

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

September 1995

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

Ethics and Justification by Faith Alone

Edited by John W. Robbins

But know this, that in the last days perilous times will come, for men will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, unloving, unforgiving, slandering, without self-control, brutal, despisers of good, traitors, headstrong, haughty, lovers of pleasures rather than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying its power. From such people turn away (2 Timothy 3:1-5).

Once it was generally accepted that right and wrong must be judged by some objective, absolute standard. More than one hundred years ago society began to believe in evolution instead of divine creation. The next step was perfectly logical and inevitable. If God is not our creator, perhaps he is not our judge. Existentialism, situation ethics, and relativism are based on the premise that each person is the only judge of his beliefs and actions, and therefore he is not responsible to any absolute, external, objective standard for his conduct.

Christians need to be especially aware that this same spirit of disrespect for law flourishes in the visible church. In Paul's list of last-day sins, quoted above, the burden is not to show how bad the world will be at the end time. The apostle describes the conditions that will exist in *the visible church* in the last days (*i.e.*, among those "having a form of godliness").

While the secular liberals talk of "the responsible self" and "social consciousness" in place of law, theological liberals talk of "Christian love" and "the guidance of the Holy Spirit" as taking the place of law. It is the same tune, second verse. Neo-evangelicals have carried on such a one-sided attack against "legalism" that *law* has become a dirty word. Under the influence of liberalism and neo-evangelicalism, *legalism* has evolved a new meaning. It used to mean the wrong use of law (as a means of salvation), now it is often taken to mean conscientious obedience to rules of any kind. As society is being deluged by corruption, lawlessness, crime, and rottenness that defies description, it needs no encouragement from the visible church to show disrespect for the moral law of God.

Justification by Faith Alone and Respect for Law

We agree with J. Gresham Machen, who wrote, "One way to encourage respect for law, we think, would be to make law more respectable" (*What Is Faith?* 168). How do we make law more respectable?

There are some, there have always been some—see Romans 9—who are ready to blame justification by faith alone for lack of ethical action in the church. They feel that this great Christian doctrine needs to be played down, while more emphasis needs to be given to sanctification and practical Christian

living. This is a happy eventuality for Rome, which has always contended that Luther's doctrine loosens the reins of moral restraint. The great Reformation principle of justification by faith alone is in no way responsible for fostering disrespect for law. This is an age that knows almost nothing about the doctrine of justification by faith alone. It is impossible to be strong on justification by faith and weak on ethics. *Justification* is a term of *law*. No two Bible concepts stand more closely related than *justification* and *law*. To honor and uphold justification is to honor and uphold the law (*Romans* 3:31). Returning to Machen's proposition, how may we make law more respectable? By putting the truth of justification back into the center of the Christian message where it belongs. Wherever and whenever this truth is exalted and taught, the Spirit of God breathes new life into the church and equips its members for "every good work."

The Fear of God, Justification, and Ethics

The great Biblical truth of justification by faith alone does not make sense unless it is seen against the background of the fear of God. The Bible says the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom (*Proverbs* 9:10), the foundation of piety (*Job* 1:8), the core of obedience (*Ecclesiastes* 12:13; *Genesis* 22:11, 12), the basis of ethical integrity (*Genesis* 20:11; *Proverbs* 8:13; 16:6), and the foundation of sanctification (*2 Corinthians* 7:1). The Holy Spirit is called "the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord" (*Isaiah* 11:2). To fear God means to respond to him with reverential awe, humble respect, and profound adoration. This attitude toward God comes by a vivid understanding of the majesty of him who is constantly aflame with holiness, truth, and goodness, and of the wrath of him whose justice is fiery indignation against sin.

Whenever men are taught the fear of the Lord by a confrontation with God's righteousness and his claims upon their lives, they are led to cry out, "How can I be just with God?" They do not take it for granted that God forgives, but they are so impressed with the righteousness of God that their own conscience demands, "How can God justly

forgive me?" They feel like Spurgeon, who cried out, "I felt I could not be forgiven unless I could be forgiven justly." This is the great problem that Paul solves for us in his message to the Romans—how God demonstrates his justice in the remission of sins (*Romans* 3:25-26).

When we look at the current religious scene, there is little evidence that people are asking such *theocentric* (God-centered) questions. Instead, they are asking *anthropocentric* (man-centered) questions: How can God make me happy? How can Christ make my life run smoothly and joyously? How can I solve my problems and find fulfillment in life? Never has so much religious activity been so disinterested in the question of *justification* with God. Why? Because there is so little fear of God. People can wave their arms or jump up and down "in the Spirit." But if the religious interest is not marked by a great fear of God, it is not the work of the Holy Spirit, for he is "the Spirit . . . of the fear of the Lord." Again, why is there such an appalling disinterest in justification by faith? Because people are taking it for granted that God is gracious and forgiving. In fact, they feel that they are on such good terms with him that they talk to him as if he were (to use Luther's complaint against the Enthusiasts) "a shoemaker's apprentice." How can justification be a concern when there is no marked fear of God?

Consider how these man-centered questions are patently foolish in the light of man's predicament. Here is a wretched sinner, bound hand and foot and consigned to Hell for his great crimes against his maker. Standing on the threshold of eternal damnation, he presumes to ask, "How can God make me happy?" Such a question shows he has no understanding of his awful predicament. If the Spirit gives him any true enlightenment of his situation, he will cry out, "How can I be right with God?"

We are not suggesting that God is indifferent to the earthly happiness of his children. But we do not find happiness in trying to use God as if he were our lackey. Nowhere do we find such genuine, exultant joy as in *Romans* 5 and 8. This holy, sacred joy comes to the man who, because of Christ, has found justification at the hand of a just and merciful God.

Such a man is ready to follow Christ anywhere, to make any sacrifice, to perform any duty, to obey any commandment, and to count it all a "reasonable service" from an "unprofitable servant." He does not take his forgiveness for granted or begin to walk before God with irreverent familiarity. Imagine saying to the man who wrote Romans, "Paul, I accept your doctrine of justification by faith alone. But can you tell me how my life can be vitalized with Christian joy?" With one stroke of the Word, the apostle would say, "Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord shall not impute sin." "We also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (*Romans* 4:7; 5:11). Understanding justification without joy in the Holy Spirit is unthinkable.

The message of justification by grace alone, because of Christ alone, through faith alone is the sweetest and most joyful melody that can ever come to the human heart. Then why are people rushing off to find "the Spirit" in a "second blessing," tongues, or some guru or celebrity? It is because the fear of God is the one great ingredient most lacking in the current religious scene, and therefore the truth of justification is unappreciated as the gift of the Spirit.

The New Testament teaches the fear of God as much as does the Old Testament. Luke describes the church as "walking in the fear of the Lord" (*Acts* 9:31). The writer to the Hebrew Christians exhorts the believers not to "draw back" and find that it "is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (*Hebrews* 10:38, 31). And Paul exhorts the Gentile Christians: "Do not be haughty, but fear. For if God did not spare the natural branches, he may not spare you either" (*Romans* 11:20, 21).

God is not a popular figure with whom sinners may fraternize on their own level. He is so high, so holy, that he can have no direct fellowship with any man save Jesus Christ. Christ alone will he accept, and Christ's righteousness alone makes him propitious toward us. Well may the most holy saint flee from his throne with dread and terror except that he may *keep* looking to his Substitute at God's right hand

and *keep* believing the good news that he is justified in God's sight solely because Jesus stands there instead of him and for him. This is the only atmosphere in which the Christian continues to live and breathe. Such a Christian will never look on sin as if it were as harmless as a Sunday afternoon frolic.

In short, two things belong together—the fear of God and Christian ethics—just as Solomon declares, "Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man" (*Ecclesiastes* 12:13). And the last book of the Bible declares, "Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment has come; and worship him who made Heaven and Earth . . ." (*Revelation* 14:7).

The Satisfaction, Justification, and Ethics

Paul did not write the book of *Romans* just to tell us that God is willing to forgive. The Old Testament had already made that abundantly clear. Nor did he write *Romans* just to tell us that we should live by trusting in God's mercy. The Old Testament was clear enough on that too. The central issue that the epistle deals with is this: How can the God of law and justice forgive sin? How can the moral governor of the universe justify people who deserve to be condemned? It is important to see that the theme of Romans, therefore, is not merely the justification of sinners, but *the justification of God in his justification of sinners*.

God's justice in passing over sins was prefigured in types and shadows of the old dispensation. The prophets who "prophesied of the grace that should come" "inquired and searched diligently" into God's answer to the problem of sin (*I Peter* 1:10, 11). God had revealed himself as gracious and forgiving. He passed over the sins of Israel times without number. He passed over the sins of David without inflicting upon him what justice required. He even forgave the sins of Manasseh, who filled Jerusalem with the blood of God's saints. How is all this consistent with justice? Does the supreme Judge treat his law as a mere regulation to be modified, relaxed, or set aside at pleasure? Should not the Judge uphold the law irrespective of any person? We might even say that God's passing by the sins of men might look

like moments of weak leniency on the part of the great Judge, and therefore his act of pardon might appear as a scandal against the divine government.

Then God himself answers in the holy wrath that fell on the person of Christ. Never had Earth or Heaven beheld such a display of awful, holy justice as when God spared not his only Son. So Paul points to the cross of Christ and declares:

God meant by this to demonstrate his righteousness, because in his forbearance God had passed over the sins that were previously committed to demonstrate his righteousness at the present time that he might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus (*Romans* 3:25-26).

There are some who feel that forgiveness of sins proceeds from an easy-going benevolence. Consequently, they are also easy-going about sin, saying in their hearts, "There is plenty of forgiveness with the Lord." Others propose that Christ died merely to show us that God will excuse our sins and good-naturedly pass them by. Such sentimental thoughts of Calvary allow them to sin with an easy conscience. Then there are some who see the atonement as a skillful maneuver on the part of God to "get around his law." So why should not they also spend their lives getting around the law?

