

UNDERSTANDING OUR TIMES

Cicero once said, "It is impossible to know the truth and not be held responsible." We find in America today millions of apathetic people who realize that something has gone wrong in our country, but who have not taken the initiative or the interest to find out what is at the root of our problems and what steps must be taken to solve those problems. We must now begin to face the duties and responsibilities of our citizenry, or soon we will be unwillingly experiencing the disciplines of tyranny.

Resounding throughout the West in recent years has come the voice of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn. Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, recipient of a Nobel Prize for literature, is an intellectual, a teacher, a writer, a decorated war hero, and a man who once wrote a letter in which he made some "unflattering comments" about Stalin. Because of this letter, he spent eleven years in Siberian prison camps. One of the most famous books of our time, *The Gulag Archipelago*, came out of his experience. Alexandr Solzhenitsyn is a man who knows from firsthand experience the situation in Soviet Russia. After he was expelled from the Soviet Union in February 1974, Mr. Solzhenitsyn visited America and horrified his listeners with his denunciation of communism. He spoke of the catastrophic world situation and of "the West's fantastic greed for profit and gain." He asked of America, "Is it possible or impossible to warn someone of dan-

ger?" And he quoted a Russian proverb, "When it happens to you, you'll know it's true." His words fell on an all-too-apathetic public.

Too many Americans blame our corrupt politicians for "the sad state we find America in today." We cannot place the full blame upon our national leaders. It is we, the American people, who voted them into office. Now it is time for us to face the truth responsibly and do something to turn America around. We can warn, as do some key figures in America, about the accelerating evolution of our society into a collectivist state, wherein government officials become rulers rather than servants. We agree with the top economists of our country who are trying to warn Americans that there is a bond among personal freedom, political freedom, and economic freedom that is an indissoluble one. We can talk about inflation, about big government, about crime in the streets, about America's lack of defense, and about a host of other critical subjects—and we will discuss these and other topics throughout the course of this book. But the fact remains that at the root of America's problems today is the decay of our individual and national morals. This has resulted in the subsequent decadent state and instability of everything else in America—including economics, politics, defense, etc. The choices we as Americans have made in moral and religious questions have determined the way America is going today.

In the first twelve days of November 1979, the *Washington Post* conducted a nationwide poll entitled, "Americans' Hopes and Fears About the Future." In the poll results, printed in the December 16, 1979, issue of the *Washington Post*, we read, "Clearly expressed in the survey answers is the survival of living religious faith—once considered threatened by the secular prosperity of the post-World War II generation. God is very much alive for most Americans of all persuasions—73 per cent consider themselves 'very religious' or 'somewhat religious.' And 31 per cent of the people feel that religion is more important to them than it was to their parents, while 28 per cent feel it is less important."

This survey points out that citizens felt most threatened by national and international events beyond their personal control, by war, depression, shortages, nuclear war, oil crises, economic disaster, too much dependence on foreign nations, no leadership, etc. *Washington Post* writers explain the American temperament using words such as "narcissism," "alienation," and "malaise."

Some of the soundings of the decade of the seventies were ominous. There was turmoil and unrest. Let us examine the decade of the seventies and determine what was the climate then and what is the actual climate of the vast majority of the American people today.

On May 4, 1970, a volley of fire was directed into a crowd on the campus of Kent State University. Before students knew what had happened, thirteen students had been shot—two in the front, seven in the side, four in the back. Four lay dead. Angry students ushered in the decade of the seventies. They were violent students, many who thought nothing of burning the American flag, throwing rocks, shouting obscenities, and violently protesting the Vietnam War.

Within days after the Kent State shootings, nearly a thousand U.S. universities and colleges were either shut down or came close to being shut down. Demonstrations swept throughout our country. "Kent was the United States in a kind of microcosm, with all its good and its potential and all its bad at the same time," related Gordon W. Keller, associate vice president of academic and student affairs at Kent State. The tumultuous seventies began with student revolutions and carried through with Vietnam demonstrations, Watergate, oil embargoes, gasoline shortages, inflation, big government, and the dwindling dollar.

What was the general consensus of life in America in the seventies? Several magazine articles provide insights. In his editorial entitled, "What Kind of People Are We?" in the February 5, 1979, *U. S. News & World Report*, Marvin Stone asked, "What has happened to the America we knew?"

"That plaintive cry is sounded time and again in letters from

our readers, by people we meet on our trips, by those close to home.

"What kind of people have we become?" Mr. Stone quotes the farewell issue of *New Times* magazine, "Come July it will be ten years since Neil Armstrong stepped on the moon—and ten years since Teddy Kennedy and Mary Jo Kopechne rode off Dike Bridge. Of the two events, Chappaquiddick far better presaged the decade ahead. It was so callous, so sloppy.

"We shrug off almost everything now, moving on—with a lot of help from the omnivorous media—to the next fleeting titillation.

"It's as if we're beyond making distinctions, beyond caring. . . . Third-graders are selling dope, White House aides are buying it. Our appetite for violence is insatiable.

"Exhausted from our exertions of the sixties, all we ask for now is relief. Six hours of TV help to get us through the day—life once removed is close enough, thanks. The impetus to rethink-reform-transform has long since slid into the ennui.

