

### **Let This Mind Be In You, Parts One through Four by John Quade**

Scripture tells us clearly, that in order to be Christ-like, we must learn to think and reason as Christ did. This does not mean that we are to be omniscient or to take on the extent of God's attributes. We are told, however, to "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus:..." *Phil. 2:5*, and Paul says that, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

The closer we get to this state of thinking in interpreting the world about us, the more we glorify God. The problem is, modern Christians do not think in such terms because their Christianity occupies one part of their mind and thought, while the worldly side occupies another. This is what Dr. Rushdoony has called, 'intellectual schizophrenia.' We know that a mind or house divided against itself cannot stand, or be effective against the world's ideas.

Many Christians make a great deal of the literal interpretation of the Scripture, but when it comes to taking into captivity every thought, they divide their minds into the secular and profane and thus live in intellectual schizophrenia and a constant state of contradiction and what is worse, they never know it.

Recently on a tour stop back east, I was cornered in the hall by a group of people and their pastor, all from the same church. They proceeded to beat me about the head and shoulders with something I had said during an earlier address to the group, which was: "One may be a pre-millennialist and totally committed to the 'rapture fever, scare and share' doctrines that are being taught in the churches today, but one cannot at the same time work for reform without contradicting himself."

The pastor and his group proceeded to argue that they were both pre-mil, rapture fever types and also worked for reform, which is why they were at Our conference.

Note carefully, I did not say one could not work for reform if he were a pre-mil, rapture fever type, but that, one could not be consistently pre-mil, rapture fever, etc., and also work for reform.

My point had to do with consistent thinking, not whether one could in fact do or not do a thing. To this day, I still hold that one cannot - consistently - look for the Lord's return next Wednesday at 12:15 or 12:28, and still work for the reform of the world about him..

As a footnote to this incident, I received a message from one of the pastor's people who was present during the incident and he said that, time brought the pastor to his senses and my prediction came true. Given enough time, the errors of one's thinking will manifest themselves whether we like it or not.

The point in bringing up this incident is to illustrate that today, with all the intellectual tools at man's disposal, Christians are typically the most inconsistent, self-contradictory, and self-refuting thinkers of the day. Yet, these characteristics are supposed to be indicative of humanistic thought, not Christian thought.

If this movement we are involved in is to have any real long term success, then a radical change must take place in the quality of Christian thought if we are to have any long-term hope of reformation and reconstruction.

Two men who have perhaps, more than any others in America, pointed us in the right direction and to right thinking as Christians - are Dr. Cornelius Van Til, former Professor of Apologetics at Westminster Seminary, in Philadelphia, and Dr. Rousas John Rushdoony, founder of the Chalcedon Foundation in Vallecito, California, who is recognized as the father of Christian Reconstruction, the fastest growing movement of its kind in Christendom around the world.

In this article I want to focus on the thinking of Dr. Van Til, who passed on to be with the Lord a few years ago, on a Good Friday. His works indeed live after him in the minds and hearts of millions of laymen and also in the present works of many men of the cloth.

I met Dr. Van Til just a few years before his death and with Dr. Rushdoony, they have had a greater impact on my thinking than all the others I've read outside Scripture. I love them both as fathers in the faith. It is my belief that these two men will, in the future, be recognized as the men that initiated the New Reformation now beginning in the land. We owe them both a great deal and ought to be on Our knees thanking God for His blessing us with their great learning (see Page fourteen for a sample of Rushdoony).

Though Van Til confined himself to apologetics, i.e., the defense of the faith, his thought was so fundamental that it sparked a new philosophy for Christians. Van Til's apologetics, when applied to philosophy is called Christian Presuppositional Philosophy, for reasons that will become clearer as we progress. His most important works are, "The Defense of the Faith," and "Common Grace." His widest influence on the greatest number of people, however, has come through his class syllabi, short works that summarize his teaching in his apologetics classes at Westminster.

