gospel puts man's reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ above all else.

The humanist sees "sin" as primarily man's maladjustment to man; for the Christian, sin is disobedience to God's revealed will.

Humanism is concerned about man's physical, environmental, and material welfare, but not about his soul. Christianity recognizes that only as man is reconciled to God can he be properly adjusted to the conditions of everyday life, and that by the presence and grace of God situations that otherwise would be unbearable are often means to draw him closer to God.

Humanism is willing to make use of any secular power or means to accomplish its ends. Christianity depends on the presence and power of the Holy Spirit for its effectiveness.

Christians need to recognize the solemn fact that humanism is not an ally in making the world a better place in which to live. It is a deadly enemy for it is a religion without God and without hope in this world or the next.

The danger lies in the confusion of the objectives of humanism and Christianity, a confusion rooted in totally divergent concepts of God and man.

Dr. Bell then lists the tenets of Humanist Manifesto I, and concludes his chapter with these words:

This manifesto is a frank statement of the great counterfeits being perpetrated on today's world,

one for which many within the Church have fallen.

Play down the fact of sin in the human heart; think of man as sufficient in himself; obliterate God and His Christ from their sovereign rights, then you have humanism as a substitute for Christianity, and man's efforts in the place of redemption through Christ.

Humanism, the supreme counterfeit, is here among us. Recognize it and turn from it as you would turn from the plague. Our hope is in Christ and in nothing else.³⁴

Chapter Five

The Four Major Goals of Secular Humanism

The first major goal of Humanism is to establish a new world order in which war is obsolete, in which poverty is vanquished, in which racial inequality is abolished, and in which all of our social problems will be solved. The pet phrase "world community" is used repeatedly in Humanistic writings.

In *Introduction to American Education: A Human Relations Approach*, Theodore Brameld is quoted as saying, "the overarching purpose of public education is to create citizens for a world government."³⁵

Harold G. Shane states:

"As young people mature, we must help them develop ... a service ethic which is geared to the real world ... the global servant concept in which we will educate our young for planetary service and eventually for some form of world citizenship ... implicit within the global servant concept are the moral insights that will help us live with the regulated freedom we must eventually impose upon ourselves."³⁶

Karen Mann, a member of the State Legislature in Iowa writes:

The U.S. Department of Education division of International Education and the National Endowment for the Humanities are involved in funding the creation of programs for global interdependence at various colleges and universities. The teacher training textbooks are full of this stuff. *Introduction to American Education, a Human Relations Approach* by George Henderson discusses the theories of education influencing the development of American Schools. One prominent theory, reconstructionism, holds "that education should be the principal means for building a better social order; that the schools

should take the lead in building the widest possible consensus relating to the values that should motivate the reconstruction of the social order; and that the overarching purpose of American Education should be to help in the development of a world civilization."³⁷

All of us know that world conditions are in a sad state of affairs, and since the Humanists desire to establish a new world order in which war is obsolete, in which poverty is abolished, and in which all of our social problems will be solved, why don't all of us join with them and help them accomplish these worthwhile goals? The problem is that the new world order they seek to establish is Anti-God, Anti-Christ, Anti-Bible, and Anti-American. Biblical Christianity must be destroyed before their goal can be accomplished. Patriotism must be done away with. For example, Robert M. Hutchins, one of the founders of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, referred to patriotism as "tribal self-adoration," and said, "the current definition of patriotism is worse than silly, it is suicidal."³⁸ Some Humanists refer to patriotism as bloody gore. Instead of having the Declaration of Independence, we now have a new declaration of interdependence. Instead of calling the new world order a ruthless dictatorship or the reign of anti-Christ, such as the Bible describes it, they refer to it as "world community."

The second major goal of Secular Humanism is to establish a new world religion. Such a religion must not in any way be confused with the Christian faith. It will be a religion based on science, having man or the state as its god. It will be an ecumenical religion combining with Humanism the best out of all of the world's great religions. The introduction to Humanist Manifesto I states: "While this age does owe a vast debt to traditional religions, it is nonetheless obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of this age. To establish such a religion is a major necessity." Atheist John Dewey, one of the signers of Humanist

Manifesto I, describes the religion that Humanists desire to establish, in his book, *A Common Faith*.³⁹

All are agreed that the Babel of many religions and cults is confusing to say the least. I have discussed this subject at length in my book *The Ecumenical Movement in the Light of the Holy Scriptures*. The Bible calls this world religion "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth."⁴⁰ The Bible says, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."⁴¹

The third major goal of Humanism is to change the economic system. They sincerely believe it is impossible to have a just world order with the present economic system. The necessity of changing the economic system is a recurring theme in their writings. Every honest educator will admit that necessity of changing the economic system is a theme that is constantly pushed in many books on education. Many patriots are wrong in thinking that all Humanists are Communists. Perhaps a large percentage of them favor Socialism or Communism, but Humanist Manifesto II does not openly advocate Communism; it simply states, "The economic system must be changed."

Mr. J. Fred Bucy, president of Texas Instruments Incorporated, closed his booklet *Without Free Enterprise There Is No Freedom* with these words, "Our forefathers were outraged by Great Britain's Stamp Act. The cost was only about twenty cents per citizen. But in 1775, Americans recognized that it was one more step toward the Crown's control of enterprise.

"Americans of today need to relearn the lesson our founding fathers knew so well — without freedom of enterprise there is no personal freedom."⁴²

The fourth major goal of Secular Humanism is to produce a new race of people for the new world order. If we are to have a new world that is free from the countless problems that threaten to destroy us, the people that inhabit the earth must be changed. The global planners have no thought of trying to change patriotic, Bible-believing Christians into citizens of the new world order.

In all likelihood if such people do not cause trouble, they will be disregarded. If they cause trouble, or if they are potential trouble makers (such as those who are fighting Humanism at the present time), they will be eliminated.

This new race will be produced in three ways:

First, the Humanists tell us that we have now evolved to the place where we can control our own evolution. The ideal man will be bred and produced by genetic engineering. But, who is to decide what are the characteristics of the ideal man?

Second, a recurring theme in Humanistic writing is that if a new world order is to be brought in, the educational system must be controlled. Humanists want to control our children from age two through university.

(Humanism and Public Education is discussed in Chapter VII of this book. It is discussed in chapter nine of Humanism in the Light of Holy Scripture, and the last half of The Religion of Secular Humanism and the Public Schools and shows that the religion of Secular Humanism is being taught in the public schools.)

Third, the Humanists are not waiting for fulfillment of the two slower processes of genetic engineering and controlling the educational system, but they are now successfully promoting Humanism through the mass media (the press, radio, and TV), the courts, the churches, and government agencies.

Chapter Six

Humanism and the Theory of Evolution

Humanism and the theory of evolution are both integral parts of a vicious circle. The one cannot exist without the other. The theory of evolution was nurtured in the philosophy which taught that man is sufficient in himself and does not need God. Men do not believe in the theory of evolution because it is an established fact; they believe in evolution because they wish to escape the authority of Almighty God. That is one side of the coin.

Humanism as we know it today would never have developed apart from the widespread teaching of evolution.

Humanist Manifesto I states:

First: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

Second: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as the result of a continuous process.

Third: Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.

Fourth: Humanism recognizes that man's religious culture and civilization, as clearly depicted by anthropology and history, are the product of a gradual development due to his interaction with his natural environment and with his social heritage. The individual born into a particular culture is largely molded to that culture.

Even though evolution is an unproven theory, it is taught as a fact of science in our educational system, and is assumed to be a fact of science by most uninformed people. The Bible says that in the last days when men

will not receive the love of the truth that they might be saved, God will send them a strong delusion that they will believe THE LIE.⁴⁴ The lie is the first falsehood that Satan told Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, namely that man is sufficient in himself and that he does not need the help of God. Evolution is a corollary to this first lie, and Humanism is a corollary to evolution. All honest scientists, both atheistic and Christian, recognize that evolution is an unproven theory.

Statements by Men Who Are Evolutionists
Who Recognize That Evolution
Is Theory and Not a Fact of Science

Charles Darwin himself made this statement in *The Origin Of The Species*: "Long before the reader has arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to him. Some of them are so serious that to this day I can hardly reflect on them without being in some degree staggered; but, to the best of my judgment, the greater number are only apparent, and those that are real are not, I think fatal to the theory." Toward the end of his life Darwin confessed, "not one change of species into another is on record.... We cannot prove that a single species has changed (into another)."⁴⁵

Thomas Huxley admitted that "evolution was not an established theory but a tentative hypothesis, an extremely valuable and even probable hypothesis, but an hypothesis none the less."⁴⁶

Professor Theodosius Dobzhansky, a leading evolutionary spokesman, has admitted that "it would be wrong to say that the biological theory of evolution has gained universal acceptance among biologists or even among geneticists."⁴⁷

Dr. Austin H. Clark, noted biologist of the Smithsonian Institution, stated bluntly: "There is no evidence which would show man developing step by step from lower forms of life. There is nothing to show that man was in any way connected with monkeys.... He appeared SUDDENLY and in substantially the same form as he is today.... There are no such things as missing links." He

further said, "So far as concerns the major groups of animals, the creationists appear to have the best of the argument. There is NOT THE SLIGHTEST EVIDENCE THAT ANY ONE OF THE MAJOR GROUPS AROSE FROM ANY OTHER. Each is a special animal complex, related more or less closely to all the rest, and appearing therefore as a special and distinct creation."⁴⁸

professor J. Doyle, president of the Botany Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, said (in effect): Since we cannot prove the evolution of a single organism, it is intellectual presumption to talk of the evolution of the universe in a thousand million years.

Dr. D'Arcy Thompson says, "In the study of evolution and in our attempts to trace the descent of the animal kingdom, our score years' study of *The Origin of Species*, has had an unlooked for and disappointing result. It... has not taught us how birds descended from reptiles, mammals from other quadrupeds, quadrupeds from fishes, nor vertebrates from the invertebrate stock. The invertebrates themselves involve the selfsame difficulties, so that we do not know the origin of the echinoderms, of the molluscs, of the coelenterates, nor one group of protozoa from another.... This failure to solve the cardinal problems of evolutionary biology is a very curious thing."⁴⁹

Professor G.A. Kerkut, an evolutionist, states, ". . . there is the theory that all living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form. This theory can be called the 'General Theory of Evolution' and the evidence that supports it is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it as anything more than a working hypothesis."⁵⁰ When a recognized scientist raises such doubts, he usually provokes cries of anger and denunciation from the camp of evolutionists.

However, when John T. Bonner reviews Kerkut's book he says: "This is a book with a disturbing message; it points to some unseemly cracks in the foundations. One is disturbed because what is said gives us the uneasy feeling that we knew it for a long time deep down but

were never willing to admit this even to ourselves. It is another one of those cold and uncompromising situations where the naked truth and human nature travel in different directions. The particular truth is simply that we have no reliable evidence as to the evolutionary sequence of invertebrate phyla. We do not know what group arose from what other group or whether, for instance, the transition from Protozoa occurred once, or twice, or many times . . . We have all been telling our students for years not to accept any statement on its face value but to examine the evidence, and, therefore, it is rather a shock to discover that we have failed to follow our own sound advice."⁵¹

Professor Albert Fleishman, professor of Comparative Anatomy at Erlangen University said: "The theory of evolution suffers from grave defects, which are becoming more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge, nor does it suffice for our theoretical grasp of the facts. The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination."⁵²

Dr. Robert A. Millikan, famous physicist and Nobel prize winner said, "Everyone who reflects believes in God."⁵⁴ In an address a few years ago to the American Chemical Society, he said: "The pathetic thing about it is that many scientists are trying to prove the doctrine of evolution, which no scientists can do." Dr. Millikan is an evolutionist; but he is honest enough to admit it is a theory that cannot be proved.

Loren Eiseley, a leading evolutionist, says: "With the failure of these many efforts, science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories of living origins which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort could not be proved to take place today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past."⁵⁵

Dr. D.M.S. Watson writes, "... the theory of evolution

itself (is) a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative is special creation, which is clearly incredible."⁵⁶

Rus Walton, the director of the Plymouth Foundation, writes:

The controversy concerning evolution generally centers in three areas: constitutional, academic, and scientific. Here is how the article is shaping up:

Constitutional: Evolutionists contend teaching creation in public schools violates First Amendment, say it is "tantamount to teaching religion." Creationists assert Constitution is already violated by exclusive teaching of evolution, a basic tenet of religion of humanism. They argue such exclusivity violates free exercise rights of students who believe in creation; violates "establishment" clause of 1st Amendment (no state religion); violates "neutrality" (no preference) intent of Amendment, and violates 14th Amendment (discrimination on basis of religion). Further, excluding creationism violates parental right to direct child's moral/ spiritual beliefs, and deprives student of "right to hear" all relevant educational material (deemed to be a constitutional right).

Academic: Evolutionists argue requirement to teach creationism violates academic freedom; that teacher must be "free" to teach as he chooses. Creationists retort that academic freedom means "freedom" to teach all aspects of a subject; that it means "freedom" to educate not indoctrinate, and that prohibiting or failing to examine creation science is a violation of academic freedom. Further, "academic freedom" includes not only teacher's right to teach but also student's right to be taught comparative subjects (i.e. "freedom to hear," to consider, to conclude). Therefore, a balanced presentation in which creationism and evolution are taught is only way to uphold and preserve academic freedom.

Scientific: Evolutionists argue that creation story is a religious myth; that science has proved that man is a product of bio-chemistry, that life progressed from a one-celled origin to the present state through series of biological changes (over a period of billions of years). Creationists insist that man was created, and assert that the creation dogma is supported by far more evidentiary fact than is evolution (for legal and strategic reasons, creationists base their arguments more on scientific data than Bible truths). They argue that evolution is the myth; that it is based on assumptions, conjecture and shifting suppositions; that it is a chain of missing links. They point out that Charles Darwin, in *The Origin of Species*, warns of unanswered questions and speculations included therein — 800 times in his book Darwin used such subjective phrases as "Let us assume". Even one of today's most vociferous believers in evolution, astronomer CARL SAGAN, admits "this (evolution) is still a statement of faith."

Points vs. evolution raised by creationists include: there are no transitional forms to fill the gaps (if evolution were valid, there would be thousands (millions); major bases for evolution have been discredited/discarded (acquired characteristics, natural selection, large mutation, small mutation, accidental alteration, etc.). Weismann cut off tails of mice for 20 succeeding generations but mice did not produce a new breed of tailless mice; 40 years of mutation experiments with fruit flies did not produce a new kind of fly. Countless experiments dating back to 1780 have proved that life does not come from non-life; the inanimate does not produce the animate. Advanced studies in molecular biology show man's DNA code is totally distinctive from animal codes; the study of amino acid components attests that the flesh of each species is distinct from that of others.

Evolutionists insist earth is billions of years old; say the suggestion of a cataclysmic flood is fable.

Creationists assert earth is young, as proven by extensive research in such fields as earth spin, cornet decay and dust, ocean concentration and sediment, decay of magnetic moment (earth's magnetic field), oil bed pressures, population projections and reverse projections, entropy, helium content, moon sediment and sun shrink, etc. They point to radiocarbon dating (C-14) as provably unreliable, and call to attention the fact that some of the major "human fossils" have been shown to be hoax or doctored specimens (Piltdown man, "Nebraska" man, Java man, etc.). As for the great flood, creationists assert that fossil finds and stratigraphic records throughout the globe substantiate the Genesis account.

How far will some go to "prove" evolution? In the 1920s, a team of USSR scientists was sent to start a new race. How? By artificially impregnating apes with human semen. Suffice it to report, they failed.

Writing on the "big bang" theory of the earth's origin, and how it may well be further proof of Genesis 1:1, astronomer Robert Jastrow concluded with this: "For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance, he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the biggest rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries."⁵⁷

The Crumbling of Evolution

by Dr. D. James Kennedy

Text: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth "
(Genesis 1:1).

I hope that you will pay particular attention to this message, "The Crumbing of Evolution," because I believe it is vital to our country that this information which has been repressed be disseminated to the American populace, and that Christians be informed and able to speak on this issue.

