

## Dedication



This book of sermon outlines is being dedicated to the Nesbit Church of Christ 50-year anniversary. October 10, 1971 was the first meeting of the Nesbit congregation. Over 40 Christians met in the home of Floyd and Martha Embrey for worship. John Pickle preached. On October 17<sup>th</sup> the Nesbit congregation was meeting in a rented house with Roy Hearn, Director of the Memphis School of Preaching, as minister. On November 11<sup>th</sup> during a business meeting, upon a motion by James Mercer, a committee composed of Guy Bernard, Robert Brown, Lee Harris, Earl Manning, and John Pickle was selected to study a possible site for construction of a building. On November 14<sup>th</sup> a special meeting was called to discuss accepting a gift of the location for the building was offered by Earl and Floy Manning. After Roy Hearn quoted the scripture, "A city set on a hill cannot be hid," the decision was made that the present location (685 Nesbit Road, Nesbit, MS 38651) to be the building site.

Rick Popejoy, editor

## Preface



“From Machiavelli’s *The Prince* to Alford Kinsey’s *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, from Karl Marx’s *Communist Manifesto* to Margaret Mead’s *Coming of Age in Samoa*, these ‘influential’ books have led to war, genocide, totalitarian oppression, the breakdown of the family, and disastrous social experiments. And yet the toxic ideas peddled in these books are more popular and pervasive than ever. In fact, they might influence your own thinking without you realizing it.” (Wiker, 2008).

“Many people think the world is controlled by generals, politicians, and executives. They are wrong! Our world revolves around ideas. Military's have power but they are beholden to the ideas on which their nation was founded. Politicians may think they rule the world, but they are held captive by their ideas about government. Executives may think they have the world by the tail, but they too are indebted to ideas. Behind every historical event or social policy lies an idea. Ideas are the guiding force behind every twist and turn in public opinion. Ideas determine what we accept or reject in art, media, business, medicine, government, church, and family. We will never fully understand what is going on around us unless we understand the ideas which form the root structures of the world.” (LaRue, 2020).

With this 2022 *Standing in the Gap* Lectureship program, we stand firm with and loudly proclaim the principle that God’s word is always true and that any time man’s ideas disagree with God that it is man that is wrong; it is man’s ideas that are suspicious and in need of change.

The right margin has been deliberately left at two inches to allow the student to take his own notes while listening to the speaker. We hope that this helps in the utilization of these notes into the curriculums of many High School and Adult Bible classes.

This book is sent forth with the prayer that it will be blessed of God and useful in the training of men for both proper reasoning and divine service.

Rick Popejoy, editor

# *Let God be true but every man a liar*

23<sup>rd</sup> Standing in the Gap Lectures - January 26-30, 2022

Nesbit Church of Christ - 685 Nesbit Rd. Nesbit, MS 38651

## Wednesday, January 26, 2022

7:00 PM Jesus, The Master Controversialist (Terrance Brownlow-Dindy)

## Thursday, January 27, 2022

7:00 PM Julius Wellhausen (Keith A. Mosher, Sr.)

## Friday, January 28, 2022

1:00 PM Karl Marx (Jason Rollo)

2:00 PM Alfred Kinsey (Michael Light)

3:00 PM Vladimir Lenin (Jason Rollo)

7:00 PM Friedrich Nietzsche (Michael Light)

8:00 PM John Dewey (B.J. Clarke)

## Saturday, January 29, 2022

1:00 PM Margaret Mead (Trent Thrasher)

2:00 PM Betty Friedan (Morne Stephanus)

3:00 PM John Maynard Keynes (Omari French)

## Sunday, January 30, 2022

9:00 AM Margaret Sanger (Morne Stephanus)

10:00 AM Muhammad (Omari French)

11:00 AM Fellowship Meal

1:00 PM Singing

1:30 PM Christian, Contend for Thy Cause (Terrance Brownlow-Dindy)

Thirteen powerful lessons. Eight godly speakers. Booklet produced with 25 lessons. Wonderful fellowship. Amazing sing. Leadership roundtable possibilities on Thursday.

# Table of Contents



<b>Jesus, The Master Controversialist</b>	
Terrance Brownlow-Dindy .....	7
<b>Muhammad – Peace Thorough Brutality (570-632)</b>	
Omari French .....	14
<b>Niccolo Machiavelli – The Prince (1513)</b>	
Rafael Ramirez .....	24
<b>John Calvin – Institutes of the Christian Religion (1536)</b>	
Tom Moore .....	37
<b>Rene Descartes – Discourse on Method (1637)</b>	
Ryan Smithey .....	46
<b>Thomas Hobbs – Leviathan (1651)</b>	
Charles Hall .....	64
<b>Jean Jacques Roseau – Discourses on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality Among Men (1755)</b>	
Hank Lawrence .....	69
<b>Thomas Paine – The Age of Reason (1794)</b>	
Bryan Braswell .....	79
<b>Soren Kierkegaard – Journals &amp; Discourses (1838-1855)</b>	
Israel Rodriguez .....	92
<b>Karl Marx – The Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848)</b>	
Jason Rollo .....	111
<b>Charles Darwin – The Descent of Man (1871)</b>	
Paden Reed .....	139
<b>Julius Wellhausen – Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (1883)</b>	
Keith A. Mosher, Sr. ....	157

<b>Friedrich Nietzsche – Beyond Good and Evil (1886)</b>	
Michael Light .....	166
<b>Vladimir Lenin – The State and Revolution (1917)</b>	
Jason Rollo .....	173
<b>Margaret Sanger – The Pivot of Civilization (1922)</b>	
Morne Stephanus .....	191
<b>Adolf Hitler – Mein Kampf (1925)</b>	
Joe Caesar .....	206
<b>Sigmund Freud – The Future of an Illusion (1927)</b>	
Anthony Flunder .....	218
<b>Margaret Mead – Coming of Age in Samoa (1928)</b>	
Trent Thrasher .....	231
<b>John Dewey – Humanistic Education (1884-1949)</b>	
B.J. Clarke .....	245
<b>John Maynard Keynes – The General Theory (1936)</b>	
Omari French .....	259
<b>Alfred Kinsey – Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (1948)</b>	
Michael Light .....	268
<b>Betty Friedan – The Feminine Mystique (1963)</b>	
Morne Stephanus .....	275
<b>Christian, Contend for Thy Cause</b>	
Terrance Brownlow-Dindy .....	291



# Jesus: The Master Controversialist

Terrance Brownlow-Dindy

## INTRODUCTION:

### 1. Controversy

- a. Definition: Discussion marked by the presentation of opposing views; a lengthy discussion (usually public in nature) of an important question in which opposing positions clash; debate; disputation
- b. Etymology: From Latin: *controversus* – turned in an opposite direction. (We would say: “To be on two different pages”)

### 2. Is it Accurate to Describe Jesus as a Controversialist?

By virtue of the fact that the Bible records Jesus often clashing, debating, and disputing in the course of public discussions marked by the presentation of opposing views, it is certainly accurate to describe Him as a controversialist.

### 3. How is Christ the *Master* Controversialist?

The author of a deductive argument always intends that the premises provide the sort of justification for the conclusion whereby if the premises are true, the conclusion is guaranteed to be true as well. Loosely speaking, if the author’s process of reasoning is a good one, if the premises actually do provide this sort of justification for the conclusion, then the argument is valid.... In effect, an argument is valid if the truth of the premises logically guarantees the truth of the conclusion (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, para. 3, 4). An argument is sound when both the premises are true, and the conclusion logically follows.

Christ is the Master in that...

- i. His premises are always true
- ii. His conclusions always logically follow (i.e., His reasoning is always valid)
- iii. Thus, His arguments are always sound!

### 4. Jesus being the Master controversialist should come as no surprise:

- a. Jesus is God
  - i. *Hebrews 1:4-12* – Presentation of His Preeminence –
    1. In relationship, He is the Son
    2. In nature, He is Deity
    3. In longevity, He is Eternal

- ii. *Isaiah 9:6-7* – Prophecy of His Majesty –
    - 1. Wonderful Counselor
    - 2. Mighty God
    - 3. Everlasting Father
    - 4. Prince of Peace
  - iii. *John 1:1-3* – Introduction of His Existence –
    - 1. Word with God
    - 2. Word was God
    - 3. Eternal Presence
    - 4. Universal Creator
- b. God’s Thinking Differs from Man’s
- i. *Amos 3:3*
    - 1. God addresses the Northern Kingdom of Israel (Ephraim)
    - 2. Rhetorical question is posed emphasizing opposing views between God & Israel
  - ii. *Isaiah 55:8-9*
    - 1. The thoughts & ways between God & man contrast.
    - 2. God’s thoughts & ways drastically transcends that of man.
  - iii. *1 Samuel 16:7*
    - 1. God pointed out to Samuel differences in perspective between God and man.
    - 2. Even when men are righteous, such as Samuel was, the superior mindset of the Almighty God becomes evident.
- c. Unless man conforms his thinking to God’s (as the divine design for human existence demands), controversy will always exist between the Creator and His most cherished Creation. Sadly...
- i. *Genesis 3:1-6*
    - 1. In Satan, a perpetually opposing view exists.
    - 2. Man has, from the beginning, shown a propensity toward entertaining this perpetually opposing position.
  - ii. *Judges 21:25*



1. What is right in his own eyes is often the standard proposed for human conduct.
  2. Man has historically opposed God's authority in arenas of religion (idolatry, nomadic priest for hire), sexuality (homosexual practices), humanity (turning over of the priest's concubine to be abused and murdered), etc.
5. *TRANSITION*: The frequent controversy that often characterized the ministry of the Christ is self-defining. Again, controversy is conflict arising from people assuming opposing views, or being "turned in opposite directions."

### DISCUSSION:

#### I. JESUS IS LIGHT; MEN LOVE DARKNESS

- A. The apostle John's glorious introduction of the Messiah is comprised of his presentation of Jesus as:
  - i. Deity (Jho. 1:1-3)
  - ii. Light (Jho. 1:4-12)
  - iii. The Incarnate Word (John 1:14)
- B. John is concerned from the beginning and throughout his Gospel account with men's response to the Messiah.
  - i. Cf. John's thesis statement: (Jho. 20:30-31)
  - ii. Jesus came to give Light to the world (Jho. 1:9)
  - iii. Generally speaking, the Jews rejected Jesus (Jho. 1:10-11)
- C. Derivation of this controversy is explained by Christ Himself in a conversation with Nicodemus the Pharisee.
  - i. John 3:16-17 – Christ was given by the Father to save men.
  - ii. John 3:18 – Regrettably, most men were "turned in the opposite direction."
  - iii. John 3:19-21 – Reason: Jesus is Light, and men love darkness. (The Lord's subsequent encounter with the Samaritan woman at the well of Jacob epitomizes this source of controversy between the Son of God and man. The two were turned in the opposite direction spiritually, morally, and ecclesiastically).
- D. Other examples of Jesus and men "turned in the opposite direction" are observed in the areas of...

- i. Sovereignty over the Sabbath (Jho. 5:1-16)
- ii. Identity as God's Son (Jho. 5:17-47) – Note the Lord's unwillingness to cower or shy away from controversy (15 more times in the ensuing discourse He refers to Himself as God's Son, or to God as His Father)!
- iii. Strictness of discipleship (Jho. 6:32-66)
- iv. Pointing out defiance & hypocrisy in judgment (Jho. 7:19, 23-24)
- v. Revealing inconsistency in words and deeds (Jho. 8:12-59)

## II. JESUS IS TRUTH; MEN LOVE LIES

- A. Men have long had affinities for and love affairs with falsehoods, rather than developing love for the truth. This puts man in direct conflict with God. As Jesus is Truth personified (Jho. 14:6), He is often "turned in the opposite direction" of men.
  - i. 1 Kings 13:11-22 – The young prophet chose a lie rather than revealed truth.
  - ii. 2 Chronicles 18:1-28 – Ahab preferred the lies of false prophets over the truth.
  - iii. Isaiah 30:9-11 – Israel desired "smooth" lies rather than prophetic truth.
  - iv. Jeremiah 5:30-31 – The prophets prophesied lies, and the people loved it.
- B. In the beginning, Eve chose the Devil's lie over God's truth (Gen. 2:15-17; 3:1-6)
  - i. God said, "Thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2:17)
  - ii. Satan said, "Thou shalt *not* surely die." (Gen. 3:4)
- C. Jesus continues to be a controversial figure to many, because many still love lies rather than truth! Jesus is "turned in the opposite direction" from people on the many issues wherein the lies of men have been embraced over the truths of God...
  - i. Marriage and divorce (Mat. 19:3-19)
  - ii. Sanctity of life (Gen. 18:4)
  - iii. Oneness of man (Acts 17:26-28)
  - iv. Gender (Gen. 1:26-27)
  - v. Religious plurality (Mat. 7:13-14; Jho. 14:6)

- vi. Church exclusivity (Mat. 16:18; 17:1-6)

### III. JESUS IS RIGHTEOUSNESS; MEN LOVE WRONG

- A. Righteousness: Jesus the Epitome is seen in prophecy.
  - i. “Jehovah our Righteousness” is the prophetic and Messianic title given to Christ by God via the utterances of Jeremiah in the 7<sup>th</sup> century B. C. (Jer. 23:5-6).
  - ii. “The Lord is Righteous in all His ways” – One of David’s Psalms of Praise extolling the Lord of Glory lauds the infinite righteousness of the Savior (Psa. 145:17).
  - iii. “The Lord loveth Righteousness” – In another Messianic Psalm, the author professes, through prophecy, the Holy Son’s anointing by the Heavenly Father upon the basis of the Son’s righteous reign and His love of righteousness (Psa. 45:6-7).
- B. The Contrast between Jesus & men in this area is evident.
  - i. Lyrics of popular modern music becoming extremely revealing as touching the subject of man’s affinity for wrong behavior:
    - 1. **Me and Mrs. Jones** (Billy Paul) –  
*Me and Mrs Jones  
We got a thing goin’ on  
We both know that it’s wrong  
But it’s much too strong  
To let it go now...*
    - 2. **I Don’t Want to be Right** (Luther Ingram) –  
*If loving you is wrong, I don’t wanna be right  
If being right means being without you  
I’d rather live a wrong doing life...  
Your friends tell you it’s no future in loving a married man  
If I can’t see you when I want, I’ll see you when I can...  
If loving you is wrong, I don’t wanna be right...*
    - 3. **Little Things** (Bush)  
*I bleach the sky every night  
Loaded on wrong, a further from right...*
    - 4. **I Just Wanna Do Wrong** (40 Below – local hip hop artist)
  - ii. U.S. political paradigms are extremely revealing as touching the subject of man’s affinity for wrong behavior:

1. Roe v Wade (1973) – Legalization of murder of unborn babies
2. Obergefell v Hodges (2015) – Legalization of same sex so-called “marriage”
3. 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment (1933) – Repealed the 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment, ending prohibition of alcohol
4. Colorado Amendment 64 (2012) – Recreational legalization of marijuana
5. California “Zero Bail” policy (2021) – Inhibits law enforcement to detain those who commit “non-violent” crimes.

C. Nightly news!

- i. Societal anarchy
- ii. Disregard for the law of the land
- iii. Corporate crime
- iv. Person vs person atrocities

D. With Jesus being the inherent Author, Finisher, Promoter, Protector of all things righteous, it is no wonder that He is often involved in controversy (i.e. turned in the opposite direction) concerning those who are determined to do wrong.

- i. The unbelieving (Jho. 8:21-24)
- ii. The false teacher (Mat. 7:15-20)
- iii. The hypocritical (Mat. 23)
- iv. The self-righteous (Luke 18:9-14)
- v. The disobedient (Mat. 15:1-14)
- vi. The legalistic (Mat. 12:1-8)
- vii. The unloving (Luke 10)
- viii. The uncompassionate (Luke 7:36-50)
- ix. The carnally minded (Mark 8:31-33)

**CONCLUSION**

1. We are often conditioned to perceive anything controversial as forbidden territory. “Cancel Culture” has most people terrified to touch any subject or to assume any view deemed politically incorrect. We must keep in mind that controversy is not inherently sinful. It is, in fact, many times absolutely necessary!

2. As people of God, we must be “turned in an opposite direction” from ANYTHING to which God is opposed. Jesus, God who tabernacled in flesh and dwelt among men, did not cease to be God while on earth. Thus, being Righteousness personified, the Lord could not help but be embroiled in one controversy after another.
3. Well did Moses observe:

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually (Gen. 6:5)
4. And well did David affirm:

The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one (Psa. 14:2-3)
5. As long as a man loves darkness, lies, and wrong, Jesus will stand in an opposite direction from that man – thus remaining the Master Controversialist!

# Muhammad: Peace Through Brutality

Omari French

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Muhammad's philosophies regarding peace, violence, and brutality are categorically inconsistent with God's views presented in the Bible.
  - a. Interpreting the Qur'an is based upon five fundamental principles:
    - i. Muslims hold the Qur'an as the ultimate source of divine guidance. Even the Prophet Muhammad could not have contradicted the Qur'an, let alone anyone else.
    - ii. The Qur'anic verses should not be taken in isolation from other verses or from the "Prophetic experience."
    - iii. The Qur'anic verses, commands or otherwise, have different levels of priority; some are general in scope and are to be treated or upheld as norms, while other verses might be contextual, delimited, or transitional.
    - iv. Life is an integrated whole, and Islam is a guidance for the whole life in a comprehensive or holistic manner, where a sense or goal of balance is of supreme importance.
    - v. Life needs to be treated as life, which from the Islamic viewpoint should be understood as based on Fitrah, the innate human nature.
  - b. These five principles highlight the fact that the Qur'an is not divinely inspired. The very existence of the concept of Fitrah, whereby innate human nature plays a role in the understanding of the content of alleged inspired scriptures highlights a fundamental flaw in Muhammad's philosophies, Islam as a religion and the Qur'an itself. There can be no objective doubt that human morality and experience leads to a flawed outlook from a moral perspective (Eph. 2:3). Thus, speech claiming to be from God must be categorically inspired from God and infallible and not therefore subject to the error of the human experience (2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20).
    - i. Additionally, the idea of priority of some sections of scripture over other sections of scripture is subjective and proves that the Qur'an is not inspired. The scriptures must be entirely true as taken together without any contradiction. (Psa. 119:160; Isa. 28:10-13; Mat. 5:17-18). For the biblical narrative, the scriptures are understood as rightly divided with key distinctions forged between the Old and the New Testament (2 Tim. 2:15). The issue is not priority when it comes

to the scriptures, but instead that the Old Testament was written for our learning and is a schoolmaster. (Rom. 15:4; Gal. 3:23). The Old Testament was abolished by the sacrifice of Christ on the cross (2 Cor. 3:13; Col. 2:14; Eph. 2:14-15). But prior to being abolished, it was fulfilled by Christ by himself (Mat. 5:17-18; Luke 24:44-45).

- ii. Also, the idea of the Qur'an being interpreted based on life as a balanced whole is further evidence that it is not inspired. The Bible in contrast is clear that our life is to be hid in Christ in reference to our sinful existence and status (Col. 3:4; Rom. 6:6; Gal. 2:20). For example, Christ is clear that if any are to follow Him, they are to deny themselves, take up their cross, and follow Him thereby losing their life in the process (Mat. 16:24-25). The commitment to Christianity must transcend concerns of this life and view those life concerns in conflict with the foundation of Christianity (Acts 20:24; 1 Jho. 2:15; Col. 3:1-2).
- c. By way of brief background, historians agree that Muhammad was born sometime around 570 A.D. and that he was the founder and first leader of the Islamic community. He was the military and community leader until his death in 632 A.D. Islamic tradition holds that he began receiving revelations from Allah (which is "God" translated into English) in the year 610 A.D. until his death in 632 A.D.; all of them are compiled in the Qur'an. As for Muhammad's wives, Khadija was his first and only wife until her death in 619 A.D. The origins of brutality in terms of Muhammad's life and teachings begin with the brutal step of the slaughter of the Qurayza tribe within Medina following the significant Muslim victory in the Battle of the Trenches. This was a horrendous slaughter in the tumultuous Arab world led by a leader claiming revelation from God. Muhammad was attempting to bring his faith and a people in a hostile environment, and likely viewed this act as necessary not only for survival but also for asserting his willingness to defend his message violently and absolutely from those seeking to destroy it.
- d. Muhammad's main passages advocating for violence in the Quran are:
  - i. "Fight in the Way of God against those who fight you, but do not go beyond the limits. God does not love those who go beyond the limits." {Quran 2:190}.
  - ii. "Let not the unbelievers think that they can get the better (of the godly): they will never frustrate (them). Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies, of Allah and your

enemies, and others besides, whom you may not know, but whom Allah doth know." [Quran 8:59-60].

- iii. "Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush." [Quran 9:5].
- iv. "Let there be no hostility except to those who practice oppression." [Quran 2:193].
- v. "But if the enemy inclines towards peace, you (also) incline towards peace, and trust in Allah" [Quran 9:61].
- vi. They are those who have been expelled from their homes in defiance of right, - (for no cause) except that they say, "our Lord is Allah". Did not Allah check one set of people by means of another, there would surely have been pulled down monasteries, churches, synagogues, and mosques, in which the name of Allah is commemorated in abundant measure. Allah will certainly aid those who aid his (cause); - for verily Allah is full of Strength, Exalted in Might, (able to enforce His Will). [Quran 22:39-40].

2. These very tenets of the Qur'an authorize physical violence as a means to achieve peace and are in conflict with the Bible. Thus, the philosophies of Muhammad must be regarded as philosophies of man that conflict with the will of God. (Col. 2:8).

#### **DISCUSSION:**

#### **I. MUHAMMAD'S NOTION THAT VIOLENCE IS A DIVINELY AUTHORIZED MEANS TO FACILITATE PEACE CONFLICTS WITH BIBLICAL TEACHING.**

- A. For New Testament purposes, we look no further than the words of Jesus who was clear that because His kingdom is not of this world then his servants do not fight. (Jho. 18:36). The context of this is Jesus being arrested and delivered up as an innocent man and not allowing His disciples to retaliate with physical violence. (Jho. 18:11; Mat. 26:52). Even amid the forty-day period of Christ's resurrection, the apostles were still inquiring about the physicality of the restoration of the kingdom of Israel that could only occur through military action. (Acts 1:6). The response of God was instead to baptize the apostles with the Holy Spirit so that the church of Christ would be established and the ushering in of a spiritual kingdom that would never see an end. (Acts 1:8; Dan. 2:44). Christians are unequivocally to follow Christ in this very scenario. (1 Pet. 2:21-24). There is no spiritual allowance to use physical violence as an agenda for spiritual gain. In fact, those who use violence in reference to the facilitation of the kingdom are properly labeled as wicked accordingly. (Mat. 11:12; 17:12).



- a. The analogies of warfare in the New Testament are all figurative in reference to the soul. For example, Peter warns that we should abstain from fleshly lusts that war against the soul. Likewise, Paul teaches that our weapons are not carnal but mighty to the pulling down of strongholds and imaginations that exalt themselves above the knowledge of Christ. (2 Cor. 10:4-6). All governmental power is subject to the will of God (Rom. 13:1-2; Jho. 19:10-11). Inherently, there is an economic system explained in the word of the God that the citizenry including Christians pay tribute to the government so that government can perform their God ordained function of law enforcement and the punishment of evildoers (Rom. 13:6). Also, inherent in this realm is the requirement of sufficient cost counting methods so that the government can determine whether they have adequate means to perform basic governmental duties such as policing and protecting (Luke 14:31).
- b. Additionally, we see that God was categorically consistent in condemning excessive violence categorically even amid his people given that his will would not be accomplished ultimately in the New Testament through physical violence or governmental war and upheaval.
  - i. For example, in Genesis 49:7, Jacob curses both Simeon and Levi for their violent response to the defiling of their sister Dina by Shechem. (Gen. 34:26-27). Ideally, Jacob wanted to have peaceful interactions, if possible, with the inhabitants of Canaan during his sojourning in the land of promise like his fathers. (Gen. 34:30; 24:6; 26:29). We should look to emulate this by trying to live at peace with all men, if possible. (Rom. 12:18). Jacob blesses his descendants by faith which means that it was facilitated by the word of God itself. (Heb. 11:21; Rom. 10:17). So, the word of God was dictating that God was not pleased with violence without proper provocation even from an Old Testament perspective.
  - ii. Likewise, in the Mosaic dispensation God's position was clear that when Israel approached to destroy a city militarily, they were to proclaim peace and wait for a response of peace. (Deu. 20:10-11). This reflects that God's position was not one of warmongering or a desire that nations would be destroyed by warfare without provocation according to the standard of God. (Eze. 33:9; 2 Pet. 3:9). The option was specifically provided for peace for many nations if they receive the proclamation of peace which parallels from a spiritual perspective the message of peace proclaimed in Christ. (Eph. 2:17; 2 Cor. 5:18; Col. 1:20-21).

Notably, excluded from this option of peace were the Canaanite nations and the Amalekites. (Deu. 20:17-18; Exo. 17:14-16). We must consider how God recalled the wickedness of nations that was a predicate for his people eradicating those nations that were cruel, fierce, and contrary to God. (1 Sam. 15:2). This was true with equal force for the people of God that if they practiced wickedness contrary to God then they would not be able to stand militarily before their enemies. (Lev. 26:37; Jos. 7:12). This was again due to the recompense of God for the wickedness of these nations. (Gen. 15:16). Given this is God's judgment for warfare, it is still consistent with the New Testament standard for us not to give place to wrath and allow God to recompense for wrath. (Rom. 12:19).

- iii. Warring conflict between nations in the Old Testament was still predicated on righteousness with hostile nations not allowed to encroach on the sovereignty of others according to God. For example, in Judges 11:27, Jephthah responds to the Ammonite king in a pending border dispute on the precipice of war by telling him that the king did wrong in coming out for warfare against Israel. Interestingly, Jephthah describes that the Lord is the judge in the cause of warfare, and God subsequently grants Israel the victory because of the righteous cause in the dispute of Israel. (Jdg. 11:33). Even Israel is held to this standard of righteous warfare in border disputes as they were disallowed from facilitating military conflict with Edom, Ammon, and Moab as they came out of the land of Israel. (Jdg. 11:14-19).
- iv. The plan of God was always designed to supersede military conflict and actions according to the prophets. For example, in Isaiah 2:1-4, God prophesied about the coming of the church from Jerusalem and specifically states that when God judges the nations and rebukes many people with the gospel, the response will be beating their swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks and not learning war anymore. (Mic. 4:3-4). We compare this passage to the concepts expressed in Joel 3:9-13 describing proclaiming war against the Gentiles and beating their plowshares into swords and their pruning hooks into spears with the weak saying that they are strong. Although this appears on the surface to be a contradiction in scripture, a closer review of the passages shows how they are easily reconciled. We see similarly situated language of the state of strength out of

weakness applied spiritually in the New Testament as opposed to military dynamics of Joel 3. For example, in 2 Corinthians 12:9-10, Paul describes coping in Christ amid physical adversity as being strong spiritually with the power of Christ despite being physically weak. Likewise, in Hebrews 11:34, the Hebrews' writer describes the prophets as "out of weakness being made strong". The context of Hebrews 11 is what the elders or ancient men and women did and accomplished by faith. So, we are again dealing with a spiritual as opposed to a military context for any New Testament application that will be aligned with the will of God. Similarly, John the Baptist forbade soldiers to extort and required them to properly repent for the kingdom of God. The entire biblical saga was pointing to warfare in a spiritual capacity being the will of God for the New Testament. (Luke 3:14).

- B. Also, the idea that peace can be accomplished through brutality violates plain biblical teaching that good can be accomplished through evil. (Rom. 3:8). God never allows the ends to justify the means. Christ is sufficient as our peace. (Eph. 2:14). This renders earthly retribution and violence as meaningless according to God. (Mat. 5:38-40). We cannot do anything against the truth of God's word, and we are limited to striving lawfully according to God's word. (2 Cor. 13:8; 2 Tim. 2:5). In fact, the Bible is clear that when a man is aligned with God, it affects his enemies' outlook towards him and renders his own need for retribution as irrelevant. (Pro. 16:7; Psa. 120:7). Overriding this dynamic is unnecessary and sinful. (1 Pet. 3:13; Jer. 39:12).

## II. THE SPECIFIC TENETS OF THE QURAN CONFLICT WITH BIBLICAL TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY IN REFERENCE TO VIOLENCE.

- A. The first tenet we must evaluate against biblical truth is "Fight in the Way of God against those who fight you, but do not go beyond the limits. God does not love those who go beyond the limits." [Quran 2:190].
  - a. The biblical New Testament dynamics pertaining to fighting for God are limited to the spiritual rather than a literal military sense. For example, Paul admonishes Timothy to fight a good warfare. (1 Tim. 1:18). Likewise, Paul admonishes the church at Ephesus to engage in warfare spiritually and specifically enumerates the fight against wickedness as not constituted by violence or military action (Eph. 6:10-14). The idea in the tenet of the Quran is that it is prohibited to go beyond limits in reference to warfare. We certainly see this dynamic also in the Old Testament in the example of Joab's wickedness that is recompensed in the days of Solomon. (1 Kgs. 2:5). This is a reference to

how Joab under terms of peace, killed more righteous men than himself (2 Sam. 2:13; 20:10). Keeping the culpability of unnecessary violence away from the righteous is indeed a key precept of the Old Testament (1 Sam. 25:28-29; 20:20; 1 Kgs. 2:13).

- b. The words of Christ consistently reinforce this notion of the significance of facilitating peace (Mat. 5:9). Additionally, God continually reinforced that even violence that facilitated political regime changes would not ultimately reflect His will for New Testament conduct. For example, the main cited reason as to why David could not build the house of God was because he was a bloody man of war, and his successor and son Solomon was going to be the builder, given God was going to give him peace (1 Chr. 28:13). The ultimate ideal for man as given by God is a state of peace without the allowance for man to use violence on his own terms to facilitate that peace.
- B. The second tenet we will examine of the Quran is likewise in violation of the biblical standard. "Let not the unbelievers think that they can get the better (of the godly): they will never frustrate (them). Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies, of Allah and your enemies, and others besides, whom you may not know, but whom Allah doth know." [Quran 8:59-60]".
- a. It is certainly true that the New Testament authorizes different treatment between unbelievers and believers with believers receiving the preferential treatment. (Gal. 6:10). This includes a requisite level of distancing from evildoers and actions (2 Cor. 6:14-17). Moreover, we as Christians should in fact, be vexed in righteousness regarding the unlawful deeds from day to day of the filthy conversation of the wicked. (2 Pet. 2:7-8). However, these concepts should never equate to an allowance for violence for recompense which is exclusively the prerogative of God. (2 The. 1:5-8). In fact, the New Testament biblical decree is to love our enemies and to pray for them who spitefully entreat us, which reflects the position of God himself. (Mat. 5:43-48). In fact, in Romans 12:20-21, Paul informs the church that if our enemies' hunger, we feed them and heap coals of fire on their heads as we are not overcome with evil but overcome evil with good. This aligns with Peter's admonition to the church that they not render evil for evil, but contrary, a blessing (1 Pet. 3:9). This tenet of the Quran is unconscionable in its conflict with biblical teaching.
  - b. Any inclination towards the allowance of physical violence by God is misguided given that Christ was sent for our peace and is completely sufficient in that regard. (Eph. 2:14). Our role can never be to "strike

terror” in the hearts of unbelievers. Instead, we are to arm our minds (1 Pet. 4:1) so that we can patiently endure persecution and emphasize the limitations of what opposition can do to us if we are in Christ (1 Pet. 3:13-16; Mat. 10:28). The word of God is what affects the heart (Heb. 4:12; Eph. 6:17). Rather than “striking terror” we for evangelism should be by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God (2 Cor. 4:2). For example, in Acts 16:22, Paul and Silas are shamefully entreated and violently beaten by governmental authorities. Upon a great earthquake sent by God they have the opportunity to escape but instead stayed and appealed to the conscience of the jailor who shamefully entreated them. (Acts 16:28-33). Rather than engage in any vindictive or retributive violent behavior, they focused on the will of God which is always the advocacy of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Paul did exercise his civic right to be fetched by the magistrates as he was a Roman citizen unlawfully beaten without being condemned. (Acts 16:37). The Bible is clear that citizens can in fact assert through lawful means the undermining of their rights including violent actions by the government. This never includes violent reprisal. The notion of striking terror in the hearts of unbelievers is an incorrect tenet of Muhammad as Christians allow the word of God as the exclusive vehicle to develop the fear of the Lord in the heart of the unbeliever.

- C. Third, the following passage of the Quran that enables violence in certain circumstances is inconsistent with God’s word as proclaimed in the Bible. "Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush." [Quran 9:5]. Again, the notion of taking captive is relegated to spiritual imagery towards sin according to the New Testament. For example, in Ephesians 4:8 the entire activity of Christ’s ascension to the right hand of the Father is predicated on him leading captivity captive. This is a reference to the hold of mankind to the regime of sin because of their disobedience to God. (2 Tim. 2:25-26). The teaching of Christ is clear that whosoever commits sin is the servant of sin and therefore the liberation that Christ affords makes reference from a freedom of the regime of sin. (Jho. 8:34; Gal. 5:4). Adding to this fact, literally killing, besieging and taking captive individuals is a complete violation of the New Testament. Again, several Old Testament figures were commanded by God to engage in military campaigns to recover those who were unlawfully taken away. For example, in Genesis 14:14, Abraham armed 318 trained servants to recover Lot who had been taken captive. God affirmed his action as he is blessed by Melchizedec after his return from the slaughter. (Heb. 7:1-4). Likewise in 1 Samuel 30:8, David inquired of God as to whether he would be successful in bringing back those taken captive at Ziklag. God told him to go to recover them

and the campaign was indeed successful. Now, God is only speaking through His Son. (Heb. 1:1). The age of miraculous revelation is over as the words of Christ and his apostles and prophets are final (1 Cor. 13:10; Jas. 1:25; Jude 1:3; 2 The. 2:15). It is significant that the time of Muhammad is approximately 500 years after the end of revelation, yet this passage of the Quran seeks to go backwards chronologically to negate the New Testament by allowing allegedly God authorized military campaigns to slay idolators and those taken captive by God. True believers in God should not be fooled by this inherent contradiction to the Bible.

- D. Fourth, the following tenet of Quran is inherently contradictory- "Let there be no hostility except to those who practice oppression." [Quran 2:193]. Based on this passage hostility can be facilitated towards those who practice oppression by the followers of Islam. The New Testament contemplates the response to oppression in an opposite fashion. For example, in James 2:5-6, we see that God has promised the kingdom to the poor who are rich in faith who are oppressed consistently. Accordingly in James 5:7-8 we see that the proper response according to God is to be patient for the coming of the Lord who will recompense. Hostility towards those who oppress as advocated by the Quran is in direct opposition to this biblical command. For example, in Acts 14:19 the Apostle Paul was stoned and left for dead upon preaching the gospel. His response was simply to continue to preach the gospel and then he advocated to the church that despite persecution and oppression, the only way for us to enter into the kingdom is through much tribulation (Acts 14:22; 2 Tim. 3:12). Those who practice oppression will fall into the hands of a just God not violence at the hands of followers of God. (Heb. 10:30-31). Islam's attempt to contradict this fundamental point shows that the teachings of Muhammad are at odds with biblical truth.
- E. Lastly, "But if the enemy inclines towards peace, you (also) incline towards peace, and trust in Allah" [Quran 9:61]. This idea conflicts with the Christian responsibility to be the one who facilitates overtures of peace without condition. Consider James 3:18 where the scriptures teach that the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace. Here, we see peace is made by the righteous and is in no way dependent on the overture of peace made by the ungodly. In fact, Hebrews 12:14 teaches us to follow peace with all men without equivocation. Without following this peace no man will see the Lord. The Quran in this passage is teaching the opposite, that one must be responsive to the enemies' inclination towards peace. This is entirely foreign to the New Testament, and we must expose it as such.

## CONCLUSION:

Christianity is predicated on fighting the good fight. (2 Tim. 4:6). In order to fight the good fight, we have to be clear as to who the enemy truly is. (1 Sam. 25:28). The enemies are not individuals in human flesh and blood but the spiritual wickedness that is reflected in high places through principalities. (Eph. 6:10ff). The last enemy is in fact death to be defeated by God. (1 Cor. 15:25-27). The notion that we can disregard this plain biblical teaching because another, namely Muhammad, has allegedly received subsequent conflicting revelation is clearly contemplated by the apostle's doctrine (Acts 2:42). Paul is clear that even if an angel from heaven or the apostles themselves teach another gospel then they are accursed. (Gal. 1:6-9). The ministers of unrighteousness will attempt to disguise themselves in godly principles (2 Cor. 11:15). The philosophies of Muhammad therefore appeal to the base elements of humanity's bloodthirsty (Pro. 29:10) desire for retribution under the claim that it is sanctioned by God. The untrained biblical student will find these tenets similarly situated to Old Testament biblical stories not grasping that adherence to these philosophies' conflicts with the complete sufficiency we now enjoy in Christ. In fact, a closer inspection of the law would have revealed that the law would ultimately give way to the fulfillment of Christ. (Gal. 4:21). Various passages in the Old Testament itself demonstrate that the New Testament would ultimately replace it. (See Jer. 31:31; Heb. 8:14; Psa. 40:6-8; Heb. 10:7-14; Psa. 110:4; Heb. 7:2). The righteousness (Phi. 3:9) in the law is superior to the Quran in its entirety given that at one time the Law of Moses was inspired and holy and given by God (Rom. 7:12; 1 Tim. 1:9-10; Gal. 3:19). If the Law of Moses could not be assimilated into the New Testament by way of the authority of Christ, how much more do the teachings of Muhammad and the Quran, which were never inspired by God, fail as well? A glaring indication of how incompatible this teaching is with the holy scriptures is the contradictory allowance of brutality and violence to facilitate peace.

## WORKS CONSIDERED

Andrae, Tor. Mohammed: The Man and His Faith. New York: Scribner, 1936. Reprint, Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2000.

Pirenne, Henri. Mohammed and Charlemagne. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1939. Reprint, Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2001.

Watt, W. Montgomery. Muhammad at Mecca. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Watt, W. Montgomery. Muhammad at Medina. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1956.

# Niccolo Machiavelli: The Prince

Rafael Ramirez

## INTRODUCTION:

1. It is the purpose of this lesson to expose the main thoughts that Niccolo Machiavelli portrayed in his literary work titled "The Prince."
2. This will be done by providing a brief summary of the author's life, a summary of "The Prince," and a comparison of some of his main thoughts with the word of God.
3. The goal of this lesson is to prove, indeed, that the knowledge that comes from God is true and that which comes from Niccolò Machiavelli is a lie (Rom. 3:4).

## DISCUSSION:

### I. NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI.

- A. He was born in Florence on May 3rd 1469.
- B. His parents were Bernardo di Niccolò Machiavelli and Bartolommea de Stefano Nelli.
- C. There were three main periods in his life:
  1. His Youth (1469-1494).
    - a) He lived his youth during the time when Lorenzo de' Medici, Il Magnifico, ruled in Florence.
    - b) These were the times of the greatness of Florence as an Italian power.
    - c) Machiavelli was highly influenced by the life of Lorenzo de' Medici.
    - d) Machiavelli often mentions Lorenzo in his writings.
    - e) The Prince was dedicated to Lorenzo Di Piero De' Medici- Lorenzo de' Medici's grandson.
    - f) Young Machiavelli regarded studying very highly because in a letter to his Son Guido he wrote "if you wish to please me, and to bring success and honour to yourself, do right and study, because others will help you if you help yourself" (5).
  2. His Office (1494-1512).
    - a) When the Medici family lost their power to the free Republic of Florence, Machiavelli began his public service to the city.



- b) He became Chancellor and Secretary to the Second chancery, the Ten of Liberty and Peace.
- c) His office allowed him to spend time with the nobility of his days like Catherina Sforza of Forli, Louis XII of France, Ferdinand of Aragon, and Emperor Maximilian.
- d) Most of his public life was spent with events around Pope Alexander VI and his son, Cesare Borgia, the Duke Valentino.
- e) Cesare Borgia is seen by Machiavelli as both, an example for someone who wants to keep his state to follow, and as an example of someone who rises, and falls based on the power of others.

3. His Literature and Death (1512-1527).

- a) After the Medici family regained power in Florence, Machiavelli was dismissed from his office and sent to prison accused of conspiring against the Medici family.
- b) After being released from prison, he retired to a small place near Florence and dedicated himself to writing.
- c) Machiavelli longed for and often remembered the times that he spent around the nobility when he held his public office.
- d) It was during this time (1513) that he wrote “Il Principe” (The Prince).
- e) He also wrote “Discorsi sopra la prima deca de T. Livio” (Discourse on the First Decade of Titus Livius, 1512-1517; “Dell’ arte della guerra” (Art of War, 1519-1520); “Istorie fiorentine” (History of Florence, 1521-1525) among many other works.

D. Machiavelli died on June 22, 1527.

**II. MACHIAVELLI’S MAIN IDEAS IN LIGHT OF THE WORD OF GOD.**

A. The place of prayer in the life of a prince.

- 1. Machiavelli: “It is necessary, therefore, if we desire to discuss this matter thoroughly, to inquire whether these innovators can rely on themselves or have to depend on others: that is to say, whether, to consummate their enterprise, have they to use prayers or can they use force? In the first instance they always succeed badly, and never

compass anything; but when they can rely on themselves and use force, then they are rarely endangered” (43).

2. The Bible speaks about the importance of prayer in the life of a leader.
  - a) King Solomon prayed for the temple (1 Kgs. 8:1-61).
  - b) King Jehoshaphat prayed for deliverance from the Moabites and Ammonites (2 Chr. 20:1-19).
  - c) Hezekiah prayed for deliverance from the Assyrians (Isa. 37:14-20).
  - d) Nehemiah prayed constantly for the success of rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. 1:5-11; 2:4; 4:4-5, 9; 5:19; 6:9,14; 13:14, 22, 29, 30).
  - e) Kings and leaders today need the prayer of Christians (1 Tim. 2:1-4).
3. The Bible speaks about the importance of prayer in general.
  - a) “The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” (Jas. 5:16).
  - b) “Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need” (Heb. 4:16).
4. The Bible speaks about the role of God in the affairs of the kings.
  - a) Proverb 21:31: “The horse is prepared against the day of battle: but safety is of the LORD.”
  - b) Daniel 4:17: “This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men.”
  - c) The authorities that exist are appointed by God (Rom. 13:1-7).

B. The place of evil in the life of a prince.

1. Machiavelli:
  - a) “To slay fellow-citizens, to deceive friends, to be without faith, without mercy, without religion” in order to gain an

empire, should not be a reason to esteem someone “less than the most notable captain” (57).

- b) “Hence it is to be remarked that, in seizing a state, the usurper ought to examine closely into all those injuries which it is necessary for him to inflict, and to do them all at one stroke so as not to have to repeat them daily; and thus by not unsettling men he will be able to reassure them, and win them to himself by benefits” (60).
- c) “Injuries ought to be done at one time, so that, being tested less, they offend less; benefits ought to be given little by little, so that the flavor of them may last longer” (Machiavelli 60).
- d) “a man who wishes to act entirely up to his professions of virtue soon meets with what destroys him among so much that is evil” (91).
- e) It “is necessary for a prince wishing to hold his own to know how to do wrong, and to make use of it or not according to necessity” (92).
- f) “Everyone will confess that it would be most praiseworthy in a prince to exhibit all the above qualities that are considered good; but because they can neither be entirely possessed nor observed, for human conditions do not permit it, it is necessary for him to be sufficiently prudent that he may know how to avoid the reproach of those vices which would lose him his state; and also to keep himself, if it be possible, from those which would not lose him it; but this not being possible, he may with less hesitation abandon himself to them” (92).
- g) “Hatred is acquired as much by good works as by bad ones, therefore, as I said before, a prince wishing to keep his state is very often forced to do evil; for when that body is corrupt whom you think you have need of to maintain yourself—it may be either the people or the soldiers or the nobles—you have to submit to its humours and to gratify them, and then good works will do you harm” (113).

2. The Bible speaks about the importance of godliness in a king.

- a) The king was commanded by God to have a copy of the law of Moses so that he could learn to fear the Lord, observe His

commandments, have an appropriate view of himself and prolong his days as a king (Deu. 17:18-20).

- b) When Joash was established as king of Judah, he was given the testimony of the law of Moses (2 Kgs. 11:12).
- c) Ezra, the governor of the recently reconstructed city of Jerusalem, stood up on a wooden podium from morning until noon and took the responsibility of reading the book of the law of Moses (Neh. 8:1-8).
- d) Gospel preachers had no hesitation in holding accountable gentile kings to the law of God (Mat. 14:1-4; Acts 24:24-25).
- e) "Take away the wicked from before the king, And his throne shall be established in righteousness" (Pro. 25:5).

C. The place of giving in the life of a prince.

1. Machiavelli:

- a) Liberality "exercised in a way that does not bring you the reputation for it, injures you; for if one exercises it honestly and as it should be exercised, it may not become known, and you will not avoid the reproach of its opposite" (94).
- b) "A prince, therefore, provided that he has not to rob his subjects, that he can defend himself, that he does not become poor and abject, that he is not forced to become rapacious, ought to hold of little account a reputation for being mean, for it is one of those vices which will enable him to govern" (95).
- c) "We have not seen great things done in our time except by those who have been considered mean; the rest have failed" (95).
- d) "A prince, therefore, provided that he has not to rob his subjects, that he can defend himself, that he does not become poor and abject, that he is not forced to become rapacious, ought to hold of little account a reputation for being mean, for it is one of those vices which will enable him to govern" (95).
- e) The prince "who goes forth with his army, supporting it by pillage, sack, and extortion, handling that which belongs to others, this liberality is necessary, otherwise he would not be followed by soldiers. And of that which is neither yours nor

your subjects' you can be a ready giver, as were Cyrus, Caesar, and Alexander; because it does not take away your reputation if you squander that of others, but adds to it; it is only squandering your own that injures you" (96).

f) A prince "should guard himself, above all things, against being despised and hated; and liberality leads you to both. Therefore it is wiser to have a reputation for meanness which brings reproach without hatred, than to be compelled through seeking a reputation for liberality to incur a name for rapacity which begets reproach with hatred" (96).

2. The law of Moses, to which many of the kings had access, addressed the poor about liberality (Deu. 15:7-11; 24:19-22).
3. Kings wrote about the importance of being liberals (Psa. 41:1-3; Pro. 3:9-10).
4. King David is an example of a liberal king (1 Chr. 29:1-9).
5. King David recognized that all riches come from God (1 Chr. 29:10-20).

D. The place of cruelty in the life of a prince.

1. Machiavelli:

a) "Therefore a prince, so long as he keeps his subjects united and loyal, ought not to mind the reproach of cruelty; because with a few examples he will be more merciful than those who, through too much mercy, allow disorders to arise, from which follow murders or robberies; for these are wont to injure the whole people, whilst those executions which originate with a prince offend the individual only" (97).

b) Friendships that are "obtained by payments, and not by greatness or nobility of mind, may indeed be earned, but they are not secured, and in time of need cannot be relied upon; and men have less scruple in offending one who is beloved than one who is feared, for love is preserved by the link of obligation which, owing to the baseness of men, is broken at every opportunity for their advantage; but fear preserves you by a dread of punishment which never fails" (99).

- c) When “a prince is with his army, and has under control a multitude of soldiers, then it is quite necessary for him to disregard the reputation of cruelty, for without it he would never hold his army united or disposed to its duties” (99).
    - d) Men “loving according to their own will and fearing according to that of the prince, a wise prince should establish himself on that which is in his own control and not in that of others; he must endeavour only to avoid hatred, as is noted” (100-101).
  - 2. Assyria was punished by God for its sins, one of which was cruelty (Nah. 1:14; 2:3-7; 3:1-7; Zep. 2:13-15).
  - 3. The Romans were cruel, and they demonstrated it in their treatment of the Son of God (Mat. 26:67; 27:28-31).
  - 4. Rome was also punished for its sins, one of which was their cruelty against Christians (Rev. 17-18).
- E. The place of keeping one’s word in the life of a prince.
  - 1. Machiavelli:
    - a) “Borgia was by all accounts ruthless, ambitious, and boundlessly energetic, possessing a forceful personality that impressed those around him. It is no accident that these are the same qualities possessed by Machiavelli's ideal prince” (The Prince).
    - b) “Machiavelli's endorsement of Borgia's tactics, including deceit, brutality, and betrayal of his own agents, is enthusiastic” (The Prince).
    - c) Those princes “who have done great things have held good faith of little account, and have known how to circumvent the intellect of men by craft, and in the end have overcome those who have relied on their word” (102).
    - d) A “wise lord cannot, nor ought he to, keep faith when such observance may be turned against him, and when the reasons that caused him to pledge it exist no longer” (103).
    - e) “If men were entirely good this precept would not hold, but because they are bad, and will not keep faith with you, you too are not bound to observe it with them” (103).
  - 2. Observations:

- a) "Machiavelli's admiration for Borgia shines throughout the description. He sees in Borgia a model for all princely conquerors" (The Prince).
    - b) "Interestingly, these are the very same qualities he condemns Agathocles for lacking in Chapter 8, but here, he advises the prince to dispense with them when necessary" (The Prince).
  - 3. The Bible is clear about one's duty to fulfill his promises (Ecc. 5:4-5; Deu. 23:21; Psa. 50:14; 76:11; Mat. 5:33-37).
  - 4. The Bible is also clear about speaking the truth and not lying (Eph. 4:25; Zec. 8:16; Col. 3:9).
- F. The place of weapons in the life of a prince.
- 1. "There never was a new prince who has disarmed his subjects; rather when he has found them disarmed he has always armed them, because, by arming them, those arms become yours, those men who were distrusted become faithful, and those who were faithful are kept so, and your subjects become your adherents" (120).
  - 2. "But when you disarm them, you at once offend them by showing that you distrust them, either for cowardice or for want of loyalty, and either of these opinions breeds hatred against you" (121).
  - 3. A prince who has the "necessity to earn renown" "causes enemies to arise and form designs against him, in order that he may have the opportunity of overcoming them, and by them to mount higher, as by a ladder which his enemies have raised" (122).
  - 4. Many "consider that a wise prince, when he has the opportunity, ought with craft to foster some animosity against himself, so that, having crushed it, his renown may rise higher" (123).
  - 5. "Princes, especially new ones, have found more fidelity and assistance in those men who in the beginning of their rule were distrusted than among those who in the beginning were trusted" (123).
  - 6. It "is easier for the prince to make friends of those men who were contented under the former government, and are therefore his enemies, than of those who, being discontented with it, were favourable to him and encouraged him to seize it" (124).

7. “Fortresses, therefore, are useful or not according to circumstances; if they do you good in one way they injure you in another” (124).
8. The “prince who has more to fear from the people than from foreigners ought to build fortresses, but he who has more to fear from foreigners than from the people ought to leave them alone” (124).
9. The “best possible fortress is—not to be hated by the people, because, although you may hold the fortresses, yet they will not save you if the people hate you, for there will never be wanting foreigners to assist a people who have taken arms against you” (124).

G. Bible thoughts on towers and weapons.

1. The name of the Lord is a strong tower, the righteous run to it and are safe (Pro. 18:10).
2. The Lord is a rock, a fortress and a deliverer (Psa. 18:2; cf. 2 Sam. 22:3).
3. For You have been a shelter for me, a strong tower from the enemy (Psa. 61:3).
4. The Lord is a refuge and a fortress (Psa. 91:2).
5. The weapons of the Christian are not carnal but mighty (2 Cor. 10:4).
6. Faith hope and love are the Christian’s defense weapons (1 The. 5:8).
7. God provides the Christian with the weapons they need (Eph. 6:11-17).

H. The place of self-promotion in the life of a prince.

1. Machiavelli:
  - a) “Nothing makes a prince so much esteemed as great enterprises and setting a fine example” (126).
  - b) A “prince ought, above all things, always endeavour in every action to gain for himself the reputation of being a great and remarkable man” (127).
  - c) “A prince is also respected when he is either a true friend or a downright enemy, that is to say, when, without any reservation, he declares himself in favour of one party against the other; which course will always be more advantageous than standing neutral; because if two of your powerful neighbours come to blows, they are of such a



character that, if one of them conquers, you have either to fear him or not” (127).

- d) “a prince ought to take care never to make an alliance with one more powerful than himself for the purposes of attacking others, unless necessity compels him, as is said above; because if he conquers you are at his discretion, and princes ought to avoid as much as possible being at the discretion of any one” (129).

2. Biblical thought about self-promotion and alliances.

- a) Kings should practice good deeds to bring glory to God not to the king (Mat. 5:16; Jho. 15:8).
- b) Christians do practice good deeds to gain a reputation but to bring glory to God (Mat. 6:1-4; 16-18).
- c) “It is not good to eat much honey; so for men to search their own glory is not glory” (Pro. 25:27).
- d) “Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips” (Pro. 27:2).

I. The place of counselors in the life of a prince.

1. Machiavelli:

- a) “When they are capable and faithful he may always be considered wise, because he has known how to recognize the capable and to keep them faithful. But when they are otherwise one cannot form a good opinion of him, for the prime error which he made was in choosing them” (132).
- b) “There are three classes of intellects: one which comprehends by itself; another which appreciates what others comprehended; and a third which neither comprehends by itself nor by the showing of others; the first is the most excellent, the second is good, the third is useless” (132).
- c) “But to enable a prince to form an opinion of his servant there is one test which never fails; when you see the servant thinking more of his own interests than of yours, and seeking inwardly his own profit in everything, such a man will never make a good servant, nor will you ever be able to trust him; because he who has the state of another in his hands ought never to think of himself, but always of his prince, and never

pay any attention to matters in which the prince is not concerned" (133).

2. The Bible and counsel.

- a) Proverbs 1:5: "A wise man will hear, and will increase learning; and a man of understanding shall attain unto wise counsels:"
- b) Proverbs 3:32: "For the froward is abomination to the LORD: but his secret is with the righteous."
- c) Proverbs 8:14: "Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom: I am understanding; I have strength."
- d) Proverbs 11:14: "Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety."
- e) Proverbs 12:15: "The way of a fool is right in his own eyes: but he that hearkeneth unto counsel is wise."
- f) Proverbs 15:22: "Without counsel purposes are disappointed: but in the multitude of counsellors they are established."
- g) Proverbs 19:21: "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the LORD, that shall stand."
- h) Proverbs 24:6: "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the LORD, that shall stand."

J. The source of hope for a country.

1. Machiavelli:

- a) "Nor is there to be seen at present one in whom she can place more hope than in your illustrious house, with its valour and fortune, favoured by God and by the Church of which it is now the chief, and which could be made the head of this redemption" (146).
- b) "With us there is great justice, because that war is just which is necessary, and arms are hallowed when there is no other hope but in them. Here there is the greatest willingness, and where the willingness is great the difficulties cannot be great if you will only follow those men to whom I have directed your attention" (147).
- c) "Further than this, how extraordinarily the ways of God have been manifested beyond example: the sea is divided, a cloud

has led the way, the rock has poured forth water, it has rained manna, everything has contributed to your greatness; you ought to do the rest. God is not willing to do everything, and thus take away our free will and that share of glory which belongs to us" (147).

- d) "Look attentively at the duels and the hand-to-hand combats, how superior the Italians are in strength, dexterity, and subtlety. But when it comes to armies they do not bear comparison, and this springs entirely from the insufficiency of the leaders, since those who are capable are not obedient, and each one seems to himself to know, there having never been any one so distinguished above the rest, either by valour or fortune, that others would yield to him" (147).
- e) "This opportunity, therefore, ought not to be allowed to pass for letting Italy at last see her liberator appear. Nor can one express the love with which he would be received in all those provinces which have suffered so much from these foreign scourings, with what thirst for revenge, with what stubborn faith, with what devotion, with what tears" (149).

K. Bible thoughts on nations and God.

1. Psalm 33:12: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance."
2. Proverbs 14:34: "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people."
3. Psalm 144:15: "Happy is that people, that is in such a case: yea, happy is that people, whose God is the LORD."
4. Psalm 127:1: "Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

#### WORKS CITED

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*, translated by W. K. Marriott, Kindle ed., Library of Alexandria, 2018.

"The Prince." *Book Summary*, <https://www.cliffsnotes.com/literature/p/the-prince/book-summary>.

*Holy Bible*, New King James Version, Thomas Nelson, 1982.

# John Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion

John Moore

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Calvinism is basic to nearly all the religious questions that the Christian will answer when talking to those who are in denominations because it permeates almost all denominations.
2. Whenever someone contends that faith is a gift from God, affirms that he is saved by faith only, embraces false teachings about the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in the conviction and conversion of sinners or believes it is impossible for a child of God to sin and be eternally lost, he has fallen victim to the Calvinist system of doctrine.
3. Calvinism is also found in most cults, even those which claim to avoid denominational doctrines. The Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, embrace the doctrine of inherited sin, the foundation doctrine of Calvinism.
4. Calvinism has become a danger and threat to the Lord's Church.
  - a. Decades ago, preachers used to preach upon it frequently, but now, in many congregations, it is rare to hear an entire sermon on the topic.
  - b. Many members of the church think it is wrong because it "sounds" wrong or because their parents said it was wrong. But they cannot begin to tell anyone why it is wrong.

## DISCUSSION:

### I. JOHN CALVIN

- A. John Calvin was born in Noyon, France July 10, 1509.
- B. He began the study of the classics in Paris in 1523 at the age of fourteen.
- C. Because of his skill at disputation, his father sent him to study law at the University of Orleans in 1528 and later in Bourges.
  1. After his father's death in 1531, he returned to Paris to study the classics and Hebrew.
  2. It was at this point he became interested in the principles of the Reformation.
- D. After experiencing what he later termed a "sudden conversion," variously dated from 1529 to 1534, he began preaching Reformation in Paris.
  1. To avoid government persecution, he traveled from place to place.
  2. In 1536 he settled in Switzerland.

- E. In Basel, Switzerland in 1536 he completed the first version of his Institutes of the Christian Religion.
  - 1. He intended it to be only a brief manual stating the doctrines of the Protestants.
  - 2. In reality, it contained a complete outline of his system of theology.
  - 3. This work was based on the principle that the Scriptures are the sole source of truth in religion (Oh, if only he practiced what he preached!).
  - 4. It was later revised and enlarged.
- F. In 1536, at the request of religious reformer Guillaume Farel (1489-1565), he settled in Geneva, Switzerland.
  - 1. He acquired a large following and was elected preacher by the city magistrates.
  - 2. He compiled a systematic Protestant confession of faith of 21 articles which the citizens were required to profess under oath.
  - 3. He wrote the first Geneva Catechism (1536) for use in religious instruction.
  - 4. The reforms he advocated were so extreme that he alienated many of his adherents and provoked strong political opposition.
- G. Exiled from Geneva in 1538, he went to Strasbourg, France and became a pastor and professor of theology.
  - 1. In Geneva, irreligion and disorder became prevalent during his absence.
  - 2. He was persuaded to return to Geneva in 1541.
- H. After returning to Geneva, he revised the laws of the city.
  - 1. He organized a theocratic form of government for the control of both the social and religious life of its citizens.
  - 2. His second Geneva Catechism (1542) became the standard of doctrines for most of the Reformed churches in Europe.
- I. His rigid dogmatism and severe discipline led to more controversies.
  - 1. Not only were they with Roman Catholicism but also with other religious reformers.
  - 2. His differences with Martin Luther about the nature of the Lord's Supper resulted in the splitting of the evangelical churches into the Lutheran and Reformed groups.

3. His strictness gave rise to discontent even among his followers in Geneva.
- J. His political foes, known as the “Libertines,” were expelled from Geneva in 1555.
1. For the next six years he deepened and extended his influence and that of Protestantism throughout Europe.
  2. He systemized the doctrines of Protestantism and organized its ecclesiastical discipline.
  3. He constructed and made a new church organization that consolidated the scattered forces of the Reformation.

## II. THE DOCTRINES OF CALVIN

### A. Total Hereditary Depravity

1. In Calvin’s discussion on Romans 3, he says, “Now his intention in this passage is not simply to rebuke men that they may repent, but rather to teach them that they have all been overwhelmed by an unavoidable calamity from which only God's mercy can deliver them...Let this then be agreed: that men are as they are here described not merely by the defect of depraved custom, but also by depravity of nature. The reasoning of the apostle cannot otherwise stand: Except out of the Lord's mercy there is no salvation for man, for in himself he is lost and forsaken [Rom. 3:23 ff.] ...it is futile to seek anything good in our nature. (Institutes 2.3.2).
2. A person is born in sin through Adam. He is so depraved that he cannot do anything of himself to save himself.

### B. Unconditional Election

1. “By predestination [or, Unconditional Election; TM] we mean the eternal decree of God, by which he determined with himself whatever he wished to happen with regard to every man. All are not created on equal terms, but some are preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation; and, accordingly, as each has been created for one or other of these ends, we say that he has been predestinated to life or to death.” (Institutes 3.21.5)
2. God personally elects a person unconditionally. Those He chooses for salvation are the elect. Those He chooses for damnation are reprobated. Man can do neither good nor bad to deserve either.

### C. Limited Atonement

1. Whence it comes about that the whole world does not belong to its Creator except that grace rescues from God's curse and wrath and eternal death a limited number who would otherwise perish. But the world itself is left to its own destruction, to which it has been destined. Meanwhile, although Christ interposes himself as mediator, he claims for himself, in common with the Father, the right to choose. 'I am not speaking', he says, 'of all; I know whom I have chosen' (John 13: 18). If anyone ask whence he has chosen them, he replies in another passage: 'From the world' (John 15:19), which he excludes from his prayers when he commends his disciples to the Father (John 17:9). This we must believe: when he declares that he knows whom he has chosen, he denotes in the human genus a particular species, distinguished not by the quality of its virtues but by heavenly decree. (Institutes 3:22:7).
2. Christ did not die for all; He died only for the sins of the elect.

### D. Irresistible Grace

1. Free will does not enable any man to perform good works, unless he is assisted by grace; indeed, the special grace which the elect alone receive through regeneration. For I stay not to consider the extravagance of those who say that grace is offered equally and promiscuously to all...The grace of God has no charms for men till the Holy Spirit gives them a taste for it. (Institutes Vol. 2)
2. This grace of God comes through the Holy Spirit, who puts faith in the heart of man and makes him acceptable for salvation. He cannot resist this grace, and none receive it but those whom God chooses.

### E. Perseverance of the Saints

1. John Calvin, speaking on imputation, said, "...I answer, that the grace which they call accepting, is nothing else than the free goodness with which the Father embraces us in Christ when he clothes us with the innocence of Christ, and accepts it as ours, so that in consideration of it he regards us as holy, pure and innocent. For the righteousness of Christ (as it alone is perfect, so it alone can stand the scrutiny of God) must be assisted for us, and as a surety represent us judicially....Our imperfection and purity, covered with this purity, are not imputed, but are as it were buried, so as not to come under judgment until the hour arrive when the old man being destroyed, and plainly extinguished in us, the divine goodness shall receive us into beatific peace with the



new Adam, there to await the day of the Lord, on which, being clothed with incorruptible bodies, we shall be translated to the glory of the heavenly kingdom." (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book III, p. 82)

2. Once God has taken one out of sin by the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit has forced this grace on him by the gift of faith, the elect can do nothing to fall. Once saved is always saved and is not allowed to sin so as to ever endanger his soul.

### III. A REFUTATION OF THE FALSE PHILOSOPHY.

#### A. Total Hereditary Depravity

1. Exodus 32:31-32
  - a) Moses asked God to let him receive the punishment for the people's sins so that they could be spared.
  - b) In His answer, God let's all know that it is the ones who sin, not the ones born in sin, whose names are removed from the book of life.
2. Deuteronomy 1:34-39 – The Israelites could not enter the promise land because of their sin but their children could.
3. Ecclesiastes 7:29
  - a) God made man upright.
  - b) He is not depraved when born; rather, he is without sin.
4. Isaiah 59:1-8 - "Your" sins, not someone else's, separate you from God.
5. Ezekiel 18:5-20
  - a) A righteous son is not guilty of his wicked father's sins and a righteous father is not guilty of the sins of a wicked son.
  - b) The conclusion of verse 10 is too obvious to miss: "The soul who sins shall die."
6. Matthew 18:1-5
  - a) If we are to be like little children and if Total Hereditary Depravity is true, we need to be more like sinners.
  - b) This doctrine is inconsistent with the teaching of Jesus about the nature of children.
7. Romans 7:9-11
  - a) Rather than being born spiritually dead, the apostle Paul was born spiritually alive.

- b) We become spiritually dead because of our own sins not the sins we inherit from our ancestors.
- 8. 1 Corinthians 14:20 – If babes are totally depraved, why would Paul encourage anyone to be like them?
- 9. 1 John 3:4
  - a) Those who believe in inherited sin do not understand the very nature of sin.
  - b) One sins when he violates God’s law.