The Biblical doctrine of the satisfaction of God's law undergirds all Christian ethics. It shows us that God was not only providing for the justification of sinners, but for the justification of his moral order in the universe. It shows us that the divine law and government must be maintained and vindicated. Calvary was the highest honor that God himself could pay to his law. Prophecy had declared of Christ, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable" (*Isaiah* 42:21). Never was the law of God more highly honored than when Christ stood before the bar of justice to make satisfaction for the damage done. Luther declared, "Now although out of pure grace God does not impute our sins to us, he nonetheless did not want to do this until complete and ample satisfaction of his law and his righteousness had been made." Carl Henry wrote in

Personal Christian Ethics: "The Cross is the center of the moral universe, unveiling God's absolute refusal to suspend his law of holiness."

Faith, Justification, and Ethics

We must now consider the nature and action of faith in the sinner's justification. Faith is the root of every good work, the tree that blossoms and bears a harvest of ethical action. God does care for good works and the honor of his law. His holy nature demands a righteousness that conforms to his commandments without variableness or shadow of turning. Paul declares, "the doers of the law shall be justified" (*Romans* 2:13). Perfect obedience to his law is the only condition upon which God will give any man eternal life (*Matthew* 19:17). As Luther said, "The law must be fulfilled so that not a jot or tittle shall be lost, otherwise man will be condemned without hope."

The good news of the Gospel is that Christ has lived this life of perfect obedience. He has fulfilled the conditions upon which God will justify his people. Jesus lived this life in our name and on our behalf. This is why the apostle says that we are justified by Christ (*Galatians* 3:17), by his obedience (*Romans* 5:18, 19). So it is perfectly true to say that the *meritorious* cause of our justification is a life of good works—not ours, of course, but Christ's. While the death of Jesus (his passive obedience) is the basis upon which God forgives sin, the life of Jesus (his active obedience) is the basis upon which God can impute to us a life of perfect obedience. We need to hear more about the redemptive nature of Christ's life, for this is what fulfills the law and entitles us to eternal life.

God does not justify us because of our faith—as if faith had any redemptive value. Neither does God now accept faith instead of perfect obedience to his law. (This is the error of neo-nomianism, which says that Christ died to change the conditions, to make it possible for God to impose an easier standard.) Faith is not the *meritorious cause* of justification but merely the *instrumental cause*. By faith a sinner assents—agrees—to God's offer of

salvation. Justice acknowledges that this life, which the sinner now accepts as his, satisfies the demands of the law, and God pronounces him justified.

The Reformers clearly saw that the moral law of God has three uses:

- a. First use—to restrain sin in society;
- b. Second use—to point out sin and to lead the sinner to Christ;
- c. Third use—to be a rule of life for Christians.

In the last one hundred years it has become quite popular to reject all three uses of the law. This is antinomianism. It undermines the whole structure of Christian ethics, destroys all legal content of justification by faith, and betrays the cause of the Reformation.

When we say that the Christian is not under the obligation to the law, we had better be clear that we mean obligation to satisfy its claims for perfect righteousness and not obligation to obey it as a rule of life. But many fail to make that distinction. Does the justified believer have any dealing with the law? The satisfaction should be to us a constant reminder of the unrelieved heinousness of breaking God's law. The freedom of justification by faith alone is freedom to obey, the privilege to obey a law so royal, so holy (*Romans* 7:6, 12, 25; *James* 2:10). Far from not being under obligation to keep the law, love puts us under double obligation to keep it.

There are at least four kinds of teaching that open the door to antinomianism:

a. *Making Grace Antagonistic to Law.* The Reformers made a sharp distinction between the law and the Gospel, but they were careful to write into all the great confessions that the moral law of God always remains valid as a rule of life for believers. But in the last one hundred years there has developed a kind of teaching that sets the moral law in opposition to grace and discards the concept of the law's third use.

b. *Enthusiasm.* By "enthusiasm" we do not mean religious fanaticism which causes people to jump up

and down in spiritual ecstasy. "Enthusiasm" is a teaching that claims direct guidance from the Holy Spirit apart from the written, outside-of-me Word of God. Instead of sound teaching on the proper use of the law, there are many today who feel that the Holy Spirit dwells in them and tells them what to do quite apart from any teaching of the law. Luther had to meet this error from those whom he called "Enthusiasts." The Reformer saw that their basic error was to make a dangerous separation of Word and Spirit. Luther and Calvin had to maintain that the Holy Spirit works in the Word and never apart from the Word. The only way to hear the Holy Spirit speak to us is to listen to the Word, and the only way to obey the Spirit is to obey that objective Word of God. We must have none of this notion that we can get a private word from the Lord. The charismatics who claim visions, private revelations, and direct information from God are only carrying what has been a popular notion to its logical end. Under the guise of honoring the Holy Spirit, the Enthusiast's inner voices replace the absolute norm of God's moral law.

c. *Quietism.* Quietism is the teaching that the Christian life is lived by being a passive channel for the operation of the Holy Spirit. The victorious life is said to be lived when the believer stops trying and lets God do it all. ("Let go and let God.") The error of quietism is that it tends to make the Holy Spirit's work in the heart *substitutionary*. This is the result of an inadequate focus on the grand facts of Christ's substitutionary work. The work Christ did in life and death was substitutionary—it was in our place and instead of us. Justification comes by the passive acceptance of what was done on the cross apart from any effort of ours. But the same thing cannot be said about the inward, sanctifying work of the Spirit. The Spirit does not replace human effort. He does not substitute for human obedience. The Christian life is not a matter of refraining from effort while the Spirit does it all. The Christian life is a struggle, a race, a fight; and the Spirit stirs the believer up and equips him for holy warfare. Faith is not an opiate but a stimulant. It does not compose us for sleep but for action.

Justification is possessed only by *faith*. He who has no faith has no justification. Saving faith is faith in

Christ and his work, not in some personal experience of being born again. There is a popular doctrine which says that a man can be eternally saved whether he believes or not. But belief is not optional. He who does not obey does not believe, and he who does not believe will not be saved. The churches are full of spiritually dead souls who are asleep in their sins; yet they content themselves that they are saved because of some past experience. They have faith in their experience; they have no faith in the Gospel.

Extensively revised and adapted from Present Truth, a defunct magazine.

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

January, February 1989

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

The Puritans and Situation Ethics

Gordon H. Clark

Editor's note: A lecture originally delivered in 1976, this edition is a conflation of two slightly different lectures delivered before two different audiences.

In spite of the deplorable decline in the morals of our nation, it may be that this year in which America celebrates its two hundredth birthday some public figure will make a polite reference to the Puritans. They deserve more than a polite mention. It is they who maintained the high morals of an earlier era and established the intellectual foundations of our colleges and universities. Samuel E. Morrison, in a book called *The Puritan Pronaos* – the entry to the temple is the meaning of the word – says, "The story of the intellectual life of New England in the 17th century is not merely that of a people bravely and successfully endeavoring to keep up the standards of civilization in a new world. It is one of the principal approaches to the social and intellectual history of the United States." The Puritans, however, do not constitute the total American heritage in religious and intellectual affairs. One must assign a good measure of credit to the Presbyterians of Pennsylvania and the Carolinas. These people too had a sturdy religion and high academic standards. Though there were some differences between the Presbyterians and the Puritans, nevertheless, the differences were minor and their basic Calvinistic religion was the same.

Misrepresenting the Puritans

Of these two groups the Puritans have been the more maligned and dishonestly caricatured. Even the gentle Longfellow, and perhaps because he was gentle, felt it necessary to say, "The stern old puritanical character rises above the common level of life; it has a breezy air about its summits; but they are bleak and forbidding."

Calvinism has always seemed bleak and forbidding to gentle opponents, while the less gentle use stronger terms. Within the field of ethics the main reason for opposition to Calvinism is the seriousness with which it views the Ten Commandments. Calvin's *Institutes* and the *Westminster Catechisms* broke with Romish laxity by devoting important sections to their exposition. The Scottish Presbyterians and the English Puritans both endeavored to obey the law of God. Sir Walter Scott, despite his antipathy toward the Covenanters, tellingly describes their devotion to truth under the most heart-rending temptations to lie, in *The Heart of Midlothian*. Similarly the English Puritans were moral giants, and men of lesser stature still feel uncomfortable in their presence. Macaulay, who ought to have known better, for he wrote one paragraph acknowledging the virtues and importance of Puritanism, allowed himself to make the jibe, now become familiar, "The Puritans hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectator." Certainly the Puritans condemned people for taking

pleasure in the wanton and deliberate infliction of pain on animals. The man who can enjoy torturing animals will soon develop a pleasure in torturing human beings. Is Puritanism to be condemned because it would condemn Hitler for torturing Jews? But it is false to say that the Puritans condemned pleasure as such. Yet Macaulay's jibe has been more irresponsibly developed by a later writer.

Ernest Boyd, in *Portraits Real and Imaginary* (109) is more imaginary than real when he wrote of the Puritans, "Pleasure is the enemy, not evil, and so the joys of mind and body are under suspicion." This is caricature because the Puritans were not enemies of or unsusceptible to pleasure. They enjoyed even the physical pleasures of food and drink. Apparently Professor Boyd had never heard of Thanksgiving dinner. Instead of confining themselves to the drabness of black clothes as cartoons regularly represent them, they actually wore bright colors. Those who condemn them on the ground that they hated beauty and art not only failed to make allowances for the necessity of wresting a dependable living from an uncultivated wilderness, but also fail in their own appreciation of the Puritan sense of art and proportion in their architecture and household utensils. But credulity and animosity is extreme when Boyd, in the quotation just made, accuses them of disparaging and avoiding the joys of mind. Does he not know that the Puritan community enjoyed a higher degree of literacy than any other American colony?