"After two centuries, we have reached a consensus of indifference."

Mr. Stone continues, "So we ask: If we have really come to that, is there any turning back?

"The answer has to come from intangibles not readily calibrated. But the answer is crucial, because our future will surely be endangered if we continue aimlessly to drift." Mr. Stone went on in his editorial to discuss America's retreat from dominance, her economic disorder, big government and its misfeasance, loss of respect for government, lack of voter participation, degeneration in education, and other issues. He ended his editorial with these comments: "Certainly we have the intelligence to understand that we are going through one more social revolution in this country and the challenge is to preserve the best of the past and embrace the good and the new. But it will take leadership to define and inspire a common purpose, and desire by the rest of us to pursue it."

A February 26, 1979, *U. S. News & World Report* article entitled, "The Doubting American—a Growing Breed," reports

"pessimism, distrust of leaders, laxity in standards—all raise a basic question about the U.S.: Whatever happened to belief?" The article begins with these statements: "Belief, the energizer of progress and the cement of civilization since the dawn of history, is running into trouble—in America, of all places.

"In speeches, surveys, sermons and editorials, Americans are being told of a 'credibility gap' and the decline of old certitudes, whether secular or religious, that once bred faith in leaders, institutions and the U.S. future.

"The growth of disbelief—whether thoughtful skepticism or casual cynicism—is all the more striking in a nation long viewed as an exemplar of idealism and faith in the future."

In the November 12, 1979, issue of the *Washington Post*, staff writer Kathy Sawyer reports in an article entitled, "A Sleeping Lion: The 'Me Generation' of Nonvoters" responses from people who do not vote, including these: "It seems like a vote doesn't have very much power. Promises aren't kept. . . . It just seems sort of pointless." "Regardless of what I do, see, it's not going to have any effect. . . . After you take so much water in a boat, you're not going to save the ship." Kathy Sawyer includes Republican pollster Robert N. Titter's report that of the seventy-five million Americans who reached voting age since 1960, about fifty million have not even registered to vote. She points out that "among blue-collar workers in the twenty-seven-to-thirty-five age group, nearly half never even have registered." "Recent interviews with nonvoters around the country revealed a mosaic of bitterness, cynicism or merely indifference—a feeling that voting is unconnected to the concerns of their lives. Among all age groups, voting has declined and cynicism toward politics has risen." A young man sums up the attitude of many: "There is only one word I can use to describe myself—and I'm speaking for a lot of people: cynicism. It's very hard to believe in anything anymore."

Dennis Carey was one of those students who stood on that hill at Kent State ten years ago and saw the shots and heard the screams of that awful tragedy. The agony of Kent State led to the formation of a new program for the university that attracted

Carey's attention. At the time of the shooting, he was finishing his graduate work in psychology. Since that time, Carey has been involved in a peace studies program at Kent State and is acting director of the Kent Center for Peaceful Change. In a December 16, 1979, *Washington Post* article by Haynes Johnson, Carey is reported to have made these comments: "Kids who come into our program are still very much influenced by the belief you can do something, that you can make a difference," he says. "But other kids that we get in our classes will say, 'Yes, I see your point, but there isn't a lot we can do about that. It's too big, it's gone too far down the road. And at this point I measure the boundaries of my personal application of energy to what it is I need to carve out a life for me, to make money and stay out of trouble.'"

"Many of them simply believe they may not survive their lifetime. They honest-to-God believe that, deep down. And perhaps the main reason they carve so small a place for themselves is there's no point in trying something else: They think they have this time to enjoy this much. I think the arms race is real to them, and that spells a kind of imminent disaster. Not being able to get a job like they've been told they're going to be able to get, and the economic collapse of the country are real enough. And, unlike years ago, they don't see profound political problems causing that. They simply think it's the system running out. And what do you do in these circumstances? You say, 'Look, you've convinced me. I believe it. Okay. Leave me alone and let me enjoy what I've got.'"

"It's frightening, really frightening, because the motivations have become so narrow.'" Sadly enough, this has been the all-too-prevalent condition in our country for about thirty years. People are discouraged and defeated. Americans have a no-win policy in their hearts because they have lost respect for their government and for their leaders. People in America are realizing that the world is losing respect for America.

We could go on and on. The headlines ring out, "Is the malaise real? Nation's mood in Autumn. Americans today are dismayed by the sick economy, worried about social decline,

concerned over lack of leadership in Washington." (*U. S. News & World Report*, November 12, 1979)

"To friend and enemy alike, America seems to be slipping," reports a November 26, 1979, *Newsweek* article entitled, "Has the U.S. Lost Its Clout?"

"Americans were living in an age of innocence prior to the Johnson presidency, and people assumed that our government was honest and that we were the most moral people around. All those generalities have now been questioned, and once confidence is shaken on a national basis, it is going to be very difficult to re-establish," says Angus Campbell, professor of psychology and sociology at the University of Michigan, in an interview in the December 24, 1979, *U. S. News & World Report*.