B. Unconditional Election

- 1. God has given man freedom of choice.
  - a) God gave Adam and Eve the freedom of choice (Gen. 2:16-17).
  - b) Mankind still has freedom of choice (Jos. 24:15).
- 2. God is impartial – no respecter of persons (2 Chr. 19:7; Acts 10:34-35; Rom. 2:11; 1 Pet. 1:17).
  - a) If Unconditional Election is true then God has indiscriminately condemned those who will be eternally damned while favoring those who are of His elect, but God is just (Psa. 89:14) – where is the justice in this?
  - b) God has not exempted anyone from the opportunity to obtain eternal life (1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9).
- 3. Salvation is not wholly dependent on God.
  - a) The origin of salvation is utterly dependent on God (Eph. 2:4-10).
  - b) The reception of salvation is dependent on man (Rev. 22:17; Phi. 2:12).
    - (1) The reception of salvation comes through meeting the conditions God has set forth in His word (Mark 16:16; et. al.).
    - (2) God placed on man the responsibility of obtaining the salvation which He foreordained (1 Cor. 2:7-8; 2 Tim. 1:9-10) – but man must obey to receive the benefits of His grace.
- 4. God wants all to be saved (1 Tim. 2:3-4; 2 Pet. 3:9) – He has not arbitrarily doomed any individual without giving him a chance at eternal life.

5. Unconditional Election nullifies the great commission (Mat. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16).
6. Unconditional Election nullifies the universal invitation of Christ (Mat. 11:28-30; Rev. 22:17) – Why would Jesus plead with people to do the impossible?

#### C. Limited Atonement

1. The gospel is for all (Mat 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16).
2. Jesus died for all people.
  - a) Luke 19:10
  - b) John 12:32
  - c) Romans 5:18
  - d) 2 Corinthians 5:14-15
  - e) 1 Timothy 2:5-6
  - f) 1 Timothy 4:10
  - g) Hebrews 2:9
3. The blood of Christ can wash away anyone's sins.
  - a) 1 John 2:1-2
  - b) John 1:29

#### D. Irresistible Grace

1. Irresistible Grace contradicts the Scriptural principle of free agency.
  - a) The Bible plainly teaches that one's salvation is conditional upon his obedience – one can reject or accept the offer of salvation.
  - b) The grace of God has appeared to all men (Tit. 2:11) and yet millions have rejected it.
  - c) Each person is accountable for his response to the gospel (Jho. 12:47-48).
  - d) Those who reject the teachings of Jesus are held responsible (Jho. 5:24; 8:24).
2. Irresistible Grace mistakenly portrays how people are called by God to salvation
  - a) All people are called by the gospel (2 The. 2:14).

- b) The Bible does not say that people are called by some still, small voice or by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit on them.
    - c) The Holy Spirit in the conviction and conversion of the sinner does not work apart from the word (Rom. 1:16).
  - 3. Irresistible Grace changes the order of belief and salvation.
    - a) In the Bible, salvation always follows belief, i.e., faithful obedience always precedes salvation.
    - b) John 3:16 – There is belief then salvation.
    - c) Acts 16:31 – There is belief then salvation.
    - d) Mark 16:16 – There is belief, baptism, and then salvation.
    - e) Hebrews 11:6 – One cannot be saved without faith, thus making it a condition of salvation, and causing it to have to precede the salvation of one’s soul.
  - 4. Irresistible Grace has an erroneous view as to when one is made alive spiritually.
    - a) The Bible teaches that one is made alive when, after hearing the gospel, he is baptized.
    - b) Colossians 2:12-13
    - c) John 3:3-5
- E. Perseverance of the Saints
1. Matthew 13:41-42 – All who are in Christ’s kingdom have been born again (Jho. 3:3-5) but some of those in the kingdom who “practice lawlessness” will be gathered out of it.
  2. John 15:1-6
    - a) Jesus warns His disciples to continue to abide in Him.
    - b) If it is impossible for one to fall from grace, then this warning has no meaning.
  3. Acts 8:9-24
    - a) Without question, Simon was a Christian (v. 3).
    - b) Yet he was told to repent and pray lest he be lost (v. 22).
  4. Romans 8:12-13
    - a) This passage is directed toward “brethren” (v. 12).

- b) It is possible for a brother to live according to the flesh and die (v. 13).
- 5. Romans 11:22 – they are warned to be faithful or be “cut off.”
- 6. Romans 14:15 and 1 Corinthians 8:11
  - a) Both passages warn Christians not to cause their brethren to sin in matter of judgment.
  - b) Those “for whom Christ died,” Calvinists would call them the elect, can be destroyed (Rom. 14:15) or perish (1 Cor. 8:11).
- 7. 1 Corinthians 9:27 – A Christian can be a “castaway.”
- 8. Galatians 5:2-4 – A Christian can fall from grace.
- 9. 1 Timothy 4:1 – Some will depart from the faith.
- 10. Hebrews 6:4-6 – Not only can a Christian fall away, but he could also fall so far away that it would be impossible to renew them to repentance.
- 11. James 5:19 – A Christian can wander so from the truth putting his soul in jeopardy.
- 12. Revelation 3:5
  - a) All Christians have their names written in the book of life (Rev. 20:15).
  - b) Those names can be removed if they do not live faithfully (Rev. 3:5; 22:19).

#### WORKS CITED

<https://www.britannica.com>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Calvinism>

Institutes of Christian Religion; <https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/calvin-the-institutes-of-the-christian-religion>

# Rene Descartes: Discourse on Method

Ryan Smithey

## INTRODUCTION:

1. The wisdom of this world is an interesting and often dangerous thing.
  - A. In it many have elevated their evaluation of own thoughts above those of God and in so doing have turned from that which may be known of Him; as Paul stated, “the world by wisdom knew not God” (1 Cor. 1:21).
  - B. These philosophies sadly appeal to many because of the appearance of their wisdom and they are led astray from God by empty and vain imaginations of the mind of men; they have their ears tickled and are turned unto fables (2 Tim. 4:3-4).
  - C. Such that are led away fail to heed the warning of Paul to the Colossians, “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8)
  - D. Thus, that which is imagined and set forth of men must be evaluated, not for its eloquence and loftiness of thought, but for its truthfulness and accuracy.
2. René Descartes is one such philosopher who was able to set forth lofty ideas in a seemingly humble and intriguing fashion by which one may think there was great wisdom and value in what he promoted.
3. However, further examination would lead one to discover a great danger in the work he spent a large part of his life pursuing and by which he continues to influence many in his writings.

## DISCUSSION:

### I. THE PHILOSOPHER

- A. René Descartes was a French mathematician, scientist, and philosopher who lived from 1596 to 1650.
  1. He was born in La Haye en Touraine in central France, a town which has since been renamed Descartes in his honor.
  2. Following the death of his mother when he was only one year old, he was raised by his grandmother and then sent to higher education at the age of 8.
  3. He was well educated in logic, philosophy, mathematics, physics, and law.

4. Following his schooling, he would dismiss much of his education, writing that he was “resolving to seek no knowledge other than that of which could be found in myself or else in the great book of the world” (Descartes, Part I, Par. 13).
  5. Descartes would spend a great bit of his time traveling, moving from place to place, and working on his writings concerning philosophy, mathematics, and science.
- B. He is often credited as the “founder of modern philosophy”.
1. He developed a system of methodical doubt, in which “he dismissed apparent knowledge derived from authority, the sense, and reason” (Watson).
  2. Instead, he claimed to base his beliefs on observation and experimentation which would lead to the philosophies he set forth in *Discourse on the Method* as well as a system of mind-body dualism “that distinguishes radically between mind, the essence of which is thinking, and matter, the essence of which is extension in three dimensions” (Watson).
- C. He also contributed greatly to the study of mathematics, physics, and other sciences.
1. He is “the inventor of the cartesian coordinate system and the founder of analytic geometry, crucial to the invention of calculus and mathematical analysis” (Mastin).
  2. In physics, he would introduce the concept of momentum of a moving body, describing his “laws of nature” which would become the basis of Newton’s “laws of motion”. (Mastin)
  3. He also wrote concerning the law of refraction and reflection as well as a theory concerning planetary motion.
- D. Descartes was invited in 1649 to Scotland to teach Queen Christina. It was here in Stockholm, Sweden that Descartes would die of pneumonia on February 1, 1650, at the age of 53.
- E. Like many, Descartes’ influence continued well past the years of his life and continues to influence many today; such can serve as a warning or a challenge to us in how we are living our lives and the influence we will leave.

## II. THE PHILOSOPHY

- A. Descartes published his work “Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Science,” often shortened to “Discourse on

the Method," in 1637 and it has been considered by some as "one of the first important modern philosophical works not written in Latin." (Watson)

1. It is in this work that he states his best-known philosophical statement; in French: "Je pense, donc je suis", better known in Latin: "cogito, ergo sum", and maybe most recognizable in English: "I think, therefore I am".
  2. It is said he wrote in French so that all would be able to "read his work and learn to think for themselves." (Watson)
  3. In his own words he notes it is the "language of my country," and that he expected those "who make use of their unprejudiced natural reason will be better judges of my opinion than those who give heed to the writings of the ancients only." (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 11).
    - a. He was interested, not in writing to the academic arena, but to the unbiased man who would reason and consider what he was setting forth.
    - b. This fits in with his writing that challenged the educational system of his day and encouraged more to think and reason for themselves.
- B. This work is his "attempt to explain his method of reasoning through even the most difficult of problems." (Sparknotes)
1. Descartes believed that all possessed the "power of judging aright and of distinguishing truth from error" (Descartes, Part I, Par. 1).
  2. This statement is limited, however, as he also recognizes the greater problem is that not all use that power, as the "prime requisite is rightly to apply it" (Descartes, Part I, Par. 1)
  3. This method of reasoning was his way "of gradually augmenting my knowledge, and of raising it by little and little to the highest point which the mediocrity of my talents and the brief duration of my life will permit me to reach." (Descartes, Part I, Par. 3).
  4. He claims that his explanation of this material is not "to teach the method which each ought to follow for the right conduct of his reason, but solely to describe the way in which I have endeavored to conduct my own" (Descartes, Part I, Par. 5).
    - a. In other places he will admit, "I may be mistaken," recognizing "how very liable we are to delusion in what relates to ourselves" (Descartes, Part I, Par. 4)
    - b. This appears as a false humility on his part as he is setting forth this method as a means by which all could grow to greater knowledge if they



would apply themselves to such reasoning, and indeed his work would go on to influence many by his philosophy.

- C. The background to his method lies in rejecting his own education and knowledge and building again only from that of which he can have absolute certainty.
1. Of his education, he states that he had been “familiar with letters” from his childhood and was “ardently desirous of instruction,” thinking that such would help him obtain “a clear and certain knowledge of all that is useful in life.” (Descartes, Par I, Par. 6).
  2. But having completed his studies, his opinion changed as he was “convinced I had advanced no farther in all my attempts at learning, that the discovery at every turn of my own ignorance” (Descartes, Par I, Par. 6).
    - a. Descartes seems to have seen a vanity in the learning that he could gain from others for it was limited, incomplete, uncertain, and disputed; therefore he “abandoned the study of letters, and resolved no longer to seek any other science than the knowledge of myself, or the great book of the world.” (Descartes, Part I, Par. 13).
    - b. Thus, he set out traveling with the “earnest desire to know how to distinguish the true from the false, in order that I might be able clearly to discriminate the right path in life, and proceed in it with confidence” (Descartes, Part I, Par. 13).
    - c. His desire was to be able to reject anything that was in error and follow only that which he could prove by reason.
      - (a) This set him up as, “the first major figure in the philosophical movement known as rationalism, a method of understanding the world based on the use of reason as the means to attain knowledge” (Spark Notes).
      - (b) His previous education would have been in the “Aristotelian method of study, which held that nature was inherently stable and ordered and that one could rely on information derived from sense perceptions to deduce truths” (Spark Notes).
  3. As he set about in this quest, he concluded that “it is almost impossible that our judgments can be so correct or solid as they would have been, had our reason been mature from the moment of our birth, and had we always been guided by it alone.” (Descartes, Part II, Par. 1).
    - a. As a city that is built up over time from a small village is never as orderly as one designed afresh, so, he concluded, it is with us.

- b. And so, by sweeping all of his opinions away and forming them anew under “the scrutiny of reason,” he concluded “I should much better succeed in the conduct of my life.” (Descartes, Part II, Par 2)
4. Descartes then had to devise a system by which he could arrive at the truth he was seeking. He decided upon a set of four rules for himself:
- a. “Never to accept anything for true which I did not clearly know to be such” (Descartes, Part II, Par. 7).
  - b. “Divide each of the difficulties under examination into as many parts as possible, and as might be necessary for its adequate solution” (Descartes, Part II, Par. 8).
  - c. “Conduct my thoughts in such order that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, I might ascend by little and little, and, as it were, step by step, to the ledge of the more complex” (Descartes, Part II, Par. 9).
  - d. “In every case to make enumerations so complete, and reviews so general, that I might be assured that nothing was omitted” (Descartes, Part II, Par. 10)
5. He seemed to believe that in following this set of rules, that there is no knowledge which can be known that would be “beyond our reach, or so hidden that we cannot discover it, provided only we abstain from accepting the false for the truth, and always preserve in our thought the order necessary for the deduction of one truth from another” (Descartes, Part II, Par 11).
- D. Now Descartes was faced with what to do while rebuilding his beliefs; if he restarts from scratch, he needs some basis or morals upon which he will operate while deciding what is real and right that will guide him going forward.
1. Again, he settles on some basic principles, deciding he must:
- a. “Obey the laws and customs of my country” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 2).
  - b. “Be as firm and resolute in my actions as I was able.” For a while, until he was able to determine what was true, he would have to choose what was most probable and leave it for consideration at a later time (Descartes, Part III, Par. 3).
  - c. “To endeavor always to conquer myself rather than fortune” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 4).

- (a) In so doing Descartes was seeking to be content in what he had achieved, rather than longing for what he dreamed he might have achieved.
  - (b) He recognized that such would require “prolonged discipline and frequently repeated meditation” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 4).
- d. “Devoting my whole life to the culture of my reason, and in making the greatest progress I was able in the knowledge of truth, on the principles of the method which I had prescribed myself” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 5).
- (a) Essentially, rather than occupying himself in some employment, he would devote himself full-time to the pursuit of knowledge through his own reasoning.
  - (b) He would thus continue the “work of self-instruction” with the goal of “attaining all the knowledge to the acquisition of which I was competent” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 5).
  - (c) How very convenient for Descartes that he was from an Aristocratic family and able to sell his property, “investing the proceeds in bonds which provided him with a comfortable income for the rest of his life” (Mastin)!
2. With these principles in place, Descartes notes that he, “with freedom set about ridding myself of what remained of my opinions” and “during the nine subsequent years, I did nothing but roam from one place to another, desirous of being a spectator rather than an actor in the plays exhibited on the theater of the world” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 6).
- a. Nine years later and Descartes has to admit that they passed, “before I had come to any determinate judgment respecting the difficulties which form matter of dispute among the learned, or had commenced to seek the principles of any philosophy more certain than the vulgar” (Descartes, Part III, Par. 7).
  - b. These years would account for almost a sixth of the years of his life and he again sees that it has shown him just how much he does not yet know.
- E. So, what was the product of these years in which he would seek to “reject as absolutely false all opinions in regard to which I could suppose the least ground for doubt, in order to ascertain whether after that there remained aught in my belief that was wholly indubitable” (Descartes, Part IV, Par. 1).
- 1. The first great conclusion he writes of is that for which he is possibly most famous, “I observed that, whilst I thus wished to think that all was false, it

- was absolutely necessary that I, who thus thought, should be somewhat; and as I observed that this truth, I think, therefore I am (COGITO ERGO SUM), was so certain and of such evidence that no ground of doubt, however extravagant, could be alleged by the sceptics capable of shaking it, I concluded that I might, without scruple, accept it as the first principle of the philosophy of which I was in search” (Descartes, Part IV, Par. 1).
- a. Descartes has led himself to a point in which he believes he must question everything but yet have some basis upon which to begin rebuilding what he knows to be true.
  - b. The answer he comes up with is the very fact that he must exist because he is thinking and there is no way in which he could unimage himself.
  - c. He would further conclude that he “was a substance whose whole essence or nature consists only in thinking,” not “dependent on any material thing,” that he was “wholly distinct from the body” (Descartes, Part IV, Par. 2).
2. From this, his next conclusion was that “all things which we very clearly and distinctly conceive are true, only observing, however, that there is some difficulty in rightly determining the objects which we distinctly conceive” (Part IV, Par. 3).
3. Next, he decided that since he doubted some things and thus was not wholly perfect, there must be “a nature which was in reality more perfect than mine” (Descartes, Part IV, Par 4).
- a. This being is what Descartes will identify as God, deciding, “there was of necessity some other more perfect Being upon whom I was dependent, and from whom I had received all that I possessed” (Descartes, Part IV, Par 4).
  - b. From his reasoning, Descartes claims he has defined and rationalized a proof of God’s existence.
  - c. He will conclude “that all the things which we clearly and distinctly conceive are true, is certain only because God is or exists and because he is a Perfect Being, and because all that we possess is derived from him: whence it follows that our ideas or notions, which to the extent of their clearness and distinctness are real, and proceed from God, must to that extent be true” (Descartes, Part IV, Par. 7).
  - d. In further considering this, he states that while some thoughts of man may have some falsity, these are not from God, and are because we are not perfect and can be deceived, even by our senses; thus, “whether awake or asleep, we ought never to allow ourselves to be persuaded of

the truth of anything unless on the evidence of our reason” (Descartes, Part IV, Par. 8).

- F. Descartes then goes into a lengthy section showing other truths he has learned from the application of these rules and fundamental truths from which he started.
1. He makes consideration of the world around him and then turns his focus on the heart and cardiovascular system of man.
  2. In these thoughts he presents the body as a machine, little different from the animals about us, little more than material objects operating because of the forces of nature.
- G. In his final section, Descartes sets forth a reasoning for publishing his work.
1. He seems content to have waited until after his passing to have the work published, in order that he would not be distracted by critics.
    - a. It is likely he has in mind the censure of Galileo Galilei and Nicolaus Copernicus by the Roman Catholic Church in 1633 (Mastin).
    - b. Again, one can see a false humility in Descartes when he states, “I have never made much account of what has proceeded from my own mind” (Part VI, Par. 2).
    - c. It is as if he is anticipating his critics and at the same time attempting to appear humble in his reasons for writing; yet he goes on to suggest that it would be sinful for him not to write these thoughts as they were in the promotion of “the general good of mankind” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 2).
  2. He also admits to the daunting work of his task, knowing that his experiments to discern and prove all that is true are so numerous, “that neither my hands nor my income, though it were a thousand times larger than it is, would be sufficient for them all” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 3).
    - a. In this he hopes others would pursue a similar path in such experiments, “as to assist me in those that remain to be made” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 3).
    - b. In reality, he admits the same conclusion of his present undertaking as he did concerning his early education, “I am quite willing it should be known that the little I have hitherto learned is almost nothing in comparison with that of which I am ignorant” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 4).
    - c. This is interesting as he sets that forth as a criticism of his early education but is content with such in his own work of discerning truth.

3. In writing he recognized that there may be some opposition to what he says and such “would be useful both in making me aware of my errors and...in bringing others to a fuller understanding of it.” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 5).
  - a. Yet he further states that of any objections to his work, he cannot anticipate “any profit from them” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 5).
  - b. Trusting in his own reason he states, “it has rarely happened that anything has been objected to me which I had myself altogether overlooked,” so that “I have never met with a single critic of my opinions who did not appear to me either less rigorous or less equitable than myself” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 5).
  - c. Essentially, Descartes dismisses any critic of his work as one who had not considered the matter as well as he had or was as qualified as he was, and thus was likely incorrect in their criticism.
4. But Descartes does admit that the greatest thing one would gain from following his principles would be, “the habit which they will acquire, by seeking first what is easy, and then passing onward slowly and step by step to the more difficult” (Descartes, Part VI, Par. 6).
5. He concludes with stating he has, “resolved to devote what time I may still have to live to no other occupation than that of endeavoring to acquire some knowledge of Nature” (Descartes, Part VI, Par 12)
  - a. He would go on seeking knowledge by studying the world around him and trying to discover what was true.

### III. THE PROBLEM

- A. Descartes’ philosophy in “Discourse on the Method” is a dangerous mixed bag; there are some concepts one might find desirable to pursue but others are, at best, a luxury of the wealthy, and at worst a dangerous path away from Biblical reasoning.
- B. Some good qualities, with caveats.
  1. Be willing to question in order to arrive at truth.
    - a. While Descartes took this to extremes, we certainly should be willing and expected to question things that we are taught to prove that they are accurate and true.
      - (a) Jesus says God’s Word is true (Jho. 17:17) and that it is the standard by which we will be judged (Jho. 12:48).

- (i) We must be careful that this is the standard by which we judge things as true or false.
    - (ii) One glaring point to Descartes' philosophy is the elevation of human reasoning to prove what is true and uses the "great book of the world" as his textbook (Descartes, Part I, Par. 13).
  - (b) We are instructed to, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 The. 5:21) and even to, "try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 Jho. 4:1).
    - (i) This necessitates the questioning and investigation of what is good and right, whether that is a doctrine being taught or one who is teaching it.
    - (ii) Paul would praise the Bereans who, "searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so" (Acts 17:11).
    - (iii) If they were expected and praised for investigating the words of an inspired apostle of God, should not we do the same?
  - b. Certainly, on its face, the desire to know truth is a pursuit in which we can agree with Descartes.
2. All can reason.
- a. Again, while Descartes does make mention that he knows not all will be able to devote the time he has to his endeavor, nevertheless he does attribute all with the ability to reason.
    - (a) He presents this seemingly sarcastically at the very beginning, noting that all have, "the power of judging aright and of distinguishing truth from error," but a major difference is in whether all will do so, as the "prime requisite is rightly to apply it" (Descartes, Part I, Par. 1).
      - (i) So, we all have good sense or reason, but will we apply ourselves to it?
      - (ii) The problem he sees is that in regard to good sense, "every one thinks himself so abundantly provided with it," that they, "do not usually desire a larger measure of this quality than they already possess" (Descartes, Part I, Par. 1).
    - (b) In this he does not set his quest for truth and knowledge above anyone else's ability, it is more a question of who will make such endeavors.
  - b. Even to this we may readily agree and be challenged by him.

- (a) We certainly recognize that there are those who may be debilitated in some sense or others to whom reasoning may come easier than to others; but we ought to be encouraged to apply ourselves unto a desire to know what is true.
  - (b) Consider Paul's charge to Timothy to, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).
    - (i) Paul was not going to think and reason for him; Timothy had the ability and responsibility to do so himself.
    - (ii) He should diligently apply himself unto the study of God's word to know how to apply it his life and thus be approved of God.
    - (iii) That same responsibility falls to each of us as each individual will stand before God in judgment (Rom. 14:12; 2 Cor. 5:9-10).
  - (c) In Acts 2 as Peter and the apostles preached, it is recorded that, "with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation" (Acts 2:40).
    - (i) Peter expected them to reason and to prove the things that they were hearing.
    - (ii) It was an individual choice that each was expected to make.
  - (d) Concerning the preaching of Paul, it is often noted that he, "reasoned with them out of the scriptures" (Acts 17:2; cf. 18:4, 19; 24:25).
    - (i) The great task of preaching should be getting people to understand what God's word says and to apply it to our lives (cf. Neh. 8:8).
    - (ii) I should never want someone to blindly follow my beliefs, but rather reason from the scriptures and decide these matters for themselves, so that their "faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God" (1 Cor. 2:5).
- c. In all of these examples, we ought to see the personal responsibility of the individual to reason for themselves and do that which is right.

## C. Dangerous Problems and Warnings

### 1. Skepticism

- a. Descartes did attack the skepticism of his day, but he did so by becoming a skeptic himself.



- (a) Skepticism casts doubt on everything, holding that certain knowledge is impossible.
- (b) This same idea runs rampant in our society today in the idea of subjectivism, that there is no such thing as absolute truth.
  - (i) It is suggested that what might be true now, for you might not be true for another or at a different time.
  - (ii) Even in the current gender discussions, many are led to believe that gender is not a fact but is subject to one's opinion as to how they "identify."
  - (iii) Pilate long ago asked, "What is truth?" (Jho. 18:38), and many are still asking that same question.
    - 1. But Jesus tells us we can know the truth (Jho. 8:32).
    - 2. That truth was not limited to a certain time, place, or people; rather the truth of God's Word was to be sounded forth to all (Mat. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16).
- b. To combat the idea of skepticism, Descartes claimed to want to know what was true.
  - (a) He sought to separate himself from the skeptic, "Not that in this I imitated the sceptics who doubt only that they may doubt, and seek nothing beyond uncertainty itself" (Descartes, Part III, Par. 6).
  - (b) Nevertheless, his idea was, "I ought to reject as absolutely false all opinions in regard to which I could suppose the least ground for doubt" (Descartes, Part IV, Par. 1).
  - (c) He threw everything into doubt in order to be able to find some basis of truth.
  - (d) In this method, Descartes would even go so far as to deny reality.
    - (i) It would lead him to wonder, is everything just imagination, or is there any certainty upon which we can rely?
    - (ii) This would force him to his conclusion, "I think, therefore I am;" for surely if he could imagine then his mind, at least, was real!
    - (iii) So, what he really laid the basis for was solipsism, the theory that the self is all that can be known to exist.
  - (e) The danger in this is denying the reality of the world in which God has placed us and in which He has revealed Himself.

- (i) God made man and the world in which we exist (Gen 1, 2; Acts 17:24-25).
- (ii) While God has revealed Himself (as far as His nature and will) by His Word (2 Tim. 3:16-17); He has used the creation to show His existence.
  - 1. Psalm 19:1 reminds us, “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.”
    - a. Of this declaration, there is no language in which it cannot be understood or any point on the earth where it has not reached (Psalm 19:3-4).
    - b. This knowledge of God, that is His existence and glory by means of the created works of this earth, can and should be known by all men who behold them.
  - 2. Further in Romans 1:20 Paul states by inspiration, “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.”
    - a. Man who does not recognize and seek after God because of the creation is willfully ignorant.
    - b. God has made himself known but of those who reject Him, Paul says they “became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened” (Rom. 1:21)
    - c. Descartes’ philosophy takes the creation, which should be evidence of God, and casts its very reality into question (after all it may just be imagined), thereby casting doubt not only in his own existence but upon God’s.
    - d. He then has to recreate proofs for the existence of both himself and God, rather than simply accepting what God has already revealed!
- c. Break With Reality
  - (a) One author notes, that philosophies like Descartes’ skepticism, “is a kind of intellectual disease that generally arises among people who are both well fed and well read” (Wicker, 18).

- (i) He continues with the example that one who is hungry does not take time to question if the food before him really exists nor does the farmer who has chores to do, wonder if he can really know what a cow is.
- (ii) Descartes had the wealth, time, and opportunity to do little more than travel and think for over nine years of his life while he pondered what he could really know as real or true; certainly, that is a luxury most are not afforded.
- (b) It is simply not logical that we should question everything about us and wonder what is real and what is not.
  - (i) "Skepticism is a problem in our minds. It is a deadly trap only if we retreat into our mind to escape it" (Wilkin, 22).
  - (ii) Instead of retreating to our mind to wonder what is real, we need to be reminded that "the real world outside our minds has been factually solid all along" (Wilkin, 22-23).
- d. What we must remember is "reality exists before our thinking, so that our thinking depends on reality, and this in two ways. First, our thinking depends on the reality of our own existence. If we don't exist, we can't think. Second, our thinking correctly depends on our properly conforming our minds to what really exists" (Wilkin, 23).
  - (a) Theories are proven by whether they conform to the reality of the world around us; it really does not matter what we think about it, it is either true or false.
  - (b) And so Descartes was left wondering if he even had a body, but such denied the reality of his senses by which he saw, tasted, touched, heard, and smelled all that was around him.
- e. We don't exist because we think, we exist because God fearfully and wonderfully made us with the ability to think (Psa. 139:14).

## 2. Egotism

- a. This also seems a natural outpouring of Descartes skepticism, for if I doubt everything and only trust in that which I have reasoned to be real, then we set ourselves in judgment of all things.
  - (a) My own reasoning becomes the standard by which I judge reality and truth instead of relying on the true standard of God's Word (Jho. 17:17)

- (b) It is a condition of narcissism, “believing I sit in god-like judgment of everything else but nothing stands in judgment of me” (Wilkin, 20).
  - (c) Everything is subject to my reasoning, even as to whether I have a body or whether there is a God who created all things.
  - (d) I ultimately get to decide what is right and wrong based upon my judgments, when those things are already settled by the revelation of God.
- b. Basically, Descartes’ philosophy tells us we must doubt all things and begin from one solid point to build again up—again for Descartes that point was, “I think, therefore I am.”
- (i) He places himself at the center and says the only thing I can start with being absolutely sure of is myself (at least his thinking or mind; his body was still in question at that point).
  - (ii) But what if, at this point, Descartes does not go on to reason that God exists, the Bible is God’s Word, or what God says should be followed? Does that make those facts any less true?
  - (iii) Paul speaks to that, “let God be true, but every man a liar” (Rom. 3:4)!
  - (iv) Whether we accept what God has revealed as true or not, does not change the truth of the matter.
- c. One only has to remember the parable of the rich farmer in Luke 12:16-21 to see the danger of thinking too much about self!
- d. This egotism is further evidenced in his writing as he knows that not all will be able to give the time and effort to such an endeavor as he has.
- (i) While not addressed, it leaves one wondering if Descartes has set himself up as the philosopher of the world.
  - (ii) The great thinking “I”, Descartes himself, will determine what is right and share that knowledge with the world.
- e. We must remember that God created us in His image, man is not God and neither has man created God in his image – yet that is what many have sought to do by elevating themselves (the danger of which is explored in the next point).
3. Concept of God
- a. Descartes’ reasoning for the existence of God essentially boils down to the idea that he could think of a being more perfect than himself!

- (a) Therefore, since Descartes could imagine Him, He must be so!
  - (b) Just because we can think of something does not make it so. That seems to go against the very skepticism that Descartes claimed to be working against.
  - (c) The greater danger to which it has led is the prevalent idea among many today that God is whatever we imagine Him to be, and many have fallen into that trap!
  - (d) How often in discussions of God and His nature, as revealed in the Bible, does someone exclaim, “Well, the God I know, would never....,” and on they go with what their concept of God is – a concept that is not founded upon the pages of God’s Word, but their imagination of Him.
- b. It is interesting that Genesis does not set forth an argument for the existence of God; it begins with the fact that He is and He is the cause for all that we have.
- (a) As one reads through the pages of God’s Word, he finds God revealing Himself by His Words and His actions.
  - (b) Sadly, man would seek to create God in his own image, making idols of “silver and gold, the work of men’s hands” (Psalm 115:4).
    - (i) They, the being created by God, would take another portion of God’s creation and fashion it according to his own imagination and then turn around and worship it (Jer. 10:2-5; Rom. 1:25)!
    - (ii) Rather than learning what they could of God their creator, they worshiped the objects of their imaginations.
- c. We must not allow our imagination to form God as we want Him to be, but rather seek after Him through His revealed Word.
4. Mind-Body Dualism
- a. Descartes presents the human body as not much more than a machine in which we are trapped.
  - b. He became the father not just of modern philosophy but also of modern dualism, “the belief that human beings aren’t one thing—an intimate and essential union of soul and body-but two entirely different and independent entities, a ghostly soul banging around in a ghostly machine” (Wilkin 26-27).

- c. The great warning here is we need to retreat to the pages of God's Word, not the recesses of our imagination, to learn about the soul and body and what God says about man.
  - (a) We have been made in the image of God, not our own minds (Gen. 1:27).
  - (b) We have been fearfully and wonderfully made, not just a random chance of nature (Psa. 139:14).
  - (c) To imagine that the body is just a machine that acts only according to the regulations of nature attempts to remove responsibility from the individual for its actions and denies the truth of God's Word that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Eze. 18:20).
  - (d) Remember each person shall be judged for "the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10).
  - (e) Paul sets an example for us in that he said, "I keep under my body, and bring it under subjection" (1 Cor. 9:27).
  - (f) Finally, we are reminded that we are to "mortify your members which are upon the earth" (Col. 3:5)
    - (i) There are attitudes and actions that the Christian is to put from him and no longer follow in.
    - (ii) We bear responsibility for what we think and do; it is only in man's imagination that the actions of the body and the thoughts of the mind are completely separated (Pro. 23:7; Mat. 12:35; 15:18-19).
- d. In short, Descartes used his own reasoning to imagine a divide that God does not make between the mind and body.
- e. Let us seek to learn from our Creator and what He has to say about us more than what man has imagined us to be.

**CONCLUSION:**

1. René Descartes challenged himself to rise above his teachers and in many ways did challenge himself and others to think and reason more for themselves.
2. Sadly, though his life and work would do much harm in setting forth philosophies, that continue to impact the lives of many today, in a way that focuses more on the individual and reasoning than it does on the true wisdom revealed to man by God.

3. I think, because I exist, because Almighty God created me – what an amazing thought that elevates God, the Creator, not myself (cf. Psa. 8:4)

#### WORKS REFERENCED & CITED

Descartes, René. "Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Sciences." *Project Gutenberg*.

<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/59/59-h/59-h.htm>

Watson, Richard A. "René Descartes". *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Rene-Descartes>.

Mastin, L. "René Descartes". *The Basics of Philosophy*.

[https://www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers\\_descartes.html](https://www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers_descartes.html)

SparkNotes Editors. "René Descartes." *SparkNotes*.

<https://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/descartes/>.

Wilker, Benjamin. *10 Books that Screwed Up the World and 5 Others That Didn't Help*. New York, NY: MJF Books, 2008.

Skirry, Justin. "René Descartes." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

<https://iep.utm.edu/descarte/>.

Biography.com Editors. "René Descartes." *Biography*.

<https://www.biography.com/scholar/rene-descartes>.

# Thomas Hobbs: Leviathan

Charles Hall

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Leviathan: Autocratic Monarch State
  - a. Autocratic: Ruler who has absolute power, who takes no account of other's wishes or opinions; Domineering; Sovereign.
  - b. Socialism (in Marxist theory): a transitional social state between the overthrow of Capitalism and the formation of Communism.
  - c. Communism: A political theory derived from Karl Marx advocating Class War and leading to a society in which all property is government owned, and each person works and is paid according to their abilities and needs.
  - d. Marxism: The political and economic theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels used to form the basis for the theory and practice of Communism.
2. God gave us the capacity to think and commands we do so.
  - a. Leviathan=Autocratic=Marxism=Communism/Socialism. All believe we need a social contract and a dictatorship, because we cannot think and make responsible decisions.
  - b. God always wants us to think and make responsible spiritual decisions.

Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things (Phi. 4:8).
3. Christians already have a Contract with God, written in His Holy Word, the Bible (Acts 2:38, Acts 2:47, 2 Tim. 3:16-17).
  - a. The Beatitudes (Mat. 5: 1-12).
  - b. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God" (Col. 3:1).
  - c. God has given us all things that pertain to life and godliness, therefore... Add to your faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and love (2 Pet. 1:3-8).
4. Thus, due to the sinful way God, the Bible, and Christians are treated under Marxism, Communism and Socialism, it is obvious that these three horrible forms of dictatorship are works of Satan's darkness (Jho. 8:44-47). They will destroy any free-



standing Bible based democracy based upon the pattern of a Constitutional Federal Republic with Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **I. THE LIFE OF THOMAS HOBBS**

- A. Life
  - i. Lived 1588-1679
  - ii. Attended Oxford, England.
- B. Characteristics of Thomas Hobbes
  - i. Amoral, Fool, Liar
  - ii. ATHEIST- "The fool has said in his heart, There is no God" (Psa. 14:1; 53:1).
- C. Full of himself, like those at the tower of Babel.
  - i. Attitude problem: Let's make a name for ourselves
  - ii. Genesis 11:1-9
  - iii. Jeremiah 10:23
  - iv. Proverbs 3:5
  - v. The Prince of Tyre thought he was a god and he died (Eze. 28).
  - vi. Herod was worshipped as a god and he died (Acts 12:23).
- D. Self-Intellectualism Reigns Deceptively
  - i. Isaiah 5:20
  - ii. Isaiah 55:8-9

### **II. DANGEROUS BELIEFS OF THOMAS HOBBS**

- A. He didn't believe in God or that God was the Creator of all. (Houlgate, 137).
  - i. Genesis 1-2.
  - ii. Nehemiah 9:6
  - iii. John 1:1
  - iv. Colossians 1:16
- B. Hobbes believed in materialism and that motion was responsible for all that was created. Thus, he believed falsely, in Spontaneous Generation (Houlgate, 137).
- C. He played both sides of politics and religion for his own benefit and with his Intellectualism, he manipulated countries and religion to get the outcome he wanted. Mental gymnastics pleased him the most (Houlgate, 79, 80, 82, 86).
  - i. ...men must learn not to think of themselves above that which is written (1 Cor. 4:6).

- ii. ...the way of man is always right in his own eyes (Pro. 21:2).
- D. Hobbes believed in a dictatorship, set up similar to the false doctrine of the Catholic structure. Thus, the "Leviathan" (Hobbes, 235, 238; Houlgate, 173).
  - i. Rule by dictatorship
  - ii. Rule by fear
  - iii. Rule by religion intertwined within the government
  - iv. Against the Pope and Catholic Religion (2 The. 2:1-4).
  - v. Against the false doctrine of fables (2 Pet. 1:16).
  - vi. Against Maryology (Luke 11: 27-28).
- E. Hobbes allows any conduct, if okay with the Dictator/Papal Government (Hobbes, 236-245).
  - i. The national government will promise you "peace and security, which is a LIE! They say you can live any way you want, if ok with the Government.
  - ii. This is nothing but a cloud for the DANGERS OF Marxism, Communism, and Socialism. Only Jesus can give us perfect peace (Jho. 14:27; 16:33).
  - iii. Since Hobbes is an Atheist, anything immoral, amoral, and anti-Bible is allowed. WRONG (Gal. 5:19-21).
- F. Hobbes believes that a Dictatorship is the best way to prevent Civil War (Hobbes, 284).
  - i. A Democracy/Constitutional Federal Republic based upon the Bible is the BEST way to prevent civil war.
  - ii. As Christians, we are in a spiritual war already. Putting on the whole armor of God (Eph 6:10-18), tells us how to war against Satan and be victorious!
- G. Hobbes teaches that the government will take away fear. WRONG! (Houlgate, 90, 191, 192).
  - i. By the governments' Socialist/Communist/Marxist power, they will keep people in constant fear.
  - ii. We must remember that Jesus has all authority (Mat. 28:18-19) and reigns over the one Body of Christ (Eph. 4:4-6).  
God will take away all fear if we depend on Him!

1. Matthew 10:28

Romans 21:8

- |                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 2. 2 Timothy 1:7    | John 14:27       |
| 3. Matthew 11:28-30 | Isaiah 41:10     |
| 4. Exodus 14:13     | Joshua 1:9       |
| 5. 1 Peter 3:13-14  | Deuteronomy 31:6 |
| 6. 1 John 4:18      | 1 Peter 5:6-7    |
| 7. Hebrews 13:5-6   | Romans 8:28      |

### III. ACCOUNTABILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. Judgment day awaits us all (Heb. 9:27).
- B. We will be judged by the words Jesus has spoken.
  - i. John 12:48                      2 Corinthians 5:10-11
  - ii. John 5:28-29                      Hebrews 10:26-27
  - iii. 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9
- C. Leviathanism, Communism, and Socialism are sadly alive and well in so many countries.
  - i. Is this our nation today?
  - ii. Some would say Yes.
  - iii. Some would say we are moving that way.
  - iv. Folks, we are already there!
- D. What is our responsibility as Christians in this great nation?
  - i. Stand fast against all false doctrines!
  - ii. Stand fast against dictatorships!
  - iii. Stand fast against fear!
  - iv. Stand fast against the spiritual lies of Thomas Hobbes in his book: The Leviathan.
  - v. Watch out for Spiritual Deception (Rom. 10:1-4; Mat. 15:8-9).
  - vi. Identify it (2 Tim. 2:15; Neh. 8:8).
  - vii. Mark it (Rom. 16:17-18).
  - viii. Preach against it (2 Tim. 4:2-5).
  - ix. Separate from it (Eph 5:11; John 17:17; Acts 20:32; Lev. 10:3).

## CONCLUSION:

1. Standing fast against the destructive teachings of Marxism, Communism, and Socialism, which Thomas Hobbes has written about in his book "Leviathan," will help slow down their spread in the United States and help protect our Christian freedoms!
2. REMEMBER: Thomas Hobbes is an Atheist and obviously a liar and will spend eternity in Hell and so will all those who endorse, walk along side of or take pleasure in his beliefs (Rom. 1:32; Rev. 21:8; 22:1).
3. Romans 8:35-39

Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

## WORKS CITED

King James Bible

Webster's Dictionary

Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. 1651

Houlgate, Laurence D. Understanding Thomas Hobbes. Houlgate Books, San Luis Obispo, California, 2020

# Jean Jacques Roseau: Discourses on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality Among Men

Hank Lawrence

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Jean-Jacques Rousseau may well be called the “grandfather” of liberalism.
  - a. Rousseau’s beliefs can be centered around the idea that mankind is naturally good but corrupted by society.
  - b. In his view, mankind was born naturally equal while living in what he refers to as a “state of nature,” but became corrupted when the first human being acquired private property.
  - c. Therefore, man becomes absolved of personal responsibility and is better as an animal. The “victimhood mentality” is one of the major results of this ideology.
2. This victimhood mentality is something witnessed in the modern generation with many ideas and beliefs being objected against because of their ability to “offend.” Today, a number of college campuses offer “safe spaces” from many “offensive” ideas.
  - a. These “offensive” thoughts are typically those thoughts that speak out against transgenderism, homosexuality, and a number of different sins.
  - b. Sadly, entire generations have grown up with a victimhood mentality. As generations grow up in the present, they believe things were always the way they were, not knowing the past before them. As Solomon lamented, “Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us” (Eccl. 1:10).
3. While many refer to Jean-Jacques Rousseau as a major player in the enlightenment age, his ideas have done nothing to further mankind’s enlightenment.
  - a. A few questions arise from this ideology.
    - i. What caused Rousseau to have such a belief?
    - ii. What is this ideology and what is the problem with it?
    - iii. What are the ramifications of such a belief (then and now)?
  - b. Most importantly, what does the Bible say about these beliefs?

## DISCUSSION:

### I. IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND ROUSSEAU'S BELIEFS AND IDEOLOGY, IT IS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND HIS BACKGROUND.

- a. Jean-Jacques Rousseau was born in Geneva, Switzerland on June 28, 1712.
  - i. His mother died a few days later, so he was raised by his father. His only other sibling, an older brother, ran away from home early in Rousseau's life.
  - ii. He departed from Geneva at age sixteen and traveled to France where he met the Baroness de Warens (also known as Louise de Warens), who educated him and helped mold many of his philosophical ideals.
- b. In 1750, Rousseau wrote his first discourse in response to the Academy of Dijon's essay contest on the question, "Has the restoration of the sciences and arts tended to purify morals?"
  - i. This discourse would go on to win the Academy's prize and would skyrocket Rousseau into the public eye.
  - ii. Rousseau answered this question with a resounding "NO" and believed the sciences and arts degraded society rather than purified it. In his first discourse he writes, "While government and laws provide for the safety and well-being of assembled men, the sciences, letters, and arts, less despotic and perhaps more powerful, spread garlands of flowers over the iron chains with which men are burdened, stifle in them the sense of that original liberty for which they seemed to have been born, make them love their slavery, and turn them into what is called civilized peoples" (Rousseau, 1964)
  - iii. His belief that mankind would be better in a sort of utopian "state of nature" is seen both in this discourse and later beliefs. Rousseau states in the first discourse, "The good man is an athlete who likes to compete in the nude. He disdains all those vile ornaments which would hamper the use of his strength, most of which were invented only to hide some deformity" (Rousseau, 1964).
- c. In one of his later writings, Rousseau would write, "The fundamental principle of all morality, upon which I have reasoned in all my writings and which I developed with all the clarity of which I am capable is that man is a being who is naturally good, loving justice and order; that there is no original perversity in the human heart, and the first movements of nature are always good" (Rousseau, 1762).

- i. It was Rousseau's fundamental belief that man is born good but corrupted by society. Therefore, following this reasoning, man is not responsible for his own failings, but it is the fault of external forces (i.e., society).
- ii. If one is to believe this view, it must hold true that we are not responsible for our actions or the outcomes of our life. We are merely molded by society as either victors or victims.
- iii. As a result of this belief, the victimhood mentality is born.

**II. WHILE IT IS DIFFICULT TO NARROW DOWN THE SINGLE MOST DAMAGING WORK OF ROUSSEAU, ONE OF THE PREMIERE WORKS THAT HAS INFLUENCED COUNTLESS GENERATIONS IS HIS *DISCOURSES ON THE ORIGIN & FOUNDATIONS OF INEQUALITY OF MEN*.**

- a. In this work, Rousseau strives to answer a question posed by the Academy of Dijon in 1753: "What is the origin of inequality among men, and is it authorized by the natural law?"
  - i. This discourse became known as the "Second Discourse" or otherwise known as *Discourses on the Origin & Foundations of Inequality of Men*. It carries much of the same ideology as the first discourse but descends further into the madness of this belief system.
  - ii. In an effort to establish the exact moment in which society corrupted mankind, he wrote in this discourse, "On the other hand, free and independent as men were before, they were now, in consequence of a multiplicity of new wants, brought into subjection, as it were, to all nature, and particularly to one another; and each became in some degree a slave even in becoming the master of other men: if rich, they stood in need of the services of others; if poor, of their assistance; and even a middle condition did not enable them to do without one another" (Rousseau, 1964).
  - iii. The division of labor began in complex societies by some people becoming skilled in farming, others in construction and some in economics. Consequently, men became dependent on one another for these services.
  - iv. Rousseau believed this was the exact moment when society became corrupted and continued in his second discourse, "Each one began to consider the rest, and to wish to be considered in turn; and thus a value came to be attached to public esteem. Whoever sang or

danced best, whoever was the handsomest, the strongest, the most dexterous, or the most eloquent, came to be of most consideration; and this was the first step towards inequality, and at the same time towards vice. From these first distinctions arose on the one side vanity and contempt and on the other shame and envy: and the fermentation caused by these new leavens ended by producing combinations fatal to innocence and happiness” (Rousseau, 1964).

- v. One of Rousseau’s firm beliefs was that sincerity was corrupted by the necessity to interact with others who have different abilities than ourselves. He writes, “I could explain how much this universal desire for reputation, honours and advancement, which inflames us all, exercises and holds up to comparison our faculties and powers; how it excites and multiplies our passions, and, by creating universal competition and rivalry, or rather enmity, among men, occasions numberless failures, successes and disturbances of all kinds by making so many aspirants run the same course. I could show that it is to this desire of being talked about, and this unremitting rage of distinguishing ourselves, that we owe the best and the worst things we possess, both our virtues and our vices, our science and our errors, our conquerors and our philosophers” (Rousseau, 1964).
- b. In an effort to rid the world of this perceived “inequality,” Rousseau said, “In a word, I could prove that, if we have a few rich and powerful men on the pinnacle of fortune and grandeur, while the crowd grovels in want and obscurity, it is because the former prize what they enjoy only insofar as others are destitute of it” (Rousseau, 1964).
  - i. Basically, if wealth inequality could be eliminated, all of the feelings related to this perceived “corrupted sincerity” would go away.
  - ii. It was his belief that humans only acted nice towards each other out of necessity for their own personal gain. He states, “Man must now, therefore, have been perpetually employed in getting others to interest themselves in his lot, and in making them, apparently at least, if not really, find their advantage in promoting his own. Thus he must have been sly and artful in his behaviour to some, and imperious and cruel to others; being under a kind of necessity to ill-use all the persons of whom he stood in need” (Rousseau, 1964).
  - iii. Rousseau’s belief concludes that mankind’s decency to each other is built upon personal gain.
- c. To believe in Rousseau’s ideology is to believe that we (as individuals) are not responsible for our actions, but society is the cause of our problems.



- i. Rousseau supported the idea of this “natural man” accompanied with a firm belief in “free love.” The idea of “free love” removes the consequences of the individual’s actions and frees him to do what he likes. Rousseau states in the second discourse, “Instead, in the primitive state, having neither houses, nor huts, nor property of any kind, everyone took up his lodging by chance and often for only one night. Males and females united fortuitously, depending on encounter, occasion, and desire, without speech being a very necessary interpreter of the things they had to say to each other; they left each other with the same ease” (Rousseau, 1964).
- ii. Ultimately, Rousseau’s beliefs are firmly rooted in a utopian society where sexual immorality is celebrated, morality is unnatural, private property ownership is evil, and man is better as an animal.

### III. TRULY, JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU MAY WELL BE CONSIDERED TO BE THE GRANDFATHER OF POLITICAL LIBERALISM.

- a. Historically speaking, Rousseau’s effects on men such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels cannot be understated.
  - i. Based on many of the similar ideals supported by Rousseau, Marx and Engels would later write in the *Communist Manifesto*, “The communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. WORKINGMEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!” (Marx, 2011).
  - ii. Rousseau’s belief that private property is bad, morality is unnatural and society is at fault rather than the individuals is reiterated in not only the literature behind communism, but the real world examples of it.
- b. Rousseau could be called the originator of the “social justice” movement who focus their beliefs on feelings rather than facts.
  - i. This movement focuses on the emotional state of others and how comfortable they are as the basis for what should be said or refrained. If someone is uncomfortable, the elements that make them uncomfortable must be removed (even if this is the truth).
  - ii. Carol Blum noted in her book *Rousseau and the Republic of Virtue* that Rousseau, “repeatedly explained that his happiness depended

on his union with goodness and, therefore, that anything that made him unhappy must be evil and false.” Ms. Blum continued: “With this as a sure foundation, he could judge the truth-value of any assertion . . . by an immediate standard: It either harmonized with his feeling of goodness or it threatened it” (Blum, 1989).

- iii. Rousseau was more concerned about whether information made him feel bad than whether or not it was truthful. Imagine a world in which the truth is hindered or altogether banned because someone is offended by it. The citizens of the United States do not have to imagine this reality, it is already one!
- c. If everyone is a victim as a result of society who has corrupted them, they cannot be shamed for their behavior because it is not their fault.
  - i. So long as a person is a victim of society, they cannot be condemned for their choices or beliefs since it is “not their fault.”
  - ii. Rousseau’s ideology encourages self-indulgence victimology. His ideology states our actions do not matter if we profess to be a “victim” because it is someone else’s fault for my decisions.
  - iii. Rousseau is the ultimate advocate for weak victimized men who cry out against the truth when it offends them. How can we expect to face the difficulties of life if we can retreat to a safe space when we are scared or offended? The truth is life is sometimes hard and situations are sometimes tragic. To face these difficulties and overcome them, we must strive to be strong individuals who aren’t afraid of the truth.
  - iv. As Judith Shklar said of Rousseau, “He . . . is the Homer of the losers” (Shklar, 1978).

#### **IV. FINALLY, THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION WE MUST ASK OURSELVES IS, “WHAT DOES THE BIBLE THINK OF ROUSSEAU’S IDEOLOGY?”**

- a. To begin, the idea that man is not responsible for his own actions, since it is society to blame for his corruption, is utter nonsense. Each man, as an individual, is responsible for his actions.
  - i. It is correct to note that people sin, “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23). However, this is not caused by society. It is caused by a decision made to turn away from God, “The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the

righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him” (Eze. 18:20).

- ii. The Bible teaches that mankind has the choice of whether to turn toward sin or toward God, “There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it” (1 Cor. 10:13).
- b. Who is responsible for sin? Is society?
- i. In order to sin, man must make the choice to sin. It is not the fault of society that I choose to disobey God’s commandments. There is an endless stream of things to blame for our problems. When God created man, He created in them the ability to choose, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (Gen. 1:27).
  - ii. People seem to always be trying to find a reason why people are forced to make a certain choice. The truth is, we are all responsible for our choices. While good parenting will generally produce good children, this is not always the case. The same is true about bad parenting. Bad parents usually produce bad children, but not always. In the end, it boils down to the **choices** we make as individuals.
- c. The Bible does not buy into the “victimhood” mentality.
- i. There are various reasons for playing the “victim card,” but one of the main reasons Rousseau was so intent on it, was to avoid responsibility for his actions. If it is the fault of society for what I do, I am not responsible for my actions and can do whatever I wish because it is not my fault. It is easy to reverse the blame of my own actions onto society.
    - 1. One would do well to remember the time when King Saul tried to play the victim, “And he tarried seven days, according to the set time that Samuel had appointed: but Samuel came not to Gilgal; and the people were scattered from him. And Saul said, Bring hither a burnt offering to me, and peace offerings. And he offered the burnt offering. And it came to pass, that as soon as he had made an end of offering the burnt offering, behold, Samuel came; and Saul went out to meet him, that he might salute him. And Samuel said, What hast thou done? And Saul said, Because I saw that

the people were scattered from me, and that thou camest not within the days appointed, and that the Philistines gathered themselves together at Michmash; Therefore said I, The Philistines will come down now upon me to Gilgal, and I have not made supplication unto the LORD: I forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt offering” (1 Sam. 13:8-12).

2. Saul played the victim card and wanted sympathy for his disobedience to God. He claimed it wasn't really his fault, it was Samuel's because he wasn't there yet. What Saul didn't point out was it was his **choice** to sin, not someone else's.
- ii. When Israel was forced into captivity, they soothed themselves by believing it was the fault of their ancestors for their current state. However, the truth was they were suffering because they **chose** to continue in the sins of their ancestors
1. There was a proverb in Israel that said when a father ate sour grapes, his children's teeth were set on edge. By this proverb, the people meant that children inherited the sins of their fathers. Notice God's response: “As I live, saith the Lord GOD, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel” (Eze. 18:3).
  2. God then goes on to prove his point. Suppose a man lives righteously, then God will reward him for his righteousness. If that righteous man has a wicked son, the sins of the son will not affect the reward of the righteous man. Similarly, the righteousness of the wicked man's father will not benefit him. No matter how righteous your father is, his righteousness will not save you from your own sins.
  3. Continuing, suppose the wicked man has a righteous son. The same rules apply. The son is not held accountable for the wickedness of his father. Similarly, the wicked father cannot derive any benefit from his righteous son. Ezekiel 18:20 summarizes the rule: “The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.”
- iii. Sin has always been the result of man's **choice** to sin, “If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth

at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him” (Gen. 4:7).

1. As Joshua puts it, “Now therefore fear the LORD, and serve him in sincerity and in truth: and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt; and serve ye the LORD. And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD” (Jos. 24:14-15).
2. Man is accountable for his own individual actions, “But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons” (Col. 3:25). Rousseau’s “victimhood” ideology falls short when compared with God’s Word.

#### CONCLUSION:

1. While Rousseau’s work was (and still is by some) hailed as revolutionary in the realm of political science, one can easily find how flawed and pitiful it is when compared to the Word of God.
  - a. Mankind is **not** corrupted by society and absolved from his own personal responsibilities. Every individual is responsible for his actions and the choices he makes, “Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off” (Rom. 11:22).
  - b. Rousseau’s political ideology greatly influenced many radical thinkers after his time and even influences some still today in our “easily offended” generation. In a world of uncertainties and ever changing so-called “truths,” it can be difficult to discern right from wrong without a guide.
  - c. Thankfully, the Bible is our guiding light, even in this time of darkness, “Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path” (Psa. 119:105).
2. While it is true that all of mankind eventually makes the **choice** to sin (cf. Rom. 3:23), it is equally true that God has planned a way for man to be forgiven from sin.
  - a. His plan was formulated even before the world began, “To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Eph. 3:10-11).

- b. This plan would require the sacrifice of the life of Jesus on earth , “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. 2:9).
- c. God executed His plan and now offers forgiveness for all who will be obedient to His conditions. It is time for all of us to take responsibility for our actions and turn to God in obedience to rid ourselves of spiritual death in sin.

#### WORKS CITED

- Blum, Carol. *Rousseau and the Republic of Virtue: The Language of Politics in the French Revolution*. Cornell University Press, 1989. Print.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Penguin Books, 2011. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Roger D. Masters, Judith R. Masters, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *The First and Second Discourses*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile: Or on Education*. New York: Basic Books, 1979. Print.
- Shklar, Judith N. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Equality*. *Daedalus*, vol. 107, no. 3, The MIT Press, 1978, pp. 13–25, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20024561>.

# Thomas Paine: The Age of Reason

Bryan Braswell

## INTRODUCTION:

Thomas Paine was an American activist from England likely best known for his pamphlet titled *Common Sense* that stirred the desire for independence from European rule and taxation. Written in 1776, this document was accepted as one of the most important documents, next to the Bible itself to influence sentiments of freedom from the tyranny of England. *Common Sense* helped amplify emotions, leading up to and during the days of the American Revolution.

- 1) *Common Sense* was read to the troops of George Washington's army in the field, during the Revolution. Thomas Paine's influence helped tip our society over-board and to the point of no return regarding the desire to be a free nation. The war for independence would be codified by said influences. However, when he was imprisoned in Europe, he would write another (blasphemous) piece called *The Age of Reason* which would grant him no benefits, and that would be the primary concern of this outline.
  - a. The Bible is the root motive behind such movements of the day, having been loosed and set free from the chains of Catholicism and other Tyrants.
  - b. Historically, with the invention of the printing press, the *Enlightenment* period was cast. Now, with the means to create documents en masse, to send and deliver materials, the *enlightened* minds of men were being set free.
  - c. The Bible enjoyed in the original King James Version, and distributed abroad, freedom's cause was destined to be coursed as Jesus' principle is taught in John 8:31-32.
  - d. Many or most "Americans" of European decent were motivated by an eternal truth, which only the Bible reveals. The Bible is the word of God.
- 2) There is much to be said about the influences of the written word and its freeing application to one's life. Consider that eternal principle mentioned above in the book of John 8:31-22. Also, consider 1000 years before this, the principle "buy the truth and sell it not..." (cf., Pro. 23:23).
  - a. With the availability of parchments and papers to write on and the printing press, came a great freedom to read and ascertain facts. During the days of Thomas Paine many pulpiteers and prophets of

philosophy, and academics, fulfilled their desires to freely worship, to live, and to pursue happiness. None of this was stemmed without the God of the Bible.

- b. Many Men wrote with vigor.
- 3) Thomas Paine was a key influencer of the day. Yet, his motives are curious, based upon his many productions and treatises.
- 4) Lastly, we must see that true freedom is happily granted by the God of Heaven when we activate and keep his words.
  - a. This is contrasted with the many opinions of man's mind even today.
    - i. Maybe more so today because of the influences enabled by technology and the amplified ability to express thought through so many different platforms-means today.
    - ii. Herein is the balance of this discussion.
  - b. Therefore, we are to "preach the word," and nothing else according to 2 Timothy 4:2. *What a defining motive from God, and one that will keep us out of trouble if we can practice it with great discipline.*

#### DISCUSSION:

##### I. THOMAS PAINE'S CHARACTER CONCERNS

- a. Paine was an English-born political philosopher and writer who supported revolutionary causes not only in America, but also in Europe. It is sometimes difficult to impugn motives, but as a man who writes to influence, his intentions should be obvious.
- b. Modern-day articles about Paine attribute him as "the original publishing viral superstar." From this same source, data is given to supporting this, particularly as it pertains to *Common Sense*.
  - i. Note here: *"Common Sense sold 120,000 copies in its first three months, and by the end of the Revolution, 500,000 copies were sold. The estimated population of the Colonies (excluding its African-American and Native American populations) was 2.5 million. An estimated 20 percent of colonists owned a copy of the revolutionary booklet. In current-day sales, that would amount to sales of 60 million, not including overseas sales. Only a handful of books have sold more than 60 million copies in the past two centuries, and those books had the benefit of modern publishing outlets and promotion."*
- c. Relative to Paine's character, there is an outstanding fact: Though he is considered to be a Founding Father (by many) of the United States of America, such is not true.



- i. This is highly questionable in his actual historical role of the day.
- ii. (Shifting attention to his *Age of Reason*) One Author points out that:
 

*“While Paine’s Age of Reason gets a great deal of press from skeptics [today, BRB], misinformed separationists, and atheists of every stripe, almost no one mentions Boudinot’s book-length response [a response to T.P.’s Age of Reason, added here by BRB].*

  - 1. *Paine [is considered] an American Founding Father, and yet, unlike Paine, Boudinot actually served in a civil capacity in the United States. Paine’s only elective office was in France. Boudinot is a true American Founding Father. Paine had no role in the founding conventions of America and their documents. (The Age of Revelation, Forward by Gary DeMar, pg. viii).*
  - 2. The quote is taken from the book *The Age of Revelation* by Elias Boudinot, or *The Age of Reason Shewen [sic] to Be an Age of Infidelity* a response to Thomas Paine’s *The Age of Reason*.
  - 3. This is an important resource because it, like many resources in that day and age, quickly exposed Thomas Paine’s heresies.
- iii. We are late to the game today exposing Thomas Paine.
- iv. Those exalting him today are foolish for using him as an offence against the Bible.
- d. Thomas Paine’s problems were with himself and his use of logic or reason. One cannot help but see a sophistry bleeding through, with many fallacious arguments and principles demonstrated. His use of logic, to his own destruction, reasoning from his own experiences alone (elevating his own ego), is apparent and should be understood.
- e. Compare the principle of 2 Peter 3:16 regarding wresting *“the scriptures unto their own destruction.”* When we use logic/reason wrongfully, wrongfully our conclusions will be in life.

## II. THOMAS PAINE, A CONCISE LOOK AT HIS CHARACTER

- a. Thomas Paine was born in Thetford, Norfolk, Kingdom of Great Britain on February 9, 1737. There is some discrepancy surrounding this date due to the change from the (O.S) Julian calendar to the (N.S.) Gregorian calendar in European countries beginning in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.
- b. Thomas died on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 1809, at the age of 72. When he died, only six people are reported to have attended his funeral.
  - i. Because of his bitter and open criticisms, his prolific writings, (mostly in opposition to Christianity and the Bible), and in particular his attacks on very popular leaders (such as George Washington), and

his open advocacy for Deism, it is no surprise then at his death, Paine's death was not celebrated or honored.

- c. Thomas advocated Deism and denied the Bible as the inspired word of God as the Revelation of the Master for all of humanity.
  - i. His support for deism and his assertions which are still very typical today of such thinkers were based upon sole implications and inferences drawn from *the natural creation*, which are [then] only logically and sufficiently able to demonstrate that there is a *god* (cf., Rom. 1:19-20).
    - 1. However, natural creation and the order of the universe proves that there is a God but does not reveal the word or will of God to mankind (cf., Rom. 16:25-27).
    - 2. To *know* and *do* the will of the Eternal God, we must have special revelation.
    - 3. Paine's *special* reason (or attempts to prove his point of view like every other false teacher) existed only from these said origins, proving he only speaks from his own experiential causes, and not logically deduced principles from the Bible.
    - 4. This is the fundamental problem with Thomas Paine.
  - ii. The Bible is the only objective source we have to use in debate regarding this issue.
    - 1. It was then, and is today, the only information that can answer these questions.
    - 2. While Thomas Paine never demonstrates a profound understanding of the Bible's words in any of his writings, he does demonstrate surface (typical) observations in critique of the Bible's message.
- d. Paine's authorship of *Common Sense* (1776) and *The American Crisis* (1776-1783) catapulted his popularity and made him a most popular influencer leading to the Independence of the American colonies, such that we still enjoy to this day.
  - i. These two pieces did have much influence in instigating the American Revolution.
  - ii. The Declaration of Independence from Great Britain, and his enlightened ideals encouraged principles of freedom we enjoy today in the United States of America.
  - iii. However, many during that day were hungering and thirsting for freedom.
  - iv. Our history proves this.

- e. From another source, quoting Thomas Jefferson and giving context to Paine's influence of his day, one notes here:
- i. *"In his later years, Paine would become a controversial figure because of his writings on religion and his role in the French revolution; only a handful of people attended his funeral in 1809. President Thomas Jefferson had permitted Paine to return from France in his final years and wrote about the author in 1821. 'No writer has exceeded Paine in ease and familiarity of style, in perspicuity of expression, happiness of elucidation, and in simple and unassuming language,' Jefferson said. 'In this he may be compared with Dr. Franklin; and indeed his Common Sense was, for a while, believed to have been written by Dr. Franklin, and published under the borrowed name of Paine, who had come over with him from England.'* [Continuing the quote] *At the time, it was still a crime in England to publish any sections of Common Sense."*
  - ii. This is a very telling quote. Paine being confused with Benjamin Franklin as the author of *Common Sense* may have had as much to do with its popularity as the content of the material itself.
  - iii. In other words, Benjamin Franklin was heralded as a hero whereas Thomas Paine was more obscure in this country at this time.
- f. His emigration to the colonies did not take place till 1774, and apparently happened with the help of Benjamin Franklin. This puts Paine in this country at a most sensitive time.
- i. The sentiments of rebellion by the loyalists to England and those of patriotism were the two common persuasions of the day:
    1. Those that desired to be free from tyranny and taxation from England, and...
    2. Those that desired the freedom from religious dominance by either the Catholic or Church of England's control:
    3. *These two differing yet ripe motives in this country were festering when he arrived.*
- g. Incidentally, Thomas Paine returned to Europe and stays in France for most of the 1790's.
- i. There he played a key role in the French Revolution.
    1. While in France, he wrote the *Rights of Man* (1791), which, in essence, argued for the right of the people to overthrow governments.
    2. In 1792 opponents such as William Pitt the Younger, worrying that the French Revolution would spread to the Kingdom of Britain, began his effort to quench Paine's works, calling his philosophies radical.