"Christianity is fighting for its very life," said Richard Bozarth, an atheistic evolutionist. It is fighting for its life in its struggle against evolution because it is well-known that evolution makes the entire mission of Jesus Christ superfluous. Christ came to deliver us from sin — sin which entered the human race, we are told in the New Testament, through one man: Adam. Through the fall of mankind, through the advent of original sin, sin permeated the human race and it was to that problem Christ came to address Himself and to give Himself. If evolution is true then that whole idea of redemption is false and Christ came for naught; and Christianity is, therefore, untrue.

Evolutionists have long seen this. Unfortunately, many Christians have not. Rather, they have often sought for one type or another of compromise. Supposing evolution had proved itself to be a scientific fact, they felt there was nothing to do but accommodate themselves to this new "fact." Therefore, all manner of accommodations were conceived and evolution was acknowledged to be true by many within, as well as without, the church. The results of the introduction of this new evolutionary concept of life into the world a little over a hundred years ago, have been nothing less than staggering. They have affected virutally every single academic discipline that you will find in our educational system. They have affected every single sphere of our lives.

Are these results compatible with Christianity? Some Christians have tried to maintain that they are. Jacques Monod, a Nobel prizewinning scientist (not a Christian but an evolutionist), says: "[Natural] selection is the blindest, and most cruel way of evolving new species, and more and more complex and refined organisms ... The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts ... I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea ..."

People who say that the Bible simply says that

God created man and does not say how are so utterly simplistic that their ignorance of both science and Scripture is overwhelming. If the first eleven chapters dealing with cosmology in the Scripture were simply to tell us that God created the heavens and the earth, might I point out to you that He successfully did that in the first verse of the first chapter! Furthermore, the concept of creation permeates not only the Old but the New Testament as well. Therefore, it cannot be dismissed so lightly. Further, the entire ethical system that flows from evolution is completely antithetical to all that is Christian.

Indeed, we are engaged in a life struggle. I might point out to you that every single anti-Christian "ism" that has come down the pike in the last century or more has found as its pseudoscientific foundation the idea of evolution. Whether we are talking about Nazism, Fascism, Communism, Secular Humanism, Freudianism, Behaviorism, or any one of a dozen other "isms," they all rest their case on evolution. The two massive non-Christian, anti-Christian systems that dominate our world today are: in the East, Communism; and in the West, Secular Humanism. Both of these massive, atheistic systems rest upon the singular pillar of evolution.

Is it true? Must we accommodate? Must we bow the knee? If all the facts on one side of the case are presented and all the facts on the other side are repressed, that is not education — that is, by definition, brainwashing. It is precisely that brainwashing that has been going on in America for the last fifty or sixty years. I have never met a student in any public educational institution in this country who could tell me one fact he ever learned in school which contradicted evolution. All such facts have been utterly repressed.

Evolution has not established itself as an irrefutable fact, as its adherents would like people to believe, but, rather, it is crumbling on every side.

The fortress is cracking; the walls are giving way-the citadel is coming down; there are fissures everywhere! The whole of evolution is in absolute chaos today and the public does not know it. Students are still being taught the same old lies.

What is evolution? In the words of one of the most prestigious scientists in the world, Dr. Paul LeMoine, an editor of *L'Encyclopedie Francais*: "Evolution is a fairy tale for adults." I am sure that to the average American who has been indoctrinated and brainwashed with evolution for so many decades, such a statement as that is positively stunning.

Dr. Duane Gish, a noted biologist, puts it slightly differently — but it is still a fairy tale. He said that if you kiss a frog and it turns into a prince, that is a fairy tale. But in evolution if you kiss a frog with the pixy dust of a little time, it turns into a prince — and that is science. Or, at least so we are told.

Four fissures in the foundation of evolution have appeared within the last two or three years and they have all been discovered by evolutionists. They totally demolish the whole structure of evolution and, yet, most people know nothing about them.

First, let us consider the origin of the universe. Since atheistic evolutionists reject God, they must postulate that matter is eternal. They are forever fond of asking the question: Where did God come from? If you get rid of an eternal God you are left with the necessity of eternal matter. As one scholar said: "The matter with matter is it has no mater." The fact is that increasing discoveries of science are showing that matter absolutely cannot be eternal. For example: The current wisdom in cosmological circles is that the universe began with a "big bang." Of course, with the idea that there was an initial bang and out of this the galaxies exploded and are moving outward, it did not take the evolutionists very long to realize that this theory just would not do. Why? The answer, very simply, is because a big bang had to have a beginning — and if there is one

thing evolutionists cannot tolerate it is a beginning!

Matter must be eternal! The universe must be eternal because there is no God. It is absolutely inconceivable to suppose that the universe at one time did not exist and God did not exist — and then the universe started to exist. So the universe must be eternal.

Therefore, the evolutionists postulated the idea that instead of simply a "big bang" we had an "oscillating universe": The universe exploded and expanded for so many billions of years. Finally the gravitational pull began to act upon the galaxies; they slowed down and finally began to recede. They collapsed in upon themselves until they came together again into a composite piece of mass the size of a basketball (some of them say the size of a pea). Some evolutionists say it exploded once more so that we have an oscillating universe which goes in and out forever and ever. Thus they have dispensed again with a beginning — and with God!

There is not the first scientific fact, or piece of evidence, or bit of data, that confirms such a theory as an oscillating universe. It is simply based on the faith of evolutionists. Evolution is a religion and it is founded upon faith. I can easily bring forth two hundred statements from evolutionists stating the fact that evolution is based upon faith. In this case also, "faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen."

But certain things are testable. Just a couple of years ago, two of the most esteemed astronomers in this country, Dr. Allan Sandage of the Hale Observatories, and Dr. James Gunn, using Mount Palomar's 200-inch telescope, after fifteen years of painstaking study of the red shift of galaxies, revealed their conclusions — which absolutely astonished, first of all themselves, and then the whole scientific world. They said that though they had always held to a belief in an oscillating or closed universe, the "premier fact" is that it is an open, expanding universe which will never close in upon

itself. There was a beginning!

How do other evolutionists react to that statement? Isaac Asimov, probably the most prolific science and science fiction writer of all time said: "Emotionally I am an atheist. I don't have the evidence to prove that God doesn't exist, but I so strongly suspect He doesn't that I don't want to waste my time." When confronted with the scientific fact, he says: "I have a hunch that we'll find the matter." Does not that cause great relief in the evolutionary community? We thought we were going to have to rest on scientific facts — but the "hunch" has come to the rescue again! The faith of evolution: the hunch. Though 99% of the necessary matter is missing, it will be found! We may base our cosmology upon Dr. Asimov's hunch! And millions of children will continue to be taught that is the way it is.

Furthermore, physicists have made some examinations of the possibility of a collapsing universe and have found out that if ever it did collapse, the laws of physics absolutely preclude any collapsing universe from exploding once more. And so again, the scientific facts totally rule out the possibility of an oscillating universe. Therefore, the universe must have had a beginning. Therefore, there must be a God. But will our children be taught that in school next year? No. Because evolution is a dogmatic, narrow, bigoted religion. It will suppress and repress all scientific facts that do not support it.

Secondly, as all of you may remember from your school days, evolutionists had to create a story about how life began. For a century or more they tried to invent a story. This is like concocting a fairy tale. But it has to have a sort of scientific aura to it. You may recall that they used to say that life began by spontaneous generation: things just popped into existence. But the trouble with spontaneous generation was that it, too, was testable. And testable means scientific. Pasteur tested it and demolished

it. But that only meant — to devout evolutionists — that though life was not arising now, it must have arisen sometime in the dim past — in the untestable, nonscientific past. That way, it could not be disproved.

It is into that land of the untestable that they always retreat because whenever anything in the theory of evolution is scientifically testable, it always proves to be false. To wit: Lamarkianism — the idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics; that our children acquire characteristics which we developed in our lifetime. Not so! And it was decisively disproved. But now they have retreated, as always, into the dim past where they cannot be tested.

The fairy tale continues. In 1936 Alexander Oparin, a Russian biochemist, devised a story in which he postulated that life arose in a primordial soup of organic chemicals. Once upon a time molecules and atoms got together and formed biopolymers; they formed macromolecules which in turn formed amino acids. Finally these amino acids bound themselves together into long chains and produced proteins. These proteins got together by the hundreds of thousands and at last they created a living cell! However, the scientists realized that one thing was absolutely necessary: There must be no free oxygen in the atmosphere because oxygen destroys these rudimentary biopolymers, these amino acids, that are trying to bind themselves together. What do they do? Well, in a fairy tale you add anything you want. They created a new atmosphere in which there is no oxygen; a reducing atmosphere which is made up of methane, ammonia and water vapor — no free oxygen. And so, Oparin said, that is the way it was — once upon a time!

That theory was repeated in virtually every single biology text and primer for the last fifty years. That life began in the primordial sea in a non-oxidized atmosphere has been taught to tens of millions of school children all over the world. Is that based

upon fact? Not the slightest! It is based upon faith: the faith of evolutionary religion; that it must have been that way because evolution must have happened. How do we know that evolution must have happened? It is very simple: Here we are! And it is unthinkable to think that God created us, so we must have evolved and, therefore, there must have been an ammonia, methane atmosphere.

But what happened? Along came real science with its testability. As recently as ten months ago, evolutionists Harry Clemmey and Nick Badham published an article entitled "Oxygen in the Precambrian Atmosphere" in the March 1982 issue of *Geology*, a prestigious scientific magazine. In it they said: "Although biologists concerned with the origin of life often quote an early atmosphere consisting of reduced gases, this stems as much from ignorance of recent advances as from active opposition to them," This is to say that science teachers in our high schools and colleges who are presently teaching that life arose in a methane, ammonia atmosphere, are either ignorant of recent advances or they are actively opposing any scientific evidence that refutes their view of evolution.

Also, Dr. John Gribbin, of England, writing in *New Scientist*, said that the scientific folklore every child has been taught concerning the origin of life must now be completely abandoned and we must now rewrite all of our scientific textbooks. Can you imagine this? Dr. Henry Morris in an excellent book on this subject says the "assured scientific fact" of one generation becomes the next generation's "scientific folklore"! There was no non-oxidizing atmosphere in which life could originate. And remember: if there is oxygen present those amino acids will never bind together! Therefore, life could not have begun by merely natural means.

Thirdly, in addition to the origin of the universe and the disappearing reducing atmosphere, evolutionists are now faced with the science of probabilities in the origin of life. Creationists for years

have been saying that the laws of probability completely destroy the possibility of evolution taking place. This was mostly ignored. But in recent years certain individuals of great prestige in the scientific community have been facing the cold realities of probability science as it relates to the formation of an initial living cell.

No less a figure than Francis Crick, one of the world's most prestigious biologists and co-discoverer of DNA, examined the possibilities of a cell coming into existence. When he discovered the incredibly complex molecule of DNA (the most complex molecule known to man), he began to examine the possibilities of this happening by chance on this earth and concluded that it was not possible. It could not have happened. But what did Crick do? Did he leap into the arms of God? No. He leaped into the arms of "directed panspermia." That is a new evolutionary fairy tale, my friend. You ought to be aware of it. It goes with Hansel and Gretel, The Three Little Pigs and some of the others.

"Directed panspermia" comes right out of "Star Trek" or "Star Wars." It means that some highly advanced beings on some other planet sent missiles out into the universe that had sperm cells, living cells, in them — and they planted us here on this earth! However, there does not happen to be the least bit of scientific evidence to support such a theory. But it is part of the faith and religion of evolution. It does not really solve the problem but simply extends the shadow because the question must surely be asked: Where did these advanced beings come from on another planet?

Well, we won't talk about that! But it seems that some other scientists did want to talk about that probability — even one, perhaps, of greater prestige than Francis Crick. I am speaking of Sir Fred Hoyle of Cambridge University, one of the most noted astronomers and mathematicians in the world today. In fact, he is the originator and founder of one of the two cosmogonies of our time: the Steady-

State Theory of the universe ... Having examined the probabilities of life forming on this planet, he said: "The notion that not only biopolymers but the operation programme of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on the earth is evidently nonsense of a high order." Hoyle, who was an atheist all his life, said that what you and your children were taught in school as absolute scientific fact is nothing less than nonsense of a high order.

Hoyle went further than Crick and examined the possibilities of life arising by chance on some other planet, taking not merely four and a half billion years as the supposed age of the earth, but, rather, twenty billion years as the supposed age of the universe. He came to the conclusion that life would never have originated by chance in twenty billion years. The truth is that it would not have arisen by chance in twenty trillion times twenty billion years! It never would have happened at all. He came to the conclusion that the only way life could have come to pass is through the application of a very high order of intelligence which he says we may call (are you ready?): God! Sir Fred Hoyle of Cambridge, originator of the Steady-State Theory of the universe was forced by scientific and mathematical computations to conclude that the only conceivable answer for the origin of life in the entire universe is God.

He said that he is amazed by some of the evolutionary scientists who seem to sort of predicate that there is a miracle worker at work somewhere in nature; that there is a miraculous factor that is always coming to the aid of the biologists. He says that these people "are always to be found living on the twilight fringes of thermodynamics" the basic laws of the universe which totally conflict and confound the idea that life could have happened by chance. These scientists who say that it does are those that refuse to face the real laws upon which our universe is established.

So we have seen the evolutionists have no answer for the origin of the universe; the universe had to have a beginning; and there was no methane, ammonia atmosphere in which life could have come into existence, and the probabilities of it happening are zero.

Lastly, in October 1981 at a worldwide meeting of evolutionists in Chicago, Dr. Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University (perhaps the most vocal advocate of evolution in America today) and Dr. Nils Eldredge of the American Museum of Natural History presented a new view of evolution. They said there that it has long been a "trade secret" of paleontologists that transitional forms do not exist; that missing links do not exist. He is saying that paleontologists have long known as a "trade secret" that there are no missing links. They know that there are not; they have always known it! And he said that the time has come for them to admit it.

Is Dr. Gould also going to leap into the arms of God? Well, not so quick for this atheist. He invents instead a whole new view of evolution: "punctuated equilibria"! Instead of saying, as Darwin did, that between this species and that species, there were hundreds of thousands of minute transitional forms — none of which they have ever been able to find. They should be, as Darwin himself said, around by the billions; we should stumble over them when we step out the back door. But they do not exist.

"Punctuated equilibria" declares that species came into being, they stayed about the same for millions of years and all of a sudden there was a great leap, a saltation, and they jumped to an entirely different form. Like Dr. Richard Goldschmidt taught at the University of California in his "hopeful monsters" theory: A lizard laid an egg and another lizard came out; that happened a few hundreds of thousands of times, and one day another lizard laid an egg and a bird hatched out and flew away!

My friend, that does not even have the semblance

of plausibility. It is, on the very face of it, an absurdity! If that were true, then everyone of you ladies who is "infanticipating" ought to view the idea of going into the maternity ward and having a baby, with considerable horror. I would suggest that you keep the windows closed lest "it" fly away!

And yet this is the extreme to which the atheistic evolutionists have been reduced in the last two or three years. We see here, indeed, that not over many tiny changes, but with a leap, the frog practically becomes a prince. A fairy tale for adults! Why do we not find transitional forms? Because there aren't any.

The entire citadel is collapsing all about the evolutionists. And yet virtually all of this evidence is suppressed and kept from our children so that they might be taught the evolutionistic, atheistic, amoral view of life which is destroying our civilization and our world today. May it be that Christians may become informed enough, vocal enough, and demanding enough that the scientific evidence for creation be taught along with the supposed evidence for evolution in our schools. (A recent poll indicated that 86% of the American people now desire to have creation as well as evolution taught in the public schools.) May it be that this will no longer be suppressed by the evolutionists who are continuing to brainwash our children into believing their fairy tales — which they call science. PRAYER:

Father, we thank Thee that Jesus Christ came into this world, not on a useless mission, but He came into a world which was created perfectly by Thee and which plunged itself into sin: a sin which brought death and decay. We thank Thee that through His death and resurrection, life and immortality are brought to light and that we who trust in His atoning death may find forgiveness and life eternal as a free gift through Him. We pray, O God, that we may know the truth and be set free by that truth; that the light of truth may flood our country

and our schools and that our children may see the evidence on both sides of this issue and may be free to make up their own minds. We know that this will be to Thy glory, Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.⁵⁸

For additional scholarly, scientific information about the theory of evolution, write to:

CREATION-LIFE PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 15666
San Diego, CA 92115

INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH

P.O. Box 2666
El Cajon, CA 92021

CREATION-SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTER

P.O. Box 23195
San Diego, CA 92123

The following books are recommended by Rus Walton: *The Origin and Destiny of Man*, Francis Nigel Lee, Christian Studies Center, P.O. 11110, Memphis TN 38111; *The Creation/Evolution Issue*, R.L. Wysong, Enquiry Press, 4925 Jefferson Ave., Midland, MI 48640. For further information on creation research and creationism in the schools, write **CITIZENS FOR FREEDOM IN EDUCATION**, 2820 LaConte Rd., Anderson, SC 29621, or **INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH**, 1319 Brush Hill Circle, Naperville, IL 60540.