The January 7, 1980, issue of *Time* magazine, in an article entitled "Epitaph for a Decade," discusses the "Me Decade." Lance Morrow says, "In a sense, life styles (a very seventies preoccupation) were the distinguishing characteristic of the decade. Social critic Tom Wolfe, in a 1976 essay, called it the Me Decade, a term that caught the epoch's dreamily obsessive self-regard. The seventies were given over to building private, not public morale."

Lance Morrow is optimistic about the 1980s, hoping that "the U.S. is emerging from the privatism and divisions of the Me Decade."

Is there reason for optimism in the 1980s? Can we truly write an epitaph for the Me Decade?

The 1970s were characterized by an obsession with consciousness expansion, self-awareness, and a type of narcissism. The supposed new narcissism of the seventies expounded the ideas that within each individual there is a glorious talented personality, that each individual is possessed with an inner divinity that he alone can bring out in himself; each individual must think only of himself and do exactly what he or she feels like doing. The seventies proposed exactly what the Bible speaks of when it says, "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes." (Jg. 17:6)

Until sin is eliminated, it will never be possible to write epitaphs for the "Me Decade." People have not changed. The only difference with the decade of the seventies was that it produced new terminology for human sin. The basic questions asked in the seventies were the same questions man has always asked: "Who am I? Why am I here? Where am I going?" These questions spring from a dissatisfaction with life that results with alienation from God.

We are living in a society today that is quite sophisticated and very educated. Ours is indeed a clever generation, but one that is suffering because men are doing what is right in their own eyes and disregarding God's immutable laws. If a person is not a Christian, he is inherently a failure because he has rejected that one third of his being that must be satisfied—the human spirit. While he is working to please the body and soul, he is ignoring the part of man that yearns for God. He needs a new birth, and this is a second birth—one in which an individual invites Jesus Christ, the Lord, in the person of His Holy Spirit, to come and indwell him.

In the third chapter of the first book of the Bible we have the story of the fall of man. Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden. They were completely innocent, never having committed sin even though they were capable of sinning. There were other creatures in the garden, including Lucifer, the son of the morning. This was Satan, who revealed himself as a serpent. God had told Adam and Eve that they could partake of all the fruit, and the vegetables, and the offerings of the garden, but they were warned not to partake of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Satan first tempted Eve, and then Eve tempted Adam. Both Adam and Eve disobeyed God and sinned. Because they sinned, they died. Because of them every human being who has ever and who will ever live, is doomed to one day die.

In the first verse of Chapter 3 of Genesis, Satan approached Eve and asked her a question, "Yea, hath God said?" The official satanic campaign to discredit the Bible, the Word of God, began with that question mark regarding Holy Scripture.

Adam and Eve knew well that God had said, "Thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thou shalt surely die." God was speaking of spiritual and physical death. Because Adam and Eve partook of that forbidden fruit, they were doomed to spiritual and physical death.

The satanic campaign to discredit the Bible continues to this day. It has continued down through every generation to this present hour. Why is it wrong to refuse to accept the Genesis account of creation? If man is not basically bad; if he is not inherently evil, having received from the fall the very nature of sin and having had death passed upon him and all men; if the depravity of man is not a fact from the very fall in the garden, then the death, the burial, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ were needless and worthless.

Man was created in the image of God, with a body, a soul, and a spirit. Man was created a free moral agent with the choice of either obeying God or sinning and disobeying God. If man did not sin and fall from his original state, there is no need to accept the Gospel message. This is the concept of modern-day humanism and naturalism that has permeated our country and led men and women to believe foolishly that they are good and can pick themselves up by their own bootstraps. I here propose that man by nature is not good. One has only to look at the chaotic condition of our nation and our world to confirm the fact that men without Christ have no lasting peace and security. Each and every man and woman alive today needs a new birth experience. Man must be born again; he must be regenerated and believe in the death, the burial, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ and accept the shed blood of the Savior as the atonement for his sin in order to be complete.

A thorough study of the Bible will show that it is indeed the inerrant Word of the living God. The Bible is absolutely infallible, without error in all matters pertaining to faith and practice, as well as in areas such as geography, science, history, etc.

The disintegration of our social order can be easily explained. Men and women are disobeying the clear instructions God gave in His Word. Because of this, we live in a world of people with

confused priorities who are giving maximum time to that which is of minor importance. It is no wonder that we see materialism on every hand today. People are living and dying for money. We see drug addiction and alcoholism and people worshipping the idol of and the god of sex. These people are spending their time, their talent, and their energies lusting after things that only lead to a dead end. We live in a world of confused and depressed people because, having violated divine laws, they have dissipated and ruined their lives. They have found that the pleasures of sin are but for a season.

The law of sowing and reaping is as immutable as the law of gravity: “. . . whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.” In the Old Testament it is also stated this way: “Be sure your sin will find you out.” Today we are living in an amoral society where millions of people are discounting the reality of sin as taught in the Bible.

Sin is a transgression of God’s law, and God’s law is unalterable. To sin is to voluntarily disobey God and His divine laws. When man does what is right in his own eyes, he is really saying that it does not matter to him what God thinks about it. He is endorsing what God has condemned, whether God likes it or not. The Bible clearly points out in Proverbs 14:34, “Righteousness exalteth a nation: But sin is a reproach to any people.” Righteousness uplifts a nation. Sin brings reproach upon a people. This is the reason we are in a nosedive as a nation.