- a. Sometime in 1792, a warrant or written request was authored seeking Paine's arrest. Fleeing Britain back to France, he would be elected to the French National Convention.
  - b. He did not have overwhelming support in France.
  - c. There would be a debate over his citizenship - whether he is a U.S. or British (English) citizen.
  - d. Because of his *Rights of Man*, he was granted honorary citizenship in France; but others from the U.S. were also granted the honor: Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin.
- 3. Another interesting point relative to Paine's citizenship in this world, is that he was only seemingly granted citizenship in America by the "Colony of Pennsylvania."
  - a. He likely was a natural born citizen of England, but did he renounce that, or did he have it revoked due to his writings?
  - b. It is something to consider here for the Christian.
  - c. Consider our eternal citizenship, never in question, and one that provides great stability to our welfare. When we know where our citizenship is, which is in heaven according to the Bible, we will not be disturbed or troubled by such concerns here in this world (cf., Phi. 3:20).
- h. In December of 1793 Paine was arrested and imprisoned in Luxembourg-Prison in Paris.
  - i. It seems to be here that he began work on *The Age of Reason*. His conflicts with society and experiences must have created must antagonism within Paine.
  - ii. James Monroe, a future president of the United States, used his diplomatic influences to have Paine released from prison in 1794.
  - iii. However, Paine did not return to the United States until 1802-1803.
    - 1. Paine adopted the attitude that The U.S. betrayed and abandoned France during their Revolution.
    - 2. In his open letter to George Washington, he would argue, that the U.S. could *not* have succeeded in their fight for independence without the aid of France.
- i. Therefore, on a world level, I argue that Thomas Paine was troubled by too much in this physical life, that led to the neglect of his own spiritual welfare.

- i. A bitter man developed within Paine's soul.
- ii. Jesus said, "by their fruits you shall know them," and Paine's fruits are well defined.
- iii. The Proverbs writer forever says:

*"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed: but he that feareth the commandment shall be rewarded. The law of the wise is a fountain of life, to depart from the snares of death. Good understanding giveth favour: but the way of transgressors is hard. Every prudent man dealeth with knowledge: but a fool layeth open his folly" (Pro. 13:13-16).*

### III. THOMAS PAINE'S REAL PAIN: HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD GOD

- a. Everyone reasons from a motive, and that motive is developed and shaped by world influences or one's own environmental circumstances.
  - i. Every person who is honest should analyze where those motives stem from in their lives.
  - ii. The Bible offers man a way to escape bad reasoning and impure motives, and to develop pure motives and unity by the truth.
  - iii. But without the Bible, man's motives *will* be corrupt.
- b. Relative to Paine's motives, one source pointed out Paine's time in prison, when he began his work on the *Age of Reason*, which was published as a series of pamphlets in 1794, 1795, and 1807.
  - i. **The *Age of Reason* was simply an argument against faith and in favor of reason** [Bold emphasis, BRB], stating the Bible was a piece of literature written by men rather than a divine text.
  - ii. Paine saw corruption in the Bible and the organized Christian churches of the day.
  - iii. The *Age of Reason* was received in the United States, England, and France.
    - 1. Note, his arguments over "faith" and "reason" are easily dismantled. If one knows the Bible, true faith is not and cannot be separated from true reason. (Cf., Rom. 10:17; Heb. 11:1).
    - 2. God is the true reason, and His will or words, expressed by holy men of God, cannot be negated from reason. Therefore, our faith is founded.
    - 3. Thomas Paine did not have faith; therefore, one might conclude that he was a very unreasonable man, not having the word of God abiding in his heart (cf. 2 The. 3:2).
- c. Consider what the apostle Peter tells us in 2 Peter 1:15-21:

*“Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able to after my decease to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”*

- d. Therefore, the Bible, and Paine’s arguments cannot be harmonized.
  - i. Either one is true or the other, but both cannot be true.
    - 1. Paine is a presumptuous man who stands opposed to the core truth of God.
    - 2. The Bible, though beaten, marred, scarred, perverted, twisted/wrested, lied about, added to and subtracted from, the Bible, amazingly, has not lost its veracity.
  - ii. Though claims of the Bible being corrupted, mutilated, and manipulated abound, these claims are all destroyed against the Rock that has stood the test of time.
    - 1. It is a grinding stone against which many men have destroyed themselves trying to outsmart God.
    - 2. Thomas Paine has gone to his reward, but the Bible is still with us today, being exercised by a few men honestly, still encouraging men to prepare for the rewards of eternity!
    - 3. Men will come and go, but the word of God will endure forever (Cf., Mat. 24:35; Jho. 12:48-50).
- e. One interesting fact of history surrounding Paine’s death and burial should be considered.
  - i. When he died in 1809 in Greenwich Village, New York City, at the age of 72, his last will decreed that his body should be buried in the Quaker graveyard (T.P.’s father was a Quaker).
  - ii. However, the Quaker community would not allow it, so he was buried instead under a Walnut tree on his farm in New Rochelle.
    - 1. In 1819, an English journalist named William Cobbett arranged for Paine’s bones to be exhumed and transported back to England with the intent to rebury them there.

2. However, this never happened. When the journalist died the remains of Paine were still in his possession.
  3. To this day, Thomas Paine's remains have been lost to history with no sound evidence of where they might reside.
- iii. This interesting because only one Being knows the answer to where his remains are, and that is the God of Heaven, *Who* will resurrect all the dead at the last day, and at that point there will be no more argument from anyone over God's Word versus the corrupt will of mankind or where any man's remains were and will be (cf., Jho. 5:28-29).
- f. It would be good to quote *Paine's own words and what his religious beliefs were*, and such are profoundly available.
- i. (Before I give concise and adequate quotes for this paper, I want to call attention to his use of personal pronouns and his positions based upon in his own opinions.)
    1. What we record here is blasphemy against the Bible.
    2. However, without hesitancy, we could show (and we will do so as concisely as possible within this treatise) by evidence and little aid outside of itself, the Bible is the Word of God. It will stand the test of time. It is eternal (cf., Mat. 24:35 Et. Al.).
  - ii. Taken from Wikipedia on 11/29/2021, the section on Thomas Paine records concisely his own words and his religious views, which should be very telling for the honest Bible student and academic student of history.
    1. Taken from this source in brackets; [*Thomas Paine; et al. (1824). The Theological Works of Thomas Paine. R. Carlile. p. 31. Archived from the original on October 16, 2015. Retrieved July 1, 2015.*] we quote a few lines from Thomas' own work in *The Age of Reason*:

*"I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life...I do not believe in the creed professed by the Jewish church, by the Roman church, by the Greek church, by the Turkish church, by the Protestant church, nor by any church that I know of. **My own mind is my own church.** All national institutions of churches, whether Jewish, Christian or Turkish, appear to me no other than human inventions, set up to terrify and enslave mankind, **and monopolize power and profit...**Whenever we read the obscene stories, the voluptuous debaucheries, the cruel and tortuous executions, the unrelenting vindictiveness with which more than half the Bible is filled, it would be more*

***consistent that we call it the word of a demon than the word of God. It is a history of wickedness that has served to corrupt and brutalize mankind; and, for my part, I sincerely detest it, as I detest everything that is cruel.***  
[Bold emphasis added by BRB].

- g. Obviously, Paine was struggling with the effects of cruel and torturous events, in his very own and historical experiences, from organized false religions and creeds of men of the day.
  - i. However, he inadequately assigns the Bible as the motive behind it all. *I wonder how much of a Bible student he ever really was, if any.*
  - ii. His bitterness is what I'd like to mention here.
    - 1. Note how he attributes so much of the world's problems to "organized" religion of his day.
    - 2. Much of what his arguments state are the same used today if you pay attention to modern day academics, universities, humanists, and politicians. They are all an interesting *Red Herring* in logic, but not a new illogical problem.
- h. Though Paine asserts the Bible is the stem of false religion, it does not imply that the Bible is false.
  - i. If, as Paine argued, organized religion is the problem, then would not that mean (logically deduced) that the individuals who formed their religious organization (that promoted and produced cruel and tortuous events) are the problem, and not the Bible?
  - ii. If there were divisions in the religious world, and there were, and there still are today, does sound logic conclude that the Bible is the reason?
  - iii. The argument is like those who advocate and argue the evil of guns.
    - 1. Are guns evil because someone kills another person with a gun? How many people handle guns very honestly every day and never kill anyone?
    - 2. Guns are a tool.
      - a. The Bible is our instrument, but if man handles inaccurately, then it is not the Bible that has caused cruel and tortuous events. It is evil and cruel men that mishandle the Bible, or the gun.
      - b. Therefore, the Bible instructs us to handle it precisely and carefully, and if we do not, we will not be approved of (or by) God (Cf., 2 Tim. 2:15). This is such a fundamental truth regarding the Bible.



- i. In his discourse, *The Age of Reason*, Paine “advocated Deism, promoted reason and freethought, and argued against institutionalized religions in general and the Christian doctrine in particular.”

#### IV. HISTORICAL MOMENTS IN HIS LIFE THAT POTENTIALLY SHAPED HIS CHARACTER AND ATTITUDE

- a. “[O]n September 27, 1759, Paine married Mary Lambert. His business collapsed soon after. Mary became pregnant; and, after they moved to Margate, she went into early labor, in which she and their child died.”
- b. He went into business elsewhere in a tobacco shop, married a second time, and failed at both.
- c. His apprenticed business as a young man was as his father’s, a “stay-maker” which pertains to the fitted and anatomically accurate wearing of corsets.
  - i. Corset makers were specialist tailors. Known by the French equivalent terms corsetier (male) and corsetière (female), the stay-maker is an obsolete name for a corset maker.
    - 1. Thomas’ father was an expert stay-maker.
      - a. Who knows, but with these kinds of events shaping his character at an earlier age in his life, the collapse of businesses, the death of his first wife and child, failure of his second marriage, one must wonder.
    - 2. As noted, the best corset makers are highly skilled tailors with a knowledge of anatomy that enables them to make well-fitting, long-lasting corsets.
- d. We mention these points in closing to give some humanity to Paine’s life away from all the political rhetoric.
  - i. A man’s homelife is his core life.
  - ii. It is a biblical argument for one’s character to state, “the apple doesn’t fall far from the tree” (cf., 1 Jho. 2:29).
  - iii. I have not investigated deeply into Paine’s personal background or researched his father’s characteristics, but I know his father was a Quaker.
  - iv. I know that Paine was not an unintelligent person based upon his skills and his ability to write well.
    - 1. If you read his *Common Sense*, and I have and I have listened to an oral reading of *The Age of Reason*, you will observe Paine’s thought patterns and themes.
    - 2. This is a way to exercise a few principles the Bible teaches us to exercise: (1) Patience, being swift to hear and slow to speak, which then you can (2) [Choice] judge more

righteously, and therefore (3) [Understand accurately] define the fruits of life (cf., Jas. 1:18-21; Jho. 7:24; Mat. 7:16).

- e. Without going into extensive details from Paine's *Age of Reason*, I have simply tried to dismantle fundamentally the core-objective factors.
  - i. It should not take a constitution of great length to expose error.
  - ii. Falsehoods are always in contradiction to laws or principles, which are true.
  - iii. When we analyze the Bible, its principles and laws are eternal—they are time tested and stamped, proven true.
  - iv. Our lives will always be harmonious emotionally, spiritually, and physically if we tune our hearts to God's.
  - v. That has been the proven fruit of any and every society that has obliged God's word.
  - vi. The Bible is such a precious jewel. It is so intact and unmarred by man's evil attempts to destroy it.
  - vii. All arguments against it will fail with the evidence abundant.
  - viii. Thomas Paine was a failure, but our faith will be our victory (1 Jho. 5:1-5).

#### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Solomon ended the book of Ecclesiastes:

*"And moreover, because the preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yea, he gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs. The preacher sought to find out acceptable words: and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd. And further, by these, my son, be admonished: of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh. Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Ecc. 12:9-14).*

2. And, as the apostle John recorded relative to life of our Master and Savior:

*"This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written everyone, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen" (Jho. 21:24-25).*

3. Our best enterprising efforts will be in learning and knowing the Bible, trying, and testing its principles in our life.

- a. The Bible's message when rightly handled and accepted as it is, the word of God, and not the words of mere mortal men, which it proves to be, all sufficient and able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work, mankind will be blessed, and the world will be a better, freer place to live.
- b. Examine deeply all your life the immortal words of our Creator.
- c. He is at the door. We must knock. He will open, and as we stay hungry, He will nourish us all the days of our lives.

#### WORKS CITED

Online article: (<https://constitutioncenter.org/blog/thomas-paine-the-original-publishing-viral-superstar-2>)

*The Age of Revelation or The Age of Reason Shewn to Be An Age of Infidelity* by Elias Boudinot, L.L.D. and directors of the Mint of the United States. Philadelphia: Published by Asbury Dickins, Opposite Christ-Church. Hugh Maxwell, Printer, Columbia-House. 1801 (originally)

Wikipedia – referred to in the text. ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas\\_Paine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Paine))

Paine, Thomas (2014). "Of the Religion of Deism Compared with the Christian Religion, and the Superiority of the Former over the Latter (1804)". In Calvert, Jane E.; Shapiro, Ian (eds.). *Selected Writings of Thomas Paine. Rethinking the Western Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press. pp. 568–574.  
doi:10.12987/9780300210699-018 (inactive October 31, 2021). ISBN 9780300167450. Archived from the original on August 27, 2016. Retrieved August 7, 2021.

Gary Summers Published Articles From 2011, *Spiritual Perspectives* Published by the South Seminole Church of Christ, 5410 Lake Howell Rd. Winter Park, FL 32792-1097 Contact: Office: (407) 657-0657 Home: (407) 681-8807; (garywsummers@gmail.com)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mDd0wYDD2ew> (Video Documentary about Thomas Paine)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G5SpliLcV5I> (Video of Audio Reading of *The Age of Reason*)

# Soren Kierkegaard: Journals and Discourses

Israel Rodriguez

## INTRODUCTION:

1. How strange the details of our existence. We neither asked to be born, nor did we have a choice in the circumstances of our birth, yet we awake to a world full of mystery and intrigue, wholly dependent upon our powers of thought and observation for guidance. Driven by a spirit of inquiry, we instinctively set out to acquire true knowledge through practical insight and external study by methodical research and reflection in ethics, attempting to discover the events of our origin and the meaning of our existence.
2. In time, humanity's love of knowledge, pursuit of wisdom and systematic efforts to understand themselves and the world around them would be described as "philosophy" (from the Greek terms *philo*, "loving" and *sophia*, "knowledge, wisdom"). Three senses of philosophy would gradually emerge (WordNet).
  - a. "A belief (or system of beliefs) accepted as authoritative by some group or school."
  - b. "The rational investigation of questions about existence and knowledge and ethics."
  - c. "Any personal belief about how to live or how to deal with a situation."
2. In mankind's philosophical quest for answers to life's conundrums, the story of Adam and Eve, as recorded for us in the first few chapters of the Book of Genesis, is significant. As indicated by the circumstances of our first parents in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2.7-9, 15-17, 21-22, 25), the test of mankind's freedom centered on his and her power of cognition ("The mental process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses," New Oxford American Dictionary). When Adam and Eve chose to disobey God by eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil this resulted in a type of moral cognition characteristic of God and illegally acquired by mankind (Genesis 3.5, 7, 22). Instead of humbly submitting themselves to God, learning to trust and depend upon Him, Adam and Eve allowed themselves to be seduced and beguiled by Satan, who had convinced them to misappropriate the knowledge of God (cf. 2 Samuel 14.17, 20). Hence, the fall of mankind, the very first story of the Bible, discloses its underlying theme—*humanity's attempt to acquire true knowledge (the knowledge of God, specifically the knowledge of life and how one ought to live) apart from God.*
3. Though separated from the fall of mankind by thousands of years, humanity still struggles with the perverted desire of "leaning on [one's] own understanding," as opposed to "acknowledging [God] in all [their] ways that He may direct [their] paths" (Proverbs 3.5–6). Many people having "a zeal for God, but not according to

knowledge, being ignorant of [His] righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, [do] not subject themselves to the righteousness of God” (Romans 10.2-3). Therefore, did the apostle Paul caution, “Take heed lest there shall be anyone that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men [*humanism*], after the rudiments of the world [*materialism*], and not after Christ [*sensualism*]” (Colossians 2.8; explanation added).

4. In due course, as genuine philosophical thought arose in many cultures roughly contemporaneously, what German philosopher Karl Jaspers termed an Axial Age in human thought (beginning around the 7th century and concluding around the 3rd century BC), philosophers of every stripe would arise. Among the numerous and notable philosophers that appeared was a man by the name of Søren Aabye Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard was a brilliant, gloomy, anxiety ridden, hilarious nineteenth century Danish theologian, poet, social critic, and religious author who lived most of his life alone. He was born on May 5, 1813, in Copenhagen, Denmark to an immensely wealthy family, and was the youngest of seven children. Life was unkind to Kierkegaard, as he was extremely frail and sickly, and by the time he was twenty-two had lost all his siblings except an older brother named Peter Christian. Death was constantly around him from an early age and was to obsess him throughout his career. In a sense, death was his only theme. Kierkegaard died on November 11, 1855, from an excruciating spinal disease at the age of 42.
5. These traumatic experiences not only soured Kierkegaard, earning him the title “the melancholy Dane,” but drove him to a passionate production of books (thirty-eight works in two parallel series of pseudonymous and signed works) over fifteen years. As a profound thinker, who possessed an elegant and brilliant style of writing, and could articulate his thoughts well, he was sometimes called a “poet–philosopher.” Kierkegaard did not write to make money, as his father was a wealthy merchant in Denmark and left him a healthy inheritance, but to save himself (and he thought) humanity from the horror of life.
6. Kierkegaard is widely considered to be the “father of existentialism” (though he did not coin the term nor describe himself in that manner), because he often discussed the “existing individual” and devoted considerable attention to articulating its special character. As the term itself suggests, existentialism (notice the word “existence” in “existentialism”), is a philosophy or ethical theory of human existence.
  - a. Existentialism is derived from the Danish term *existents-forhold*, which means “condition of existence,” a phrase frequently used by Kierkegaard, and is generally defined as, “A philosophical theory or approach which emphasizes the existence of the individual person as a free and responsible agent determining their own development through acts of the will” [“Generally taken to originate with Kierkegaard and Nietzsche,

existentialism tends to be atheistic (although there is a strand of Christian existentialism deriving from the work of Kierkegaard), to disparage scientific knowledge, and to deny the existence of objective values, stressing instead the reality and significance of human freedom and experience. The approach was developed chiefly in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Europe, notably by Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, and Simone de Beauvoir.”] (The New Oxford American Dictionary).

- b. A more specific definition, though it leaves much to be desired, is, “As originally defined by Simone de Beauvoir and Jean-Paul Sartre [twentieth-century French philosophers, along with Albert Camus, who founded the philosophy of existentialism], existentialism is the ethical theory that we ought to treat the freedom at the core of human existence as intrinsically valuable and the foundation of all other values” (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; explanation added).
  - c. In *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre* Walter Kaufmann gives us, perhaps, the most elaborate and insightful definition of existentialism (if indeed the word “definition” can be used seeing it defies existential thinking), “Existentialism is not a philosophy, but a label for several widely different revolts against traditional philosophy. Most of the living ‘existentialists’ have repudiated this label, and a bewildered outsider might well conclude that the only thing they have in common is a marked aversion to each other. To add to the confusion, many writers of the past have frequently been hailed as members of this movement, and it is extremely doubtful whether they would have appreciated the company to which they were consigned. In view of this, it might be argued that the label ‘existentialism’ ought to be abandoned altogether. Certainly, existentialism is not a school of thought nor reducible to any set of tenets. The three writers who appear invariably in every list of ‘existentialists’—Jaspers, Heidegger, and Sartre—are not in agreement on essentials. Such alleged precursors as Pascal and Kierkegaard differed from all three men by being dedicated Christians; and Pascal was a Catholic of sorts while Kierkegaard was a Protestant. If...Nietzsche and Dostoevsky are included in the fold, we must make room for an impassioned anti-Christian and even a more fanatical Greek-Orthodox Russian imperialist. By the time we consider adding Rilke, Kafka, and Camus, it becomes plain that one essential feature shared by all these men was their perfervid individualism” (Kaufmann 86-87).
7. Kierkegaard was reared a Lutheran and vehemently attacked Christendom (what he called the herd, the mob, people who do not make decisions but go along with the flow of the crowd, people who did what they were supposed to do)

represented primarily by the Danish National Church. When denouncing the State Church of Denmark and religious establishments, in general, Kierkegaard often left the impression of an agnostic. Karl Popper (a 20<sup>th</sup>-century Austrian-British philosopher) referred to Kierkegaard as “the great reformer of Christian ethics, who exposed the official Christian morality of his day as anti-Christian and anti-humanitarian hypocrisy” (Popper 406).

## DISCUSSION:

### I. A SUMMARY OF KIERKEGAARDIAN PHILOSOPHY

- A. The sheer breadth and complexity of Kierkegaard’s philosophy would be impossible to summarize in a seven-to-fifteen-page chapter. Nevertheless, we will attempt to distill the essence of his philosophy considering some of his core teachings.
- B. ***Kierkegaardian philosophy is purposefully elusive, seductively appealing to one’s curiosity, carefully blending half-truths with error (Col. 2:8).*** To begin, we notice that much of Kierkegaard’s philosophy is cryptic and contradictory. Interestingly, we are told this is by design.
  1. In Kierkegaard’s *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, as he considers how so many celebrated names and figures of his day have sought to make life easier and easier, he recounts for us how he came to the idea that he ought to make things more difficult—“So there I sat and smoked my cigar until I drifted into thought. Among other thoughts, I recall these. ‘You are getting on in years,’ I said to myself, ‘and are becoming an old man without being anything and without actually undertaking anything.’ On the other hand, wherever you look in literature or in life, you see the names and figures of celebrities, the prized and highly acclaimed people, prominent or much discussed, the many benefactors of the age who know how to benefit humankind by making life easier and easier...then suddenly this thought crossed my mind: ‘You must do something, but since with your limited capabilities it will be impossible to make anything easier than it has become, you must, with the same humanitarian enthusiasm as the others have, take it upon yourself to make something more difficult.’ This idea pleased me enormously; it also flattered me that for this effort I would be loved and respected, as much as anyone else, by the entire community” (Hong 188–189).
  2. Kierkegaard would later explain concerning his writing, “Thus it is left to the reader to put it all together by himself, if he so pleases, but nothing is done for a reader's comfort” (Hong ix).
  3. As to why Kierkegaard presented his philosophy in such elusive and ambiguous writing...

- a. First, he tells us in his *Journals and Papers*, “The task must be made difficult, for only the difficult inspires the noble-hearted” (Ibid.).
  - b. Second, working from the premise that Christendom is an enormous illusion, and believing that most people in Christendom are Christians only in imagination, Kierkegaard believed one had to communicate indirectly (ironically) in order to destroy the illusion—“No, an illusion can never be destroyed directly, and only by indirect means can it be radically removed...That is, one must approach from behind the person who is under an illusion” (Mullen 36).
4. “Kierkegaard writes in a remarkably varied way. Some of his philosophy is in fact almost a parody of the Hegelian form with all the Hegelian language and its obscurity. Much of his philosophy, especially the stuff that he writes just for himself, is aphoristic, it’s very simple, it’s almost like little sayings and reminders about how one should live one’s life. But the idea is as we read this stuff and as we become more and more moved, as good readers always are, by the emotions of the author, what we find is that we become seduced and that’s a language that Kierkegaard takes very seriously. You can’t argue someone into religion. You can’t argue someone into existence. But what you can do is you can provide them with enough of the sensibility, so that what you do is you get them of their own volition to come along with you. That’s what seduction is all about and what Kierkegaard is doing to us, as Camus does to us in *The Fall*, he’s seducing us into joining him in his way of thinking” (Solomon).
- C. ***Kierkegaardian philosophy attacks the sanctity of marriage and the establishment of the home, the bedrock of morality (Gen. 2:22-24; Eph. 6:1-4).*** Kierkegaard mocked the notion that one could ever fuse romantic love with marriage, that one could have passion and sex and at the same time, children, stability, and routine. He respected both, he just did not believe you could have them both at the same time in a cozy marriage sanctified by the state and the neighborhoods (Botton).
- D. ***Kierkegaardian philosophy attacks traditional godly values (Ecc. 7:29; Jer. 6:16; cf. Tit. 2:1-10).*** In two of the more popular and profound works of Kierkegaard, *Either/Or* and *Fear and Trembling*, what he wants us to do above all else is wake up and give up our cozy sentimental illusions. Within these works he systematically attacks the pillars of modern life (Botton):
1. Our faith in family
  2. Our trust in work
  3. Our attachment to love
  4. Our general sense that life has purpose and meaning.



- E. ***Kierkegaardian philosophy attacks the wisdom of God (Job 28:1-28; Pro. 1:7; 9:10).*** Kierkegaard's enemies were the pretentious well-to-do, particularly the prosperous Danish elegant bourgeoisie, and the members of the established Danish church. He tells us, "When I became an adult, when I opened my eyes and saw actuality, then I started to laugh and have never stopped laughing since that time. I saw that the meaning of life was to make a living, its goal to become a councilor, that the rich delight of love was to acquire a well-to-do girl, that the blessedness of friendship was to help each other in financial difficulties, that wisdom was whatever the majority assumed it to be, that enthusiasm was to give a speech, that courage was to risk being fined ten dollars, that cordiality was to say 'May it do you good' after a meal, that piety was to go to communion once a year. This I saw, and I laughed" (Hong 42–43).
- F. Everywhere he turned, Kierkegaard saw intolerable incompatibilities and impossible choices. This led him to one memorable explosion in *Either/Or*—"Marry, and you will regret it. Do not marry, and you will also regret it. Marry or do not marry, you will regret it either way. Whether you marry or you do not marry, you will regret it either way. Laugh at the stupidities of the world, and you will regret it; weep over them, and you will also regret it. Laugh at the stupidities of the world or weep over them, you will regret it either way. Whether you laugh at the stupidities of the world or you weep over them, you will regret it either way. Trust a girl, and you will regret it. Do not trust her, and you will also regret it. Trust a girl or do not trust her, you will regret it either way. Whether you trust a girl or do not trust her, you will regret it either way. Hang yourself, and you will regret it. Do not hang yourself and you will also regret it. Hang yourself or do not hang yourself, you will regret it either way. Whether you hang yourself or do not hang yourself, you will regret it either way. *This, gentlemen, is the quintessence of all the wisdom of life*" (Hong 43–44; emphasis added).
- G. ***Kierkegaardian philosophy attacks the meaning of life (The Book of Ecclesiastes and its conclusion in 12:13–14).*** Key to Kierkegaard's philosophy is the only intelligent tactical response to life's horror is to laugh defiantly at it. One book that fascinated the existentialists was Kierkegaard's, *The Concept of Anxiety*, published in 1844, in which he emphasized a new word, "angst," a condition where we understand how many choices we face, and how little understanding we can ever have of how to exercise these choices wisely. As Kierkegaard wrote, "Philosophy is perfectly right in saying that life must be understood backward. But then one forgets the other clause—that it must be lived forward. The more one thinks through this clause, the more one concludes that life in temporality never becomes properly understandable, simply because never at any time does one get perfect repose to take a stance—backward" (Hong 12). Our constant angst means that unhappiness is a natural part of life, as Constantin Constantius observed,

“Anyone who has painstakingly pondered the matter will certainly agree with me that it has never been granted to a human being in his whole life, not even for as much as a half hour, to be absolutely satisfied in every conceivable way” (Hong 109). “No one has come into the world without weeping. No one asks when one wants to come in; no one asks when one wants to go out” (Hong 40). “How empty and meaningless life is.—We bury a man; we accompany him to the grave, throw three spadefuls of earth on him; we ride out in a carriage, ride home in a carriage; we find consolation in the thought that we have a long life ahead of us. But how long is seven times ten years? Why not settle it all at once...” (Hong 41).

- H. “In his journals Kierkegaard writes as a young man, ‘What I seek is a truth for which I can live and die.’ The idea of the ethically existing individual as opposed to the merely objective individual (the notion of existence is essential to Kierkegaard) has to do with taking control of one’s life, making decisions, being passionate, understanding the drama of life. Kierkegaard distinguishes between really existing and what he calls merely so-called existence. There is a sense in which everyone exists. In fact, inanimate objects like a desk or a cup, have existence, but not in a very interesting sense. Humans exist in a very different way, and it is not just because we are conscious, because consciousness can easily be tranquilized into a mere kind of herd mentality, but rather we exist because we are passionate, because we make decisions, because we in some sense have taken control of our life, and Kierkegaard makes the rather rude distinction between such people and the herd, the mob, the general run of Christendom, people who in fact do not make decisions, people who in fact go along with the flow of the crowd, people who do what they are supposed to do...Kierkegaard gives a little analogy of two horse riders, one hanging on to an untamed stallion committing himself to hanging on (i.e., taking risks and chances) compared to one who falls asleep in a hay wagon simply going along for the ride (i.e., people asleep at the wheel, most people do what the crowd tells them to do, they do what they are supposed to do, with no excitement in their lives)” (Solomon).
- I. Kierkegaard believed that the existence of God could not be proven by reason. Therefore, he maintained that it was not rational to believe in God, but rather that one should have faith in God even if it seems to reason an absurdity. For Kierkegaard Christianity was a paradox. Many have described his reasoning along these lines as a “leap of faith” (though Kierkegaard himself never used this phrase)—“a blind leap, a close-your-eyes kind of moment or series of moments where, in the face of insufficient evidence, you somehow trust God with your life anyway” (Bohlinger). “Recall the objective uncertainty one confronts in becoming subjective. By turning ‘inward’ I confront the issue of commitment: I have to choose what shape to give my life as it continues, and those choices matter in that there is no undoing their effects. Moreover, I cannot now know what effects those

choices will really have and so I must choose under conditions of ignorance. If I am wishy-washy and dither—evading the issue of choice—then I am committing myself to a dithering life and this too is a form of despair. Alternatively, I can go ‘all in,’ skating myself decisively to something (or someone—marriage is a good example of the kind of commitment at issue). But doing this requires *faith*, since the ‘success’ of those decisions depends on factors well beyond anything I can control or make happen. That is why Kierkegaard says that ‘faith is precisely the contradiction between the infinite passion of the individual’s inwardness and the objective uncertainty.’ Faith is a kind of willingness to let things matter while acknowledging one’s inability to eliminate that uncertainty” (Cerbone 22-23).

- J. ***Kierkegaardian philosophy attacks the Christian System, wherein salvation can be found only in the church of Christ (Mat. 16:18; Acts 4:12; 1 Cor. 3:11; Eph. 1:22-23; 4:4-6; Rom. 16:16).*** “Kierkegaard says there is no correct form of Christianity, and because he so deemphasizes ritual and social institutions, there is no true church, there is no correct way to behave, but it remains completely within, it is the religious person themselves who must decide what kind of religion is suitable for him or her” (Solomon).

## II. THE MANIFESTATION OF KIERKEGAARDIAN PHILOSOPHY TODAY

1. ***Radical Individualism***—One of the ways we see Kierkegaardian philosophy manifesting itself today is in the varied freethinking expressions of our younger generations—“You do you,” “Let me do me,” “YOLO” (“You only live once”). These, and other similar expressions, capture one of the primary tenets of Kierkegaardian philosophy that emphasizes moral individualism. “Existentialism holds that there is no basic and given ‘human nature’ that is common to all people, and so each person must define *individually* what humanity means to them and what values or purpose will dominate in their lives” (Mastin; emphasis added). Simply put, existentialism is about individualism, which begins with a contrast between the ideal pattern set out for us by God and what we actually are. It is a radical (from its etymological sense as an “attack at the roots”) critique and departure from prior tradition, as one seeks to become a “specific individual human being.”
2. ***Rampant Relativism***—Another way we see Kierkegaardian philosophy manifesting itself today is in the wildly popular belief that there is no absolute standard by which one can measure his or her life. What this means is we are all left to ourselves to decide how we should live. This belief is often conveyed through such statements as, “That’s just your interpretation (or opinion),” “You have your beliefs, I have mine,” “Let’s just agree to disagree.” “For existentialism, the lesson of modernity is that the world has nothing to offer in terms of determining or validating any way we might try to understand ourselves and our place in the world. No story about who we are or why

we are here can ever be shown to be the ‘right’ story. The conclusion the existentialist draws is that there *is no deep truth about the kind of beings we are*...We are beings for whom there is no fact of the matter about who we are. We are beings who strive to understand ourselves and our place in the world without there being any way of validating that self-understanding by appealing to how the world is. Sometimes this idea is summarized by saying that we are *self-interpreting beings*” (Cerbone 6–8).

3. ***Bleak Nihilism***—Kierkegaardian philosophy is also seen in modern day shades of *skepticism* (“Doubt as to the truth of something,” New Oxford American Dictionary) and *agnosticism* (“Nothing can be known of the existence or nature of God beyond material phenomena,” New Oxford American Dictionary) that tends to a kind of bleak nihilism. In other words, because true knowledge is difficult (if not impossible), and Christianity is paradoxical, then people often find themselves committing to a way of life they do not fully comprehend. “The distinctively modern picture of human beings as cast into a meaningless world without any preordained aim or purpose forms the backdrop to existentialism” (Cerbone 6). Simply put, if knowledge is impossible, then human values are baseless, which means life is pointless.
4. ***Pernicious Pluralism***—Religious pluralism is another way we see Kierkegaardian philosophy manifested today. As Kierkegaard believed there was no correct form of Christianity, and because he so deemphasized ritual and social institutions, the belief that one religion is just as acceptable as another, or that it does not matter how one worships God, or what god one should worship in the first place for that matter, can in many ways be traced back to Kierkegaard.

### III. A REFUTATION OF KIERKEGAARDIAN PHILOSOPHY

#### A. *The False Doctrine of Individualism.*

1. The Bible categorically denies the claim that there is no basic and given “human nature” that is common to all people, so that each person must define *individually* what humanity means to them and what values or purpose will dominate in their lives. In fact, the Bible emphatically declares just the opposite. Human beings are created in God’s “image” and “likeness” (Gen. 1:27). Thus, mankind is not left to him or herself to decide *what* they are in order to discover *who* they are. Contrary to existential thinking existence does not precede essence.
2. Created in God’s image and likeness means humans are representative figures that resemble God’s nature. But in what way are humans like God.
  - a. First, God is Spirit (Jho. 4:24). This indicates that He is not made up of anything material. Therefore, God’s image obviously does not consist in man’s body which was formed from earthly matter (Gen. 2:7).

- b. Second, humans are “spirits in body” (Jas. 2:26a). This demonstrates that mankind is not only physical but spiritual (cf. Mat. 4:4). Thus, if the similarity between God and man is not physical, it must be spiritual. This was the thrust of Paul’s argument to the Athenian philosophers in Acts 17:28-29. If humans are “the offspring of God,” and we are “spirits in body,” then certainly God who is “the Father of spirits” (Heb. 12:9) is Himself a spiritual being. Paul uses this line of reasoning (even quoting from two Stoic poets, Aratus and Cleanthes) to establish the absurdity of idolatry. Simply put, when man sculpts and shapes an idol out of physical matter, because man cannot create spirit, they erroneously represent God as a physical being.
3. Therefore, humans are like God in that we are spiritual, intellectual, and moral beings. The common denominator of these qualities is thought. Our ability to produce ideas by thinking demonstrates how we are most like God.
  4. The objective of all thinking is to discover truth. Driven by a spirit of inquiry, mankind seeks to understand the nature of things to make sense of him or herself in the greater scheme of existence. Perplexing questions surrounding our origin, purpose and destiny motivate our search for the truth.
  5. Before thoughts can become knowledge they must be measured against truth. Truth is, “Being in accord with fact or reality; Fidelity to an original or standard” (New Oxford American Dictionary). As a correlate of God, truth is established in one of two ways: through the observation and experimentation of the physical world and its laws (Rom. 1:20) or the proper interpretation of God’s written revelation (2 Tim. 2:15).
  6. Our beliefs are founded upon our knowledge. Those who have been misinformed or misguided in any way will adopt a fallacious belief system. The misinterpretation of information will result in misapprehension that will lead to misapplication. Beliefs are powerful intra and interpersonal forces.
  7. Our understanding of truth, the quality of our thinking, the certitude of our knowledge, and the soundness of our beliefs will result in a particular mode of behavior. People are what they think (Pro. 23:7; 27:19). Consider how language makes the communication of truth possible, which is the objective of thinking, the standard of knowledge, and the means of establishing one’s belief system that is the foundation of human functioning.
  8. Thus, the Bible carefully documents mankind’s existence and demonstrates that his and her existence is inextricably tied to their essence. To claim, as existentialist do, that existence precedes essence is to grossly misrepresent the truth of the matter. According to the Bible, our existence and essence are one and the same. In other words, mankind’s essence is woven into their

existence. Coming to terms with our existence, that we could not have created ourselves, points us to the inevitable fact of our essence—“The God that made the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth...giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and he made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being...” (Acts 17:24-28).

*B. The False Doctrine of Relativism.*

1. Living in a postmodern age we sometimes come across people who question the authority of God, as invested in His word, the Bible. These are individuals who have abandoned scriptural authority. They do not respect nor honor the truth of the Bible. Instead of submitting to the will of God declaring, “Thus saith the Lord” they routinely say, “I feel this in my heart, therefore I know it is truth.” This, my friends, is relativism. Relativism is “the doctrine that knowledge, truth, and morality exist in relation to culture, society, or historical context, and are not absolute” (New Oxford American Dictionary). In other words, right and wrong depend on the person, circumstances, or social situation.
2. Be that as it may, utter nothingness cannot give rise to matter, nor can non-living matter generate life, much less conscious life. The fact that something exists today implies that something has always existed. According to the Bible, God is the “uncaused cause” of all things (Psa. 90:2). We are also informed that God and truth are correlates (Psa. 31:5). Therefore, man does not begin his and her life in a vacuum, but within a fully functioning system of truth that is both eternal and absolute (Isa. 40:6-8; cf. Psa. 119:89). Consequently, from the Bible we learn “that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps” (Jer. 10:23). In another place it says, “There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; But the end thereof are the ways of death” (Pro. 14:12). Only God who is good and upright can instruct us in our way (Psa. 25:8).
3. In somewhat of a paradox the Bible describes God as both personal (cf. Gen. 1:27; Exo. 3:13-15; 33:7-23; 34:5-7) and invisible (Col. 1:15). As a person, God desires an intimate relationship with humanity (Psa. 139:1-17; Isa. 55:6-7; Acts 17:26-28; Jas. 4:8a). His invisibility (which is interconnected with His holiness) is for our own good, “For no man shall see [God], and live” (Exo. 33:20b). Divine majesty is made up of such inconceivable splendor that human eyes could not look upon God without dying. Therefore, God’s desire to establish a relationship with humanity, despite His awesome glory, was achieved through the revelation of His word (cf. 2 Tim. 1:9; 1 Pet. 5:10).

4. The word of God is an extension of Himself and from the Bible we gather that God's mind, which is the reason for His nature, is the foundation of truth (Tit. 1:2; Heb. 6:18). Thus, God Himself (His thoughts and character expressed in His will) is not only the basis of existence (Jho. 1:3; Col. 1:16-17) but the standard of right and wrong (Psa. 25:8; Mark 10:18; 1 Pet. 1:15).
5. It is through the study of God's word (and the application thereof) that one forms a relationship with Him. Paul prayed on behalf of the church that they might be given "a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him" (Eph. 1:17). The more one grows in the knowledge of God the deeper a relationship one has with God. James encouraged the first-century church to seek a personal relationship with God, "Draw near to God and He will draw near to you..." (Jas. 4:8a). The churches of Galatia were described as forming an intimate bond with God, "But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known by God..." (Gal. 4:9a).
6. Consequently, the revelation of scripture is God's personal invitation to know Him and by that knowledge to secure happiness and hope (Jer. 29:11).

C. *The False Doctrine of Nihilism.*

1. Nihilism, or the lack of belief in one or more reputedly meaningful aspects of life (Most commonly, nihilism is presented in the form of existential nihilism, which argues that life is without objective meaning, purpose, or intrinsic value.) Moral nihilists assert that morality does not inherently exist, and that any established moral values are abstractly contrived. Nihilism can also take epistemological, ontological, or metaphysical forms, meaning respectively that, in some aspect, knowledge is not possible, or that reality does not actually exist.
2. Those who argue that absolute knowledge is impossible do so from an untenable position. To make such a claim is to affirm the very thing one denies. To claim that absolute knowledge is impossible is to make an absolute claim about knowledge. The argument is self-defeating. Too, granting the fact that absolute knowledge is not possible in every aspect of life (Mat. 24:36; Acts 1:7; et. al.), one should not take this to mean that nothing can be known. There are things God has revealed that He intends for us to know absolutely. The apostle Paul would say of completed revelation, "For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known" (1 Cor. 13:12). In the Bible, the written revelation of God to mankind, do we have access to a "full knowledge" of all things God intended humanity to know (Rom. 3:20; 2 Pet. 1:3).
3. As the divine expression of God, Jesus came "to draw out in narrative" and "unfold in teaching" the person and salvation of God (Jho, 1:1, 18). The apostle

John summarized this fact by stating, “And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life” (1 Jho. 5:20).

4. To what end did God reveal Himself through His Son and Spirit (Rom. 8:9)? The Bible tells us God revealed Himself so mankind could “have life and have it abundantly” (Jho. 10:10). Contrary to the doctrine of existential nihilism God’s thoughts toward His conscious creation are not thoughts of evil (i.e., pain, distress, adversity, misery, injury, calamity, etc.), but of peace to give mankind hope in their latter end (Jer. 29:11). God not only makes it possible for His followers to be victorious over the world (1 Jho. 5:4), but to gain a “decisive victory” over self and sin (Rom. 8:37), the very source of our despair.

*D. The False Doctrine of Religious Pluralism.*

1. While the concept of unity (which includes the idea of parts) is familiar to the Bible, the philosophy of religious pluralism is not. Religious pluralism is defined as, “The state of being where every individual in a religiously diverse society has the rights, freedoms, and safety to worship, or not, according to their conscience” (Porterfield). From this theory comes the concept of denominationalism, which is the noun form of the verb denominate. To denominate something is to “formally name” it, from *de* “away, formally” and *nominare* “to name.” Thus, denominationalism refers to, “The tendency to separate into religious denominations” (American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Ed.). Notwithstanding, denominationalism is the belief that all religions, regardless of their name, title of identification, faith, and practice, are acceptable to God. The origin of this concept (also referred to as ecumenism and sectarianism) is owed to G. W. F. Hegel and F. D. E. Schleiermacher.
2. The origin of religious pluralism
  - a. The separatist movement of an angel of high authority (Rev. 9:1, 11; 12:7-9).
    - (a) Angels created by God (Psa. 148:2, 5).
    - (b) Angels possess free moral agency (Rom. 5:13b; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6).
    - (c) Angels can sin (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6).
    - (d) Satan’s sin was pride (1 Tim. 3:6).
  - b. The separatist mentality transferred by Satan to mankind (Gen. 3:1-8).
    - (a) Satan beguiles the mind of Eve (Gen. 3:1-5; 2 Cor. 11:3).
    - (b) Adam and Eve disobey God (Gen. 3:6).



- (c) Adam and Eve disfellowshipped by God (Gen. 3.22-24).
3. Religious Pluralism Under the Patriarchal and Mosaic Eras
    - a. In the land of Shinar or Sumer (Gen. 10.10).
      - (a) Sumer was one of the first civilizations of the earth.
      - (b) Terah and Abraham worshipped false gods of Sumer (Jos. 24.2).
    - b. In the land of Mizraim or Egypt (Gen. 10.6).
      - (a) Egypt one of the first civilizations of the earth (cf. Gen. 12.10-20).
      - (b) Egypt known for its polytheistic society (Ex. 12.12).
    - c. The kingdom of God divided (1 Kings 12).
      - (a) Jeroboam rebels against God (vs. 25-27).
      - (b) Jeroboam sets up alternate system of worship (vs. 28-33).
  4. Religious Pluralism Today
    - a. Denominationalism prophesied in the New Testament
      - (a) Acts 20.29-31 (would arise from apostasy of church leaders).
      - (b) 2 Timothy 4.3-4 (would arise from apostasy of the church).
    - b. Denominationalism seen in the New Testament (2 Cor. 11.3, 13-15)
      - (a) Revelation 2.2, 6, "false apostles;" "the Nicolaitans."
      - (b) Revelation 2.9, "the synagogue of Satan."
      - (c) Revelation 2.13, "where Satan's throne is;" "where Satan dwelleth."
      - (d) Revelation 2.15, "the teaching of the Nicolaitans."
    - c. Denominationalism in the world
      - (a) Baha'i
      - (b) Buddhism
      - (c) Christianity
      - (d) Hinduism
      - (e) Islam
      - (f) Judaism
      - (g) etc.
    - d. Denominationalism in the United States
      - (a) Catholic

- (b) Southern Baptist
- (c) Methodist
- (d) Mormon
- (e) Lutheran
- (f) Church of God in Christ
- (g) Presbyterian
- (h) National Baptist
- (i) Assemblies of God
- (j) Evangelical
- (k) Episcopal
- (l) Jehovah's Witness
- (m) Seven-Day Adventists
- (n) Christian Church
- (o) Church of the Nazarene
- (p) etc.

E. Biblical Arguments Against Religious Pluralism

1. Argument from Matthew 16.18 and 1 Corinthians 3.11
  - a. Jesus came to build "His" church.
  - b. Jesus built His church.
  - c. Therefore, Jesus built the church of Christ.
2. Argument from Matthew 7.21-23 and 12.46-50
  - a. It is not enough to be religious.
  - b. One must "do" what God commands.
  - c. Therefore, if one is religious, but does not do what God commands he or she is unacceptable to God.
3. Argument from Romans 10.2-3
  - a. It is possible to be religious and wrong.
  - b. True religion is in accordance with God's knowledge not mankind's.
4. Argument from 1 Corinthians 12.12-31
  - a. Paul is here illustrating the solidarity of the local congregation.

- b. Paul is here considering the collective vs. the individual.
- 5. Argument from Ephesians 1.22-23 and Colossians 1.18,24
  - a. The Bible says, “one body.”
  - b. The “body” is the “church,” the “church” is the “body.”
  - c. Therefore, there is one church.
- 6. Argument from Ephesians 4.4-6
  - a. The Bible says, “one body” and “one faith.”
  - b. The “body” is the church, and the “faith” is her belief and practice.
  - c. Therefore, there is one church with one system of belief and practice.

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Life is a journey of self-discovery. Eventually, all human beings are confronted with their desire to revere and adore something or someone greater and beyond themselves. Of the nine million species on earth, human beings are the only ones that experience this phenomenon. The answer to this mystery lies in the constitution of man and their inherent ability to ascribe meaning to life. When one surveys all the available evidence afforded us by the physical world and the records of human history, ascertaining the meaning of life is not difficult. The existence of God is a first truth. Creation and the Bible help us to know what God is like and what He is not like. While creation merely implies a superhuman controlling power, the Bible describes God as a self-existent, personal and benevolent being—“The God that made the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth... as though he needed anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things...for in him we live, and move, and have our being...” (Acts 17:24-28). Without the authority of the Bible, an attempt to explain the idea of God would be no better than an opinion (cf. Job 42:7). Only what God has chosen to reveal of Himself can be known (cf. Deu. 29:29). God revealed Himself through actions and words that were eventually recorded and preserved for posterity. Today, God’s Word is verifiable through archeological discoveries and uniformity to truth. All that can be known of God is recorded in the Bible, as we pass from His actions and words to qualities or attributes, and then to the substance or essence to which these qualities or attributes belong. Substance and attributes are correlates; one cannot exist without the other. There is no quality that does not qualify something; and there is no thing, either material or spiritual, that can be known or can exist without qualities to differentiate it from other things. Thus, we are led naturally from the works of God to His attributes, and from His attributes to His essence. The attributes of God are “those distinguishing characteristics of the divine

nature which are inseparable from the idea of God, and which constitute the basis and ground for his various manifestations to his creatures" (Strong). We call them attributes, because we are compelled to attribute them to God as fundamental qualities or powers of his being, to give rational account of certain constant facts in God's self-revelation. As free moral agents, human beings must seek God, not simply because He is the wellspring of goodness, but because He holds our best interest at heart—"For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith Jehovah, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you hope in your latter end" (Jer. 29:11). Thus, mankind was created for the glory of God (i.e., for God to share His glory with His saints)—"Every one that is called by my name, and whom I have created for my glory, whom I have formed, yea, whom I have made" (Isa. 43:7). And again, we read, "The people which I formed for myself, that they might set forth my praise" (Isa. 43:21). To obey the gospel is to become "a partaker of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4). As we bathe ourselves in His word, we "come to know God, or rather to be known by God" (Gal. 4:9). The end of human intelligence is the acknowledgement of God's separateness (i.e., His holiness), which is why we worship God.

2. In a world dominated by philosophical sectarianism and religious indifference the people of God would do well to remember what it means to worship God acceptably. As the church, God has separated us from the world for His holy service. Our mission is simple—"That [we] may show forth the excellencies of him who called [us] out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet. 2:9). The purpose of the church is to promote the righteousness of God in the world. More specifically, it is to demonstrate the excellence of God revealed in His work of salvation. Thus, the children of God have a solemn responsibility. Flippancy, levity, and carelessness should never characterize the work of the saints of God. To keep us from adopting a demeanor of this sort a firm understanding of the holiness of God is essential. Much, if not all, of the sectarian and religious indifference we experience today, is the direct result of a failure to fully appreciate what it means to be a saint or Christian. The English word "saint" translates the Greek term *hagios* that fundamentally signifies "separated" and means "sanctified" or "holy one." Consequently, a Christian is one separated by God for His holy service. Among the many things this would entail one is the strict adherence to the divine demands upon the conduct of the believer. Man's place is to obey, not to direct. Yet, much of religion today is nothing more than an elaborate ploy to satisfy one's inordinate desire for power, popularity, and prosperity. In the process many have minimized the importance of "handling aright the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15) and have cultivated an impetuous enthusiasm to discard "the good way of God" (Jer. 6:16). "These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their lusts (and their mouth speaketh great swelling words), showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage" (Jude vs. 16). Yet the gospel is unmistakable in its emphasis regarding the significance of separation, "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose them; for it is shameful even to speak of those things which are done by

them in secret” (Eph. 5:11-12 NKJV). The work of God must continue through His saints. His utter holiness should lead us. His inaccessibility should warn us. And let the clarion call of God be shouted from the mountaintops—“He hath redeemed my soul from going into the pit, and my life shall behold the light. Lo, all these things doth God work, twice, yea thrice, with a man, to bring back his soul from the pit, that he may be enlightened with the light of the living” (Job 33:28-30). God is true!

#### WORKS CITED

All scriptures taken from the American Standard Version 1901 unless otherwise noted.

Breese, Dave W., 1990. *Seven Men Who Ruled the World from the Grave*. Chicago: Moody Press, p. 213.

Botton, Alain de., “Philosophy–Søren Kierkegaard.” YouTube: The School of Life, June 26, 2015, <https://youtu.be/D9JCwKx558o>.

Bohlinger, Travis., “Kierkegaard’s Leap of Faith.” The Logos Academic Blog, Faithlife, 26 September 2018, <https://academic.logos.com/kierkegaards-leap-of-faith/>.

Cerbone, David., 2015. *Existentialism: All That Matters*. Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton, p. 6–8.

Crowell, Steven, "Existentialism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/existentialism/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/existentialism/).

“Denominationalism.” The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4<sup>th</sup> ed, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.

Hong, Howard V., and Edna H., 2000. *The Essential Kierkegaard*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, p. ix, 12, 41, 42–43, 43–44, 109, 188–189.

Kaufmann, Walter A., 1956. *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*. New York, N.Y.: New American Library, p. 86–87.

Mastin, L. (January 2009). “Existence and Consciousness.” Retrieved [December 23, 2021], from [https://www.philosophybasics.com/branch\\_metaphysics.html](https://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_metaphysics.html).

Mullen, John D., 1981. *Kierkegaard’s Philosophy: Self-Deception and Cowardice in the Present Age*. New York and Scarborough, Ontario: New American Library, p. 36.

Popper, Karl, 2011. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, p. 406.

Porterfield, Daniel R. “Religious Pluralism 101.” The Aspen Institute. September 4, 2019. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/religious-pluralism-101/>.

Princeton University. "Philosophy." WordNet. Princeton University. 2010.

- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Agnosticism." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Cognition." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Existentialism." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Individualism." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Relativism." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Skepticism." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Stevenson, Angus, editor. "Truth." *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed, Oxford University Press, 2001. Mac Dictionary. Version 2.3.0 (284).
- Strong, Augustus H. *Systematic Theology: A Compendium Designed for the Use of Theological Students*. Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1970. Print.
- Solomon, Robert C. "No Excuses: Existentialism and the Meaning of Life." *The Great Courses*, July 8, 2013, The University of Texas at Austin. Lecture.

# Karl Marx: The Manifesto of the Communist Party

Jason Rollo

## INTRODUCTION:

1. As one excellent little book asks, “Who Was Karl Marx?”
  - A. As recently as 2020, “Portland, Oregon [was] burning and various] cities face[d] continuous looting, rioting, and destruction. Literal miles of Minneapolis, Minnesota have been destroyed. Democrat-run cities are hemorrhaging people, the Antifa/Black Lives Matter mob is wreaking havoc, destroying businesses and neighborhoods. Leaders in those communities have taken an inexplicable hands-off attitude, even to the point of restraining police response. Today, George Floyd has assumed hero status, with huge murals erected even as an unprecedented illegal immigration crisis at our southern border is instigated by Biden. Per Tucker Carlson, around 270,000 crossed illegally into the United States in November 2021, alone! JBR]. Prices are rising. Meanwhile, poisonous Critical Race Theory and public-school curriculums are being used to teach children to hate America. Those same children are also being indoctrinated to believe they can change sexual identity. But, the issue is never the issue. The issue is always Revolution, No matter what the issue, be it gay and ‘transgender’ rights, civil rights, immigrant rights, welfare rights, ‘social justice,’ ‘equity’ etc., the issue is only relevant insofar as it can advance the ‘Revolution’. In many ways, we are actually witnessing a Communist overthrow of the United States in real time. They attack us through our vulnerabilities: our freedom, our open society, our generous natures and willingness to ‘play fair.’ Ironically, those same concepts that gave us the freest, most generous, wealthiest nation in history, have left us vulnerable to attack. Where did this all come from? It is actually nothing new, Much of it comes from the mind and work of Karl Marx.” (Simpson ix-xii). So, again, **we must ask, Who Was Karl Marx?**
  - B. “The history of all society is the history of class struggle” Karl Marx (Parker 291).
  - C. Karl Marx was about the destruction of Everything! As will be noted later, understanding Karl Marx involves looking into Dialectical Materialism, Etc.
  - D. Reality/Statistics—We (cf., pulpits, too!) had better wake up! Error of every type must be deal with! Cf., Rom. 16:17-18; 2 Jho. 9-11; Eph. 5:11; 1 Tim. 1:3, 10, 4:1f, 6:20.
    - 1) “In 1942 Roper/Fortune survey found that 25% of Americans considered socialism a good thing, compared with 43% in 2019”

(Maginnis 36). Yes, we have seen cycles of liberalism vs. conservatism within American society, but certainly the last number of years (cf., especially since the 1960s) seems to show a downward moral/anti-God spiral. Yet, we must always remember, God is in control of nations, not us. Further, never forget that TRUE Christianity is not dependent upon the United States of America. Cf., The Book of Acts!

- 2) Other recent surveys/polls connected with Americans and Marxism found such things as: “Over a quarter of Americans (26%) support the gradual elimination of the capitalist system in favor of a more socialist system...30% of Gen Z has a favorable view of Marxism, up 6% from 2019. Over one-third of Americans (39%) are likely to support a member of the Democratic Socialist party for office with greater support among younger generations (51% of Gen Z and 44% of Millennials. Over half of Gen Z (51%) think that America is a racist nation with a long history of discrimination.” (Maginnis 38-39).
- 3) Yes, be concerned! “You may be interested in knowing that we have preachers, preachers active in churches, who are members of the Communist Party.” Who said this? Earl Browder, general secretary of Communist Party USA to students at Union Theological Seminary. When did he say it? February 15, 1935! (Kengor xxiii). 1935! Let that sink in for a moment. The influence of Marxism/Communism has been around for decades, even in the USA—and even within various religious groups! For example, look at the reaction of numerous “churches” during all of the 2020 Covid situation, especially as it relates to the BLM movement. And remember, BLM, Inc. (on their website) ADMITS to being a Marxist organization. They also make it clear that they are against the nuclear family, and they support homosexual/transgender issues, etc. Note: I have personally seen (with my own eyes) a large “church” in the Dallas area with a large Black Lives Matter (BLM) banner on their building. Further, and even more shocking, I worshipped with the Lord’s people in Florida in late 2020 and the gentleman sitting behind me (a brother?) wore a BLM mask. The influence of Marx is REAL—even in our time (and especially over the last few years)!

2. Again, Who Was Karl Marx? As one historian noted, “The Industrial Revolution inspired political groups to organize workers and promised to improve their lot. A philosophy called socialism arose that argued that wealth should be shared by putting it in the hands of its, supposed, creators. Similar sentiments had inspired the German Peasants Revolt in 1532-34 and had also caused unrest in England, but the



industrialized Europe of the 19<sup>th</sup> century provided the first arena for these ideas to be put into practice. Early 19<sup>th</sup>-century socialists including Robert Owen, a Welsh industrialist, proposed a society in which property was owned collectively. In France, Henri Saint-Simon's followers wanted an end to private property. By the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, many European countries had established socialist parties, including the Labour Party in Britain (1900) and the Socialist Party in France (1902). More radical still were the ideas of the German-born philosopher and economist Karl Marx (1818-83), who viewed history as a series of class struggles that would lead to the end of capitalism. Distrusting the compromises of more moderate 'Social Democrats,' Marx helped establish the International Working's Men Association in 1864, which acted as a platform for the dissemination of Marx's revolutionary theories. Although he believed that the full revolution would break out in France or Germany, it was in 1917 in the relatively underdeveloped Russia that Marxists would finally seize power." (Parker 291).

3. BOTH "...the Bolshevik Russian and the Communist Chinese—were launched or consolidated under the banner of 'Marxism.' Today half the population of the world is led and governed in his name" (Kamenka xi). Thus, it's imperative that we know something of the man and teachings of Karl Marx.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **I. A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF KARL MARX**

- A. Karl Marx—His Background, Early Days/Early Writings, Influences Upon Him
  1. Karl Marx was born in the ancient Rhenish city of Trier, Germany on May 5, 1818. His father, Heinrich Marx, descended from a long line of distinguished Jewish rabbis. His father also served as a lawyer and public notary in Trier.
  2. Due to the social pressure of the day, Marx's father left Judaism and converted to Protestantism at some point in the late 1810s or early 1820s.
  3. "Marx's father introduced him to Voltaire, Frederick the Great, the Prussian state, various Enlightenment thinkers like John Locke, (who saw human nature as a blank page) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (who wrote, 'We do not know what our nature permits us to be).'
  4. In 1830, at the age of twelve, Marx entered school with a liberal Kantian headmaster. He graduated from school in 1835, with excellent marks in Greek, Latin, and German, but much weaker results in mathematics, French, and especially history.

5. In the autumn of 1835, Marx entered the University of Bonn as a student of jurisprudence. His conduct at Bonn was not exemplary; he was arrested by the police and punished by the University authorities for 'nocturnal noisiness and drunkenness'.
6. By October 1836 he transferred to the University of Berlin, where he studied law, philosophy, and history. It was here that he joined the 'Young Hegelians'...a group of German intellectuals [read, liberal radical nuts!, JBR] who reacted to the writings of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, the father of progressivism. After the death of his father in 1838, Marx abandoned any intention of embarking on a legal or administrative career and turned frankly to philosophy. He identified himself with the left wing of the Young Hegelians, became an atheist, a democrat, and a radical critic of the Prussian authoritarian state.
7. Between 1839 and 1841, he worked on his doctoral thesis, a study of philosophy of nature in Epicurus and Democritus. As an example of the impact regarding such things, especially the influence of German Rationalism, JBR] Marx wrote in his PhD dissertation, his view of the deities: 'In truth, I hate all gods.' He continued, 'I shall never exchange my fetters for slavish servility.' Thus, Marx spent his life arguing against the existence of the God of the Bible" (Maginnis 13-14).
8. In 1843, he married Jenny von Westphalen. They promptly began what was virtually a lifelong exile from Germany. First, they settled in Paris, where Marx became better acquainted with socialist and radical literature, and where he formed a friendship with Friedrich Engels. Together they prepared the Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848) as a statement of the Communist League's policy.
9. In 1848 Marx returned to Germany and took an active part in the unsuccessful democratic revolution. The following year he arrived in England as a refugee and lived in London until his death in 1883. Helped financially by Engels, Marx and his family nevertheless lived in great poverty. After years of research (mostly carried out in the British Museum), he published in 1867 the first volume of his...work, *Capital*. From 1864 to 1872 Marx played a leading role in the International Working Men's Association, and his last years saw the development of the first mass worker's parties founded on avowedly Marxist principles" (Kamenka ii).

10. In the 1850s Jenny and Marx suffered the loss of two sons in infancy and childhood.
11. Marx spent his time between the British Museum, an occasional pub crawl, and his home. His only significant political activity was his participation in the International Working Men's Association (the First International) formed by French, German and Italian workers in 1864. He spent most of the 1850s and 1860s gathering material for his economic and historical analysis of capitalism, *Das Kapital*.
12. His wife, Jenny, died in 1881 from cancer.
13. . Marx, died in London, on March 14, 1883. There were [only] eleven people to attend his funeral; the eulogy was read by Engels" (Ibid xv-xxii).
14. NOTE: When studying Marx, it is very important to also understand/study things like: The French Revolution, German Rationalism, Right vs. Left Hegelians, Ludwig Feuerbach's work, Dialectical Materialism, etc.—as it relates to the shaping/teaching of Karl Marx. As one writer put it, "There is a sense in which German philosophy underlies the whole of Marx's intellectual development, molding his basic attitudes, giving his work direction and thrust". In 1842 and 1843, when Marx began reading French political pamphlets and French histories of the Great Revolution of 1789, he came to realize that German philosophy alone had failed to penetrate to the roots of the problem. To Marx, the real problems that were obscured in the German development were made clear in the French. The Great Revolution of 1789 that swept aside the government and law associated with a system of feudal privileges and estates had proclaimed liberty, equality, and fraternity—but only in the political sphere. This political liberation resulted in a thoroughgoing economic 'liberation.' Capitalism, the sway of property, the 'civil society' of Ferguson and Hobbes and the British economists, the 'material world' of industry and trade, were freed from the political, social, and moral restraints that feudalism had always imposed on them. The abstract slogan 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' thus could and did lead to a social order that was profoundly individualistic, weighted in favor of a minority of property owners" (Ibid xxviii).

## II. A SUMMARY OF MARX'S PHILOSOPHY

### A. What Is Classical Marxism?

1. "The neo-Marxists distort Marxism and reduce it to a war between 'oppressors' versus the 'oppressed.' The BLM neo-Marxists target 'oppressors' for punishment. But it's important to realize, as we explore Marxism below, that not everyone who claims to be a Marxist is true to Marx's original intent, which is radical enough" (Maginnis 10). But, practically speaking, the end-result of "the classical version" and the various "applied versions" both end in disaster for freedom loving "individuals."
2. "What is classical Marxism? It is a political philosophy developed by Karl Heidrich Marx, a nineteenth-century German philosopher, economist, historian, sociologist, political theorist, journalist, and socialist revolutionary. Marx's philosophy focuses on [and sees, per its false assumptions, JBR] class struggle to ensure an equal distribution of wealth for all citizens and illustrates the inequalities created by the ruling class in a capitalistic system that historically oppresses the lower (working) classes, thus triggering social revolution that creates a classless society, where there is not private property and every citizen gives selflessly to the good of all persons. This ideal model is variously called socialism (communism) or progressivism" (Ibid).
3. "Marx's theory is perhaps best known for its sharp critique of capitalism, which claims that workers in a capitalist system are little more than a commodity, 'labor power.' This economic clash, which is set forth in Marx's 1859 book, *Das Kapital*, creates a conflict between the proletariat (workers who transform raw commodities into goods) and the bourgeoisie (owners of the means of production), which has [per this false view, JBR] a 'built in' inequality. The bourgeoisie, with the help of government, according to Marx, employ social institutions against the proletariat. Marx argues in his writings that capitalism creates an unfair imbalance between the bourgeoisie and the workers whom they exploit for gain, and those inherent inequalities and exploitative relations ultimately lead to revolution that abolishes capitalism and reconstructs society into a socialist form of government...It is a comprehensive ideology—some call it a religion—that expresses a broad worldview about most aspects of ordinary life and society that are contrary to a Christian, biblical worldview" (Ibid).