Van Til begins with a very simple idea that has a very far reaching impact on every area of Christian thought. Basically, it is this: all systems of thought or ideas can be reduced to one of two starting points or, presuppositions as he called them that must be in the thinkers mind in order for him to say what he does. For example, one does not say 'praise the Lord Jesus,' unless one's ultimate starting point or presupposition is Christian.

Thus, it does not matter whether one is a Christian or not; all ideas are derived ultimately from one of the two fundamental starting points or, presuppositions. Regardless of which presupposition one begins with, if one is consistent, his presupposition will govern the meaning of his ideas and what he believes and how he will act on his belief. In a sense, over time and history, one becomes what his presupposition is.

Thus, one's presupposition predestines the nature and meaning of one's life. Von Hayek, the noted Austrian economists said something similar when he said that 'all ideas have consequences.' Rushdoony described the same thing in his own thought and called it 'the given.' Therefore, everyone begins from some ultimate starting point in all their thinking and that ultimate starting point determines the meaning and consequences of our thought in everything we say, do, feel, and think.

The difference in Van Til' (and Rushdoony) that caused such an uproar was, he said that both of these two starting points or presuppositions, are religious. The thought of all men is predestined

by the ultimate, religious presupposition the man holds to. In theology, philosophy, law, science, biology, education, politics, the family, and all other things, a man who holds to one of the two possible starting points comes to one conclusion as to what these things are, while the man who holds to the opposing presupposition comes to an entirely different conclusion as to what they are.

If one knows which presupposition lies behind a thought or idea, one can predict - generally - the consequence of the idea in time and history, if one is consistent with his own presupposition. If one can predict the general outcome of an idea implemented on a specific presupposition, held self-consciously, one has a very powerful intellectual tool that can be used to great effect in propagating the Gospel and in combating humanism in the culture about us.

Now, when we say 'self-consciously' we mean that, one knows consciously, what his presupposition is and he knows consciously, the connection between his ideas and his presupposition and that his idea is consistent with his presupposition. One has a good idea of where it will all lead. The key is, he knows all this - consciously.

To be self-conscious of one's own thoughts is to know what one knows, and why one knows it. Thus, the self-conscious presuppositionalist does not do something because it makes him feel good, or because it gives him gratification, or gives him a thrill, but, because he knows that he does what he does because of his desire to be consistent with his ultimate presupposition. He does everything for a specific reason, that he himself knows about, consciously, and believes is true. He is not dependent on other men for his authority and even when men advise him, he will interpret the advice in the light of his presupposition.

This will be clearer if we define the two basic presuppositions that Van Til talked and wrote about all his life.

Presupposition One begins and ends with the idea that God is who He claims to be in Scripture, which is His own inspired revelation to Man. This is the presupposition of the Christian.

Presupposition Two holds to the idea that all knowledge is derived solely from man's reason which is a law unto itself. He does not believe that one needs or should harken to any revelation outside his own mind. This is autonomous reason at work in the religion of humanism.

At no point does either presupposition share a common starting point, and thus, they are called 'mutually exclusive ultimates' because, each denies the validity of the other, logically and in fact.

Both are religious in the sense that religion is the reverence or worship of an ultimate ground of appeal. The Christian appeals to God and Scripture, while the Humanist appeals to his own autonomous reason. They are similar in that each presupposes an ultimate starting point for all their thinking.

To show the importance of presuppositional study, consider the following.

A talks with B about some subject or idea and B comes to a conclusion. In the discussion, no mention of presuppositions is made. The idea and its consequence stated by B hangs in a vacuum and is mere opinion.

Why? Because there is no context for interpreting what man A or B says.

But, 'A does not allow B's conclusion to stand in a vacuum and he questions 'B' about his presuppositions. B does likewise to A. Now, we find that A and B are both Christian. The next move on the part of A is to determine if B's conclusion is valid on Christian presuppositions. If B's conclusion is consistent with his Christian presupposition, the conclusion no longer hangs in a vacuum, but rests on a solid foundation, because both sides are now speaking within the context of their presuppositions.

In the end, B's conclusion is tested by the law of Scripture if A is consistent with his own presuppositions.