Psychiatrist Karl Menninger, in his book *Whatever Became of Sin?* asks: “The very word ‘sin,’ which seems to have disappeared . . . was once a strong word, an ominous and serious word. It described a central point in every civilized human being’s life plan and life style. But the word went away. It has almost disappeared—the word, along with the notion. Why? Doesn’t anyone sin anymore?” Dr. Menninger believes, “To revive the half-submerged idea of personal responsibility and to seek appropriate reparation might turn the tide of our aggressions and of the moral struggle in which much of the world’s population is engaged. A conscious sense of guilt, and implicit or

explicit repentance, would be consequences of the revival of an acknowledgment of error, transgression, offense, and responsibility—in short, of sin.” (pp. 16, 218)

Men and women today try to rationalize their sins by calling them shortcomings or errors. Many modern theologians evade the word “sin.” It is time that we began calling sin by its right name and calling for what is America’s only hope—a biblical and spiritual awakening in the lives of her people. The Bible declares, “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

We live in a world under God’s judgment. Until man realizes that his greatest problem is sin and that this is what has alienated him from God, his Creator, there can be little hope of curing the chaotic conditions in our nation and world. Countless people are searching desperately for something that will bring inner peace and stability to their lives. People are lonely and filled with fear about the future, about failure, about death.

Men and women cannot ignore God, live as they please, and expect to be happy and blessed. This is, however, precisely what has happened. Men and women have placed their priorities on acquiring tangible possessions and achieving tangible goals. Man, rather than God, has been placed at the center of all things. Humanism in some form has taken the place of the Bible. Secular humanism has become the religion of America. Through education and the media, man is constantly being told that he is nothing more than a machine.

According to Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, humanism is “a doctrine, attitude, or way of life centered on human interests or values; a philosophy that asserts the dignity and worth of man and his capacity for self-realization through reason and that often rejects supernaturalism.” Humanism is man’s attempt to create a heaven on earth, exempting God and His Law. Humanists propose that man is in charge of his own destiny. Humanism exalts man’s reason and intelligence. It advocates situation ethics, freedom from any restraint, and defines sin as man’s maladjustment to man. It even advocates the right

to commit suicide and recognizes evolution as a source of man's existence. Humanism promotes the socialization of all humanity into a world commune.

Christianity is ruled out of humanism and is said to be an obstacle to human progress and a threat to its existence. Mao Tse-tung once said, "Our God is none other than the masses of the people. Ye shall be as Gods." The first version of the *Humanist Manifesto* appeared in 1933. The second version appeared in 1973 and was printed in its entirety in the *New York Times*. *Humanist Manifesto I* and *Humanist Manifesto II* openly deny the existence of a Creator, urge abolition of national sovereignty in favor of world government, and embrace complete sexual freedom, abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia.

Naturalism also has gained a stronghold. Naturalism looks on man as a kind of biological machine. To those who believe this philosophy of life, sexual immorality is just another bodily function, as is eating or drinking. The birth of a child is no different than the birth of an animal. Man lives a sort of meaningless existence in life, and it really doesn't matter what significance he thinks he has or what goals he is headed for. The only thing that really is important for man is to try to make himself happy in the immediate now. "If something feels good, do it." It is this philosophy that is destroying the basis and foundation of our nation today.

America's decadent state is evident. A highly respected "key figure" in society today is Harvard psychologist B. F. Skinner. Skinner's hypothesis is that every man and woman is merely a bundle of behaviors determined by an environment and nothing more. He believes that through evolution the environment selected the behaviors that survive in man's genes and that environmental conditioning shapes the lives of each and every individual. He does not believe that men and women possess "inalienable rights." In more than forty years of psychological research, Skinner has developed techniques for the modification of behavior by operant conditioning. Behaviorists all across America are completely committed to Skinner's view. They ac-

cept man as a machine and treat him that way. Many of these men are now controlling the educational process in America.

When mankind absolves his Christian base, he loses respect for human life. This is clearly shown in America's recent change of attitude toward abortion. As men and women fall under the satanic effects of humanism and naturalism, they begin to lose value for the most important thing in God's universe—human beings. Humanists do not value humankind; they value themselves.

A biology professor at Rutgers University, Dr. David Erhenfeld, makes these comments in his book *The Arrogance of Humanism*: "Evidence is piled all around us that the religion of humanity is self-destructive and foolish, yet the more it fails, the more arrogant and preposterous are the claims of its priests." (p. 58)

In his commencement address at Harvard University in 1978, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn made these comments: "Society appears to have little defense against the abyss of human decadence, such as, for example, misuse of liberty for moral violence against young people, motion pictures full of pornography, crime, and horror.

"Such a tilt of freedom in the direction of evil has come about gradually but it was evidently born primarily out of a humanistic and benevolent concept according to which there is no evil inherent to human nature; . . . Strangely enough, though the best social conditions have been achieved in the West, there still is criminality. . . . How has this unfavorable relation of forces come about? How did the West decline from its triumphal march to its present sickness? . . . The West kept advancing socially in accordance with its proclaimed intentions, with the help of brilliant technological progress. And all of a sudden it found itself in its present state of weakness.