Also order *Evolution: The Incredible Hoax* by Homer Duncan from MC International Publications, 2451 34th Street, Lubbock, TX 79411, for \$2.50.

Chapter Seven

Humanism and Public Education

Christian leaders have long realized that we are engaged in a gigantic battle for the minds and souls of men. With the rise of Secular Humanism we must realize that we are struggling for the minds of boys and girls and the youth of our nation. This battle is being fought in our public schools and, unknown to most Americans, the humanists have been winning the battle so far in the Twentieth Century. The false evolutionary hypothesis, which has been widely accepted as a scientific fact, has all but destroyed the basis for education as it existed at the beginning of the century.

It is quite likely that Professor John Dewey of Columbia University had more to do with the molding of educational thought in the early part of the Twentieth Century than any other man. Dewey's biographer said of him:

The starting point of his system of thought was biological: he sees man as an organism in an environment, remaking as well as made. Things are to be understood through their origins and functions, without the intrusion of supernatural considerations.⁵⁹

In the early 1920s, spiritually-minded educators could see the handwriting on the wall and realized that humanism was on the verge of making a tremendous onslaught on the culture through the public educational system. Now both Christians and humanists recognize the great impact that evolutionary humanism has made on traditional theism through the public education system.

In 1963, Dr. Henry Morris wrote:

The evolutionary origin of the universe, of life and of man is taught as scientific fact even to elemen-

tary school children in probably most public schools, at least by implication. The Christian and Biblical record of origins is usually ignored, sometimes allegorized or even ridiculed. Such concepts as Creation, the Fall, the Curse, Sin, Redemption, etc. — which really are the most important and basic facts of science and history — are taboo. Such patronizing references to "religion" as are allowed at all in the public schools are given in a context of comparative religions, of "world communities," of "brotherhood," of "social progress," and the like.

This is a remarkable phenomenon in a nation founded largely on Christianity and the Bible. Undoubtedly, many factors have contributed to this ... but it is highly probable that the introduction of the nineteenth century doctrines of evolutionary optimism is back of most of it.⁶⁰

In 1976, humanist Paul Blanshard made the boast:

I think that the most important factor moving us toward a secular society has been the educational factor. Our schools may not teach Johnny to read properly, but the fact that Johnny is in school until he is sixteen tends to lead toward the elimination of religious superstition. The average American child now acquires a high school education, and this militates against Adam and Eve and all other myths of alleged history.⁶¹

In 1978, Harry Conn wrote:

The Humanist Manifestos I and II were drafted in 1933 and 1973 respectively, and signed by leading humanists such as John Dewey, B.F. Skinner and Sir Julian Huxley. These two documents define the philosophy that has been reshaping our society, and is now the foundation of public education in the United States.⁶²

I quote a statement made by Dr. Francis Schaeffer:

Everywhere I go I find behaviorists completely committed to (Skinner's) view. Man is accepted as a machine, and he is treated as a machine. Such professionals are there by the hundreds, some of them with understanding, some of them with power, some of them only in little places. In some places they control the educational process down into the earliest days of school.⁶³

How have the humanists been able to gain control of our education system? There are several answers to this question. First, they do it by educating the educators. Students who themselves later will be the teachers are thoroughly indoctrinated in evolutionary humanism. Secondly, they do it by controlling the textbooks that are used from the primary schools through the universities. One of the founders of the older publishing houses is reported to have said, "Let me publish the textbooks of a nation and I care not who writes its songs or makes its laws." Alexander J. Bourke, Jr., states, ". . . textbooks both mirror and create our values."⁶⁴ For those who are interested in making a study of the textbook situation in our schools we strongly recommend *Textbooks On Trial* by James C. Hefley.

Perhaps some of my gentle readers think that I am overstating my case in discussing the evil effects of evolution and Humanism on the students in our public school system. It is quite likely that the students themselves would say, "I never hear my teachers talking about Humanism." But if I wanted to poison you, I would not say, "This is strychnine, drink it." I would mix the poison with some palatable drink, and then give it to you. This is the method of all false religions.

In her paper *The Religion of Humanism in Public Schools*, Barbara Morris writes:

I often think about the religion of Humanism being promoted in public schools and without fail, I find myself asking, Where, oh WHERE are the Christians? Why do those who claim to be true followers of Christ permit this hoax to go unchallenged?

Every Christian and every Christian church should be actively exposing and working to remove this Godless religion from our public schools. One woman's efforts resulted in a ban on prayer and Bible reading. How is it that the people of a nation that claims to be predominantly Christian cannot rout the religion of Humanism from their schools?

Barbara Morris raises the question, "How are the principles of Humanism as outlined in the second Humanist Manifesto applied in public education?" She answers:

Very simply. Every course in the curriculum can serve as a vehicle to promote Humanist beliefs ... history, math, literature, languages, social studies, sex education, environmental education, home economics ... everything. Over the years during the steady influx of Humanist influence in the schools via the use of Humanist-oriented textbooks and teachers unknowingly trained to become missionaries of Humanist beliefs, over many years ... Humanist influence has been steady and subtle. However, we have reached a point where apparently it has been determined our society and schools are ready for intensive indoctrination into Humanism because we now openly have the ultimate apparatus for promoting Humanism in the schools and it's called "values education."

When you bring up the subject of values education, someone will always insist that teachers have always been involved in value information, and indeed this is so. It is impossible for a teacher to avoid conveying values to students. Her voice, her dress, her general demeanor, all convey values of some sort. However, in years past, the values conveyed by teachers in the main, reflected parental values, or at least, reflected those values that were considered in accord with prevailing Judeo-Christian morality. In years past, there usually wasn't a value conflict between schools and parents.

However, today we have a whole new ball game. Young teachers coming out of teachers colleges have had a thoroughly Humanistic education. Many of them, in the process, have lost the religious faith of their youth, or, they hang on to their religious orientation in name only or adopt some ersatz Christianity. They are quite ready to promote a system of values that is at odds with the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic. They are quite ready to facilitate a value system that will promote Humanist beliefs, and in fact, that will create practicing Humanists. Many young teachers, thoroughly indoctrinated into Humanism have a missionary zeal that would put so-called Christians to shame.

Now, about values education. Let's look at the rationale for having values education in the schools at all. What is the justification offered by promoters of values education? The best answer can be found in a book titled, *Values Education: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*, written by the three most prominent leaders in the values education movement... Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe and Howard Kirschenbaum. The authors explain that young people brought up by moralizing adults are not prepared to make their own choices about what they want to believe. They ask, and I quote, "How does the young person choose his own course of action from among the many models and many moralizing lectures with which he has been bombarded? Where does he learn whether or not he wants to stick to the old moral and ethical standards or try new ones?"

Well, where he learns whether or not he wants to stick to the old morals or try new ones is in Humanistic values education. And this book gives the teacher 79 different ways to help the student discard the values he has come to school with, and find new ones. And lest you still doubt the intent of values education, you should read a book titled *New Principles in the Curriculum*, by Louise M. Bernam.

She states very clearly that it is a proper role for the schools to change, create and clarify students' values.

Now, let's see how values education is used to promote those Humanist beliefs.

A series of papers published by the Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, New York, explains most compellingly how values education promotes Humanist beliefs.

Let's start with sex education. In one of those papers titled, "Sexuality and the School," by Marianne and Sidney Simon, the authors tell us that too many teachers are not merely asexual, they are downright anti-sexual, to the degree that they cause sexual destruction in the schools by causing children, as they put it, to wrinkle up like raisins in the sun. The Simons boldly declare, "some changes are desperately needed. Schools can no longer be permitted to carry out such a horrendously effective program for drying up students' sense of their sexual identity. The schools must not be allowed to continue fostering the immorality of morality. An entirely different set of values must be nourished."

And this is precisely what is happening in sex education. If you still naively think sex education deals only with the facts, be aware that sex education goes beyond the mere teaching of physiology and biology. Sex education openly and frankly deals with development of attitudes and values. The fact that sex education often extends from kindergarten through grade 12 should tell you that more than teaching the facts of sex is going on. Anything a child needs to know about sex at any given stage of his development can be explained to him in a very brief period of time by you, a clergyman or physician. It doesn't take 12 continuous years, unless of course, you are trying to establish or alter values, attitudes and behaviors along with the facts.

The presumption of sex education is that children come to school without values or with values that cause them to wrinkle up like raisins in the sun ...

values that must be changed. A goal of sex education is to eliminate harmful myths and hangups, that are, according to Humanist belief, and here I quote from the Manifesto, "fostered by intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures ..." Such "repressive" attitudes about sex prevent children from attaining their full potential as "sexual beings" and prevent them from expressing, according to Humanist terminology, "their sexual proclivities and (to) pursue their lifestyle as they desire." And you've seen the product of this permissive Humanistic philosophy ... young people with a scorn for Christian standards of morality, open homosexuality, rampant VD and untold numbers of abortions.

For children from a home where strong traditional moral values and standards of behavior are stressed, conflict and guilt are likely to ensue if they choose to depart from their moral upbringing. They have been taught about salvation and damnation which they can't easily dismiss. So what is the solution? One way to get rid of the Christian "myth" of salvation and damnation is to teach death education. Interestingly, many death education courses are being taught by sex educators, which is quite logical. Sex education tells students sex is for fun, and this is followed by death education, which in accord with Humanist belief, teaches that this life is all there is ... there is nothing after death. So, if Humanistic sex and death education are effective, young people can pursue their sexual proclivities as they desire, in keeping with Humanist teaching, because they have been taught in death education that heaven is here and now, and they will not have to worry about salvation or damnation because this life is all there is.

Another Humanist principle, the belief in situation ethics morality, finds its way into just about everything, but let's take drug education for example. Information is presented to students from the position that "we are giving you all the facts ... you

make up your own mind as to how you will use the information." Children without wisdom or maturity are given loaded information and told to make up their own minds about how they will use the information! Then need we wonder, when under peer pressure or under the influence of drug oriented rock music and "entertainers," whom they idolize, that they decide to use drugs? Christians believe that the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit and is not to be abused. Humanist philosophy says make up your mind ... what's important is having fun here and now, for this life is all there is. Lives shattered by disease and addiction are the monuments to Humanistic situation ethics behavior, fostered by Humanistic situation ethics values education.

Another Humanist principle is the belief in the right of maximum individual autonomy ... the right to do one's own thing, whatever it may be. A dictionary defines "autonomous." as meaning "without outside control." Some time ago in the country in which I live, there was an uproar over a questionnaire administered in the schools by Johns Hopkins University. Parents were outraged by the many questions that invaded student and family privacy. Parents were justified in their outrage, but they completely overlooked the purpose behind the questionnaire, which was to determine how autonomous the students were becoming! A report issued by Johns Hopkins explained that one of the goals of "open education" which is a euphemism for Humanistic education ... was to develop self-reliance and autonomous behavior. The report stated, "a major part of the growing-up process is developing a willingness to act autonomously, to no longer have to depend on one's family or others for excessive guidance and decision-making help ..." Common sense tells us that we cannot take immature children, lacking wisdom, and turn them loose to act autonomously with any degree of responsibility. This was recognized by educator Thomas B. Gregory in an article in the November 1971 issue

of "Educational Leadership." He warned that in becoming autonomous, "Internal controls may not develop, and seeking autonomy may become the immature action of simply resisting further external control. As a result, seeking autonomy may include experimenting with asocial actions (delinquency)."⁶⁵

Mrs. Morris defines a change agent as "a person, organization or institution that changes or hopes to change the beliefs, values, attitudes or behavior of people without their knowledge or consent."

She closes her book *Change Agents in the Schools* with these words:

The Time Has Come For Action

I challenge parents to face up to their obligations and responsibilities; to be worthy of the religious freedom our forefathers shed their blood to obtain for us. Children are helpless, captive victims in the classroom. If parents won't free them from the clutches of those who have usurped parental rights, then who will?

Furthermore, I challenge those good teachers in the government schools who want to stay and fight, to quickly put on their gloves and get to work helping parents. It will take those on the "inside" to help those working on the outside. Other teachers who "have had it up to here" — I challenge them to make the financial sacrifices necessary to strike out on their own — to start their own schools — correspondence or actual bricks and mortar, or to join the faculties of good private or church schools. The world is full of opportunities waiting to be taken. No one need sell his soul to Satan for financial security.

May God give parents, grandparents, businessmen and true educators the courage and ability to do what must be done if America is to survive as an educated, civilized, sovereign, Constitutional Republic.

The hour is very late. What will you do?⁶⁶

Even though Mrs. Morris carefully documents the material in her book, I thought that it might be slanted until I bought *Teaching In The Elementary School* at the Texas Tech University Bookstore.⁶⁷ When I read this book I discovered that students studying Education at Texas Tech University were being taught to teach the very things that Mrs. Morris said were being taught in our public schools.

There is no end to the material that can be studied as to what is going on in our school systems. Two of the best booklets that I have found are: *Public Education: River of Pollution*, and *The Source of the River of Pollution* by Joseph P. Bean, M.D. Dr. Bean was a member of the Glendale California School Board until he resigned in protest against what was taking place in the schools of that city.

Many of our present day educators no longer believe that the primary purpose of education is to teach subject matter, but their goal is to change the child for the new social order.

The results of teaching humanism in our schools should stir every patriotic American to action. Every day 13 boys and girls and young people commit suicide. In the past 20 years the suicide rate for children 10-14 has doubled and the rate for young people 15-19 has become three times as high. Violent crime by young people has doubled in a decade. Drug and alcohol offenses by young people have increased 37 percent. Assaults on teachers have increased 77 percent. Harry Conn writes:

According to the Wall Street Journal, there were over 1700 school teachers in the United States who were the victims of brutal assaults by their pupils in 1972. Nine of the teachers were killed by their students.

In 1976 over 7000 school teachers were violently assaulted by their students. In the United States, the students are allowed to physically assault their teachers because there is no code of conduct. At the same time, the teachers are not allowed to spank their students. In the city of Chicago, it is common

knowledge that it is more dangerous to be a public school teacher than it is to be a city policeman.⁶⁸

The situation in the schools is so far out of hand that at Crenshaw High School in Los Angeles teachers are wearing wrist transmitters. If violence erupts, the teacher pushes the alarm button on her wrist transmitter, which alerts the central station. A school guard with a walkie-talkie is notified and hurries to assist the teacher. In Brooklyn, New York, some teachers have to sit behind a protective screen while they teach.

Many educators, say that these conditions are caused by the breakdown of the family, and surely much of the blame can be laid to this cause. But, do not forget that one of the avowed aims of the Humanists is to destroy the family. Any honest, sensible person can see that the influence works both ways, and that through the schools, disintegration and ruin can be and are being introduced into the family. Anyone who knows what is being taught in our schools can easily recognize that the results, both in the schools and in family life, would be exactly what we are seeing.

Since Public Education is one of the principle means used by Humanists to accomplish their goals, an abundance of antihumanist literature has been and is being produced. Your attention is directed to the bibliography in the back of this book.

The good Lord has enabled me to write three books on Humanism. We praise the Lord these books are being widely circulated. In each of the books I have a chapter or section on Education. I urge you to read *Humanism in the Light of Holy Scripture*, and *The Religion of Secular Humanism and the Public Schools*.

Chapter Eight

Humanism, Psychology and Sociology

Most ordinary mortals have difficulty understanding the jargon of psychologists, much less their thinking, but the little we do understand causes grave concern.