But, suppose we now interject a specific idea, such as abortion. If B is pro-abortion, he is no longer thinking, consistently, as a Christian, because the Scripture opposes abortion. At this point, A knows that B is not thinking like a Christian, but like a humanist. B may still profess to be a Christian, but his ideas contradict him, and now A knows something about B, i.e., that 'B' is a double-minded man.

Now, if B is a humanist, his pro-abortion stand is more consistent with his avowed presupposition, but it is still not the right consequence, because abortion is contrary to God's Law. But, if B were pro-life and an avowed humanist, there is the inconsistency all over again, because the pro-life conclusion is only possible on Christian presuppositions.

The point of all this discussion about A and B is, to illustrate how all men, most without knowing it, always argue questions that are important to them, on the basis of specific presuppositions, whether they are aware of it or not. And, most haven't got a clue as to whether or not they are being consistent with their presuppositions. The man who is consciously aware of the importance of knowing which presupposition lies behind a specific idea, is in a position to know a great deal more than his friend who suffers from epistemological myopia.

Another premise of Van Til, equally radical, was, that the humanist never knows truth unless he smuggles God into his equation somewhere. In simple terms, the humanist may deny God's existence, or redefine His nature and attributes to eliminate His presence in humanistic thought, but, he must at the same time presuppose that God exists, or he would not even be able to communicate with other humanists.

For example, since 1900, there have been many continental philosophers who have sought to create 'new' philosophies, based upon the possibility of inventing languages that are devoid of so-called 'God-words.' Wittgenstein was typical of these. But, all such attempts have failed and the linguistic philosophers have given up for one simple reason. Language and communication between men is impossible without presupposing God's hand in the creation of languages.

In science, if a humanist conducts a scientific experiment and then expects that the experiment can be repeated with the same results, he presupposes on one hand that God has created a consistent universe of Law, while at the same time he posits, in his public speaking, that all is relative and chance rules in his theory of evolution. In other words, he wants his cake and he wants to eat it as well.

In this case, the humanist contradicts himself. What he says in his writings and speeches may be evolutionary in nature, but when he does real work, he must presuppose that God is in the background upholding and sustaining all things by His power. To think otherwise provides no

justification for doing the experiment a second time and expecting his results to be the same in both cases.

Thus, to use an oft-quoted phrase of Van Til's, "the humanist possesses knowledge as a thief possesses goods." He steals knowledge from the very God whose existence makes knowledge possible in the first place and never admits it.

Van Til has also pointed out that it does not matter if a man knows his thought is religious or not, or whether he admits to his religious stance or not, he is still a religious being and thinker, even in his own ignorance of himself.

As Paul has said so tellingly, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness, Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse.: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things."

Van Til took Paul literally, as he should have. This means that the atheist, agnostic, Buddhist, and all others who deny the God of Scripture and His existence, still know in fact, that He does exist, whether their heart has been darkened or not. One can travel to the furthest reaches of the universe and still not avoid the revelation of God that surrounds him, 'in Whom he lives, and moves, and has his being.'

Thus, a denial of God is an act of will that is ethical in nature and content. Evidence has nothing to do with it. Men deny that God is, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary and suppress their real knowledge of Him as a conscious act, knowingly, willingly, and deliberately to advance their own agenda while suppressing their true knowledge of Him..

Stop for a moment and think about this.

If Christians dealt with Non-Christians, in their day to day dealings as if Paul's statement of fact is true, i.e., if this presupposition was the Christians' presupposition, then the Christian would know something about the Non-Christian that the Non-Christian believes he has hidden. What an enormous intellectual and psychological advantage this should be for the Christian!!!

More importantly, if Christians knew, consciously, that this was the case and acted consistently with this stance, and put into practice Van Til's extension of Paul's statement, what a difference it would make in the way Christians think.

How is this possible?

First, we have been talking about knowing. The sub-set of philosophy that deals with the problems of knowing is called epistemology. The word comes from 'episteme' (knowing) and 'ology' (the study of ...) Epistemology is the study of how we know, but also the basis of certainty in knowing. It asks the questions, 'how do you know, you know?'