"This means that the mistake must be at the root, at the very basis of human thinking in the past centuries. I refer to the prevailing Western view of the world which was first born during the Renaissance and found its political expression from the pe-

riod of the Enlightenment. It became the basis for government and social science and could be defined as rationalistic humanism or humanistic autonomy: the proclaimed and enforced autonomy of man from any higher force above him. It could also be called anthropocentricity, with man seen as the center of everything that exists . . . we turned our backs upon the Spirit and embraced all that is material with excessive and unwarranted zeal. This new way of thinking, which had imposed on us its guidance, did not admit the existence of intrinsic evil in man nor did it see any higher task than the attainment of happiness on earth. It based modern Western civilization on the dangerous trend to worship man and his material needs. Everything beyond physical well-being, an accumulation of material goods, all other human requirements and characteristics of a subtler and higher nature were left outside the area of attention of state and social systems, as if human life did not have any superior sense. That provided access for evil, of which in our days there is a free and constant flow. Merely freedom does not in the least solve all the problems of human life and it even adds a number of new ones."

The Bible declares that men and women who do not acknowledge God, although professing themselves to be wise, become fools. God desires to give America revival. But before there can be revival, there must first be a conviction of sin, and there cannot be a conviction of sin until there is awareness of sin. The hope for America is for her people to believe the Bible to be the Word of God and to begin to live by the laws of God.

EDUCATION

In his inaugural address on March 4, 1797, John Adams, our second President, stated that one means of preserving our Constitution was to "patronize every rational effort to encourage schools, colleges, universities, academies, and every institution for propagating knowledge, virtue, and religion among all classes of the people." He spoke of the high destiny of this country and of his own duties toward it, having been "found on a knowledge of the moral principles and intellectual improvements of the people deeply engraved on my mind in early life." When John Adams graduated from Harvard, its handbook for "rules and precepts" stated: "Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well the main end of his life and studies is to know God, and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life. And therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning."

Our Founding Fathers knew the importance of education. They considered it a privilege of free men to be educated and to perpetuate their freedom by teaching the religious principles upon which our republic was built. When John Adams was President he said, "So great is my veneration for the Bible that the earlier my children begin to read it, the more confident will be my hope that they will prove useful citizens of their country and respectable members of society."

D. Bruce Lockerbie says in his recently published book *Who*

Educates Your Child?: "Education is a framework like the forms that hold molten lead or liquid concrete, helping to mold character. Education is a mirror to reflect the development of that character. In other words, education is the instrument for carrying out society's philosophical goals." (p. 46)

In the past, parents did not have to worry about the education of their children because the schools—the public schools—were without question the best in the history of the world. I remember when I attended Mountain View Elementary School in Lynchburg, Virginia. I enrolled there in 1940 and spent six years there. Every week we attended chapel. Someone would read the Bible to all of the students and we would have prayer and sing hymns. We were taught to reverence God, the Bible, and prayer. Although, at that time, I was not a Christian and I did not know the Bible or have any religious knowledge, I gained a respect for God, the Bible, the church, and for things that were holy. I learned all those principles in a public school.

Until about thirty years ago, the public schools in America were providing that necessary support for our boys and girls. Christian education and the precepts of the Bible still permeated the curriculum of public schools. The Bible was read and prayer was offered in each and every school across our nation. But our public schools no longer teach Christian ethics, which educate children and young people intellectually, physically, emotionally, and spiritually. The Bible states, "The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge." (Pr. 1:7) I believe that the decay in our public school system suffered an enormous acceleration when prayer and Bible reading were taken out of the classroom by our U. S. Supreme Court. Our public school system is now permeated with humanism. The human mind has been deceived, and the end result is that our schools are in serious trouble.

Since World War II, there has been a continuing infiltration of socialism onto the campus of our major colleges and universities. As the Bible and prayer were removed, they were replaced with courses reflecting the philosophy of humanism. It is no wonder that as we review the 1970s, we find radicals and revolu-

tionaries on our campuses who plundered and defamed their colleges and universities in the name of academic freedom.

Humanism claims a "life adjustment" philosophy. The emphasis is placed on a person's social and psychological growth instead of on factual knowledge. "Socialization" has become the main purpose of education. Students are told that there are no absolutes and that they are to develop their own value systems. The humanist creed is documented in two humanist manifestos, signed in 1933 and 1973. Humanists believe that man is his own god and that moral values are relative, that ethics are situational. Humanists say that the Ten Commandments and other moral and ethical laws are "outmoded" and hindrances to human progress.

Humanism places man at the center of the universe. The philosophy of naturalism projects man as an animal concerned only with fulfilling the desires of the moment. It teaches that man is not a unique and specific creation of God. Man is merely the ultimate product of the evolutionary process who has gained a sense of intelligence that prevents him from acting like an animal.