We can be grateful that there are some truly born-again psychologists. One such man is Dr. Paul C. Vitz. In his book, *Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self-Worship*, Dr. Vitz writes:

It is difficult to document such a thing as the general attitude of a profession. But the hostility of most psychologists to Christianity is very real. For years I was part of that sentiment; today it still surrounds me. It is a curious hostility, for most psychologists are not aware of it. Their lack of awareness is due mostly to sheer ignorance of what Christianity is — for that matter, of what any religion is. The universities are so secularized that most academics can no longer articulate why they are opposed to Christianity. They merely assume that for all rational people the question of being a Christian was settled — negatively — at some time in the past.⁶⁹

Harry Conn writes:

According to sociologists, man is a product of society. This social determinism, with its categories of "behaviorism," "functionalism," and "voluntarism," makes society responsible for everything man does. Individual responsibility has been abandoned in favor of social responsibility. The inevitable conclusion of this teaching is that society must be responsible for crime and deviancy, since it is responsible for all man's social behavior. Personal

blame and guilt then lose their traditionally accepted meanings; after all, you can't really "blame" someone for wrong action that was not the result of a personal choice, but was the inevitable consequence of their past history. Man, then, can't help what he is doing; he is a helpless victim of heredity and social factors. He is bound to do whatever he does. If you can't really "blame" someone, then it's not right to punish them either, so it is not at all surprising then to find present day sociologists calling for the elimination of our prisons and jails. Their demands are logical and consistent if social determinism is true and social responsibility is allowed to replace individual responsibility. However, these presuppositions, according to the Bible and our own personal experience, are wrong. The Bible is the only book of "preventive psychology" ever written.⁷⁰

The Bible teaches that man was made in the image of God. Man, therefore, has the freedom to exercise his will. As a free moral agent he is responsible for his actions, and he will be held accountable. Eventually every man will face the Lord Jesus Christ, whether as Savior or Judge, and will be held accountable for the production of his life. Humanists do not like this idea. They desire to be free from any sense of responsibility or accountability.

Conn continues:

For a thorough convincing that the above is no wild-eyed assessment, you should read some of the books on "Community Psychiatry" which masquerade as preventive psychology such as those written by Gerald Caplan, Lindeman, Frantz Fanon Duhl, L.K. Frank and Robert Coles. They have programs and have government money in many instances to carry them out. Their books show how the psychiatrists are becoming more active in politics and what lies in store for the Christian or anyone else who disagrees with them.⁷¹

If you would like to understand something of the thinking of modern psychologists, read what Francis Schaeffer has to say about Harvard psychologist B.F. Skinner. Schaeffer gives this quote from T. George Harris:

But man in his conceit refuses to accept himself as an organism shaped by his environment. The trouble starts, Skinner says, with the proud belief that underlies democracy: the notion that in each of us there is a mentalistic being — an ego, personality, anima, spirit, character, soul or mind — that is somehow free. He denies the existence of this Autonomous Man and of any other cognitive entity able to claim, as Americans did in the Declaration of Independence, to hold "unalienable rights." In cold passion, Skinner seeks to destroy our pretensions to the freedom and dignity whose literature is written in brave blood. To take their place, Skinner offers the passionless hypothesis of his experimental laboratory: each man and woman is a unique bundle of behaviors determined by environment; only that, and nothing more. Through evolution the environment selected the behaviors that survive in our genes, and environmental conditioning shapes each of us in this life. If you would control, or change, human behavior, you need only control environment.⁷²

After quoting Harris, Schaeffer continues:

Surely, we say, what Skinner suggests could never be put into practice. But listen to what Harris says: "Nobody would panic at Skinner's attack upon our idea of freedom if he were only talking. But he has a program and followers to push it. In more than 40 years of psychological research, he has developed and proved out ingenious techniques for the radical modification of behavior, animal or human, by operant conditioning."

Everywhere I go I find behaviorists completely

committed to his view. Man is accepted as a machine, and he is treated as a machine. Such professionals are there by the hundreds, some of them with understanding, some of them with power, some of them only in little places. In some places they control the educational process down into the earliest days of school.⁷³

Schaeffer continues:

The way Skinner treats his critics and anyone who would disagree with him is especially interesting. He writes, "A literature of freedom may inspire a sufficiently fanatical opposition to controlling practices to generate a neurotic if not psychotic response. There are signs of emotional instability in those who have been deeply affected by the literature." Anyone who would stand against B.F. Skinner is neurotic or psychotic. This accusation is immediately reminiscent of Ward 7 in Russia, the wing in the mental hospital full of men with deviant political views. A person can be put in Ward 7 without a trial and without a sentence. As long as the state says he is insane, he remains there. What Skinner is saying is, If you stand against my position you are really neurotic or emotionally unstable. Then he names some well-known men who differ with him (Fyodor Dostoevsky, Arthur Koestler and Peter Gay), accusing them of namecalling.⁷⁴

Schaeffer concludes his booklet with these words:

What do we and our children face? The biological bomb, genetic engineering, chemical engineering, electrical stimulation of the brain, the behavioristic manipulation of man. All these have come to popular attention only very recently. But they are not twenty years away. They are not five years away. They are here now in technological breakthroughs and soon in practice. This is where we live,

and as true Christians we must be ready. This is no time for weakness in the church of Christ. What has happened to man? We must see him as one who has torn himself away both from the infinite personal God who created him as finite but in His image. Man was made to be great, he was made to be beautiful and he was made to be creative in life and art. But his rebellion has led him into making himself into nothing but a machine.⁷⁵

Chapter Nine

Humanism and the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ

In the book of Ephesians three figures are used to describe the Church: the body of Christ⁷⁶ the bride of Christ;⁷⁷ and a building made of spiritual stones to be a habitation for God.⁷⁸ However, most Christians do not realize that the Church is to be an embattled army.⁷⁹ In I Samuel 17:3 we read, "The Philistines stood on a mountain on one side, and Israel stood on a mountain on the other side: and there was a valley between them." Most people are not aware of the gigantic battle that is being fought with God and His forces on one side, and Satan and all of the hosts of Hell on the other side. As we approach the end of this age the battle becomes more intense, since Satan knows that his time is short.⁸⁰ Since the only true and living God is a holy God, and since Satan is a monster of iniquity, there can be no compromise between them. There must be no compromise between righteousness and wickedness, light and darkness, or between truth and error. The Bible clearly reveals that Satan is the master deceiver and as such he has been very successful in infiltrating the Church of Christ.⁸¹

The Apostle Paul tells us that the false apostles were deceitful workers, and that they transformed themselves into the apostles of Christ. "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works."⁸² Jude speaks of certain men who crept in secretly.⁸³ At the beginning, the false teachers who infiltrated the Church were creepers, but now they are strongly entrenched or are in control of almost every major Protestant denomination in America. Missouri Synod Lutherans are one exception. They had a housecleaning a while back.

The false teachers in the Christian Church do not generally call themselves Humanists, but are more commonly known as modernists or liberals. Unlike the Humanists, most liberals do believe in God; not the God of the Bible, but a god of their own invention and imagination. They deny the supernatural fundamentals of Christianity. The five fundamentals of the Christian faith are:

1. The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures
2. The Virgin Birth of Christ
3. The atoning, substitutionary Death of Christ
4. The literal, bodily Resurrection of Christ
5. The Second Coming of Christ

Liberals deny any or all five of these cardinal doctrines.

It is bad enough for the American taxpayer to be paying for his own destruction; it is worse when born-again Christians pay for the destruction of their own denominations and for propagation of doctrines that will cause the damnation of their own children. For those who may think I am misinformed, permit me to give statements made by liberal clergymen.

A Washington, D.C., minister said, "We liberal clergymen are no longer interested in the fundamentalist modernist controversy. We do not believe we should even waste our time engaging in it. So far as we are concerned, it makes no difference whether Christ was born of a virgin or not. We don't even bother to form an opinion on the subject."

An Arlington, Virginia, minister said, "We have closed our minds to such trivial considerations as the question of the resurrection of Christ. If you fundamentalists wish to believe that nonsense, we have no objections, but we have more important things to preach than the presence or absence of an empty tomb 20 centuries old."

A leading minister in Washington, D.C., said flatly, "In our denomination what you call the Faith of our Fathers is approaching total extinction. Of course, a few of the older ministers still cling to the Bible. But among

the younger men, the real leaders of our denomination today, I do not know a single one who believes in Christ, or any of the things that you classify as fundamentals.

"We are moving in the direction of the elimination of prayer from our services entirely. We still include it occasionally, to please those who are accustomed to it, for prayer is a sort of habit with folks. It takes time to educate them to a realization that it is a hang-over from the superstitious past. We do not teach them to pray. Our youth program is centered around recreation."⁸⁴

Some of my readers may think that I have picked out a few extreme examples, and that these men do not represent the condition as we find it in the Church today. I give you the results of a poll that was taken of the delegates to a convention of the National Council of Churches:

33 percent denied the existence of God;
36 percent expressed doubt about the deity of Christ;
31 percent doubted life after death;
62 percent questioned the miracles;
77 percent denied that the devil actually exists.

If you want to know what is taking place in our churches, read *The Battle For The Bible* by Harold Lindsell.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon lived and preached in England from 1834-1892. This man, who was called the Prince of Preachers, refused to compromise with evil. His fight for the faith cost him his life. A few days before his death he wrote the following words:

Numbers of easy-minded people wink at error so long as it is committed by some clever man and good-natured brother who has so many fine points about him. Let each believer judge for himself, but for our part we have put a few fresh bolts on our door, and we have given orders to keep the chains up, for under color of begging the friendship of the servant, there are those who aim at robbing the master. These preachers are not mistaken friends, but enemies of the Cross of Christ. There is no use in

employing circumlocutions and polite terms of expression — where Christ is not received as to the cleansing of His blood and the justifying merit of His righteousness, He is not received at all. Those who know and love the truth of God cannot have fellowship with that which is diametrically opposed thereto, and there can be no reason why they should pretend that they have such fellowship. My counsel has always been "come out from among them." I have felt that no protest could be equal to that of distinct separation.

To pursue union at the expense of truth is treason to the Lord Jesus. If we are prepared to enter into solemn "league and covenant" for the defense of the crown-rights of King Jesus, we cannot give up the crown jewels of His Gospel for the sake of a larger charity. To tamper with His doctrine would be to drift into compromises which they would not at first propose but which they seem forced to justify. Yielding to be the creatures of circumstances, they allow another to gird them and lead them whither they would not; and when they wake up, and find themselves in an undesirable condition, they have not always the resolution to break away from it.

As a matter of fact, believers in Christ's atonement are in declared religious union with those who make light of it; believers in Holy Scripture are in a confederacy with those who deny its plenary inspiration; those who hold evangelical doctrine are in open alliance with those who call the "Fall" a fable, who deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, who call justification by faith immoral. Yes, we have before us the wretched spectacle of professedly orthodox Christians publicly avowing the union with those who deny the Faith, and scarcely concealing their contempt for those who cannot be guilty of such gross disloyalty to Christ.

The New Testament not only teaches the necessity of contending for the faith, but it also exhorts us to separate ourselves from those who deny the faith. There is not need for any child of God to be in

ignorance as to his stand and his position before God and man. The Word of God is clear as to His instructions.

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith, which was once (for all) delivered unto the saints."⁸⁵

"Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed: For he that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds."⁸⁶

In the early 1900s, Dr. Francis L. Patton, a godly and able president of Princeton University, wrote, "The only hope of Christianity is in the rehabilitating of the Pauline theology. It is back, back, back, to an incarnate Christ and the atoning blood, or it is on, on, on to atheism and despair."

Our Christian leaders did not heed the warning of this man of God. Instead they turned aside to a social gospel and allowed the enemies of Christ to infiltrate Christian seminaries, and then the churches. If the ministers in our churches had stood firmly on the Word of God, the enemies that are now destroying our society would have been driven back.

The Word of God gives us this wonderful promise, "When the enemy comes in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him."⁸⁷ Dr. Francis Schaeffer is one of the standards that the Spirit of God has raised up to face the enemy in these last days. Christians need to read Schaeffer's books.

Spiritual Adultery Today

In his book *The Church at the End of the 20th Century*, Schaeffer writes:

Now, let us notice where we have come. When those who claim to be God's people turn aside from the word of God and from the Christ of history, this is far more heinous in the sight of God than the worst case of infidelity in marriage, for it destroys the reality, the great central bride-groom-bride relationship. I have taken care to emphasize that God does not minimize promiscuity in sexual relationships, but apostasy — spiritual adultery — is worse. And the modern liberal theologian is in that place. How do we look at it? I would suggest we must be careful to look at it no less clearly than God does. Consider the liberal theology of our day. It denies the personal God who is there. It denies the divine, historic Christ. It denies the Bible as God's verbalized Word. It denies God's way of salvation. The liberals elevate their own humanistic theories to a position above the Word of God, the revealed communication of God to men. They make gods which are no gods, but are merely the projection of their own minds.

Of course, we must treat men as human beings while having discourse with them, and that very much includes the liberal theologians. We must treat them as made in the image of God, even if they are actively in rebellion against God, and we must let them know that we love them as individuals. But this does not mean that we should forget that apostasy must be named as apostasy. Apostasy must be called what it is — a spiritual adultery. We must have politeness and struggle for human relationships with the liberal theologians with whom we discuss. But as to the system they teach, there is to be no toning down concerning what it is — spiritual adultery. As I said, in our generation we tend to tone down the word adultery in divorce cases, for we do not much like the word. Far more in the religious realm do we tone down the terms spiritual adultery and apostasy. But in doing this we are grievously wrong, because the Bible's perspective should be our own, and this is the way God speaks of it and

looks upon it, and so this is the way God's people are called to look upon it.

This spiritual adultery is worse, much worse, than physical adultery. But it is also much worse, let me say, than the Jews following their idols. Oh, how God spoke out against the Jews following their idols! What strong figures of speech he used in love in order to bring them to their senses. But modern liberal theology is far worse than this, for it turns against greater light, against greater blessing. Modern liberal theology is worse than following the Molech of old.

Do you know the facts concerning Molech? Molech, whose idol was in the valley of Hinnon, was a heathen god whom the Jews were constantly warned against following. What kind of a god was Molech? He was the god of the sacrifice of new-born babies. This was the central act of his worship: The first-born of every woman's body had to be sacrificed to Molech. According to one tradition, there was an opening at the back of the brazen idol, and after a fire was made within it, each parent had to come and with his own hands place his first-born child in the white-hot, outstretched hands of Molech. According to this tradition the parent was not allowed to show emotion, and drums were beaten so that the baby's cries could not be heard as the baby died in the hands of Molech. And there, I would say, stand many in our day. Many of those who come to me, those with whom I work, are the children destroyed by a worse than Molech. Men — men who were supposedly the men of God — have stood by while their children were eaten up by modern theology. And then we are told that there is supposed to be no emotion shown.

Some of you who read this bear yourselves the marks of these things from the background from which you come. All of us are marked by this in some way, to some extent, because our Western post-Christian world has been undercut by this liberal theology. Every scar this present generation

has, every tear cried, every baby which some of you who read this have willfully aborted, every drug trip you have taken, cannot be separated from the fact that the church has turned away and become unfaithful. This generation are the babies in the hands of Molech. And are we, as mere dilettantes, supposed to stand by and hear their cries and cover them up by beating loudly the drums of a profitless dic-sussion? I tell you, No. We are to weep and to act.

For those of us who are the children of God, there can be only one end to this study concerning adultery and apostasy. We must realize the seriousness of modern apostasy; we must urge each other not to have any part in modern apostasy. But at the same time we must realize that we must love our Savior and Lord. We must be the loving, true bride of the divine bridegroom in reality and in practice, day by day, in the midst of the spiritual adultery of our day. Our call is first to be the bride faithful, but that is not the total call. The call is not only to be the bride faithful, but to be the bride in love.⁸⁸

If some should think that Dr. Schaeffer is too severe in his indictment of liberalism, they need to know something of his ministry in L'Abri, Switzerland with the lives of hundreds of young people whose lives have been destroyed by liberalism.

Humanism and the Courts of Law

While the average American has been busy here and there, and with this and that, primarily in seeing how much of this world's goods he can accumulate, unknown to him, revolutionary changes have been taking place. We are often perplexed by the decisions of our courts. We are amazed when judges slap the wrist of habitual criminals and turn them loose to prey on society. I do not need to cite specific examples, as the daily papers and current magazines are filled with such accounts.