And, if we look at today's philosophy teaching in universities, we find that while there is always an overview of what the great philosophers have said about epistemology, there is never any attempt to answer how one knows which system of philosophy really answers the problem of knowledge.

This is because humanist philosophic thought has given up trying to answer the questions of epistemology, because no sooner does the humanist attempt to answer it, than another humanist comes along and blows up the argument. This in-fighting between humanists, has destroyed all real philosophic study in the humanist controlled schools, because given their presupposition about knowing, i.e., that it proceeds from the autonomous reason of man, there is no solution to the problem of knowing. And, whether they know it or not, in their system, all knowledge is purely a matter of opinion.

The Christian, however, already has an answer to the problem of knowledge, knowing, and knowing how and why he knows. His answer is found in the Godhead, and in the words used to define God in Genesis 1:1.

But, first, let us look a little more closely at the nature of the problem of knowledge that epistemology tries to answer, for this problem has plagued philosophers since the Greeks and on the answer to the problem whole systems of government and civilizations have floundered and collapsed.

The solution to the problem of knowledge lies in solving the relationship between the whole and the parts, the one and the many, the universal and the particular.

An example of how the solution is applied might explain the seriousness of the effort to solve the problem. Thus, in civil government, we have the government (the one) and the people (the many). How do we balance the two ends of the spectrum here? Is a balance even desirable? If we cannot answer the problem of the relationship between the one and the many in civil government, then we are left in the following quandary:

If the scales favor civil government, then we will have some form of socialism, communism, a dictatorship, or other tyranny, that will be supported by the military, and there will be great bloodshed.

If the scales favor the power of the people, then we will have a democracy, autocracy, and finally, anarchy, and great bloodshed.

These two extremes are the history of civil government in the world, until the formation of the Constitution of the United States of America, which was the first instrument of civil government that explicitly sought to create a balance between the civil power and the power of the people. Needless to say, in the entire history of man, no Non-Christian philosopher has ever set forth a solution to the problem of knowledge that lasted more than one generation. The basic reason why, is; they could not decide whether the one, or the many should dominate. Any idea of the two being balanced was out of the question, for no such thing was possible - given their presuppositions.

That the founders of America were aware of the problem of knowledge is well known. That modern man, including the modern Christian could care less, changes nothing. The problem of the one and the many in epistemology is of vital interest to all of us, whether we know it or not.

Examples could be shown in virtually every area of life, in the family, the church, in one's calling, and so on.

Genesis 1:1, says: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Of specific interest is the Hebrew word for 'God,' which is 'elohim.' Elohim means, literally, 'unity and diversity, equally ultimate.'

As many commentators have pointed out, this says that God in His unity as God, is equally ultimate with God in His diversity as Father, Son, and spirit. In God, there is a perfect balance between Himself as One and as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Thus, in the name of God in the very first verse of the Scripture, there is the key for the Christian, to the problem of knowledge and the answer to the epistemological question of 'how do we know we know.'

Again, we see a telling example of the importance of the presupposition to all of our thought, including the answers we give to problems that face us. In Greek thought, the possibility of balancing the one and the many never occurred to them, because given the starting point of the autonomy of reason, they could only see the two extremes, the one, or the many, and because they knew not the God of Scripture, it never occurred to them that there was even a remote possibility that they could be balanced.

This is the reason why Greek thought vacillated between Socialism and Communism and ultimately collapsed. This is the reason why all subsequent systems of thought that began from the presupposition of autonomous reason also collapsed.

If the Scripture is the Christians' alpha and omega in all his thought, all facts, regardless of what they look like at first glance, must be interpreted by Scripture. No fact interprets itself. There is no brute fact, i.e., one that speaks for itself, because all facts can only have meaning when interpreted and understood in the light of God's Word, for the omniscient God of Scripture knows every fact that is, exhaustively.