Two authors, J. Truslow Adams, in *The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System*; and Harlan Updegraff, *The Origin of the Moving School in Massachusetts*, two other authors whose moral standards of truth do not attain to the Puritan ideal, complain that in the town of Natick in 1698 only one child in seventy could read. But what J. Truslow Adams fails to say is that Natick was an Indian town without a single white inhabitant.

The New England populace was well educated and its scholars were not far below the best in Europe. They founded Harvard in 1636, only 16 years after landing. It is true, however, that they were unwilling to assign to pleasure, especially physical

pleasure, a value higher than their philosophy allowed it. Pleasure can be deceitful. It can be evil and it would seem that modern detractors of the Puritans are less realistic in their appraisals. But it was the evil, not the pleasure as such, that they fought against. And if Puritans attacked bear-baiting and bullfights it is because they believed that pleasure in wanton cruelty is evil.

Ralph Barton Perry, Professor of Philosophy at Harvard from 1902 to 1946, has a well-written section on "The Puritan as the Moral Athlete," in *Puritanism and Democracy* (245-268). Now first let us understand one thing. Perry is no advocate of Puritanism. He firmly rejects their ideals. Furthermore, he seriously misunderstands Puritan theology and this results in an appreciable measure of distortion. Nevertheless, he sees more clearly than many the moral strength of Puritanism and turns back on careless critics their inconsistent objections.

Perry begins by describing a school boy he knew who wanted to become the best high hurdler in the world. This decision was grim, unconquerable, irresistible. He abstained from tobacco and candy. His vacations were taken, his friends were made and his hours of sleep arranged by schedule. He weighed himself daily and clipped fractions of seconds from his record. Finally, he gathered assurance that he was one of the elect.

Perry then transfers this picture to the moral athleticism of the Puritans. Jonathan Edwards, for example, determined to achieve complete self-mastery and control. He deliberately undertook moral exercises, weighed himself regularly, and kept his spiritual record. Cotton Mather was even more methodical and business-like than Edwards. He actively sought ways of moral improvement.

The objection to this moral athleticism is the one also directed against Perry's school boy athlete, namely, he exaggerated the importance of the activity and turned play into hard work. Instead of remaining a college amateur, he wanted to become a professional. This obvious objection, however, is superficial, and those who use the objection are inconsistent. They are inconsistent because,

although they do not want to be professional moralists, they want to be professional in some other field. One may be a professional politician aiming at the Presidency, and for the purpose he chooses his friends and arranges his hours of sleep according to schedule.

Another may be a professional businessman, exhausted and ulcerated because business is all important. So too the artist, who is perhaps the most contemptuous critic of the Puritan. He objects strongly to moral discipline but devotes himself with infinite patience to the mastery of his own technique. The point is that a professional cannot consistently object to professionalism.

Perry then gives reasons for rejecting Puritanism. Some of these are objections to the Puritan technique. In some matters of method and detail, their decisions were faulty. They were not professional and efficient enough. This objection, however, is an objection to Puritans. The Puritans themselves would have agreed, in fact did agree, that they never achieved perfection either in method or in achievement. But while this is an objection to Puritans, it is not an objection to Puritanism. Perry's basic objection is, and consistently must be, an objection to their theology, their concept of God, and their high regard of moral excellence.

In what line Perry wanted to be professional I do not care to say. On what supreme principle he wished to organize all his life's activities may be difficult to discover. But it is quite clear that Perry's god could not command his allegiance. "God," he said, "and conscience, like the Supreme Court, take no cognizance of the greater part of life" (264). Clearly this sort of finite god, ignorant of the greater part of our life, is little better than another human being to whom we should, no doubt, pay some attention, but who, after all, is of minor importance.

Yet for all his rejection of the Puritan God and conscience, Perry, with commendable candor and honesty can say,

The Puritan sailed his ship in the open seas. Despite his cult of moral vigor, he was not a moral introvert. He did not confine himself within his moral gymnasium but

used his strength out-of-doors, in the world.... In the wars...he assumed the role of statesman and soldier...such men as William the Silent, Admiral Coligny, John Knox, Oliver Cromwell...and our New England ancestors. The Puritans imprinted on English and American institutions a quality of manly courage, self-reliance and sobriety. We are still drawing [now this is not written by a man who agrees with the Puritans, but he was candid enough to say] we are still drawing upon the reserves of spiritual vigor which they accumulated.

Contemporary Impuritans

We need very much to replenish those reserves today. That this country needs to replenish its moral resources seems too obvious to need saying, but so few people seem to care that it cannot be said enough. The list of American deficiencies can begin with riots, the looting, the arson, and the murders in Detroit, Newark, and many, too many, other cities. These riots did not just happen spontaneously. They were prepared. Remember the plot uncovered in Philadelphia to put cyanide in the soldiers', policemen's, and firemen's coffee. But while these riots were prepared for by Communists and pro-Communists, like Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, and Martin Luther King, of sainted memory, there has been a much longer preparation of indifference to mounting crime. The government officials whose responsibility it is to protect life and property are dilatory, because for years the increase of violent crime has been encouraged by liberal theories of penology, a perverted judicial development that has hamstrung the police and prosecutors, and a general sympathy with the criminal instead of his victim.

In addition to the increase of unorganized crime, there is also the tremendous power of the Mafia. Not only does it deal in prostitution, narcotics, and gambling, but more recently it has infiltrated legitimate businesses to confiscate their assets, all of which entails the bribery and intimidation of government officials and a few murders when necessary.

Narcotics were just mentioned. Below the level of heroin there is LSD, glue, marijuana, alcohol, tobacco, barbiturates, sleeping pills, and tranquilizers. The halls of scholarship also, where claims to seek truth are proudly made, the halls of scholarship also are tainted with moral and intellectual decay. Professor Carl Van Doren, a few years ago, shamed us all on television by being able to answer a stupendous array of questions on all sorts of topics. Hailed into court, he denied under oath that he had been coached. He was then convicted of perjury. After his conviction, the students at Columbia voted to have him returned to the faculty. They shared their professor's devotion to truth.

The central cause of this widespread moral collapse, so it seems to me, is located in the decline of Puritan religion. This returns us to the main theme of religious rather than civil history. When the seminaries and churches declare that God is dead, or when, less extreme, they substitute for the Puritan God of the Ten Commandments a different concept of god, inconsistent with the Ten Commandments, it logically and factually follows that morality is changed, too. A man's view of morality depends on his view of God or whatever his first principle may be. Different types of theology produce different types of morality.

Joseph Fletcher

In order to avoid the inaccuracies and vagueness of a general description of contemporary Protestant theology, I choose the single and well-known case of Dr. Joseph Fletcher, Professor of Social Ethics in the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Certainly he is representative of a great many contemporary theologians and churchmen, but for the sake of clarity and definiteness, I shall confine myself to his precise formulations.

To make very clear the contrast between Professor Fletcher and the Puritans, let us note first that he attacks the Ten Commandments one by one right down the line. He advocates disobedience to every one and approves of profanity, murder, adultery, theft, false witness and covetousness. To be sure he

does not advocate these actions for every day of the week. His position is that on occasion, in certain circumstances, we should commit murder, adultery, and perjury.

Professor Fletcher supports his attack on the Ten Commandments, first by a general argument and second, by particular examples. The general argument is motivated by a distaste for a divine law and a view of life that disparages system, or as I would put it, disparages logical systematization. He contrasts system and method; the former, system, "indicating that which is most opposed to life, freedom, and variety, and the other, that which without they cannot exist."

It is not clear that this distinction between system and method can be sustained. A logical, methodical procedure must be systematic. If, on the other hand, a method is not logical and not systematic, the kind of freedom and variety it produces is what I do not want. I see no advantage in relinquishing the logical rationality of Calvinism for irrational lawlessness. However, Fletcher goes on to say, "Any ethical system is unchristian.... Jesus had no ethics, if...ethics [is] a system...intelligible to all men." On a later page a subtitle reads, "Principles, Yes, but not Rules." This subtitle seems to indicate that Fletcher is not so unsystematic and unprincipled as the previous quotation suggests. However, under this subtitle he very pointedly says that "even the most revered principles may be thrown aside" in certain situations. Therefore, one is justified in asserting that Fletcher repudiates all inviolable principles. There is no divine law and every one of the Ten Commandments ought to be broken.

In addition to his ideal of a life of lawless variety, Fletcher supports his attack on the Ten Commandments with a list of horrible examples. His procedure is to state a law, then describe a situation in which obedience to the law results in disaster. Some of these laws, however, are not chosen from the Ten Commandments but are merely civil laws. Such examples are irrelevant because a Christian is not obliged to defend the rectitude of every civil law. An evil law or a foolish law can, of course, produce unfortunate results, but

these cannot be used as arguments against Puritanism.

Let us therefore consider a relevant attack on one of the Ten Commandments. It's perhaps the best known example in his book. Fletcher's defense of adultery is a story of a German woman, captured at the end of World War II and sent to prison in the Ukraine. Her children were scattered. Shortly her husband returned from his prison camp in England and collected the children, but the wife was still absent. Somehow she heard of her husband's return, but release from the Ukrainian prison camp was allowed only for serious illness or pregnancy. Accordingly, she became pregnant by one of the other prisoners and returned to her family. Therefore, concludes Fletcher, it is sometimes moral to commit adultery.

In reply to this specific case used as an argument, there are two things to be said: First, no such heart-rending story justifies Fletcher's apparent approval of suburban clubs for daily wife-swapping. Nor can he on this basis assert, as he does assert, that "whether any form of sex, (hetero, homo, or auto) is good or evil depends on whether love is served.... All situationists would agree...that they can do what they want as long as they don't do it in the street and frighten the horses." I insist that the story of the German woman does not justify the inviolable law and universal principle of not frightening horses.