On the whole, our nation was founded by God-fearing people. The Pilgrim Fathers came to this country because they wished to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The Constitution of the United States was based on the old English law, which was based on Roman law, which was based on the Mosaic law.

Whitehead and Conlan write:

Early American law was no less theistic in its configuration. Probably the greatest influence on the law as understood by the men responsible for formulating the foundations of the American legal system was William Blackstone's Commentaries. Regarding the basis of law, Blackstone wrote: "The doctrine thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures. ... Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws. That is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these."⁸⁹

We have seen how Satan infiltrated our churches, causing most of our religious leaders to discard the Bible as an absolute moral standard. This same thinking has now infiltrated our legal system. Whitehead and Conlan write:

Beginning in the 1940s, however, traditional religions came under increasing attack ... Society's basis of truth was shifting from traditional theism's emphasis on God-centeredness to Secular Humanism's emphasis on man-centeredness.⁹⁰

Historian R.J. Rushdoony writes:

What we are witnessing at present, amid much tension and conflict, is a shift in the American legal establishment. A shift from Christianity to humanism. Humanism is a religion no less than Christianity. Paul Tillich's definition of religion as ultimate concern does the most justice to all religions and clearly defines religions, both theistic and non-theistic. Theistic here has reference to belief in a personal God. Non-theistic religions make some entity, such as the state, or a creature, such as a man, or men in general (as with humanism), the working god of their system. The denial of God does not eliminate the fact that there is an operative god in every religious system or faith. The religious motivation, impetus, and fervor behind our present law structure, our state establishment of religion, is humanism.⁹¹

Whitehead and Conlan write:

Therefore, there can be no tolerance in a law system for another religion. In the latter part of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century the American legal order released its hostility against the theistic foundation of American law and developed a secular humanist religion to replace it. Because tolerance is nonexistent, the obvious consequence is either open or subtle hostility or persecution of the former theistic foundation of law ... Thus, the Supreme Court has adopted a concept of religion which is tantamount to Secular Humanism's position of the centrality of man, because the basis of both is the deification of man's reason.⁹²

Most of us are little aware of the profound influence that some university professors have on the American way of life. Such a man was Roscoe Pound, the eminent dean of the Harvard Law School. He wrote, "It must be borne in mind that 'nature' did not mean to antiquity what it means to us who are under the influence of the idea of evolution."

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., a contemporary of Pound, applied the principles of evolution to both life and law. He remarked:

I see no reason for attributing to man a significance different in kind from that which belongs to a baboon or a grain of sand. I believe that our personality is a cosmic ganglion, just as when certain rays meet and cross there is a white light at the meeting point, but the rays go on after the meeting as they did before, so, when certain other streams of energy cross at the meeting point, the cosmic ganglion can frame a syllogism or wag its tail. (See Whitehead and Conlan, p. 58, footnote).

The philosophy of these jurists has radically affected the thinking of many of our Supreme Court Justices. Chief Justice Fred Vinson in 1951 said:

Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the considerations which give birth to nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending threat by encasing it in a semantic straitjacket, we must reply that all concepts are relative.⁹³

We can be grateful that our courts have not sold out completely to humanism as evidenced by their decision not to remove "In God We Trust" from our coins. We must keep in mind that it is God who "removeth kings, and setteth up kings."⁹⁴ He removes judges and sets up judges. God gives the people of any nation the kind of rulers they deserve. If the people of America will repent

and turn from their sins, we can look to God to give us leaders who will bring honor to His name. Every Bible-believing Christian looks forward to that day when Jesus Christ will reign on the earth as King of Kings and Lord of Lords.⁹⁵

Humanism and Absolute Standards

In the early part of the Twentieth Century, everyone recognized the need for some kind of standard to determine what was right and what was wrong. In the physical realm we had the Bureau of Standards in Washington check to see to it that all measurements were the same in every state. One standard "yardstick" was the standard for every yard measurement throughout the United States. A gallon was four quarts in every state. Think of the confusion that would have resulted if a gallon had been four quarts in Texas and five quarts in Oklahoma, or if the yard had been 36 inches long in New York and 40 inches long in New Jersey.

Stanley J. Rowland, Jr., has written:

People need a way of acting justly, both as individuals and as groups. A person, to maintain his integrity and probably his sanity, needs some consistent idea that his acts will produce certain results, including rewards or punishments. A society, to survive intact, must have some system to decide between right and wrong, and balance out its rewards and punishments.⁹⁶

Russian scholar Vadim Borisov has said:

The American Founding Fathers who many years ago first propounded the "eternal rights of man and the citizen" postulated that every human being bears the form and likeness of God; he therefore has an absolute value, and consequently also the right to be respected by his fellows.

Rationalism, positivism and materialism, developing in opposition to religion, successively

destroyed the memory of this absolute source of human rights. The unconditional equality of persons before God was replaced by the conditional equality of human individuals before the law. Deprived of divine authority, the concept of the human personality could now be defined conditionally, and, therefore, inevitably arbitrarily. The concrete person became a judicial metaphor, a contentless abstraction, the subject of legal freedoms and restrictions.

And it is here, in the admission of the conditionality of the human personality, that we find the root of its calamitous ordeals in our barbarous world. If the human personality is conditional, then so are its rights. Conditional too is the recognition of its dignity, which comes into painful conflict with surrounding reality.

In breaking the link between human personality and the absolute source of rights, and yet affirming them as something to be taken for granted, rationalist humanism has from the very outset been inherently inconsistent, as its more logical successors very quickly understood. Darwin, Marx, Nietzsche and Freud (and many others) resolved the inconsistency each in his own way, leaving not one stone upon another in the edifice of blind faith in man's dignity. . . These men represented the theoretical, logical culmination of mankind's humanist rebellion against God. . . This century's totalitarianism, trampling the human personality and all its rights, rhinoceroslike, under foot, is only the application of this theory of life, or humanism put into practice.⁹⁷

Harry Conn writes:

You are not considered to be educated by some people unless you believe there is no such thing as absolute truth. Even the word moral is a dirty word today in most educational circles. This same college president had just returned from a meeting at the

University of Wisconsin, which was attended by 400 college and university presidents. They had agreed, but not unanimously, that nothing is absolutely right and nothing is absolutely wrong (and they were absolutely sure!). They did, however, agree upon one absolute: belief in absolute, academic freedom. In other words, they'll believe in absolutes when they serve their purposes.⁹⁸

The Twentieth Century strategy of Secular Humanism is to personalize (privatize) traditional theism by introducing subjectivism, and thus to destroy all absolute standards. Harvard law professor Harold Berman has written:

The significant factor in this regard — in the nineteenth century and even more so in the twentieth — has been the very gradual reduction of the traditional religions to the level of a personal, private matter, without public influence on legal development, while other belief systems — new secular religions ("ideologies," "isms") — have been raised to the level of passionate faiths for which people collectively are willing not only to die but also ... to live new lives."

Whitehead and Conlan write:

Evolutionism has altered the course of history by shifting the base of moral absolutes from traditional theism to Secular Humanism. The replacement of "will" by "chance" as the mediator of biological change has transformed our view of man's relation to the universe. If life came into existence through natural, materialistic, chance processes, then it is without absolutes, moral direction or purpose. Without the traditional theistic absolutes revealed by God, Man must speculatively produce a set of arbitrary absolutes or situational ethics by which he can only hope to arrive at an orderly society. Therefore, life's answers to the

myriad of questions facing Man emanate from a materialistic religion. "Materialistic philosophy relieves one of responsibility to anyone, including the supernatural. Atoms have no morals, thus, if they are our progenitors, man is amoral." Morality and ethics are, therefore, purely relative to the Secular Humanist who is logical to his faith.¹⁰⁰

As we begin to understand the changes that have taken place in the thinking of many of the people in the United States, we can begin to understand some of the things that are taking place in this country. It may seem a bit far-fetched to some of my readers, and it would be far-fetched if I were the one who said it. But, I remember a statement in one of Francis Schaeffer's books something like this. It matters not (to an Existentialist, a devotee of one of the more radical modern philosophies) whether a young man helps a kindly old lady across the street, or whether he cuts her throat. Who is to say which act is right or wrong?

When we discard the Bible as our standard of absolute truth, the standard for determining what is right or wrong, we have no standard for determining moral values. The Bible says that murder is wrong, but nowadays many murderers are set free to kill again simply because the judge thinks they are mentally sick. Rapists are not accountable for their actions, so they are set free to ravish little girls. It happens all of the time. Read your daily paper. The Bible says that adultery and fornication are wrong, but since we have thrown away the Bible, college students and thousands of others live together without restraint. The Bible pronounces the death penalty for homosexuality,¹⁰¹ but if the Equal Rights Amendment passes we will be compelled by law to send our children to homosexual teachers. The Bible teaches that stealing is wrong, but robbery, theft, shoplifting, and dishonesty of all kinds are skyrocketing since we have turned from God's Word as a standard of values. The Lord Jesus said, "Blessed are the pure in heart," but our TV programs, our theaters, and much of our literature is filled with filth. Oh yes, I know we had these

things before Secular Humanism became the new religion. I also realize that the profit motive is the main factor in pornography and the production of filthy movies and TV programs, but as I said at the beginning of this book, Humanism is causing the American people to cast off all restraint; it is throwing gasoline on the fire instead of seeking to put out the fire. We have sown the wind; now we are reaping the whirlwind.¹⁰²

The Intensity of the Battle

The nearer we get to Armageddon, the more intense the conflict becomes. One of Satan's chief delights is to make people think that he does not exist, but every Christian warrior knows that he does exist. Each has wrestled him many times in spiritual conflicts. In Revelation 12:12 we read that Satan's wrath is great because he knows that his time is short. Satan is not omniscient, but right now he can see the handwriting on the wall, and for this reason he is stepping up his attacks on Biblical Christianity in many ways.

The Children of Israel and the Philistines were inveterate enemies. When Saul became the first king of Israel, many of the Children of Israel were hiding in dens and caves for fear of the Philistines. Jonathan, King Saul's son, and his armor bearer went out to reconnoiter the Philistines. When the Philistines saw them, they said, "Behold, the Hebrews come forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves."¹⁰³ After the famous Scopes Monkey Trial in Tennessee in 1925, many Bible-believing Christians crawled into their holes and did not confront the enemy. Thus, another reason for the intensity of the battle is that a new generation is coming out of its holes to take their stand for right and righteousness. The phenomenal growth of Christian schools is one of the great evidences of Christian resurgence. The growth of the Christian school movement is far greater than most people realize. The devil and his cohorts are not at all happy about what is taking place. Through the Internal Revenue Service and other government agencies,

they are seeking to hinder, harass and discredit Christian schools and other Christian agencies. Historian R.J. Rushdoony writes:

It is a well-planned war. When virtually all 50 states embark on a common program, in unison, and appear with federal directives in hand, it is no accident. Of course, they declare themselves innocent of any attempt to control a Christian School, church, missions agency, or organization, but this is the practical result of their requirements. These efforts are directed at present mainly against small or independent groups, those least able to defend themselves. Meanwhile, major church groups are not disturbed or upset. Legal precedents established against these smaller groups can later be applied against all others.

These demands take a multitude of forms: attempts to control church nurseries, the various religious uses of church buildings, zoning regulations, etc. Christian Schools are told that they must pay unemployment compensation, seek accreditation by the state, use state textbooks, teach humanism, and so on. Catholic orders and Protestant missionary agencies are told that they must pay unemployment compensation also. The National Labor Relations Board seeks to unionize parochial and Christian School teachers and so on and on. Now too there is a demand that Christian Schools be integrated at a percentage set by the Internal Revenue Service, this despite the fact that such schools have not been involved in segregation.¹⁰⁴

The following is a quotation from Congressman George V. Hansen, R-Idaho, in the Congressional Record of September 20, 1978.

In 1978 the Internal Revenue Service proposed that all schools — formed or expanded at or about

or after the implementation of desegregation plans in the respective communities will be presumed guilty of systematic racial discrimination and their tax-exemption revoked retroactively.

We have become inured to the routine contempt the IRS has chronically demonstrated for accepted civilized standards of fairness, something which has its roots in the regrettable presumption that in tax matters the citizen is guilty until proven innocent, an innocence that has to be proven at the expense of the taxpayer, no matter how groundless or frivolous the charges. The proposed regulation I have mentioned to you is a fresh example of this attitude. It proposes to make a blanket finding of racial discrimination and automatically harass all private schools, putting on its victims the onerous burden of proving their innocence. At the same time, it says that it will be practically impossible to refute the charges unless there is an affirmative program operating.

I have objections to all of this, which forms the substance of the proposed regulation. But what shows truly brazen boldness on the part of the IRS, what puts all their previous efforts at trickery in the shade, is the fact that they have the astonishing gall to say that this is an insignificant regulation, a mere procedural change which does not merit public hearing.

We can be grateful that Congress has rejected for the time being the request of the IRS for funds to investigate all Christian schools. Congressman Ron Paul, D-Texas said:

I would like to suggest one further consideration. Taxes are for the purpose of raising revenue needed to sustain legitimate, constitutional functions of government. They ought not be used ... as a weapon to compel citizens and organizations to conform to sociological models favored by federal politicians and bureaucrats.

In the first edition of this book which was printed in August of 1979 I wrote, "The victory of Bob Jones University over the IRS should be a cause of great rejoicing among Christians everywhere."

I then reprinted the following article from the February 3, 1979, issue of Human Events:

University Wins Court Victory Over IRS

by John D. Lofton, Jr.

On Dec. 28, 1978, when U.S. District Court Judge Robert F. Chapman ordered the Internal Revenue Service to pay back \$21 to Bob Jones University (BJU), he said that the refund being sought "belies the importance of this litigation" since the resolution of the suit required a determination of whether the university qualified as a tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code. Well, His Honor wasn't just whistling Dixie.

The facts: On April 16, 1975, the IRS revoked the tax exemption of BJU — a private, fundamentalist Christian school which receives no local, state or federal aid. The Service made its revocation effective from December 1, 1970. Subsequently, the school paid \$21 under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for one employee during the calendar year 1975, and then asked for the money back. When this request was denied the school sued.

The IRS argued that it revoked BJU's tax exemption because the school racially discriminated, specifically forbidding inter-racial dating and marriage. This policy was not allowable, according to the way the IRS interpreted Section 501(c)(3) and several of its revenue rulings and procedures.

To make a long story short: the Court tore the IRS case to shreds.

It declared: "To condition the availability of benefits upon the plaintiff's (BJU) willingness to violate a cardinal principle of its religious faith effectively penalizes the free exercise of its constitutional liberties" and "constitutes an unconstitu-

tional infringement of the plaintiff's right to the free exercise of its religious beliefs."

The Court said it was "troubled" by the construction the IRS had placed on Section 501(c)(3) of the tax code, charging that the Service's interpretation of this statute was "unwarranted by its legislative history or express terms" and that the IRS "has overstepped its authority and usurped that of Congress." Calling the enumeration of exempt purposes "plain and unambiguous," and pointing out that Congress had said nothing at all about exemptions having to conform with "public policy," the Court observed:

"Federal public policy is constantly changing. When can something be said to become federal public policy? Who decides? With a change of federal public policy, the law would change without congressional action — a dilemma of constitutional proportions. Citizens could no longer rely on the law of Section 501(c)(3) as it is written, but would then rely on the IRS to tell them what it had decided the law to be for that particular day. Our laws would change at the whim of some non-elected IRS personnel producing bureaucratic tyranny."

The Court cited a 1966 case involving the IRS (*Commissioner v. Tellier*) in which the Supreme Court decreed:

"We start with the proposition that the federal income tax is a tax on net income, not a sanction against wrongdoing. That principle has been firmly inbedded in the tax statute from the beginning. One familiar facet of the principle is the truism that the statute does not concern itself with the lawfulness of the income that it taxes."

Last month the IRS held several days of public hearings on some proposed new lengthy and complex guidelines which would force certain private schools, including religious schools, to prove that they are "racially non-discriminatory" in order to

retain or obtain a tax exemption. An often repeated objection voiced by the overwhelming majority of witnesses who strongly opposed the Service's suggested revenue procedure was this: regardless of the merits of the proposal (and few felt it had any) the issue is one of substantive tax law and public policy and thus a matter to be decided by Congress, not unelected bureaucrats at the IRS.

It seems that those who made this complaint have at least one friend in court: Judge Robert F. Chapman.