4. “What is socialism? It is the [view] of the social and economic theory attributed to Karl Marx that embraces state ownership of all property and means of production. This idea of sharing wealth in society theoretically results in a classless society where everyone is equal...it is in direct opposition to capitalism. Socialism depends on Marx’s wrongheaded assumption about life based on the Hegelian dialectic, thesis, antithesis, synthesis—which is a social evolutionary theory much like Charles Darwin’s evolution of the species. The problem for Marx and socialism is that, with hundreds of years of empirical evidence, it is capitalism, not socialism that works. As one economist observed, ‘As a prophet, Marx was colossally unlucky and his system, socialism, colossally unuseful.’ Yet, socialism is not just ‘unuseful,’...it is dangerous, because it leads to big government...[and] centralized and big-government planning inevitably leads to dictatorship. A simple study of socialist leadership over the past century conclusively demonstrates that such leftist authorities promise freedom but end up delivering only misery and tyranny” (Maginnis 19).
5. “Marx’s insistence that labor alone creates value is...incorrect” (Levin 4).

B. Marxism—Many false tenets:

1. **Dialectical Materialism** – “But what is dialectical materialism? It is of, dual origins: Hegelian Spiritualism and Materialism. Marx theorized that human history is best viewed as a series of class struggles between social forces that have contradictory interests. For example, the class struggles between slaves and their masters, between feudal lords and their subjects, and—in his day—the class struggle between capitalists and their workers. He believed that seeing history as the history of class struggle had better explanatory power than viewing it through other lenses, such as the history of ideas, technological innovations, or military conflicts. The weird thing about dialectical materialism, is that Marx seemed to cobble it together from pieces of two existing philosophies that contradicted each other. These two philosophies were *Hegelian spiritualism* (after the influential German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel) and *materialism*. Marx believed that he was building upon them, but they are incompatible. The Prussian government and the intellectuals of Prussian universities preferred Hegelian spiritualism, because it essentially said that history was guided by the world spirit, or *weltgeist*, which acted through the great men of history and government to bring

about its will. Hegelian spiritualism justified their privileged position by giving them a pretext for ruling over the plebs, since the *weltgeist* had conveniently picked them out for the task. The materialists, on the other hand, thought that reality was just “what you see is what you get,” and as such didn’t think that the Prussian aristocracy had any right to rule—even less a divine one granted by some elitist specter. They wanted to overthrow the state—by violent revolution if necessary...Hopefully you are beginning to see how Marxism combines these two theories. Marx tweak[ed] the Hegelian Dialectic. Marx tweak[ed] the Hegelian Dialectic...The *Hegelian dialectic*...goes something like this: in a society you have a prevailing doctrine which is widely accepted and taken for granted by most people—but this cannot remain indefinitely so. At some time, a movement comes along proposing to challenge and overturn the prevailing wisdom, saying that it is nonsensical and should be repudiated only to be replaced with a new one. Hegelians call the first doctrine the *thesis* and the opposing doctrine the *antithesis*. But here’s where it gets interesting. The antithesis never successfully overturns the thesis and throws it out the window completely. Instead, the two doctrines begin to fuse together creating a *synthesis*, which combines elements of both. This third doctrine becomes the dominant thesis of a new era. But no sooner has this process completed than the whole thing is poised to start again. This new prevailing wisdom, combining elements of the old movement and the one which opposed it, will soon come to be opposed by a new antithesis which opposes that. Hegel believed that this process was a law that governed history but that it also mirrored the thinking process and described the logic by which people come to understand the world itself. Marx extracted the dialectic and fused it into his own philosophy, hoping to prove that socialism was bound to come about “with the inexorability of a law of nature” by a dialectical process of class struggle in which the workers eventually threw off the chains of their capitalist overlords to create a classless society in which everyone would be equal and work for the common good” (Sammeroff).

2. “This philosophy of dialectical materialism: 1) Everything that exists is material. There are no gods, no souls, no spirits to call up at a séance, or any of that eerie supernatural stuff. *Weltgeists* are completely out of the question. What you see is what you get. Our thoughts and ideas are only reflections of material phenomena in our physical brains. This is *materialism*., 2) Everything that exists is in

contradiction and conflict with something else, like magnetic poles, Republicans and Democrats, or your in-laws arguing furiously over who burnt the turkey at Thanksgiving. They duke it out, and from their struggle emerges something new. This is *dialectics*. According to Marx, at a certain stage in their development the existing material productive forces of society come into contradiction with the existing production relations, or the established social system of property laws. This leads to an epoch of social revolution during which the superstructure transforms itself. This is the application of the Hegelian dialectic in Marxism...In *Theory and History*, Mises strives to highlight how Hegelianism stands in stark contradiction to materialism and that no rational fusion of the two is possible. For one thing, Hegelians believed that the ultimate basis of the universe was mind (which they called “spirit” or “geist”), while the materialists believed that it was matter” (Ibid). NOTE: God is Spirit (Jho. 4:24)! Materialism is not all there is!

3. Classless Society—The Ultimate Pipedream.
  - a. “The working men have no country” Karl Marx (Kamenka 224).
  - b. “In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end” Karl Marx (Ibid. 225). Cf., God’s way we are all equal (Gal. 3:27f)!
  - c. “Capital is a collective product...Capital is therefore not a personal, it is a social power” Karl Marx (Ibid. 220). This is absolute false doctrine!
  - d. Cf., the above examples with Obama’s, “You didn’t build that,” etc.
  - e. Also, cf., a study of things like: The life of Ben Carson, Candace Owens, others; Study how even in the U.S.A., ex-slaves became millionaires, etc. Examples of the “American Dream” happening among various individuals of vast backgrounds is overwhelming in American history!

4. **Greed/Theft/Etc.—Call It What It Really Is!**

- a. "...the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property" Karl Marx (Ibid. 219).
- b. "In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend" Kare Marx (Ibid 221). The more common word we would use, would be "THEFT!"
- c. "...the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class...the proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class...Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property...[Further], Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another...In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Ibid. 226-228).
- d. Yet, the Bible says: Exodus 20:15; 22:1-2; Ephesians 4:28; Titus 2:10.

5. **Abolition of the Family!**

- a. "Abolition of the family! On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeois. The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital" Karl Marx (Kamenka 223).
- b. Statistics – Even simple research will show that as goes the traditional (Biblical-based) family, so goes the stability/decency of a nation!
- c. The Bible says: Genesis 2:18-25; Ephesians 5:21-6:4; Colossians 3:18f.



6. To Better Understand Marx (and his nonsense) – “Let us take a brief look at Rousseau, Hegel and Marx...**Rousseau** [declared], ‘I conceive of two kinds of inequality in the human species: one that I call natural and physical...the other may be called moral or political inequality, because it depends on a kind of convention. It consists in the different privileges enjoyed by some at the expense of others, such as being richer, more honored, more powerful. Relating this to the history of governing system, he said that the first stage was the establishment of the law and of the right of property, the second stage was the transformation of magistracy, and the third and final stage was the transformation of legitimate power into arbitrary power. How will we know when the ‘legitimate institution’ has been achieved beyond the theoretical construct? Rousseau does not tell us. For **Hegel**, the individual finds his actualization—liberty, happiness, fulfillment—through the state. But not just any state. States evolve over time, ultimately leading to a fully developed state, or ‘final end.’ In such a state, the individual becomes part of a universalized, collective whole. That which preceded the final end is of no consequence, the individual is subservient to the state for both his own realization and the greater good of the collective. How do we know when we have reached the ‘final end’ beyond the theoretical construct? Hegel does not tell us. Marx put an emphasis on historic materialism. He wrote, ‘The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie [the capitalists, the owners of property and means of production] and Proletariat [laborer, the industrial working class]...the revolution prescribed by Marx...is the only way out. If the proletariat is to eliminate economic classes and transform society into an egalitarian paradise, he must wipe clean the present from the past—first by overthrowing the existing regime and smashing capitalism, replacing them with a centralized proletariat state, and once society and the culture are cleansed of the past, the state will wither away and what follows is an amorphous utopian state powered by the people through the collective...Marx insists that the individual’s realization and salvation are discovered through his identity with the proletarian revolution. How do we know when we have reached the ‘workers’ paradise’ beyond a theoretical construct? Marx does not tell us” (Levin 18-20).

7. Yet, cf., the above falsehood with TRUE HAPPINESS (Blessedness, Mat. 5:1f)! The true meaning of life is only found in God's Word (Col. 2:3; Ecc. 12:13-14; Jho. 10:10; 1 Tim. 4:8; Eph. 3:21, etc.).
  8. The truth is this: 1) This world is not permanent (but temporary—there will never be some “heaven on earth”), Mat. 24:35; Heb. 11:13f; 2 Pet. 3:1f, 2) The poor will always be, as long as this world is here (Deu. 15:11; Mark 14:7), 3) The needy (cf., orphans, widows; NOT some able-bodied bum (2 The. 3:10; Pro. 6:6) should be helped by God's people (Cf., Gal. 6:10; Jas. 2:14f; 1 Jho. 3:17f), etc.
  9. Marx's philosophy bred contempt for the present, seeking for a utopian future (on the earth) thru false-reality which can never be; Whereas, as noted above, the truth/religion of Jesus gives hope in the “here in now” (regardless of what happens), and hope for the future—in eternal life (Cf., 1 Tim. 4:8; 2 Pet. 1:3)!
- C. Marx looked for the perfectibility of mankind-while rejecting God!
- a. The teachings/beliefs of Marx and God cannot/do not mix. While Marx looked for man's perfection (cf., Dialectical and Historical Materialism, etc.), he rejected the spiritual—He rejected God. Yet, man is made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26-27; 9:6); While babies are NOT born in sin (as evil Calvinism teaches,) but born innocent (cf., Mat. 18:3-4, 19:14), when humans grow to an age of accountability they will/do (individually) “choose” sin (i.e., a violation of God's law, 1 Jho. 3:4), and become separated from God (Isa. 59:1-2; Rom. 3:23, 6:23). Thus, all men need salvation from sin, not from some concept of the bourgeoisie.
  - b. Thankfully, God, being eternal (Isa. 57:15; Psa. 90:2; Mic. 5:2), worked out the perfect scheme of redemption, before time even began (Rev. 13:8; Heb. 9:26; 1 Pet. 1:19-20; Eph. 3:1f). God has given us: TRUE SALVATION thru Jesus, the Gospel, His church—as taught in the Bible; We have ALL we need to live and die in this world and find a good eternity, in the next (2 Pet. 1:3; Rom. 1:16-17; Tit. 1:2), but sadly most reject the truth (Mat. 7:13f). They do not have to reject it! God wants all saved; God gives us all free-will (Rev. 3:20).
- D. Such A Sad System—Directly From The Communist Manifest (1848), We Find:
- a. “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.”

- b. “The modern bourgeois society...has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society...[there are] two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat.”
  - c. “The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.”
  - d. “The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities...and concentrated property in a few hands...We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society.”
  - e. Eventually comes, “the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism...And why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce....”
  - f. Sadly, Marx’s philosophy/theories go “on and on.” One could spend years studying his “Surplus Value” theory (cf., profit!); His Labor theory of value; More about his Material conception of history, Class conflict, and the like—But, why? After all, such nonsense comes from a fool who rejects God and truth (Psa. 14:1; Col. 2:3; Isa. 8:20)! Karl Marx defines (Pro. 14:12; 1 Cor. 1:17f).
- E. “Marx and Engels had a ten-point plan. Here it is, taken...from their manifesto:
- a. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
  - b. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
  - c. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
  - d. Confiscation of all property of emigrants and rebels.
  - e. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
  - f. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
  - g. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the

- improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
  - h. Equal obligation of all to work....
  - i. ...gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
  - j. Free education for all children in public schools” (Kengor 7-8).
- F. The main thing to remember is this: Marx’s ideology ultimately diminishes the individual and leads to the collective—which, as history has shown, leads to totalitarianism, control, murder and the like. His false philosophy is wicked and MATERIALISTIC to the core!
  - a. “Marx’s ‘material determinism’ simply means that individuals and mankind are influenced and motivated by purely material factors” (Levin 94).
  - b. “...mass movements attempt to devour the individual in two ways: consume is identity and uniqueness, thereby making him indistinguishable from ‘the masses,’ but also assigning him a group identity based on race, age, income, etc., to draw class distinctions.” (Cf., Bible – Jho. 5:28-29; 2 Cor. 5:10; Jas. 2:1; Gen. 3:20; Acts 17 (one blood); etc. “Hence, [Marxism leads to] identity politics, intersectionality, etc.” (Levin 95).
- G. Remember, “Marxists cloak themselves in phrases like ‘progressives,’ ‘Democratic Socialists,’ social activists,’ ‘community activists,’ etc.” (Ibid. 2).
- H. In the end, Marxism itself creates the very thing it sees behind every corner, “Class Conflict!” What irony! But, as we know, that is the very point—they want to create this conflict. Remember, as one noted earlier, the issue is never the issue. After all, as Lenin would make very clear, the issue is always—Revolution!

### III. A BRIEF INTER-RELATIONAL SUMMARY OF CONNECTED PHILOSOPHIES

- A. A Stage Set For Future Evil—Much Evil!
  - a. What an individual believes (cf., what’s in one’s heart) turns into actions (cf., Pro. 4:23; Mark 7:21f). Yes, words/thoughts have consequences (cf., Phi. 4:8; Rom. 1; Col. 3; etc.). As with individuals, the same is true with congregations, cities, as well as nations.

- b. Again, as just noted, “In America, many Marxists cloak themselves in phrases like ‘progressive,’ ‘Democratic Socialists,’ ‘social activists,’ ‘community activists,’ etc.,...They operate under myriad newly minted organizational or identifying nomenclatures, such as ‘Black Lives Matter’ (BLM), ‘Antifa,’ ‘The Squad,’ etc. They have invented new theories, like Critical Race Theory...they claim ‘the dominant culture’ and [the] capitalist system are unjust and inequitable, racist and sexist, colonialist and imperialist, materialistic and destructive of the environment. They use tactics, such as ‘cancel culture,’. They take aim at all aspects of the culture including historical monuments (including memorials to Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, abolitionist Frederick Douglas, and the 54<sup>th</sup> Massachusetts black Union regiment), Mark Twain, William Shakespeare, Mr. Potato Head, Dr. Suess, Disney cartoons, ad infinitum. Pronouns are banned. Past social media posts are scrutinized. Journalism and editorial pages are sanitized of nonbelievers [in the Marxist doctrine, JBR]! But, Marx was wrong about almost everything. The Industrial Revolution created a vast middle class unmatched at any time in world history, as opposed to an army of angry proletariat revolutionaries trying to overthrow the capitalist system. And despite the Marxist class warfare rhetoric of Democratic Party politicians, capitalism has created unimaginable and unparalleled wealth for more people in all walks of life than any other economic system. Marx’s insistence that labor alone creates value is...incorrect” (Levin 2-4).
- c. The history of so many countries could/should be studied: Venezuela, China, etc. The evidence of evil promoted within such places, based on Marxism/Communism, is overwhelming. Books like: *Unmasked*, by Andy Ngo; *Blackout*, by Candace Owens; *Give Me Liberty, Not Marxism*, by Robert Maginnis; *Dark Agenda*, by David Horowitz; *American Marxism*, by Mark Levin, *United States of Socialism*, by Dinesh D’Souza, and many others show the ugly path of Marxist philosophy! IMPORTANT NOTE (WARNING): Even those these books (overall) do a fantastic job showing the error/connected philosophy of Marxism. The reader needs to be aware that these books were not written by members of the Lord’s church and will teach the truth on many things and then (based on the error of the penman) turn around and promote Denominational “Christianity,” Calvinism, Premillennialism, etc.

Just keep this point in mind as you study secular books! Only one book has the answers—GOD’S BOOK, THE BIBLE.

- B. The Ultimate Goal—Communism! With Side Paths (Errors): Cf., U.S.A./Today:
- a. While Communism is the ultimate goal—one that Lenin was all about “forcing” early, the truth is that Marxism, Socialism, Communism, regardless of the variety, is not good. Sadly, it is (and has been) promoted—even in the U.S.A.—for many years, in such areas as: Academia, Hollywood, Media, etc.
  - b. Unbeknownst to most, this subject, loosely called ‘Social movement theory’ among academics, is widely...taught, and promoted...Ultimately, these arguments for collective identity, collective beliefs and class consciousness, in support of mass movements, wittingly or otherwise have a Marxist formulation, and form the basis not only for peaceful protests but violence, riots, and revolution—of the sort we have seen in our cities and towns with the likes of Antifa [and] BLM” (Levin 25, 31). Remember, the fellow behind me in Miami (at worship) with a BLM mask?!
  - c. Under the title, “Marxism’s Rise in America,” one penman, noted, “There are some devout Marxists in America, but most Americans influenced by Marxism aren’t even aware of their manipulated state because they are hoodwinked by the present cultural revolution. Long ago, Americans gave a home to Karl Marx’s destructive ideology within our educational establishment, the mainstream media, Hollywood, some corporations, our arts and science communities, within many churches, and among the political class—especially the Democratic Party. It should concern every capitalist and democracy-loving American that the number of self-identified progressives in the US House of Representatives is now nearly one quarter of that body” (Maginnis 40-41).
  - d. Example, “Bernie Sanders fans who favored socialism for American would tell me, ‘Well, American socialism is going to be different from Venezuelan or Soviet socialism.’” But the socialism that we see practiced in America and on American campuses is very much like Soviet or Venezuelan or Cuban socialism in that one of the basics is to prevent a conversation, to prevent the other side from speaking. Cancel culture is an evolution, a

stronger degree of Marxism” (Strang 78). Cf., Even having a President of the United States monitored/banned from Social Media platforms just to silence him. It does not matter about agreement; we are talking about CENSORSHIP vs. FREEDOM!

e. Example after Example could be given.

C. A Fuller Study Should Include:

- a. Sergey Nechayev; Willi Muzenberg; Georgi Lukacs; Antonio Gramsci; The Frankfurt School; Critical Theory & All Its Children (cf., Critical Race Theory; Critical Gender Theory), Etc., Etc., Etc.
- b. The Impact of Marxism-Leninism (Socialism, Progressivism, Communism), and so forth upon the various countries and institutions on which such things have been unleashed, is evident. As Levin says in his book *American Marxism*, “is there a Marxist regime anyplace on earth that is not a police state? China, North Korea, Cuba, Venezuela? The imposition of the Marxist ideology, from an abstraction to reality, has left tens of millions of suffering and dead human beings in its wake. In the last several decades, building on Dewey’s [evil, JBR] work, and adopting Marxists ideas developed and espoused by the likes of Marcuse [a wicked man!, JBR] and others, and adapting them for American society and culture, the teaching and promotion of Marxism and Marxist notions in the classroom have been open and pervasive on America’s college campuses” (61-62).
- c. As we have seen, even in such places as New York, Michigan, Australia, and many other places (during the Covid-19 days), the ability for Marxist philosophy to turn into violence and state oppression is anything but a “utopian dream.” No, it has been more like watching a nightmare played out in real-time, to anyone who loves freedom!

#### IV. A SYNOPSIS OF HOW HIS PHILOSOPHY IS SEEN TODAY

- A. German Rationalism, Marx, Darwin, Humanist Manifestos, etc.—Evil Stacked Up!
  1. A study of the above items shows a clear history of “why” things seem CRAZY.
  2. We Need To KNOW Certain Things (cf., none of which happened in a vacuum):

- a. **Modernism** – Roots in the Renaissance/Enlightenment; Ethics are separate from God/religion. In short, there might be truth, but it isn't from God/the Bible. In other words, man's "reasoning" (whatever that means) becomes the standard for "truth/reality." (Cf., 1 Cor. 1-2; 3:19; 2 Pet. 1:3); etc.
  - b. **Post-modernism** – The next step, namely there really isn't truth at all; Reasoning/objectivity are out since such involves nothing but "social constructs,"—per this wicked view, words have no real meaning/value since culture determines all. In short, every man does that which is right in his own eyes! Judges 17:6, 21:25; Proverbs 14:12; etc.
  - c. **Deconstructionism** – Rooted in Post-modernism, the old foundations must be removed; Feelings and experience become the governing factor. As one put it, "Language does not describe reality; it creates reality. Language is a product of society, thus all statements about reality are colored, and inevitably warped, but cultural conditioning." Cf., Jeremiah 10:23; Psalm 119:104-105; 1 John (know/write/written!).
- B. EXAMPLE: Education—Liberal/Progressive (Marxist) Education: Killing America!
- a. All TRUE EDUCATION has roots in the Bible (Col. 2:3; Jho. 17:17).
  - b. Yet, "America's college and university faculties have turned their classrooms into breeding grounds for resistance, rebellion, and revolution against American society, as well as receptors for Marxist or Marxist-like indoctrination and propaganda. Marxism presents a 'new faith,' if you will, which promises a new and better society, despite its trail of mass death, enslavement, and impoverishment. The progressive intellectuals of the late 1800s and early 1900s, [based on the early foundations of German Rationalism, etc., JBR] laid the foundation for the present-day acceptance and indoctrination of the Marxist ideology throughout academia, society, and the culture [including within religion! JBR]. Thus, there has been an 'Americanized' adaption of Marxism, which uses Marx's core precepts and contextualizes them to the American system, in order to effectively overthrow the system—governmental, economic, social, and cultural. Indeed, "Marxism and feminism, Marxism and deconstruction, Marxism and race—this is where the debates are'. Such



schemes as the 1619 Project, deconstructionists deny that one can understand any experience of the past. In American colleges and universities, there is no limit to how professors can and do use Marxism as a doctrinal tool. It bears reminding that the early progressives, like their modern progeny, are the intellectual offspring of Rousseau, Hegel, and Marx” (Levin 42-45).

- c. Question: Why do the liberals/radicals push for “free college” and the “cancellation of college debt”? One does not have to wonder! It’s because: 1) Such reflects a Marxist mindset and 2) The colleges have become the pipeline for such indoctrination.
- d. Statistic: “there has been a huge increase in the number of young people who have graduated from a four-year college (less than 6 percent in 1940), still, only about one-third of the adult population today actually graduates from a four-year college,” hence the Marxists want to continually increase these numbers so they can “begin the indoctrination process at an earlier age” (Levin 47).

C. Modern Examples:

- a. False Philosophies: Critical Theories (Ex., CRT), Intersectionality, Etc.
- b. False Organizations/Movements: Antifa, BLM, Defund the Police, DSA, Etc.
- c. Radical Politicians: Obama, Biden, Pelosi, Warren, Harris, The Squad, Sanders, Etc; We could also study history: Cf., Wilson, FDR, LBJ and so many others.
- d. Radical Citizens/Funders/Promoters: Soros, Kaepernick/LeBron James/Etc. –
- e. ANOTHER EXAMPLE among all of the above noted listing of error (and much more could have been added), consider this quote, connected with Critical Theory, namely, “What is Critical Theory, from which these other Critical Theory/Marxist movements [derive]?...‘Critical theory draws heavily on Karl Marx’s notion of ideology. Because the bourgeoisie controlled the means of production, Marx suggested, they controlled the culture. Consequently, the laws, beliefs, and morality of society reflected the interests of the bourgeoisie...In other words, [per Marx], capitalism created [this] situation...[Then], Herbert Marcuse is credited with hatching the Critical Theory ideology from which

the racial, gender and other Critical Theory-based movements were launched in America. [Remember], he was a German-born Hegelian-Marxist ideologue of the Frankfurt School of political theorists” (Levin 82). Now, connect with this concept, an example within an example, namely, CRT—Critical Race Theory. “...CRT goes beyond arguing that the different cultures are equally valid. It declares that society is a systemically racist white-dominant culture and enlists those who are disaffected, dissatisfied, and malcontented into a growing legion of anti-American revolutionaries...Like Marx, the CRT proponents deal in group stereotypes and prejudices...Assumptions are made about individuals grounded on their physical, religious, ancestral, and other characteristics...CRT is pseudo-scholarship...based on victimization, emotional appeals, balkanization, and separatism...CRT is purposively political and dispenses with the idea of rights because it blames all inequalities of outcome on what its adherents say is pervasive racism in the United States...For CRT advocates, counter-speech...and the marketplace of ideas are all poisoned by white dominance and privilege. Of course, this leads to repression, censorship, and today’s ‘cancel culture.’”...A major assumption of [CRT] is that teachers need to develop a critical social justice perspective in order to understand the complex issues related to race, gender, class, and exceptionality...and to teach in ways that will promote social justice and [equity]” (Levin 89-104).

D. Marxism—Socialism/Communism—Should Not/Must Not Be Ignored

- a. Even a fellow atheist like Marx could see where his system goes. “There is no difference between communism and socialism, except in the means of achieving the same ultimate end: communism proposes to enslave men by force, socialism—by vote. It is merely the difference between murder and suicide.” Ayn Rand, twentieth-century Russian-American writer and philosopher (Maginnis 26).
- b. Marxism has consequences! Just look up the pictures of burning buildings (even of a police building) during the riots of 2020 in certain U.S. cities). These actions/consequences upon a society—seen within the voices/choices of certain individuals, sadly, even among some within the Lord’s church—is undeniable.

- c. The Bible teaches the truth about such things as: 1) Individual Free-Will/Choice (as opposed to being part of some “systemic-uncontrollable” mechanism (Gen. 1:26-27; Mat. 11:28-20; Acts 10:34-36, 38; Jho. 5:28-29), 2) Hate (Mat. 5:43f; Tit. 3:3), 3) Racism (Jho. 7:24; Jaa. 2:1f; Gal. 3:27f), 4) One’s Right to Personal Property (Mat. 20:15; Acts 5:4), 5) Etc.
- E. Time fails us to look deeper into things like: The use of Propaganda, true impact of Hollywood, the push for Reparations, the banning of Pronouns, the tearing down/burning of memorial statues, the teachings going on inside practically all colleges/universities, corruption within certain areas/voting systems, the attack on the constitution/freedom of speech in general (cf., a number of years ago in Houston, Texas, when a mayor tried to confiscate “sermons” against homosexuality), the corruption of the teachers unions (this doesn’t mean all teachers), the works of evil people like Saul Alinsky, Piven/Cloward, Robin Di Angelo, Ibram X. Kendi and so many others, as well as works like Biden/Sanders 110 page “Unity Agenda” document, the Green New Deal, Etc., Etc., Etc.!

## V. A REFUTATION OF THE FALSE PHILOSOPHY:

- A. The Man/His Doctrine (Summary & Condemnation):
  - 1. Karl Marx (1818-1883) was influenced by Hegel (one of the fathers of the Progressive Movement). From him came the nonsense of Dialectical Materialism (cf., A godless belief wherein Evolution is applied to philosophy/economics, not organisms; It involves a rejection of all but the material; it claims that economic issues drive all of human history (I guess he missed, Abraham/Lot, (Gen. 13:8-9). Marx proposed that religion internalizes a set of beliefs that are contrary to their interest (cf., “Transvaluation,” the process by which the lower class due to their powerless conditions redefine themselves with such things as meekness, turning the other cheek, desire to be poor, etc.). Thus, to be truly a free society, religion must go (along with its reward later system (i.e., Heaven) for pain and suffering here). Remember, Marxism (Socialism/Communism) is a materialistic system, thus the need for salvation is rejected. They see the present-day society as one based upon exploitation of the vast masses by a small group of landowners, capitalists, etc. In short, they see capitalism and religion as forms of oppression that must be overthrown. To them, the charity (cf., from religious folks) is simply a way to justify themselves, as exploiters. As Karl Marx put it, “Religion

is the opium for the people.” As one writer put it, “Marx following Rousseau held that men had originally existed in a happy state of nature and only with the advent and rise of inequality, stemming from coercion and private property, had humanity become unhappy slaves of capital, sustained by the opiate of transcendental theology. It was only through inexorable historical struggle, mediated by righteous violence, that mankind would throw off its shackles and enter into a heaven on earth...it would be here that the state would wither away and...introduce an awakened humanity to unfettered autonomy and collective bliss...In this ideological worldview, there is no need to affect personal repentance or to cleanse oneself of moral impurities. In fact, the social religion would require no transcendental moral content at all because what had been traditional notions of right and wrong—good and evil, would become extinct and pass away from the horizon of memory. Any religious-like devotion, however, would be directed to the State...Beginning from a non-moral beginning and utilizing an amoral process, it hoped to arrive at a moral endpoint thru a reasoning that reduced justice, mercy, nature, happiness, etc. But,nothing remains in its camp but the myriad of unmarked graves stretching out across a century.” Cf., Socialism (per Marx) as a pit stop on the road to the overthrow of Capitalism, thus Communism. But this system has major flaws: 1) It assumes there is not God (or Truth), 2) It assumes there is therefore no soul/life beyond this life, 3) It assumes individuals will act out of selflessness for others (and never selfishness) in the state of Communism—which is, of course, laughable (if it were not so tragic), since the very reality of Communism has done the exact opposite on 100 million people now dead (Isa. 5:20)!

2. The Bible Teaches – That GOD CREATED ALL AND IS IN CONTROL (Gen. 1:1f; 48:15; 50:20; Dan. 4:17, 25, 32, 5:21; Heb. 1:3; Acts 14:27; Col. 4:3, Etc.). Marx’s nonsensical meanderings about how history flows toward the necessity of a rise to Communism (his view of utopia) is utter nonsense!
3. “...Marxist ideology preaches a monumental and deadly distortion of man’s nature. Individuals are complex and complicated, unique, and spiritual. They are influenced by innumerable events, circumstances, motivations, desires, interests, etc. [Tragically], it is the Marxist and critical...academics and activists who create [various] categories for their own convenience and revolutionary purposes when demanding the dissolution of society” (Levin 92).

4. Again, God's Word Teaches: 1) Individual Accountability (2 Cor. 5:10), 2) Work Ethic (Ecc. 9:10), 3) Time/Chance connected with humanity (Ecc. 9:11), 4) That God Is In Control/Not Mankind (Including His use of Providence, Psa. 2:1f; Isa. 40:1f, 43:11, 46:5, 9-10, 57:15).
- B. God Exists—And Is Absolutely Provable!
1. Moral Argument
  2. Uniqueness of Man Argument
  3. Cosmological Argument
  4. Teleological Argument
  5. Ontological Argument
  6. Anthropic Principle, Jesus Argument, Bible Argument, Etc., Etc., Etc.
- C. The Bible Is God's Word—And is the ONLY Provable Pattern for Mankind!
1. Scientific Foreknowledge Argument
  2. Typological Argument
  3. Prophecy Argument
  4. Bible Influence/Indestructability Argument
  5. Impartiality of Scripture Argument
  6. Higher Code of Ethics Argument
  7. Accuracy of Prophecy/History/Geography Argument
  8. Anticipation of Error Argument/Unity of the Bible Argument
  9. Brevity/Restraint Argument, Logic Demands It Argument, Etc., Etc. Etc.
- D. The Bible & Marxism Do Not Mix! The Bible Teaches...
1. Unique valued, dignity and worth of every INDIVIDUAL Person—made in God's image.
    - a. Genesis 1:26-27; Hebrews 12:9; Psalms 139:1f; Jeremiah 1:5
    - b. John 3:16; Luke 15:1f; Matthew. 7:12, 22:37f; 2 Timothy 4:6-8
  2. Individual Work-Ethic.
    - a. Genesis 3:19; 1 Thessalonians 4:11; 2 Thessalonians 3:10; Matthew 25:26

- b. Proverbs 6:6; 13:4; 20:4; 21:25; 24:30-34
- 3. Each Individual's Personal Right to Own/Control Private Property.
  - a. Exodus 20:15, 17; 22:12; 1 Kings 21:1f (vs. stealing/murder w/ Marxism!)
  - b. Proverbs 31:16, 24; Matthew 20:1-16; Acts 4:37; 5:4; Matthew 25:1f
- 4. A Person's Obligation to the Stewardship Principle/including Charity (Giving).
  - a. 1 Corinthians 16:1-2; Philippians 4:14-18; Matthew 7:12 (vs. the hate/theft of Marxism!)
  - b. Acts 11:29-30; 2 Corinthians 8-9; Acts 20:35; James 2:14f; 1 John 3:11-18
- 5. Every Person is Accountable to God for their Own Individual Actions/Choices.
  - a. This includes choices of good and bad. The Bible teaches sin's impact, as well as the PROPER way in which sin cannot be dealt with (thru Jesus and His plan of salvation/church, Acts 2:1f; 8:1f; 20:28; etc.)
  - b. Doesn't consider the risk/reward factor (cf., entrepreneurs)
- 6. The Essentiality of the Family (the Biblical model) within a Society.
  - a. From the opening of Genesis onward God's truth on the family is there
  - b. God's model is clear (Gen. 2:18f; Mat. 19:1f; Eph. 5; Col. 3; Psa. 127:1f!)
- 7. Law and Order within a Nation, NOT Chaos, Murder and Revolution.
  - a. God has 2 Divine Institutions: Home, Government, Church
  - b. Yes, corruption is evident in all 3—BUT that is not of God, but man! (Cf., Pro. 14:12; Jer. 10:23; Isa. 8:20; Jer. 17:5f, 22:29; 2 Pet. 1:3)
  - c. Christianity is a THE ONLY RELIGION acceptable to God. It is NOT a United States religion! (Jho. 14:6; Jho.3:16; Heb. 2:9; 1 Jho.2:1-2)
  - d. Yet, as citizens of a country built upon the PRINCIPLES of the Bible (cf., the Constitution and the freedoms that have

brought about (over time) much good to all (cf., this country not only ended slavery, but has elected men/women to almost every office imaginable over time! How did this happen? PRINCIPLES OF FREEDOM! And upon what are the PRINCIPLES based? Clearly, the Bible—certainly not something like Marxism/Communism)! Why any rational person would want to destroy such freedom is almost unimaginable, but Marxist and those connected with such “thinking” (sadly) DO want to tear/burn it down.

- e. “We have allowed the American Marxists to define who we are as a people. They defame us, slander our ancestors and history, and trash our founding documents and principles. They are mostly reprobates who hate the country in which they live and have contributed nothing to its betterment. Indeed, they live off the sweat and toil of others, while they pursue destructive and diabolical course for our nation, undermining and sabotaging virtually every institution in our society. Their ideology and worldview are based on the arguments and beliefs of a man, Karl Marx, whose writings are responsible for the enslavement, impoverishment, torture, and death of untold millions. While clearly, just as with each person now alive, men/women have both good and bad decisions/beliefs connected with them (and always will!), yet, these Marxists ignore a holistic approach to “every person” and work hard to dishonor the sacrifice and bravery of our early patriots, people like Joseph Warren, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Paul Revere...George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, and many others. They willfully ignore the tremendous sacrifice seen within the Civil War to end slavery. No other country has ever done this, costing hundreds of thousands of lives. They disregard the millions of Americans who fought, and hundreds of thousands that died, in two world wars, not counting all of the other wars. Both of the nation’s largest teacher unions support the Black Lives Matter organization [with curriculum being promoted] ‘committed’ to ideas such as a ‘queer-affirming network,’...and [curriculum that] promotes racially charged essays [textbooks, etc.]” (Levin 242-247).

- f. Woke? Yes, The United States Better WAKE-UP (Psa. 9:17), and even more importantly the Lord's Church, the Church of Christ (Acts 2:38-47; 20:28-32; Rom. 16:16-18) better WAKE-UP (1 The. 5:1f)!
- g. The Bible Condemns: Hate, Theft, Murder, Etc. (Rom. 1:1f; Mark 7:20f).
- h. The Bible Condemns Hypocrisy—Marxism Promotes It (Mat. 23:3).

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. You Cannot Be A Socialist/Communist & Be A Christian—PERIOD!
  - A. "...according to veteran pollster George Barna...98 percent of Americans who support socialism reject the biblical worldview" (Maginnis 18). Let this quote sink in!
  - B. The Explicit and Implicit teachings/principles of the B.I.B.L.E. are against Marxism.
  - C. Yes, certainly Christians help other Christians (Acts 2; 4; Etc.), as well as even non-Christians (Gal. 6:10), but they do such out of a proper heart/free-will (1 Tim. 6:6-21).
  - D. God's people use "riches" as God intends (Acts 10:38). They do not trust in them (Mark 10:24). Christians do not live for this world (Phi. 3:20), but for the next (1 Jho.2:25). Ironically, Marxist only trust in riches and in this world—after all, they are atheist and have nothing else. Marxism is a very sad and tragic atheistic philosophy/belief system.
  - E. The Marxist use "guilt" falsely (cf., even though, ironically, to an atheist, "guilt" does not even really exist). On the other hand, God shows men and women—from all nations—how to fix their guilt/sin problem, thru Jesus (Jho. 14:6; Acts 4:12; 2:38, 8:26f, 22:16). Yes, Marxists use guilt. God fixes the guilt (when individuals come to Him on His terms)!
2. "In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time...The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling class tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!" Karl Marx (Kamenka 241). Cf., Matthew 16:26, 2 Peter 3:1f and Acts 17:30-31!



3. “My object in life is to dethrone God and destroy capitalism” Karl Marx, author of *Das Kapital* (Maginnis 9).
4. “With disdain I will throw my gauntlet full in the face of the world, and see the collapse of this pygmy giant whose fall will not stifle my ardour. Then I will wander godlike and victorious through the ruins of the world, And, giving my words an active force, I will fell equal to the Creator” Karl Marx.
5. But I’ll quote one of Marx’s poems in part, “Thus Heaven I’ve forfeited, I know it full well. My soul, once true to God, is chosen for Hell” (Kengor 51).
6. Choices/Consequences – From the Soviet Gulags to the killing fields of Cambodia to the burning of buildings/lawless rioting seen within the United States in 2020, Marxism is clear.
7. President Ronald Reagan once said it this way, “Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn’t pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children’s children what it was once like in the United States where men were free” (Levin 13). Cf. with Joshua 24/Judges 1-2, and then apply it to the Lord’s Church and our obligation to spread of the Gospel/Truth (John 8:32; 17:17-21; 18:36-37)!
8. Karl Marx, in essence, said BURN IT ALL DOWN. Over time, 100 million plus have been murdered due to the “yoke” that Marx (and those with him) have placed upon the lives of countless scores of humanities; Poverty, torture, murder, lack of freedom and the like have defined Marxism!
9. Jesus, on the other hand, said, “Come unto to Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy, and my burden is light” (Matthew 11:28-20). When Jesus/True Christianity has been applied FREEDOM has risen!

#### WORKS CITED

- Parker, Philip. World History. New York, NY: Sterling Publishing, 2010.
- Maginnis, Robert. Give Me Liberty, Not Marxism. Crane, MO: Defender Publishing, 2021.
- Kengor, Paul. The Devil And Karl Marx. Gastonia, NC: Tan Books, 2020.
- Simpson, James. Who Was Karl Marx?—The Men, The Motives, and The Menace Behind Today’s

Rampaging American Left. Baltimore, MD: Simpson Publishing, 2021.

Kamenka, Eugene. The Portable Karl Marx. New York, NY: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1983.

Levin, Mark. American Marxism. New York, NY: Threshold Editions, 2021.

Sammeroff, Antony. The Big Reason Mises Rejected Marx's Dialectical Materialism.

Article from mises.org, 05-25-2020.

Strange, Stephen. God And Cancel Culture: Stand Strong Before It's Too Late. Lake Mary, FL: Frontline, 2021.

# Charles Darwin: The Descent of Man

Paden Reed

## INTRODUCTION:

1. In Psalm 11:3 we read “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?”. When we look across America, many Christians are left wondering how we became such a godless society. Our country today is a place of extreme political division undergirded with religious division. News articles come out on a daily basis showing new attacks on the Christian faith. In fact, nearly every metric that would gage the acceptance and push for sin has increased by staggering amounts over the last seventy years. Whether it’s LGBT, environmentalism, socialism, radical feminism, critical race theory, crimes, rioting, suicide, etc. or simply those that no longer claim belief in God or attend worship, the statistics are staggering and point to a crumbling foundation. Many congregations of the Lord’s church have closed their doors for good, while others are not far behind. In many congregations there are many gray heads and few crying babies. Consider just a few statistics below.
  - a. In 1973 there were 211 million people living in the United State of America of which approximately 2.5 million were members of the Lord’s church. This represented a ratio of 1 Christian to 84 non-Christians. Today there are approximately 330 million people living in the United States of America of which approximately 1.112 million are members of the Lord’s church. This represents a ratio of approximately 1 Christian for every 300 non-Christians. (Whitacre, 2021)
  - b. Those claiming belief in atheism or agnosticism has gone from about 4% in 2007 to 9% in 2019. Half of millennials claim unaffiliated or non-Christian faiths. U.S. church attendance has declined from 54% in 2007 to 45% in 2019 (Pew Research, 2019).
  - c. In 2009 a survey of 1000 twenty- to thirty-year-olds who left their faith were asked why? While shallow reasons were initially given such as politics, hypocrisy, and boring services, the survey revealed that the vast majority had no firm conviction that the word of God was true and therefore authoritative. When asked when they had their first doubts, 39.8% said in middle school, 43.7% in high school, and 10.6% in college (Ham & Beemer, 2009).
  - d. According to a 2020 Gallup poll, Generation Z (born 1997-2002) is comprised of 15.9% of those who identify at LGBT vs 1.3% of Traditionalist (born before 1946) (Jones, 2020).

2. Despite the depressing nature of these statistics, we are still left with the question, how did we get here? Many older Christians reminisce of the past wondering what happened that caused this country to change so rapidly? The answer is quite simple, and it is not new. The Bible says in 1 Peter 5:8 “Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.” We understand that all of Satan’s attacks fall into one of three categories. In 1 John 2:16 we read “For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.” We also understand from King Solomon in Ecclesiastes 1:9 “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun.” Not that man doesn’t invent new things, he does, but the very nature of man is cyclical. When we consider the present day, we are just going through another cycle whereby man is rejecting God’s word and His authority. Recall Satan’s first attack in Genesis 3. Satan came to Eve and tempted her to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. He did so in three ways. The lust of the flesh when Eve saw the tree was good for food. The lust of the eyes when Eve saw that the tree was pleasant to the eye. The pride of life when Eve found out the tree was desirable to make one wise. Nearly four thousand years later, Satan employed the same tactics on Jesus Christ after fasting in the desert (Matthew 4), only this time Satan was not successful. Why was Satan not successful? Jesus did not appeal to human wisdom, rather He appealed to the authority of God’s word.
3. This understanding of sin, as it relates to Satan’s attacks to reject the authority of God’s word, is why the foundations are being destroyed. Satan has employed this tactic many times throughout history and in particular the history of the church. He employed this tactic with Gnosticism in the early church by leading men to think they had special revelation apart from God’s divine revelation. This was seen again with Roman Catholicism when the emphasis of God’s word was replaced with tradition and the papal system. Many other denominational sects and religious uprisings have done the same (ex. Mormonism and Islam). So, while the same tactic has been employed by Satan over the years to compromise the authority of God’s word, he has merely packaged it in a different flavor each time. This leads us to our most current attack from Satan against God’s word today, Darwinian evolution. In the following sections we will observe these points regarding Darwin’s ideas on evolution as laid out in his second book, *The Descent of Man*.
  - a. Short Biography of Charles Darwin – Here we will examine how Charles Darwin came up with his ideas on evolution and the extent to which they have evolved today.
  - b. Darwin’s Evidence for Evolution – Here we will examine three lines of evidence laid out by Darwin in *The Descent of Man*: vestigial structures, homologous structures, and embryology.

- c. Impacts of Darwinian Evolution on Society – Here we will examine the consequences of accepting Darwinian evolution and how such a worldview has affected the foundations of Christianity.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **I. SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES DARWIN**

1. Charles Darwin was born February 12, 1809, in Shrewsbury, England to Robert and Susannah Darwin. Interestingly, he shares the same birthdate of American president Abraham Lincoln, a man who did much good in fighting racism compared to Darwin as we will note later. Darwin's father was a wealthy medical practitioner and his mother died early in Darwin's life (Thompson, 1981).
  - (a) Due to Darwin's father being a doctor and raising him, Darwin originally went to school at the University of Edinburgh to study medicine in 1825. This was never Darwin's passion. As he quickly learned he was squeamish of the operating room leading him to abandon the medical field for good. He next tried his hand at law although that did not last long either, as his passion really lied in studying nature (Thompson, 1981).
  - (b) At the age of 19 Darwin eventually decided to accept the creed of the Church of England and enrolled at Cambridge University. He graduated with a degree in Divinity In 1831 though he never had any interest in joining the clergy (Thompson, 1981).
2. The greatest benefits to Darwin stemming from his education were the connections he made. One such connection made at Cambridge landed him a spot on a 5-year voyage on the H.M.S. Beagle. The captain, Robert Fitzroy, had invited Darwin to be the ship's naturalist. This expedition set sail in 1831 from Plymouth England and traveled to many parts of the world including New Zealand, Australia, and the famous Galapagos Islands. During this voyage Darwin formulated many of his ideas about evolution. He took with him a copy of *Principles of Geology* by Charles Lyell. Lyell laid the groundwork for Darwin's ideas by incorporating the idea of millions and billions of years into earth's history, a fundamental pillar for evolution (Thompson, 1981).
  - (a) "I always feel as if my books came half out of Lyell's brains and that I never acknowledge this sufficiently, nor do I know how I can, without saying so in so many words – for I have always thought the great merit of the Principles of Geology, was that it altered the whole tone of one's mind and therefore that when seeing a thing never seen by Lyell, one yet saw it partially through his eyes." (Darwin, 1844)

- (b) During Darwin's trip to the Galapagos Islands, Darwin observed finches with varying characteristics such as size and beak shape. These variations allowed for different finches to adapt to their environment better based upon food source. This is where Darwin developed his idea for natural selection. The concept of Natural Selection in and of itself is not controversial. It merely suggests that animals better suited for their environment are more likely to survive and pass on their genes to offspring. Animals less suited for their environment tend to die out and not pass on their genes. When Darwin coupled this concept with the ideas of Lyell, it laid the groundwork for his ideas of evolution which he penned in his first book (Thompson, 1981).
3. Charles Darwin published his first book *The Origin of Species* in 1859. Few people are aware of its full title: *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. This book sold 16,000 copies in 17 years which was a phenomenal achievement for that day and age. While some dispute whether or not Darwin should be credited with his ideas on evolution vs other contemporaries of his day such as Alfred Russell Wallace, the fact remains that Darwin is given credit for popularizing this view. The reality is the ideas of evolution predate Darwin by thousands of years before the time of Christ. There are many reasons why Darwin's work made the biggest impact in acceptance of evolution but in short, they can all be summarized by the right time and place. While this book is the most well-known of Darwin's pen, the book that really made application and sought further justification was his second book (Thompson, 1981).
  4. Darwin's second book, *The Descent of Man*, was published in 1871. This book took off where Darwin was not willing to go in his first book in discussing human evolution. The implications of Darwinian evolution are clearly laid out in this book in what is sometimes referred to as "social Darwinism". Darwin begins this book seeking to give justification for evolution and then proceeds to explain its logical outcomes. These justifications and logical outcomes will be analyzed and answered shortly. Before proceeding to that analysis, it is worth noting that Charles Darwin died in 1882 at his home in Downe, United Kingdom. He is buried today in the actual floor of Westminster Abbey by the Church of England in order to celebrate him. It is quite ironic, even though the Church of England is not the New Testament church, to consider this fact in light of Psalm 11:3. The quote below appears in Darwin's home where he wrote his two books (now a museum) as the final exhibit over silhouette of Genesis 1 (Ham, 2006).

- (a) “Many Christians believed that the world and everything in it, including mankind, had been created by God in the beginning and had remained unaltered ever since.... Darwin’s theory made nonsense of all of this. He said that the world was a constantly changing place and that all living creatures were changing too. Far from being created in God’s own image, Darwin suggested that human life had probably started out as something far more primitive—the story of Adam and Eve was a myth.” (Ham, 2006)

## II. DARWIN’S EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION

- A. We will now examine the three lines of evidence Darwin pursued in the *Descent of Man* to give justification for his ideas. In the introduction of *Descent of Man*, Darwin made the following claim. “The homological structure, embryological development, and rudimentary organs of a species remain to be considered, whether it be man or any other animal, to which our attention may be directed; but these great classes of facts afford, as it appears to me, ample and conclusive evidence in favour of the principle of gradual evolution” (Darwin, 1871). It is important to understand that these are not the only arguments made in favor of evolution today. However, these arguments are still found peddled around today by textbooks and advocates even though they are demonstrably false.
- B. Homology
  - (a) Merriam-Webster dictionary defines homology in the evolutionary sense as “correspondence or similarity in form or function between parts (such as the wing of a bat and the human arm) of different species resulting from modification of a trait possessed by a common ancestor: similarity of traits reflecting common descent and ancestry. (Webster, 2021). In *The Descent of Man*, Darwin argues that homology is evidence of human evolution from ape like ancestors by making the following admission. “It is notorious that man is constructed on the same general type or model as other mammals. All the bones of his skeleton can be compared with corresponding bones in a monkey, bat, or seal. So it is with his muscles, nerves, blood-vessels, and internal viscera” (Darwin, 1871). Darwin goes on to argue that like man many animals, particularly monkeys, can catch the same diseases. Just as man is subject to the addicting nature and effects from alcohol and other drugs, so are animals. This line of argument is still popularly used today. As one college biology textbook notes “Amphibians, birds, and other reptiles, and mammals typically have four limbs, and the number and positions of the bones that make up those appendages are strikingly

similar. The simplest explanation is that modern vertebrates descended from a common ancestor that originated this skeletal organization” (Hoefnagels, 2012).

- (b) Homology is representative of many evolutionary arguments. Void of actual scientific thinking and full of hand waving pseudoscientific superstition. Many scientists today have been properly taught that correlation does not equal causation yet very few scientists seem capable of applying this. The quotes presented previously bring with them many true facts and pieces of data. These are not in dispute by either side. The bone structure of the hand in man is very similar to a whale, a bat, and a horse. However, to go as far as to interpret this data as being cause for a common ancestor through evolution is unwarranted by the data and doesn't represent scientific thinking. A creationist can just as easily look at the data and speculate a common designer rather than common descent. After all, take just about any man-made product today and look at the variations between them. Ford vehicles, for example, are going to vary over the years but they will all have characteristics and similarities that make them a Ford. In like manner, there are similarities to a truck, motorcycle, train, boat, and plane. All of these are used for transportation and contain wheels, steering wheels, seats, lights, engines, etc. However, one would be laughed at for looking at such machines and saying they must have evolved from a single tire. The reality is if animals did evolve on the same planet which they function and survive we would expect to see similarities. Additionally, we would expect to see similarities between animals created by an intelligent designer that breathe the same air and eat the same food. However, what this argument fails to consider is the vast differences between humans and animals in spite of the many similarities. Popular secular outlets and evolutionists have long claimed that human DNA and chimpanzee DNA is 98% similar when in fact this is absolutely false. The real percentage ranges from 86%-89% (Tomkins, 2011). When we consider that there are only four DNA bases representing two pairs that describe every living thing on this planet, we would expect an incredibly high similarity even between animals and plants. In fact, we share 50% of the same DNA as bananas but that doesn't mean we are 50% like bananas (Wieland, 2002). The data on the molecular level, if evolution were true, should be a strong support for the homology but it simply is not. What is born out time and time again is what is obvious to us in our everyday lives. Design demands a designer, and our bodies are a



strong testament to God's wonderful design. "I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Marvelous are Your works, And that my soul knows very well." (Psalm 139:14)

### C. Embryology

- (a) Embryology is the study of embryo development in the womb from humans to animals. Darwin argued that embryos in the womb are evidence of evolution in the following way. "Man is developed from an ovule, about the 125<sup>th</sup> of an inch in diameter, which differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals. The embryo itself, at a very early period, can hardly be distinguished from that of other members of the vertebrate kingdom (Darwin, 1871). The idea behind this argument is animals look very similar at early stages of development and only start to look different toward the later stages of development in the womb. This argument is also still used today in college biology textbooks. "Because related organisms share many physical traits, they must also share the processes that produce those traits.... By comparing embryos at different stages, it should be possible to deduce some of the steps that have led to differences among species" (Hoefnagels, 2012).
- (b) The refutation of this argument is rather straightforward. It's simply not true. The original argument used by Darwin was based off the work of Ernst Haeckel who intentionally forged hand drawn images of vertebrae embryos. In fact, it's rather ironic given this statement from Darwin himself about embryo sketches comparing a human and a dog, "...at about the same early stage of development, carefully copied from two works of undoubted accuracy" (Darwin, 1871). Haeckel not only committed forgery; he was also very selective in which vertebrates he chose to represent, leaving out several classes of vertebrates that didn't fit his narrative. He also chose examples such as a salamander over a frog even though both are amphibians and look incredibly different at the development stage. Even though leading embryologists of the day had spoken out against this work, it is still used today as an argument (Wells, 2002). One college biology textbook even states that while Haeckel did forge his images, modern photographs of embryos using scanning electron microscopes show they are actually similar. The textbook shows examples of a fish, mouse, and alligator. Perhaps the author thinks her students are too ignorant or dumb to actually examine the photos provided because they certainly don't support her argument as they are all obviously different and unique (Hoefnagels, 2012). If

one would take the time to examine embryos at the very earliest stages of development from the time the egg is fertilized, to the cleavage stage, to the gastrulation stage they would realize just how vastly different these embryos are, even before the alleged similar stages of evolutionists (Wells, 2002). At the end of the day, this argument is vastly untrue and supported by no scientific evidence.

#### D. Vestigial Structures

- (a) According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary the word vestigial means “of a body part or organ: remaining in a form that is small or imperfectly developed and not able to function: being or having the form of a vestige” (Webster, 2021). Darwin actually spends the greatest amount of time on this third argument by going through and listing structures, primarily in humans, that he claims are rudimentary leftovers from evolutionary ancestors that serve no purpose for humans today. Here is how Darwin described this argument. “Not one of the higher animals can be named which does not bear some part in a rudimentary condition; and man forms no exception to the rule. Rudimentary organs must be distinguished from those that are nascent; though in some cases the distinction is not easy. The former are either absolutely useless, such as the mammae on male quadrupeds, or the incisor teeth of ruminants which never cut through the gums; or they are of such slight service to their present possessors, that we can hardly suppose that they were developed under the conditions which now exist. Organs in this latter state are not strictly rudimentary, but they are tending in this direction... Rudimentary organs are eminently variable; and this is partly intelligible, as they are useless, or nearly useless, and consequently are no longer subjected to natural selection.” (Darwin, 1871)
- (b) Darwin lists several structures which he argues are vestigial including the muscles of the ear, incisor teeth (wisdom teeth), appendix, coccyx (tail bone), male mammae (male nipples/breasts), body hair/goose bumps, sense of smell, and semilunar fold in the corner of the eye. In fact, in 1895 German anatomist Robert Wiedersheim expanded the list of rudimentary useless organs to 86 including the tonsils, parathyroid, pineal and pituitary glands, adenoids, and valves in veins (Wiedersheim, 1895). Even today this argument is still used in college textbooks like *Biology Concepts and Investigations* with repeated examples from Darwin including body hair/goose bumps, coccyx tail bone, and ear muscles (Hoefnagels, 2012). In 2016, a

video was produced by Vox on YouTube titled “Proof of evolution that you can find on your body” went viral. As of 2021, the video had amassed over 34 million views and peddled some of the same arguments used by Darwin such as wisdom teeth, goose bumps, ear muscles, palmaris longus and the coccyx tail bone (Vox, 2016). Sadly, a rebuttal video was produced by Answers in Genesis with Dr. David Menton shortly afterwards, but as of 2021 has only gained slightly over 17 thousand views (Menton, 2016).

- (c) Before looking at the organs themselves we must first examine some of the fundamental flaws with the vestigial organ argument. For example, why are vestigial organs still around after millions of years if evolution is true? If an animal no longer needed a particular organ or bone then what advantage would such a feature add to its ability to survive and pass on offspring? By an evolutionists own admission, humans have many physical features that lower order animals lack, so how did some features and organs disappear while others remained? It is also important to note that loss of use does not explain an organ’s origin. Evolution must explain how life can go from simple single celled organisms to complex animals. Losing function or losing genetic information does not aid evolution’s goal when going from simple to complex. Perhaps one of the biggest problems with the vestigial organ argument is the medical consequences from such a belief. We must ask how do we know an organ is useless? This incorrect line of thinking has resulted in the medical field (largely steeped in Darwinian evolution) to just cut off “useless” organs like the appendix and tonsils. We must understand that just because we do not have evidence of a function for an organ this does not imply evidence does not exist. Said another way absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Next time you hear an evolutionist make this argument just ask them if they would be okay with removing all of their alleged vestigial organs. It’s doubtful you will have any takers.
- (d) Time and space do not permit a detailed refutation of each alleged leftover and useless organ from evolutionary ancestors. However, brief explanations of function of the more popular organs presented by evolutionists are given below. It should be noted that the list Robert Wiedersheim compiled and was later expanded has essentially been eliminated down to zero as science was allowed to work itself out and discover the functions of certain organs.

1. The Appendix – one of the most famous “vestigial organs”, the appendix is part of the gut associated lymphoid tissue and plays an immunological role. It serves as a safe house for beneficial bacteria in the large intestine and helps to support our immune system (Menton, 2016).
2. Male Mammae & Nipples – This organ is rather interesting for an evolutionist to use. Do they wish to suggest males once nursed as females? Regardless, mammary glands begin development in the sixth week of gestation. It is during the early stages of embryonic development that humans (both male and female) have similar makeup. Depending on whether they have the XX or XY chromosomes will determine which features are expressed and which features are repressed in development. Male nipples are also very sensitive and contain nerves and blood flow, something unexpected if totally worthless baggage (Mitchell, 2011).
3. Wisdom Teeth – Some people have their wisdom teeth removed because they lack room in the jaws to accommodate them. The number of people estimated needing to have wisdom teeth removed is 20% (MacGregor, 1985). Some people do not even develop wisdom teeth but there is still a large number of the population who do develop them and have no issue accommodating and putting them to use. The fact that humans today can and do use them makes them not vestigial. The reason why some people likely cannot accommodate them is due to diet. If we study Neanderthal skulls we see they had larger skulls and could easily accommodate a third pair of molars (Menton, 2016).
4. The Coccyx Tailbone – Thankfully this is not a part of the human body the medical field has tried to remove. Some evolutionists have even tried to argue that very rare genetic abnormalities are actually human tails or that we have tails like a monkey as embryos. None of this true, and while the coccyx is referred to as a tailbone it has no connection to being a tail. The coccyx is composed of about 4 or 5 vertebrae at the end of the spine connected to one’s head. These vertebrae serve as an anchor connecting six muscles forming the pelvic diaphragm. It supports the organs in our

abdominal and pelvic cavities such as the urinary bladder, uterus, prostate, rectum, and anus (Menton, 2016)

5. Body Hair & Goosebumps – We experience goosebumps either when we are cold or as an emotional reaction. Evolutionists argue that hair stands up on animals when they are cold to help warm them up. In fact, humans also use goosebumps to contract hair follicles, secrete protective oil, and produce heat. The hair on our body serves many purposes and changes based on location, age, and hormones. It also acts as a sensory mechanism. Body hair and goosebumps are certainly not vestigial but rather point to God’s masterful design in helping regulate our internal temperature on average to 98.6 degrees Fahrenheit whether it is 32 degrees outside or 110 degrees (Menton, 2016).

### III. IMPACTS OF DARWINIAN EVOLUTION ON SOCIETY

- A. “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” (Psalm 11:3).  
While we have answered Darwin’s arguments for evolution, we now want to see the consequences when Darwinian evolution is accepted and applied. It is the belief of this author that acceptance of Darwinian evolution lays the foundation for the majority of issues we are facing in the world today. While this will not be an extensive overview of Darwinian evolution carried out to its logical conclusion, it should impress upon the reader the profound influence Satan has had on society through Darwinian evolution.
- B. Racism
  - (a) While racism or prejudice are not new for humanity, Darwinian evolution fueled the fire for justifying evolution going into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In fact, it is perplexing that in today’s cancel culture where confederate statues are overthrown in the name of racism that Charles Darwin has not been canceled and his statues overthrown. In short, Darwin believed that individuals with lighter skin were more evolved than individuals with darker skin and he used evolution as the justification. In fact, Darwin gives an entire chapter on the subject of races and consistently refers to those with darker skin as “savages”. Consider a handful of quotes from Darwin himself along with those who held to his views.
    1. “At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage

racess. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes, as Professor Schaaffhausen has remarked, will no doubt be exterminated. The break will then be rendered wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state as we may hope, than the Caucasian and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as at present between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.” (Darwin, 1871)

2. In arguing for vestigial structures in the ear muscles, Darwin says the following. “It has been asserted that the ear of man alone possesses a lobule: but ‘a rudiment of it is found in the gorilla’; and, as I hear from Prof. Preyer, it is not rarely absent in the negro.” Again in regards to sense of smell being less in man than in some animals, Darwin states the following. “But the sense of smell is of extremely slight service, if any, even to the dark coloured races of men, in whom it is much more highly developed than in the white and civilized races.” (Darwin, 1871)
3. Thomas Huxley, known as Darwin’s bulldog for his advocacy of Darwinian evolution and often referenced in *Descent of Man*, said the following in a speech. “No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average Negro is the equal, still less superior, of the white man”. (Huxley, 1865)
4. A college biology textbook in 1914 stated the following. “At the present time there exist upon the earth five races... the highest type of all, the Caucasians, represented by the civilized white inhabitants of Europe and America.” (Hunter, 1914)
5. Famous Harvard evolutionary paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould said the following. “Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1859 but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory.” (Gould, 1977)

(b) If one will take the time to read and understand the mind of Hitler they will see that he was an evolutionist. Hitler viewed the Jews as an inferior race and he was only helping to speed up natural selection and survival of the fittest in advancement of the “Aryan race”. The Nazi practices of sterilization were also applied to Roma Gypsies, handicapped individuals, and African-German children in order to suppress reproduction (Holocaust Encyclopedia, 2021). Consider the

following quotes as they relate to the views of Hitler, Nazi Germany, and the holocaust.

1. The following quote comes from Hitler's autobiography, *Mein Kampf*. "If Nature does not wish that weaker individuals should mate with the stronger, she wishes even less that a superior race should intermingle with an inferior one; because in such a case all her efforts, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, to establish an evolutionary higher stage of being, may thus be rendered futile." (Hitler, 1925)
2. From Hitler's *Secret Conversations* the following quote comes from Hitler. "If I can accept a divine Commandment, it's this one: "Thou shalt preserve the species." The life of the individual must not be set at too high a price. If the individual were important in the eyes of nature, nature would take care to preserve him. Amongst the millions of eggs, a fly lays, very few are hatched out — and yet the race of flies thrives. (Hitler, 1953)
3. German historian Joachim Clemens Fest, who grew up in Nazi Germany and was a part of Hitler's youth, noted in his book *The Face of the Third Reich* the following. "Hitler was influenced above all by the theories of the nineteenth-century social Darwinist school, whose conception of man as biological material was bound up with impulses towards a planned society. He was convinced that the race was disintegrating, deteriorating through faulty breeding as a result of a liberally tinged promiscuity that was vitiating the nation's blood. And this led to the establishment of a catalogue of 'positive' curative measures: racial hygiene, eugenic choice of marriage partners, the breeding of human beings by the methods of selection on the one hand and extirpation on the other." (Fest, 1970)
4. British anthropologist and atheistic evolutionist Sir Arthur Keith also noted the following. "The German Führer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution. (Keith, 1947)

### C. Sexism

(a) Darwin believed that man was superior to woman in nearly every aspect. He concluded this view based on the idea of survival of the fittest. It is quite ironic that most of the radical feminist movement today ignores this fact or that atheists who try to criticize the Bible for alleged sexism forget the logical outcomes of Darwinism. If evolution is true, then every trait is either favorable or unfavorable to fitness. Evolution, therefore, forces the idea of ranking light skin vs dark skin or male vs female. However, the Bible has no starting point which to derive such prejudice as we are all made in the image of God. The Bible does assign different roles to both men and women and common sense tells us that men are better equipped for certain tasks and women are better equipped for certain tasks. This is something we should be thankful for because it is a great benefit to the marriage union and to the church. Consider what Darwin had to say from his own lips.

1. "The chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is [shown] by man attaining to a higher eminence, in whatever he takes up, than woman can attain--whether requiring deep thought, reason or imagination, or merely the use of the senses and hands. If two lists were made of the most eminent men and women in poetry, painting, sculpture, music, comprising composition and performance, history, science, and philosophy, with half-a-dozen names under each subject, the two lists would not bear comparison. ...if men are capable of decided eminence over women in many subjects, the average standard of mental power in a man must be above that of a woman." (Darwin, 1871)
2. Here is a quote from The Autobiography of Charles Darwin by Nora Barlow from Darwin in regard to why marriage was beneficial to a man. "Who will feel interested in one, object to be beloved and played with—better than a dog anyhow—Home, and someone to take care of house—Charms of music and female chit-chat. These things are good for one's health". (Barlow, 1958)

### D. Morality

(a) Where do morals come from? This is the basis of the anthropological argument for the existence of God. If God does not exist, then



morals do not exist. Since morals do exist, God must exist. This leaves the atheist with only two possible outcomes to refute this argument. Either they must explain the origin of objective morality, or they must look like a scumbag. The latter is because they cannot definitively say why anything is right or wrong. Very few atheists are willing to accept the consequences of believing in no objective morality. If you were to ask an atheist, who rejects objective morality, why rape or slavery is wrong, they could not give you an objective answer, thus looking like a scumbag. Consider the following quote from atheist William Provine in a rare glimpse of atheist honesty.