There is a second and more cogent reply to Fletcher's story. The force of Fletcher's story depends on the assumption that adultery is a legitimate price for returning home. This is precisely the proposition that needs to be proved. And Fletcher gives no reason whatever for this assumption. The general idea seems to be that the wife loved her husband, and this love justifies any kind of conduct that returns her to him. One may question whether a wife who really loved her husband would commit adultery for any reason. One could also question whether a devoted husband would want his wife to commit adultery, and, if committed, whether he could accept such a sacrifice. These are aspects of the situation Fletcher never mentions. His horrible examples beg the question and assume the point at issue.

The Puritans would have asked a still more basic question. Regardless of how much the woman loved her husband, did she love God? The Puritans would insist that no specious assertion of love could possibly justify disobedience to God. Christ said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." The Ten Commandments are not civil laws poorly written or stupidly conceived. They are divine commands.

But what about the broken family? Here the Puritans would point out that by the rules of the prison camp, the woman would be released if she fell seriously ill. Adultery was not the only possibility. Further, even Communist rules are sometimes changed, and one could pray for less severe restrictions. There is also the possibility of a personal appeal to the Soviet authorities, and God might cause the officials to favor her. Hence, there are several possibilities of release that Fletcher ignores in his attempt to justify adultery. But if these possibilities do not eventuate, the Puritans would still insist that man must obey God.

Fletcher advocates adultery not so much because of horrible examples, but rather because he acknowledges a different god. Theology is the crux of the matter, for ethics depends on theology. Instead of a God who gives moral laws, Fletcher acknowledges a god who commands nothing but love. Now, one can wax eloquent and plausible about love. One can even sound devout and Christian, but if we are logical and rational, we must analyze the position to see exactly what it means.

It is not clear that Fletcher knows what he means by love. He quotes Tillich that the law of love is the ultimate law because it is the negation of law. But this paradoxical statement contains no positive information. Fletcher tells us also that "Christian love is not desire...it is an attitude." But this statement too is negative and devoid of specific information. Later he says that love and justice are the same. "Justice," he says, "is Christian love using its head, calculating its duties." But Fletcher does not tell us what justice is or how we are to use our heads. Beyond this, Fletcher makes several other statements about love. But even if some of them should happen to be true, none of them shows how

love can justify any action, even any good action, let alone disobedience to God.

The point I wish to make is not merely that love all by itself does not justify murder, theft, and perjury. The important point is that love all by itself does not justify any action. Morality cannot be based on love alone because love alone gives no guidance whatever. As a quotation a moment ago showed, the Scriptures may require us to love God but how we are to love God is spelled out in detail: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." Without the specific and detailed instruction of the commandments we could never know how to express our love for God.

Now this is an appropriate place, and it will surely contribute to a fuller understanding of the matter, to show that very little Christianity remains in Fletcher's construction. The quotation from John's Gospel, already twice made, disposes of Fletcher's contention that Jesus had no ethics if ethics is a system of values and rules intelligible to all men. In another place he agrees with Judas in condemning the waste of costly ointment on Jesus. But then he adds that the story must be wrong because Jesus never said, "The poor always ye have with you." But if the Gospels are so untrustworthy that we cannot accept this statement as genuine, how do we know that the recorded remark about loving one's neighbor is genuine? This type of textual criticism, ignoring all the established criteria, eliminates indefinite amounts of Christianity's contents.

The fact is, Fletcher has trouble even with the command to love. When he rejects "all revealed norms or laws but the one commandment to love God *in* the neighbor," he misquotes the commandment he refers to and omits the one on which it depends, namely, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Now a man doesn't have to be a Christian. A man may adopt any principles he pleases if he can rationally defend them. But what kind of a Christian is it that accepts a garbled Second Commandment while rejecting the First from the same authority?

Again Fletcher says, "Christian situation ethics" – he calls it Christian – "Christian situation

ethics...denies that there are any unwritten, immutable laws of heaven, agreeing in this with Bultmann." This quotation needs analysis on three points: First, Christian situation ethics; second, unwritten laws; and third, idolatrous demonic pretensions.

The present subdivision of this lecture aims to show that there is no such thing as Christian situation ethics. Situation ethics is anti-Christian. Second, Christian ethics does not inculcate unwritten laws. The Ten Commandments are written. Why Fletcher threw in this irrelevant word can only be guessed. One may guess that in the absence of a rational defense of this principle, this word prepares the way for his invidious question-begging accusation of idolatrous demonic pretensions. Does love dictate such name calling?

It is no doubt too intricate for a lecture of this sort to examine some of Fletcher's attempts to use the Pauline epistles. Such an analysis would interest those who had the time to study it; and were this done, one could see in greater detail how much Fletcher deviates from Christianity. But even without this additional material what has already been said is sufficient to show that "Christian situation ethics" is not Christian.

Utilitarian Calculation

The final section of this lecture must now attempt to do justice to a part of Fletcher's theory not as yet mentioned. Above, it was said that love, all by itself, gives us no information as to what we ought to do. Fletcher actually admits this and tries to supply the deficiency. In fact, he says, "Love can calculate. Otherwise it is like the bride who wanted to ignore all the recipes and simply let her love for her husband guide her when baking a cake." Now this is excellent, and I could not have said it better. Because Fletcher wants to provide love with a recipe, or a method, one might infer that my remarks on the uselessness of love, all by itself, were beside the point, and that they leave Fletcher untouched.

There were, however, two reasons for noting the uselessness of love. One reason is that some other

religious writers do not provide love with a recipe or method so that this facet of our religious situation should be somewhere turned to the light. The second reason is that a recipe seems inconsistent with Fletcher's attack on rules, laws, and systems. His attempt to substitute the word *method*, and even worse the word *recipe*, for system does not remove the inconsistency. Nevertheless, if Fletcher's methodical calculation succeeds, the inconsistency can be forgotten. On the other hand, if Fletcher cannot carry through his method, then he faces the full force of the objection to love all by itself.

I now wish to show that Fletcher's method of calculation is a failure. To make love workable and to give the bride a recipe for cake, Fletcher professes to accept the use of the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham. "The love ethic," he says, "takes over from Bentham and Mill the strategic principle of the greatest good of the greatest number." There is, however, one important difference between Bentham and Fletcher. Original utilitarianism aimed to produce the greatest amount of pleasure. In choosing between two lines of action, one should determine which gives the most people the most pleasure. At this early point, Fletcher shies away from the notion of hedonism. Pleasure seems too ignoble. Therefore, he explicitly substitutes love for pleasure.

Now the proposal to seek pleasure for one's self and to give other people pleasure is intelligible. It is as intelligible as my inviting you to have a dish of ice cream with me. But while I understand how to increase your pleasure, I am at a loss as to how to increase your love. Utilitarianism is not a method for achieving the greatest amount of love for the greatest number of people. If the vacuity of choosing your actions on the basis of increasing other people's love does not fully register at first, and if you want some further technical details, why we can have either public or private discussion. But if it doesn't fully register at first, it can also be shown that the utilitarian method of determining, producing, and distributing pleasure is impracticable. If then the method will not work for pleasure, and I've tried to show that in other publications, if this method will not work for pleasure, all the less can it calculate love.

Bentham's method of calculation presupposes the identification of units of pleasure. Whether we wish to count pebbles or pints, we must be able to identify a single pebble and a single pint. We may then discover that a quart of ice cream is exactly twice a pint. But is the pleasure of eating a quart of ice cream exactly twice the pleasure of eating a pint? Does a movie give one and a half times the pleasure of a television show? What is the unit of pleasure? We can count pints of ice cream, but do we count pints of pleasure or perhaps inches or ounces of pleasure? Without distinct numerable units, calculation is impossible. If now this objection is one unit of impossibility for utilitarianism, the next objection is three or four units of impossibility.

The method requires us not only to count the units of present pleasure, but, in order to select the course of action, utilitarianism requires us to predict the amounts of future pleasure this action will produce. For example, should a college student take a job on a newspaper as a war correspondent, or should he become a professor? Both choices would produce some pleasure. The professor's life will be more calm but will have fewer hardships. The war correspondent will face hardships but his pleasures will be more intense. Which life gives the greater sum total? Can you count it up?

Remember also that thirty years from now your views on what is pleasurable will have changed. Does this moral arithmetic help you decide? Worse yet, the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number requires you to count not only your own future pleasures but also the future pleasures of every member of the human race. It's the greatest good of the greatest number. But can anyone, in order to choose between two actions, seriously claim to predict which one will give the greatest amount of pleasure to a Chinese peasant ten years from now? Yet, unless such calculations can be completed, the greatest good of the greatest number is a meaningless formula.

The usual utilitarian defense against this objection is to rely on some vague general guesses and estimates. But such sloppy arithmetic is insufficient

for any confidence in purely personal matters, let alone in questions of universal scope.

A particular case puts this objection in emphatic form. This is the case of Hitler's massacre of the Jews. The principle of the greatest good for the greatest number is precisely what Hitler needed to justify his brutality. He murdered five million Jews to make ninety million Germans happy – really more than ninety million, for Hitler and utilitarianism looked forward to a thousand year Reich. If anyone should suggest that Hitler wanted only Germans to be happy and was less solicitous about pleasure on a universal scale, we may turn from national socialism to international socialism. Not only is utilitarianism a support for Hitler, it is even a better defense for Lenin and Stalin. It is, indeed, standard liberal left-wing policy.