Meanwhile, a spokesman for the Service adamantly refuses to comment on Judge Chapman's ruling, saying only: "We're studying it." I bet, the same way a cobra studies a mongoose.

The rejoicing over the Bob Jones victory was shortlived. On May 24, 1983, the Supreme Court revoked the tax exempt status of BJU. The following quotations are taken from a pamphlet published by Bob Jones University:

Shock waves from the bomb dropped on Bob Jones University by the Supreme Court will eventually reach all Christian schools, parochial schools, churches, and other American religious institutions. This same bomb has exploded the constitutional provision of religious freedom and left only toleration for religion that government can control. It has exploded the myth of the separation of powers between court and Congress and has revealed the court as usurper of power to make law, heretofore belonging only to Congress. It has exploded the myth that we are a nation governed by laws and has revealed that we are a nation governed by the whims of jurists who have abandoned all regard for the Constitution, choosing instead decisions designed to please the liberal media whose wrath would have exploded upon the court had the court ruled differently.

Attorney John McLario added in the same pamphlet:

The Supreme Court strikes again. In just 20 years they have robbed us of the right to freely practice our faith by outlawing prayer, Bible reading, and devotions in public schools. Now they have arrogantly assumed that they have public support for a sweeping judgment, set forth in *Bob Jones University v. United States*, that clearly declares public policy as superior to religious liberty.

This decision, as stated by the dissenting justice, William Rehnquist, is unconstitutional. It is contrary not only to the law as duly enacted by Congress but contrary to the authority vested in the judiciary by the Constitution. The courts are to interpret the law, not make the law. They are to adjudicate, not legislate. A quotation from Justice Rehnquist in his dissent makes it clear:

"I am convinced that Congress simply has failed to take this action and, as this Court has said over and over again, regardless of our view on the propriety of Congress' failure to legislate, we are not constitutionally empowered to act for them." (Emphasis added.)

This is strong language. Not only did he disagree with the majority's reasoning, but he declared that this decision was illegal and in violation of our Constitution. Justice Powell, in a separate opinion, also expressed concern over the usurpation of congressional authority:

"It is not appropriate to leave the IRS on the cutting edge of developing national policy. The contours of public policy should be determined by Congress, not by judges or the IRS."

The concept that some unwritten body of law termed "public policy" is dominant over constitutional rights is repugnant to the very purpose of the Bill of Rights. Our founding fathers refused to give any authority to the federal government unless certain rights enumerated in the first ten amendments were guaranteed to be free from government interference. Today "public policy" is just a new

name for the totalitarian rationale known as *raison d'etat* (reason of state), from which our forefathers came to this country to escape. It is antithetical to our fundamental principle of limited government and is blatantly unconstitutional.

Nevertheless, in recent years our "enlightened" judiciary has determined that rather than waiting for duly elected representatives to legislate the public will, the court should decide and announce the will of the people. Thus, in the name of "public policy," the courts have:

1. Legalized the murder of unborn and infant children;
2. Sanctioned and encouraged homosexuality and lesbianism as legitimate and alternative lifestyles;
3. Decriminalized sex crimes between consenting adults;
4. Established divorce on demand, known as no-fault divorce;
5. Removed prayer and Bible reading from the public schools;
6. Approved the teaching of the religion of secular humanism in the public schools;
7. Allowed children access to oral contraceptives without parental notice and consent.

The list goes on and on. The judiciary has been powerfully leading the battle to destroy the Judeo-Christian ethic in our country.

Now the IRS desires to destroy the source of that ethic — Bible-believing churches, schools, and organizations. The question whether Bob Jones University is right or wrong regarding its beliefs is irrelevant. The issue is religious freedom, not race. Recent history clearly reveals that once a precedent of governmental control is established, massive controls extending to all aspects of an organization

follow with astonishing rapidity. No religious organization will be free from the tyrannical demands of the IRS if it wishes to qualify for tax-exempt status.

Yes, federal regulations usually begin with some aspect of the race issue. But as soon as the courts and government agencies established regulations concerning racial policies in public schools, they immediately proceeded to establish controls over policies concerning sex discrimination, radical feminism, sodomy ("sexual preference"), school discipline, dress rules, hair length, coed sports, staff qualifications, curriculum, and on and on. This is not overstated by any means. We have no assurance that these and other shocking controls will not be thrust upon Christian organizations. In fact, we have already been told in no uncertain terms that public policy "substantially outweighs whatever burden" is placed upon a religious belief and practice. Truly, religious freedom in America has been murdered.

We can clearly see the future by looking to the present practices of socialist countries. They also claim to have religious freedom, but unless you conform to every "public policy," you are penalized, persecuted, and even killed. Sermons must be approved to ensure content that is in harmony with state policy. You cannot even proselytize your own children. You will suffer job discrimination, surveillance, and severe penalties for your faith. Even long prison terms because of your Christian faith are all too common in the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

I read with deep regret the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court entitled *Bob Jones University v. United States*. These are adversaries not only in judicial confrontation but in an ideological confrontation. These are also two entities which I love and have been loyal to for many, many years.

This 29-page pamphlet, The Bomb and Its Fallout, can be obtained without charge by writing to:

Office of Public Relations
Bob Jones University
Greenville, SC 29614

We urge you to order the same, and suggest you send a dollar or so to help with printing and mailing costs.

The Wine of the Wrath of God

It is one thing for atheists and humanists to be free to propagate their own religion, but it is another thing when they declare war on the Christian faith and seek to destroy it through the public schools. It is worse yet when they attack Christian schools and other Christian agencies. In their pride and haughtiness, they have overstepped themselves in this. Yes, they have won some of the battles, but the final outcome is certain. God is laughing at their efforts.¹⁰⁵

Most people are not aware that the wrath of God is almost ready to break on this sin-cursed earth. I believe that God is saying, "I've just about had enough of this foolishness." In the Second Psalm we read these wonderful words:

Why do the heathen rage,
and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves,
and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his Anointed, saying,

Let us break their bands asunder,
and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh:
the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath,
and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion.

I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.
Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance,
and the uttermost parts of the earth
for thy possession.

Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

Be wise now therefore, O ye kings:

be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.

Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye shall perish

from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him. (KJV)

The primary interpretation of this Psalm looks forward to the Second Coming of Christ. The 19th chapter of the book of the Revelation pictures Christ coming from heaven riding on a white horse with the armies of heaven riding with Him. (Read the entire chapter for yourself.) When the military powers of the world see Christ coming in this manner, they will set themselves against Jehovah and against the Lord Jesus Christ, saying, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." They will foolishly think that they can blast the Son of God from the sky with their mighty rockets, armed with atomic warheads. Will all of this have God terribly worried? Most certainly not! "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure."¹⁰⁵ In that day God will smash the rebellious nations in the same way that you and I would dash a clay flower pot into a thousand pieces (v. 9).

The twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew is the greatest chapter in the Bible on the signs of the times. In His Olivet Discourse, as recorded in that chapter, the Lord Jesus said, "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."¹⁰⁶ In that day men will say to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: For the great

day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"¹⁰⁷ The Bible has more to say about this awful time, known as the Great Tribulation, than it does about either Heaven or Hell. For details of what will take place during those days, read Revelation 6-19. The Lord Jesus Christ is coming again, personally, visibly, bodily.¹⁰⁸ When He returns, every knee will bow and every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.¹⁰⁹

However, there is another vital application that we can make from the Second Psalm. Just as in the day of the coming of the Lord, when the kings of the earth take counsel against Jehovah and the Lord Jesus Christ, so now the evolutionists and the Secular Humanists are imagining a vain thing (v. 1). They are attempting to dethrone God and enthrone man. Every person who has a solid basis on which to build his thinking knows that evolution and Humanism are vain and empty philosophies. Unbelieving men grasp at these vain theories simply because they wish to escape the authority of Almighty God. I am not making idle, ungrounded charges. Read Humanist Manifesto I and II for yourself. God is laughing at them!¹⁰⁵ They are endeavoring to do by their own ingenuity what Christ will do when He returns.

Yes, there will be righteousness and peace on the earth. Sin, sorrow, and suffering will be banished, but this will not be accomplished by the efforts of fallen men. There will be no peace among men as long as men are at war with God. There will be no lasting, abiding peace without the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace.

In the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I call on you to turn from the vain, foolish, empty philosophies of men. Turn to the true and living God, and to His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ.

I Defend the Right of Every Man

I defend the right of every man to be an atheist, agnostic, Muslim, Hindu, Jehovah's Witness or what not. I defend his right to propagate his belief by every honorable means, but I strongly protest when any man seeks to use the agencies of the United States Government, including our public educational system, to destroy the principles that have caused the American nation to grow strong and become great. With every fiber of my being I stand against those, such as Secular Humanists, who seek to dethrone the God whom I worship and serve. I stand against those who seek to take my children and grandchildren and make them wards of the State. I stand against those who seek to propagate their damnable doctrines at the taxpayers' expense.

The first amendment guarantee of religious freedom has been translated to separation of church and state, and as such it poses some problems . . .

The religion of the first amendment is traditional theism and, in particular, Christianity. Justice Joseph Story, a leading Unitarian of his time, who served on the Supreme Court from 1811 to 1845, has said:

Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the first amendment to it . . . the general if not the universal sentiment in America was that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation . . . But the duty of supporting religion is very different from the right to force the consciences of other men, or to punish them for worshipping God

in the manner, which, they believe, their accountability to him requires. It has truly been said that "religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator," and the manner of discharging it, can be dictated only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence . . . The real object of the amendment was not to countenance, much less to advance, Mahometan-ism, or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.¹¹⁰ Justice Story's construction of the first amendment has been corroborated by others. In the words of James Madison, the first amendment religion clauses were prompted because "the people feared one sect might obtain a preeminence, or two combine together, and establish a religion to which they would compel others to conform." The concern of Madison and the founding fathers was that some Christian denomination might prevail over the others. Thus, the first amendment was not meant to prevent the "establishment" of Christianity as a religion, but to prevent a single Christian denomination from dominating all the rest. The framers had no intention of eradicating traditional theism via the first amendment because, to them, "religion entailed a relationship of man to (a) Supreme Being." James Madison termed religion as "the duty which we owe to our creator, and the manner of discharging it." Madison, as well as the majority of the founders, was a theist. The framers never intended a complete separation of church and state, and, interestingly, such has never occurred. History is replete with the close connections between the public institutions of this country and the religious policies of traditional Christian theism. The predominantly Christian orientation of the American people mitigates against the absolute separation of church and state. It is these facts that the framers had in mind when they drafted the first

amendment. What they did not foresee was that the Supreme Court would take an active role in expanding the definition of "religion."¹¹¹

Keep The Record Straight

The Good Book says, "Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."¹¹² This book is designed to expose the sinister forces that have infiltrated our government and that are seeking to destroy the American way of life. What I have written, I have written without apology. However, this does not mean that I am saying that everyone in government is a Humanist. I am not saying that all public officials are corrupt. Some of our judges are God-fearing men. Some federal judges wrote to the editors of the Texas Tech Law Review commending them for the article on Humanism. In their book *Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power*, James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman give many examples of dedicated Christians who are in key positions in Washington. We praise God for this.

In the early 1900's, the Humanists set out to gain control of our public schools. Without most Americans' knowing it, they have achieved their purpose, but this does not mean that there are not hundreds, perhaps thousands, of dedicated, God-fearing, Bible-believing teachers in our public schools.

Some Problems We Face

The people of many nations in the world are limited to one religion. This is especially true in Muslim countries. Note the recent events in Iran, or be reminded that to be baptized in Afghanistan would cost you your head. Do not be deceived into thinking that religious freedom exists in Russia. None of us (unless it is the Humanists!) wants conditions such as this in America. From a practical standpoint it seems to be impossible to treat all peoples and all religions with fairness. The atheists resent

having prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. Jewish people resent their children's being taught about Christ in public schools. Jehovah's Witnesses do not want their children to have to salute the flag. Many people believe that the solution to these problems is to start private schools, but it is manifest to all that governmental agencies, both federal and state, strongly oppose this. Many Christians oppose the teaching of evolution as a fact of science in the public schools. A strong move is now under way to have both creation and evolution taught in the schools. What about the teaching of moral values? Someone suggests that the schools should be "neutral" in this area, but to attempt neutrality would play into the hands of the Humanists, who wish to destroy Christian moral values.

First, I contend that all minority groups should be treated as fairly as possible, but it was foolish for a Christian nation to allow one atheistic woman to get prayer and Bible reading put out of the public schools. Of course, she could not have done this if the courts had not been strongly biased by Humanism.

Second, since the United States was founded as a Christian nation, we should seek to preserve those principles which enabled us to become strong and to grow great. America is the most affluent nation on the face of the earth. Our Christian heritage enabled our first citizens to be strong and industrious. Our founding fathers were willing to sacrifice and often to die for the freedoms that you and I now enjoy.

Third, our Christian heritage has so molded the character of our people that we have been able to help downtrodden people all over the world, both physically and spiritually.

Fourth, however, we should not seek to preserve the theistic basis on which our nation was founded because of what it has done for us, or because of what it has enabled us to do for others. Our Judeo-Christian heritage must be preserved simply because it is the only system with a strong factual basis. Since Humanism is based on false presuppositions, it leads to absurdity.

The time has come when we must recognize that the values which enabled us to be strong and to grow great are now being eroded by sinister forces. The time has come for the turning of the tide. If the tide of evil that now engulfs us is not turned, we shall soon be completely destroyed.

Chapter Thirteen

What We Can Do and Must Do

So often we have that helpless feeling that there is nothing we can do. We stand by, wringing our hands, as we watch our nation go down the drain. If the tide that is now destroying us is to be turned, born again, Godfearing, patriotic Americans must join the battle. Since God is for us who can be against us?¹¹³ We must understand that this is not a minor skirmish, but that God and Satan are battling for the minds and souls of men. God is looking for soldiers to stand in the hedge and make up the gap for the land.¹¹⁴ Will we bow our knees to the pagan gods of Humanism, or will we dedicate ourselves to worship and serve the only true and living God?

Since this is a spiritual battle, it must be won by spiritual forces. We must put on the whole armor of God that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that we may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with perseverance and supplication for all saints.¹¹⁵

If we do not have on the armor of God, we will not last long in this battle. The Christian soldier needs to be on

guard, watching for the enemy to attack. The enemy is now within our gates, and is strongly entrenched in every area of thought in American life.

We Must Get Right With God

If you are not willing to get right and stay right with God, do not whine about what is taking place in our country. Genuine repentance is the first prerequisite for being right with God.¹¹⁶ Repentance means an "about face." It means leaving the broad way that leads to destruction and walking in the narrow way that leads to life. It means turning to God, and turning from your sin.

We cannot have physical life without a physical birth, and we cannot have spiritual life without a spiritual birth. That is why the Lord Jesus said, "You must be born again."¹¹⁷ We are born again when we by faith receive the living Christ to come into our heart. In the 12th and 13th verses of the first chapter of the Gospel of John we read these wonderful words: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Sin is the root of all the problems that plague the human race. When we become a Christian all of our sins are cleansed by the precious blood of Christ.¹¹⁸

We are saved by the Gospel of Christ: "Moreover brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."¹¹⁹ To justify means to declare righteous. We are not justified on the basis of who we are or on the basis of what we do, but when we exercise saving faith in Christ, God Almighty Himself declares us to be righteous on the basis of what Christ has done for us in His death and resurrection.

If you do not have a crystal clear conception of salvation, write to us for these booklets: Who Is a Christian?, The Living God, and So Great Salvation.

Through the atoning death of Christ, God has made a marvelous provision whereby every Christian can be right and stay right with Him. First John 1:9 is the greatest verse in the Bible on the way back to God: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." For a fuller discussion of this subject, order the booklet, Nine Biblical Basics.

Knowledge and application of the Bible, the Word of the only true and living God, is the greatest deterrent to Humanism and evil of every kind. Since the Bible is the foundation of the Christian faith, Satan always makes his first attack on the Word of God. David asked, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"¹²⁰ The answer is they can do absolutely nothing. Think it through! If we do not build on the solid foundation of the Word of God, all that we build will crumble. If your faith needs to be strengthened, order the booklet Why I Believe the Bible and the paperback book How Firm a Foundation. If you accept the false, Satanic, unscientific theory of evolution, you are putty in Satan's hands. Don't waste your time trying to save our country, for all that you do will be wood, hay and stubble. You will be building on a foundation of muck. If you think that evolution is a proven, scientific fact, order the book Evolution: The Incredible Hoax.