1. “No purposive principles exist in nature. Organic evolution has occurred by various combinations of random genetic drift, natural selection, Mendelian heredity, and many other purposeless mechanisms. Humans are complex organic machines that die completely with no survival of soul or psyche. Humans and other animals make choices frequently, but these are determined by the interaction of heredity and environment and are not the result of free will. No inherent moral or ethical laws exist, nor are there absolute guiding principles for human society. The universe cares nothing for us and we have no ultimate meaning in life.” (Provine, 1988)

- (b) Now consider an atheist who believes in evolution rationalizing where morals come from because they are not willing to look like a scumbag. Since they believe in evolution, they must argue that morality evolved from inorganic matter and then from animals. It must be noted that this argumentation is false because we cannot derive morality through evolution because inorganic material shows no signs of morality and neither do animals. Have you ever seen or heard of a group of monkeys sitting around holding a trial for the crime of another monkey? No, in fact, many animals eat their young, kill for fun, and steal from one another, never showing any sign of morality. Nevertheless, consider the logical outcomes if one looks to the animal kingdom and nature for morality as many in our secularized world have. On the subject of homosexuality, many have argued that it is natural and moral because some animals are observed engaging in homosexual like behavior. On the subject of abortion, it has been argued that a baby in the womb is just a clump of cells and doesn't really have any value over any other living organism. Consider the animal rights movement, though animal

cruelty is morally wrong, the notion of animals are equal to humans is equally wrong. Such thinking leads to ideas like vegetarianism and veganism in the name of animal rights. What about climate change and environmentalism? The Bible teaches us to be good stewards of God's creation and have dominion over it but it doesn't teach us to worship the creation. Some atheistic evolutionists have even sought to justify infidelity in the name of evolution due to some animals having multiple sexual partners. Consider the following case history of Jeffrey Dahmer.

1. Jeffrey Dahmer was one of the most notorious serial killers in modern history. He murdered 17 men and boys, dismembered them, stored human body parts in his apartment, practiced homosexual necrophilia and cannibalized his victims. He was convicted of 16 counts of murder and sentenced to serve over 900 years in prison. During his incarceration, he was murdered by another inmate. Due to the fascination by the media of such heinous crimes, Dahmer gained national spotlight attention. In 1994, Stone Phillips interviewed Jeffrey and his dad Lionel for NBC's Dateline. During the interview, Lionel asked his son when he first felt that everyone is accountable for their actions. Note how Jeffrey responded. "Well, thanks to you for sending that creation science material. Because I always believed the lie that evolution is truth, the theory of evolution is truth. That we all just came from the slime, and when we died, you know, that was it. There was nothing. So, the whole theory cheapens life.... And I've since come to believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the true Creator of the Earth. It didn't just happen" (Phillips, 1994).
2. What is fascinating about Jeffrey Dahmer is that he simply followed Darwinian evolution to its natural conclusion. Man is his own god with no moral accountability and no authority over him.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

“If the foundations are destroyed, What can the righteous do?” (Psalm 11:3). Hopefully by now you can clearly see Satan's attack on the authority of the word of God through evolution. When many Christians ask, what is happening to our society, culture, and church members, the answer is Satan's attack on the authority of God's word through Darwinian evolution. While the strategy is not new for Satan, the flavor is unfamiliar to many sleeping Christians. In this review and analysis of Charles Darwin's *The Descent of*

*Man*, we have noted the life of Darwin, refuted his arguments for evolution, and examined the logical outcomes and teachings of Darwin's worldview. It is my sincere hope that you will take the words of 1 Peter 3:15 and Mathew 28:19-20 and go out into the world, preach the Gospel, and defend the authority of God's word from the fiery darts of Satan. We are at war with Satan, and we need Christians to put on the armor of God and go to battle.

#### WORKS CITED

- Barlow, Nora. The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809–1882, W. W. Norton & Company, 1958
- Darwin, Charles. The Correspondence of Charles Darwin, Vol. 3, 1987, P. 55
- Darwin, Charles. The Decent of Man, London: John Murray, Albemarle St., 1871
- Encyclopedia, Holocaust. Nazi Racism, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2021, <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/nazi-racism>
- Fest, Joachim Clemens. The Face of the Third Reich, Pantheon, 1970
- Gould, Stephen Jay. Ontogeny and Phylogeny, Belknap Press, 1977
- Ham, Ken. The Ghost of Darwin, Answers In Genesis, 2006 [answersingenesis.org/charles-darwin/biography/the-ghost-of-darwin/](http://answersingenesis.org/charles-darwin/biography/the-ghost-of-darwin/)
- Hitler, Adolph. Hitler's Secret Conversations, Straus and Young, 1953
- Hitler, Adolph. Mein Kampf, Franz Eher Nachfolger GmbH, 1925
- Hunter, George William. A Civic Biology Presented in Problems, American Book Company, 1914
- Huxley, Thomas. Science & Education: Essays: Emancipation – Black and White, D Appleton and Company, 1895 (Note: Speech given in 1865)
- Jones, Jeffrey M. LGBT Identification Rises to 5.6% in Latest U.S. Estimate, Gallup, Inc., 2020 [news.gallup.com/poll/329708/lgbt-identification-rises-latest-estimate.aspx](https://news.gallup.com/poll/329708/lgbt-identification-rises-latest-estimate.aspx)
- MacGrego, A.J. The Impacted Lower Wisdom Tooth, Oxford University Press, 1985
- McDowell, Josh, and Sean McDowell. Evidence That Demands a Verdict: Life-Changing Truth for a Skeptical World. Rutledge Hill Press, 2017.

- Menton, David. The New Answers Book 3, Vestigial Organs – Evidence for Evolution?, Master Books, 2016
- Menton, David. Anatomist Dr. David Menton Responds to "Proof of Evolution That You Can Find on Your Body", Answers in Genesis, 2016, [youtube.com/watch?v=Z4J3327IoWc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z4J3327IoWc)
- Merriam-Webster. Homology, Merriam-Webster, 2021 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/homology>
- Merriam-Webster. Vestigial, Merriam-Webster, 2021 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vestigial>
- Mitchell, Tommy. Why Do Men Have Nipples?, Answers in Genesis, 2011, [answersingenesis.org/human-body/vestigial-organs/why-do-men-have-nipples](https://www.answersingenesis.org/human-body/vestigial-organs/why-do-men-have-nipples)
- Pew Research. In U.S. Decline of Christianity Continues at Rapid Pace, Pew Research Center, 2019 [pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/](https://www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/)
- Phillips, Stone. Jeffrey Dahmer Stone Phillips Interview, NBC Dateline, 1994 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4MK9glxbxrk>
- Provine, William. Scientists Face It! Science and Religion are Incompatible, The Scientist, 1988
- Thompson, Bert. The History of Evolutionary Thought, Apologetics Press, 1981
- Tomkins, Jeffery. Genome-Wide DNA Alignment Similarity (Identity) for 40,000 Chimpanzee DNA Sequences Queried against the Human Genome is 86–89%, Answers Research Journal, 2011
- Vox. Proof of evolution that you can find on your body, Vox, 2016, [youtube.com/watch?v=rFxu7NEoKC8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rFxu7NEoKC8)
- Wells, Johnathan. Icons of Evolution Science or Myth?, Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2002
- Whitacre, Rob. Evangelism Simplified A Christian's Guidebook. Glad Tidings Publishing, 2021
- Wiedersheim, Robert. The Structure of Man: An Index to His Past History. Macmillan and Co., 1985
- Wieland, Carl. Furry little humans?, Creation, 2002

# Julius Wellhausen: Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel

Keith A. Mosher, Sr.

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Wellhausen's background information will help the student to understand the direction of Wellhausen's modernistic tendencies, as he developed his theory of a non-inspired Bible.
2. Wellhausen was a confused theology student who thought he saw contradictions in Holy Writ, and so he attempted to find answers to the supposed difficulties through a literary, historical approach to the Bible (*Encyclopedia.com* 1).
3. He wrote: "I became a theologian because a scientific treatment of the Bible interested me; only gradually did I come to understand that a professor of theology also has the practical task of preparing students for service in the Protestant Church, and that I am not adequate to this practical task, but that instead, despite all caution on my own part, I make my hearers unfit for their office. Since then, my theological professorship has been weighing heavily on my conscience" (<https://religion.wikia> 2).
4. Wellhausen moved several times as he changed his teaching duties to subjects other than theology (*Ibid.*).
5. Wellhausen is best known for his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* and his contributions to the error based *documentary hypothesis* (*Ibid.*).
6. When studying Wellhausen and his theories, the student should keep in mind that most of his efforts to secularize the Bible were focused on the *Hexateuch* (Genesis through Joshua; *Ibid.*).
7. The *documentary hypothesis*, while not entirely Wellhausen's creation, states that there were a least four Old Testament authors, all of whose writings were edited by later writers as the Bible evolved into its present form (*Ibid.*).
8. This writer has personal knowledge of the fact that historical-critical approaches to the Bible are believed and taught in some of our graduate schools.

## DISCUSSION:

### I. WELLHAUSEN'S HISTORY:

1. Wellhausen was born in Hamelin, Germany in the kingdom of Hanover on May 17, 1844 (*religion.wikia* 2).
  - a. He died on January 7, 1918 at age 73 (*Ibid.*).

- b. His father was a Lutheran “clergyman” (Ibid.).
- 2. Wellhausen became a student of theology at the University of Gottingen and studied under a conservative Protestant teacher named Georg Heinrich August Ewald (Ibid.).
  - a. In 1870 Wellhausen became a professor in Old Testament history at Gottingen, but then moved to the University of Greifswald where he was a professor of theology (Ibid.).
  - b. The quote above in the introduction was from a letter that he wrote to the president of Greifswald when he resigned in 1872; his conscience, he wrote, would not let him teach Bible theology as if it were true history (Ibid.).
- 3. Wellhausen was then hired as a professor of oriental languages in the faculty of philology at the University of Halle, but then moved to the University of Marburg in 1885, and from there was transferred back to the University of Gottingen where he stayed until his death (Ibid.).
- 4. He is best known for his *Prolegomena*, but also wrote ten other works (Ibid.).
- 5. McGarvey (a gospel preacher) wrote of Wellhausen and his reaction to a review of his *Prolegomena* by two men named Peake and Dr. Baxter. The reaction from Wellhausen is wrathful as the two reviewers struck directly at his evolutionary theory of how the Bible came to be. In part, Wellhausen wrote: “they can count on a number of readers who detest me...What a pity that I live in an age in which I can no longer be burned at the stake” (*Biblical Criticism* 168).
  - a. McGarvey then penned that Wellhausen’s note “clearly showed that Baxter’s review had struck Wellhausen in a very tender spot” (Ibid.).
  - b. Brother McGarvey then added: “It (Wellhausen’s reply, K.M.) is the old cry of every man who, by false teaching, excites the disgust of earnest men” (Ibid.).
- 6. Wellhausen advanced a definitive formulation of the developing *documentary hypothesis* and his theory remained the dominant model for Pentateuchal studies until the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (*Encyclopedia.com* 2).
  - a. At the end of the last century Wellhausen’s theory of just four authors and the editors began to be challenged by modern theologians who had opted for a multiplicity of writers of every book of the Bible (Ibid.).
  - b. Wellhausen’s uncompromisingly secular approach to the Bible and his theories of the Jewish people, denied that they were the chosen people

of God and has even led to the accusation that he intended to destroy the Jewish religion and that his writings led to the anti-semitic affairs in Germany (Ibid.). (There is no material evidence that his writings did so; there may be only a coincidental relationship. Certainly the Jewish people were hated in Germany; K.M.)

7. Wellhausen was a historian, linguist, and textual critic, and his name will ever be associated with higher criticism and the study of Hebrew and Greek Scriptures from a purely scientific and critical/historical point of view (Ibid).
8. Wellhausen's first theology teacher, Ewald, and he, had a gradual falling-out over the years and often quarreled over the proper view of the Old Testament, but Wellhausen's Ph.D. in theology was granted from Gottingen, nevertheless.
  - a. At the time Wellhausen studied under Ewald a book had been completed by D. F. Strauss, *The Life of Jesus*, in which Strauss asserted that the four gospels were mere myth and another book by F. C. Baur claimed that Acts was not factual. In the latter contexts, Wellhausen lost his faith by studying and accepting such materials (Ibid.).
  - b. The critics of an accurate, genuine, authentic text had won Wellhausen away from Christianity and into the world of evolutionary thought about a community produced Bible (Ibid.).
  - c. During his professorship at Marburg (1885-1891) Wellhausen confessed that he was "fed up" with the Old Testament (Ibid.).

## II. WELLHAUSEN AND THE LAW OF MOSES:

- A. For more than two thousand years, Judaism had taught that the law of Moses preceded the Hebrew monarchy, and that the Hebrew prophets preached from the ninth to the fifth centuries B.C. (*Encyclopedia.com 4*).
- B. Wellhausen, in his vexation from misinterpreting the relationships between the Hebrew prophets and the Law of Moses, decided that the Mosaic code was written after the time of the prophets, and his view added to the documentary hypothesis of earlier, higher critics (Ibid.).
- C. This misunderstanding, by Wellhausen, concerning Moses and the prophets began when he was a student of Ewald's. [The standard work on the chronology of the law and the prophets at that time was A. W. Knoble's commentaries on the Pentateuch, and Knoble's views are correct and taught today by me. K.M.] Note the following quote from Wellhausen: "At last, in the course of a casual visit to Gottingen in the summer of 1867, I learned through Ritschle that **Karl Heinrich Graf** placed the Law later than the Prophets, and almost without knowing his

reasons for the hypothesis, I was prepared to accept it; I readily acknowledged to myself the possibility of understanding Hebrew antiquity without the book of the Torah" (*Encyclopedia.com* 4; emphasis mine, K.M.). [The latter theory is often taught to graduate students as the Graf-Wellhausen theory of higher criticism.]

- D. The question was, was the Law of Moses in existence before or after the prophetic writings? To place the prophetic texts first, however, requires that one must reverse the logical law of cause and effect.
- E. Wellhausen's Prolegomena was the result of his errors; also, at that point Wellhausen adopted the entire idea of the documentary hypothesis (*Ibid.* 5).
- F. Wellhausen's major conclusion to his error was that Ezra, not Moses, instituted Judaism in 444 B.C. (*Ibid.*).

### III. THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS:

- A. This theory teaches that Deuteronomy was the first book of the Hexateuch or first six books of the Bible, and was the only scroll found by Hilkiah the priest during the reign of Josiah (2 Kin. 22:8; KJV); thus being completed about 650 B.C. (McGarvey 7).
- B. The documentary hypothesis also contains the concept that the other five books of the Hexateuch were not written until after the captivity (*Ibid.*).
- C. In the eighth century before Christ, two texts are said to have existed, though separate, that resembled one another. One of those writers used the name Jehovah for God and he is called the J author, but the other writer preferred the name Elohim for God, and he is the E author (*Ibid.*).
- D. A third, unknown writer, in the eighth century B.C., combined the J and E materials (*Ibid.*). [The latter idea has led to redaction criticism theories, K.M.]
- E. During the Babylonian captivity, per the theory, the laws now found in the Pentateuch were composed by interested priests or maybe for their interests, and this document is known as the P text (*Ibid.*).
- F. A fifth writer combined J, P, and E with some of his own additions and produced the Hexateuch (*Ibid.*).
- G. The D document is, supposedly, the work of those interested in maintaining a Mosaic stamp on the Torah and was, supposedly, a very late work (Class Notes, Alabama School of Religion, 1978). The documentary hypothesis thus has the initials, JEDP, to this day, although modern critics are more attuned to form criticism than to the old theory. [My opinion is that form critics are actually just wolves in JEDP "clothing."]



- H. McCallum, (*Evangelical Imperatives* 239-240), set out what are my next five points about these historio-critical theorists:
1. The critics have argued that there are inconsistencies in the text with genealogies and numbers, and view such as evidence of more than one writer.
  2. They criticize any repetition of texts and see it as evidence for more than one writer.
  3. Any difference in style of writing is seen as evidence for more than one author, rather than a difference in the topic being discussed.
  4. Another error or source of their thinking for literary critics is that they think the Bible text should never discontinue at any point, even if the history did change.
  5. But, their biggest error is that they have presupposed that the prophets could not have known the Torah, and so they think they must late date the latter!

#### IV. "MODERNISM:"

- A. Modernism is evolutionary thought applied to the Bible and denies that this universe is created (Shoulders 750).
- B. However, as decidedly anti-God as modernism was, there was a dialogue available to Christians as to what they observed and knew through evidences. For example, Wellhausen could be seen as illogical in his reasoning. [See above.]
- C. Post-modernism, however, does not allow for a dialogue, and experience is the only reality today (Ibid. 751).
- D. Post-modernism teaches that "the only way we perceive anything is by symbols in our minds. For all intents and purposes, culture creates language and language is our only means to perceive reality; culture creates reality" (McCallum 239).
- E. However, to the post-modernist, no culture is wrong in what is real to it, for all truth is relative (Shoulders 751). Compare Judges 17:6 here.
- F. Wellhausen and modern Christians are now called "logocentric," for they are interested in what words mean; therefore Christian ideals must be subjugated to the cultural imperialists who know no truth at all (Ibid.).
- G. Shoulders noted that a recent Gallup poll showed that 88% of evangelicals said they believed the Bible to be the written Word of God, but that only 53% believed in absolute truth (753)!

- H. In reality, since post-modernism has no set values, there is no place to reason with it!

#### V. WELLHAUSEN'S "BATTLE AT THE RED SEA:"

- A. McGarvey called Wellhausen, the "head master of modern scientific criticism" and added: "He can make and unmake history at will; a fit specimen is his account of the crossing of the Red Sea by Israel" (369).
- B. Wellhausen wrote: "The situation was a critical one; but a high wind during the night had left the shallow sea so low that it became possible to ford it. Moses eagerly accepted the venture and led the people across. The Egyptians rushing after came up with them on the further shore, and a struggle ensued. But the assailants fought at a disadvantage, the ground being ill suited for their chariots and horseman; they fell into confusion and attempted to retreat. Meanwhile, the wind had changed; the waters returned, and the pursuers were annihilated" (McGarvey 239; from Wellhausen's article on Israel in the Encyclopedia Britannica 406).
- C. McGarvey then added: "This is the man who is chiefly followed by our English and American 'evangelical critics'" (369).
- D. The Bible furnishes no account of the Red Sea crossing that even is close to what Wellhausen wrote, but his distaste for the miraculous and his re-writing of history are well documented in the above quote from the Encyclopedia Britannica found in McGarvey's *Biblical Criticism*.

#### VI. WHAT IS SOURCE CRITICISM?

- A. There are scrolls, other than the Bible, mentioned in the text (Num. 21:14; 1 Kgs. 14:19; 14:29, et al). [As noted above, however, the main forum for higher criticism has been the Hexateuch.]
- B. A rabbi named Ibn ben Ezra (12<sup>th</sup> century) wrote of his suspicions about the use of written documents by Bible writers, as did the Catholic Spinoza (17<sup>th</sup> century); then Jean Astruc, a physician to King Louis of France, wrote of the same theory (1753) (*religion.wikia* 2).
- C. Then in 1875, Wellhausen synthesized the theories mentioned above in his ***fragmentary hypothesis*** concerning numerous, ancient articles that had to be edited to form the finished Bible; and such were done in a continuous way over centuries of time according to this critic (*Bible Odyssey* 1).
- D. At that point, Wellhausen "saw" a new author whom he called E2, adding to what was called the P or priestly document in the JEPD documentary hypothesis (*Ibid.*).

- E. His theories' popularities are because of the fondness for evolution in his day, taught and believed in scientific circles; as it is today.
- F. Source criticism replaced Wellhausen's literary views in the 1970s and the Bible was relegated to the area of humanity studies in liberal seminaries. (Ibid.). Modern theology professors refer their students to numerous "written sources" and "oral traditions" as the origins of the Bible text. [Not relevant here, but applied to the New Testament, is Rudolph Bultmann's "Messianic secret." K.M.]
- G. This type of source or form criticism owes its origins to Wellhausen's theories as well as those of Jean Astruc and others and was originally called higher criticism because of its emphasis on written documents (See *John Barton, Source Criticism*, in the Anchor Bible *series*.).
- H. Source criticism sees three Isaiahs, but the Lord only saw one; it sees multiple sources of the Pentateuch; and it treats the Bible as the evolutionary product of man; etcetera (Ibid.).

#### VII. PROBLEMS WITH HIGHER CRITICISM:

- A. Note what would happen to a children's poem if a higher critic were to do a literary analysis on it. The following is from McGarvey (34-35):
- B. "Old Mother Hubbard went to the cupboard, to get her poor dog a bone; But when she got there, the cupboard was bare; and so the poor dog got none."
  1. Wellhausen would have wondered if *the composition* was from one or two or more writers because no one could know when she got to the cupboard. He also would have speculated that the story was just a legend and not true; perhaps he would have tried to figure out if the title "mother" would mean it was an actual account, but who could really tell? Besides; an editor probably composed the poem from two different sources since a venerable mother is represented by one author, and a poor dog by another! Did this event happen every time the dog was hungry? So the literary critic would want to know, and maybe she kept the dog poor by not laying away something in the cupboard; and this would mean she was stingy. Or maybe she was just mean-spirited and pretended that the cupboard was bare!
  2. Wellhausen would have styled the two authors as Goose A and Goose B, and would probably have decided that some editor had claimed that Mother Goose wrote the poem. And, Wellhausen would have proudly announced that literary criticism had proven that the poem was now preserved by his ability to separate the authors and show their inconsistencies.
- C. It is a historical fact, also, that when literary critics are shown copies of their own decades old material on which they worked with an associate, the critic cannot

distinguish which part was actually his and which was originally the associate's (*McGarvey* 312).

- D. Critics also disagree amongst themselves as to the sources, numbers of authors, and other details when they are examining materials. A Mr. Dana and a Mr. Grisham were asked to analyze a letter from President Cleveland as to whether he or his Secretary of State wrote it. Dana argued for President Cleveland and Grisham for the Secretary of State (*McGarvey* 94-95).
- E. It is also a fact that literary critics have misrepresented the Bible and have applied their abusive techniques to their wrong interpretation.

#### **VIII. AFFECTS ON FAITH FROM HIGHER CRITICISM:**

- A. Those who would take a "so what" approach to such critics and try to ignore them need to realize that if Moses did not write the books bearing his name, then the entire Bible is a lie.
- B. Too, Jesus and the apostles did not tell the truth when they said that a certain prophet wrote or that Moses wrote. [For example, note Matthew 19:6.]
- C. The above two thoughts are why the higher critics are often called destructive critics.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Wellhausen's frustration over Old Testament texts, that he could not fathom, led to his exiting denominationalism and becoming a hateful critic of the Bible.
2. This German rationalist's father was a Lutheran pastor, but Wellhausen, himself, has a name that will forever be associated with professor Graf and higher criticism.
3. Wellhausen believed that the prophetic writings preceded the Torah, and denied that Moses wrote anything.
4. Wellhausen added a priestly theory to the documentary hypothesis and modern critics now opt for a multiplicity of Bible writers and editors.
5. The faithful Christian needs to be ready to answer such attacks on God's Holy Word.

#### WORKS CITED

Barton, John. "Source Criticism." In Anchor Bible series;  
[www.udallas.libguides/bible/Bible\\_commentaries](http://www.udallas.libguides/bible/Bible_commentaries).

Bible Odyssey; <http://www.bibleodyssey.org/en/tools/what-is-source-criticism>. The foregoing material was submitted by Steven L. McKenzie, professor at Rhodes College.

Encyclopedia.com; <https://www.encyclopedia.com/people/literature>.

Higher Critics; <http://www.religion.wikia.org>

*The Holy Bible, King James Version*. Print.

McCallum, Dennis. "Evangelical Imperatives." In *The Death of Truth*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 1996.

McGarvey, John W. *Biblical Criticism*. Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate Company, 1956 Reprint.

Mosher, Keith A. Class notes on the theories of Old Testament origins. Alabama Christian School of Religion, under Rex A. Turner, Sr. 1978.

Shoulders, Timothy. "Post-Modernism." In *Dangerous 'Isms*. Editor B.J. Clarke. Pulaski, TN: Sain Publications, 1997.

# Friedrich Nietzsche: Beyond Good and Evil

Michael Light

## INTRODUCTION

1. “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 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 perish** from the way, when **his wrath is kindled but a little**. **Blessed are all they that put their trust in him**” (Psa. 2; emp. mine ML).
2. James is not the last to wonder, “O vain man,.....” It is truly mind boggling to delve into the abyss of the minds of the wicked. The above text is a perfect backdrop for the study before us in our assignment.
3. We will be noting the work of Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, in particular the thesis of the book, Beyond Good and Evil. This will not be a “book report.” But an attempt to give a flavor of the man’s thinking on the subjects most relevant to morals and then to look at how many of those radical and wrong ideas now permeate our culture and the world.
  - A. Here is a sampling of his most famous quotes. There are literally hundreds of them readily available at the click of a mouse on thousands of websites. (<https://quotes.thefamouspeople.com>).
  - 1) “A casual stroll through the lunatic asylum... shows that faith does not prove anything.” This quote is extremely ironic in that Nietzsche spent the last decade of his young life in an asylum crazy out of his own mind ([gotquestions.org](http://gotquestions.org)).
  - 2) “To live is to suffer, to survive and to find some meaning in the suffering.”
  - 3) “Faith means not wanting to know what is true.”
  - 4) “Everything in the world displeases me: but, above all, my displeasure in everything displeases me.”

- 5) "There are days when I am haunted by a feeling that is blacker than the blackest melancholy. I have a contempt for humanity. I despise the people I have been fated to call my contemporaries. I feel suffocated by their very breath."
- 6) "There are no facts *only* interpretations."
- 7) "In heaven all the interesting people are missing."
- 8) "Every deep thinker is more afraid of being understood than being misunderstood."
- 9) "What is good? All that increases the feeling of power, will to power, power itself, in man."
- 10) "All things are subject to interpretation whichever interpretation prevails at a given time is a function of power and not truth."
- 11) "There are two different types of people in the world, those who want to know, and those who want to believe."
- 12) "I cannot believe in a god who wants to be praised all the time."
- 13) "What is the ape to man? A laughingstock, a thing of shame. And just the same shall man be to the superman: a laughingstock, a thing of shame."  
(Both Darwin and Nietzsche were looking and even predicting the rise of the ubermensch - or over-man; or superman. Hitler did not conjure his master race from thin air; he was taught by the generation of atheists and humanists and nihilists that preceded him).
- 14) "Woman was God's second mistake."
- 15) "God is dead. God remains dead. And we have killed him. Yet his shadow still looms. How shall we comfort ourselves, the murderers of all murderers? What was holiest and mightiest of all that the world has yet owned has bled to death under our knives, who will wipe the blood off us? What water is there for us to cleanse ourselves?" (This comes from one of his writings – "the Parable of a Madman").
- 16) "Is man one of God's unders, or is God one of man's blunders?"
- 17) "You have your way. I have my way. As for the right way, that correct way, and the only way, it does not exist."
- 18) "But when faith is thus exalted above everything else, it necessarily follows that reason, knowledge and patient inquiry have to be discredited: the road to truth becomes a forbidden road."
- 19) "Whatever a theologian regards as true must be false: there you have almost a criterion of truth."

- 20) “Christianity has been the most calamitous kind of arrogance yet.”
- 21) “None of these ponderous herd animals...wants to know or even sense that “the general welfare” is no ideal, no goal, no remotely intelligible concept, but only an emetic – that what is fair for one *cannot* by any means for that reason alone also be fair for others; that the demand of one morality for all is detrimental for the higher men, in short, that there is an order of rank between man and man, hence also between morality and morality. They are a modest and thoroughly mediocre type of man, these utilitarian Englishmen.”

B. Literally hundreds more such quotes could be given, but this should suffice to show the dark places to which this man had descended. I want to reference one more. This one is almost prophetic as it points to a course of action that a right-thinking person (according to Nietzsche) should take. The rise of Hitler and the Third Reich seems to be a product of this thinking.

- 1) “I mean such an increase in the menace of Russia [for example] that Europe would have to resolve to become menacing, too, namely, *to acquire the will* by means of a new caste that would rule Europe, a long terrible will of its own that would be able to cast its goals millennia hence – so that the long-drawn-out comedy of its many splinter states as well as its dynastic and democratic splinter wills would come to an end. The time for petty politics is over: the very next century will bring the fight for the dominion of the earth – the *compulsion* to large-scale politics” (Wiker 112).
- 2) He hoped for a world ruled by power with no regard for right and wrong. A dominate ruling class that crushed the lower classes into subjection. And truth be told, and I’m telling it, this same spirit permeates many in our government and not a few of our fellow Americans even as this article is being penned.
- 3) Nietzsche has been dead for over 120 years – but his ideas are alive and well....and totally destructive and damning.
- 4) This is not a study (specifically) in Geopolitics so now we turn our attention to Moral and biblical implications.

**DISCUSSION: LET’S NOTICE A FEW BIBLICAL POINTS RELATIVE TO DOCTRINES SPUN FROM THE IDEOLOGY OF GOING “BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL”...**

**I. ATHEISM IS FALSE**

- A. At its root the idea of being “beyond” good and evil is ultimately be “beyond God.” Nietzsche, to his credit, was consistent (most atheists – most false teachers of every stripe aren’t) with the implications of his positions. When



he said that God is dead and that men like him and his generation had killed Him; he was following the implications of his ideology.

1. Since there is no absolute morality without an absolute standard of morality (God); and since atheists deny that there is a God, then there is no absolute morality. Hence, no good and no evil.
  2. There but “is.” What happens, happens. What you do, you do. Sprinkle in a little Darwinian evolution and viola’ – might makes right.
- B. The consequences of this have led to hundreds of millions dead and billions lost.
1. Several political theories have used this philosophy (and its variations) to destroy, subjugate, murder and eliminate all opposition.
    - a. Socialism
    - b. Communism
    - c. Fascism
    - d. And other forms of “soft” and “absolute” totalitarianism.
  2. And while they probably couldn’t write it on paper, many, if not most people on the earth follow a nihilistic type of life. They do about anything they want to with no real concern of future consequences or the moral rightness, or wrongness of any given action.
    - a. They live not in the Universe but in their one “YOUiverse.”
    - b. They make their own rules and do whatever they are brazen enough to pull off and get offended if ever challenged.
- C. There are multiple ways to disprove atheism and/or prove that the God of the Bible does indeed exist.
1. The Ontological argument (reasoned from our sense of “oughtness”)
  2. The Cosmological argument (cause and effect).
  3. The Teleological argument (deals with design).
- D. The Bible begins and ends with a declaration of God.
1. His creative powers (Gen. 1,2).
  2. His plan to save us from ourselves (Gen. 3:15; Gen. 12; Isa. 7:14; Mat. 1:23; Jho. 1:29, 3:16; Mat. 26:28; Acts 2:38; Rom. 6:1-6).
  3. His design for the best life we can live (Psa. 23; Jho. 10:10).

4. His promises to save us eternally with Him in heaven (Jho. 14:1-6; Rom. 8:30f; 1 The. 4:13-18).
- E. The Bible also speaks of the foolishness and wickedness that arises when men deny His existence and sovereignty.
1. Psalm 14:1
  2. Romans 1:19f
  3. Proverbs 13:15
- F. Let it once again be stressed that virtually every lesson in this lecture series is dealing with the work and teaching of atheists who have truly hurt mankind as they seek to lead without God in view. You cannot have good without God.

## II. SUBJECTIVE AND RELATIVE ETHICS ARE FALSE

- A. Most atheists, when pushed, turn into Agnostics.
1. Nietzsche admitted that his rejection of Christianity was not rational but instead volitional. "It is our preference that decides against Christianity, not arguments" (Lubac, 49).
  2. Notice one of his quotes which I listed earlier: "There are no facts *only* interpretations."
    - a. This is an agnostic position. If it is true that there are no facts; then it is true that this statement cannot be called a fact; hence cannot be an absolute truth. Therefore, it could be wrong. And you are left with agnosticism.
    - b. You cannot live life consistently like that.
- B. The Bible denies subjectivity and relativity in matters of truth.
1. John 8:32, "And ye **shall know the truth** and **the truth** shall make you free."
  2. Jeremiah 6:16, "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in **the ways**, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is **the good way**, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein."
  3. "There **is a way that seemeth right** to a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" (Pro. 14:12).
  4. "...let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom. 3:4).
  5. Luke 6:46, "Why call you me Lord, Lord and do not **the things that I say?**"

6. “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the **only true** God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent (Jho. 17:3).
  7. “...that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (1 Jho. 1:5).
  8. 1 Corinthians 15:58; John 17:21; et.al. call on harmony and “sameness” of doctrine and of life.
- C. The Bible not only teaches “one way” that is “one truth” it obligates us to combat and destroy the doctrines of the wicked.
1. Romans 16:17f, “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which **cause divisions** and offenses **contrary to the doctrine** which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such **serve not our Lord Jesus** Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair **speeches deceive** the hearts of the simple.”
  2. “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock... for I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them” (Acts 20:28-30).
  3. Second Timothy 4:1-3; 1 John 5:3 and hundreds of other texts both in the Old and New Testaments, repeatedly warn us about being deceived by false teaches and call upon us to be vigilant in defeating them for the sake of the souls of men.
  4. In Ephesians 4:11, we are taught specifically to not only avoid false doctrines but “reprove” them. We must falsify them, expose them in an attempt to save others from the snare of the devil.
  5. Often the false teachers look and sound really good (2 Cor. 11:13ff), but they are still false and demonic and following their lead will take us to hell.
  6. Other false teachers “seem” educated and wise. I don’t see them in that light but many place Darwin, Nietzsche, Sagan etc., on a pedestal. I refuse to call those whom God calls “fools” (Psal. 14:1) anything higher. And I would encourage you to do the same.

## CONCLUSION

1. The world is a darker and more dangerous place (both physically and spiritually) because of the life lived, and the doctrines written by Nietzsche.
2. May we not be seduced by the “pseudo-intellectualism” that is so rampant among the godless hordes.

3. May we see more clearly than the masses and teach them the truth. I have always liked the axiom, “Well-spoken nonsense – is nonsense none the less.”
4. May God give us the strength to stay the course in the battle for the right. The souls of men (and even our own souls) hang in the balance.

#### WORK CITED

<https://quotes.thefamouspeople.com>

<https://gotquestions.org>

Wiker, Benjamin, Ph.d. 10 Books that Screwed up the world and 5 more that Didn't Help., MJF Books, New York, NY 2008.

# Vladimir Lenin: The State and Revolution

Jason Rollo

## INTRODUCTION:

### 1. History—We Need to Study It:

- A. "...they had continued their protests against the shortage of bread and the war. Now, by midmorning on Saturday, March 10, 1917, the thermometer had climbed to 20 degrees Fahrenheit, and crowds of strikers, unemployed workers, students and housewives were again on the streets, heading for the center of Petrograd, the Russian capital...Some, besides, demanding, bread shouted, 'Down with the tsar'" (Thompson 215). Note: This was barely 100 years ago (in Russia). Don't think the long-tenured government within a nation can't fall—they can (and do)!
- B. "Queen Victoria dies in 1901. The old order was shattered in World War I, which unleashed forces that would shape the century: the struggle against colonialism, the rise of revolutionary Marxism, the intense nationalism too easily corrupted into totalitarianism. The uneasy peace that followed the first great war bred monsters; an even greater war was required to silence them. And the second war gave way to a new, unnerving cold war that kept peace only through an insane nuclear ransom: the threat of mutual destruction. Meanwhile, the vacuum left by the collapse of empires was filled by the voices of millions, clamoring to enjoy prosperity and dignity" (Isaacson 4).
- C. We study history to learn from the past. Wise individuals and nations learn from the evil and the good—how to avoid the former and embrace the latter. Understanding (as the above snippet notes) who the "monsters" (i.e., evil men/women—tyrants/dictators!) are, is VERY important. This outline/lecture will deal with one of these monsters. His name: Vladimir Ulyanov—Lenin!

### 2. Analyzing/Understanding Lenin:

- A. To understand the man Lenin requires (as with any person) a study into his background—his beliefs/his choices. In short, we need to do some "digging"—some research! Thankfully, we live in a free country (at least at this point), wherein research is allowed. Let us never take our freedom for granted. God has been so very good to us! Especially, IN Christ (Eph. 1:3f), but also in the U.S.A.!
- B. Very early after he came to power, "Lenin made it clear that the Bolsheviks intended to dominate. Lenin had permitted elections to the Constituent Assembly, as promised in the Bolshevik platform. In January 1918, it became evident that the Bolshevik minority could not control the assembly, [thus]

Lenin forcibly dissolved it. For all practical purposes, the Bolsheviks had created a one-party dictatorship over the country, which extended until 1991” (Thompson 226).

- C. Yet, while countless thousands of pages have been written about this wicked man, and while a simple detailed outline (like this one) cannot do much besides summarize a few highlights, it is our hope that even this brief outline (connected with our lecture/sermon) will demonstrate WHO he was and HOW his life/false philosophy has caused (and still causes) untold harm to multiplied millions. Sadly, a study of his life and the false beliefs of socialism/communism connected with him will demonstrate that truly he was one of the “monsters” referenced above.
- D. EXAMPLE, Lenin stated in 1920, “We did not hesitate to shoot thousands of people, and we shall not hesitate to do that again, and we shall save the country.” As this historian correctly notes, and as Lenin would agree, “Revolutionary terror is justified in the pursuit of liberation. The delusion of achieving complete social equality embraces the shedding of blood.” (Critchlow xv)

## DISCUSSION:

### I. A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF VLADIMIR LENIN

#### A. His Early Years

1. He was “born in 1870 to a comfortable, well-off family... [He was] born Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov and only as a revolutionary took the alias and pseudonym ‘Lenin,’ probably derived from the River Lena in Siberia. His father was a school inspector who rose to the rank of state councilor. Lenin’s mother came from a wealthy family (her father had been a physician). Lenin’s father was a deeply religious Russian Orthodox Christian. His mother was an indifferent Protestant with possible Jewish ancestry. But they were united in considering themselves enlightened, reform-minded liberals.” (Critchlow 7).
2. “Two shocking events seem to have had a profound impact on Lenin. First was the death of his father in 1886 at the age of fifty-four. Second, in 1887, his older brother Alexander was executed [read, hanged at age 20, JBR] for plotting to assassinate the czar” (ibid 7).
  - a. KEY – Alexandar (Lenin’s older brother—who was adored by Lenin), while a college student at St. Petersburg University, was introduced to the writings

of Karl Marx. Remember, Marx and Engels had written their Communist Manifesto in 1848. This “introduction” (association) to the twisted writings of Karl Marx would find full development in the mind of the younger Lenin a little later (i.e., 1888, around age 18).

- b. What is so sad about the above is that apparently to some degree, Lenin and his older brother Alexander enjoyed an idyllic childhood. ((Isaacson 12). KEY – The dangers of “association” our children/grandchildren face are real. Let us guide them correctly (Gen. 18:19)!

3. So Many Lessons for Us:

- a. Influence at Home (Deu. 6:6f; Eph. 6:1f; 2 Tim. 1:5, 3:13-17)
- b. Influence of “Friends” (1 Cor. 15:33; 2 Sam. 13:3; Pro. 13:20)
- c. Influence of Secular Education (Pro. 4:23; Mark 7:21; Jos. 22:5)
- d. Influence of Evil Men/Writings (2 Tm. 3:13; Pro. 1:10; 1 Pet. 4:1f)

B. His Person/Personality:

1. Lenin suffered blinding headaches, recurrent insomnia, and stomach problems throughout his life. (Sebestyen 75). Cf., Psa. 127:2; Mat. 6:24f.
2. Lenin is yet another personification of the Marxist personality type. He has been described as ‘Self-righteous, rude, demanding, ruthless, despotic, formalistic, bureaucratic, disciplined, cunning, intolerant, stubborn, one-sided, suspicious, distant, asocial, cold-blooded, ambitious, purposive, vindictive, spiteful, a grudge-holder, and a coward. Lenin appeared to be unpretentious and soft-spoken. His enormous willpower was hidden behind a façade of modesty. His personality was basically cold, yet he gave the impression of warmth” (Simpson 41). In short, he was an impenitent sinner living for power!

C. His Wife/His Adultery:

1. On February 13, 1894 (at an illegal Marxist meeting) Lenin met Nadezhda ‘Konstantinovna Krupskaya. Like Lenin, she, too “hoped

for a socialist revolution in Russia and the downfall of the Tsarist autocracy. She was as fanatically devoted to the cause as was Lenin. She was a passionate and intense believer in socialism. Her father was an army officer from the minor nobility. He died when Nadya was fourteen, and she always felt a bitter personal grudge against the regime. Her view was simple and never changed: the capitalists were, quite simply, 'the enemy,' Their courtship has been described as 'a very Marxist courtship'. (Sebestyen 77-81). As we would say, "Birds of a feather flock together." NOTE: There is a HUGE lesson here on who your children marry (1 Kgs. 11:1f; Neh. 13:23f; 2 Cor. 6:14f; Mat. 6:33).

2. Now, fast forward to 1909 and let's introduce Inessa Armand. She first met Lenin towards the end of May 1909. She knew him by reputation and had read his books. She admired him as an intellectual. Eighteen months later, a love affair started. Over that period, she became an ardent Bolshevik. (Ibid 202-204). (Cf., Pro. 5-7).
3. "Nadya offered to leave him and let him go off with Inessa, but he told her to stay. Perhaps Lenin simply wanted to have his cake and eat it. Inessa didn't seem to mind" and even more insane is that "the two women in his life were genuinely becoming good friends." In fact, "Nadya was patient and determined to make the best of it. She may have been jealous, but she saw her main task as Lenin's helpmate, ensuring his peace of mind. If that meant giving Inessa warmth and friendship, it probably seemed like another sacrifice she was prepared to make for the Revolution" (Ibid 205-214). The atheistic mind is a bizarre thing indeed!

#### D. His Movement & Rise to Power:

1. Timeline/Dates, Lenin & Things Connected:
  - a. 1870 – Born in Russia (April 22nd)
  - b. 1888 – Studies Marx (cf., in radical groups; expelled from Univ., etc.)
  - c. 1897 – Exiled to Siberia
  - d. 1914 – Start of WWI
  - e. 1917 – Returns to Russia (cf., German aid); Leads Revolution/Communism
  - f. 1918/21 – Civil War



- g. 1920 – Russia a Wasteland (cf., 20 mill. died (disease/famine), 1914-21)
  - h. 1924 – Dies (age 53) (January 21st)
  - i. 1924/53 – Stalin reigns (cf., Trotsky exiled in 1928/murdered in 1940)
  - j. 1991 – Collapse of Soviet Union
  - k. 2020/22 – As in 1940's/50's, the U.S. sees a rise in Socialism/Communism
  - l. NOTE: One should also study: China (1949f); Cuba (1923/65); Etc.
2. “After earning a law degree, Lenin went to Switzerland to meet the exiled Georgi Plekhanov, the eminence grise of Russian Marxism; then to meetings with other radicals in Paris and Berlin; then, on his return home to arrest, trial, jail and exile in Siberia. When he emerged from Siberia in 1900, he once again joined forces with Plekhanov and his small Social Democrat party. With other Marxists he founded a party newspaper, *Iskra* (Spark), and attended the second meeting of the party in Brussels and London in 1903. The Leninists took the name of Bolshevik, after *bolshoi*, big. The small group was called Mensheviks (minority). Plekhanov tended to side with the Mensheviks, and so did a brilliant newcomer named Lev Bronstein, who signed his pamphlets ‘**Trotsky.**’ Lenin fought ruthlessly for control of the movement” (Isaacson 12-13). Like Stalin, Trotsky would be within the inner circle with Lenin. After Lenin’s death, Stalin would exile Trotsky (and later have him murdered in Mexico). Friendship doesn’t mean much without God in the picture (yet, cf., 1 Sam. 18:1f; Phi. 2:19f).
  3. The first attempted revolt in 1905 failed (with Trotsky more involved). “in the largely spontaneous revolt of 1905, Trotsky was a leader in St. Petersburg’s first soviet of workers, but the Czar’s soldiers crushed the revolt and Trotsky was jailed and later sent to Siberia. Lenin remained in exile in Switzerland, plotting. In 1912 he finally forced the Mensheviks to form a separate party” (ibid). NOTE: Lenin thought the party should remain small, as opposed to his opponents who were more open-minded to taking in all supporters, finding partners/coalitions. Lenin’s view won.
  4. “The Bolsheviks were a tiny and powerless faction. History appeared to have passed Lenin by. Then came a world war. When Germany

declared war on Russia in August 1914, Lenin was living in Austrian-controlled Poland. Threatened with arrest as a Russian agent, he fled to Berne, Switzerland. There he convened a conference of Bolsheviks to declare their opposition to the imperialist war and to denounce socialist leaders who supported their countries' war efforts as betrayers of the working class. While Lenin preached revolution, Russian armies were suffering horrible losses, and civil discontent was rising. In March 1917, in the wake of general strikes, with the police unable to control mass demonstrations and protests, and with mutinies in the ranks of the army and the navy, Czar Nicholas II abdicated. With the fall of the Romanov dynasty, which had ruled Russia since 1613, the entire country teetered on the verge of collapse. Petrograd, as St. Peterburg had been renamed in 1914, became the epicenter of the revolutionary struggle between the Petrograd Soviet and the legislative Duma. German officials helped smuggle Lenin and his entourage into Russia, with the understanding that Lenin would remove Russia from the war, allowing German troops to be redirected to the Western Front. Little did the Germans realize they were unleashing a monster, forty-seven years of age, not in the prime of health. Lenin returned to Russia intent on overthrowing the provisional government" (Critchlow 16-17).

5. "The disasters of war finally brought down the czarist regime. It was replaced by a provisional government under the liberal-minded Prince Lvov, and then by socialist revolutionary Aleksander Kerensky. Lenin, living in Zurich, worked feverishly to get back to Russia; the government refused. Lenin, who had received \$10 million from the Germans to further the revolution, again turned to Berlin. The Germans finally provided him with a closed railway carriage and sneaked him into Russia. And so, on April 16, 1917, after almost 20 years in exile, Lenin finally arrived by train to a tumultuous welcome at the Finland Station in Petrograd (St. Petersburg). Climbing onto an armored car, he called for revolution. Rioting broke out in July but quickly fizzled out. The Bolsheviks (who grew fourfold, to hundreds of thousands, in 1917) were banned and Lenin went into hiding in Finland. In October, Lenin returned to Petrograd and called for an immediate revolt. Kerensky, now in command, called for troops to maintain order in the capital. But the government forces would not fight. Led by Lenin and almost without opposition, the Bolsheviks in November seized government buildings, electric plants, the post office and finally the Winter Palace, where Kerensky's Cabinet had taken refuge. The ministers were forced to resign at gunpoint.

Meanwhile, in the first democratic vote in Russian history, a Constituent Assembly was elected. Voters had rejected the Bolsheviks, but Lenin simply sent troops to disperse the new assembly. Thereafter the 'Little Robespierre,' as Trotsky once called him, launched his own Terror. The Czar and his family were executed, the systematic liquidation of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie began. For muscle, Lenin formed the Cheka (secret police). Not even Soviet historians are sure how Lenin's regime managed to survive the next few years: the invasion by Allied armies, the civil war, the total economic chaos. By some estimates, 5 million died in the first few years of his rule. A crashing economy soon forced him to trim his Marxist sails: in 1921 he instituted the New Economic Policy, a right turn toward partial capitalism that gave Russia a brief respite from monetary woes—though politically the regime remained dictatorial. This reform was to be among Lenin's last official acts, for in 1922 he suffered a series of strokes that left him paralyzed and almost speechless. He died in 1924 at only 53 years old, exhausted from a lifetime of perfecting men by hitting them on the head" (Ibid). NOTE: This last line about "hitting them on the head," comes from a Lenin quote (apparently connected with music). It is said that he "loved music, but he claimed he hated listening to it. He supposedly said, because "It makes you want to stroke the heads of people who could create such beauty while living in this vile hell. But you mustn't stoke anyone's head—you'll get your hand bitten off. You have to hit them on the head, without mercy" (Isaacson 13). (Jas. 2:13).

6. "After the Revolution of 1905, Tsar Nicholas II had been forced to agree to an elected Duma (parliament). However, the tsar retained the ability to dissolve the Duma, which he did [a number of times, JBR], which were in constant conflict with Nicholas. Also, as the war [WWI] went progressively worse for Russia, rising prices prompted industrial workers to strike. Violence erupted on the streets of Petrograd (St. Petersburg) and Moscow in the February Revolution, led by the Petrograd Soviet (council), and Nicholas abdicated on February 28, 1917. Power was handed to a Provisional Government under Prince Lvov, but its position was contested by the Petrograd Soviet, which was dominated by Vladimir Lenin's revolutionary Russian Bolshevik Party. In July riots erupted in Petrograd. Prince Lvov was replaced by Alexander Kerensky, who suppressed an outbreak of revolutionary riots [and] Vladimir Lenin fled to Finland. Then in August 1917, General Lavr Kornilov, the army commander in chief,

ordered troops into Petrograd. Suspecting an attempted coup, Kerensky asked the Bolsheviks for help, arming the Bolshevik Red Guard militia. Kornilov's alleged attempt to seize power was unsuccessful, but Kerensky's regime was fatally weakened. In mid-October, the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party met to plan the seizure of power. On October 25, Leon Trotsky, the party's chief organizer, launched an almost bloodless coup in Petrograd. Armed squads of pro-Bolshevik revolutionaries occupied key positions such as railroad stations and telephone exchanges. Kerensky surrendered and the Bolsheviks moved quickly to implement Lenin's revolutionary program" (Parker 326-327).

7. "The popular uprising that led to the disappearance of the tsardom after three hundred years of rule by the Romanov dynasty known as the February Revolution, took place between February 24 and 28, 1917. The second upheaval, which brought Vladimir Lenin and the Bolsheviks to power, happened between October 24 and 26, and is called the October Revolution. The February and October revolutions were two separate events, but many writers argue that they were simply stages in one continuous, radical transformation of Russian society in 1917. (Ibid 216).
8. NOTE: A more in-depth study would involve studying about the White Army (i.e., Anti-Bolshevik) vs. Red Army (under the leadership of Lenin, Trotsky, etc.); The NEP (New Economic Policy) wherein peasants were given more control; Also, the USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) created in 1922 by Stalin (who followed Lenin); Cf., too, Stalin's policies of "Collectivization" involving giving the land of the Kulaks (cf., prosperous peasants) to cooperative styled farms; Lenin's Writings; Etc., Etc. (Ibid 328-329).

## II. A SUMMARY OF LENIN'S PHILOSOPHY

### A. Marx—The Philosopher; Lenin—The Revolutionary!

1. "In 1888 Ulyanov—soon to be known as Lenin—discovered the works of Karl Marx. Marx predicted that the collapse of capitalism was inevitable in and advanced industrial society, and he shaped his theories to this prophecy; Lenin would apply them to a backward peasant country. Marx was inclined to sit back and let the revolution come; Lenin taught that it had to be helped along with the aid of a corps of professional revolutionaries" (Isaacson 12). NOTE: Marx's predictions that such would take place in highly industrialized nations (cf., England, U.S., etc.) did not

happen—instead it was in “Russian” (a behind-the-times, not-developed country) full of dying/starving folks (cf., the influence of WWI, too) that revolution came. So much for Marx’s supposed “intellectual” theories!

2. “Lenin’s decision to establish soviet power derived from his belief that the proletarian revolution must smash the existing state machinery and introduce a ‘dictatorship of the proletariat,’ that is direct rule by the armed workers and peasants which would eventually ‘wither away into a non-coercive, classless stateless, Communist society. He expounded this view most trenchantly in his brochure *The State and Revolution*, written while he was still in hiding, the brochure though never completed...To Lenin...the Provisional Government was merely a ‘dictatorship of the bourgeoisie’ that kept Russia in the imperialist war.” Thus, “Lenin therefore raised the slogan, ‘All power to the Soviets!’” (Britannica).
3. In short, “As founder of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and leader of the Bolshevik coup d’état (1917), Vladimir Lenin created the Soviet Union. Along with Karl Marx, Lenin created the communist worldview” (Britannica). Put another way, Lenin “used” Marx’s “theories” to justify his rhetoric in seeking power. Never forget, this is about POWER, pure and simple!
4. Stated another way, Lenin implemented what Marx had theorized. While some might argue that Lenin “jumped ahead a bit” of Marx orthodox viewpoint (cf., stages), the reality was/is (and always will be) the same—Cruelty, No Individual Freedom, Oppression, Coercion, Propaganda, State/Government Control, Theft, thus NO ownership of property, rampant immorality (all thanks to atheism), and yes, murder—a lot—a whole lot of “MURDER!”

#### B. Terror/Wickedness

1. “Vladimir Ilyich Lenin came to power in Russia in October 1917. Shortly after coming into power, Lenin’s Bolshevik government issued a decree dissolving the courts. Freed from legal shackles, the Red Terror campaign began in 1918. Within two months, there were a least 6,185 summary executions (By comparison, between 1825 and 1917, Russian courts had issued 6,321 death sentences.) ...In December 1917, he established a secret police force, the Cheka, which became an instrument of terror to arrest, imprison, torture, and execute opponents of the Bolshevik dictatorship. The Cheka was reported to have scalped people, cut off their limbs with hacksaws, impaled people on stakes, rolled them in spike-laden barrels, and burned victims in furnaces” (Critchlow 2).

2. “Only weeks after the Russian Revolution the Bolsheviks created secret police forces far more brutal than any that had existed under the tsar. Millions of people were incarcerated in concentration camps where they were tortured and frequently worked to death” (Gellately 3).

### III. A BRIEF INTER-RELATIONAL SUMMARY OF CONNECTED PHILOSOPHIES

#### A. Background—Study Atheism/Humanism, German Rationalism!

1. Darwinism/German Rationalism behind Marx who is behind Lenin, etc.
2. Consider The Consequences/Examples:
  - a. “Since its birth in the French Revolution, the political left has been at war with religion, and with the Christian religion in particular” (Horowitz 4). Cf., This same point with Progressives, Modern Democrats and Liberals! (2 Cor. 10:3-5; Jho. 3:19-21, 7:7, 15:22).
  - b. “In Russia, Marx’s disciples removed religious teaching from schools, outlawed criticism of atheists and agnostics, and burned 100,000 churches. Religious leaders were sentenced to death. Between 1917 and 1935, 130,000 Russian Orthodox priests were arrested, 95,000 of whom were executed by firing squad. In the twentieth century alone, Communist atheists slaughtered more than 100 million people in Russia, China and Indochina. Too many ignore the appalling body count of Marxism—an ideology that is explicitly atheistic, whose atrocities were committed in the name of social justice” (Ibid 4-6).
3. It all goes back to John 8:44, the Devil and those living like/for him.
  - a. Isaiah 5:20 (cf., Hos. 4:6; Col. 2:3; Jho. 8:32-32)
  - b. 1 John 5:19, Matthew 7:13-15 (cf., Mat. 25:41)

#### B. False Philosophy/Doctrine Always (in various degrees) ALWAYS Harms!

1. Revelation 2:10, 13; 1 Peter (the entire book); 2 Timothy 3:12-13; Etc.
2. Many Examples/People Should Be Studied: Eugene Debs/Woodrow Wilson (D’Souza 79); W.E.B. Du Bois, co-founder of the NAACP (Ibid. 78); Franklin Delano Roosevelt (Ibid. 88-94); Etc.—Saul Alinsky, Bill Ayers, So many evil men/women, we could study about. We must KNOW our Bible to confront error (all error)—politically, socially, morally; The only REAL solution is the Gospel of Jesus Christ (Luke 19:10; Jho. 10:10; 1 Cor. 6:11).
3. No excuses, please! — The Scandinavian model? Don’t even try it. Even a brief look at the history/current state of: Russia, Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea, Zimbabwe, and especially, China, makes it clear that twisting reality

about some “Scandinavian model” won’t work! Like many others (cf., Glenn Beck [but also beware of other errors many of these men hold too, like Premillennialism, etc.]), D’Souza deals with this “Scandinavian Model” nonsense in his book *The United States of Socialism* on page 135f.

C. The Frankfurt School—Don’t Forget About the Frankfurt School!

1. “Herman Weil, yet another spoiled rich son of a wealthy German industrialist...decided to fund a new university in Frankfurt [Germany] that would develop Lukacs and Muzenberg’s ideas. Then, with Hitler’s rise to power in 1933, the Frankfurt School Communists faced a serious dilemma. Most were also Jewish, so they had two marks against them. Ironically, almost all of these scholars were like Marx, virulent anti-Semites, despite their Jewish heritage. They fled Germany to England, France and America assisted by Edward R. Murrow, who would later become a famous CBS newscaster. Not coincidentally, Senator Joseph McCarthy later accused Murrow of being a possible Communist. Murrow was a protégé of John Dewey, the ‘progressive’ so-called father of public education. Dewey had also visited the Soviet Union. Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* became the bible for Columbia University’s Teachers College. The Frankfurt School was reinstated at Columbia, with Dewey’s help. To this day, the school brags of its Franklin School heritage” (Simpson 53-54).
2. We must understand that Marx (who influenced Lenin) was about the “ruthless criticism of everything existing and his true goal was to attack every aspect of Western culture. Once established in the U.S., the Frankfurt School communists took Marx’s cue and proceeded to do just that. Borrowing heavily from Lukacs’ vision of cultural terrorism (cf., Critical Theory!, JBR)...Frankfurt School teaching relentlessly accused Western societies of being ‘the world’s greatest repositories of racism, sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism, fascism, and Nazism. Sound familiar? Don’t forget—Critical Theory attacks Christianity, capitalism, authority, the family, the patriarchy, hierarchy, morality, tradition, sexual restraint, loyalty, patriotism, and nationalism—any and all foundations of society, in order to destroy culture and ‘make Western civilization stink’. The Frankfurt School’s key goals for Western society that grew out of Critical Theory [include]: 1) The creation of racism offenses, 2) Continual change to create confusion, 3) The teaching of sex and homosexuality to children, 4) The undermining of schools’ and teachers’ authority, 5) Huge immigration to destroy identity, 6) The promotion of excessive drinking, 7) Emptying of churches, 8) An unreliable legal system with bias against victims of crime, 9) Dependency on the state or state benefits, 10) Control and dumbing down of media, [and] 11) Encouraging the breakdown of the family” (Simpson 54-55).

3. All of this nonsense (cf., Ecc. 1:9), “is simply a repackaged version of the same old ideas first embraced by Marx—and even those weren’t new. Whether it is abortion, environment, gun control, taxes, welfare, women’s rights, gay rights, minority rights, illegal immigration, global warming or something else, the issue is never the issue. It merely serves as a vehicle to upend our culture” (Simpson 44). WOW! Satan, and those with him, are truly evil! Let us never forget that error/sin cannot be tolerated (justified) or else it will destroy everything decent. The world needs more King Jesus!
4. KEY – “Our constitutional republic requires an attentive, involved, educated and ethical electorate” (Simpson 45). More importantly, we need people (citizens) who know and apply God’s Word to their lives (Hos. 4:6; 2 Tim. 2:15)! In short, what we really need are faithful members of the Lord’s church within a society—and more of them (cf., Gen. 18:32; Jer. 5:1; Pro. 14:34; 29:2; Psa. 9:17; Mat. 5:13-16). NOTE: As goes the individual Christian, so goes the family; As goes the family; so goes the church; As goes the church, so goes the community; As goes the communities, so goes the state/nation/world! IT MATTERS “how” we think, “what” we believe and “in what way” we live (Pro. 14:34; Eph. 3:21).

#### IV. A SYNOPSIS OF HOW HIS PHILOSOPHY IS SEEN TODAY

- A. Socialist/Communist—Practically Speaking, What’s the Difference?!
  1. Also, when studying socialists (communists, depending on the context), keep in mind “three broad types: the hard-core socialists, the quasi-socialists and the socialists lite” (D’Souza 16-17). Clearly, Lenin was hard-core! Yet, consider how “close” some of these things are to us (i.e., in the U.S.A.)!
    - a. “The constitution of the Democratic Socialists of America, a group that counts at least two Democratic congresswomen (Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Rashida Tlaib), as members—states, ‘We are socialists we share a vision of a humane social order based on popular control of resources and production, economic planning, equitable distribution, feminism, racial equality and non-oppressive relationships’” (D’Souza 14). One certainly has to question that “non-oppressive” line when considering the rioting, looting and violence that was witnessed in 2020-21 in various U.S. cities (spurred on) by such people as those noted above!
    - b. Example, “Joseph Buttigieg, the father to failed presidential candidate and now Secretary of Transportation, Pete Buttigieg. Joseph was a prominent Marxist and Notre Dame professor who was well known in leftist circles as a leading scholar of Gramsci. He confounded and



presided over the International Gramsci Society and translated all of Gramsci's work in a project that took him three decades before its initial 1992 publication. He personified Munzenberg's call to 'organize the intellectuals and use them to make Western civilization stink,' a perfect example of Lenin's 'useful idiots.' Pete Buttigieg proudly carries on his father's tradition" (Simpson 51-52). Note, as to Antonio Gramsci, he was "a prominent Italian Communist in the 1920s. In 1924 he became the leader of Italy's Communist Party. Jailed by Mussolini in 1926, he further developed Nechayev's and Munzenburg's ideas in what became known as the *Prison Notebooks*. Gramsci never left prison and died there in 1937. But his Notebooks survived him, and were picked up with enthusiasm by American Marxists, most notably 60s radicals. According to Gramsci, capitalism's power rested in its institutions, that is, churches, schools, the media, Hollywood, the military, government and political parties. The answer of course was to infiltrate, subvert, dominate and control these institutions to serve Communist ends. He advocated doing this not through revolution or warfare, but rather by a 'war of position' in the culture. Communist subversives would seed socialist ideas gradually by penetrating the various institutions of culture until those ideas took hold and were accepted as mainstream. This has come to be known as 'the long march through the institutions'" (Ibid 50-51). RECENT EXAMPLE – My son, Josiah, who just graduated in December 2021, from Texas A&M University, (not exactly a "liberal" place, compared to most), was in a class wherein the young liberal Professor started the course with pretty much these words, "I am a Marxist and I will be teaching Marxism philosophy during this course." For the record, the class was not about studying Marxism! As citizens (and even more so, as Christians), we better WAKE-UP!

B. Standing-up For Truth Matters—Before It's Too Late.

1. Example, "Where has the teaching of the Christian faith been described as child abuse? In Communist Russia and other totalitarian states. A Romanian preacher, Richard Wurmbbrand, spent fourteen years imprisoned in Communist Romania, where he was tortured. His 'crime' was that he publicly declared Communism and Christianity to be incompatible. He wrote a book, *Tortured for Christ*" (Horowitz 28).
2. Another, Example, "Susan Rosenberg, a true insurrectionist who participated in numerous bombings in 1983 and 1984, including the National War College, an FBI office, the U.S. Capitol and other targets, had her sentence commuted by Bill Clinton in 2001 just before he left office" (Simpson 88).

3. And Another, “Few words are needed to describe the crisis at the border. It is unprecedented. In April 2021 alone, 178,666 illegal aliens were apprehended by Border Patrol a 20 year high. Under Biden, these people are being housed, fed and bussed or flown within the U.S.” (Ibid. 90). NOTE: Per Tucker Carlson, the number in November 2021 was 270,000! That’s only one month.
- C. It MATTERS what people believe (and HOW they vote!)—Even more important, we must become more evangelistic (Mat. 9:36-38; Mark 1:17; 2 Cor. 2:12-17). Souls are lost, we must not shy away from the Old Jerusalem Gospel (Jer. 6:16; Luke 24:44f). The Cross and the Church must be preached strongly (Rom. 5:8-10; Heb. 2:9; Acts 2:1f, 8:26f, 20:28). People need to obey the Gospel (2 The. 1:7f; Rom. 10:13f). The TRUE Gospel Message is the ONLY HOPE for lost souls. It is also the only thing (including the principles connected therewith) that will salvage a nation!

## V. A REFUTATION OF HIS FALSE PHILOSOPHY

- A. So Many Errors To Confront!
1. Government’s creation/purpose – God is in control! (Dan. 4:17, 25, 32; 5:21; Rom. 13:1f; 1 Pet. 2:12-17) What a contrast Revolution/Communism is to God’s Truth (1 Tim. 2:1-4, Mat. 5:43-48, 22:34-40, Luke 10:25-37, Etc.)!
  2. Power – It is Jesus who has ALL power/authority (Matt. 28:18; 26:53), and yet He lived/died for others (Mat. 20:25-28; 2 Cor. 8:9; Phi. 2:5-8, Etc.)! Compare these things (and “the principles” which shaped free countries—like the United States) with the selfishness and murder of Communists.
  3. Free-Will/Work Ethic/Capitalism – God teaches free-will, private responsibility, personal ownership and a work ethic, and NOT coercive principles of communism that promote meanness, harshness, stealing, hatred and murder. Note: Eze. 18:20f; Deu. 30:19; Mat. 11:28; Rev. 3:20, 22:17; Gen.1:28; Acts 4:37; 5:4; Exo. 20:15, 17; Mat. 20:15; 25:1f; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev.2:23; 2 The.3:10; Pro. 6:6, 10:4, 13:4; Mat. 25:26.; Cf., Also, concepts connected with free-willed giving (based on one’s personal prosperity (1 Cor. 16:2; 2 Cor. 8:1-5, 12; 9:7), the decency connected with inheritance (Luke 15:12), and so forth.
  4. Atheism – Those who do not believe in God are fools (Psa. 14:1; 19:1f; Rom. 1:20). Marx/Lenin (like many/most who follow them now) were atheists! Equally true, those who reject the great evidence proving God, Christ, the Bible, His True Church (the Church of Christ, Rom. 16:16), etc., are equally foolish and leave themselves following their own errant ways without a true guide in life (Jer. 17:9-10; Pro. 14:12; 2 Pet. 1:3; 2 Tim. 3:16-17; Jho. 20:30-31; 12:48; Acts 20:32; Jho. 8:32 w/ 17:17-21).