For the non-believer, facts are only interpreted in the light of his own reason. This presents major problems for him, because he cannot know if his view of the facts is the true view. Another humanist will have a different view of the same fact. Neither has any standard by which to measure the truth or falsity of either view. Who knows, the meaning of the fact may change tomorrow, or next week, or next year. As to whose interpretation is actually put to use, well, that's all a matter of who has the greater power and influence. Truth has nothing to do with it.

This is why all humanistic systems of government can only maintain control by military force. And, why all power in humanism flows from the top down, not the bottom up.

Conversely, Christian civil governments de-emphasize military power and emphasize the rule of Law. And, why in Christian systems, power flows from the bottom up? "Not by power, but by My Spirit," sayeth the Lord.

Second, since the Christian knows that God created man in His own image and created all that is, then it's possible for a Christian who thinks like God, analogically, to truly interpret the facts before him. All facts are created by the same God, including God's earthly interpreter, i.e., the Christian.

As Van Til would say, "we must learn to think God's thoughts after him." If this becomes our goal, to see and interpret all facts as God has already interpreted them, then the Christian can know truth and properly interpret reality, but he cannot know it exhaustively, as God does.

Third, in humanism, as suggested above, all facts are subject to change and hence there can never be any confidence in the humanistic view of any fact. This was the failing of Plato's view of the facts. By his own admission, Plato could not conceive of the ultimate idea of 'mud, hair, and filth.' He believed that he could conceive of the ideas of good, beauty, right, and justice, but he could not handle mud, hair, and filth, and for this reason, Platonic and Neo-platonic thought floundered on the rocks of skepticism. For one never knew when a fact such as mud, hair, and filth might turn up to change everything.

The Christian, however, with the Holy Spirit as his teacher and Scripture as his textbook of life and reality, can take confidence in the fact that God would not deceive him. Though he may not know any more than the humanist, what the Christian does know he can know truly and take confidence in it. The future for the Christian may not be known in great detail, but he knows also that God is in control and that all things work together for the Christians' good. As the Scripture says, "Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask *for* bread, will he give him a stone?" *Matthew 7:9*.

Fourth, with humanism, dominated as it is by relativism, uncertainty, and so on, we see that over time, the level of confusion and chaos must increase and the system must eventually collapse. Thus, a humanist may put a certain view of the facts into practice, but, as time goes on, his view will increasingly interpret the outcome of his view of the facts - incorrectly. He may see quite clearly, that there is something wrong, but he cannot possibly know, truly, how to fix it. He will then try something else, which will be just as wrong as his first view of the facts, because his relativistic reason cannot do otherwise. His second view will also be fraught with error as his first view was, and thus he will merely add error to error and the confusion level will rise accordingly.

When civil governments are dominated by humanism, the ideas never fail because they are wrong, but only because the civil power hasn't enough money or power to do it right. The result: at the next session of the legislature, more power and taxes will be demanded to fix the problems, "so that it will never happen again."

How many times do we hear the modern politician make a 'guarantee' to the people, that with only a little more power and taxes, 'thus and so, will never happen again.'

This process is further aggravated by the humanists' own ego that cannot admit that its interpretation of the facts was wrong the first time. No, such an admission would be tantamount to an admission that reason has failed with the obvious conclusion being, that for the answer we must turn to God, which in the humanists' heart, he knows is always there. In short, he will not willingly repent of his first error, because he has no basis upon which repentance is possible.

We must not forget that there is no forgiveness for error (sin) in the humanistic system. How often have we seen them savage their own people, like piranha, when their mistake becomes public.

The Christian can, however, move forward with confidence in his interpretation of the facts, knowing all the time that he will likely have to modify his position as time goes on. We assume



here, that the Christian has made a full study of the facts, both sacred and profane and that he has interpreted them by the Holy Spirit and Scripture. And, when he or a brother or sister in Christ, sees error in the first view of the facts, there can be an immediate repentance of the error, the view of the facts can be modified and one moves on. The Christian knows that in all he does, the Lord is guiding him, teaching him, and reproofing him, because the Lord God loves him and cares for him.