When Lenin lost interest in the proletariat because he perceived that the working classes would not support a revolution, and transferred his hopes to criminal conspirators, the theory was that these latter were the avant-garde whose massacres would usher in better days for all mankind. Hence, the Ukrainians and later the Tibetans and all the officers of the Polish army must be liquidated for the greatest good of the greatest number. The calculation may have been a little rough and sloppy, but anyone with a sense of the future can see that the sum of pleasure will soon be sufficiently great to overbalance a few temporary pains.

The conclusion is obvious. Utilitarianism does not preserve Fletcher's love from moral vacuity. The bride has no recipe for baking a cake. Nobody has any reason for doing anything. Everyone is free to follow his own individual, irresponsible, irrational preferences. Fletcher prefers occasional idolatry, occasional profanity, occasional murder, not so very occasional adultery, occasional theft, and occasional perjury.

The Toronto School

Situation ethics and the rejection of the Ten Commandments have more recently insinuated their way into supposedly Calvinistic camps. This is the work of certain disciples of Herman Dooyeweerd of

the Free University of Amsterdam. These disciples of Professor Dooyeweerd, located chiefly in Toronto, Canada, have established multiple organizations for the vigorous propagation of their views. To what extent Professor Dooyeweerd approves of his disciples' views is not now under consideration. The point under discussion is the ethical stance of members of the Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship and the other related organizations they have founded. Attention must now be centered on their rejection of the Scriptures, with which rejection Dooyeweerd agrees, and the implications relative to the Ten Commandments, with which the Professor in Amsterdam may or may not agree.

In a small book entitled *Understanding the Scriptures*, A. H. De Graaff, on page two, begins by saying, "You distort the Scriptures when you read them as a collection of objective statements about God and man. They do not contain any rational, general, theological statements about God and his creation. It is not the purpose of the Bible to inform us about the nature of God's being or his attributes" (9). He also adds, "The Scriptures are neither rational nor irrational in character" (18).

All these statements are patently false. The first three are false because the Scriptures say that God is righteous and man is sinful. In saying this the Bible informs us about the nature of God's being and attributes. The last of the four statements is nonsense. To say that the Scriptures are neither rational nor irrational is like saying that the number two is neither odd nor even, or like saying that man is neither mortal nor immortal. To search the Bible for even one statement that is neither rational nor irrational is like going to the zoo to find an animal that is neither vertebrate nor invertebrate.

More directly concerning morality, Dr. De Graaff writes, "Nor does it – the Bible – contain moral applications that tell us how to live the good life – virtues that we share with the humanist" (21). It is true that a Christian does not share any virtue with a humanist because a humanist just cannot have any Christian virtue. But it is false to say that the Bible gives no moral rules. Dr. De Graaff objects to teaching boys and girls in Vacation Bible School

moral lessons about purity, chastity, and Victorian, middle-class American standards. Instead of warning them against the prevalent loose views of sex, we should tell them about irresponsible deforesting, yellow smog, dirty water – and we should tell them these things in "a non-moralistic manner" (26). Apparently dirty water is worse than a dirty mind.

In answer to many objections from Christians Dr. De Graaff repeats, "The Bible does not teach us how to be good and how to avoid being bad" (29). So says Dr. De Graaff. But the Bible says, "All Scripture...is profitable...for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be...completely furnished to every good work." The Bible also says, "Thy word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee."

But Dr. De Graaff plunges on. Speaking of the Ten Commandments (which he strangely says are not commandments at all) he says, "None of them can be literally followed or applied today, for we live in a different period of history in a different culture" (35). Imagine! It is impossible to follow or apply the commandment, Thou shalt not steal, because we live in a different culture. Thou shalt not commit adultery cannot be literally obeyed today because God commanded it in 1500 B. C. This line of thought is incredible. But check the reference: page 35, *Understanding the Scriptures*, De Graaff and Seerveld, Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship, Toronto, Canada. Since none of the Ten Commandments can be literally applied today, Dr. De Graaff suggests that for them we substitute agitation against police brutality (36). Love your neighbor's wife, but hate the police.

There is a further implication. If God's command against adultery is inapplicable in our different culture, why should we suppose that God's covenant with Abraham is applicable? Dr. De Graaff seems to retain some respect for the covenant. Yet how can the Mosaic command against adultery be culturally conditioned in 1500 B. C., while a religious covenant some 500 years earlier escapes such cultural conditioning? A rational thinker might in consistency reject both. A

consistent Christian accepts both. But it takes some explaining to accept the one and reject the other.

In order that no one may suppose Dr. De Graaff to be an anomaly among the disciples of Dooyeweerd and that these criticisms are not relevant to the whole movement, the same ideas are to be noted in the writings of Dr. Calvin Seerveld. In the same volume with Dr. De Graaff, Dr. Seerveld has an interesting section on the exegesis of *Numbers* 22-24. He uses this passage to distinguish three methods of understanding the Scriptures.

The first method is that of evangelical fundamentalists. Dr. Seerveld has collected phrases from Alexander Maclaren, W. B. Riley, Clarence Edward Macartney, and others who note that (1) Balaam had a strong passion for earthly honor; (2) he wanted the best of two incompatible worlds; and (3) he beat his ass unmercifully. From these points the fundamentalist concludes that we should not put earthly honor first among our choices, that we should seek righteousness first of all, and that we should not be cruel to dumb animals. Dr. Seerveld continues his list with a number of such applications and moral lessons.

The second method is beside the present purpose. The third method Dr. Seerveld assigns to the "remnants of staunch orthodox churches," and he cites Hengstenberg and Calvin. This method specializes in doctrine, rather than in ethical application. It notes that *Numbers* 23:19 is a clear statement of God's immutability. And there is considerably more in the passage.

Dr. Seerveld disapproves of these methods. He challenges their hidden *aprioris*; he suggests that they miss the richness of Scripture, and mislead fledgling readers who use them (67). As for the fundamentalist method of moral application, Dr. Seerveld says, "Balaam's invitation from Balak is not remotely within my experience as a Christian school teacher because my twentieth century situation and the ancient parallel made abstractly ideal jibe of sorts only after a dozen qualifications...the binding force is lost" (68). Thus "the world upside down changing message of

Numbers 22-24 is reduced to a mess of moralistic pottage" (69).

The method of the Reformers, the orthodox Calvinistic method, is equally bad. This "Scholastic reading of the Scriptures is always after truths that can be theoretically formulated and held to be universally valid, consistent Bible teaching against all attack" (74). This Reformed method is bad, says Dr. Seerveld, because "it removes the reader half a step from the convicting comfort and humbling facing God's love and anger brings, removes the reader half a step away from existential confrontation with the living Word of God and asks him to comprehend these realities in codified propositional dogmas" (75).

But is the Reformation method, the method of studying and learning what the Bible says, such a bad method? Is it not rather commendable? Let it be noted that the Apostle Peter at the beginning of his second epistle says, "Grace to you and peace be multiplied by the knowledge of God" (3:18). The Apostle John also emphasizes doctrine and propositions. Without mentioning existentialism or irrational confrontations, John, in fact Jesus himself says, "If any one guards my doctrine, he shall not see death, ever" (8:51). Another verse that makes Christianity depend on an understanding of and an assent to propositions is, "If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me; but if you do not believe his writings, how can you believe my words?" (5:47). Jesus also said, "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life" (6:63). The Reformation use of the Bible, like the evangelical fundamentalist method also "is interested in the practical lessons we can learn from it." The Westminster divines would have rejected Dr. Seerveld's charge of reducing the Bible to a "mess of moralistic pottage." Their careful and very detailed exposition of the Ten Commandments in the *Larger Catechism* shows how greatly they valued morality.

But Dr. Seerveld in his remarks on *Numbers* says, "To make Balaam a warning model for the reader is to distort the nature of biblical narrative and ignore the historical solidity of God's disclosure. Scripture

never gives biographic snatches to serve as ethical models" (68).

In contrast with Seerveld's view of the Bible stands the practice of the Apostle Peter. Speaking of the false teachers who introduced heresies instead of accepting orthodox propositions, and who lived in contempt of Dr. Seerveld's moralistic pottage, the Apostle writes, "having forsaken the right way they went astray, having followed the way of Balaam, son of Beor, who loved the hire of wrong-doing" (2 *Peter* 2:15ff.). Here the Apostle most assuredly uses "biographic snatches to serve as ethical models." If a modern exegete condemns the Apostle's use of the Bible, then the modern exegete must have gone astray – not the Apostle.

Conclusion

Now, for a short conclusion let it be noted, as was indicated four paragraphs back, that the Scriptures stress doctrine, information, and knowledge. Second, let it be noted that this information and knowledge includes rational statements about the nature and attributes of God. Third, let it finally be noted that the Bible teaches morality. While the outside world founders in moral perplexity and considers the murder of unborn children as desirable, while the apostate churches organize congregations for homosexuals and make contributions of fifty-thousand dollars to a prostitutes' union, we who believe the Bible can rely on the Ten Commandments. In contrast with a great amount of contemporary counseling, let us emphasize the exposition of those commandments as it is found in the *Westminster Larger Catechism*. The Puritans lived by the Ten Commandments. Our choice today, then, is between the colonial Puritans and the contemporary impuritans.

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

May, June 1982

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

The Ethics of Abortion

Gordon H. Clark

Parts of this paper were given in connection with a demonstration before Erlanger Hospital in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Today many hospitals, institutions which are supposed to save life, permit and even encourage their doctors to kill innocent babies. They tear the babies limb from limb or sometimes the nurses have thrown the living babies into garbage cans. Abortion is legal because the Supreme Court in Washington, D.C. said so. A majority of nine men, without any amending of the Constitution or any referendum of the population, but all by themselves, negated the legal right of innocent persons to live. Having rejected God, they wish to assume His prerogatives.

One argument abortionists frequently use to defend themselves against the charge of murder is the claim that the baby is not a human being. But if the baby in the womb is not human, what is it? Is it canine? Is it feline? I think that some babies born thirty or forty years ago have turned out to be asinine.