5. Cruelty – Exo. 6:9; Psa. 25:19; 27:12; 71:4; 74:20; Pro. 11:17; Eze. 34:4; Also, cf., verses on gentleness, compassion, kindness, love, mercy, and so forth, compared with cruel/cruelty, hatred, and the like. Even a brief study of TRUE Christianity shows a world of difference between the religion of Jesus (cf., Jas. 1:27; Tit. 3:3) and the evil philosophy of Marx/Lenin!
6. Murder – In addition to what is noted above, even a simple study of murder would certainly lead any honest mind to see the contrast between Christianity (again, TRUE Christianity—don't confuse this with false Catholicism, Denominationalism, etc.) and Marxism-Leninism (Socialism/Communism); Cf., Pro. 6:16f; Jer. 7:9; Mat. 19:18; Rom. 1:29; Note, also, there is a difference between killing (i.e., authorized taking of life as in self-defense or the just punishment of a murderer, rapist, etc.) and that of murderer (i.e., the unauthorized taking of life, such as is seen in the countless and brutal MURDERS connected with vile/wicked inhumane Communism!).
7. Adultery – Mat. 19:1f; Heb. 13:4; Gal. 5:19; Col. 3:1f; Eph. 5:3; 1 The. 4:3-4; Etc.; What a difference between the purity (cf., innocence demanded before marriage and the sanctity demanded within it) of the Christian marriage/family and the rank filthiness related to that atheism or Marxism-Leninism. NOTE: Both Marx and Lenin were unfaithful to their spouses. After all, what would one expect of atheists and unrepentant sinners?! One thing is for sure: Such men and such philosophies NEVER make a family, a city, a county, a world—a better place. No, not at all!
8. Lying/Propaganda – Pro. 6:16-19; Rev. 21:8; Eph. 5:25, 29; Col. 3:9.
9. Stealing – Exo. 20:15; Lev. 19:11; Deu. 5:19; Pro. 30:9; Jer. 7:9; Eph. 4:28; Note: Although Christians give to others in need, it is a matter of free-will—out of TRUE LOVE (and not coercion, 1 Cor. 13:1-3!), cf., Jam. 2:14f; 1 John 3:14-18; Helping is a principle of God that apparently the wicked Socialist/Communist mind does not understand – Exo. 23:5; Deu. 22:4; Jdg. 5:23; 1 Kgs. 17:11f; Job 29:12; Jas. 1:27; Mat. 19:21 (cf., the context, Mar 10:24; cf., 1 Tim. 6:6f (vs.17). The key is to “do good” and “be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate” (vs. 18)—and this is always connected with one's ability, prosperity, and so forth (Gal. 6:10; Acts 10:38)). It is a heart issue (Lev. 19:10) not a matter of Government FORCE. KEY: Marxism-Leninism is actually a MATERIALISTIC philosophy because it ties everything to the HERE and NOW. It strives for an unrealistic pipedream of utopia (on earth) even through “forced” misery upon the masses, as they try to give them more “equity” and more “treasure on earth.” Ironic & insane! Compare this, with what Jesus said in Matthew 6:19-21 (cf., Phi. 3:20; 1 Pet. 1:17). Error cannot be consistent.

10. Many Principles/Verses Should Be Studied – Lev. 25:47; Mat. 11:5; Etc.

B. Individualism—Not, Collectivism!

1. Individuals are all unique, created in the very image of God (Gen. 1:26-27).
2. Every person will give account of his/her actions in this life (2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 14:12; Jho. 5:28-29; Ecc. 12:13-14; Acts 17:30-31 w/ 24:15).
3. Definition, “Socialism...a system in which ‘as a matter of principle, the economic affairs of society belong to the public and not the private sphere’ ...Marx’s definition of socialism—not original with him—as worker ownership of the means of production...In full-scale socialist countries, the government owns or controls all major sectors of the economy, not only defense and infrastructure but also food and finance and even recreation. That was true of the old Soviet Union; it’s true of Cuba today...” (D’Souza 11-12). In short, the STATE owns (or controls) it all—everything!
4. “In contrast to the progressive mission of saving ‘society,’ the goal of Christian belief is saving individuals souls...The social redeemers, on the other hand, do not see individuals as agents of their own destinies. They see them as products of ‘social force,’ as objects of class, race, gender and religious oppressions. Progressives focus on alleged injustices that do not depend on the willful acts of racists or sexist individuals, but on mythical factors like ‘institutional bias’ and ‘systemic discrimination.’ Through the progressive lens, individuals and their choices disappear. That is why progressives do not hesitate to impose their solutions on others BY FORCE, including the people they propose to save” (Horowitz 34). ASK: If the State can control your production/property, why do you even have a right to your thoughts/beliefs? A Communist would answer, “You don’t!”

C. Absolute Hypocrites & Bums!

1. They attack entrepreneurs (as selfish/greedy) while they themselves have no clients to serve/help, but only industries to steal and lives to ruin.
2. D’Souza in his book, *The United States of Socialism* shows this blatant hypocrisy noting an example wherein 100 elites (cf., Google execs, Hollywood types, Billionaires, etc.) flew in on their private jets and helicopters, as well as using yachts to come to Sicily recently for a meeting about Climate Change (cf., The Green New Deal Nonsense). Cf., Heb. 1:3; 2 Pet. 3:7! While no sensible person is against responsibility, these have no concept of the purpose of this life, this planet or much of anything else (Ecc. 12:13). They are primarily atheists and immoral. Even those who are religious among this number, are shamefully inconsistent with what the Bible teaches

and would certainly reject it as of no use. Instead, they use another guide—THEMSELVES! (cf., Isa. 5:20, 8:20).

3. Socialism/Communism (and, yes, we understand that there are various differences between all of the “types”) is evil. From the mass murder of Lenin’s/Stalin’s Russia to the same within China, to the “lite” versions of control, like: Forced minimum/higher wages, Repressive taxation upon business owners (cf., 28% vs. 70%, etc.; which actually just hurts the workers/the economy), Promotion of Sexual Perversion (cf., the gender nonsense, LGBTQ2S, etc.), Continuous attacks upon Religion (especially, Christianity; cf., Bible reading and prayer taken from schools, while Darwinism is repeatedly taught) and Freedom (cf., Churches/Business shutdown during 2020, some forcibly!), and many other such examples, prove that a study of Lenin is indeed as relevant in January 2022 in the United States, as any subject we could study.
4. “Marx’s patron, Friedrich Engels, was a successful businessman, but Marx himself was a ne’er-do-well journalist who lived off his mother-in-law and Engels. Neither Lenin, nor Trotsky, nor Stalin—until they came to power—had ever worked for a living” (Critchlow 6). This statement pretty much tells us what we need to know. These “scholars/revolutionaries” are really nothing more than EVIL BUMS who never accomplished anything that was not connected with harm, heartache, misery, and disaster!

#### **CONCLUSION:**

1. This World is NOT our home (cf., Phi. 3:20; Jho. 18:36; 2 Tim. 2:4; Yet, also, Paul used his citizenship wisely (Acts 16:37, 24:13, 25:11)—Let us remember both truths.
2. Time has gone on for over 6,000 years and evil (as well as good) men come and go.
3. But ALL will come into Judgement (Acts 17:30-31; Rev. 20:11f; Mat. 25:31f).
4. Lenin made his choice (as did Joshua, Jos. 24:15); The question is, “What about you?”

#### WORKS CITED

Thompson, John. Russian and the Soviet Union: A Historical Introduction from the Kievan State to the Present. Philadelphia, PA: Westview Press, 2009.

Isaacson, Walter. Great People of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. New York, NY: Time Inc., 1996.

Critchlow, Donald. Revolutionary Monsters: Five Men Who Turned Liberation Into Tyranny. Washington, D.C.: Regnery History, 2021.

Parker, Philip. World History. New York, NY: Metro Books, 2010.

Simpson, James. Who Was Karl Marx?—The Men, the Motives, and the Menace Behind Today's Rampaging American Left. Baltimore, MD: Simpson Publishing, 2021.

Gellately, Robert. Lenin, Stalin and Hitler—The Age of Social Catastrophe. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 2007.

Horowitz, David. Dark Agenda: The War To Destroy Christian America. West Palm Beach, FL: Humanix Books, 2018.

From Britannica.com on Vladimir Lenin.

Satter, David. 100 Years of Communism—100 Million Dead. Article written on in 2017, wsj.com.

Sebestyen, Victor. Lenin: The Man, the Dictator, and the Master of Terror. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 2017.

D'Souza, Dinesh. United States of Socialism—Who's Behind It. Why It's Evil. How To Stop It. New York, NY: All Points Books, 2020.

# Margaret Sanger: The Pivot of Civilization

Morne Stephanus

## INTRODUCTION:

1. “A great nation is like a great man: When he makes a mistake, he realizes it. Having realized it, he admits it. Having admitted it, he corrects it. He considers those who point out his faults as his most benevolent teachers” — Lao Tzu (“Realize Quotes (168 Quotes)”).
  - A. When I embarked on the research for this lectureship, never did I imagine that my understanding of this subject would be so profoundly enlightened.
    - 1) Indeed, the study of this issue has been a *most benevolent* teacher.
  - B. I am grateful for the opportunity to engage in this study and to share some of its findings in this outline.
2. It is my task to present information about Margaret Sanger and, among other relevant information, an insight of her book *The Pivot of Civilization*.
  - A. The word that aptly sums up my research of Mrs. Sanger’s book is, “duplicitous.”
  - B. To the uninformed (as I was) Margret Sanger was just a terribly misguided individual with horrible ideas and views concerning humanity.
  - C. However, when I delved deeper into a combined study of her history and involvement on the world stage it became apparent, Margret Sanger was a major role player and influencer of the world’s most vile human beings and ideologies.
3. Today Mrs. Sanger is hailed as a pioneer of women’s rights; in this she has accomplished one of the devil’s greatest tricks: convincing Adam and Eve he sought their best interest (Cf. Gen. 3:4-5).
  - A. Make no mistake, the subject matter at hand is not about birth control, abortion, or women’s rights per sé.
  - B. These matters are vehicles to accomplish a greater agenda.
  - C. The study of Margret Sanger is about genocide: strategic, ingenious, and perfectly executed genocide of black people in this country and “unfavored” ethnicities in others.
4. As Christians, we are all too familiar with the unrighteousness of the worldly, but seldom do we understand the depths of evil that still lurk in the shadows.
  - A. It is my prayer that this study will wake us, shake us out of an ignorant slumber to the realization that unadulterated pure evil is currently at work in our nation, yes even the world!

## DISCUSSION:

### I. A CHARACTER PROFILE

- A. “Born September 14, 1879, in Corning, New York, the sixth of eleven children born to Michael Hennessey Higgins, a stonemason, and Anna Purcell Higgins, a devoutly Roman Catholic Irishwoman. Sanger’s life course was shaped by the poverty of her childhood and the death of her mother at age 50, which Sanger understood resulted from the physical toll of eleven pregnancies. Sanger later became a nurse, attending Claverack College and Hudson River Institute in 1896 and completing the nursing program at White Plains Hospital in 1902. That year she married William Sanger, an architect, and moved to Hastings, New York, where the couple had three children” (Michals).
1. Mrs. Sanger’s history reads like most, yet the impact of her work changed the course of history and influenced the lives of many for the worse.
- B. Sanger became an outspoken activist for nationalized birth control under the guise of women’s rights.
1. As with the best of intentions, hers may have been well-meaning at one point.
  2. Her views on motherhood and women seemed to express genuine concern.
    - a. “In answering the needs of these thousands upon thousands of submerged mothers, it is possible to use their interest as the foundation for education in prophylaxis, hygiene and infant welfare. The potential mother can then be shown that maternity need not be slavery but may be the most effective avenue to self-development and self-realization. Upon this basis only may we improve the quality of the race” (Sanger et al.).
    - b. “Every year I receive thousands of letters from women in all parts of America, desperate appeals to aid them to extricate themselves from the trap of compulsory maternity” (Sanger et al.).
  3. In 1914, she started her own feminist publication, The Woman Rebel, which propagated birth control (Michals).
    - a. On the surface, her motives seemed to stem from a genuine interest in the rights of women, especially mothers.
    - b. “Birth Control concerns itself with the spirit no less than the body. It looks for the liberation of the spirit of woman and through woman of the child” - Margret Sanger” (Widger and Muller).
-



4. In 1916 Sanger illegally opened the first birth control clinic in Brooklyn, NY for which she was sent to prison for thirty days (The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica).
    - a. While in prison in Queens, NY, she published the Birth Control Review (The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica).
    - b. The subheading of this publication read, "Dedicated to the principle of intelligent and voluntary motherhood" (Sanger et al.).
  5. In 1921 Sanger established the American Birth Control League and served as its president until 1928 (The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica).
- C. At this juncture one's research indicates nothing of genocide, nothing about the extermination of certain ethnicities.
1. For all intent and purposes Mrs. Sanger was merely advocating for women's rights and addressing the desperate plight of motherhood.
- D. However, Sanger's own words betray her duplicitous character.
1. "The curious situation has come about that while our statesmen are busy upon their propaganda of "repopulation," and are encouraging the production of large families, they are ignoring the **exigent problem of the elimination of the feeble-minded**" (Widger and Muller). (Emphases MWS)
  2. "Surely it is an amazing and discouraging phenomenon that the very governments that have seen fit to interfere in practically every phase of the normal citizen's life, dare not attempt to **restrain, either by force or persuasion**, the moron and the imbecile from producing his large family of feeble-minded offspring" (Widger and Muller). (Emphases MWS)
  3. "**Segregation** carried out for one or two generations would give us only partial control of the problem. Moreover, when we realize that each feeble-minded person is a potential source of an endless progeny of defect, **we prefer the policy of immediate sterilization, of making sure that parenthood is absolutely prohibited to the feeble-minded**" (Widger and Muller). (Emphases MWS)
- E. Do the words of Mrs. Sanger depict an individual who is concerned about preserving women's rights and fostering healthy motherhood?
1. No, the heart of Sanger is revealed as one continues to read her book.
  2. Nothing but complete **annihilation** of these so-called "morons" and "feeble minded" would suffice.
  3. This begs the question, who are these morons or imbeciles to whom she keeps referring?

- F. In my ignorance, I believed she was speaking of mentally disabled individuals and their progeny; I could not have been further from the truth.
  - 1. It is only when one delves into the following section that Sanger’s work becomes clearer.

## II. A CONVENIENT PARTNERSHIP

- A. A better understanding of Margaret Sanger and her impact on our world is to understand the Eugenics Movement.
- B. Eugenics is the philosophy of selecting desired heritable characteristics in humans in order to improve future generations (Wilson).
  - 1. In other words, the creation of a “perfect race.”
  - 2. Francis Galton, who happens to be a relation of Charles Darwin, coined the term Eugenics in 1883 (Farber).
    - a. Charles Darwin is the author of the pernicious and profligate book called " The Origin of Species by Means Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life."
    - b. “Galton, who, influenced by Charles Darwin’s theory of natural selection, advocated a system that would allow “the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable” (Wilson).
  - 3. Mr. Galton took his cousin’s ideas and philosophies about perfecting a perfect race and put it into practice, this practice is known as Eugenics (Live Action).
    - a. In his book *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*, Galton advocated that society should promote only the marriage of the fittest individuals (Galton).
  - 4. It would be an understatement to say that this family has done more harm to the cause of righteousness than many of their peers.
    - a. Galton and Darwin’s efforts are at the core of Adolf Hitler’s Ideologies.
    - b. Contrary to widespread belief that Hitler was not the author of his heinous ideas, he merely identified with the views already propagated at large in the United States by the Eugenics Movement (Live Action).
- C. At the core of Eugenics is the elimination of so-called inferior peoples.
  - 1. Those of Jewish and African decent were at the top of that list.
  - 2. Eugenicists believed that Africans were inferior, not just mentally but physically (Live Action).

- D. In order to curb the birthrate of black people, eugenicists engaged in what is called “Positive Eugenics” (Live Action).
1. Positive Eugenics sought to “out populate” the black community by promoting vigorous reproduction amongst the Caucasian population (Live Action).
- E. However, this plot did not have the desired effect, so the movement initiated what is called “Negative Eugenics” (Live Action).
1. “They knew that they could not round up all the blacks in the nation and execute them, so they decided to create an environment where they would convince the blacks to severely limit the number of children they were going to have, and thereby commit race suicide” (Live Action).
- F. In a society growing less tolerable to the treatment of black people, the Eugenics Movement knew they could not approach the matter openly.
1. Thus, Charles Davenport, Co-founder of the American Eugenics society suggested that “The problem of the socially fit must be treated not as one of color but as a problem of the spread of feeble-mindedness” (Live Action).
  2. “Eugenics realized that they could not promote their agenda simply because they knew it'd be viewed as politically incorrect and socially unacceptable. So, what they did was use code words that were once successful in slavery terms, such as "feeble-minded," "unfit," words such as "imbecile," "immoral," "criminal"; they tagged those labels upon the targeted community. These words were less inflammatory, so it let society more or less not be totally alarmed of the original intent” (Live Action).
    - a. These “less inflammatory” descriptions of black people saturate the pages of Mrs. Sangers book.
    - b. Without comprehension of the climate in which she wrote, the partnerships she formed and the admiration she had for eugenics, one might be fooled into believing her goals were noble.
- G. However, it is impossible to deny the shared ideology between Sanger and the Eugenics Movement.
1. In making her case for forced nationalized birth control, Sanger devoted an entire chapter to dismantling Positive Eugenics or what she called “Cradle Competition” as an approach with no teeth.
  2. “Eugenics thus concerns itself with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also, with those that develop them to the utmost advantage. It is, in short, the attempt to bring reason and intelligence to bear upon HEREDITY. But Galton, **in spite of the immense value of this approach**

and his great stimulation to criticism, was completely unable to formulate a definite and practical working program” - Margaret Sanger (Widger and Muller). (Emphases MWS)

3. “All these things the Eugenists sees and points out with **a courage entirely admirable**. But as a positive program of redemption, orthodox Eugenics can offer nothing more "constructive" than a renewed "cradle competition" between the "fit" and the "unfit" - Margaret Sanger (Widger and Muller). (Emphases MWS)
  4. “Birth Control which has been criticized as negative and destructive, is really **the greatest and most truly eugenic method, and its adoption as part of the program of Eugenics** would immediately give a concrete and realistic power to that science. As a matter of fact, Birth Control has been accepted by the most clear thinking and far seeing of the Eugenists themselves as the most constructive and necessary of the means to racial health” - Margaret Sanger (Widger and Muller). (Emphases MWS)
- H. If you did not know Margaret Sanger was talking about black people, when you understand Eugenics and you get to chapter 9 of her book it becomes clear who the morons, imbecilic and feeble are.
- I. Yet, even if the connection was not readily made, a letter from Mrs. Sanger to Dr. C.J. Gamble, a member of the Birth Control Federation of America, settles the matter.
1. In this letter Sanger unveiled her duplicitous plan to involve black ministers in her ideal of eliminating the black race.
  2. “The minister’s work is also important and also he should be trained, perhaps by the Federation as to our ideals and the goals that we hope to reach. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the negro population and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members” (Sanger).
- J. “Make no mistake when Margaret Sanger advocated for birth control, she was not advocating for women’s rights, she was not advocating for a better motherhood; she, in lockstep with the Eugenics Movement was advocating the systematic sterilization and ultimate eradication of black people” - Morne William Stephanus
- K. This shared ideology is further proven by the marriage formed by these two parties.
1. Eugenics had to undergo a facelift to acquire broad acceptance.

2. The preservation of a perfect race by the elimination of people of color had to be packaged in such a way that their intent was unrecognizable.
3. To accomplish this, the Eugenics Movement singled out Margret Sanger and her Birth Control League to be the face of this heinous plot (Live Action).
  - a. "On a practical level, the relationship between Sanger and these elitists was basically a marriage of convenience. In order to advance their common agendas, they needed a front man, and she needed money. And the whole thing would be held together by this kind of bizarre obsession with race and class. The result was that the American Birth Control League became the driving force behind the American eugenics movement. Eugenics would no longer just be a philosophy. Sanger and others like her were going to put it into practice" (Live Action).
  - b. It was a marriage of which their father the Devil would be proud.
- L. Although Sanger disagreed with the Eugenics Movement's approach, she shared their views, believed in their cause, and became the instrument by which that cause could be propagated in plain sight.

### III. CONSEQUENT PROFLIGACY

- A. A single idea, good or bad, with the right backing and propagation can influence people for generations.
- B. Margret Sanger, along with the Eugenics Movement, became the catalysts for some of the world's most horrific practices.
- C. It would surprise the average person to learn that Adolf Hitler's campaign against the Jews and Afro Germans was supported by Margret Sanger's Birth Control League and the Eugenics Movement.
  1. "Since World War II, it has been well documented that Adolf Hitler was profoundly influenced by the American eugenics movement and that many of his governments' racial policies were actually developed from the writings of American eugenicists, like Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin. In fact, Hitler referred to Grant's book, "The Passing of the Great Race" as his bible" (Live Action)
- D. Not to be outdone, Margret Sanger's Birth Control League was not far behind in its promotion of the Nazi Ideal.
  1. A Director for the American Birth Control League and writer for the Birth Control Review, Lothrop Stoddard authored a book "The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy." (Live Action)

2. In 1939 Stoddard was given a personal meeting with Hitler and the man who implemented Hitler's Holocaust, SS leader Heinrich Himmler. (Live Action)
- E. In 1927 Margret Sanger organized the World Population Conference in Geneva Switzerland. (Live Action)
1. In this conference Sanger proclaimed, "The Earth is strictly limited in size and inability to support human populations. But these populations keep on growing; and in so doing they are creating social, economic and political situations which threaten to alter profoundly our present civilization" (Cagiano).
  2. Once again, on the surface this sentiment of Mrs. Sanger and her cohorts seem genuine.
  3. However, among the attendees was Eugen Fischer, the man who would eventually lead the Nazi effort to eradicate Black people from Europe. (Live Action)
    - a. I think it fair to say that Hitler's campaign was in part educated and motivated by Francis Galton, Charles Darwin, and Margret Sanger.
- F. In April 1933, Margaret Sanger devoted an entire issue of her publication, the Birth Control review, to Eugenics. (Flaherty)
1. Among others, one of the articles was, "Eugenic Sterilization: An Urgent Need," written by Ernst Rudin, Hitler's director of genetic sterilization and a founder of the Nazi Society for Racial Hygiene (Flaherty).
- G. In all of its influences, one rises above them all.
1. "By the late 1930's and early 1940's, revelations about Nazi and fascist atrocities in Europe were causing the public to become increasingly uncomfortable with terms like "eugenics" and "population control." This alarmed the leaders of the American Birth Control League, who were aware that this shifting attitude can impact both their ability to implement their racial agenda and their ability to raise funds. They were also aware that the connections between the American Birth Control League and the Nazis were starting to become known. Marketing research had shown them that in this environment, they needed to move away from words like "control," in favor of less threatening words like "planning." So, in 1942, they changed the name of the organization. From then on, the American Birth Control League would officially be known as Planned Parenthood. The important thing to understand here is that this name change did not change the organization's agenda. The same people were still in control, they were still obsessed with race, and they were still dedicated to eugenics" (Live action).

- H. In the late 1940s Sanger’s dream of providing readily available contraceptives became a reality.
  - 1. In the 1940s and 1950s, Sanger closely followed scientific research on birth control and personally funded some of it. Planned Parenthood Federation of America also made support for new birth control technology a major focus of its advocacy efforts. The turning point came when Sanger’s longtime friend — Katharine Dexter McCormick — threw her financial support behind research to produce an oral contraceptive” (Planned Parenthood).
- I. It is a grave mistake to suppose that the ardent believers of Eugenics and race perfection have ceased their evil deeds.
  - 1. If so, one might as well believe that sin and evil individuals no longer exist.
- J. The statistics regarding Planned Parenthood bare out that the Eugenics movement is alive and well.
  - 1. Hidden behind the façade of women’s choice and women’s reproductive rights, is the ongoing malicious attempt at population control, specifically that of people of color.
  - 2. Clinics in neighborhoods where non-whites are the majority, only around 15 percent of U.S. neighborhoods, make up 40 percent of all abortion clinics in the United States. This means that, even on Guttmacher’s (Planned Parenthood Statistics Arm) own showing, abortion clinics are indeed disproportionately found where the local population is predominantly minorities” (The Federalist).
- K. Even though these abortion clinics predominantly reside in minority communities, the millions of children murdered in the womb is not limited to people of color.
  - 1. The Eugenics Movement is slowly but surely accomplishing its evil goals, sadly slow and steady wins the race.

#### IV. THE CASE FOR “PROGRESS” IN CONFLICT WITH THE POTENTATE

- A. The *Pivot of Civilization* is divided into chapters with each chapter making an argument of some sort for Nationalized Birth Control.
- B. It would be a paper too lengthy to refute all of Sanger’s foolishness.
- C. Critical to our understanding is that Margaret Sanger was operating contrary to the Great Potentate, Jehovah God.
- D. Mrs. Sanger advocated that Eugenics was part of Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount.

1. Anglican priest and Eugenicist William Ralph Inge is quoted saying, "We do wish to remind our orthodox and conservative friends that the Sermon on the Mount contains some admirably clear and unmistakable eugenic precepts. 'Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, neither can a good tree bring forth evil fruit. Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.' We wish to apply these words not only to the actions of individuals, which spring from their characters, but to the character of individuals, which spring from their inherited qualities" (Sanger et al.).
    - a. Sanger agreed with this gross misapplication of scripture and commented on in the following fashion.
    - b. "If we believe this, and do not act upon it by trying to move public opinion towards giving social reform, education and religion a better material to work upon, we are sinning against the light" (Sanger et al.).
  2. This fool, along with Sanger, believed that the Savior of the world advocated for the "casting into the fire" of people with "undesirable" hereditary qualities.
  3. This is not the context of the text nor is it in line with the nature of God!
    - a. Ironically, the passage in question (Mat. 7:16-20) addresses false teachers.
      - (i) Our Lord was educating Kingdom citizens on how to spot a false teacher by looking at their actions, or the fruits they produce.
      - (ii) They are draped in pretense (Mat. 7:15) much like being concerned about women and mothers when in reality, the aim is genocide.
      - (iii) They desire to proselytize (Cf. Acts 20:30) much like getting black religious ministers to preach birth control from the pulpit.
    - b. Moreover, our Lord did not come to exclude certain ethnicities from the saving grace He offered.
      - (i) "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in **every nation** he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts 10:34-35) (Emphasis MWS)
- E. Mrs. Sanger was also a Premillennialist, most likely practicing what is called Amillennialism.



1. "The Christian conception of a kingdom of God upon the earth teaches us to turn our eyes to the future, and to think of the welfare of posterity as a thing which concerns us as much as that of our own generation" (Sanger et al.).
  2. The Amillennialist... "believed that they were living in a (symbolic thousand-year) time period in which Christ was ruling from heaven, Satan was bound, and they were God's workers appointed to bring about a kingdom on earth worthy of Christ" (McMahon).
  3. If nothing convinces one of the dangers of preaching God's Kingdom on a renovated earth, the mere fact that being in league with Margaret Sanger should.
  4. The Christ prevented an attempt to make Him an earthly King and He preached against such an idea.
    - a. "Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world. When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone." (Jho. 6:14-15)
    - b. "Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews? Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." (Jho. 18:33-36)
- F. In a stunning display of Sanger's character, she focused an entire chapter on criticizing benevolence, calling it the "Cruelty of Charity."
1. " Even if we accept organized charity at its own valuation, and grant that it does the best it can, it is exposed to a more profound criticism. It reveals a fundamental and irremediable defect. Its very success, its very efficiency, its very necessity to the social order, are themselves the most unanswerable indictment. Organized charity itself is the symptom of a malignant social disease" (Sanger et al.).
  2. "These dangers inherent in the very idea of humanitarianism and altruism, dangers which have to-day produced their full harvest of human waste, of inequality and inefficiency, were fully recognized in the last century at the moment when such ideas were first put into practice" (Sanger et al.).
  3. The law of benevolence is clearly set forth in Scriptures.

4. These Divine laws ensure not only the care of the less fortunate, but also protect against potential abuse.
    - a. “And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” (Galatians 6:9-10)
    - b. “For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. (2 Thessalonians 3:10-11)
  5. Mrs. Sanger’s plight with benevolence seems to be the abuse of it, yet her own words and racist tendencies point not to a problem of abuse but rather where the benevolence is allocated.
- G. Mrs. Sanger’s conflict with God sees its apex in her complete and utter disregard for human beings.
1. “Modern studies indicate that insanity, epilepsy, criminality, prostitution, pauperism, and mental defect, are all organically bound up together and that the least intelligent and the thoroughly **degenerate classes** in every community are the most prolific” (Sanger et al.). (Emphases MWS)
  2. “Surely it is an amazing and discouraging phenomenon that the very governments that have seen fit to interfere in practically every phase of the normal citizen's life, dare not attempt to restrain, either by force or persuasion, **the moron and the imbecile from producing his large family of feeble-minded offspring**” (Sanger et al.). (Emphases MWS)
  3. “The actual dangers can only be fully realized when we have acquired definite information concerning the financial and cultural cost of these classes to the community, when we become fully cognizant of **the burden of the imbecile** upon the whole human race; when we see the funds that should be available for human development, for scientific, artistic and philosophic research, being diverted annually, by hundreds of millions of dollars, to the care and segregation of **men, women, and children who never should have been born**” (Sanger et al.). (Emphases MWS)
  4. These are not the sentiments of a person who values humanity, and I assume Mrs. Sanger would throw her own children over a cliff had they some “undesirable” trait.
  5. The Bible is clear, mankind is cut from the same cloth, furthermore we were all made in the image of God.

- a. And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation” (Acts 17:26).
- H. Whether it is her complete disregard for human life or her misguided ideologies Mrs. Sanger and anyone who shares her views are indeed the enemies of God (Cf. Matthew 12:30 & James 4:4).

## **CONCLUSION**

1. There is an evil in this world disguised as a noble cause, Planned Parenthood.
2. Those who advocate for its continued existence fall into one of two categories, the ignorant and the malevolent.
3. A previous article I penned regarding late term abortion laws should now more than ever be realized in our lives.

“In an attempt to bring sanity to the table, many have once again reemphasized the tried and tested argument of when life begins. This, in my estimation, is an exercise in futility for the times in which we live. Going back and forth with abortion apologists about the sanctity of life and when it begins is tantamount to arguing with the Devil about the need for obedience. The truth of the matter is that most of these individuals could not care less about when life begins. They know the truth; they have heard the truth for years and they have outright rejected it. We ought not to cast the precious pearls of Christ before these swine or give that which is holy to the dogs (Matthew 7:6). The tone of our message must reflect the times in which we live. We must take our cue from the Lord when He addressed various nations including His own about their sins. In these instances, the message was that of repentance. This is the type of message we must preach to a nation who has refused to reason, Repent or Perish (Luke 13:3-5, Acts 17:30-31)” (Stephanus).

## WORKS CITED

All scripture references taken from: Meyers, Rick. E.Sword. Version 13.0.0, Rick Meyers, 2000. Software.

Cagiano Deazevedo, Raimondo, and International Meeting on Aid and Cooperation in the Field of Population and Development. Population, Aid and Development Proceedings of an International Meeting on Aid and Cooperation in the Field of

- Population and Development; Issues and Strategies; Florence 1985. Liège, Belgium: IUSSP, 1987. Print.
- Chesler, Ellen. (1992). *Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Farber, Steven A. "U.S. Scientists' Role in the Eugenics Movement (1907–1939): A Contemporary Biologist's Perspective." *Zebrafish*, vol. 5, no. 4, Dec. 2008, pp. 243–45, <https://doi.org/10.1089/zeb.2008.0576>.
- Flaherty, Michael K. "A White Lie." Aug. 1992, *The American Spectator*.  
[https://groups.csail.mit.edu/mac/users/rauch/nvp/eugenics/american-spectator\\_eugenics.html](https://groups.csail.mit.edu/mac/users/rauch/nvp/eugenics/american-spectator_eugenics.html)
- Galton, Francis. *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. Macmillan And Co., 1883, [play.google.com/books/reader?id=6ojBZOYc7d0C&pg=GBS.PR2&hl=en](http://play.google.com/books/reader?id=6ojBZOYc7d0C&pg=GBS.PR2&hl=en).
- Live Action. "Maafa 21 - Black Genocide in 21st Century America - Full Documentary." YouTube, 23 Feb. 2018, [www.youtube.com/watch?v=I6XfU8KVkzI](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I6XfU8KVkzI).
- McMahon, T. A. "The Shameful Social Gospel." *The Berean Call*, 1 Sept. 2008, [www.thebereancall.org/content/shameful-social-gospel?sapurl=Lys5MjZkL2xiL2xpLyt3dm44dWs4P2JyYW5kaW5nPXRYdWUmZW1iZWQ9dHJ1ZSZeZWNlbnRSb3VOZT1hcHAud2ViLWFwcC5saWJyYXJ5Lmxc3QmcmVjZW50Um91dGVUbHVnPSUyQnd2bjh1azg=](http://www.thebereancall.org/content/shameful-social-gospel?sapurl=Lys5MjZkL2xiL2xpLyt3dm44dWs4P2JyYW5kaW5nPXRYdWUmZW1iZWQ9dHJ1ZSZeZWNlbnRSb3VOZT1hcHAud2ViLWFwcC5saWJyYXJ5Lmxc3QmcmVjZW50Um91dGVUbHVnPSUyQnd2bjh1azg=).
- Michals, Debra. "Margaret Sanger." National Women's History Museum, 2017, [www.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/margaret-sanger](http://www.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/margaret-sanger).
- Planned Parenthood. "The Birth Control Pill - A History." Planned Parenthood, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, 2015, [www.plannedparenthood.org](http://www.plannedparenthood.org).
- "Realize Quotes (168 Quotes)." [www.goodreads.com](http://www.goodreads.com), [www.goodreads.com/quotes/tag/realize](http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/tag/realize). Accessed 2 Dec. 2021.
- Sanger, Margaret, et al. "The Birth Control Review." Hathi Trust, 1917, pp. 24 volumes, [babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.hnp3k3&view=1up&seq=7](http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.hnp3k3&view=1up&seq=7).
- Sanger, Margaret to Gamble C.J. "Negro Project of the South." 10 Dec. 1939. Link to letter. <https://www.focusonthefamily.com/pro-life/discovering-abortion-impact-on-the-black-community-moved-me-from-apathy-to-action/>.
- Stephanus, Morne. "Bloodthirsty." *The Moral Compass*, Morne Stephanus, 1 Feb. 2019, [moralcom.org/2019/02/01/bloodthirsty/](http://moralcom.org/2019/02/01/bloodthirsty/).

The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. "Margaret Sanger | Biography, Birth Control, & Significance." Encyclopedia Britannica, 2019, [www.britannica.com/biography/Margaret-Sanger](http://www.britannica.com/biography/Margaret-Sanger).

The Federalist. "Yes, Planned Parenthood Targets and Hurts Poor Black Women." The Federalist, edited by Willis L. Krumholz, 18 Feb. 2016, [thefederalist.com/2016/02/18/yes-planned-parenthood-targets-and-hurts-poor-black-women/](http://thefederalist.com/2016/02/18/yes-planned-parenthood-targets-and-hurts-poor-black-women/).

Widger, David, and Dan Muller. "The Pivot of Civilization, by Margaret Sanger." [www.gutenberg.org](http://www.gutenberg.org), [www.gutenberg.org/files/1689/1689-h/1689-h.htm](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1689/1689-h/1689-h.htm).

Wilson, Philip K. "Eugenics | Description, History, & Modern Eugenics." Encyclopedia Britannica, 20 Dec. 2018, [www.britannica.com/science/eugenics-genetics](http://www.britannica.com/science/eugenics-genetics).

Chesler, Ellen. (1992). *Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

# Adolf Hitler: Mein Kampf

Joe Caesar

## INTRODUCTION:

1. This outline and study is designed to compare the ideology of National Socialism (aka Nazism) with the doctrine of Christ. I will provide: a summary of the author of the ideology, its major tenets, an inter-relational summary of similar ideologies, a scriptural refutation of its flaws, and provide application to the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
2. Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* will be used as a primary source to understand Adolf Hitler, Nazism, and its origins.
3. The King James Version of the Bible will be used as a primary source to provide scriptural references and refutation.

## DISCUSSION:

### I. ADOLF HITLER: BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

- A. Adolf Hitler was born in Austria on April 20, 1889 and is of German descent. He is the founder of the fascist ideology of National Socialism and the Nazi Party. Hitler was a German, but he was born in Austria and this fact is of great significance in the development of the character of Hitler (Hitler 13).
- B. He fought in World War I, because he believed Germany was unfairly treated by being blamed for causing the start of the war (Hitler 108-110). In his mind, the German people were deceived as it pertains to the validity of Social Democracy and the Marxist ideology (Hitler 47). At the heart of this alleged misinformation was the Jewish-led Press (Hitler 45). Hitler's passion to defend his homeland and his people led him to successfully request permission from King Ludwig III to enlist in the Army and serve in a Bavarian regiment (Hitler 110).
- C. From an early age, he believed that nationhood and race have primary significance with regard to the very foundations of human existence and human civilization (Hitler 49).
- D. A newly created political party named the German Labour Party was founded by Anton Drexler in 1919 (Hitler 144). By 1920, Hitler was able to seize control of the German Labour Party and turn it into what he believed it should be. Over time, the party embodied his beliefs and became known as the Nationalist Socialist German Workers' Party or the Nazi Party (Encyclopædia Britannica, n.d.). His rebranded party called for an abandonment of the Treaty of Versailles which was agreed upon after World War I. In 1923, Hitler led the Party to unsuccessfully attempt a coup of the Bavarian state government, and he was

subsequently sent to prison for the majority of 1924 (Encyclopædia Britannica, n.d.). During his imprisonment, Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf*.

- E. Upon his release, Hitler grew the Nazi Party from a membership of 25,000 in 1925 to 180,000 in 1929 (Encyclopædia Britannica, n.d.). By July of 1932, the Nazi Party was the “largest voting bloc in the Reichstag (the German Parliament)” (Encyclopædia Britannica, n.d.).
- F. During the Great Depression, Germany was hit especially hard given the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles. In 1921, Germany was ordered to pay \$31.5 billion as reparations for the damages caused in World War I (Wilde, 2020). The amount was reduced to \$29 billion in 1928, but this amount was still too much for the fractured German economy to sustain (Wilde 2020, January 29). On January 30, 1933, President Hindenburg, having no answers to the current economic crisis and the cries of the people, appointed Adolf Hitler as Chancellor. German leaders also passed the “Enabling Act” which gave Adolf Hitler the ability “to assume dictatorial powers” and to “issue decrees independently of the Reichstag and the Presidency.” (Campbell, n.d.).
- G. Hitler’s racist ideology was not hidden, and neither was he ashamed. For example, he stated that “[e]very manifestation of human culture, every product of art, science and technical skill, which we see before our eyes today, is almost exclusively the product of Aryan creative power. This very fact fully justifies the conclusion that it was the Aryan alone who founded a superior type of humanity; therefore he represents the archetype of what we understand by the term: MAN (Hitler 182-183).”
- H. He led Germany into a second World War as he invaded Western Europe and the Soviet Union. World War II included a Hitler led Holocaust in an effort to exterminate the Jews in German-occupied Europe. Yehuda Bauer and Robert Rozett estimated 5.59 - 5.86 million Jews were massacred during the Holocaust (Baur & Rozett 1799).
- I. On April 30, 1945, with the Soviet Army hunting him, Adolf Hitler committed suicide in his underground bunker (Huxen, 2020). He died as the Führer of Germany at the end of World War II.

## II. NATIONAL SOCIALISM DEFINED

- A. Nationalism can be defined as an ideology in which an individual would be supportive of his/her own nation and its interests above that of other nations. This ideology could even be to the detriment of other nations. Hitler’s extreme form of Nationalism included the oppression of other nations, religions, and cultures of people. This form of extremism is a subset of Nationalism and is now called fascism. Ironically, the term fascism was first used to “describe the political

force headed by [Benito] Mussolini between March 1919 and April 1945 and became the official ideological basis of a dictatorial regime established in Italy by him between 1925 and 1943 (Griffin 1).”

- a. Hitler revealed his nationalistic views when he expressed his belief that Germany and Austria should be “restored to the great German motherland” because “[p]eople of the same blood should be in the same Reich (Hitler 13).”
  - i. An important event in the development of Hitler’s views is the fact that Hitler’s father fought in the Franco-German War of 1870-71 (Hitler 14).
  - ii. As Hitler reflects on the Franco-German War, once he has studied it, he sees that Austrians and other Germanic peoples did not participate in the defense of their homeland, so he pondered the question, “Are we not the same as the other Germans? Do we not all belong together (Hitler 15).”
  - iii. This resulted in Hitler describing himself as a nationalist (Hitler 17).
  - iv. While in Austria, Hitler stated that at an “early age I took part in the struggle which the nationalities were waging against each other (Hitler 18).”
- B. Contrary to the term Hitler used to describe his ideology of “National Socialism”, he was not a socialist and hated the concept of socialism (Hitler 248). While his mother was on her deathbed, Hitler went to Vienna to “take the entrance examination for the Academy of Fine Arts (Hitler 22). There, he claimed to have experienced the harshness of life (Hitler 23). It was then that he began to form his hatred for Jews and socialism. He stated, “It was during this period that my eyes were opened to two perils, that names of which I scarcely knew hitherto and had no notion whatsoever of their terrible significance for the existence of the German people. These two perils were Marxism and Judaism (Hitler 23).”
  - a. Rather than socialism, Hitler believed in an ideology he referred to the “folk idea”. There are several fundamental principles which constitute the “folk idea”:
    1. Hitler believed all races are not equal; the Aryan race is superior and all other races are inferior (Hitler 241)
      - a. In the unfortunate event that Aryans are “exterminated or subjugated, then the dark shroud of a new barbarian era would enfold the earth” (Hitler 241).



- b. A “world composed of mongrels and negroids” would cause “all ideals of human beauty and nobility and all hopes of an idealized future for our humanity” to be “lost forever (Hitler 241).”
  2. Hitler described the Aryan race as the “founders and custodians” of human culture and to undermine them would be “an execrable crime in the eyes of those who believe that the folk idea lies at the basis of human existence (Hitler 241).” He also believed that “[w]hoever would dare to raise a hand against that highest image of God among his creatures would sin against the bountiful Creator of this marvel and would collaborate in the expulsion from Paradise (Hitler 242).”
  3. In his mind, the folk idea was “in profound accord with Nature’s will (Hitler 242).” The problems the world would face in the distant future would be “solved only by a superior race of human beings, a race destined to become master of all the other peoples and which will have at its disposal the means and resources of the whole world (Hitler 242).”
- b. Therefore, the fundamentals of Hitler’s economic ideology matched that of his political ideology: racial superiority. Those who were Aryan were more intellectually capable of handling political and economic matters than the commoners he referred to as mongrels and negroids.
- c. While not necessarily applicable to all instances of national socialism, Hitler believed in the concept of eugenics. This is also known as racial cleansing. The Holocaust was an effort to purge Germany of the weaker races which defiled the blood of the dominant race (Hitler 180-181). With regard to miscegenation (mixed breeding of races), Hitler stated that the results of such breeding is that:
  1. “The level of the superior race becomes lowered;
  2. “physical and mental degeneration sets in, thus leading slowly but steadily towards a progressive drying up of the vital sap (Hitler 180-181).
  - ii. “The act which brings about such a development is a sin against the will of the Eternal Creator. And as a sin this act will be avenged (Hitler 181).”

- C. With regard to charity, Hitler stated, “that the aim of all social activity must never be merely charitable relief, which is ridiculous and useless, but it must rather be a means to find a way of eliminating the fundamental deficiencies in our economic and cultural life - deficiencies which necessarily bring about the degradation of the individual or at least lead him towards such degradation (Hitler 28).”
- a. This perspective is alleviated through his ideology of eugenics. He stated, “If Nature does not wish that weaker individuals should mate with the stronger, she wishes even less that a superior race should intermingle with an inferior one; because in such a case all her efforts, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, to establish an evolutionary higher stage of being, may thus be rendered futile (Hitler 180)”. This was one way to “eliminate the fundamental deficiencies” in Germany (Hitler 28). He expounds on this notion by asserting that “Nature’s will is scorned” when the “natural struggle for existence which allows only healthy and strong individuals to survive” is replaced by “a sheer craze to ‘save’ feeble and even diseased creatures at any cost (Hitler 92).”
    - i. Hitler believes that it is in “the stronger race to oust that which has grown weak” because the “humanity of Nature ... wipes out what is weak in order to give place to the strong (Hitler 92).”
  - b. Therefore, if the weak people within a nation are eliminated, then the need for charity is removed.
- D. Finally, Hitler’s National Socialism treated religion as merely a means to an end. He referred to himself as a Christian and attempted to justify his evil behavior by twisting Jesus’ treatment of the Jews. For example, he states that Jesus (who he refers to as the Founder of the Christianity), “[w]hen He found it necessary He drove those enemies of the human race out of the Temple of God; because then, as always, they used religion as a means of advancing their commercial interests (Hitler 194).” He believed the life of a Jew is “of this world and his mentality is as foreign to the true spirit of Christianity as his character was foreign to the great Founder of this new creed two thousand years ago (Hitler 194).”
- E. According to Hitler, Jesus was “nailed to the Cross for His attitude toward the Jews (Hitler 194).”

### III. INTER-RELATIONAL SUMMARY

- A. While there are similarities to concepts such as Patriotism, Nationalism, and Nazism, there are major differences.

- a. Patriotism describes a person that “loves his country and has a sentimental attachment to it and the people that inhabit it (Bowen, 2019).” “Patriotism is essential for any society” and has been described as the “first principle of public affection” as it is “a social glue that helps bind the society around the love and affection of events and principles (Bowen, 2019).” It is possible for a person to be patriotic without being a nationalist or a Nazi.
- b. As I have previously outlined the characteristics of Nationalism and Nazism, it is important to note that the primary difference between these ideologies is the treatment of other nations. One can be a nationalist without being a Nazi, but patriotism is an essential aspect of Nationalism. While Nationalism does not always imply the lack of care or concern for other nations, it is possible to both be patriotic and a nationalist.
- c. Absent a deep pride in one’s country or ethnicity, any Nationalistic goals would be futile. Finally, one who is a fascist, Nazi, or (as Hitler described) a national socialist, would inherently be a nationalist and patriotic. However, this perversion of Nationalism and/or patriotism is rooted in racism.

#### IV. 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY APPLICATIONS

- A. The existing movement described as the Alternative Right (or “Alt-Right”) is a group that is self-described as “white nationalists” (Dimmer, 2016). One sect of this group is led by Richard B. Spencer who is extremely inflammatory in his language and uses terminology reminiscent of Hitler. In reference to African-Americans, he said, “[t]hey get ruled by people like me” and “they look up and see a face like mine looking down at them” (Coaston, 2021).
- B. One of the best examples of how destructive the Alt-Right ideology can be, would be the tragedy that took place in Charlottesville, VA on August 27, 2017. This was a “Unite the Right” demonstration organized by Jason Kessler (Silverman, et al., 2021).
  - a. There is plenty of video and other documentation on the tragedy in Charlottesville. While this is only one case, the Alt-Right ideology is still prevalent in our nation today. Racism has always existed in the United States of America and will continue to be a part of our culture for the foreseeable future. As Solomon stated, “there is no new thing under the sun.” (Ecclesiastes 1:9)

## V. SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION

- A. The concept of patriotism or nationalism in a secular sense are not inconsistent with biblical principles. Paul wrote, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom. 13:1) There is no sin in being proud to be a citizen of a particular country, but sin is committed when there is pride in the oppression of people. In the United States, Christians should not have been patriotic toward a system of slavery designed to oppress human beings.
- a. From a spiritual perspective, the church is described as a "nation" (1 Pet. 2:9). Therefore, there should be some patriotism toward the church. In fact, the church is nationalistic in a sense. We are to look out for the well-being of our brethren before we look outwardly to relieve those who are not considered to be a part of the "household of faith." (Gal. 6:10) Nationalism is not sinful; it is good when it is used for purposes that are beneficial to mankind rather than destructive. Fascism and Nazism do not fit this criteria and should not exist within the psyche of a Christian. Paul stated, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." (Rom. 12:18)
- B. Central to Hitler's ideology of "National Socialism" is the notion an individual's race could make them inferior or superior to that of another is flawed to its core. Scripturally, any ideology or doctrine pertaining to any race being superior to another is errant and sinful. In Christ, race is irrelevant to one's salvation. Paul stated, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:28). In fact, in explaining God's love for all of mankind equally, Jesus stated, "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (Jho. 3:16)
- a. The Nazi doctrine of Aryanism and Anti-Semitism is inherently sinful. Biblically, God is the creator of all men and all men have been made into the image and likeness of God (Gen. 1:26). In Christ, He "hath made of one blood all nations of men." (Acts 17:26).
  - b. Through the Holy Spirit, God asserts the contrary. Luke accounted for Peter's assertion that God is not a respecter of persons (Acts 10:34). This fact is repeated all throughout scripture (see Deu. 10:17, Job 34:19, Mat. 22:16, Rom. 2:11, Col. 3:25 as examples). Not only is God not a respecter of persons, but we are commanded to avoid such sins ourselves. James plainly states, "But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors." (Jas. 2:9).

- C. Hitler's adoption of the philosophy of eugenics (or racial cleansing) may seem too far-fetched to be believable or even applicable to today's world. Unfortunately, there are brethren within the church who subscribe to such heretical doctrines. They attempt to justify themselves of such beliefs through scriptures such as Moses addressing marriages between Jews and Gentiles by stating, "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them." (Deu. 7:3) This scripture and other similar passages in the Old Testament address a child of God marrying an unbeliever. Protecting the purity of the dominant race was never the intent of God. The very next verse explains that the Lord was attempting to protect the children of Israel. God warns them that such marriages to unbelievers would "turn away thy sons from following me, that they may serve other Gods." (Deu. 7:4) The same was the case in the days of Noah when God observed that "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose" and ultimately led to God repenting that He made man and destroying the world with a flood. (Gen. 6:2-3)
- a. God's commands for us are clear: Christians are only to marry Christians. This is without regard to the underlying race of the two individuals who are joined together. Paul wrote, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath light with darkness?" (2 Cor. 6:14) This is consistent with what he told the church in Corinth in his first epistle addressed to them when he commanded that their widows could marry whoever she desires "only in the Lord." (1 Cor. 7:39)
  - b. We are to resist the temptation to marry solely on the basis of appearance, feelings, etc. when those desires are in contradiction with God's will for us. He never intended race to be a prerequisite for an honorable marriage before Him.
  - c. That said, if we operate within the confines of the biblical mandate of marrying within the Lord, we are permitted to have preferences.
- D. Hitler's perspective on charity and his lack of empathy for those who would receive it should be troubling for those who understand God's will for those who have prospered by His power. Followers of God understand that "it is He that giveth [us] power to get wealth" and we are only stewards of the resources He has allowed us to have. (Deu. 8:18, Psa. 24:1) Giving is frequently translated as love and is often synonymous with it. John wrote, "for God so loved the world that He gave." Jesus stated, "For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do to them good" while in the house of Simon. (Mat. 14:7) Giving is so ingrained in the fabric of our faith, Jesus tells us that "it is more blessed to give than to receive" and encourages us to give as freely as we have received. (Acts 20:35, Mat. 10:18)

- a. Giving should not be viewed as a burden to those who have the means to do so generously. We're commanded to be "rich in good works, ready to distribute, and willing to communicate." (1 Tim. 6:18) While this is the role of the church, Hitler's view as a human being is contradictory to these principles. He believed that the nation would be better off without those who would become needy (e.g. the sickly, maimed, weak, etc.) and blamed Socialism for draining the nation's resources by attempting to enable them with financial support (Hitler 28).
  - b. When Israel was a nation, God instituted the tithe as a means to provide for the needs of the Levites (who had no inheritance land), the widows, orphans, and even the strangers of their community. (Deu. 14:28-29) As Christians, our giving does not need to be outsourced to the State. As autonomous congregations and individuals we are to handle our God-given mandate and spirit of giving on our own. However, that spirit must exist within each God-fearing Christian. As the Apostle John stated, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 Jho. 3:16-17) Hitler's perspective is ungodly and would taint the minds of Christians were it to seep into their hearts.
- E. Hitler's views on religion were warped and twisted. He only viewed the practice of religion from a political perspective and a way to appease the intellectually incompetent. He stated that the "political leader should not estimate the worth of a religion by taking some of its shortcomings into account, but he should ask himself whether there be any practical substitute in a view which is demonstrably better. Until such a substitute be available, only fools and criminals would think of abolishing the existing religion. (Hitler 169). While acknowledging his belief in Christ, he treated religion as merely a tool to keep those who value it happy and in subjection. The notion that a political leader or system of government has the ability to abolish a religion is presumptuous at best. Jesus states that "upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall prevail against it." (Matt. 16:18) Even the great Gamaliel understood that if a religion "be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." (Acts 5:39)
- a. While the events Hitler describes occurred, he misguides his readers as to the cause. It was not how Jesus treated the Jews that caused Him to be sent to the Cross, it was to fulfill a plan God set in motion from the foundation of the world that Jesus had to suffer and die as a propitiation for the sins of all of mankind. (1 Pet. 1:18-20)

- b. Jesus is the Great Redeemer of the sins of the world and the Jews of His day were only characters in a much larger plot between God and Satan. (Eph. 6:12)
- c. In reference to Hitler's belief that Jesus was nailed to the Cross for His attitude toward the Jews, the scriptures teach otherwise. Jesus was nailed to the Cross because of the world's attitude toward God and not Jesus' attitude toward the Jews. He died because the "wages of sin is death" and His death was the only sacrifice perfect enough to pacify the Father for our sins. (Rom. 6:23) He bore the Cross because we needed Him to eliminate the division of mankind based upon race and we still have not understood this purpose. (Eph. 2:16) Hitler was wrong about much in religion, but his misunderstanding as to why Jesus came to this world should surprise no one.

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Adolf Hitler was a profoundly evil ruler of a people who were grasping at anything that could potentially alleviate their suffering in the post-Treaty of Versailles Germany. He was a racist, a fascist, a confused individual that was proud of who he was and more than likely believed all of the hate for "Jews, mongrels, and negroids," he could store into his tiny calloused heart until the day he died. The world is clearly better without him.
2. Despite the fact that he is one of the most evil men in the history of the world, many are still intrigued by just how arrogant and proud he actually was. This is why he continues to be studied. He was more dishonest in the extent of his evil ways than dishonest in any attempt to hide it. He believed that he was doing the work of God as he killed millions as the result of his hate. Even more interesting was his use of propaganda to deceive a nation into thinking his views were acceptable. In my estimation, *Mein Kampf* itself is a form of Hitler propaganda. Even today, it is used as a manual to Neo-Nazis, White nationalists, and other hate groups who hope to revive a society similar to the Third Reich.
3. While I did not refute or discredit his account of his life, there is a good amount of what is documented in *Mein Kampf* that has been determined to be false. His experience in Vienna, the hypocrisy of not meeting the criteria to be called "Aryan" himself, and the false accusations charged to the Jewish people (e.g. being the cause of prostitution, etc. in Austria and Germany, etc.) are just a few areas that have been challenged. Despite these challenges, Hitler has stated in his own words the substance of his heart. Below are a few quotes that are able to summarize his mentality toward the Jewish race.

- a. *"I recalled to mind the names of the public leaders of Marxism, and then I realized that most of them belonged to the Chosen Race - the Social Democratic representatives in the Imperial Cabinet as well as the secretaries of the Trades Unions and the street agitators. ... One face became quite evident to me. It was that this alien race held in its hands the leadership of that Social Democratic Party with whose minor representatives I have been disputing for months past. I was happy at last to know for certain that the Jew is not a German."* (Hitler 47)
- b. *"Thus I finally discovered who were the evil spirits leading our people astray. ... Gradually I became an expert in the doctrine of the Marxists and used this knowledge as an instrument to drive home my own firm convictions. ... A Jew can never be rescued from his fixed notions."* (Hitler 47)
- c. *"Sometimes I was dumbfounded. I do not know what amazed me the more - the abundance of their verbiage or the artful way in which they dressed up their falsehoods. I gradually came to hate them."* (Hitler 48)
- d. *"... because I now understood the language of the Jew. I realized that the Jew uses language for the purpose of dissimulating his thought or at least veiling it, so that his real aim cannot be discovered by what he says but rather reading between the lines. This knowledge was the occasion of the greatest inner revolution that I had yet experienced. From being a soft-hearted cosmopolitan I became an out-and-out anti-Semite."* (Hitler 49)
- e. *"And so I believe to-day that my conduct is in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator. In standing guard against the Jew I am defending the handiwork of the Lord."* (Hitler 49)
- f. *"History furnishes us with innumerable instances that prove this law. It shows, with a startling clarity, that whenever Aryans have mingled their blood with that of an inferior race the result has been the downfall of the people who were the standard-bearers of a higher culture."* (Hitler 180)
- g. *"But in North America the Teutonic element, which has kept its racial stock pure and did not mix it with any other racial stock, has come to dominate the American Continent and will remain master of it as long as that element does not fall a victim to the habit of adulterating its blood."* (Hitler 180)
- h. *"On this planet of ours human culture and civilization are indissolubly bound up with the presence of the Aryan. If he should be exterminated or subjugated, then the dark shroud of a new barbarian era would enfold the earth."* (Hitler 241)



## WORKS CITED

- Bauer, Yehuda and Robert Rozette *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*. New York: MacMillan, 1990
- Bowen, William R. (2019, February 22). *What's the Difference between Patriotism, Nationalism, and Fascism?*, Soapboxie. Retrieved December 23, 2021, from <https://soapboxie.com/us-politics/Whats-the-Difference-Between-Patriotism-Nationalism-and-Fascism>.
- Campbell, Heather (n.d.). *Enabling Act*. Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved December 8, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Enabling-Act>
- Coaston, Jane. (2019, November 4). *Audio Tape Reveals Richard Spencer Is, as Everyone Knew, a Racist*. Vox. Retrieved December 28, 2021 from [www.vox.com/identities/2019/11/4/20947833/richard-spencer-white-nationalism-audio-milo-alt-right](http://www.vox.com/identities/2019/11/4/20947833/richard-spencer-white-nationalism-audio-milo-alt-right).
- Dimmer, Olivia. (2016, November 23) *The Difference between 'Alt-Right' and 'Neo-Nazi', Explained*. USA Today, Gannett Satellite Information Network. Retrieved December 29, 2021, from [www.usatoday.com/story/college/2016/11/23/the-difference-between-alt-right-and-neo-nazi-explained/37424923/](http://www.usatoday.com/story/college/2016/11/23/the-difference-between-alt-right-and-neo-nazi-explained/37424923/).
- Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc. (n.d.). *Nazi Party*. Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved December 8, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Nazi-Party>
- Griffin, Roger. *The Nature of Fascism*. London, UK: Routledge, 1991.
- Hitler, Adolf *Mein Kampf*. Henley-in-Arden, Warwickshire, UK: Coda Books Ltd, 2011.
- Huxen, Keith (2020, March 29). *The Death of Adolf Hitler: The National WWII Museum: New Orleans*. The National WWII Museum | New Orleans. Retrieved December 18, 2021, from <https://www.nationalww2museum.org/death-of-adolf-hitler>
- Silverman, E., Shapira, I., Jackman, T., & Cox, J. (2021, November 24). *Spencer, Kessler, Cantwell and other white supremacists found liable in deadly unite the Right Rally*. Retrieved December 31, 2021, from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2021/11/23/charlottesville-verdict-live-updates/>
- Wilde, R. (2020, January 29). *How the Treaty of Versailles contributed to Hitler's rise to power*. ThoughtCo. Retrieved December 16, 2021, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/treaty-of-versailles-hitlers-rise-power-1221351>

# Sigmund Freud: The Future of an Illusion

Anthony Flunder

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Sigmund Freud was a renowned psychoanalyst who was also an atheist. According to Gay, "Freud was a convinced, consistent, aggressive atheist" (xxiii).
2. *The Future of an Illusion* is Freud's attack on religion by propagating the following main ideologies:
  - a. Civilization is visceral and instinctual.
  - b. Civilization created the illusion of religion.
  - c. Civilization conceptualized God as part of the illusion.
  - d. Civilization must replace religion with science for its progression.
3. This outline will examine Freud's views as presented in *The Future of an Illusion* (1927) and provide a refutation of his teachings through the inspired Word of God, the Bible.

## DISCUSSION:

### **I. SIGMUND FREUD'S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH (1856-1939)**

- A. *Life*: Freud was born in Austria (1856) and died in England (1939). He fled from Austria because of the rise of Nazism and made London, England his home in 1938. He was married and fathered six children (Gay xi).
- B. *Religious Background*: Freud was a staunch atheist. He referred to himself as a "godless Jew" (qtd. in Gay xxiii). He stated "We shall tell ourselves that it would be very nice if there were a God who created the world and was a benevolent Providence, and if there were a moral order in the universe and an after-life; but it is a very striking fact that all this is exactly as we are bound to wish it to be" (Freud 42). Freud's rejection of God grew through his college years (Gay xi). He sought after and believed that there was a scientific answer for all things (Gay xi).
- C. *Education*: University of Vienna (MD, 1881). Major areas of Study: Neurology, Psychoanalysis, and Psychotherapy.
- D. *Work*: Freud established a private practice and worked primarily with patients suffering from nervous disorders (Gay xii). It was during this time he began cultivating his ideas on the unconscious mind which he asserts is the repository for sexual and aggressive impulses.

- E. *Worldwide Impact*: Freud introduced a new approach to psychology that involves psychoanalytic therapy. In the early 1900s, along with Carl Jung, he established the International Psychoanalytic Association which influenced the movement worldwide. His influence is widespread, and his theories and techniques are still utilized and taught today.
- F. *Seminal Writings*: Freud published numerous books based on his own experiences, thoughts, and beliefs beginning in 1891. Some of his works include “The Interpretation of Dreams” (1899) and “The Ego and the Id” (1923). Later in his 1929 book “The Future of an Illusion”, Freud attempted to investigate the origin of civilization and religion including the future of both. This work served as his critique on religion. His conclusions are revered by some and debated by others. Gay described “The Future of an Illusion, [as] a convinced atheist’s dissection of religion...” (xxi).
- G. *Legacy*: Freud’s theory and techniques of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy shaped the science of psychology by which he viewed the world.

He introduced his idea of psychoanalyzing patients and investigating their conscience thoughts and repressed desires. Freud credited himself as the “creator of psychoanalysis” (Freud 46). This technique is characterized by a patient reclining or laying down on a couch and talking about their experiences, feelings, etc. His therapeutic methods are still used today.

## II. SUMMARY: FREUD IN HIS OWN WORDS

### A. Civilization is visceral and instinctual

1. Freud defined civilization. “Human civilization by which I mean all those respects in which human life has raised itself above its animal status and differed from the life of beasts-and I scorn to distinguish between culture and civilization, presents, as we know two aspects to the observer” (Freud 6).
  - a. Humans have evolved.
  - b. Humans have evolved far beyond animals. Freud revealed that he was a keen observer of the Scopes/Monkey trial of 1925. He believed that many more would side with science and abandon religion based on this trial (Freud 49).
2. Freud began his 1927 work from the premise of investigating the origin of civilization and its future. “When one has lived for quite a long time in a particular civilization and has often tried to discover what its origins were and along what path it has developed, one sometimes also feels tempted to take a glance in the other direction and to ask what further

fate lies before it and what transformation it is destined to undergo” (Freud 5).

3. Freud’s thinking encompassed the belief that man is an uncivilized primordial beast. This condition is one that man is born with. “The instinctual wishes that suffer under them are born afresh with every child; there is a class of people, the neurotics, who already react to these frustrations with asocial behavior. Among these instinctual wishes are those of incest, cannibalism and lust for killing.” (Freud 13). According to Freud man is:
  - a. A primitive and amoral being. These characteristics were inherent from one’s birth.
  - b. A visceral being with longings for incest, cannibalism, and a lust for killing.
  - c. A creature of weak intelligence who is ruled by his instinctual wishes (Freud 61).
  - d. An instinctual creature who lacks the aptitude for reasonable arguments and is entirely governed by their instinctual wishes... (Freud 60).
4. Freud wrote that man looks over his predicament and is fearful that there are powers that he is powerless against. The forces of nature and death are beyond his jurisdiction. According to Freud, “There are the elements, which seem to mock at all human control, which quakes and is torn apart and buries all human life and its works; waters, which deluges, and drowns everything before them; there are diseases, which we have only recently recognized as attacks by other organisms; and finally there is the painful riddle of death, against no medicine has yet been found, nor probably will be. With these forces nature rises up against us, majestic, cruel, and inexorable; she brings to our mind once more our weakness and helplessness, which we thought to escape through the work of civilization... in the face of elemental catastrophe it forgets the discordances of its civilization and all its internal difficulties and animosities and recalls the great common task of preserving itself against the superior power of nature” (Freud 19).
  - a. Man works to comprehend his surroundings and death.
  - b. Man creates an illusion to cope with the anxieties of nature which he cannot control and death which he cannot prevent. Religion was the illusion created by man to defend/reconcile himself to the superior force of nature.