Fifth, the humanist has great difficulty communicating his view of the facts to all men, both humanist and Christian. This is because he has no standard of meaning and content for his thinking that he can appeal to, or point to, to illustrate his meaning. In short, he has no Scripture. Thus, no matter how hard he tries, other humanists and Christians will always mis-interpret his view of the facts. The humanist is therefore constantly put in the position of explaining and justifying himself, especially as time goes on and more and more error is seen by all, in his original interpretation of the facts.

Humanistic egos will modify word meanings that depart from accepted meanings and the dictionary meanings. This is why humanistic thought, over time, constantly re-defines every area of life and thought in terms of its own god (reason). All ideas must be re-made in its own image, not conformed to the image of God that he bears within himself. This is no where more evident than in the humanist idea of law and justice, evidence of which is all about us, today.

But, for a Christian, the meaning of the words he uses are always controlled by Scripture. Communication between Christians and the meaning a Christian imparts to the humanist, should always be the same, because God is the same, yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Law is thus always the same in its meaning and hence true justice is always available.

The form in which the law is applied by Christians, changes with time, but its meaning and God's intent in His Law, never changes.

Sixth, since the humanist cannot make up his mind whether the one or the many is ultimate, and he ignores the answer found in a balance of the two in the Godhead, he is also bound up in arguing over whether his method of reasoning is inductive, or deductive.

Deductive reasoning, reasons from the general, the one, to the particulars, or the many.

Inductive reasoning,, reasons from facts, particulars, or the many, to some general premise, i.e., the one.

In other words, the method of reasoning one uses will likely be determined by whether we are reasoning from the one or the many. The battle over which method is valid, especially in the sciences, has been long and bitter for centuries.

But, Van Til has made it clear, that given the solution to the problem of knowledge in the Godhead, the Christian is free to use both with equal emphasis and utility.

In sum, one can argue from the one to the many and back to the one or from the many to the one and back again. Both processes of reasoning are used without conflict. And, thus, deductive and inductive reasoning are compliments, not opposites.

Seventh, the realm of science and its prevailing whims have often been called upon to lead us in the right paths, and usually this means that one infers from certain facts, some new alleged truth about the meaning of the facts before us.

But, within the sciences, there is a pre-occupation with cause and effect. And, it is because of this doctrine of cause and effect that science has always sought some 'mechanical' solution to the problem of the orbits of planets.

On the one hand, science wants a cause for the planetary rotation, allegedly about the sun, but in his seeking for the cause to account for the rotational effect of the planets, he invariably leaves out of his equations, the fact of agency.

As Christians, we know, for example, that nothing happens without God's hand in it. In this age, God's agent is the Holy Spirit. And, we know that God sustains all things by his power. We also know that all things were created through Christ in whom we live and move and have Our being.

Thus, for the Christian, there is no bare cause and effect without God acting as the agent to keep everything in order and sustain it.

Thus, the problems that science faces in the doctrine of cause and effect, will often be sustained with great intellectual force, which are problems created by the scientist himself who has bought into a false dichotomy.

By the scientists attempting to account for the relationships between things and explaining it on the basis of cause and effect only, without God's hand in the picture, is to posit a false premise from the outset.

Eighth, is the problem of limits. Commonly, modern man asserts that he must have unlimited possibilities for finding a solution to any problem. This means, that he wants a world without limits to the possible paths down which his thinking may take him.

Yet, it is obvious to every man, great thinker or not, that man lives and moves and has his being in a world of limits.

The problem for the humanist is that, if he admits to limits on the possibilities for his thoughts or acts, he must tell us what those limits are and where the boundary lines are drawn, whether we speak of the intellectual world of the mind, or of the concrete world that we live in.

But, modern man and his humanistic leaders want to live in a world that has no defined limits, because the limits may get in the way of his freedoms, or the free exercise of intellectual possibility. Apparently life is not complex enough for these people; they want to make it more complex.

This raises the subject of a talk show I saw many years ago, in which, Charles Williams, the brilliant black economist was being interviewed. Mr. Williams gave an answer to a question asked by the host that was very simple and direct. The host replied, "But, isn't the solution much more complex than that."

Mr. Williams looked the host in the eye and said: "Tyranny always takes refuge in complexity."