Another argument which abortionists use to defend their murder of innocent infants is that the government must not base its legislation on religious principles. Legislation should always be based on irreligious principles. No doubt you have all heard that the government should never enforce morality. This may be one reason why many abortionists oppose the death penalty for murder. This is consistent, for if murder be a capital offense,

the abortionists, both doctors and mothers, are in great danger. But if a government cannot enforce morality, rape would be as legal as murder. Nor could the government prohibit theft. Note carefully that the same Ten Commandments which condemn murder condemn theft also. When irreligious bureaucrats and secular judges prohibit the display of the Ten Commandments on the walls of a public school, they erase theft as well as murder from the list of crimes. Opposition to theft is just as religious as opposition to murder. Christianity condemns both murder and theft because both are condemned by God.

If atheism is to be the law of the land, there can be no laws at all to support morality, for there is no morality apart from the laws of God. I would like to make it clear that sociology, statistics, psychology, or any empirical science can never determine moral norms. Secular science at best can discover what people do; but it cannot discover what people ought to do. From observational premises no normative conclusion follows. Any attempt to define morality by observational science is a logical fallacy. Science can invent new ways of killing people, but science can never determine who should be killed. It cannot determine who should not be killed. It can only invent more effective ways of doing what somebody for some other reason wants to do.

The controversy between those who consider life sacred and those who kill babies is not a controversy between two systems of ethics, as if we

had one system and the abortionists, secularists, and atheists had a different system. The point is that they cannot have any system of ethics at all. Scientific observation – what they sometimes call *reason* as opposed to what they misunderstand by *faith* – cannot establish any values whatever. Science often produces wonders but one thing it cannot do: It cannot establish the value of anything, even the value of itself.

Repudiation of divine laws is destructive of all morality. Abortion is immoral. Rejecting God, the abortionists try to justify their cruelty to babies, while at the same time condemning burglary, by an appeal to a social consensus. To this attempt to condemn theft while justifying murder, there is a single answer with two parts.

First, no social consensus has been established. The Supreme Court alone, nine men out of two hundred million, legalized the killing of babies on its own arbitrary authority. This is the autocracy of evil dictators.

Then, second, social consensus cannot determine what is right or wrong. The social consensus of the Spartans in antiquity and of at least some Indian tribes in North America condoned theft and even praised it. Before the Belgians took over the Congo a century or so ago, social consensus approved of cannibalism. The fact that various societies have considered theft and cannibalism to be right, does not prove that theft and cannibalism are right – nor the murder of babies, either. One can perhaps with relative ease discover what groups of people think is right; but social consensus does not make anything right or wrong.

So far as I can see, the only pertinent difference between the abortionists here and the cannibals in the Congo is that the abortionists do not eat the babies. They throw them in the garbage can. What a waste of good meat in these times of famine. Of course the meat would have to be inspected by the USDA, but I can see no reason why, on abortionist principles – or lack of principles – I see no reason for prohibiting the eating of human flesh. A nice tender baby might taste better than a Cornish hen. Or if the mothers, for no good reason, do not want

to eat their babies, they could at least send them to alleviate starvation in the Third World. Of course babies are a little small, like Cornish hens. But if the Supreme Court can legalize the murder of infants, it can as easily legalize the murder of adults. Indeed some groups already propose the murder of the elderly. Abortion logically justifies the murder of anyone. Hence the Supreme Court could legalize the murder of all who support the right of life and so produce a unanimous social consensus.

If anyone thinks that this proposal is extreme, be it noted that Hitler's National Socialism and Stalin's International Socialism attempted just that. Hitler massacred the Jews and Stalin massacred the Ukrainians and hordes of others. And aside from historical examples, rampant murder is well within the logical range of atheistic abortionism. There is a determined effort in this nation to reduce orthodox Christians to the status of second class citizens. Their recent interest in politics and law has been severely condemned. Even Barry Goldwater, supposedly a conservative of the conservatives, showed his anti-religious bigotry in denouncing the pro-life movement. In many public schools the secularist view is sustained by government imposition and the pro-life view is denied a hearing. Smut is legal, and even required reading, but the Ten Commandments are prohibited. The end of this, unless stopped, is the same persecution now practiced under Communism.

We must try to stop this atheistic program. And one place, a good place to start, is abortions.

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

January, February 1985

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

Abortion, the Christian, and the State

John W. Robbins

I'm pleased to be able to speak to you tonight about an issue that concerns all of us, the murder of millions of children each year. Approximately 1.6 million American babies will be murdered by their mothers and doctors this year. Four times as many Americans will be killed by abortion as by cancer in 1984; ten times as many will be killed by abortion as by strokes; and fourteen times as many will be killed by abortion as by pneumonia and pulmonary diseases.

When we compare the number of abortion deaths to the number of deaths by non-medical causes in the United States, the abortion statistics become even more appalling. Forty-four thousand Americans will die on highways this year; thirty-six times that number will die in hospitals and abortion clinics. An estimated 25,000 adults will be murdered in 1984; sixty-four times as many unborn children will be murdered. The number of deaths from all causes except abortion in 1984 will be almost 2 million. When we include abortion deaths, the number almost doubles to 3.6 million.

Perhaps some historical perspective would also give us a better understanding of how popular this form of murder has become. In the 210 years of our national history, from 1775 to 1984, 1.2 million Americans have died in nine wars; 1.2 million American babies die every nine months, 4,400 each day, 183 each hour. This month of October, more Americans will be killed by abortion than were killed during World War I.

Worldwide, experts tell us that from 30 million to 55 million little murders are committed each year. The people and government of the Soviet Union alone murder 12 million unborn children each year. Using the most conservative estimates of the number of abortions worldwide, 1 billion unborn children have been murdered since World War II.

Compared with these facts, the atrocities committed by the Nazis, and even those committed by the worldwide Communist movement, seem relatively minor. The victims of Nazism are estimated at 15 million, including 6 million Jews; the victims of Communism since 1917 are estimated at 125 million. But the number of abortions worldwide since 1945 exceeds those combined totals by a factor of seven.

But the number of abortions is only part of the problem. Experimentation on living babies is being widely practiced; some of our teaching hospitals have replicated the worst horrors of Nazism during World War II. In 1971, doctors at the Yale-New Haven Medical Center dissected a baby boy without anesthesia. On April 15, 1973, the *Washington Post* reported that Dr. Gerald Gaull, chief of pediatrics at the New York State Institute for Basic Research in Mental Retardation "injected radioactive chemicals into umbilical cords of fetuses While the heart is still beating he removes their brains, lungs, liver, and kidneys for study." Our scientific priesthood is offering human sacrifices to the great god Science

on a scale so foul and bloody that the ancient practices of the pagans seem more humane.

The twentieth century is the bloodiest century in recorded human history. No period in history is more characterized by war, totalitarianism, and mass murder. As Christians we must be concerned to find out how this occurred and how it can be stopped.

The Theological Background

To answer these questions correctly, we must become familiar with the recent history of philosophy and theology. The Supreme Court's infamous abortion decisions of 1973 were not made in a vacuum; the thinking of modern theologians and philosophers made the decision almost predictable. If you listen to the slogans of the mothers and doctors who have murdered babies, and read the Court decisions on this issue, you can hear the echoes of philosophers who wrote their books a century or more ago.

In the 1970s, Linda Bird Francke conducted interviews with dozens of women who had aborted their babies. A telltale thread that runs throughout the interviews is the use of the words "feel," "felt," and "feelings."

One woman reported: "I never felt we were doing anything inhumane."

Another said: "I never felt anything about the fetus."

Still others reported: "I didn't have any guilt feelings." "I didn't really think of it as a baby." "It's no different from a plant, you know." "I only thought about myself." "It's much easier not to think about the fetus, after all.... The world would be a lot better place if there were fewer babies in it." "I really don't have any strong feelings that when a woman is first pregnant that there's any kind of reality about a 'human baby' inside her. I think that she makes it real if she so chooses."

Listen closely, and you will hear the ideas of Charles Darwin—"it's no different from a plant you know"—Sigmund Freud—"I didn't have any

guilt feelings"—the Reverend Thomas Malthus—"The world would be a lot better place if there were fewer babies in it"—and Jean-Paul Sartre—"I think she makes it real if she so chooses."

Many of these mothers were guided by their feelings, not by rational thought. This is the result of their being taught that life is deeper than logic; that life is green, theory is gray; that the heart has its reasons that reason know nothing of; that experience, particularly emotional experience, is a better guide than thought. All these notions can be traced to various philosophers and schools of philosophy: to Jean-Paul Sartre, the existentialist; to Friedrich Schleiermacher and Soren Kierkegaard, founders of modern religion; to Friedrich Nietzsche, and to John Dewey.

All these philosophers and philosophies have one thing in common: an unmitigated contempt for Christianity. A little bit of that contempt may be seen in these words from a woman who had murdered her baby: "It was not a question of morality. We had no question of this is immoral, or we were killing a fetus, or any of this mythology."

The notions of morality and murder are dismissed as mythology. After all, if the God of the Old Testament is a myth, then the Ten Commandments are no more than Jewish tribal taboos, which we, thank God, have transcended. It is no accident, but an example that ought to frighten us to death, that the nation that first developed higher criticism of the Bible and then was influenced by neo-orthodox theologians and their hatred of logic is also the nation that brought Hitler to power in the 1930s. It is not only the 8 million American mothers who have had abortions who have rejected the Bible. Our whole culture has been suffused with errors that must be analyzed and refuted if we are to restore civilization to America.