## B. Civilization created the illusion of religion

1. Freud defined his illusion. "It will be found if we turn our attention to the psychical origin of religious ideas. These which are given out as teachings, are not precipitates of experience or end-results of thinking: they are illusions, fulfillments of the oldest, strongest, and most urgent wishes of mankind. The secret of their strengths lies in the strength of those wishes" (Freud 38).
2. According to Freud, religion is an illusion. "An illusion is not the same thing as an error; nor is it necessarily an error. Aristotle's belief that vermin are developed out of dung (a belief to which ignorant people still cling) was an error...It would be incorrect to call these errors illusions...What is the characteristic of illusions is that they are derived from human wishes. In this respect they come near to psychiatric delusion. But they differ from them, too, apart from the more complicated structure of delusions. In the case of delusions, we emphasize as essential their being in contradiction with reality. Illusions need not necessarily be false-that is to say, unrealizable or in contradiction to reality. For instance, a middle-class girl may have the illusion that a prince will come and marry her. This is possible; and a few such cases have occurred. That the Messiah will come and establish a golden age is much less likely. Whether one classifies this belief as an illusion or as something analogous to a delusion will depend on one's personal attitude...Thus, we call a belief an illusion when a wish-fulfillment is a prominent factor in its motivation, and in doing so we disregard its relations to reality, just as the illusion itself sets no store by verification" (Freud 39-40).
  - a. According to Freud, religion is out of the realm of reality and cannot be believed because it is without evidence of existence.
  - b. Lacking Evidentiary Support: "Having thus taken our bearings, let us return once more to the questions of religious doctrines. We can now repeat that all of them are illusions and **insusceptible of proof**. No one can be compelled to think them true, to believe in them" (Freud 40). Freud states religious ideas should have evidence to support their claims in beliefs. He says religious ideas cannot be supported due to a lack of evidence (Freud 32). Society discourages proof seeking. Because society is aware of the insecurity of the claim it makes on behalf of religious doctrines (Freud 33).

3. Freud believed that religion is thrust upon people and that man has no choice but to follow it. "Moreover, it is especially apposite to say that civilization gives the individual these ideas, for he finds them there already; they are presented to him ready-made, and he would not be able to discover them for himself. What he is entering into is the heritage of many generations, and he takes it over as he does the multiplication table, geometry, and similar things" (Freud 27).
4. To say that religion is of divine origin is merely a part of that religious system created by man.
5. Man saw that religion could also be used to regulate the primordial instinctive nature of man in which many were subject to its abuses (Freud 27).

**C. Civilization conceptualized God as part of the illusion**

1. Freud explained why he believed man created religion and God. "Thus the benevolent rule of a divine Providence allays our fear of the dangers of life; the establishment of a moral world order ensures the fulfillment of the demands of justice, which have so often remained unfulfilled in human civilization; and the prolongation of earthly existence in a future life provides the local and temporal framework in which these wish-fulfillments shall take place. Answers to the riddles that tempt the curiosity of man, such as how the universe began or what the relation is between body and mind, are developed in conformity with the underlying assumptions of this system. It is an enormous relief to the individual psyche if the conflicts of its childhood arising from the father-complex-conflicts which it has never wholly overcome-are removed from it and brought to a solution which is universally accepted" (Freud 39).
  - a. Man conceptualized God to alleviate or cope with those forces he has no control over.
  - b. Part of the illusion created by man is, "We shall tell ourselves that it would be very nice if there were a God who created the world..." (Freud 42).
  - c. Morality: "...and was a benevolent Providence, and if there were a *moral order in the universe...*" (Freud 42).
  - d. Life After: "...and an after-life; but it is a very striking fact that all this is exactly as we are bound to wish it to be" (Freud 42).

**D. Civilization must replace religion with science for its progression**

The future of civilization is science. Freud remarked, “The sole purpose of my book is to point out the necessity for this forward step” (Freud 63). Freud taught that the future of civilization must proceed in the light of science and not in the shadow of religion. He also emphasized that science is religion’s more superior replacement. Freud acknowledged religion’s contribution to humanity to move man from an intuitive uncivilized state, but its failure was the stagnation of progression. He asserted psychoanalysis and science now provide the means by which civilization could further develop and excel and answer the questions religion is incapable of responding.

“But you must admit that here we are justified in having hope for the future-that perhaps there is a treasure to be dug up capable of enriching civilization and that it is worth making the experiment of an irreligious education” (Freud 61).

### **III. AN INTER-RELATIONAL SUMMARY OF OTHER NECESSARY PHILOSOPHIES**

- A. “I have said nothing which other better men have not said before me in a much more complete, forcible, and impressive manner” (Freud 45). Freud drew from others in shaping his theories in areas such as neurology, psychoanalysis, and therapeutic remedies. The following men heavily influenced his views and are extolled in their various fields of work:
1. Charles Darwin’s (1809-1882) theory of biological evolution says that all species of organisms developed through natural selection to thrive and reproduce.
  2. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) Nietzsche believed God was an invention of man.
  3. Carl Jung (1875-1961) was a colleague of Freud. Jung and Freud were allies in the field of psychology and their studies of neurology, and psychoanalysis. They were co-founders of their school that studied psychoanalysis.
  4. Josef Breuer (1842-1925) was a physician who made key discoveries in neurophysiology and was key in developing psychoanalysis. His work would influence Freud greatly in developing the therapeutic treatment of talking to patients as a therapy for nervous disorders.
  5. Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893) was a French neurologist who used hypnosis as means of treating certain disorders. Freud would adopt his method of hypnosis as a therapeutic treatment for various disorders.

6. Thomas Hobbs (1588-1679) believed that religion was a tool for anxiety and its specific function was to prevent man's discord and aggressive tendencies.
7. Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) was an Italian politician and philosopher who believed that religion and morality was of human origin.

#### IV. THE MANIFESTATION OF FREUD'S PHILOSOPHY TODAY

- A. Today, men continue to build upon Freud's destructive philosophy. The fact that Freud is extolled in our society today is not surprising. The Bible speaks of such times. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables" (2 Tim. 4:3-4).
- B. The escalation of these ideas furthers a societal disbelief in God and godly values. According to his philosophy, our society today is a derivation of our instinctual past. The modernization of Freud's thoughts has encroached on ways in which children are instructed, normalized ungodly behavior, and created an environment in which gender and sexuality are subjective, fluid, and nonbinary.
- C. Our current society is heavily influenced by science. One can simply turn on the news and hear elected officials proclaim, "I'm going to trust science and the scientists". This is direct influence from Freud's viewpoint that science is the future of civilization. Recent examples of this viewpoint can be noted in the handling of the COVID-19 pandemic in conjunction with the Lord's church such as:
  - a. Prohibiting and limiting the capacity of Sunday worship assembly.
  - b. Congregations fined for allegedly exceeding the instructed capacity and disregarding the social distance mandates of governors.
  - c. Advising against congregational singing as it was viewed as a possible spreader of the virus.
  - d. Science was the first and last word on all things religious or otherwise.
- D. Freud's idea of a religion-less society manifests itself today in various ways.
  - a. Individuals of the same sex are allowed and encouraged to marry.
  - b. Children now dictate their own discipline standards, gender, and any other non-rational desire.



- c. Collective worship has been discouraged. Worship on Sunday, every first day of the week, has even been prohibited by elected officials.
- d. Society has promoted the “It’s my body my choice” mindset wherein abortion is a valid, lawful, and reasonable option.
- e. Some profess that their lustful desire for same sex relationships was formed in the womb.

**V. THE REFUTATION OF FREUD’S FUTURE OF AN ILLUSION.**

- A. This refutation aims to counter the core of Freud’s ideas as presented in *The Future of an Illusion*. Any true investigation of our future should begin and end with the Bible, the all-sufficient and inerrant word of God. The integrity of the scriptures and the holy men who were moved by God to pen the scriptures stands firm as shown in the following passages:
  - a. All scripture is given by inspiration of God (2 Tim. 3:16-17).
  - b. No scripture is of any private interpretation (2 Pet. 1:20-21).
  - c. “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth” (Jho. 17:17).
  - d. “Thy word is true from the beginning...” (Psa. 119:160).
- B. Freud wrote about the following four ideas that are biblically refuted as follows:
  - a. The ideology that *Civilization is visceral and instinctual* is false because God made man upright and gifted man with a good nature.
  - b. The ideology that *Civilization created religion* is false because God established man’s moral order.
  - c. The ideology that *Civilization conceptualized God* is false because God exists and is everlasting.
  - d. The ideology that *Civilizations must replace religion with science for its progression* is false because Man’s hope is the gospel.
- C. **God made man upright and gifted man with a good nature**
  - a. Freud’s view of primitive man born laden with instinctual desires of murder, lust, cannibalism, and incest is false. Man has never been a lumbering prehistoric “caveman”. Man was never mindless, wild, lacking intelligence, and without moral order that instructed him how to live. The same God that created the universe also created man with free-will and the nature of man is good.
    - i. All mankind is born innocent and sinless. God made man upright (Ecc. 7:29).

- ii. Gentiles who were without the law, did by nature, the things the law contained (Rom. 2:14-15).
- iii. Man is wonderfully made, and his soul knows right (Psa. 139:14).
- iv. Man has choice and free will. However, man may choose to go against his God given nature. It is then that man sins (Ecc. 7:29).
- v. Man can be reasoned with (Acts 17:2; Isa 1:18).

#### **D. God established man's moral order**

- a. The integrity of the scripture resounds evermore. Freud's attack on religion is focused on Christianity. The same God who created man is the same God who established laws for morality. Morality left up to man's devices leads to destruction:
  - i. It is not in man to direct his steps (Jer. 10:23).
  - ii. There is a way that seems right to man, but the end is death (Pro. 14:12).
  - iii. God's grace teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts (Tit. 2:11-12).
  - iv. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" (Psa. 119:60).
- b. "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue" (2 Pet. 1:3).

#### **E. God exists and is everlasting**

- a. The fool continues to say there is no God (Psa. 14:1). The evolution theory was wrong then, is wrong now, and will be wrong tomorrow. The book of Genesis, Moses's inspired record, teaches us the beginning of the universe, mankind, and God's design in them all. The design of our universe and world cannot be naturalistic, it did not come from nothing. The "big bang" continues to be the "big whimper" when juxtaposed against the inspired word of God. A person must go against the intellect and reason given to him by God to believe the evolution theory. Our universe necessitates a designer. The designer would have to be omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. God is that designer. God created the universe.
  - i. "...God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen. 1:1).
  - ii. "...God made the earth and the heavens" (Gen. 2:4).

- iii. “By the word of the Lord were the heaven made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth” (Psa. 33:6).
  - iv. “For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast” (Psa. 33:9).
  - v. God created the heavens and stretched them out (Isa. 42:5).
  - vi. God laid the foundations of the earth (Job 38:4-9).
  - vii. “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork” (Psa. 19:1).
- b. Freud’s attempt to bind man’s existence to the Darwinian theory of natural selection failed. God created the animals before he created man. The animals are separate and apart from man. Man is not equal to animals. Man was given dominion by God over the animals. How pernicious the theory that man has evolved from the smallest molecule to an inorganic substance, to tadpoles, to monkeys, and finally into human beings. There is not a spade in all of archeology that has uncovered any evidence whatsoever to indicate that was the case. The same God who created the universe created man.
- c. God created the animals before he created man. The animals are separate and apart from man (Gen. 1:20-25).
- i. “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness...” (Gen. 1:26).
  - ii. “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (Gen. 1:27).
  - iii. “And the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Gen. 2:7).
  - iv. Adam was the first man (1 Cor. 15:45).
  - v. God created woman from Adam’s rib (Gen. 2:22-23).
  - vi. Jesus said, “...He which made them at the beginning...” (Mat. 19:4).
  - vii. God is the God of all flesh. There has never been, nor will there ever be anything too hard for him to accomplish (Jer. 32:27).

#### **F. Man’s hope is the gospel.**

- a. When one elects to examine the future, it is imperative that one do so through the right lens, which is the Bible. Freud rejected the Bible, the

correct lens, which holds the answers for the future of mankind and also compels man to consider his present spiritual state. What the world needs now and into the future, until Jesus comes, is the gospel! It is this great commission that Jesus issued to his Apostles. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Mat. 28:19). What must be taught is the gospel. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark 16:15-16). God adds man (Acts 2:47) to only one church (Eph. 4:5) upon obedience and baptism. That same church is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15). The gospel message commands us to obey God, submit to the authority of his Son, Jesus, and live faithfully until death. "...Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Rev. 2:10).

- b. We are not in the middle stage of man's existence; we are in the last days (Heb 1:2). This is the time that God has allotted man to repent and obey the perfected gospel. Man's present duty is to obey the gospel and keep God's commandments. Man's future appointment is standing before Jesus in judgment.
- c. "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, silver, or stone, graven by art and mans' device. And at the times of this ignorance winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead" (Acts 17:29-31).
- d. All have an appointment with death and judgement (Heb. 9:27).
- e. All must appear before Jesus Christ the Judge for an accounting of our life's deeds (2 Cor. 5:10).
- f. If man only focuses on the temporal that he assumes will always be, he will miss the present opportunity God has given him to obey the gospel and have hope for eternity.
- g. God promised eternal life, before the world began (Tit. 1:1).
- h. The faithful in Hebrews 11 hoped for a better country than earth, heavenly, where God is not ashamed to be called their God (Heb. 11:16).
- i. Paul hoped for a crown of righteousness that was laid up for him, that the Lord would give (2 Tim. 4:8).
- j. We look for that blessed hope of Christ's glorious appearing (Tit. 2:12).

- G. Freud based his future upon his manly disillusioned ideas and man's ingenuity. However, we must base our future on the Biblical promises of God. If it is God's permissive will to allow us to see tomorrow, then our charge remains unchanged. Man's charge is to fear God and keep his commandments. The hope for mankind, and remedy for sin, is the gospel. As the Apostle Paul stated:
- a. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:16-17).
  - b. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Tit. 2:11-13).
  - c. Scripture also gives a warning for not obeying the gospel. Peter asked an important question. "...What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God" (1 Pet. 4:17)? Paul answered the question Peter posed:
  - d. "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" (2 The. 1:7-9).
  - e. The Bible gives warnings about devilish philosophies and doctrines. Evidence is plentiful in the Word of God as shown the following scriptures:
    - i. Paul warned the church about false doctrines such as Freud's (Col. 2:8).
    - ii. Vain words (Eph. 5:6).
    - iii. The wisdom of this world is foolishness (1 Cor. 3:19-20).
    - iv. Enticing words (1 Cor. 2:4-5).
    - v. God will destroy the wisdom of the wise (1 Cor. 1:19-25).

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Freud's viewpoint is not novel by any degree. Whether it was Gnostics, Epicureans, or Stoics, the "new thing" has always captivated carnal man when he has chosen to abandon God. Freud's theory of the future of civilization is no different. This

manuscript is not anti-science by any means. We believe and bear witness to many accomplishments that science has contributed to the world. However, our objection is to a science that operates without the knowledge of God and guidance of God's word.

2. Freud's critique is a rejection of God and religion. He believed that for civilization to progress it must move beyond God and religion with the advancements and knowledge of science to cultivate, restrain, govern, and advance mankind. Consider Romans 1: 19-25. Freud's philosophies and other similar philosophies are a danger according to Paul's inspired writing. "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (Col. 2:8).
3. *The Future of an Illusion* is derived from Freud's own personal errant philosophy. Unfortunately, this book has been printed, reprinted, translated, and is readily available at your local bookstore. BUT READER BEWARE! Paul is warning against errant philosophy. Freud's motivation was intended to spoil you just as Paul warned.
4. Solomon encourages us to seek after God's wisdom:

"Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths. Be not wise in thine own eyes: fear the Lord and depart from evil" (Pro. 3:5-7).
5. Finally, Freud's prepositions are false because:
  - a. God made man upright and gifted man with a good nature.
  - b. God established man's moral order.
  - c. God exists and is everlasting.
  - d. Man's hope is the gospel.
6. Jesus Christ's return is our hope for the future (Tit. 2:11-14). The Bible is profitable for man (2 Tim. 3:16-17). The Bible is right, and every word of the Bible is right!

#### WORKS CITED

Freud, Sigmund. *The Future of an Illusion*. Translated and edited by James Strachey, 1927, Norton & Company, 1961.

Gay, Peter. *Sigmund Freud: A Brief Life*, Norton & Company, 1989.

# Margaret Mead: Coming of Age in Samoa

Trent Thrasher

## INTRODUCTION:

1. The wise man Solomon wrote long ago “of making many books *there is* no end; and much study *is* a weariness of the flesh.” (Ecc. 12:12).
  - A. A great number of books should never have existed for their contents are not a help but a hindrance to mankind.
  - B. Studying such books indeed is a “weariness of the flesh”. The hope is that we gain a better understanding of the falsehoods being peddled to give a better answer for the hope that is in the Christian (cf. 1 Pet. 3:15).
2. *Coming of Age in Samoa* is one book that we all would have been better off without.
  - A. This book was written by a young anthropologist named Margaret Mead and was published in 1928 (Mark 37).
  - B. Other books published in the same decade include “Margaret Sanger’s *The Pivot of Civilization* (1922) and its faith in the liberating power of our sexual glands, Adolf Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* (1925) and its identification of the Jews as the greatest problem facing genetic progress, and Sigmund Freud’s *The Future of an Illusion* (1927), and its assertion that we are by nature amoral savages and that morality is only a series of taboos erected by man in the name of religion (itself an illusion).” (Wiker 177).
  - C. It was a time of much confusion in the world and the field of pseudo-science (false science) continued to gain more propagators and followers. We see the effects of such philosophy yet today.
3. The English word “philosophy” is derived from the Greek word *philosophia* which “denotes ‘the love and pursuit of wisdom,’ hence, ‘philosophy,’ the investigation of truth and nature” (Vine 470).
  - A. When a philosopher rejects God, who is the Giver of wisdom, knowledge, understanding and truth (cf. Pro. 2:6; Jho. 17:17), then their philosophy will be corrupted.
  - B. Rejecting God and inserting man’s wisdom results in skewed thinking and is exactly what the apostle Paul warned about in Colossians 2:8 when he wrote by inspiration “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”.

## DISCUSSION:

### I. A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF MARGARET MEAD

- A. Margaret Mead was born on December 16, 1901, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Edward Mead (a professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania) and Emily Fogg Mead (a graduate student in sociology) (Mark 13).
1. Margaret was the oldest child of four (one brother and two sisters) and her grandmother, Martha, lived with her family and influenced her greatly in her formative years (Mark 13-14).
- B. Mead began her college education in 1919 at DePauw University in Indiana but quickly transferred to Barnard College in New York City (Mark 16-17).
1. It was at Barnard College where she met Ruth Benedict, who encouraged her to study anthropology. This eventually led to her becoming an anthropologist (Mark 19).
  2. Mead would sign up for anthropology taught by Franz Boas in her senior year. Boas would be instrumental in Mead going to Samoa to test a theory he had heard (Mark 19, 25).
  3. Eventually, Margaret would obtain a B.A. degree in psychology from Barnard College, an M.A. degree in psychology and Ph.D degree in anthropology from Columbia University (Mark 101-102).
- C. Besides *Coming of Age in Samoa*, Mead would write several other books including but not limited to *Growing Up in New Guinea* (Mark 44), *The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe* (Mark 45), *Sex and Temperament* (Mark 57), *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples* (Mark 59), *Balinese Character: A Photographic Analysis* (a co-effort with Gregory Bateson; Mark 71) and *And Keep Your Powder Dry* (Mark 79).
- D. Mead was an active public speaker when she was not in the field and would often defend young people at a time when a common saying was “never trust anyone over 30” (Mark 93).
1. One of her key speaking topics was sex and marriage where she advocated for “trial marriages” and “serial monogamy, that is, having a series of sexual partners but being faithful to each one as long as the arrangement lasted.” She felt “people expected too much of marriage” (Mark 93).
- E. Throughout Margaret’s life she had relationships with three different men, Luther Cressman (1923), Reo Fortune (1928) and Gregory Bateson (1936). All three relationships would end in divorce though she had one child, Mary Catherine Bateson, born in 1939 (Mark 24, 36, 39, 61, 70, 85).



1. Mead was also known to have sexual relationships with other individuals including women. One of those relationships was with Ruth Benedict (Mark 94; Wiker 190).
  2. Mary Pipher, who wrote the Introduction to the Perennial Classics Edition of *Coming of Age in Samoa*, summarizes Margaret this way “Mead was the original flower child, interested in peace, justice, sexual freedom, and adventure.” (Mead xvi).
  3. If it sounds like she was instrumental in sparking the sexual revolution, which particularly characterized the 1960s, then you have successfully grasped her influence.
- F. Margaret Mead died in New York City on November 15, 1978 of pancreatic cancer at the age of 76 (Mark 103).
1. Though Mead is no longer on the Earth she left an erosive influence that continues to eat at the very foundation of society today.

## II. A SUMMARY OF MARGARET MEAD’S PHILOSOPHY

- A. Margaret Mead was on a mission to answer such questions as: “Are the disturbances which vex our adolescents due to the nature of adolescence itself or to the civilisation? Under different conditions does adolescence present a different picture?” (Mead 9-10).
1. Those “different conditions” are in reference to a location different than America and its society for she asks, “Were these difficulties due to being adolescent or to being adolescent in America?” (Mead 5).
- B. Behind those questions was another concept heralded by Mead’s college professor, Franz Boas, which he clearly stated in the foreword of *Coming of Age in Samoa* “Courtesy, modesty, good manners, conformity to definite ethical standards are universal, but what constitutes courtesy, modesty, good manners, and ethical standards is not universal.” (Mead xviii).
1. Boas felt that the results of *Coming of Age in Samoa* “confirm the suspicion long held by anthropologists, that much of what we ascribe to human nature is no more than a reaction to the restraints put upon us by our civilization.” (Mead xviii).
  2. It should be apparent that this line of thinking leads to man defining and propagating his own standard for living. Furthermore, it is no surprise that Mead found exactly what she was looking for in the Samoans.

- C. Within these questions, she had other motives, not the least of which was changing the educational system for children (Mead 11).
1. In fact, she believed children “must be taught how to think, not what to think” (Mead 169).
  2. By what standard could this be accomplished? According to Mead the only standard is that there is not a standard. For the child “must be taught that many ways are open to them, no one sanctioned above its alternative, and that upon them and upon them alone lies the burden of choice. Unhampered by prejudices, unvexed by too early conditioning to any one standard, they must come clear-eyed to the choices which lie before them.” (Mead 169).
- D. She had a disdain for the “nuclear family” (i.e., God’s plan for the family) as she often derided it in her book and used the Samoans’ way of life to attack it.
1. “in which Americans are brought up...imprisoned in the small, fragile, nuclear family from which there is no escape and in which there is little security” (Mead xviii).
  2. “No mother will ever exert herself to discipline a younger child if an older one can be made responsible” (Mead 18).
  3. “But just as a child is getting old enough so that its wilfulness is becoming unbearable, a younger one is saddled upon it, and the whole process is repeated again, each child being disciplined and socialised through responsibility for a still younger one” (Mead 19).
  4. “Few children live continuously in one household, but are always testing out other possible residences” (Mead 31).
  5. “Samoans rate romantic fidelity in terms of days or weeks at most, and are inclined to scoff at tales of life-long devotion.” (Mead 108).
  6. “The home must cease to plead an ethical cause or a religious belief with smiles or frowns, caresses or threats...And because old errors die slowly, they must be taught tolerance, just as today they are taught intolerance” (Mead 169).
- E. It becomes quickly apparent (even within her own introduction) she had a fixation on sex which will become a common topic throughout her book. She even included a chapter entitled “Formal Sex Relations”.
1. Listen to how her book begins and judge for yourself, “The life of the day begins at dawn, or if the moon has shown until daylight, the shouts of the young men may be heard before dawn from the hillside. Uneasy in the night, populous with ghosts, they shout lustily

to one another as they hasten with their work. As the dawn begins to fall among the soft brown roofs and the slender palm trees stand out against a colourless, gleaming sea, lovers slip home from trysts beneath the palm trees or in the shadow of beached canoes, that the light may find each sleeper in his appointed place.” (Mead 12).

2. Sexual relationships are mentioned throughout the book in various perverted forms and fashions. Some quotes are intentionally left out due to their content but many more could be quoted.
  - a. “More frequently still an older man, a widower or a divorced man, will be a girl’s first lover.” (Mead 62).
  - b. “many adulteries occur— between a young marriage- shy bachelor and a married woman, or a temporary widower and some young girl— which hardly threaten the continuity of established relationships.” (Mead 75).
  - c. “To live as a girl with many lovers as long as possible and then to marry in one’s own village, near one’s own relatives and to have many children, these were uniform and satisfying ambitions.” (Mead 109).
3. Homosexuality is mentioned very casually as if it is no issue and experimentation is deemed “natural”.
  - a. “There were several pairs of boys in the village who had been circumcised together and were still inseparable companions, often sleeping together in the house of one of them. Casual homosexual practices occurred in such relationships.” (Mead 49).
  - b. Speaking of a boy who could not win a girl Mead states, “Often partially satisfactory solutions are relationships with men.” (67).
  - c. “Among grown boys and girls casual homosexual practices also supplant it (self-pleasure **TAT**) to a certain extent.” (Mead 95).
  - d. “These casual homosexual relations between girls never assumed any long- time importance. On the part of growing girls or women who were working together they were regarded as a pleasant and natural diversion, just tinged with the salacious.” (Mead 103).

- e. “The general preoccupation with sex, the attitude that minor sex activities, suggestive dancing, stimulating salacious conversation, salacious songs and definitely motivated tussling are all acceptable and attractive diversions, is mainly responsible for the native attitude towards homosexual practices. They are simply play, neither frowned upon nor given much consideration.” (Mead 103).
  - f. “all the accidents of emotional development which in a civilisation, recognising only one narrow form of sex activity, result in unsatisfactory marriages, casual homosexuality and prostitution, are here rendered harmless.” (Mead 104).
- F. Listen to this smattering of quotes from the Introduction to the Perennial Classics Edition of *Coming of Age in Samoa* to observe the danger of her philosophy.
- 1. “From my reading of *Coming of Age in Samoa*, I acquired several ideas that I still find powerful today— that gender differences are not set in stone, that sexuality is culturally shaped” (Mead xvii).
  - 2. “*Coming of Age in Samoa* influenced the nature vs. nurture debate that raged at the beginning of the century and still rages today.” (Mead xviii).
  - 3. “Mead’s viewpoint in *Coming of Age in Samoa* on the destructive effects of isolation and intensity in nuclear families influenced our first generation of family therapists. Early advocates of sexual freedom, such as Havelock Ellis and Bertrand Russell, loved this book. And of course, Mead’s ideas about sexual experimentation were wildly popular during the sexual revolution of the 1960s. Her ideas about adolescence have permeated our culture.” (Mead xviii).

### III. A SUMMARY OF SIMILAR PHILOSOPHIES

- A. Several interconnected philosophies factor into the ideologies found in *Coming of Age in Samoa*. The listing below highlights only a few due to space constraints but others could be provided.
- 1. Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Sigmund Freud all believed that human nature was best understood in man’s primitive state (Wiker 178). The Samoans were deemed a primitive culture and thus a perfect people for this line of thinking. The basic supposition was, the closer one got to primitive man, the closer one got to truth.

- a. “When Hobbes, Rousseau, or Freud imagined man’s pre-civilized state, they did so not on the basis of historical evidence, but on supposition.” (Wiker 178).
- B. Thomas Hobbes “is the father of the all too familiar belief that we have a right to whatever we want— however morally degraded, vile, or trivial it may be— and further, that it is the government’s job to protect such rights.” (Wiker 31).
  1. In essence, whatever you desire must be good. Whatever you hate must then be evil. It is a subjective standard and is seen in Mead’s philosophy where no standard is the standard.
  2. Hobbes’ philosophy is also seen in such statements as “No one has a right to tell me what to do” but this has nothing to do with moral right or wrong. The “right” is equated with desires (Wiker 40).
  3. In a sexually charged society demanding “equal rights”, Hobbes has certainly influenced this thinking.
- C. Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s philosophy set forth that “primitive men were suave, peaceful, innocent, carefree, and cheerfully libidinous bonobos. Rousseau therefore gave us a new Adam, a carefree, make- love- not- war ancestral archetype who became the societal ideal of the ‘free love’ movements.” (Wiker 45).
  1. Mead’s idea of casual sexual relationships and brittle marriages was nothing new for Rousseau stated “‘Males and females united fortuitously, depending on encounter, occasion, and desire,’ and ‘they left each other with the same ease.’” (Wiker 45).
  2. Naturally this would affect the home and the love that is to be found there. Children are merely the byproduct of care-free sex in a society imagined this way. To state it another way “If we imagine that sexual paradise consists in the carefree satisfaction of any sexual whim, then marriage and sexual morality will seem unnatural fetters on our desires.” (Wiker 52). Sadly, this behavior can be found in society today.
- D. Sigmund Freud declared himself a “godless Jew” and he made no qualms about attacking religion (Wiker 165).
  1. Like Hobbes and Rousseau, Christianity and its morals were deemed as “unnatural” and furthermore were merely an illusion (Wiker 167). What to do about this? “The rational thing to do, Freud asserts, is to give up this illusion. Grow up. Drop religion and embrace science. Become ‘irreligious in the truest sense of the word’ and admit ‘man’s

insignificance or impotence in the face of the universe.” (Wiker 175).

- a. In other words, if you believe in God, you are a child and need to grow up! The “illusion” is seen in believing that rejecting God will lead to maturity when reality proves just the opposite (cf. Heb. 5:11-14; 2 Pet. 1:3-11).
  2. Mead, in being a scientist (anthropology is the science of human beings), would easily use this line of thinking to show what a “primitive” people were doing and use this as a pattern for how we should live.
- E. There is an overarching philosophy that predates all of these individuals, and it is found at the conclusion of Judges 21:25 “In those days *there was* no king in Israel: every man did *that which was* right in his own eyes.” The source of this line of thinking is found earlier in the book “and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the LORD, nor yet the works which he had done” (Jdg. 2:10).
1. When God is rejected, man will always turn to himself as the standard.

#### IV. MARGARET MEAD’S PHILOSOPHY AS SEEN TODAY

- A. Margaret Mead’s philosophy is seen in several prominent movements and ideologies, yet today, including: LGBTQI+ and the sexual movement, destruction of the home, liberal education and science as god. Some of these areas have already been referenced earlier but we will devote a little space here.
- B. LGBTQI+ is the acronym that defines the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersexual community. If you are wondering what “intersexual” means it is defined below.
  1. Intersexual is defined as “existing between sexes” or “intermediate in sexual characters between a typical male and a typical female” (Merriam-Webster).
  2. Our society is inundated with confusion about sexual orientation and gender.
  3. A philosophy like Mead’s urges acceptance and experimentation in these areas and worse yet, declares them as essentially harmless. Current media and society prove otherwise.
- C. Mead’s philosophy is detrimental to the home which is frequently attacked.

1. The marriage rate in the United States of America (USA) has been on an overall decline since 1982 with a 6% drop seen from 2017 to 2018 (Curtin).
  2. The divorce rate in the USA has also been declining since the year 2000 (CDC).
    - a. This is not because people have changed their views on divorce, it is because fewer people are getting married.
  3. Mead had the idea of “trial marriage”. If marriage does not work out get a divorce and move on to the next relationship.
    - a. Today this has degenerated further into living together and foregoing marriage altogether.
- D. One of the fundamental goals Mead had in writing *Coming of Age in Samoa* was to change how children are educated.
1. Changing how a generation thinks results in a generation aligned with the beliefs you taught them. Children have been taught, ironically enough, *what* to think not *how* to think.
    - a. The public school system teaches that “God does not exist” (a position that cannot be logically defended and thus irrational) and “humans are but an evolved animal” so we have people that act like animals in their carnality and thinking. Such thinking is not logical or rational and does not follow the evidence.
  2. Mead is a contributor to the liberal educational system we have in our public schools today and it is not uncommon to have her book(s) read in college (Mead xv).
- E. In our current culture, “science” has become god. Science is simply defined as “knowledge”. There is another type of science, pseudo-science (false science) which has become the pervading thought. Paul warned Timothy about this type of science (cf. 1 Tim. 6:20-21).
1. Benjamin Wiker makes the point regarding anthropology that it “was thus the perfect scientific cover for cultural analysis that was no more scientific than the state of nature imagined by Hobbes and Rousseau.” (191).
  2. Another salient point Wiker makes is that “The desire that something be true, rather than the desire for truth itself, may well be the root

of all evil. It is certainly the origin of all ideology, and ideology was the source of much of the evil in the past century.” (191).

3. Indeed, science was merely a cover for Mead’s ideology which sought to “mold truth to desire” (Wiker 192). This is the issue with making “science” (pseudo-science) as god as it is false and worse yet, deceitful.
  4. If a scientist or doctor said it, then it must be true, right? All must be filtered through the Word of God (cf. 1 Jho. 4:1; Acts 17:11).
- F. All these areas have tinges of Mead’s philosophy and other philosophies within them. The answer to the problems of society remains the same since sin entered the world. It is God’s way or no way (cf. Jho. 14:6; Pro. 14:12).

## V. A REFUTATION OF MARGARET MEAD’S PHILOSOPHY

- A. God made mankind male and female “<sup>26</sup> And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. <sup>27</sup> So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” (Gen. 1:26-27).
1. No mention is made of some “in between” gender or any other gender but two: male and female.
    - a. Jesus confirmed this centuries later in Matthew 19:9 “Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female”.
    - b. Note the simplicity and beauty of our origin as God created us.
  2. The Bible is clear that transgenderism is sinful.
    - a. To wear the clothing of the opposite gender was an abomination to God (cf. Deu. 22:5).
  3. Mead’s philosophy certainly factors into the LGBTQI+ movement of which transgenderism is a part. God finds this behavior reprehensible and thus it is not natural i.e., no one was born this way (cf. Ecc. 7:29).
- B. Shortly after the creation of woman from the rib of man (cf. Gen. 2:18-23), God established marriage and the home “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.” (Gen. 2:24).



1. This relationship was for physical life (cf. Rom. 7:2; 1 Cor. 7:39) with the only exception being fornication (cf. Mat. 19:9).
  2. God makes it abundantly clear that man does not have the right to dissolve marriage for any reason he wishes “What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” (Mark 10:9).
    - a. To do so results in adultery, which is sin (cf. Mark 10:11-12; Exo. 20:14; Deu. 5:18; Rom. 13:9; Gal. 5:19-21).
  3. After the return of Judah from Babylonian captivity, the prophet Malachi indicted the people of God for their divorces and made clear that “the LORD, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away” (cf. Mal. 2:13-16).
  4. “Trial marriages” are sinful.
  5. When the design of marriage is attacked, so too, is the church (cf. Eph. 5:22-33).
- C. God placed the sexual relationship in marriage and only in marriage “Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.” (Heb. 13:4).
1. If a person is involved sexually outside of marriage, they are either classified as a “whoremonger (fornicator ASV 1901)” or “adulterer”. The difference being whether one is having sexual relations with an unmarried or married individual. In either case, God will judge that wicked behavior.
  2. The avoidance of fornication is one reason to get married (cf. 1 Cor. 7:1-5).
  3. The husband and wife are to be satisfied with each other’s love including the sexual relationship.
    - a. As Solomon worded it as inspired by the Holy Spirit “<sup>15</sup> Drink waters out of thine own cistern, And running waters out of thine own well. <sup>16</sup> Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad, And rivers of waters in the streets. <sup>17</sup> Let them be only thine own, And not strangers’ with thee. <sup>18</sup> Let thy fountain be blessed: And rejoice with the wife of thy youth. <sup>19</sup> Let her be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; Let her breasts satisfy thee at all times; And be thou ravished always with her love.” (Pro. 5:15-19). He asks a very pertinent question as well in verse 20 “And why wilt thou, my son, be ravished

with a strange woman, And embrace the bosom of a stranger?”.

- D. God has a clear purpose for the sexual relationship.
1. After God created the first man and woman, He “blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.” (Gen. 1:28).
    - a. Procreation was the primary function (and still is) for the sexual relationship (cf. Gen. 5:1-4).
  2. This eliminates such sexual perversions as homosexuality.
    - a. There is nothing casual about homosexuality. It has resulted in some of the most disgusting behavior in times past (cf. Jdg. 19).
    - b. God has prohibited homosexual relationships and deemed those that participate, and take pleasure in those that are involved, as worthy of death (cf. Rom. 1:26-27, 32).
    - c. Sodom and Gomorrah are set forth as an example of the judgment of God regarding homosexuality (Jude 7; cf. Gen. 18-19).
    - d. Homosexuality is a choice, for some in Corinth came out of it (cf. 1 Cor. 6:9-11; the terms “effeminate” and “abusers of themselves with mankind” describe homosexual practices).
    - e. Anything which violates God’s standard is not rendered harmless for it is sin (cf. 1 Jho. 3:4).
- E. If the husband and wife are so blessed to have children, there are clear responsibilities given for the home as it relates to parents and children.
1. The Father has the primary responsibility to “provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” (Eph. 6:4; cf. Col. 3:21).
    - a. Part of this responsibility includes discipline (nurture) (cf. Heb. 12:5-11; Pro. 13:24, 22:15, 23:13-14, 29:15).
    - b. God is clearly on the nurture side of the “nature vs. nurture” argument! To be even more clear, God is the one that defines nurture when He says, “of the Lord”.

- c. Nowhere do you find in Scripture that a child is to discipline another child. This confuses the clear roles of the home as God defined it.
2. Children have responsibility to their parents.
    - a. <sup>1</sup> Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. <sup>2</sup> Honour thy father and mother; (which is the first commandment with promise;) <sup>3</sup> That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." (Eph. 6:1-3; cf. Col. 3:20).
    - b. This is difficult to do if the child is "always testing out other possible residences." (Mead 31).

**CONCLUSION:**

1. In Romans 3:4, the apostle Paul would state "let God be true, but every man a liar". This statement has been verified throughout our study.
2. At the heart of these philosophies is a refusal of God and His will. As His Word is truth (Jho. 17:17), to reject God will always lead to falsehood.
3. Briefly examining these philosophers will cause one to conclude that there is no fear of God before their eyes. The Psalmist says that this leads to sin (cf. Psa. 36:1).
  - A. It would do each philosopher well to heed the words found in Proverbs 3:7 "Be not wise in thine own eyes: Fear the LORD, and depart from evil."
4. We leave our study of *Coming of Age in Samoa* with mixed feelings. On one hand, we are better educated in the peddling of false concepts which have spawned false thinking and disgusting sinful behavior, and on the other hand we have gained a better appreciation for God and His Word.
  - A. God's plan for the home and the sexual relationship is perfect (Pro. 2:6; Psa. 92:5).
5. Our society needs more Christians who will "stand in the gap" and defend the way of God against false thinking and man's philosophies. Armed with this knowledge, will you be one of them? I pray you will. Please pray for me to do the same.

#### WORKS CITED

- Curtin SC, Sutton PD. Marriage rates in the United States, 1900–2018. NCHS Health E-Stat. 2020.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Marriage and Divorce. 2019. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/dvs/national-marriage-divorce-rates-00-19.pdf>. Document.
- Mark, Joan. Margaret Mead : Coming of Age in America. New York City: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1999. Print.
- Mead, Margaret. Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation (Perennial Classics). William Morrow, 2016. Kindle file.
- Merriam-Webster, Inc. Merriam-Webster’s collegiate dictionary. 2003 : n. pag. Print.
- Vine, W. E., Merrill F. Unger, and William White Jr. Vine’s Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words. 1996. Print.
- Wiker, Benjamin. 10 Books that Screwed Up the World: And 5 Others That Didn't Help. Regnery Publishing, 2008. Kindle file.

# John Dewey: Humanistic Education

B.J. Clarke

## INTRODUCTION:

1. He did not invent the Dewey Decimal System (Melvil Dewey did that in 1876), but John Dewey was very influential in the field of education, and he remains so unto this day.
2. According to Biography.com “Dewey was born on October 20, 1859, to Archibald Dewey and Lucina Artemisia Rich in Burlington, Vermont. He was the third of the couple’s four sons, one of whom died as an infant. Dewey’s mother, the daughter of a wealthy farmer, was a devout Calvinist.”

## DISCUSSION:

### I. THE EDUCATION OF JOHN DEWEY

- A. John Dewey excelled as a student.
  - a. He attended the public schools of Burlington, Vermont.
  - b. When he was only 15 years old, he became a student at the University of Vermont, where he immersed himself in the study of philosophy, with H.A.P. Torrey as his teacher and major influence.
- B. After four years of studies, Dewey graduated 2<sup>nd</sup> in his class.
  - a. Dewey’s first teaching job was, interestingly, at a seminary in Oil City, Pennsylvania. This only lasted for two years because his cousin, who got him the job, resigned as the principal of the seminary.
  - b. For a time, Dewey returned to Vermont and taught in a private school. His yearning was to learn more about philosophy, and he read everything he could find on the subject, and consulted with his former teacher, Torrey, about these readings.
  - c. Dewey ultimately decided to take a break from teaching to study philosophy and psychology at Johns Hopkins, and he received his doctorate in 1884 (Biography.com).

### II. JOHN DEWEY AS AN EDUCATOR

- A. John Dewey as a teacher, husband and father.
  - a. After receiving his doctorate, the University of Michigan hired Dewey as an assistant professor.

- b. It was there that he met Harriet Alice Chipman, and they married in 1886. They had a large family of seven children (six by birth and one by adoption).
  - c. In 1888 Dewey and his family moved to the University of Minnesota, where he was a professor of philosophy. This was a brief stint, however. Dewey returned to the University of Michigan, and taught there for the next five years.
  - d. One of Dewey's most prestigious opportunities, as seen by those in the philosophical world, came in 1894 when he was made head of the philosophy department at the University of Chicago, where he remained until 1904, also serving for two of those years as director of its School of Education.
  - e. Dewey left for the Ivy League in 1904, when he became a professor of philosophy at Columbia University while working at Teachers College on the side.
  - f. In 1930, three years after his wife had died, Dewey left Columbia and retired from his teaching career with the title of professor emeritus.
  - g. Sixteen years later, (1946) Dewey remarried a widow named Roberta Grant. He was 87 at the time.
  - h. He and his new bride lived off of her inheritance, and his book royalties. On June 1, 1952, John Dewey died of pneumonia at the age of 92. (Biography. com).
- B. John Dewey as a lecturer and writer.
- a. During the 1920s, Dewey traveled extensively and lectured on educational reform at schools all over the world. He was captivated by the approach of the Russian educational system and brought back a favorable report of their agenda, namely, that education should focus mainly on students' interactions with the present, rather than views of the past.
  - b. Dewey was a prolific writer, with more than 1,000 published works, ranging from essays to articles to books. His writing covered a diversity of issues: psychology, philosophy, educational theory, culture, religion, and politics (Biography.com).

### III. JOHN DEWEY'S THEORY OF EDUCATION

- A. "The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences

which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences" (Hickman and Alexander 231).

- B. "I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform" (Dewey, "The Early Works" 93).
- C. The school must be "a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons" (Dewey, "AZQuotes.com" 600226).
- D. "We never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment. Whether we permit chance environments to do the work, or whether we design environments for the purpose makes a great difference" (Dewey, "AZQuotes.com" 1461869).
- E. "There is no god and there is no soul. Hence, there is no need for the props of traditional religion. With dogma and creed excluded, then immutable truth is dead and buried. There is no room for fixed and natural law or permanent moral absolutes" (Dewey, "AZQuotes.com" 651880).
- F. "Schools should take an active part in directing social change, and share in the construction of a new social order" (Dewey, "The Later Works, 1925-1953" 408).
- G. "Were all instructors to realize that the quality of mental process, not the production of correct answers, is the measure of educative growth something hardly less than a revolution in teaching would be worked" (Dewey, "Democracy and Education" 132).
- H. "The first step in freeing men from external chains was to emancipate them from the internal chains of false beliefs and ideals" (Dewey, "Democracy and Education" 132).
- I. "Schools have ignored the value of experience and chosen to teach by pouring in" (Dewey, "AZQuotes.com" 1370968).
- J. "Too rarely is the individual teacher so free from the dictation of authoritative supervisor, textbook on methods, prescribed course of study, etc., that he can let his mind come to close quarters with the pupil's mind and the subject matter" (Dewey, "Democracy and Education" 83).
- K. "Each generation is inclined to educate its young so as to get along in the present world instead of with a view to the proper end of education: the promotion of the best possible realization of humanity as humanity. Parents educate their children so that they may get on; princes educate their subjects as instruments of their own purpose." (Dewey, "Democracy and Education" 72).
- L. "The educational process has no end beyond itself; it is its own end. John Dewey (2009). (Dewey, "Democracy and Education" 89).

- M. "Knowledge is humanistic in quality not because it is about human products in the past, but because of what it does in liberating human intelligence and human sympathy. Any subject matter which accomplishes this result is humane, and any subject matter which does not accomplish it is not even educational" (Dewey, "Democracy and Education" 173).
- N. "There is nothing left worth preserving in the notions of unseen powers, controlling human destiny, to which obedience and worship are due (Dewey, "A Common Faith" 7).
- O. "No thought, no idea, can possibly be conveyed as an idea from one person to another. When it is told it is to the one to whom it is told another fact, not an idea. The communication may stimulate the other person to realize the question for himself and to think out a like idea, or it may smother his intellectual interest and suppress his dawning effort at thought. But what he directly gets cannot be an idea. Only by wrestling with the conditions of the problem at first hand, seeking and finding his own way out, does he think" (Dewey, "The Middle Works" 166).
- P. "Experiences in order to be educative must lead out into an expanding world of subject matter, a subject matter of facts or information and of ideas. This condition is satisfied only as the educator views teaching and learning as a continuous process of reconstruction of experience" (Dewey, "Experience and Education" 111).

#### IV. THE WORLDVIEW OF JOHN DEWEY

- A. John Dewey's philosophical journey took him from believing in God to believing in man, a philosophy known as humanism. Humanism should not be confused with the terms "humane, humanitarian, and the humanities."
  - a. Humanism is a philosophical system which asserts there is nothing that exists that is morally superior to man.
  - b. In the 5th century B.C., Protagoras affirmed that "man is the measure of all things." Humanism worships man as the source of all knowledge and truth; Theism worships God as the source of all knowledge and truth.
  - c. To put it another way, Humanism promotes faith in man instead of faith in God. It's creed is "Up with man, down with God."
- B. In 1933, thirty-four professors signed a document known as the Humanist Manifesto (HM1, hereafter).
  - a. John Dewey, the father of progressive education, led the way in signing it.



- b. The American Humanist Association annually awards the John Dewey Humanist Award, and maintains a 2,000 volume John Dewey Humanist Library.
  - c. In 1973, Humanist Manifesto 2 (HM2, hereafter) was authored, with over 200 individuals signing their names to it. Humanist Manifestos 3 and 4 have also been published. A study of these manifestos as they relate to the basic questions of life will clearly show Humanism's true colors.
- C. What worldview does humanism teach?
- a. Humanism denies the existence of God, and affirms the theory of evolution.
    - i. "Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created" (HM1).
    - ii. "The human species is an emergence from natural evolutionary forces" (HM2).
    - iii. "We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of the supernatural...As non-theists, we begin with humans not God, nature not deity" (HM2).
    - iv. Noted evolutionist and humanist Julian Huxley adds: "I use the word "Humanist" to mean someone who believes that man is just as much a natural phenomenon as an animal or plant; that his body, mind and soul were not supernaturally created but are products of evolution, and that he is not under the control or the guidance of any supernatural being or beings, but has to rely on himself and his own powers" (Ankerberg).
    - v. What does the Bible teach about the origin of man?
      1. Man was specially created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26).
      2. God breathed life into man (Gen. 2:7).
  - b. Humanism teaches that man is his own saviour.
    - i. Corliss Lamont agrees that man must rely totally upon himself. In his book *Philosophy Of Humanism*, he wrote, "Humanism assigns to man nothing less than the task of being his own saviour and redeemer" (30).
    - ii. HM2 declared: "While there is much that we do not know, humans are responsible for what we are or will become. No deity will save; we must save ourselves" (HM2).

- iii. A children's book, written by humanist Chris Brockman, is called *What About gods?* He wrote, "We no longer need gods to explain how things happen. By careful thinking, measuring, and testing we have discovered many of the real causes of things, and we're discovering more all the time. We call this thinking..." (27).
    - iv. Consider the following: "As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to love and care for persons, to hear and understand their prayers, and to be able to do something about them, is an unproved and outmoded faith" (HM2).
    - v. What does the Bible teach about the sufficiency of man?
      - 1. Our sufficiency is not in earthly wisdom, power, or wealth (Jer. 9:23-24).
      - 2. Our sufficiency is in knowing God (Jer. 9:24; John 17:3) and trusting in Christ (2 Cor. 11:4; Col. 3:1-4) who came to seek and to save the lost (Luke 19:10).
- c. Humanism teaches that man's only purpose is to realize his earthly potential.
  - i. "Religious humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfillment in the here and now" (HM1).
  - ii. In other words, man can do whatever he wants to do to realize his human potential. What is man doing here? He is here to do anything he pleases.
  - iii. What does the Bible teach about the purpose of man?
    - 1. Man's purpose is to fear God and keep His commandments (Eccl. 12:13).
    - 2. Man's purpose is to glorify God (Matt. 5:16; 1 Cor. 10:31).
- d. Humanism teaches that man is not bound by any absolute standard of right and wrong.
  - i. Action X can be morally right for one person, but action X can also be morally wrong for another. Perhaps you have heard the quotation from humanist Ashly Montagu, who confidently

affirmed, "Absolute truth belongs to only one class—the class of absolute fools" (4-C).

- ii. "We believe, however, that traditional dogmatic or authoritarian religions that place revelation, God, ritual, or creed above human needs and experience do a disservice to the human species" (HM2).
- iii. "We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction" (HM2).
- iv. "We reject all religious, ideological, or moral codes that denigrate the individual, suppress freedom, dull intellect, dehumanize personality" (HM2).
- v. Countless crusaders for Humanism are preaching the gospel of Values Clarification to impressionable young minds.
  1. Values Clarification teaches the child that he has the right to develop his own personal values, free from parental influence and authority, free from religious influences.
  2. It aims to convince the child that there are no absolutes. No rights. No wrongs. The child is told that whatever value he chooses is right for him.
- vi. If you are wondering just how far Humanists will take the concept of not being under an authoritative standard, consider the following quotations, all from Humanist Manifesto 2:
  1. "In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct. The right to birth control, abortion and divorce should be recognized."
  2. "While we do not approve of exploitive, denigrating forms of sexual expression, neither do we wish to prohibit, by law or by social sanction, sexual behavior between consenting adults. The many varieties of sexual exploration should not in themselves be considered "evil."
  3. "Without countenancing mindless permissiveness or unbridled promiscuity, a civilized society should be a

tolerant one. Short of harming others or compelling them to do likewise, individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue their lifestyles as they desire” (HM2).

- vii. In the 1980, March/April issue of *Humanist*, Corliss Lamont, urged humanists to take the lock out of wedlock. He wrote, “The greatest danger in marriage is lack of variety. Most marriage partners need more diversity in sex interplay than they can give each other and should therefore have ample contacts with friends of the opposite sex outside the family circle” (*The Affirmative Ethics Of Humanism*).
- viii. Albert Ellis, a signer of HM2, wrote a book called *Sex Without Guilt*, in which he wrote:
  - 1. “Since premarital sex relations are no longer viewed as morally reprehensible or sinful by most educated and informed individuals, there need be no intrinsic guilt attached to them” (39).
  - 2. Ellis went on to say, “Premarital sex relations are fine and the Bible is hardly a good guide to sane sex conduct” (112). As sick as it sounds, some humanists are even referring to incest as “the last taboo.”
- ix. What does the Bible teach about ethics and morality?
  - 1. Right and wrong is determined by God’s commandments (Psa. 119:172).
  - 2. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly furnished unto every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17).
- x. Alduous Huxley admitted the honest truth about why many humanists are so antagonistic against God and His Word.
  - 1. Huxley wrote an article entitled *Confessions Of A Professed Atheist*. The quote below is from this article.
  - 2. “I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently, assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption...The philosopher who finds no meaning

in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do...For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom" (Huxley).

- xi. One cannot help but think of Paul's description of some who "did not like to retain God in their knowledge" (Rom. 1:28).

D. Humanists reject the idea that man has an immortal soul which resides in his human body, and thus rejects the afterlife.

- a. Accordingly, "for Humanism the central concern is always the happiness of man in this existence, not in some fanciful never-never land beyond the grave" (Lamont, Affirmative Ethics Of Humanism).
- b. The Humanist Manifestos affirm the very same thing:
  - i. "Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected" (HM1).
  - ii. "Modern science discredits such historic concepts as 'the ghost in the machine' and the 'separable soul'" (HM2).
  - iii. "There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body" (HM2).
  - iv. "Salvationism, based on mere affirmation, still appears harmful, diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter. Reasonable minds look to other means for survival" (HM2).
  - v. "Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful. They distract humans from present concerns" (HM2).
  - vi. "Humanists live for actions, ideals on this earth in our one and only life. Heaven must be built in this world or not at all...while we're here, let's live in clover, for when we're dead, we're dead all over" (Lamont, Affirmative Ethics).

- c. How sad it is to read these quotations! Imagine how sad the atmosphere must be at the funeral of an atheist/humanist! How sad it must be to live with no hope! (John 14:1-6; Rev. 14:13).

## V. THE RELIGIOUS ZEAL OF HUMANISTIC EDUCATORS

- A. The reader may think this main point is a misprint, based on the preceding, but make no mistake about it—the humanistic educators are aggressively advancing the religion of humanism, and this religion is being taught in the public schools across the world.
- B. Do you doubt that Humanism is a religion? Consider the evidence.
  - a. In the 1961 Supreme Court case of *Torcaso vs. Watkins*, Roy R. Torcaso was refused his commission as a Notary Public under Maryland law requiring all public officers in the state to profess belief in God.
  - b. In delivering the unanimous opinion of the court, Justice Hugo L. Black observed: “Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others” (*America at the Crossroads: Part 2*).
    - i. There you have it. The U. S. Supreme Court declared Humanism to be a religion. If it is a religion, and it is, why are its basic tenets (evolution, values clarification, etc.) allowed to be taught in our public schools?
    - ii. Humanism may not have Sunday schools, but it has something more—it has numerous Monday-Friday schools. That’s right. The humanists are bragging that Humanism is alive and well in the public schools!
- C. It is frightening to read of the zeal of these “apostles” of humanism, and their absolute determination to fill the heads of our children in the public-school classrooms with their humanistic worldview. If you need convincing, read on:
  - a. A man by the name of C. F. Potter signed HM1; he also wrote a book in 1930 entitled *Humanism: A New Religion*. In this book he wrote: “Education is thus a powerful ally of humanism, and every American public school is a school of humanism. What can the theistic Sunday schools, meeting for an hour once a week, and teaching only a fraction of the children, do to stem the tide of a five-day program of humanistic teaching?” (128).

- b. In *The Humanist*, 1976, Paul Blanchard wrote: “I think the most important factor leading us to 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 16 tends to lead toward the elimination of religious superstition. The average child now acquires a high school education, and this militates against Adam and Eve and all other myths of alleged history” (America at the Crossroads: Part 2).
  - c. The founder of the International Humanist and Ethical Union (with 4 million members) was H. J. Blackham. In *The Humanist*, Sept/Oct, 1981, he wrote that if schools teach dependence on one’s self “they are more revolutionary than any conspiracy to overthrow the government” (Cuddy 26).
  - d. Morris Storer was the director of the American Humanist Association from 1975 to 1980. He wrote a book called *Humanist Ethics* (1980). In the book he declared that “[A] large majority of the educators of American colleges and universities are predominantly humanists, and a majority of teachers who go out from their studies in colleges to responsibilities in primary and secondary schools are basically humanist, no matter that many maintain a nominal attachment to church or synagogue for good personal, social or practical reasons” (America at the Crossroads: Part 2). (AFA.net).
- D. As if the aforementioned statements were not cause for concern already, an article, *A Religion For A New Age*, authored by John Dunphy, in *The Humanist* magazine (January/February, 1983), is absolutely chilling. Both of the following quotes come from this article:
- a. “I am convinced that the battle for humankind’s future must be waged and won in the public-school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being...” (Cuddy 27)
  - b. “These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level – preschool day care or large state university. The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and new – the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism, resplendent in its promise of a world in which the never-realized Christian ideal of ‘love thy neighbor’ will finally

be achieved. Then perhaps, we will be able to say with Tom Paine that 'the World is my country, all humankind are my brethren, and to do good is my religion.' It will undoubtedly be a long, arduous, painful struggle replete with much sorrow and many tears, but humanism will emerge triumphant. It must if the family of humankind is to survive" (Cuddy 27).

- E. We hasten to point out that there are many faithful and godly men and women teaching in the public-school systems. However, it would be naïve to say that their presence completely cancels out the damage being done by zealous Humanistic educators. We must be every bit as zealous, and then some, to spread the gospel of Christ to this world!

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Humanists can make fun of "God-intoxicated" believers all they want—but at least we know exactly where we came from, and we know exactly what we are doing here, and where we are going when this life is over.
2. While the humanist stumbles through life, tripping over the consequences of following his own desires, we trust in the Lord with all our hearts instead of leaning to our own understanding (Prov. 3:5-7).
3. We do not glory in our own wisdom, but rather in the infinitely superior wisdom of God (Jer. 9:23-24; 1 Cor. 3:18-21).
4. Consequently, we freely admit that "the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jer. 10:23). We would rather let the Lord direct our steps (Prov. 16:9) because the way that seems right to us may lead to death (Prov. 16:25).
5. If we trust in the wisdom of our own hearts, we are fools—if we follow the wisdom of God we shall be delivered from "philosophy and vain deceit" (Col. 2:8).
6. Therefore, in deciding what our purpose is here on earth, "it is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man" (Psa. 118:8).
7. Christianity offers a dignified answer to the question, "Where did I come from?"
  - a. I am not the accidental happenstance of ocean slime. I am a member of the human race.
  - b. As a human being, I am a descendant of the man who was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26).
  - c. As a human being, I (or we) can say of God: "In him we live, and move, and have our being...for we are also his offspring" (Acts 17:28).



8. As long as I live upon the earth, I have the opportunity to lovingly serve the God Who sent His Son to die for me (John 3:16; Gal. 2:20).
  - a. Meanwhile, I will set my affection on things above, not on things of the earth (Col. 3:1-4; Matt. 6:19-21), for this earth will pass away and the lusts thereof, but if I do the will of God I will abide forever (1 John 2:15-17).
  - b. Consequently, I will labor not for the meat which perishes but for that which endures unto everlasting life (John 6:27).
9. As a human being, I am more than mere flesh. I have a soul that will live on after my body is dead (Matt. 10:28; 22:32). When I die, I will either spend eternity in pleasure or torment (Luke 16:19-31; Matt. 25:46). My destiny is up to me.
10. I can accept the grace of God by living according to His will, or despise being governed by His authority (Psa. 2:3; 2 Pet. 2:10) and suffer the consequences (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

#### WORKS CITED

"America at the Crossroads: Part 2." Afa.net, 2 Nov. 2020, [www.afa.net/the-stand/culture/2020/11/america-at-the-crossroads-part-2/](http://www.afa.net/the-stand/culture/2020/11/america-at-the-crossroads-part-2/)

American Humanist Association, "Humanist Manifesto 1"  
<https://americanhumanist.org/what-is-humanism/manifesto1/>

American Humanist Association, "Humanist Manifesto 2"  
<https://americanhumanist.org/what-is-humanism/manifesto2/>

Ankerberg, John. "What Is Secular Humanism." Jashow.net, 25 Aug. 2004  
[www.jashow.org/articles/what-is-secular-humanism/](http://www.jashow.org/articles/what-is-secular-humanism/)

Biography.com [www.biography.com/scholar/john-dewey](http://www.biography.com/scholar/john-dewey)

Brockman, Chris. *What about gods?* Prometheus Books, 1978.

Cuddy, Dennis. "A Chronology of Education: With Quotable Quotes." *The Florida Forum, Special ed.*, May, 1993. Dewey, John ed. *John Dewey: A Common Faith*. Yale Univ, 1934.

Dewey, John. *Experience and Education*. The 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition. Kappa Delta Pi, 1998.

Dewey, John. *The Early Works: 1882-1898*. Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 2008.

Dewey, John, and Jo Ann Boydston, Sidney Hook. *The Middle Works Of John Dewey, 1899-1924*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Dewey, John, and Jo Ann Boydston. *The Later Works, 1925-1953*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Bumbershoot Books, 2019.

"John Dewey." AZQuotes.com. Wind and Fly LTD, 2022. 04 January 2022.  
<https://www.azquotes.com/quote/600226>

"John Dewey." AZQuotes.com Wind and Fly LTD, 2022. 04 January 2022.  
<https://www.azquotes.com/quote/1461869>

"John Dewey." AZQuotes.com Wind and Fly LTD, 2022. 04 January 2022.  
<https://www.azquotes.com/quote/651880>

"John Dewey." AZQuotes.com. Wind and Fly LTD, 2022. 04 January 2022.  
<https://www.azquotes.com/quote/1370968>

Dunphy, Paul. [http://deliberatedumbingdown.com/ddd/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Religion\\_New\\_Age-Dunphy-1983-EDU.pdf](http://deliberatedumbingdown.com/ddd/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Religion_New_Age-Dunphy-1983-EDU.pdf)

Ellis, Albert. *Sex without Guilt*. Hillman Periodicals, 1959.

Hickman, L. and Alexander, T., 1998. *The Essential Dewey*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Huxley, Aldous, "Confessions of a Professed Atheist," *Report: Perspective on the News*, 1966.

Lamont, Corliss, "The Affirmative Ethics Of Humanism" [www.corliss-lamont.org/ethics.htm](http://www.corliss-lamont.org/ethics.htm)

Lamont, Corliss. *The Philosophy of Humanism*. New York: Frederick Unger Publishing Co, 1977.

Montagu, Ashley, Interview in *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, July 26, 1981.

Potter, C. F. *Humanism: A New Religion*. Simon and Schuster, 1930.

Storer, Morris B. *Humanist Ethics, Dialogue on Basics*. Buffalo, N.Y., Prometheus Books, 1980.

# John Maynard Keynes: The General Theory

Omari French

## INTRODUCTION:

1. Keynes' philosophical and economic arguments advocating irresponsible deficit spending are inconsistent with biblical principles as they undermine the truth of God over government.
  - a. *The General Theory* by Keynes advocated deficit spending during economic downturns and contradicted balanced budgets that were standard practice with the government.
  - b. *Tract on Monetary Reform*, by Keynes advocated that that governments should solve problems in the short run rather than wait for market forces to fix things over the long run, because, as he wrote, "In the long run, we are all dead."
    - i. Insofar that these philosophical and economic theories promote ideas about government spending and sovereignty that conflict with biblical values and precedent they must be categorically rejected (Col. 2:8).
    - ii. If these philosophical and economic principles lead any to put trust in the government to perform things that God alone is to perform according to His will, then these views also must be rejected (1 Cor. 1:19; 2 Cor. 10:6).
  - c. By way of brief background, John Maynard Keynes, (born June 5, 1883, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, England—died April 21, 1946, Firle, Sussex), was an English economist, journalist, and financier, best known for his economic theories (Keynesian economics) on the causes of prolonged unemployment. His most important work, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (1935–36), advocated a remedy for economic recession based on a government-sponsored policy of full employment via deficit spending against balanced budgets.
  - d. His philosophy is being manifested today. The global financial crisis of 2007–08 caused a resurgence in Keynesian thought. It was the theoretical underpinnings of economic policies in response to the crisis by many governments, including in the United States and the United Kingdom. As the global recession was unfurling in late 2008, Harvard professor N. Gregory Mankiw wrote in the *New York Times*, "If you were going to turn to only one economist to understand the problems facing the economy, there is little doubt that the economist would be John Maynard Keynes. Although Keynes

died more than a half-century ago, his diagnosis of recessions and depressions remains the foundation of modern macroeconomics. Keynes wrote, 'Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influence, are usually the slave of some defunct economist.' In 2008, no defunct economist is more prominent than Keynes himself."

2. Governmental functions must always be consistent with the will of God, given that God maintains supremacy over all governmental entities (Eph. 1:20-21).