This telling destruction of the host's typical answer led me to think of what a great blessing it was to have the Law of God and all the statements of the historic creeds and doctrines that have come down to us from The Great Reformation.

God's revelation and the historic work of the church has defined for us the limits of possibility in the most crucial areas of Our thought and this is just one reason why the study of Scripture and great works of the church are so important.

God has, in effect told us, 'don't bother to look over there, you won't find the answers.' It is amazing that in the era of humanistic dominance and its obsession with 'freedoms,' that many books have been written on the subject of power of limits.

Ninth, the mind of man is a unity with yet great diversity of thought in a thousand areas of life. This is vital to understand the confusion in the world of thought, for it relates directly to the problems of correspondence and coherence.

These problems are concerned with some very simple questions, such as: does my thought really correspond to what's out there? How are my thoughts related to things about me? What does correspondence and coherence have to do with my presuppositions? If my thoughts correspond to things as they are, does that mean my thought is coherent?

Without a solution to the problems of correspondence and coherence we are mired in doubt, uncertainty, and indecision. It is these problems that have plagued all modern philosophers since Immanuel Kant (1724-1802) and his "Critique of Pure Reason."

Since Non-Christian philosophers have utterly failed to satisfactorily answer the problems, they no longer even raise questions about whether or not the image in my mind really corresponds to what's out there, or not .

If the image I have in my mind of the object out there, is not really what's out there, then there is no possibility of my thought and ideas being coherent.

The Christian has no problem with either correspondence or coherence, because he knows that God has created all things, including the Christian, and thus everything is already coherent and related in a logical way. And, the questions of whether the object out there corresponds to the image I have of the object in my mind never comes up, because God has created us in His image and likeness and placed us within His creation in which we were designed to function.

Again, God would not deceive us and place us in an environment that he did not want us to understand.

At this point, we must realize that the process of being a Christian carries with it certain obligations that are usually ignored, if not deprecated, by the modern Christian; the goal of which is the 'renewing' of Our minds, and this means, changing the way we think.

Next month, we will move from the theoretical to the concrete and show how Dr. Van Til's view point can be applied towards the renewing of Our minds.

We can 'bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.'

## **Let This Mind Be In You, Part Two**

### The Flaw in Modern Christian Thought

In the so-called golden Age of Scholasticism (the 10th to 13th centuries), Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), a Roman Catholic scholar, tried to merge the thought of Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) and Christ. He sought to take the best of what he found in Aristotle and merge it with the best of Christianity, and thereby create a system of thought that would account for both the inner and outer world of man's existence. Aquinas set forth his ideas in a very large work, called *Summa Theologica*.

Thomas failed to realize that he was not thinking like a Christian, because he depended on his own reason to tell him where Aristotle's thought ended and Christianity began. It never occurred to Thomas to see Aristotle in the light of Christianity and Scripture and by so doing, discover major flaws in Greek philosophy. He merely assumed that Christianity was limited to the inner man, the realm of grace, and that the outer man in the realm of nature, was under reason. Most important of all, Aquinas never asked whether it was even possible for such a merger of two mutually exclusive systems, in the first place. His first presupposition was--that his own reason was capable of achieving such a thing.

The result was, Thomas bifurcated man's existence by splitting man's mind into two different realms, with each under a different authority, neither of which came under the authority of Christ and Scripture. The inner man literally came under the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, while the outer man, in the world of nature, was under the authority of Aristotle and reason. The Roman Church thought so much of Aquinas' work, that he and his work were canonized and became the accepted doctrine of the Church at Rome.

Thomism began to collapse, however, as the victim of its own bifurcation, and it fell, as Aristotle's idea of reason was applied by later generations of thinkers that revealed the hidden flaws, or presuppositions of Thomas Aquinas. The problem was then, and still is--if Christ has nothing authoritative to say about the world of nature, perhaps He has nothing authoritative to say about anything else. Christianity became increasingly irrelevant to the new humanism that gave birth to the Renaissance and autonomous reason was enthroned as king, in principal.