Naturalism looks on man as a kind of biological machine. In that philosophy of life, sexual immorality is just another bodily function like eating or drinking. Man lives a meaningless existence in which the only important thing is for him to make himself happy in the here and now. It is a philosophy of "do your own thing." Its slogan is "If it feels good, do it." Neither philosophy offers moral absolutes, a right and a wrong. Not only are these philosophies destroying our educational system, but they are destroying the basis and the foundation of the Christian family as well.

Basic values such as morality, individualism, respect for our nation's heritage, and the benefits of the free-enterprise system have, for the most part, been censored from today's public-classroom textbooks. From kindergarten right through the total school system, it almost seems as if classroom textbooks are designed to negate what philosophies previously had been taught. Under the guise of sex education or value clarification,

many textbooks are actually perverting the minds of literally millions of students. Let me lay out a brief summary of quotes that I have taken from textbooks I have in hand. These textbooks are actually being used in the classrooms of our American schools. I have found quotes such as these: "To truly induce completely creative thinking we should teach children to question the Ten Commandments, patriotism, the two-party system, monogamy, and laws against incest."

Here is another: "It's tactless if not actually wrong not to lie under certain circumstances."

Another: "To be a better citizen a person needs to learn how to apply for welfare and how to burn the American flag."

"There are exceptions to almost all moral laws depending on the situation."

"Honesty is not something you either have or don't have."

"American society is ugly, trashy, cheap, and commercial, it is dehumanizing, its middle-class values are seen as arbitrary, materialistic, narrow, and hypocritical."

"To be successful in our culture one must learn to dream of failure."

"Only by remaining absurd can one feel free from fear."

A textbook entitled *Human Sexuality: A Course for Young Adults* was approved by the California State Board of Education. Recommended to the board by the State Commission on Curriculum, the book is intended for children aged twelve to fourteen, in the seventh and eighth grades. Sex is described explicitly in words and pictures. The book advises children that because parents are old-fashioned and narrow-minded about moral values, the home is the worst place to learn about sex. It presents the view that perversion is in the eyes of the beholder, saying that unusual sexual behavior should not be considered a perversion simply because it is out of the ordinary. Students are informed that strong disapproval of premarital sexual activity is not shared by the majority of the world's cultures. Infidelity is condoned. The book spoke about subjects such as homosexuality, incest, masochism, masturbation, sadism, and nymphomania.

Many parents would be appalled and shocked if they examined the textbooks from which their children are being taught in America's schools today. Books are very significant factors in society. The textbook business for elementary and secondary schools is an \$823-million-a-year business.

When you find an advanced society such as ours, you will find that books have played an important part in the development of that society. The Book of all books has been and always will be the Word of God, the Bible. The foundation for our government, our laws, our statutes, our civilization, the structures of our home, our states, and our churches have come from the Word of God. America's past greatness has come because she has honored the Bible. The attitude America's people take toward the Bible is in direct proportion to the stability of America as a nation.

I believe that the greatness of America can be attributed to the Good Book, and also to the good books of science, literature, history, and biography that have enabled us as a people to assimilate the necessary facts to build a great republic under God.

Textbooks

Mel and Norma Gabler head a group called Educational Research Analysis. The Gablers have become known all across America for their efforts to improve the textbooks of America's schools. It all began one day when their son came home from school in Longview, Texas, with an assignment to write out the Gettysburg Address. They found that the words "under God" had been left out of their son's textbook. Thus began an extensive search of textbooks. The Gablers were absolutely incensed by what they found. They knew that evolution was already taught in textbooks, but they did not know that the very moral values upon which our nation was established were actually attacked in school textbooks. They found this not only in public-school textbooks but also in some private-school textbooks.

A committee in each state determines which textbooks are to

be accepted for use in the school systems of that state. The Gablers took action. They began to appear before the Texas committee every year when new textbooks were presented by the publishers. After doing much homework—obtaining and reading copies of prospective books—they examined and discussed the books openly. One member of a particular committee asked Mrs. Gabler what right she had to take up their time. He questioned her academic expertise. She replied that she was first of all a mother, a parent of three children, a taxpayer, and a registered voter. Because of her efforts, Texas is reported to have the best textbooks of any of the fifty states. Mrs. Gabler says there is still room for improvement but it is far better in Texas than in any other state. Her statement greatly troubles me.

Schools and textbooks are seldom suspected of contributing to the present-day situation in which more than half of our young people favor governmental ownership of industry and believe that most people are not capable of deciding what is best for themselves and, thus, are ready to dispense with freedom of the press. One third of our boys and girls would curb the freedom of speech, and 13 per cent would restrict religious worship by law. Behavior is learned.

Mel Gabler points out in a pamphlet entitled *Have You Read Your Children's School Textbooks?* that the federal government has funded a particular series of studies called "MACOS," which stands for "Man: A Course of Study." Designed for fifth-grade children, this course was hailed by liberals when it came out in 1972 as one of the greatest programs ever developed. Supposedly, MACOS teaches why man is more human than other animals and so on. But as the Gablers have pointed out, the study includes wife-swapping, men practicing cannibalism, the killing of baby girls, and eleven-year-old students role-playing leaving their grandmothers to die. The thirty MACOS booklets are filled with more examples of such cruelty, violence, and death.