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **I. KEYNES'S VIEWS REGARDING DEFICIT GOVERNMENT SPENDING ARE INCONSISTENT WITH BIBLICAL TEACHING**

- A. The role of incurring debt, including in reference to governmental regimes, violates biblical decree that states the borrower will be a servant to the lender. (Pro. 22:7). The incurring of debt, including by governmental entities, more than the lender can pay back goes against the scheme of God and renders governments insolvent and unable to perform the tasks that God has required of them.
  - a. All governmental power is subject to the will of God (Rom. 13:1-2; Jho. 19:10-11). Inherently, there is an economic system explained in the word of God that the citizenry, including Christians pay tribute to the government so that government can perform their God ordained function of law enforcement and the punishment of evildoers (Romans 13:6). Also, inherent in this realm is the requirement of sufficient cost counting methods so that the government can determine whether they have adequate means to perform basic governmental duties such as policing and protecting (Luke 14:31).
  - b. We must refute any presumption that economic prosperity or hardship is completely determined by the policies of the government, instead of controlled by God. Despite hardship, the biblical principle against false dealing was not compromised by the government.
    - i. For example, in Genesis 41:33, Joseph tells Pharaoh to look out for a man discreet and wise, and set him over the land of Egypt. While the interpretation of the dream was indeed miraculous and based on revelation, the result was to use this wisdom properly so that the government could function based upon the knowledge that the economic factors were outside of the control of the government. If wisdom was undermined and inordinate spending occurred in excess of the bounty received from earlier years, then the nation of Egypt would have fallen into calamity. Despite the money failing in Egypt due to the

- famine, there was still a fair economic exchange that Joseph engaged in as a governmental actor (Gen. 47:15-22).
- ii. Also, in Genesis 21, Abraham and Abimelech seek to swear that they will not deal falsely with one another (Gen. 21:23). Abraham reproved Abimelech, who was a governmental actor, for a well of water that Abimelech's servants had violently taken away (Gen. 21:25). This example demonstrates the expectation of God that governmental actors not deal falsely in any manner.
  - iii. Likewise, in 2 Kings 6:25, we see the siege of Benhadad destabilized the economy highlighting the futility of man's economic wisdom when compared to God's will. Specifically, the siege caused an ass's head to be sold for four hundred pieces of silver and the fourth part of a cab of dove's dung for five pieces of silver. Elisha's response was that very next day a measure of fine flour would be sold for a shekel and two measures of barley for a shekel in the gate of Samaria. (2 Kgs. 7:1, 18). This instance demonstrates that economic policies are useless against the will of God. We see this in the present distress described in 1 Corinthians 7:30-31 where those that buy are equivalent to those that do not possess given how short the time is. There is nothing that governmental policy can do to disrupt the will of God effectuated. This is also clear in non miraculous and providential scenarios as the will of God cannot be thwarted simply by violating biblical principles through government action.
- c. God's word has always been clear on the wickedness of incurring debt without repayment. (Psa. 37:21). We see the Apostle Paul prohibit Christians refusing to pay taxes and thus incurring governmental debt because this undermines the system of government ordained by God. (Rom. 13:8). Likewise, Christ instructed Peter to avoid offending the kings of the earth to pay custom and tribute for him and Peter (Mat. 17:27). Additionally, even from a personal business perspective, Christianity requires repayment based upon good faith (Phe. 1:18-19). Governmental fiscal dealings also do not allow for financial dealings including deficit spending with no means to facilitate repayment. We see in the example of Hiram and Solomon (1 Kgs. 5:1-12) that governmental spending is indeed ordained of God as a result of taxation on the people. Nevertheless, this spending is not based on irresponsible accruing based on taking on unpayable debt, but instead based on capacity to make full repayment from proper accounting methods.

## II. KEYNES'S VIEWS IMPLICITLY UNDERMINE THE INFLUENCE OF THE SUPREMACY OF GOD OVER EARTHLY GOVERNMENTAL REGIMES.

- A. First, the literal notion that the “government is God” is easily refuted by the word of God. In full fairness, this quote that the “government is God” is not found in Keynes’s writings. However, we must analyze whether the implications of Keynes’s philosophies undermine the role of God over government and misplace the intended functions of God for government. In this way, “government is God” is figuratively understood as a tacit means of promoting that society should look to government instead of God for the functioning of sustenance and principles to dictate our daily lives. In Psalm 83:18, the scripture states “that men may know thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth.” This demonstrates that governmental authority is not God nor comparable to Him in majesty and power. Likewise, in Isaiah 43:18, the Bible says “I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no saviour.” Again, giving any entity including the government the glory that God alone is due, is misplaced to say the least.
- a. The glory of earthly splendor and reigns is incomparable to the glory of God. For example, Christ describes Solomon as arrayed in glory in reference to apparel in association with his royal majesty (Mat. 6:29). This is similar to the idea that those in kings’ houses wear soft raiment (Mat. 11:8). Regardless of the splendor of majesty associated in the apparel of earthly rulers, this glory is limited as it is still associated with the fleeting glory of man that is incomparable to God (Jas. 1:10-11; 1 Pet. 1:24). Additionally, we recall the instance of Herod arrayed in royal apparel and sitting on his throne and making an oration to the people (Acts 12:21). Despite his earthly royal majesty, the angel of the Lord smote him and he was eaten by worms because he gave not God the glory (Acts 12:22-23). This demonstrates the limitation of earthly government and how incomparable it is compared to the majesty of God.
  - b. Irrespective of how much splendor and might an earthly ruler can amass under God, earthly rulers can never equal the splendor of the Almighty and are subject to be abased by God himself when operating outside of His will (Dan. 5:19; Eze. 31:11).
- B. Second, any figurative implication that government is God is equally misplaced as well. The scriptures highlight the limitations of government in comparison to the power of God. In Daniel 2:20-21 the power of God is shown to “remove kings and set up kings.” This includes the ability of God to set up the basest of men in kingdoms to accomplish his will. (Dan. 4:17). Accordingly, the righteous man, Job (Eze. 14:14) declared by inspiration that God loosens the bond of kings and girds

their loins with a girdle. He leads princes away spoiled and overthrows and weakens the strength of the mighty (Job 12:17-21). Indeed, He increases the nations and destroys the nations taking away the heart of the chief of the people (Job 12:24). A prime example of this is Pharaoh who was raised up in reference to governmental power so that God can show the supremacy of His sovereignty according to His will. (Rom. 9:17). It must be considered undeniable that the government is not God because God is supreme and all governmental power is given by God and less than God (Jho. 19:10-11). The central tenet of Christianity is that Christ, who is God (Colossians 2:9), reigns above all dominion, principality and power in this world as well as the world to come. (Ephesians 1:20-21). Thus, it is impossible to accurately conclude that “government is God” in any sense including literal or figurative.

- C. Next, we must also refute the notion that the government may do evil, borrowing amid staggering deficits, to accomplish the “good” of facilitating social programs for the alleged alleviation of poverty. The idea that the end of a good justifies the means of how one gets to that goal is entirely inconsistent with the apostles’ doctrine. (Rom. 3:8). To facilitate good, we are restricted to good with no allowance of evil. Additionally, good can only be accurately defined through scriptural authority. In 2 Timothy 3:16-17, Paul explains that all scripture is given by the inspiration of God and is profitable for reproof, doctrine, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” We learn from this that in order for something to be properly classified as a good work, it must be contained in the scriptures. The scriptures never teach that the eradication of poverty is completely within the realm of possibility. (Mat. 26:11; Deu. 15:11). Thus, society should not envision that government policy can be a means for something that God’s word describes as unattainable. The misclassification of something as good, that is not in accordance with the will of God cannot be a motivation that is used to ignore the plain biblical teaching against the accrual of debt without means to repay. It is certainly not good for any to take on debt that cannot be paid within a lifetime. Government spending should not desensitize society of the God ordained ills of engaging in spending and incurring debt without the means to repay.
  - a. For example, in 2 Kings 4:1-7, Elisha addresses the situation of a man that passes debt owed to a creditor to his wife and children upon his death. Upon the miracle of the oil being effectuated, the woman was told by Elisha to sell the oil and pay the debt and to live off the remainder of the resources. We take from this Old Testament example (Rom. 15:4) that God’s will is for debt to be paid and for us to live off of our amassed resources as opposed to living off of debt that was not to

be paid (2 Kgs. 4:7). Indeed, every potential expenditure on a personal level must be viewed as to whether there are sufficient resources to embark upon the enterprise. For example, Boaz was deferential to allowing a near kinsman that was closer in relation to Ruth the opportunity to marry her. However, the near kinsman was required to decline because the prospect of marriage to Ruth was infeasible and would mar his own inheritance (Ruth 4:6). This example demonstrates the principle that potential expenditures are adopted on the basis of feasibility in both the short and long terms for repayment within a lifetime. Foolish financial decisions cause calamity for both the institutions of family and government alike. "He that is greedy of gain troubleth his own house." (Pro. 15:27).

- b. Additionally, in the parable of the unmerciful servant we see at the reckoning the servant owed ten thousand talents (Mat. 18:24). Given that he did not have adequate means to pay his lord commanded he and his wife and his children to be sold (Mat. 18:25). This state of indebtedness without means to pay, violates the requirement for a man to provide for his own house (1 Tim. 5:8). A man should be managing his resources well enough to leave an inheritance for his grandchildren (Pro. 13:22). Taking on unnecessary debt and spending in excess of the ability to pay leads to insolvency (Mat. 5:25-26; 18:34) and undermines God's role for the family. "Poverty and shame shall be to him that refuses instruction." (Pro. 13:18). "The thoughts of the diligent tend only to plenteousness; but of every one that is hasty only to want." (Pro. 21:5). The classic example of this is the parable of the prodigal son in Luke 15 who wasted his substance in reference to riotous living. (Luke 15:13-14). In the prior parable a woman who had ten pieces of silver lost one and searched the entire house to recover the missing piece. (Luke 15:8). This teaches us the importance of being faithful stewards of the resources that God has placed at our disposal as opposed to a disposition of wastefulness and living beyond one's means. Faithfulness according to God's resources of mammon is tied to proper accounting involving sufficiency and solvency (Luke 16:10-12). Given that God has provided resources and daily bread to all including the unjust (Mat. 5:45), all humanity is required to not squander God-given wealth and to use wisdom in not living beyond one's means. The same risks of undermining God's role for government are presented through unnecessary debt.
- D. Additionally, God's role for government does not entail the stifling of free market enterprise. The teachings of Christ demonstrate that any undermining of godly



employment terms, including by governmental action, also undermines the righteousness of God. In the parable of the day laborers, the employer had lawfully covenanted with all the workers the price for their labor (Mat. 20:2-10). The murmuring of the earlier workers was ungodly, accordingly, because it undermined the good faith agreement to contractual terms (Mat. 20:11-15). The economic system of contract, commerce, and employment (Jas. 4:13) free of fraud and oppression (Jas. 5:5-6) is sufficient and dependent on God (Jas. 4:14-15) and not government. This idea is based on the notion of not dealing falsely and governmental actors are held to this same standard. Keynesian views that debt can be incurred amid deficit without reasonable means and grounds to repay constitutes false dealings and improper roles for government.

- E. Lastly, it is God's role, and not the government's role, to provide sustenance to the poor. God does this through the natural ordinances (Acts 14:17) and benevolence of the righteous (2 Cor. 9:9-10). In 1 Samuel 2:7-8, the Bible states that "The Lord makes poor and makes rich: he brings low and lifts up. He raises up the poor out of the dust and lifts up the beggar from the dunghill to set them among princes." Thus, the will of God according to his blessings and promise was never associated with borrowing and amassing debt that is not intended to be paid back. (Deu. 15:6). It was only through the disobedience to the system of God that the political vitality of Israel was undermined, including the economic lending system (Deu. 28:44; Lam. 2:17). Again, the catalyst to the wealth of nations and prosperity is inherently the observing of the commandments of God (Deu. 28:13). It is clear that Keynesian policies of inordinate deficit spending, is in conflict with several biblical principles.

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Nations have always been accountable for their violations of God's righteous standard. Jeremiah 1:10. Accordingly, nations should strive to meet the standard of God's righteousness and implement appropriate policies to that end. (Gen. 20:4-5). Leaders of nations should thus strive for all governmental policies to be aligned with the word of God and be vigilant to eradicate any form of wickedness from government (Jon. 3:6-9).
  - a. We therefore reach the conclusion that righteousness exalts a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people. (Pro. 14:34). The governmental leaders should thus be seeking wise servants and exercising wrath towards any that cause shame in this regard. (Pro. 14:35). Keynesian views of deficit spending cause shame because they violate the system of not dealing falsely (Gen. 21:23).

- b. Keynesian policies violate the biblical principle of the righteous requirement to pay back what is owed (Psa. 37:21; Rom. 13:8; Gen. 21:23).
  - i. All adherences to Keynesian views at the expense of biblical principle demonstrate an elevation of earthly government over God. All thought processes along these lines are fundamentally misguided and an affront to the sovereignty of God. Replacing the glory of God with earthly entities is at the very heart of the foolishness associated with the sin of man. (Rom. 1:22ff). All high-minded wisdom that conflicts with the word of God must be exposed and eliminated accordingly (1 Cor. 3:20).
  - ii. Even though the signs of the times certainly indicate an undermining of biblical principles (Mat. 16:1-3; 2 Tim. 3:13), there is something distinctive in the breakdown of proper biblical management principles. Even the ungodly should have a fundamental appreciation of this aspect of the system of God's righteousness. Nevertheless, the scriptures are clear that the wicked will call light darkness and darkness light. (Isa. 5:20). As lights to a lost world (2 Cor. 4:3-5) we must continue to strive against the decaying of the society around us and be angered and affected by it. (2 Pet. 2:7-8).
- 2. It is incumbent upon the church to not grow weary in well doing. (Gal. 6:9). This includes not conforming to the ways of this world in any capacity (Rom. 12:2) but showing what the perfect and the complete will of God is. With so much wickedness around us regarding government and law enforcement generally (2 Pet. 2:10), it is high time for Christians to stand for godly principles and the proper role of government according to the word of God. God is not dead. Government is not God. Government is always beneath God and government should not be performing the wickedness of incurring debt without means and ability to repay. These fundamental truths transcend political affiliation and any socioeconomic factors that can divide us as a people. Fairness and righteousness in our God-given economic circumstances need to be explained as nations go further into anarchy and chaos. This is primarily being attempted through so-called knowledge and science that is in opposition to the will of God (1 Tim. 6:20). The notion of being unspotted (Jas. 1:27) from the world means that we as Christians are not subject to these changing winds and norms. Despite the prevalence of Keynesian models, it highlights how God has chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise so that no flesh should glory in his presence (1 Cor. 1:27). The god of this world has blinded the reasoning

of the masses (2 Cor. 4:4) so we should be as vocal as possible regarding the wickedness that is evident even in high places of influence in reference to principality (Eph. 6:12)

#### WORKS CONSIDERED

Cairncross, Alec. "Keynes, John Maynard, Baron Keynes (1883–1946)". Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (online ed.). Oxford University Press.

Cohn, Steven Mark (2015). *Reintroducing Macroeconomics: A Critical Approach*. Taylor & Francis. p. 111.

Davidson, Paul (2009). *The Keynes Solution: The Path to Global Economic Prosperity*.

# Alfred Kinsey: Sexual Behavior in the Human Male

Michael Light

## INTRODUCTION

1. “When published in 1948 this volume encountered a storm of condemnation and acclaim. It is, however, a milestone of the path toward a scientific approach to the understanding of human sexual behavior. Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey and his fellow researchers sought to accumulate an objective body of facts regarding sex” (Google Books)
2. Only the first sentence in the above quotation isn’t a lie. As Google Books attempts to sell this book online today, they use the same false narrative as the original publishers in the late 1940’s.
3. “Dr. Kinsey” wasn’t a medical doctor, he was a student of “gall wasps” and had a Ph.D. from Harvard (Wiker 198). He was also an evolutionist, and viewed humans as just another animal. Therefore, he saw no difference between human and animal behavior. He was also a man who practiced not only homosexuality (though he was married) he also practiced extreme sadomasochistic acts on himself and others and filmed his wife having sex with many of his assistants (male and female). He had sex with his male assistants often and engaged in wife swapping. He (and his team) were extreme sexual perverts who were working to justify their personal deviance as much as anything else. The idea of the *Kinsey Report* (short name for the *Sexual Behavior of the Human Male*) being somehow objective and scientific is a lie.
4. Notice this quote, “In Kinsey’s work, many of the worst streams we’ve seen in previous books flow together into one reeking pool: the belief that our natural state is one of amoral sexual extravaganza; the evolutionary reduction of human beings to the level of animals; the adept use of science to mask propaganda; the attack on the Judeo-Christian understanding of male, female, marriage, and family....Kinsey’s revolution was intensely personal, a revolution rooted in his own epic sexual perversity. He represents, in sterling coin, the evil that results from attempting to change the world to match one’s character, rather than changing oneself to match the deep moral order written into human nature” (Wiker 196).
5. In 1997 historian James H. Jones wrote a biography entitled, *A Public/Private Life*, where he exposed much of Kinsey’s personal sexual perversity. This book does an excellent job of exposing the bizarre, twisted, compulsive and grotesque sexual practices of Dr. Kinsey. Unfortunately, it was about 50 years too late to stop the massive impact the *Kinsey Report* was to have on our culture.
6. I prefer the title that is found on *The Spotlight* (online newspaper); “Kinsey Kinky, Not the American Males.”

- a. They point out that, “there is something ‘queer’ about the start of what has become known as the ‘Sexual Revolution’.”
  - b. The statistical data Kinsey produced was highly flawed for a variety of reasons.
    - i. He interviewed some 10,000 men and formulated detailed statistics. But his “sampling” methods were flawed.
    - ii. He chose his “samples” from what he knew were highly likely to have unusual (non-typical) sex lives. He interviewed a high percentage of prisoners. He also interviewed what he listed as “man on the street” but more aptly would have been called ‘street walkers.’”
    - iii. He also interviewed pedophiles (child rapists) In other words, he was looking to skew the numbers.
7. He came up with “shocking” figures. The intent of which was to “normalize” abhorrent behaviors, which is exactly what he did.
- a. A few were things like his assertion that about 50% of men cheat on their spouses and that about 30% have had homosexual experiences.
  - b. About 5 years later he did a study on women’s sexual practices and “found” very similar numbers.
8. In short, he intentionally hyped and overstated the percentages of homosexuals and those who engaged in socially taboo sex acts to leave the impression “everyone” is doing it. While in truth, he was driving for liberation, not science.
9. One of the reporters for The Spotlight paper put it this way, “Kinsey gave us a private look into the private lives of perverts; and projected that persona on all American males.”

**DISCUSSION:** *Notice a few things relative to this topic in light of the Bible...*

**I. KINSEY’S ATHEISM IS FALSE**

- A. There are no “good atheists” and being an atheist leads to sin and wickedness.
  - a. Psalm 14:1, “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. They are corrupt, they have done abominable works, there is none that doeth good.”
  - b. I’ve heard people say things like, “Well, they are an atheist, but they are still good...” No they are not.
    - i. Major Premise - Any position that contradicts the Bible’s position is a false position.

- ii. Minor Premise - The position that there are good atheists in the world is a position that contradicts the Bible.
    - iii. Conclusion - Therefore, the position that there are good atheists in the world is a false position.
  - c. Romans 1:19-32, "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools, And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."
- B. All above emphasis is mine (ML), but this passage goes to the heart of the problem with all atheists and Kinsey, in particular, for this study.
  - a. God does exist. It is not in the range of this particular lesson but it is an integral part of this overall discussion of all human behavior.

- b. If God exists and He does, and if God has addressed appropriate sexual behavior among humans; and He has, then all humans are obligated to submit to those appropriate behaviors.
- c. So it does naturally follow that people who wish to be free from any sexual restraints must ultimately remove God from the equation. And that is a large part of what the *Kinsey Report* was about.

## II. KINSEY'S ARGUMENT FROM "NATURE" IS FALSE

- A. As a 'naturalist' – the idea that nature is all there is (remember God doesn't exist to these people); whatever occurs in nature is "normal."
  - a. Putting his basic premise in the form of a syllogism.
    - i. Major Premise – Whatever occurs in nature is "natural" that is, "normal" hence acceptable.
    - ii. Minor Premise – All manner of sexual "deviance" occurs in nature.
    - iii. Conclusion – Therefore, sexual "deviance" is "natural" that is "normal" hence acceptable.
  - b. Friends, that's how these people (and our society at large) arrived at the current cultural position on all sexual practices. Virtually nothing is "off limits" or to be looked at as less than normal and okay.
- B. The very concepts of right and wrong; normal and abnormal; really cease to have meaning or even exist.
  - a. We see with this approach all manner of sexual confusion being advocated.
  - b. Transgenderism; sexual fluidity (one gender one day; a different one the next).
  - c. *Marriages* between various genders and even various numbers of people. And now even postulating inter-special marriages. There truly is no end to the lengths one can go once this philosophy is adopted.
  - d. One of the more recent labels is "M.A.P." – this is used in reference to pedophiles, "minor-attracted person." A sick "softening" of the seriousness of child rape – which is all that it is.
- C. Some of the old preachers used to say, "That which proves too much, proves nothing."

- D. Kinsey's – "if it happens, it's okay" position is false. Notice other things that happen, which a society shouldn't endorse.
  - a. Rape happens in nature – we should endorse that as morally acceptable.
  - b. Incest happens in nature – that is still both immoral and illegal and rightly so.
  - c. Cannibalism occurs in nature.
  - d. And since according to them there is no difference in humans and the 'other' animals – Murder occurs; theft; torture; mental, verbal, and physical abuse. All of these actions would be "normal" hence "morally acceptable" in a "Kinseyan world."
  - e. It is not true that "whatever occurs in nature" should be recognized as acceptable behavior.

### III. KINSEY'S STATISTICS (AND ALL STATISTICS) ARE IRRELEVANT

- A. I want to warn everyone to avoid falling into the Devil's traps.
- B. The Apostle Paul warned us, "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices" (2 Cor. 2:11).
  - a. Too many brethren (including preachers) get put on the defensive and end up arguing the wrong points.
  - b. Don't let the enemies of truth dictate the terms of debate and discussion.
  - c. Do not let the Devil's people define the terms. The one who defines the terms carries the discussion more times than not.
  - d. So do not concede unnecessary and detrimental points.
- C. From the beginning of any moral matter – ALL THAT MATTERS IS GOD'S WORD ON THE SUBJECT.
  - a. "Let God be true and every man a liar" (Rom. 3:4).
  - b. It doesn't matter what the statistics say. Earlier I pointed out that Kinsey falsified his data. That mattered that to the people who wanted to throw off the "limitations" God had set. They used his misinformation to justify (in their own eyes) the sexual revolution; which wasn't a revolution, it was a rebellion against God and against nature.
  - c. But it wouldn't matter if every man on the earth was a practicing homosexual – God's word and will would still be the same.



- d. Hebrews 13:4, “Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.”
  - e. Galatians 5:19f, “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies. Envyings, murdered, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of which I tell you before, as I also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”
- D. From these passages, and there are a host more, we learn that there are behaviors that are wrong, and the recognition of such by man is irrelevant to the veracity of such principles. Read that list again in Galatians 5 – it pretty much defined the Roman culture of the day. The list was given because the list was the truth, regardless of the world’s thinking.
- E. When it comes to Bible truth – dismiss all statistical data from your mind if it runs opposite the word of God.
- F. John 8:32, ‘And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.’
- a. Major Premise – Any conclusions drawn from statistical data (scientific or otherwise) that contradicts the word of God are conclusions that are false.
  - b. Minor Premise – Modern statistics and studies are used to conclude that sexual behavior, that God calls sin, is not sinful.
  - c. Conclusion – Therefore, All such data being used to draw these unwarranted conclusions, are false and must be heartily rejected.

**CONCLUSION:**

1. No doubt much more could be said, but it really would add very little to the necessary conclusion.
2. When Alfred Kinsey set out to “study” sexuality and concluded a different (contradictory) view than what God clearly taught/teaches in His word; Kinsey missed it. Even if his motives had been pure, it wouldn’t have mattered. God’s way is right, and all others will stand in judgment (Jho. 12:28).

## WORKS CITED

Google Books – Their summary of what the book is about

Wiker, Benjamin, Ph.d. *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 more that Didn't Help.*  
MJF Books, New York, NY 2008.

# Betty Friedan: The Feminine Mystique

Morne Stephanus

## INTRODUCTION:

1. In his letter to the saints in Rome, Paul penned these words: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God" (Rom. 12:1-2).
  2. In the context of church discipline, the apostle Paul wrote "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world" (1 Cor. 5:9-10).
  3. Together, these verses paint a beautiful picture of the Christian's existence this side of eternity.
    - a. Generally speaking, the world operates in sinful ways, and the Christian must guard against conforming to those ways by having a godly mindset.
    - b. Yet, we live in this world, and it is impossible to escape interacting with the people of this world.
    - c. Hence, we must achieve and maintain a righteous balance between living with the worldly and guarding against becoming like the worldly.
  4. The Kingdom of Christ is in the midst of a world filled with immorality, changing cultures, social trends, and traditions.
    - a. The Christian is not immune to the effects of these conditions.
    - b. Thus, to ignore issues like those discussed in this lectureship is an exercise in foolishness.
  5. The Lord has given us His Word to serve as the moral anchor in times of immoral anarchy.
    - a. Thus, it is our duty to address the decaying moral fabric that shrouds us.
  6. It is my privilege to pen a few words about feminism, a social trend with an extraordinarily complex history.
    - a. Although this manuscript centers around one of Feminism's leading advocates, Betty Friedan, it is my aim to provide a broader approach to the subject.
-

- b. Betty Friedan certainly served as one of the catalysts of modern feminism, but she was not alone.
- 7. The topic of feminism is complicated for two reasons.
  - a. First, some of their plights have biblical merit and second, feminism has undergone several facelifts.
  - b. Hence, the approach must aim to be fair, balanced, and above all scriptural.
- 8. With this manuscript I desire to do two things:
  - a. First, present the facts about feminism.
    - i. It is not my intent to misrepresent any who hold this view with inaccurate information.
    - ii. The majority of my material about the movement was sourced from self-proclaimed feminists.
  - b. Second, preach the whole counsel of God.
    - i. Our work as preachers is simple, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:2).
    - ii. This should be the *modus operandi* of every preacher of the Gospel.
- 9. With all this said, I encourage the reader with the words of our late brother Garland Elkins, "If it's the truth accept it, if it is not, reject it."

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **I. THE DAWN OF MYSTIQUE**

- A. Betty Naomi Goldstein was born on February 4, 1921, in Peoria, Illinois, the oldest of three children of Harry Goldstein, a Russian immigrant and jeweler, and Miriam Horowitz Goldstein, a Hungarian immigrant who worked as a journalist until Betty was born," (Michals).
- B. In 1947, Friedan married Carl Friedan a producer and advertising expert; they had three children. (Michals)
- C. Like many others, Mrs. Friedan was not always concerned with feminist ideologies.
  - a. Friedan's history suggests that her sympathy for the movement only came later in life.
  - b. At the height of World War II, Friedan graduated *summa cum laude* in psychology from the University of California Berkeley. (Michals)

- c. After this, she became involved in a myriad of left-leaning political, labor, and union issues. (Michals)
  - d. Despite her field of study, Friedan chose to become a reporter for the Federated Press and later a writer for UE News. (Michals)
- D. Friedan's interest in women's rights was sparked by an unfortunate result of the war.
  - a. With men on the battlefield, women were left to work to provide for their families and the war effort.
  - b. Working conditions during those times were not favorable which led to the maltreatment of many female workers. (Horne)
  - c. "Women workers often faced discrimination and harassment in the workplace, and they rarely took home more than half of what their male counterparts earned" (Horne).
  - d. These conditions served as the catalyst for Friedan's interest in women's rights. (Michals)
  - e. Friedan began authoring and distributing union pamphlets arguing for women's rights in the workplace. (Michals)
- E. With the seeds of interest planted, the leap to full-on women's activist was not far.
  - a. Friedan was asked by Smith College to do a survey of college graduates at a reunion. (Stamper)
  - b. The survey was supposed to focus on post college life.
  - c. However, "Friedan found that many of them were unhappy with their lives as housewives, causing her to begin her research into *The Feminine Mystique*," (Stamper).
- F. Friedan's book became a best seller in 1964 and is said to be the catalyst for second wave feminism.
- G. In her book, she addresses various issues confronting women at the time.
  - a. She began the book with the heading "The Problem that has no Name."
  - b. Along with detailing many ailments befalling women, the following quote sums up the main concept that she wished to convey.
 

"The problem lay buried, unspoken, for many years in the minds of American women. It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning that women suffered in the middle of the twentieth century in the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she

made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night—she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question— “Is this all” (Friedan).

- H. According to Friedan, society as a whole, with variant role players, stifled women in reaching their full and better potential.
  - a. Although comprehensive in nature, and certainly bearing out some truths, Friedan’s work aimed to throw out the baby with the bathwater.
  - b. Like so many left-leaning individuals, there seems to be no middle ground or sensible solutions to problems just an “everything but the kitchen sink” approach.
- I. Friedan’s views by and large shaped and, in this writer’s estimation, negatively affected sympathy for the movement.

## II. A DIVERSIFIED HISTORY

- A. Betty Friedan’s actions and work stands far above many of her peers.
- B. However, the feminist movement did not start with Friedan, nor was it always centered around her ideologies.
- C. According to many scholars, feminism occurred in three waves, even a fourth.
- D. The first wave of feminism concerned itself with Women’s Suffrage.
  - a. This wave of feminism can rightly be labeled the purest form of feminism.
  - b. “The first wave of feminism took place in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries... The goal of this wave was to open up opportunities for women, with a focus on suffrage,” (Rampton).
  - c. Aside from voting rights, first wave feminists were also concerned about the right for woman to own property, to receive equal wages, and to be treated as equals. (Stamper)
  - d. Consider a brief timeline of events that highlighted first wave feminism.
    - i. In 1848, the first women's rights convention was held in Seneca Falls, New York.
    - ii. In 1850, the first National Women's Rights Convention takes place in Worcester, Mass., attracting more than 1,000 participants. (Timeline)

- iii. In May 1869, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton formed the National Woman Suffrage Association with its primary goal being voting rights for women by means of a Congressional amendment to the Constitution. (Timeline)
    - iv. Fifty years later, the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibited the states and the federal government from denying the right to vote to citizens of the United States on the basis of sex. (Timeline)
  - e. This was a long and arduous fight for the privilege of casting a ballot, a privilege many today take for granted.
  - f. The equality and worth of men and women alike in the sight of God is made clear in the scriptures.
    - i. “And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation” (Acts 17:26).
  - g. Furthermore, there is nothing wrong with women having the same political rights as men or being paid the same for doing the same work (Cf. Luke 10:7).
  - h. The Lord does not prohibit women from being active members of society (Cf. Pro. 31) thus the plea of these feminists was one that did not contradict or impede scripture.
  - i. Unfortunately, that can only be said of the first wave of feminism.
- E. Second wave feminism was categorized by *Identity Politics*.
  - a. It is in this wave that Betty Friedan made a name for herself.
  - b. This wave began in the 1960s and lasted all the way to the 90s. (Timeline)
    - i. This era was known for the civil rights movement and anti-war sentiment.
    - ii. These feminists used the platform of equality to promote their own agenda of immorality.
    - iii. Women’s struggles were labeled as a class struggle. (Rampton)
  - c. Riding on the coat tails of the Civil Rights Movement, they spoke against what they perceived to be inequalities.
  - d. Sexual and reproductive rights were championed. (Rampton)

- i. The inability to murder their children in the womb was considered a form of oppression.
  - ii. The Supreme Court's decisions in Roe vs Wade was a tremendous victory for the second wave's cause.
  - iii. In talking about the success of the movement, one feminist wrote, "The pill, on the one hand, allowed women to delay childbirth and establish careers in many cases. Abortion also gave women greater choices about rearing children" (Norgren).
  - iv. The cavalier attitude with which these women viewed abortion is truly an indication that many of them were "without natural affection" (Cf. 2 Tim. 3:3).
- e. Second wave feminism took a stance against heteronormativity.
  - i. Heteronormativity is: "noting or relating to behavior or attitudes consistent with traditional male or female gender roles and the assumption of heterosexuality as the norm" ("Definition of Heteronormative | Dictionary.com").
  - ii. Second wave feminism made a distinction between sex and gender, the former being biological and the latter a construct of culture or society.
- f. Also, the nuclear family did not escape the sights of second wave feminism.
  - i. Feminists during this age believed that women were still being oppressed by being homemakers and mothers.
  - ii. They fought hard against what they called the *domesticity of woman* after World War II.
  - iii. In this, Betty Friedan made a name for herself by one of her famous quotes.
    - 1. "We can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: I want something more than my husband and my children at home" (Friedan).
  - iv. Certainly, one cannot deny that there were some warped ideologies about women in the home held by men and women alike during this time.
  - v. Yet, their answer to this anecdotal problem was a complete rejection of the God-given role of a wife and mother.



- F. The third wave of feminism ushered in the postmodern agenda.
- a. Postmodernism concerns itself primarily with the rejection of absolute truth.
  - b. This movement gained traction in the late 90s. (Timeline)
  - c. During this wave, all concrete truths were subject to varying interpretations.
  - d. Femininity was reclaimed and rebranded.
    - i. “An aspect of third wave feminism that mystified the mothers of the earlier feminist movement was the readoption by young feminists of the very lip-stick, high-heels, and cleavage proudly exposed by low cut necklines that the first two phases of the movement identified with male oppression” (Rampton).
    - ii. Dressing provocatively became a sign of femininity not immodesty.
  - e. Derogatory phrases were appropriated.
    - i. Terms that defamed women were used by women to describe themselves.
    - ii. This was done “in order to subvert sexist culture and deprive it of verbal weapons” (Rampton).
    - iii. They were calling themselves derogatory names in an attempt to stop others from calling them derogatory names.
    - iv. Truly the words of the apostle Paul ring true in this case “Professing themselves to be wise they became fools” (Rom. 1:22).
  - f. Descriptive terms were rejected.
    - i. In an attempt to accommodate those who were “non-binary,” third wave feminist, rejected the term feminist.
    - ii. “Most third-wavers refuse to identify as "feminists" and reject the word that they find limiting and exclusionary. Grrl-feminism tends to be global, multi-cultural, and it shuns simple answers or artificial categories of identity, gender, and sexuality. Its transversal politics means that differences such as those of ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, etc. are celebrated and recognized as dynamic, situational, and provisional” (Rampton).

- iii. Writing in derision, one writer said: “Now that is a feminist movement. Women fighting for suffrage for years by protesting and doing parades all so they could vote. Nowadays, you see these modern feminists dying their armpit hair different colors and walking around topless – and all for what exactly? When did not shaving become a form of “oppression” (Anon)?
  - g. Fourth wave feminism is marred by ambiguity.
    - i. Feminist Martha Rampton believes there is a fourth wave of feminism in the air.
    - ii. She believes “Fourth Wavers” are not keen on the idea of being called feminist because it is too exclusive.
    - iii. “The generation now coming of age sees that we face serious problems because of the way society genders and is gendered, and we need a strong “in-your-face” word to combat those problems. Feminism no longer just refers to the struggles of women; it is a clarion call for gender equity” (Rampton).
- G. The feminist movement went from women fighting for the right to participate in society to championing the rights of confused individuals who are militant about the pronouns by which they are called, astounding!

### III. A DISTRESSING FACT

- A. I believe it would be unfair and ignorant to claim that the plight of inequality is completely unfounded.
  - a. In no way do we want to give the impression that all is well with how women have been treated and how they are still being treated in certain places.
  - b. Woman have been abused, treated like property, viewed as insignificant, lesser than men, treated unfairly, and stripped of their God-given rights and dignity.
- B. The Lord does not condone any of these actions, neither should His people.
  - a. She is His daughter, created in His image.
  - b. “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them,” (Gen. 1:27). (Emphasis MWS)
  - c. We were created in a unique way, one from dust and the other from a rib.

- d. We were created heterogeneous: we look different, and our makeup is different.
  - e. Yet, despite these, we were both created in the image of God.
  - f. Thus, men cannot claim superiority over women in worth any more than women can claim superiority over men in worth.
- C. Because she has been created equal in worth, women are entitled to the benefits and privileges afforded to her by her Creator.
- a. Women ought to be allowed to vote.
    - i. What Law of God would prohibit her from being an active member of the society in which she lives?
    - ii. She pays her taxes just like a man, should she not have a right to have a say in who gets to be in charge of said taxes?
    - iii. A denial of women to voice their vote in a country for whom they labor is tantamount to taxation without representation!
  - b. She ought to be treated with respect and dignity.
    - i. She is not property, she is not a sex object, she is not the butt of jokes. She is the daughter of Eve, the offspring of God (Cf. Acts 17:26).
    - ii. The sexual, verbal, or physical abuse of women is unacceptable in the sight of God.
      - 1. "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers" (Eph. 4:29).
      - 2. "Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered" (1 Pet. 3:7).
    - iii. To treat her with disrespect is to disrespect The One who created her.
  - c. She should be paid the same.
    - i. The principle of labor and work is clearly set forth in the scripture.
    - ii. The general rule is mentioned in various contexts.

1. "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates: At his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it: lest he cry against thee unto the LORD, and it be sin unto thee" (Deu. 24:14-15).
  2. "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, Nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat" (Mat. 10:9-10).
  3. "For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward" (1 Tim. 5:18).
- D. There are many antiquated, outdated, and rank unscriptural views concerning women held by many.
- a. May this distressing fact never be true of our conduct.
  - b. Under no circumstances are we to be party to the prejudicial treatment of anyone (Cf. Jas. 2:1; Rom. 2:11).

#### IV. A DISSENT WITH PREJUDICE

- A. We can readily agree with some of the tenets of the first feminist movement, but that is where our agreement ends.
- B. Beyond first wave feminism, we cannot agree and must dissent with extreme prejudice.
- C. Far be it from this writer to paint every feminist with a negative brush, yet feminism as it is understood and practiced today is marred by ungodliness.
- D. Misinformation is the means of communication.
  - a. Propaganda is the chief tool of postmodern and modern feminists.
  - b. They want supremacy, not equality, and they are not above lying to the public to get it.
  - c. The most notable lie is the wage gap that exists between males and females.
    - i. According to some feminists, "Women get paid .77 to every \$1 a man makes." (Anon)

- ii. “All rational people understand that this is a myth. Women do NOT get paid less than men for the same occupation – that is in fact illegal thanks to the Equal Pay Act of 1963” (Anon).
  - iii. This blatant falsehood appears in commercials and is a ready talking point for many feminists.
    - 1. The lie must be propagated as fact because the truth is far to damaging to their cause.
  - iv. If any woman is a victim from fiscal discrimination, the law is on their side.
- d. Illusive equality is the banner under which they march.
- i. Today’s feminists are still marching under the banner of equality and claim to be standing for the same principles as their predecessors.
  - ii. When you listen to their rhetoric, it is as if this nation is one law away from confining women to concentration camps.
  - iii. Feminists say they are fighting for a women’s equality.
    - 1. To these I ask, what rights are you lacking, what legitimate oppression are you facing?
    - 2. Women in the United States have more freedoms and rights than most of the world.
    - 3. In the Middle East, women are not allowed to drive or get an education, while the only complaint of American feminists is a lengthy line at Starbucks.
  - iv. Their demand for equality is also marred by prejudice.
    - 1. Feminists preach equality for women but what they really mean is equality for women who agree with their ideologies and agendas.
    - 2. One self-proclaimed first wave feminist wrote, “Feminism today is selective. If a woman is a liberal activist, she’s brave and strong. If a woman dares to be conservative, then she’s evil and gross. For example, Chelsea Handler re-tweeted a video that mocked Sarah Huckabee Sanders’ looks. When Twitter followers called her out for it, she justified her position by stating: ‘This woman deserves to be taken down. She is pure evil’” (Graig).

- v. Truth be told it is not equality for which they are striving but supremacy of their ideologies and the oppression of anyone, male or female, who stands against it.
  - e. The Christian descends with prejudice against their misinformation campaign because, “Lying lips are abomination to the LORD: but they that deal truly are his delight” (Pro. 12:22).
- E. Defamation is their modus operandi.
  - a. Modern feminists are not content to argue for equality; they may use the term equality but in reality, they mean superiority.
  - b. In order to achieve this supremacy, the heterosexual male has come under fire.
  - c. Men are stupid, dad is an idiot, and mom is the genius that’s always right.
  - d. This is the common view portrayed in all forms of media and most egregiously in children’s programming.
  - e. Feminists tell our young boys that there is something wrong with how they were created.
    - i. Masculinity is toxic and should be rejected in favor of a more “sissy boy” demeanor.
    - ii. Men are depraved, misogynists who rape woman at will.
  - f. Are there men who commit atrocious acts of violence; yes.
    - i. Is this a testament to their genetic make-up or their lack of godly morals?
    - ii. If genetic make-up was the culprit, how do we account for the millions of good men who father homes, build cities, protect the innocent, and honor women?
  - g. British Feminist Natasha Devon wrote the following in derision to postmodern feminism.
    - i. “Today’s feminism teaches British women to see themselves as victims and victims cannot exist without a villain, in this instance – men. In order for this thesis to have any kind of logic, feminists have made sweeping, inaccurate judgments about an entire demographic, based on nothing more than their gender. Ironically, the exact practice they claim to be fighting” (Devon).

- h. Nothing but the complete subjugation of heterosexual men will satisfy their lust for supremacy.
- F. Time and space will not permit me to write of the defamation of the home and the abominations feminism seeks to promote.
- G. I hope the subject preached will afford more time to that end.

## V. A DETRIMENTAL OUTCOME

- A. It is the aim of this writer and no doubt the organizers of this lectureship to distribute the truth about various subjects to facilitate the salvation of souls.
  - a. Thus, it is imperative that we approach feminism with a salvific mindset.
  - b. We do not desire the eternal destruction of the liberal feminist, furthermore, our warfare is not carnal.
  - c. We share the mind of our Creator who said, "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord GOD: and not that he should return from his ways, and live" (Eze. 18:23)?
- B. With this in mind we warn feminists, with great urgency, about the destructive path on which they are.
- C. Their path will lead to humiliation.
  - a. When I survey the words and actions of modern feminists there is a prevailing attitude.
  - b. Their speeches, writings, and actions are proud, arrogant, and audacious.
  - c. Their feverish pursuit of preeminence is sure to end in humiliation.
    - i. "O love the LORD, all ye his saints: for the LORD preserveth the faithful, and plentifully rewardeth the proud doer," (Psa. 31:23).
    - ii. "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall" (Pro. 16:18).
- D. Their path will lead to oppression.
  - a. As mentioned before, there are some who desire the oppression of anyone who stands for heteronormativity or any Christian proclaiming the whole counsel of God relating to the role of women.
  - b. However, there might be some who blindly follow and promote feminist ideologies not knowing the unfavorable result it will yield.
  - c. To these we ask, where do you suppose the denigration of men and the vilification of normative heterosexuality leads?

- d. The plea of modern feminism is not prevailing equality, it is supremacy of their ideology.
    - i. "Many feminists today also blast men repeatedly and deem far too many things as sexist. "Smash the patriarchy," and "girl power" are the battle-cry of modern-day feminists; many routinely put men down and subtly imply that men are lesser human beings than women. For all this I have to wonder what their objective is. Are they trying to show men that they believe in equality," (Graig)?
  - e. Mankind was created to have "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth," (Genesis 1:26).
    - i. Nowhere in the text does the Lord permit or condone the forceful subjugation of any human being.
    - ii. Our power of dominion is limited to the plant and animal kingdom.
  - f. The only way to sustain foolish ideas is to force individuals to abandon common sense, morality, and freedom.
- E. Their path will lead to devastation.
- a. Whether feminists believe it or not, our society is built upon the morals set in place by our Creator.
  - b. Society is able to function and progress because of the fundamental understanding and general value placed on human life and ethical interaction with one another.
  - c. Whenever the morals of God are replaced with foolish ideologies and agendas, society will cease to be a boon for itself (Cf. Rom. 1:18-32).
  - d. "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people" (Pro. 14:34).
  - e. The promotion of feminism has and will have devastating long term consequences.
- F. Finally, their path will lead to eternal destruction.
- a. As noted earlier in this manuscript, there are merits to some aspects of feminism.
  - b. However, any ideology, agenda, or effort contrary to the revealed Will of God severs the holder of it from eternal salvation.



- c. Speaking indirectly of modern feminist ideologies Paul wrote, “Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them” (Rom. 1:32).
- d. “And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power” (2 The. 1:7-9).
- e. “There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death (Pro. 16:25).
- f. There is no salvation found in espousing the ideologies of modern feminism.

**CONCLUSION:**

1. When God created the home, He created it as a place where man can find companionship, love, commitment, and loyalty.
2. He also designed it to be a chief shaper of society.
  - a. The home is the foundation for societal righteousness or unrighteousness.
  - b. In the home minds are shaped and influenced and kids are crafted into adults.
  - c. These adults will go forth and become active members of society: leaders, teachers, workers, influencers.
3. The type of society we have is heavily influenced by what happens in the home.
  - a. One of Freidan’s objectives was to destroy the nuclear family and its divine directives.
  - b. When our homes fall into profligacy so too will our society, thus it is imperative that we speak and stand against these abominations.
4. “A Song of degrees for Solomon. Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain” (Psalms 127:1)

## WORKS CITED

All scripture references taken from: Meyers, Rick. E.Sword. Version 13.0.0, Rick Meyers, 2000. Software.

Anon. Why We Don't Need Modern Feminism in America.  
outsetnetwork.com/2016/01/11/why-we-dont-need-modern-feminism-in-america/.

"Definition of Heteronormative | Dictionary.com." Wwww.dictionary.com,  
[www.dictionary.com/browse/heteronormative](http://www.dictionary.com/browse/heteronormative).

Devon, Natasha. "Modern Feminism Has Got It Wrong about Men." Telegraph.co.uk, 15 May 2014, [www.telegraph.co.uk/men/thinking-man/10831043/Modern-feminism-has-got-it-wrong-about-men.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/thinking-man/10831043/Modern-feminism-has-got-it-wrong-about-men.html).

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. W.W. Norton & Company, 1963.

Graig, Jessica. "Why the Modern Feminist Movement Is Flawed." Her Campus, Her Campus Media, 19 Feb. 2018, [www.hercampus.com/school/utah/why-modern-feminist-movement-flawed/](http://www.hercampus.com/school/utah/why-modern-feminist-movement-flawed/).

Horne, Madison. "Women of the WWII Workforce: Photos Show the Real-Life Rosie the Riveters." HISTORY, The Arena Group, 11 June 2019, [www.history.com/news/women-world-war-ii-factories-photos](http://www.history.com/news/women-world-war-ii-factories-photos).

Michals, Debra. "Betty Friedan." National Women's History Museum, 2019, [www.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/betty-friedan](http://www.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/betty-friedan).

Norgren, Christiana A. E. *Abortion before Birth Control: The Politics of Reproduction in Postwar Japan*. Princeton University Press, 2001.

Rampton, Martha. "Four Waves of Feminism." Pacific University, 25 Oct. 2015, [www.pacificu.edu/magazine/four-waves-feminism](http://www.pacificu.edu/magazine/four-waves-feminism).

Stamper, Amanda. "What Is the Second Wave Feminist Movement?" Vocal Media, 2015, [viva.media/what-is-the-second-wave-feminist-movement](http://viva.media/what-is-the-second-wave-feminist-movement).

"Timeline: U.S. Women's Rights, 1848 - 1920." Infoplease, 28 Feb. 2017, [www.infoplease.com/history/womens-history/timeline-us-womens-rights-1848-1920](http://www.infoplease.com/history/womens-history/timeline-us-womens-rights-1848-1920).

# Christian, Contend for Thy Cause

Terrance Brownlow-Dindy

## INTRODUCTION:

### 1. We Are Soldiers!

- a. The commissioned apostle to the Gentiles commanded the Colossian Christians to “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord” (Col. 3:16, *KJV* – All Scripture citations are from the King James Version unless otherwise indicated). This command is a universal and perpetual statute intended to be observed within the Christian faith throughout the Messianic age. Any faithful Christian is delighted to comply!
- b. Numbered among some of the most cherished hymns and spiritual songs offered to God in veneration are those such as, *Soldiers of Christ Arise*, *Onward Christian Soldier*, *I’m a Hard Fighting Soldier*, and *Stand Up for Jesus*. Each of these hymns, and others like them, serve to teach, admonish, and remind the Christian that in addition to being the bride of the Messiah, the children of the Creator, the body of Christ, and the kingdom of heaven, we are also soldiers in the army of God.
- c. To refer to the church of Christ as God’s army is not an imaginative or humanly devised metaphor, but a spiritual truth revealed within the pages of Divine inspiration. Jesus Christ is our Commander-in-Chief, or as the Hebrews writer puts it, “the captain” of our salvation (Heb. 2:10). The Lord has briefed us regarding our mission. *He* came to “seek and to save that which was lost” (Luke 19:10) and requires us to be involved in the same (Luke 10:1-12).
- d. Our brother, Peter, reminds us that we have a formidable foe when he warns, “Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour” (1 Pet. 5:7). Satan and his multiplicity of servants, cohorts, and henchmen are (and have always been) more than ready to withstand our Captain and every one of us as we endeavor to fight the good fight of faith.
- e. More frequently than any other biblical author, the apostle Paul puts the Christian in constant remembrance that –
  - i. We are combatants in a spiritual army
    1. 2 Timothy 2:3-4
    2. 2 Timothy 4:6-8
  - ii. We are involved in spiritual warfare
    1. 1 Timothy 1:18
    2. 1 Timothy 6:12

- 3. Ephesians 6:10-12
- iii. We have at our disposal spiritual weaponry and armor
  - 1. Ephesians 6:13-18
  - 2. 2 Corinthians 10:3-6
- iv. We are not devoid of military intelligence
  - 1. 2 Corinthians 2:10-11
  - 2. John 8:44; Genesis 3:1-5
- f. Perhaps the most pointed passage that speaks to the Christian's responsibility to take our place on the battlefield and assume our martial duty in contending with the spiritual host of wickedness in the heavens and the corporeal manifestations of such is Jude 3. There the biological brother of our Lord affirms that his primary intention was to write concerning the common salvation of the Christian family. He subsequently reveals that a present and pressing concern superseded his initial purpose – the need to exhort the church to *earnestly contend* for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.

## 2. Exegesis of the key clause of Jude 3

- a. The key clause of the thesis statement of Jude's epistle is literally, "contend earnestly for the once-delivered-to-the-saints faith." The force and gravity of this kingdom imperative is exposed in exegesis of the verse.
  - i. "Contend" is the Greek *epagwnizesqai* (epagonizesthai) and is a present middle/passive deponent verb meaning "to contend strenuously in defense of" (Perschbacher 153).
    - 1. The root word is *agwnizomai* (agonizomai) – to enter a contest; to contend with adversaries, fight; to contend, struggle, with difficulties and dangers (Thayer 10). This term in its various forms is employed multiple times in the Scriptures both metaphorically and literally (cf. 1 Cor. 9:25; Jho. 18:36; Col. 1:29; 1 Tim. 4:10; 2 Tim. 4:7, etc.)
    - 2. To prefix the Greek preposition *epi* (epi) to this verb, as Jude does, is to intensify the force thereof. Hence, the translation becomes "to earnestly contend." This particular verb is only used here in the New Testament.
  - ii. "Faith" is *pistei* (pistei) and refers to "the faith" in the objective sense. As aptly stated by Woods, "The 'faith' for which Jude's readers were thus earnestly to contend, put objectively here for the gospel, is the sum of all that which Christians are to believe and obey" (385). The call is to fight for, to struggle concerning, and to contend strenuously for all that the revealed system of Christianity entails.

1. We are to contend strenuously for the doctrine of the apostles (Acts 2:42). We are to fight for God’s prescribed worship practices (Jho. 4:23-24). We are to struggle in advocacy of the Lord’s moral standards (Eph. 4:17-32). We are to battle in behalf of the church of Christ purposed by God (Eph. 1:3-21), prophesied by holy men of God (Eph. 2:19-20), promised by the Son of God (Matt. 16:18), and purchased by the blood of God (Acts 20:28)!
  2. The fact that we are exhorted by Jude to earnestly contend for this faith of our Lord’s suggests that there are those who oppose it. Jude’s ensuing writings make this unfortunate fact apparent – as does our own present-day experiences.
- iii. “[T]he-once-delivered-to-the-saints” expression is a combination of words that form a most interesting adjectival phrase in the Greek here. They modify the term “faith.” Jude impresses upon the mind of the astute reader that the Christian faith, by Divine design, was the faith *paradoqeish* (paradotheisē) – a first aorist passive participle literally meaning: “having been given.” Jude seeks to convey the truth that the faith of Christ has been unfolded in its entirety at the time of his writing. In other words, no new doctrines, statutes, or aspects of the Christian system were still being set forth by God. The imperative is to contend vigorously for what God had already delivered. Even the doctrine of defending the faith had been punctuated by both Peter and Paul (cf. 1 Pet. 3:15; 1 Tim. 1:18-19; 6:12). Jude’s Spirit-inspired treatise is a divine reminder that God had already given what He intended for all Christians of all generations to practice.
1. Further emphasizing this truth is Jude’s use of the term *apax* (hapax – “once” *KJV*; “once for all” *ASV*). This interesting word is used of what is so done as to be of perpetual validity and never need repetition (Thayer 54). NOTE: This term is also employed in Hebrews 10:2, and implicitly points to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ – given once for all, and of perpetual validity so as to never need repeating.

### 3. Homiletical treatment of the passage

- a. A. Now that some critical elements of the Jude 3 passage have been scrutinized, the study will move in the direction of homiletical analysis.
- b. Understanding that fighting, striving, struggling, and earnestly contending are generally not activities that are universally natural, or that come easy for most, the question must be posed and answered: Why does Jude diligently exhort Christians to do such? What was *Jude’s* motivation for engaging in this

earnest contention (for his very book does exactly what he, at the outset, exhorts all other Christians to do), and what does he expect to be our motivation to comply with such an uncomfortable injunction? The answers are within:

- i. Love for the Brethren (3a).
- ii. Our Common Salvation (3b).
- iii. Necessity (3c).

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **I. LOVE FOR THE BRETHREN (3A)**

- A. Recipients of the Epistle: Those Sanctified, Preserved, and Called
  - a. Perhaps Jude's epistle, more so than any other written, warrants inclusion in the genre of New Testament texts nominated "general epistles." Not only is the subject matter that which pertains to any Christian of any age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, geographical location, or generation, but the author's address is without any reference to any particular group of Christians. The book is written to "them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called" (Jude 1:1)
  - b. NOTE: The only way any Christian could possibly exclude himself from the responsibility enjoined upon the recipients of Jude's letter is to exclude themselves from the sacred categories employed by the author in addressing his recipients. The necessity of earnestly contending for the once-for-all-delivered faith belongs to ANYONE sanctified, preserved, and called by God the Father and His Son Jesus the Christ!
- B. Term of Endearment: Beloved
  - a. Jude's motivation in contending for the faith of Christ (and his rationale behind exhorting all saints to do the same) *begins* with the love that we as fellow soldiers should have one for another. The inspired author addresses his fellow-soldiers as *agaphtoi* (agapētoi) – beloved ones. Contending for the once-for-all-delivered faith of Jesus, as established previously in this study, is a Divinely ordained imperative. It is not optional for the Christian. When one enters the family of God through obedience to the Gospel of Christ (hearing the Gospel – John 5:24, believing the same – Mark 16:16, repenting of sin – Acts 2:38, confessing Christ Rom. 10:8-9, and being baptized into Christ – Acts 22:16), that one also has enlisted in the army of God.
  - b. It has been proven via study that, among the foremost motivation for soldiers enduring the rigors of battle, is the comradery that exists between them and their fellow soldiers.

- i. Pulitzer Prize winning American Civil War historian James M. McPherson – “...I think that once soldiers are in the Army and are facing combat, there’s another kind of motive that becomes added onto whatever ideological or patriotic motives brought them into the Army in the first place, and that is indicated by the second word in the title of my book [*For Cause and Comrade: Why Men Fought in the Civil War*], ‘Comrades.’” There’s a kind of bonding that takes place within military units, especially that when they face a common danger, that motivates soldiers to fight so—because they don’t want to let their buddies down, and they don’t want to lose face in the eyes of their buddies. If they run away, if they abandon their buddies, if they prove themselves to be a coward, they will never be able to hold up their heads again. So that there’s a kind of bonding and unity within the unit that is a powerful factor I think for a soldier in all wars.” (“Why Do Soldiers Fight?” - NPR Weekend Edition, May 29, 2005)
  - ii. Samuel Stouffer, *The American Soldier* (1949 study chronicling World War II soldiers’ attitudes about facing battle) – “Combat infantrymen returning from the war most often said they kept fighting to ‘get the war over so they could go home.’ The second most common response and the primary combat motivation, however, referred to the strong group ties that developed during combat’ Stouffer reported” (“Why Do Soldiers Fight?” – NPR Weekend Edition, May 29, 2005)
  - iii. S. L. A. Marshall, *Men Against Fire* – “I hold it to be of the simplest truths of war that the thing which enables an infantry soldier to keep going with his weapons is the near presence or the presumed presence of a comrade...”
- c. Because the bond between fellow Christian soldiers forged by our mutual obedience to the faith of Christ is spiritual rather than carnal, eternal rather than temporal, and universal rather than regional, our motivation to earnestly contend for our cause (which shares all of the same characteristics as does our bond) should far supersede in fervency even that of those comrades who have fought for lessor causes!
- i. Not just comradery, but *love* for Christian comrades is the beginning of the rationale behind Jude’s earnest contention for the faith, and his exhortation of our earnest contention for the same!

## II. OUR COMMON SALVATION (3B)

### A. The Prizes of Secular Warfare

- a. In recollecting prizes valuable enough to have warranted secular warfare, the surveyor of history will be mindful of commodities of importance to nations, governments, and individuals. In their article, “The Reasons for Wars – An Updated Survey,” authors Matthew O. Jackson and Massimo Morelli provide a summarized list of warfare incentives in the following statement:

“There are two prerequisites for a war between (rational) actors. One is that the costs of war cannot be overwhelmingly high. By that we mean that there must be some plausible situations in the eyes of the decision makers such that the anticipated gains from a war in terms of **resources, power, glory, territory, and so forth** exceed the expected costs of conflict...” (2, *emphasis TFBD*)

- b. In addition to potential gains of conflict such as resources, power, glory, and territory, Jackson and Morelli further cite the following:
- i. **Religion** – A war in which “the goal might not be materially based, but might be based on the increasing size of the population of one religion or eradicating another.” (5)
  - ii. **Revenge** – “Revenge is another reason for war...” (7)
  - iii. **Resources** – “...one could in principle rationalize the incentives to eliminate another ethnic group or minority ideological group by a desire to obtain a larger share of the social cake, in the present or in the future.” (8) (by the way, this study is only quoting, not endorsing these “reasons” for secular war)
  - iv. **Prevention** – “...a country may fear that an opponent will become stronger over time and that the balance will be destabilized over time, and may therefore wish to attack today to prevent being attacked by a stronger opponent in the future.” (16)
- c. Commodities desired, or those gained with the subsequent need to be maintained have long provided the rationale behind men’s willingness to earnestly contend in the course of secular warfare. Such incentive is also supplied by Jude. The prize that incentivizes the Christian’s earnest contention for the once-for-all-delivered faith, however, is not religious supremacy, revenge, material resources, geographical territory, or



power, but **eternal salvation** – that of existing and potential soldiers of Christ.

#### B. The Prize of Spiritual Warfare

- a. The subject that was initially on the mind of the inspired author, according to his own affirmation, was the common salvation of those who have subscribed (via obedience) to the once for all delivered faith. Earnestly contending for that faith would become the thematic thrust of Jude’s treatise. Nonetheless, in his statement of original intent, that is, writing regarding the common salvation, we are reminded of the prize for which we are called to strive. The salvation that, by Divine design, accompanies the presentation and preservation of the Christian faith makes the faith worth defending.
  - i. James reminds us that a **crown of life** is promised to the enduring soldier of Christ (Jas. 1:12).
  - ii. Peter brings to our attention that the consummation of our faith is **the salvation of our souls** (1 Pet. 1:9).
  - iii. Paul declared that in light of his having “fought a good fight...finished his course...[and] kept the faith...there is laid up for [him] a **crown of righteousness...**” (2 Tim. 4:7-8). This victor’s crown will also be awarded to every other soldier of the cross that loves the appearing of Christ.

### III. NECESSITY (3C)

#### A. The Need in Jude’s Day

- a. Following the exhortation to earnestly contend for the once for all delivered faith of Christ, Jude provides a description of the most dangerous foe of the faith – the false teacher. Very reminiscent to the second chapter of 2 Peter, Jude begins by describing the stealthy operations of the false teacher who has even become so emboldened as to deny the very Lord Jesus the Christ. Both Peter and Jude also remind readers and fellow Christian soldiers that an almost inevitable and inseparable link between false teaching and lascivious living exist. Jude’s “lasciviousness” and Peter’s “pernicious ways” are of the same Greek word: *aselgeia* (aselgeia). The term refers to “intemperance, licentiousness, and outrageous behavior” (Perschbacher 56). Vine adds that the term “denotes excess...absence of restraint, indecency, wantonness” (640). One has to but observe the false teacher (both in and outside of the church) carefully over the course of time to be able to

attest personally to the truth of Peter's and Jude's assessment. The private jets of Joel Osteen, the Rolls-Royces of Billy Washington, the gaudy get-up of Tammy Faye Baker, and the immodest garb of Orpheus Heyward all provide the proverbial tale of the tape concerning these and other false teaching enemies of the cross (cf. Rom. 16:17-18; Phi. 3:18-19).

- b. Jude's survey of the faith's foremost enemy does not end with his observation of the sneaky, intemperate, excessive, lascivious, outrageous, and unbelieving conduct of these adversaries (cf. v. 4). He further marks their...
  - i. Audacity (v. 8-9 – despise dominion and speak evil of dignitaries)
  - ii. Animalism (v. 10 – do what they know naturally, as brute beasts...)
  - iii. Unrestraint, Greed, & Rebelliousness (v. 11 – being analogous to Cain, Balaam, & Cor'e (v. 11)
  - iv. Irreverence (v. 12a – feeding themselves at Christian love feasts without fear)
  - v. Instability (v. 12b – carried about of winds; cf. Eph. 4:14!)
  - vi. Uselessness (v. 12c – trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead...)
  - vii. Shamelessness (v. 13a – raging waves of the sea foaming out their own shame; cf. Jer. 6:15)
  - viii. Misdirection (v. 13b – wandering stars to whom is reserved blackness of darkness forever)
  - ix. Damnation (v. 14-15a – the Lord cometh...to execute judgment; cf. v. 5-7 & 2 Pet. 2: 4-6)
  - x. Ungodliness (v. 15b – Jude, 4 times in one stroke of the pen, uses the Greek *asebeis* (asebeis) – twice in the noun form, once as an adverb, once as an adjective in order to emphasize the irreverence/ungodliness of these false teachers)
  - xi. Murmuring (v. 16a)
  - xii. Hypocrisy (v. 16d – having men's persons in admiration because of advantage)
- c. Because of the multi-faceted makeup of the enemies of the faith, and their consorted efforts to defile the church from within, soldiers of Christ must be bold, courageous, and wholly willing to war with these satanic

mercenaries. As Paul teaches us, our defensive battle array consists of the girdle of truth, the breastplate of righteousness, the protective footwear of the Gospel of peace, the shield of faith, and the helmet of salvation (Eph. 6:14-17a). Our sole offensive weapon for decimating the forces of false teachers is the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God (Eph. 6:17b).

#### B. The Need in Our Day

- a. As long as this world stands, Satan, the adversary of all righteousness, will be waging war against God, the truth, and the church of Christ. When the Lord shall appear, the devil, the false teacher, and all other satanic cohorts will be cast into the eternal lake of fire and brimstone (Rev. 20:10; 21:8).
- b. Until then, we must fight! The same need that existed in Jude's day exists in ours. Though the means and expedients by which the devil wages war have been updated, his objectives and tactics are the same. False teaching still rears its ugly head and wreaks havoc from without and within the church. Ancient manifestations such as carnality, liberalism, legalism, materialism, egotism, and atheism persist. Newer warfare such as postmodernism, woke-ism, and virtual-ism pose significant threats to the purity and integrity of the church in some areas.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

1. It would be beautiful if we had only to relish in and celebrate every human being having embraced the salvation of Christ. This, however, simply is not reality. The fact is that Satan, the great adversary of God, the truth, and the church exists. From the beginning of time, he has had those willing to comply with his will in opposing the Creator. His forces have grown in size, and his troops are steadfast. As the army of God on earth, the church is exhorted, via the Spirit-inspired writings of holy men like Jude, to earnestly contend for the once-for-all-delivered faith of Christ.
2. The false teaching foe is formidable. Jude calls for soldiers of Christ to arise, arm ourselves with the weapon of truth, confront the enemy, and defend the faith wherein we stand and rejoice in the glory of God.

## WORKS CITED

- Jackson, Matthew O. and Morelli, Massimo. "The Reasons for War – An Updated Survey." *Handbook on the Political Economy of War*.  
<https://web.stanford.edu/~jacksonm/war-overview.pdf>. Web. 2009.
- King James Version*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1972. Print
- Marshall, S. L. A. *Men Against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command in Future War*.  
Washington D.C: Combat Forces Press, 1947. Print.
- Hansen, Liane (host). "Why Do Soldiers Fight?". *NPR Weekend Edition*.  
<https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4671512>. Web. May 29,  
2005.
- Perschbacher, Wesley J. *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1990.  
Print.
- Woods, Guy N. *A Commentary on the New Testament Epistles of Peter, John, and Jude*.  
Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1979. Print.
- Thayer, Joseph H. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan,  
1974. Print.
- Vines, W. E. *Vine's Expository Dictionary of Old & New Testament Words*. Nashville:  
Thomas Nelson, 1997. Print.