The Christian must be rooted and grounded with the Word of God; He must be saturated with the great spiritual truths of the Bible. Basically there are four things we are to do with the Bible: (1) we are to believe it, (2) we are to obey it, (3) we are to take it in, (4) we are to give it out.

We Must Have Revival

If our nation is to be saved, we must have a revival of old-time Christianity. If we are to have such revival, you and I, as individual Christians, must be revived. Second

Chronicles 7:14 is the greatest verse in the Bible on revival: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." This verse of Scripture has two parts: first, there are conditions that God says we must meet, and then we have His promises of what He will do if we meet His conditions. God is not mocking us; He is not commanding us to do more than we are able to do. What He commands us to do, He will enable us to do, if we look to Him for the necessary strength.

1. God's first requirement is that revival must begin with the right people. It will not begin with the bureaucrats in Washington. It will not begin with the liberal, Christ-rejecting, hypocritical leaders in many of our churches and denominations, but it must begin with you and me: the born-again children of God.

2. God's second requirement is humility. I know so little of the meaning of true humility that I am ashamed to write on this subject. Let us honestly face it: we Americans are a proud people. We think we are better, in every way, than any other people on the face of the earth. Even when we know that we have done wrong we are too proud to say, "I did wrong, please forgive me." If we are to have revival we must humble ourselves before God.

3. God's third requirement is prayer, but who has the time or the desire really to pray? Where are those who cry, "Oh that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence!" Most ministers know very little of the meaning of prayer.

More is said about and written about prayer and less is done about it than any other subject in the Bible. The greatest conflict in the area of our spiritual life is the battle to really pray. We sing, "A little talk with Jesus makes it right, all right," but Bounds says that little praying is worse than no praying, because it salves the conscience. If you do not have some good books on

prayer, we will be glad to recommend some. However, most of us know far more about prayer than we practice.

4. God's fourth requirement is to seek His face. This is more than praying. It means to have our heart, our mind, our soul, our affections set on God — to thirst for the living God, but most of us are too occupied with temporal things to do this.

5. God's fifth requirement is repentance, but this is a doctrine that has long been forgotten in most of our churches. Repentance is godly sorrow. It means, "About face." It means we turn from hell to heaven. It means we turn from sin to the Savior; from wickedness to righteousness. Perhaps many of my readers are feeling quite smug at this point. You are glad that you are not a murderer, an adulterer, a thief or a liar. Therefore, you see no need for repentance in your life. Most Christians need a second repentance. We need to repent of our sins, and we need to repent of the factory that continues to produce sin in our lives. Many who are not guilty of the grosser sins, are guilty of the nice, decent, respectable sins, such as unbelief, prayerlessness, neglect of the Word of God, failure to witness, lack of love, bitterness, resentment, wrong attitudes, etc.

6. When we meet God's requirements, He gives these promises: (1) then will I hear from heaven, (2) I will forgive their sin, and (3) I will heal their land. Our land needs healing physically (pollution), morally (dishonesty and sexual exploitation), politically (corruption in high and low places), economically (just the interest on our national debt is staggering), educationally (Satanic principles are being instilled into the minds of students from the first grade through university). Yes, our land is in bad need of healing. Order Revival Fires.

The Silent Majority Must Be Awakened

If this battle is to be won, if the tide of iniquity is to be turned, at least some of the Silent Majority must be awakened to action. They must understand the issues; they must become vocal. This can best be illustrated by a Biblical account which parallels our present situation.

Ahab, one of the most wicked kings of Israel, was in power. Most of the prophets of the Lord were hidden in a cave. The religion of the land was controlled by the false prophets of Baal. Elijah, the prophet of God, called all of the people together on Mount Carmel and asked them, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the LORD be God follow Him, but if Baal, then follow him." But the people answered him not a word. They were the Silent Majority. Then Elijah made the proposition that the two gods be tested, and that the god that answered by fire would be the true God. Then the people said, "It is well spoken." Read the complete account for yourself in chapters 17 and 18 of the book of I Kings. Today the Silent Majority professes to believe in God; they are nominal Christians; many of them are churchgoers, but many of them live as practical atheists. Francis Schaeffer is severe in his denunciation of them:

This Silent Majority, however, must be clearly understood to have two unequal parts: (1) the Christians, standing in the stream of historic Christianity, living under the propositional revelation of God as he has spoken in the Bible, and therefore having absolutes (These are a minority within the Silent Majority.) and (2) the totally different majority of the Silent Majority who are living on the memory of the practical advantages that Christian culture gave but have no base for these advantages. Their values are affluence (they are practical materialists) and personal peace at any price. Having no base, no absolutes, most of them will compromise liberty any time they are finally forced to choose between their affluence and personal peace on the one hand and giving up of a piece of liberty on the other. They are no closer to the true Christian than are the hippie community and the New Left. In fact, they are probably further away, for they have no values that deserve the name. Affluence and personal peace at any price as the controlling factors of life are as ugly as anything could be.¹²¹

In order for this book to have the effect that Bible believing Christians should pray for, it must be circulated far beyond their numbers. Many Christians know "the score" but many do not. Christians, therefore, of all persuasions and levels of maturity must read this book. If the tide is to be turned, some of those who are now at ease in Zion must be stirred to action. Some of them can be, and will be awakened when the facts are presented to them. The Living Christ says to us today, "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?"¹²² Circulate this book far and wide. Give a copy to your pastor. Give or sell copies to fellow church members. Give or sell copies to everyone on your block. Give a copy to elected public officials.

Our Christian Heritage

Dr. Bill Bright, the founder of Campus Crusade for Christ, writes:

Citizenship in a free country is a blessing from God. Our great system of self-government assures every Christian a voice in the affairs of the nation. God wants us to do His will in government, just as in the church and in the home.

But we have disobeyed our Lord. We have ceased to be the "salt of the earth" and the "light of the world," as Christ has commanded. As a result, the moral fiber of America is rotting away — and our priceless freedom is in grave jeopardy. Atheism is penetrating every area of our national life. America is faced with the greatest crisis in its history. We are in danger of losing our nation by default, and with it our individual freedoms and possibly our very lives.

If that should happen, our opportunity to help fulfill the Great Commission throughout the United States and the world will also be lost. And hundreds of millions will never have an opportunity to receive our Savior.

Edmund Burke said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." America is the last stronghold of freedom on earth — and citizens who are dedicated to God are the only resource for the preservation of our freedoms, including the freedom to serve Him.

It has been reliably estimated that more than half of the people of the United States profess faith in Jesus Christ. Even a small percentage of us can be used of God to set this nation on a new course of righteousness for His glory.

Be Informed

We are at war, and in war it is necessary to know of the enemy's plans and progress. When I began to study Humanism I was amazed at what is taking place in our country. Hundreds of books, booklets and pamphlets have been published warning Americans of impending judgment. God has raised up men of God to warn the American nation to turn to Him. God said to Ezekiel, "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Yet if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul."¹²³

Write to Missionary Crusader and ask us to put you in touch with other conservative, patriotic organizations.

I repeat, the knowledge of the Word of God is the greatest deterrent to humanism. Study the Book! Hide the Word of God in your heart. My book, *Satan's Strategy*, will help you understand some of the Devil's devices.

Christians Must Register and Vote

If hundreds of thousands of good, born-again Christians would vote they would make an impact on the political picture of this nation. Do not blindly follow party lines. A candidate's principles are more important than his party. Do not hesitate to question candidates concerning their stand.

From President to dog catcher, vote for God-fearing, Bible-believing politicians. In no uncertain terms let them know how you feel about Humanism. Some of them are Humanists and must be voted out of office. Others are in darkness and do not really know what Humanism is.

Get Involved

Since the Christian is the light of the world,¹²⁴ his main task and responsibility is to proclaim the Gospel of Christ to the ends of the earth.¹²⁵ But, the Christian is also the salt of the earth,¹²⁶ and as salt his influence is to be strongly felt in society. Savorless saints are one of the curses of Christendom. We must be careful not to spread ourselves too thin. None of us can do everything, but each of us can do something. Find out what God wants you to do, and do it.

Have Faith in God

Have faith in God.¹²⁷ Without faith it is impossible to please God.¹²⁸ Christian friend, we are on the winning side! Since God is for us, who can be against us?¹²⁹ From the human standpoint our cause looks hopeless. Our enemies say, "What do these feeble Christians?"¹³⁰ God has not given us the spirit of fear, but the spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind.¹³¹ God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.¹³² Study, analyze every word in these two wonderful verses. Meditate on every single word. They will give you courage and faith. The Humanists have no

refuge such as this. They boast in the arm of the flesh, but the arm of the flesh will fail them. They rest on human learning, on their university degrees, and on their own ingenuity. Being vainly puffed up they think they are wiser than Almighty God, but God says they are fools.¹³³

Perhaps you have made yourself believe that there is no God. I challenge you to do two things. First, simply read the Bible. A reading of the Bible with an honest heart and an open mind will convince you that it is the Word of God. Start by reading the Gospel according to St. John. Since eternity is a long time, I strongly recommend that you read through the Gospel of John ten times, if necessary.

Second, pray a simple prayer something like this, "Oh God, if you are there, hear me. If you will manifest yourself to me, I will surrender my life to you that you may express your life in me and your power through me." Thousands of unbelievers have prayed a prayer something like this, and in doing so have discovered the only true and living God. Thousands of others, because of their pride and self-will, refuse to read the Bible and refuse to pray this prayer. "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."¹³⁴

Appendix A

The quotations below are taken from *The Separation Illusion* by John W. Whitehead, and are printed with permission of the publisher.

"Again, Martin Luther was on target: 'I know for certain that we theologians and jurists must stay, or all the rest will go down with us. When the theologians disappear, God's Word disappears, and only heathen, aye, nothing but devils, remain. When the jurist disappears, peace goes away with it, and nothing but robbery, murder, crime, and violence, aye, nothing but wild beasts remain.'"

"To develop a natural aristocracy, the Founding Fathers greatly emphasized education. Madison, Jefferson, and Adams all insisted that the value of education could not be exaggerated because it is the condition on which effective self-government depends. Moreover, the education they had in mind was a liberal education 'rich not merely in the study of sciences but also in the study of morals.' The study of religion was essential because historically morals have been a religious concern. These men would have abhorred the secularized educational system in the United States today."

"From that era came John Adams, who wrote, 'Statesmen may plan and speculate liberty, but it is religion and morality alone upon which freedom can securely stand. A patriot must be a religious man.'"

"James Russell Lowell, an American poet and statesman of the late nineteenth century, was asked, 'How long do you think the American Republic will endure?'" Lowell replied, 'So long as the ideas of its Founding Fathers continue to be dominant.'"

"The farmers believed the government that governs least was the best government."

"As a result of the shift, the country, through a strange transmogrification, has developed from a federation of constituent states and local governments to a highly centralized, octopean, bureaucratic system. It is no longer America, but post-America. The Constitution, once worshipped as a treasure of freedoms, is now an instrument utilized to build a godlike government. In consequence, the totalitarian state stands beckoning for its curtain call, and Orwell's 1984 becomes more of a reality moment by moment."

"As men struggle to be free from God they eventually enslave themselves. Like small children, they draw a line on the earth, audaciously commanding God to stay on His side while they go their own way. That such can be is both an illusion and a lie. No matter how strenuously one labors to hold God back, he will ultimately fail. At this particular point man either despairs and calls on God or falls off the deep end. The deep end is either suicide or pretension. A man can pretend God is not there or he can separate himself from God by erecting an illusionary wall. Either way man lies to himself."

"The Court, by relying on historically inaccurate information, has erased three hundred years of American tradition and has in the process violated the very law it was sworn to uphold."

"It is conceded by most that this was once a Christian nation. The Constitution was written to reflect the Christian conscience of America. The First Amendment was to ensure noninterference with the Christian religious freedom of the states. The Supreme Court, by ruling that state-directed prayer and Bible reading in the public schools are unconstitutional, has violated that amendment. The Court, by patent misinterpretation of the Constitution, acted illegally. The appropriate question is: If the very judicial representatives of the government fail to uphold the law, how can they, in turn, expect the citizens to respect the law?"

"In 1962 the two opposing sides met on a judicial battlefield, armed with legal semantics. When the last shot was fired, the Christians had lost the battle. The war, however, continues."

"A cry is echoing throughout the land to crack down on the Supreme Court. Christians and non-Christians alike are demanding that the Court's power be limited."

FINISHING OFF GOD

"The Society of Separationists was founded by Madalyn Murray O'Hair in 1963. It boasts a membership of 60,000 hard-core atheists in the country.

"One of the more active chapters is located in Richmond, Virginia. The group's main goals are focused on the eradication of "In God We Trust" as a national motto, the cancellation of postage stamps which say "Pray for Peace," and the abolition of tax exemptions for church property.

"The current head of the group, B. Meredith Winn, Jr., sums up their objectives:

The group wants to remove the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and to challenge legislative prayers at all levels of government, religious services in the White House, prayers at athletic games and commencements in tax-supported schools, distribution of Gideon Bibles in schools, and Easter and Christmas holidays from schools...Also, it wants to challenge the swearing in of public officials, court witnesses, Civil Service employees, armed forces personnel, jury members, and others in government situations by "so help me God" and the setting aside of days of prayer by presidents and governors . . . separa-tionists want to stop government money from going to religious schools and hospitals in any way, whether by scholarship, grants or building aid. Also, the groups wants to challenge Internal Revenue Service tax exemptions connected with religion, such as church contributions, and United Fund Community Chest financing of religious-connected organizations.

"Those who strive to isolate religion completely from government, business, and education are in reality attempting to destroy the Christian religion. While trying to make this country free from religion, they are destroying the nation. There is no reason the government and the Christian religion cannot cooperate and work together. This is the American tradition that was intended to be protected by the First Amendment.

"The United States Supreme Court should be restricted to following the intent of those who drafted the First Amendment. To pretend that we are still governed by a document that is little adhered to is illusion. If the Court can flout the intention of our governing document, then we are no longer under a constitutional government."

"This move against the organized institutional church has not been effective enough. Now the area of concentration is private residential Bible studies. For example, a 1976 decision by a federal district court in Virginia ruled that it was unconstitutional for parents to conduct Bible or religious-oriented classes in their own homes with their own children. The decision was handed down on an appeal that began as a zoning case. A priest was charged with a zoning violation because he was conducting classes in private homes. Parents then began to conduct their own classes and were also charged with zoning violations. This all led to the district-court decision."

"When the barbarians entered the Roman senate, they listened to an orator proposing a plan to stop them if they should invade Rome. Some of the invaders poked the sitting Roman senators to see if they were alive because they looked like statues. The senators had become neutralized by a decaying society.

"Those with a sense of responsibility fought against the spirit of decay in Rome. Theaters, games, and festivals were organized in an unprecedented number while grain, wine, and money were distributed. Likewise, the coins were struck with words of encouragement. Answers were sought from everyone except God. Meanwhile, the German tribes were smashing through the Roman lines, and the old order was tottering to an end.

"All one has to do is look around at what is happening in the United States to see the parallel between decaying Rome and post-America. The decay is gnawing at the vitals of the country. The eagle looks more like a vulture these days."

"John Jay, the first chief justice of the Supreme Court, said, 'The people who own the country ought to govern it.' "

"The United States has had its chance and, as Francis Schaeffer makes clear in *Death in the City*, post-America is already under the judgment of God."

"As men, we must assert that we are creatures of worth made in the image of God and not machines of the government. We must not submit to servitude because pleasure commends it or because fear demands it. In the words of the apostle Peter, "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). We must stand with men like Patrick Henry, who when his young country was faced with giving in or fighting back met the challenge. On March 23, 1775, he rose from the pew in St. John's Episcopal Church in Richmond, Virginia, and said, 'Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me... give me liberty or give me death.'"