MACOS was produced by the National Science Foundation and was the brainchild of Jerome Bruner, a Harvard psychologist specializing in experimental behavior. MACOS was in-

tended to teach the universal bond among all men through a series of discovery lessons on a variety of cultures. The aim was to have children step outside of their own cultures to question values that they may have already learned. The required training for teachers forbids any new questions or clarifications to be inserted. The teacher is helpless. All questions come from manuals that have to be followed exactly, and the students are not allowed to look for answers in extracurricular source material of their own or their parents. All answers must be obtained from the course books, the simulated games, and the films. MACOS is a perfect example of a closed system of government indoctrination for neutralizing the values taught by church and home.

Children who take this course are not to take their booklets home. When parents try to examine these booklets, they find it is very difficult. Parents should be prepared for such pacifying statements as, "The books teach realism; students should learn about other cultures." Students are faced with values that are anti-American, that equate man with the animals, and that display harsh attitudes toward a home and a family. Children are taught that there are no absolute rights or absolute wrongs and that the traditional home is one alternative. Homosexuality is another. Decency is relative.

Inquiries in Sociology notes, "There are exceptions to almost all moral laws depending on the situation." (p. 37) But if God, or the integrity of the Bible, or creationism are included uncritically in a textbook, that book is immediately labeled as biased.

Hitler knew exactly how to indoctrinate people. He went right to the children and in their schoolrooms. Fascism was taught until at one point in time the children became his slaves. Children were ready and willing to turn their parents in to the state for disloyal statements. Prayer and Bible reading were taken out of the schools because they might "offend" some child who did not believe in God. The other 99 per cent of the children had to listen to evolution and secularism, humanism, and vulgarity.

The textbook *Many Peoples, One Nation* (1973), contains

this statement: "No nation on earth is guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than in the United States at this very hour." The National Education Association (NEA) is urging that a film, *The Unknown War*, put together by Soviet filmmakers, be shown to schoolchildren. The film is nothing less than Soviet propaganda.

In the book *Are Textbooks Harming Your Children?* author James Hefley points out that the Gablers were disturbed by a report from an NEA affiliate, the National Council for the Social Studies. The report, "The Study and Teaching of American History," helped to explain the changes in recent history texts. The report said: "Our principle for selecting what is basic in . . . history involves a reference to its predicted outcome. Our 'emphasis' will be determined by what we find going on in the present. . . . Most of us have pledged our allegiance to an organized world community. . . . The teacher who adopts this principle of selection is as intellectually honest as the teacher who relies upon the textbook author—and far more creative. . . ." (p. 31) We find that public education has become materialistic, humanistic, atheistic, and socialistic. This is a far cry from what our Founding Fathers intended education to be. It is a far cry from the motto of the United States of America, "In God We Trust."

The Gablers were incensed when our U. S. Supreme Court declared the official use of voluntary nonsectarian prayer in the public schools unconstitutional, and when a year later the Court outlawed Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in classrooms. They saw it as another step closer to the goals of "progressive" education.

The Gablers see only three possible ways for parents to preserve the heritage of family, church, and nation: (1) transfer their children to a Christian school teaching traditional values; (2) teach them at home; (3) fight the self-appointed system of secular humanism.

"Why shouldn't we fight?" Norma commented. "It's our children, our tax money, and our government. And it's our

rights that are being violated. If textbooks can't teach Christian principles, then they shouldn't teach against Christianity." (p. 33)

An article in the December 31, 1979, *Time* magazine regarding the Gablers states, "They have become a clearinghouse for critiques written by almost anyone of textbooks, dictionaries, and library books. Texas education officials swear by the Gablers. 'Their ideas about educational materials are the ideas parents want,' says Alton Bowen, deputy commissioner of education."

Fred Reed reports in the December 29, 1979, *Washington Post*: "The decline of education, when sufficiently prolonged, becomes irreversible and alters the structure of society. The point of irreversibility comes when a full generation has been maleducated."

"We seem to be approaching that point. Functional illiteracy is a growth stock, College Board scores continue to decline, professors complain of poorly prepared students, and universities teach remedial English (or try to: finding professors who know grammar is no longer easy).

"There might be hope if teachers were committed to excellence. But the prevailing tone in academic circles is one of apathetic mediocrity and unionism (although many infuriated teachers are exceptions).

"Worse, the people who control the apparatus of education do not want improvement. They see education as an elaborate game of who's-got-a-theory, in which children are regarded as laboratory animals. Their concern is not whether children learn anything, but how they feel about each other.

"If this sounds like an exaggeration, read a few educational journals (every parent should). They contain endless repetition of education's talismanic signature words: interpersonal dynamics, group interaction, cognitive dissonance, and self-image. There is little mention of the substance of scholarship, such as history, long division, and Spanish.

"If the education of what Marxists call 'the masses' deteriorates enough, they must eventually become the masses in a

Marxist sense—unknowing, unreading consumers of television's products. Should quality in education decline far enough, the result must be a sort of peasantrification of the country." (The title of Reed's article is "Half-educated Generation.") An estimated 13 per cent of all high-school graduates are functionally illiterate.