Modern Religion

For example, the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights said in 1980: "Several religious denominations, such as American Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, United Methodist, Disciples of Christ, United Church of Christ,

Reform and Conservative Judaism, and the Unitarian Universalist Association support this right as a matter of individual conscience and privacy." The American Baptist Churches have officially adopted the statement: "We affirm freedom of conscience for all." The Disciples of Christ denomination has stated, "we affirm the principle of individual liberty, freedom of individual conscience, and the sacredness of life for all persons." The clergy of the United States have rejected the Bible. Their moral authority justifying murder is individual conscience. Objective moral authority, such as the Bible, is dismissed as subjective, and the result is the moral anarchy we see around us. How many times have you heard someone say, echoing Jiminy Cricket, "Let your conscience be your guide"? But conscience furnishes no information on which we might base our actions; Scripture alone furnishes that information.

Another central tenet of modern religion is the notion that sincerity covers a multitude of sins: "It doesn't matter what you believe so long as you're sincere." That idiotic idea came from an obscure Danish philosopher, Soren Kierkegaard. One of his disciples, the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Episcopal Bishop of New York, applies the notion to abortion: "Few if any women make the decision casually to terminate an unwanted pregnancy. When the decision is made in favor of abortion, it can be as thoughtful and as moral as the decision in favor of childbirth." So if you sincerely believe you are doing right by killing your baby, then you are doing right. Sincerity makes it so.

The Importance of Language

By the grace of God, people's thinking wasn't always as stupid as it is today. Between 1860 and 1880 the nation's regular physicians led a crusade against abortion and succeeded in getting legislation passed by most state governments making abortion a crime. In 1871, before the philosophical irrationalism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries could affect their thinking, members of the American Medical Association denounced physicians who performed abortions in the following words: "We shall discover an enemy in

the camp ... we shall witness as hideous a view of moral deformity as the evil spirit could present It is false brethren we have to fear; men who are false to their professions, false to principle, false to honor, false to humanity, false to God...." They went on to describe physician-abortionists as "these modern Herods," "educated assassins," "Monsters of iniquity," and "wolves in sheep's clothing." The physicians were clear on their moral authority and did not hesitate to impose their beliefs. They wrote: " 'Thou shalt not kill.' This commandment is given to all, and applies to all without exception." They warned of "the uplifted hand of an avenging God [that] will suddenly fall on [the] guilty head [of an abortionist]."

When was the last time you heard anyone described as an "educated assassin" or a "modern Herod"? Today we are too polite, of course, to engage in name-calling, even when the names are accurate. But I don't think what is involved here is courtesy at all; it is, rather, an attempt to evade recognizing the truth of the matter. The A. M. A. said this about the language it used in its 1871 report:

If our language has appeared to some strong and severe, or even intemperate, let the gentlemen pause for a moment and reflect on the importance and gravity of our subject, and believe that to do justice to the undertaking, free from all improper feeling or selfish considerations, was the end and aim of our efforts. We had to deal with human life. In a matter of less importance we could entertain no compromise. An honest judge on the bench would call things by their proper names. We could do not less.

Neither could John the Baptist or the apostle Paul or Jesus Christ, if you read the Bible. Yet how many preachers, let alone doctors, engage in calling things by their proper names? Virtually none. The Reverend J. Morgan Smith gave us one reason: the fear of men. In 1880, responding to criticisms by doctors that the nation's clergy were uninterested in abortion, he said: "There are obvious reasons why the pulpit should not always be used to denounce crimes of this nature. To do it continually would be

to turn the pulpit and church into a place that many people would not like to visit." One must never offend the congregation. That violates the first rule of homiletics.

Two Modern Religionists

There is the position taken by the chaplain of the U. S. Senate, Dr. Richard Halverson. When asked his view of abortion, this was his response:

It's just very difficult: I don't really know the answer. Perhaps part of the explanation is that all of us hear God's truth a little differently. We hear it in terms of the way we were made, our backgrounds, our genes. The result is that the body of Christ is very diverse. And I suppose there is a sense in which we have to favor individualism within the church.

Dr. Halverson is the former senior minister of Fourth Presbyterian Church near Washington, D. C., a church that belongs to a presbytery that accepted a minister four years ago who denied the deity of Christ.

There is also John Taylor, Anglican Bishop of Winchester, who composed this prayer to be used after an abortion:

Heavenly Father, You are the giver of life

And you share with us the care of the life that is
given

Into your hands we commit in trust

The developing life that we have cut short.

Look kindly in judgment on the decision that we
have made

And assure us in all our uncertainty

That your love for us can never change.

Amen.

Quite frankly, I would trade any of these so-called ministers for the doctors of the 1870s. At least the

doctors had some sense of what the Bible actually said.

I hope that you are beginning to see that theology has a direct effect on matters of morality and politics. The theology of the nineteenth-century doctors was much closer to the truth than the theology of twentieth-century clergymen. The Anglican Bishop obviously believes and teaches that God is a God of unconditional love. The chaplain of the Senate, Richard Halverson, whose nomination to that position was applauded by so-called "evangelical" Christians, has made the relationship between his theology and his politics quite clear: "I would say right away that I oppose abortion, but I also believe very strongly that God endowed us with free will and the responsibility of free choice. [I] have no desire to influence legislation."

The Impact of Evolution

Perhaps the idea having the greatest impact on today's thinking is the dogma of evolution articulated during the nineteenth century.

The practice of starving less-than-perfect babies and aborting infants that amniocentesis says are defective is simply putting into practice the Darwinian notion of survival of the fittest. One of the leading evolutionists of the nineteenth century, Ernst Haeckel, believed that "We are not bound under all circumstances to maintain and prolong life, especially when it becomes utterly useless." His disciples are found throughout America, from the Yale-New Haven Medical Center to Bloomington, Indiana. Haeckel declared that the "destruction of abnormal new-born infants could not be rationally classified as murder One should regard it rather, as a practice of advantage both to the infants destroyed and to the community." His thinking and his books, which were enormously popular in Germany at the turn of the century, created the public opinion that made Hitler possible. After all, Hitler began his killing by authorizing physicians to put defective human beings to death. Later the definition of *defective* was expanded to include Jews, Poles, Gypsies, and others.

We must thank the evolutionists for eliminating the ideas of ethics and the uniqueness of man. Haeckel wrote that the precepts of moral law, like everything else, "rest on biological grounds and have been developed in a natural way." Therefore there can be no independent, intellectual, objective, rational, or ethical moral order of the world which could serve as a guide to mankind. It is to biology, not revelation, that we owe moral precepts; and those moral precepts do not forbid abortion or euthanasia.

The rejection of revelation, of Christianity, has always had the same results wherever it has occurred: Mass murder in this world, eternal punishment in the next. Plato and Aristotle endorsed abortion and infanticide, and both forms of murder were common in ancient Greece. In Rome, the father had the power of life and death over his children; today, the mother has that power. It was only the coming of Christianity that ended those practices, and it is only the disappearance of Christianity in the twentieth century that has permitted their resurgence. Murder was permitted not only in Greece and Rome, however. The Chinese, long before the Communists took over, put their baby girls to death. In Madagascar, babies born in March or April, during the last week of a month, or on a Wednesday or a Friday were exposed, drowned, or buried alive. Paganism has always and everywhere had the same bloody results. It is only in nations that have been influenced by Christianity that infanticide and abortion were, until recently, treated as crimes.

The rise of science and evolution in the nineteenth century are the primary causes of the mass murder of the twentieth century. The British philosopher Bertrand Russell understood this quite well in 1931. He wrote:

Christian ethics is in certain fundamental respects opposed to the scientific ethic which is gradually growing. Christianity emphasizes the importance of the individual soul and is not prepared to sanction the sacrifice of an innocent man for the sake of some ulterior good to the majority The new ethic which is gradually growing in connection with

scientific technique will have its eye upon society rather than upon the individual. It will have little use for the superstition of guilt and punishment, but will be prepared to make individuals suffer for the public good without inventing reasons purporting to show that they deserve to suffer. In this sense it will be ruthless, and according to traditional ideas immoral, but the change will have come about naturally through the habit of viewing society as a whole rather than as a collection of individuals.... [M]en have hitherto shrunk from inflicting sacrifices which were to be unjust. I think it probable that the scientific idealists of the future will be free from this scruple, not only in time of war, but in time of peace also. In overcoming the difficulties of the opposition that they will encounter, they will find themselves organized into an oligarchy of opinion such as is found in the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R.

Evolution, taught in the public schools, has created a generation of young people, worldwide, who believe that they are animals. Man is merely the most complex of mutants; he is not the image of God. If one believes this, then a great deal follows. Professor Peter Singer of Australia writes with glee of the passing of Christianity, which he calls the "sanctity-of-life" view. He says:

Whatever the future holds, it is likely to prove impossible to restore in full the sanctity-of-life view. The philosophical foundations of this view have been knocked asunder. We can no longer base our ethics on the idea that human beings are a special form of creation, made in the image of God, singled out from all other animals, and alone possessing an immortal soul. Our better understanding of our own nature has bridged the gulf that was once thought to lie between ourselves and other species, so why should we believe that the mere fact that a human being is a member of the species *homo sapiens* endows its life with some unique, almost infinite, value?

Once the religious mumbo-jumbo surrounding the term "human" has been stripped away, we may continue to see normal members of our species as possessing greater capacities of rationality, self-consciousness, communication, and so on, than members of any other species; but we will not regard as sacrosanct the life of each and every member of our species, no matter how limited its capacity for intelligent and even conscious life may be. If we compare a severely defective human infant with a non human animal, a dog or a pig, for example, we will often find the non human to have superior capacities, both actual and potential, for rationality, self-consciousness, communication, and anything else that can plausibly be considered morally significant. Only the fact that the defective infant is a member of the species *homo sapiens* leads it to be treated differently from the dog or pig. Species membership alone, however, is not morally relevant ...