The Separation Illusion can be obtained from:

MOTT MEDIA
305 Caroline
Milford, MI 48042

Selling price: \$5.95

Appendix B

Agencies Promoting Humanism

1. THE AMERICAN ATHEISTS - Most respectable Humanists are ashamed of Madalyn Murray O'Hair and her tactics.
2. THE AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION — publishers of Humanist Manifesto I and II.
3. THE COUNCIL FOR DEMOCRATIC AND SECULAR HUMANISM, a breakaway group from the AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, publishes Free Inquiry, a militant, forthright Humanist magazine whose main goal is to attack the new right.
4. THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION is the legal arm of militant, atheistic Humanism.
5. THE INTERNATIONAL HUMANIST AND ETHICAL UNION.
6. There are dozens, if not hundreds, of small atheistic organizations scattered all over the country.
7. As far as I have been able to determine, THE ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES is the most powerful non-governmental agency promoting Humanism. For more information about THE ASPEN INSTITUTE, send \$5.00 to Freeman Digest, P.O. Box 116, Provo, UT 84601, and ask for the January 1979 issue of the Freeman Digest.
8. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT is by far the most powerful and effective means for promoting Humanism through its various agencies, primarily through controlling education. I repeat,

American taxpayers are paying for their own destruction.

9. THE UNITED NATIONS.

10. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ALL OVER AMERICA
(both state and denominational schools).

Appendix C

Humanism and Communism

The ideological struggle between Communism and the free-enterprise system that has dominated world politics for the better part of this century is fast approaching a showdown.

Humanism and Communism are not identical twins, but they are good bedfellows. A comparison of the Communist Manifesto with Humanist Manifesto I and II reveals that their aims are almost identical. Communism is Humanism in political disguise.

Both deny the supernatural.

Both deny Divine revelation.

Both seek to control the educational system.

Both seek to destroy all religions, except their own.

Both seek the betterment of the human race.

Both promote world government.

Judging from the above comparisons it would be easy to assume that all Humanists are Communists. Such is not the case. In all likelihood most Humanists favor some brand of socialism, but they are not Communists since a major tenet of Humanism is freedom. The following quotations taken from "An Interview with Sidney Hook at Eighty" prove the above assertion. This interview was conducted by Dr. Paul Kurtz, the editor of *Free Inquiry* and appeared in that magazine. Dr. Sidney Hook has been called the leading Humanist of our time.

Paul Kurtz: What in your opinion is the most important issue facing Humanism in the world today?

Sidney Hook: The most important issue facing Humanism on a world scale is whether a free society can survive the multiple assaults of totalitarianism. By a free society I do not mean "a free-enterprise society," but one in which citizens have the power to determine through the democratic political process the economic as well as the other institutions under which they wish to

live. I am willing to call myself an atheist except when it is assumed — gratuitously — that an atheist must be a Communist. Let's face it. Freedom of religious belief or disbelief is integral to freedom of thought. Traditional lines of division on this issue no longer hold. There is less religious freedom and intellectual freedom in countries like the Soviet Union and its satellites, where atheism is the state religion, so to speak, or in Iran, where a Muslim theocracy runs amok, than in most other countries. I am therefore prepared to make common cause with anyone who genuinely believes in religious and intellectual freedom, regardless of our other differences, but not with any professed atheist who supports a totalitarianism, of any cut or fashion.

I confess to having learned something from experience. When I published *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx* on the fiftieth anniversary of Karl Marx's death, his analysis of capitalism seemed sound. Now, as we approach the one hundredth anniversary of his death, it is clear that his analysis was faulty. The relative prosperity of Western economics, the emergence of the welfare state, and the intensification of nationalism defeated his major predictions. The Soviet Union has transformed the socialist dream into a totalitarian nightmare.

Since I became interested in politics, I have always been impressed by Jefferson's fear of judicial despotism in democracy. During the thirties it was common liberal coin. I still believe that the power of a nonelected Supreme Court to nullify congressional legislation is a usurpation of power. The first time the Court dared to exercise its power of nullification, sixty years after the Constitution was adopted, it contributed to the Civil War. The attitude of many militant liberals to this power of the Supreme Court, with its absurd 5-4 votes that determine the destiny of the nation, depends upon whose ox is being gored. To my mind a principled democrat who accepts the division of powers must give preponderance to the legislative body, which is directly responsible to the people. The Supreme Court, like the presidential

veto, should be a check on an impulsive or unreflective congressional majority. But provision should be made to override vetoes. We elect our legislators not our justices. Today the courts are deciding questions that do not fall within their legitimate province. Listening to apologists for our imperial judiciary, one gets the impression that the Court, itself, is the only legitimate judge of what falls within its province...I prefer a mixed economy in which only when the private sector fails to meet the legitimate needs of the community should resort be made the public sector.

Kurtz: Does not the growth of nuclear weapons threaten all society, free and unfree?

Hook: Yes. Every sane person is or should be opposed to nuclear war. But the real problem is how to prevent such a war? Until now reliance upon the principle of deterrence has kept the peace. But what about the future? Will a nuclear freeze do it? Not unless the nuclear freeze is verifiable by on-site inspection, and not if it results in leaving the Soviet Union in a position of nuclear superiority that may tempt it to engage in nuclear blackmail. Agreements are not self-enforcing. Our free culture guarantees that if the United States violated any agreement there would be a public outcry. In the USSR there is no independent press or public opinion. Every member of the Helsinki Watch Committee, set up to monitor the Soviet fulfillment of its pledges at the Helsinki Accords, is in jail. The Soviets cheer on the nuclear-freeze movement in the West but crush it inside their own borders and in their satellites. Is that a sign of sincerity? Recall it was the United States that offered to surrender its monopoly of atomic weapons to an international authority — a proposal accepted by all nations except the Soviet Union. The Kremlin's rejection of the generous proposal of the Baruch-Lilienthal Plan led Bertrand Russell unwisely to advocate that the Soviet Union be atom-bombed.

...The paradox is that we must regard some values as dearer than life in order to enable and preserve life.

Professor Nicholas Capalde writes,

Hook is the most distinguished of John Dewey's students and the greatest living embodiment of the American pragmatic mode of thought. But it is hard to imagine Hook as a mere disciple. He was also the first Marxist professor in America and at a time when it was hardly fashionable. Here again, Hook was no follower, rather he saw in Marx the liberating possibilities that Marx himself had failed to appreciate. One way of making this point is to say that Hook saw the continuity between Marxism and pragmatism at least thirty years before anyone else. More important is the novel way in which Hook combined and understood pragmatism and Marxism, producing an ideology-resistant hybrid philosophy that transcends both of its sources. In short, it is the cross-fertilization of Dewey and Marx that makes Hook the most significant American social and political professor of the twentieth century.

Documentation

1. Harry Conn, Four Trojan Horses, Van Nuys, CA, Bible Voice, Inc., p. 25. (Reprinted with permission.)
2. Elton Trueblood, Los Angeles Times, April 1, 1978, p. 26, col. 1.
3. Harold Berman, The Interaction of Law and Religions, 1974, p. 21.
4. Francis A. Schaeffer, Back to Freedom and Dignity (Downers Grove, IL, reprinted with permission of InterVarsity Press, 1972), p. 44.
5. Genesis 3:1
6. The Columbian, Sunday, April 4, 1982, Vancouver, Washington.
7. David Ehrenfeld, The Arrogance of Humanism, New York, Oxford University Press, 1978, p. 120.
8. John W. Whitehead and John Conlan, "The Establishment of the Religion of Secular Humanism and Its First Amendment Implications," Vol. X, No. 1 of the Texas Tech Law Review, Lubbock, TX, 1979, p. 29.(Reprinted with permission of the Law Review.)
9. Francis A. Schaeffer: taken from a message given by Dr. Schaeffer at L'Abri Mini-Seminars 1982 entitled "Priorities 1982." (Reprinted with his permission.)
10. Romans 8:7
11. Renald E. Showers, The Most High God, W. Collingswood, NJ 1982. (Reprinted by permission of Friends of Israel.)
12. Edward B. Jenkinson, Censors in the Classroom, Carbondale, IL, 1979, pp. 102, 103.
13. Whitehead and Conlan, pp. 20, 21

14. Ibid, p. 24
15. The Yale Law Journal can be obtained from: The Yale Law Journal Co., Inc., 401A Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520. The article "Freedom from Establishment and Unneutrality in Public School Instruction and Religious School Regulation," which is a reprint from Vol. 2 of the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy can be obtained from the author, Wendell R. Bird, 200 Candler Building, 127 Peachtree St., NE, Atlanta, GA 30303.
16. Leo Pfeffer, "The Religion of Secular Humanism: A Judicial Myth," Free Inquiry, vol. 2, no. 2, spring 1982, p. 26.
17. John W. Whitehead, The Separation Illusion, Milford, MI 48042, Mott Media, 1977, p. 123.
18. Ehrenfeld, p. 4
19. Geisler, Norman, Is Man the Measure ? Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Book House, 1983, p. 11, 12.
20. TASB Journal, June 1, 1981.
21. Charles Francis Potter, Humanism: A New Religion, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1930, p. 128.
22. John 14:6
23. Acts 4:12
24. Matthew 1:21
25. Hebrews 9:26
26. 1 Timothy 2:5
27. Acts 1:3
28. Romans 1:4
29. Revelation 1:18
30. Genesis 3:1; 2 Corinthians 11:13-15
31. See note #6
32. Whitehead and Conlan, pp. 27, 38

33. Ibid, pp. 38-45
34. L. Nelson Bell, *While Men Slept*, Garden City, NY, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970, p. 19, (Reprinted with permission of Doubleday and Co., Inc.)
35. Taken from a newsletter published by Karen Mann, a member of the Iowa State Legislature.
36. Harold G. Shane, *Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1976, p. 83.
37. See note #35 above.
38. Sidney Hyman, *The Aspen Idea*, Norman, OK, University of Oklahoma Press, 1975, pp. 84, 85.
39. John Dewey, *A Common Faith*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1934.
40. Revelation 17:5
41. Revelation 18:4
42. Taken from a newsletter put out by Eagle Forum.
43. Whitehead and Conlan, p. 54.
44. 2 Thessalonians 2:11.
45. Charles Darwin, *My Life and Letters*, vol. 1, p. 210.
46. Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, NY, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1959, p. 366.
47. Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Science*, Nov. 29, 1963, p. 1134.
48. Fred John Meldau, *Witness Against Evolution*, Denver, CO, Christian Victory Publishing Co., 1953, pp. 73-74.
49. D'Arcy Thompson, *On Growth and Form*, p. 1092.
50. G.A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution*, Elmsford, NY, Pergamon Press, 1961.
51. J.T. Bonner, *Science*, Vol. 133, March 17, 1961, p. 753.
52. Albert Fleishman, *Victoria Institute*, vol. 65, pp. 194-195.

53. Sir William Dawson, *Story of Earth and Man*, p. 317.
54. Robert A. Millikan, *The Commentator*, June, 1937.
55. Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, NY, Random House, 1957, p. 199.
56. D.M.S. Watson, "Adaptation," *Nature*, Vol. 124, 1929, p. 233.
57. Taken from Fac-Sheet #20, Published by the Plymouth Rock Foundation, P.O. Box 425, Marlborough, NH, 03455. Published with permission.
58. This is the complete, unabridged sermon as delivered by Dr. D. James Kennedy at the Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, on January 23, 1983. Published with his permission.
59. Durant, "John Dewey," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, edition 1956, VII, 297.
60. Henry M. Morris, *The Twilight of Evolution*, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1963, pp. 19-20 (reprinted with permission).
61. Paul Blanshard, "Three Cheers for Our Secular State," *Humanist*, March and April, 1976, p. 17.
62. Conn, p. 65
63. Schaeffer, *Back to*, p. 42
64. James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman, *Textbooks on Trial*, Wheaton, IL., Victor Books, p. 139.
65. Barbara Morris, *The Religion of Humanism in the Public Schools*, Upland, CA., 1976, pp. 1-8.
66. Barbara Morris, *Change Agents in the Schools*, Upland, CA., 1979, pp. 257-258.
67. Joseph F. Callahan and Leonard H. Clark, *Teaching in the Elementary School*, NY, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1977.
68. Conn, pp. 43-44

69. Paul C. Vitz, *Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self Worship*, Grand Rapids, MI, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977, p. 12 (reprinted with permission).
70. Conn, pp. 51-52
71. Ibid., p. 106
72. *Psychology Today*, August 1971, p. 33.
73. Schaeffer, *Back to*, p. 42
74. Ibid., p. 45
75. Ibid., pp. 47-48
76. Ephesians 1:22-23
77. Ephesians 5:22, 23
78. Ephesians 2:19-22
79. Ephesians 6:10-18
80. *The King Is Coming* gives 97 signs that strongly indicate the soon return of Christ. Satan's time is short, Revelation 12:12.
81. Homer Duncan, *Satan's Strategy*, Lubbock, TX., Missionary Crusader, 1971.
82. 2 Corinthians 11:13-15
83. Jude 4
84. Homer Duncan, *The Ecumenical Movement in the Light of the Holy Scriptures*, Lubbock, TX., Missionary Crusader, 1968.
85. Jude 3
86. 2 John 9-11
87. Isaiah 59:19
88. Schaeffer, *The Church at the End of the 20th Century*, Downers Grove, IL., InterVarsity Press, 1970, pp. 125-129.
89. Whitehead and Conlan, pp. 25-26

90. Ibid., p. 10
91. R.J. Rushdoony, *The State as an Establishment of Religion*.
92. Whitehead and Conlan, p. 12
93. *Barron's*, June 18, 1951
94. Daniel 2:21
95. Rev. 19:16, 20:6
96. Stanley J. Rowland, Jr., *Ethics, Crime and Redemption*, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, p. 76.
97. Vadim Borisov, *Personality and National Awareness, From Under the Rubble*, 1975, pp. 194, 200-201.
98. Conn, p. 14
99. Berman, pp. 67-68
100. Whitehead and Conlan, pp. 54-55
101. Leviticus 20:13; also see Romans 1:27; I Corinthians 6:9.
102. Hosea 8:7
103. I Samuel 14:11
104. R.J. Rushdoony, *Chalcedon Report*, P.O. Box 158, Vallecito, CA., 95251.
105. Psalm 2:4-5
106. Matthew 24:21-22
107. Revelation 6:16-17
108. Acts 1:11
109. Philippians 2:9-11
110. Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*, Vol. II, 2nd ed. 1851, pp. 593-595.
111. Whitehead and Conlan, pp. 2-5
112. Romans 13:7
113. Romans 8:31

- 114. Ezekiel 22:30
- 115. Ephesians 6:12-18
- 116. Luke 13:1-5
- 117. John 3:1-18
- 118. 1 John 1:7
- 119. Romans 3:28; 5:1
- 120. Psalms 11:3
- 121. Schaeffer, *The Church at the End of the Twentieth Century*, pp. 34-35
- 122. Luke 6:46
- 123. Ezekiel 3:19
- 124. Matthew 5:14-16
- 125. Matthew 28:19-20
- 126. Matthew 5:13
- 127. Mark 11:22
- 128. Hebrews 11:6
- 129. Romans 8:31
- 130. Nehemiah 4:2
- 131. 2 Timothy 1:7
- 132. Psalms 46:1,2
- 133. Psalms 14:1
- 134. Deuteronomy 30:19

Bibliography

- Conn, Harry, Four Trojan Horses, Van Nuys, CA, 1978.
- Hefley, James C, and Plowman, Edward E., Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power, Wheaton, IL, 1975.
- Lindsell, Harold, The Battle for the Bible, Grand Rapids, MI, 1976.
- Morris, Barbara, Change Agents in the Schools, Upland, CA, 1979.
- Morris, Henry M., The Twilight of Evolution, Philadelphia, 1963.
- Schaeffer, Francis A., Back to Freedom and Dignity, Downers Grove, IL, 1972.
- Schaeffer, How Should We Then Live?, Old Tappan, NJ, 1976.
- Schaeffer, The Church at the End of the Twentieth Century, Downers Grove, IL, 1970.
- Whitehead, John W. and Conlan, John, "The Establishment of the Religion of Secular Humanism and Its First Amendment Implications," Texas Tech Law Review, Lubbock, TX, 1979.
- Whitehead, John W., The Separation Illusion, Milford, MI, 1977.
- Bean, Joseph P., Public Education: The River of Pollution and The Source of the River of Pollution.

These last two books can be ordered at \$1.00 ea. from:

Educator Publications
1110 S. Pomona Ave.
Fullerton, CA 92632