"The amount of cheating that goes on at major colleges and universities is phenomenal. *The Cheating Game*—Bowers's survey of 99 institutions (including such elite ones as Yale, Columbia, Penn, and Stanford)—revealed that at least half the students sampled had engaged in some form of cheating while on campus.

"The administration assumes that students coming here have a code of values about cheating, but they don't," said Fred Hall, the president of Dartmouth 1976 senior class. In many of the lower schools, the rate of cheating ranged as high as a sickening 88 per cent." (pp. 101-2)

"In the no-fault guilt-free new social order, the university's moral authority had languished. 'Character is a word that's dropped out of the university's vocabulary,' said Norman Jacobson, a political-science professor at Berkeley." (p. 102)

"In early 1978 a deeply concerned Harvard president, Derek Bok, admitted, 'We have little reason to believe that Harvard does much to promote moral reasoning, let alone moral conduct.'" (p. 103)

"'You can't teach it (morality) the way you teach the clarinet. We lack the language to discuss right and wrong,' insisted a University of Chicago professor.

"Between 1974 and 1978 Cornell's mental health center recorded a 44 per cent increase in new student patients. Columbia's counseling service reports a 50 per cent jump in visits over one academic year during the same period." (p. 89)

In the mid-seventies suicide ranked second only to accidents as a cause of death on college campuses.

"At both Berkeley and Stanford the 300-foot bell towers were enclosed at the top to discourage would-be suicides from jumping."

Sexual Anarchy

In his book *Campus Shock*, Lansing Lamont explains that he set out to explore a dozen pre-eminent liberal-arts universities: the eight Ivy League schools of the East (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Yale); the state universities of Michigan at Ann Arbor and California at Berkeley, as well as Stanford and the University of Chicago. His documentary reveals the deeply troubled students on college campuses and universities in the decade of the seventies. The mood of students on many of these major campuses was described as "an epidemic of despair."

Lamont found that sex had become the focal point for much of a young person's educational and social life. Displaced outside of marriage, the sex act fulfilled biological needs apart from accepting emotional and moral responsibilities. "Nor was the plight of Sylvia Webb, a junior at Princeton, by any means an isolated one," he says. "On the first night that her roommate had brought a man up to their dormitory quarters, she had retreated to the bathroom to finish studying for a math examination. When she emerged at 2:00 A.M. the man was still there, and within a week he'd become a regular overnight guest. Thus it is not surprising that there are on what was once a 'distinguished' campus such as Yale, rapes right in campus dormitories."

He found that the "new morality" sowed confusion across many a traditionalist campus, causing hurt and disillusionment. Psychiatrists treated growing numbers of student couples with sexual hangups. At Princeton's sex clinic the traffic in disturbed couples tripled over a two-year period. "It was impossible to just make friends," explained a pretty Cornell sophomore who'd fled to off-campus quarters after her freshman year in a mixed dorm. "The boys had sex uppermost on their minds. They'd wander into your room and ask to sleep with you. The sex came first before you even made an emotional commitment. I didn't know how to handle it and I've done a lot of agonizing since."

"A Harvard woman in her sophomore year become so withdrawn," he said, "partly for fear of sexual pressure 'that I didn't know anyone in the house outside my suite.' The mere sharing of a book could entail sexual expectations."

"At the University of Michigan, the daughter of a Detroit industrialist showed up in tears at the campus psychological clinic. 'She was under tremendous pressure to be deflowered and by God she was,' reported Professor Joseph Adelson, the clinic's director. A young freshman at Harvard dropped out after being repeatedly propositioned by a lesbian roommate."

Campus Shock is indeed a disheartening book to say the least. In the pessimism of its pages, I could say "there is hope." And I will continue to try to reach young people with the message that only Jesus Christ is that hope. In the final chapter to his book, Mr. Lamont states: "The shocks came in cumulative bursts of candor from the students—in my dawning realization that so many of them viewed their lives and selves with contempt, that so few of them found their college experience enriching or pleasurable. They recognized the cheating around them, and looked the other way. They sensed the shallowness of their career aims, and plunged blindly ahead. And, though I knew that the old nostalgia for Alma Mater was long gone, I found it still appalling that so many students viewed themselves as mere transients with no loyalties to their college."

"What shocked me most, however, was the numbness, emotional as well as moral, that I encountered everywhere. I remember too well the conclusion of Fred Hall, president of the class of '76 at Dartmouth—that 'more and more students don't react to situations and, more terrifying, don't react to people.'" (p. 128)

"Far too many students in the 1970s have become so obsessed with their entitlements, along with the determination to come out first, that the notion of responsibility seems to have been lost sight of almost entirely."

"On campus after campus, I listened to educators who envisaged a millennium in which the professions were wholly dominated by such attitudes—by businessmen whose preoccupa-

pation with the bottom line has obliterated all social concern, by doctors who have lost the ability to diagnose along with any intuitive feel for the patient as a whole person, by lawyers who have lost sight of every goal other than the maximizing of corporate profits. Their vision of the future was, in short, a leadership without a soul presiding over a technological system without a conscience." (p. 131)