Ironically the sanctity with which we endow all human life often works to the detriment of those unfortunate humans whose lives hold no prospect except suffering. A dog or a pig, dying slowly and painfully, will be mercifully released from its misery.

A Christian Counter-attack

How can we fight this evil? The first thing to realize is that we must fight as Christians, not as pagans. That means that we must use Christian language and Christian ideas in fighting the lies of secularists. The unborn child has been called, by both proponents and opponents of abortion, a fetus, a *conceptus*, potential life, gametic materials, protoplasmic rubbish, the products of conception, a piece of tissue, a part of the mother's body, and a chunk of tissue. There is no reason to use any of these terms. Even the least objectionable obscure the fact that we are talking about children. We ought to be aware that there is a principle of language similar to a law of economics: Bad terms

drive out good. We must be careful to use the correct terms to refer to unborn children.

But the matter cannot rest there. As Christians we ought not to appeal to human rights, natural rights, inalienable rights, or the right to life. Not only are such notions not found in the Bible, they are logically incoherent. If man possesses inalienable rights, then no punishment is possible. If a human being possesses an inalienable right to life, then it is wrong to execute a murderer—murderers have rights to life, too. If man possesses an inalienable right to liberty, then it is wrong to imprison him for his crime—criminals have inalienable rights, too. And if man possesses an inalienable right to property, then it is wrong to impose a fine on a criminal or make a thief pay restitution. This explains why some right to life groups also oppose capital punishment and advocate pacifism; they are simply being consistent with their incorrect assumptions about human rights. If they were fully consistent, they would have to oppose punishment of any sort, not just capital punishment, for the ideas of punishment and human rights are logically incompatible. The notion of human rights, logically developed, excludes justice, which is precisely why The Supreme Court made the murderous decisions it did in January 1973.

What is found in the Bible, what is logically sensible, and what these various phrases about human rights are designed to obscure, is the idea of divine law, specifically the Ten Commandments. It is not because a baby has an inalienable right to life that it is wrong to kill him; it is because God has said, You shall do no murder. Our moral authority is divine, not human. It consists of revealed commands, not invented rights. One of the dangers of using pagan terms—and even Francis Schaeffer did it in his book *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?*—is that of conceding the argument at the beginning. After all, it was on the basis of a theory of human rights—specifically the right to privacy—that the Supreme Court decided a mother has the right to kill her children.

Second, we must recognize that abortion is a religious issue, despite what some leading anti-abortionists would like us to believe. If one were to

draw a map of the world showing those nations which Christianity has influenced the most, and draw another map showing those nations where abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia have been outlawed—and hospitals, orphanages, and charities most widely developed—the maps would be virtually identical. So when Francis Schaeffer, or the conservative columnist Jeffrey Hart, or a Roman Catholic Bishop tell you that abortion is not a religious issue, they are ignorant of the facts. Frequently, anti-abortionists appeal to a common morality that runs through all religions, but there is no such common morality. True, almost all religions, and perhaps even every person, including murderers, condemn murder—at least their own; but each religion, and each person, defines murder differently. Christianity defines murder as the willful taking of innocent human life. Other religions say unborn children and infants are not human. Some societies not only permit murder, they practice it heartily. Ours is one of these. There is no moral consensus, no common morality, and the existence of an active pro-abortion lobby is unmistakable evidence of this, yet some anti-abortionists seem unable to get the point. There is only one moral authority, the Bible, and it is our job as Christians to impose its morality on the society in which we live.

This brings us to the third issue, that of imposing beliefs. Christians have been scared to death by the pagans who argue that one must never impose one's religious beliefs on others. Tell that to the 16 million American babies who have had the religious beliefs of seven old men on the Supreme Court imposed on them. In any civilized society, religious beliefs will be imposed; morality will be legislated. Civil law is nothing more than legislated morality. The physicians of the late nineteenth century, if not the clergy, did not hesitate to impose the Sixth Commandment on everyone in society, whether he professed to be a Christian or not. We must reject the notion, and I quote from David Little, professor of Religion (what else?) and Sociology at the University of Virginia: "In a pluralistic society, it is simply not appropriate in the public forum to give as areas on for a law or policy the fact that it is derived from the 'Word of God' or is dictated by the Bible." On the contrary, the *only* good reason

for a law or policy is that it is deduced by good and necessary consequences from the Bible.

As Christians we are commanded to do everything in the name and to the glory of God, and to bring every thought into captivity to Christ. The pagans want us to talk like Christians inside the church walls, and like pagans in the halls of government. If a Christian does that, he has betrayed Christ. The Bible claims to have a monopoly on truth, and it is about time that Christians began to talk and act as though they believed the Bible.

Abortion and the Constitution

In addition to finding out what the Bible says, all Christians, and especially Christian lawyers, ought to learn a little more about the Constitution as well. There are two doctrines of law that explain why the Supreme Court decisions of January 1973 have been regarded as the law of the land, but there is no basis for those doctrines in the Constitution. The first of these is the notion of judicial review, that the courts, particularly the Supreme Court, have the exclusive power of finding a law unconstitutional. The second is the notion that the Constitution means what the Supreme Court says it means.

To take the second first, Charles Evans Hughes, later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, stated in 1907 that "the Constitution is what the judges say it is." On the contrary, the Supreme Court is what the Constitution says *it* is. We have adopted a Roman Catholic view of the Constitution: The Supreme Court is to the Constitution as the Pope is to the Bible. They—and he—give us the infallible interpretation of the documents. We must return to the original Protestant view that is found in the Constitution itself.

As for judicial review, such different leaders as Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln agree that the power of judicial review is not granted to the Supreme Court. I quote from Jefferson:

To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions [is] a very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under despotism of an oligarchy The Constitution has

erected no such single tribunal, knowing that, to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments coequal and co-sovereign within themselves.

that my baby is much better off in Heaven with God than on earth with me. Unless you have been through this situation, which obviously you have not, you can never know what it is like to go through with the act. The Bible warns us not to judge lest we be judged. Please, please do not play God and repeal these laws.

The Theology of Murder

Finally, we must understand that we do not fight against flesh and blood, but against spiritual wickedness in high places. The pagans are very powerful in America, but they would not be half so powerful were it not for the religionists who teach pagan ideas as Christianity. Working for a member of Congress, I have the opportunity to see many types of thinking that I might otherwise miss. We get a lot of mail from all over the country, and I would like to quote from one of those letters. It reads:

A year ago last January, I unfortunately found myself in the position of being pregnant and knowing I could not have the child. I elected to have an abortion because I was making less than \$1,200 per month at the time and I knew I could not support myself and a child. I did not want to attempt to go on welfare because I believe that anyone who can work should. No one on the face of this earth can say whether or not I committed murder. ONLY God can or can't. I prayed and prayed for guidance and I found I was led to have the abortion. After the act, I felt very guilty and very depressed. I went to visit a Presbyterian minister who sat and talked with me. He did not condemn or condone. He explained that modern religion had unfortunately adopted the view of situations only having black or white sides with no gray areas. He told me that he served on the board of an agency dealing with mentally retarded children and, in his opinion, it was more of a sin to put these children away to be forgotten rather than to have had them never born. I think about my child often and wonder what he or she would be like. But, I know

Please note this woman's words, for we can learn a great deal from her letter: "I unfortunately found myself ... pregnant..." She attempts to obscure her responsibility for the actions that caused her pregnancy: She found herself pregnant, as though she had nothing to do with it. She just woke up one morning pregnant. Irresponsibility is one of the central notions of modern theology. After she had sought to assert her irresponsibility, she makes it explicit in these words: "No one on the face of this earth can say whether or not I committed murder. Only God can or can't." Now I wish pointedly to state that anyone on the face of this earth, armed with the truth, can say whether or not she committed murder. She murdered her baby. She confessed to it.

She believes, and at the end of her letter she even misquotes the Bible, that we should not judge lest we be judged. But we ought to tell this deluded and evil woman, and anyone else who thinks that we must not pass moral judgment on people and their actions lest we be judged, that we will all be judged. It is appointed unto man once to die, and after that the judgment. This woman is demanding a moral blank check in order to get away with what she has done, and she is appealing to our own natural and sinful desires to escape judgment also. As Christians, we must never fail to pronounce moral judgment, to judge righteous judgment, as the Bible says. Only by judging, by distinguishing right from wrong, good from evil, white from black, can we hope to be faithful to the commandments of Christ.

But the woman continues: "I prayed and prayed for guidance and I found I was led to have the abortion." Here is a murder directly attributable to the belief that God gives guidance outside the pages of the Bible. Many times I have heard Christians say that God has led them to do this or that, when

what they should have said is that they have a warm feeling or a hunch or an unsanctified desire to do this or that. Perhaps you have heard of people "laying out fleeces" or asking for a sign from God. This is almost as Christian as reading tea leaves or consulting ouija boards. Let me repeat myself: The Bible has a monopoly on truth. It alone furnishes us with guidance, and it says quite clearly, unequivocally, and repeatedly, you shall do no murder. The failure of modern preachers to teach *sola Scriptura*—the Bible alone—must be blamed for this murder and countless other even more horrible events.

Finally, please note what the woman says about the Presbyterian minister she visited for counseling: "He did not condemn or condone." To that only one response is appropriate: "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

Now, to answer the two questions I posed at the beginning of this talk: How did this occur? How can it be stopped? It occurred because those who professed Christ have betrayed him. They have been subverted by secular philosophy, by traditions of men, and by principles of this world. This mass murder can be stopped only by Christians who boldly witness to the truth. It cannot be stopped by compromising either our faith or our practice. It cannot be stopped by offering the world a diluted gospel designed to offend no one. "Modern Religion" offends no one but God. Christianity, if boldly, clearly, and fully preached as it was in the first century and in the sixteenth, will once again turn the world upside down—or, more accurately, right side up. Only then will the little murders end.