The Reformation reacted against the Renaissance. We have all heard how the Reformation began with Martin Luther (1483-1546) nailing his Ninety-six Thesis to the door of the Wittenburg church in Germany, but, what most do not know is, the Reformation asserted that Christ was King over the inner and outer man, over both Grace and Nature. The Great Reformation rejected any bifurcation of man existence, and asserted the contrary, by calling the excesses of the Roman Catholic Church into question on the authority of Christ and Scripture alone.

This is the background to the popular phrase of Our founding fathers': "No King but Christ." This is the core of John Calvin's (1509-1564) great work, "The Institutes of the Christian Religion," first published in 1536. Calvin's work called all thought into question that did not conform to the Scriptures of God. It is Calvinism that is embodied in the marginal references of the Geneva Bible, the Bible of the Reformation and the early Puritans.

Interestingly, Leonardo Da Vinci, the chief example of Renaissance man, spent the last two years of his life wallowing in skepticism as the guest of the King of France. Ironically, this great icon of the Renaissance arrived at the French Court at the same time as Calvin's Institutes.

Calvin's body was barely cold in his grave, when a challenge to his views came down the pike in the works of Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609) who said that Calvin's idea of predestination did not do justice to reason and free will. It was ignored by Arminius's followers that Calvin wrote very little about predestination. Luther's "Bondage of the Will," was an earlier and larger work on predestination.

At any rate, Arminius's followers wrote a Remonstrance against Calvin and the Calvinists responded with a Counter-remonstrance. A heated debate followed that led to a split in the Reformation into the Calvinists who held to the Sovereignty of God and the Arminians who asserted the sovereignty of free will. A total of five points of disagreement stood between the two camps.

Key to Arminian doctrine is the assertion that man cannot be responsible for sin unless he has a free will. Appealing not to Scripture, but to the ego of man, Arminians assert that man's will is free to resist God's Will which is beyond the sovereign power of God.

It has apparently never occurred to the Arminians that the phrase free will nor its equivalent never appears in Scripture nor has another more telling question ever arose, i.e., would or could God, ever create something that was beyond his power to control???

Thus, as Aquinas asserted that nature was under the authority of reason and not under the authority of God and Scripture, so also did Arminius assert that man's will was under his own control and guided by his own reason. Today, more than ninety percent of the modern Protestant Evangelical churches are Arminian in doctrine, if not explicitly, then implicitly.

The result is, Christ occupies one part of mind and thought, while the worldly side occupies another. This is what Dr. Rushdoony has called, 'intellectual schizophrenia' and it is this intellectual schizophrenia that is the primary reason why the Christian church has become so ineffective against the advance of humanism.

Until the work of Cornelius Van Til and his contemporaries, no one bothered to seriously challenge whether or not the question of responsibility vs. free will, vs. predestination, vs. etc., etc., was even a valid question.

In other words, is man responsible because he has a free will, or is man responsible for some other reason? If it can be shown that man is responsible whether he has a so-called free will or not, then the whole of Arminianism goes out the window, and here is where Van Til comes to the defense of the Christian position, for reasons which will become clearer further on.

Just as surely as quantities equal to the same thing are equal to each other, the form, language, and even the meaning of words may be altered, but the essential core of an idea, its meaning or content, never change the way it is manifest in history, and the same consequences always follow the same idea.

If we assume that any part of a man's life or thought is outside the power and authority of God, then it will not be long, before other aspects of life are removed from God's authority. Once the

toe is in the door, the foot soon follows, and one area of life after another is all of a sudden thought of as outside the authority of Scripture and Our King, Jesus Christ. "As a man thinketh, so is he." Man does what he thinks. As Aquinas, so also Arminius, and so also the modern Christian church.

Thus, the rule confirmed by the history of thought is, grant the exception in one case and there is no reason why the exception cannot be granted in every case. This is the inescapable consequence of any idea that seeks to assert itself as being based in some area outside the realm of God's Power and Authority.

In concluding this part, we say; if this law reform movement we are involved in is to have any real hope for long term success, then a radical change must take place in the type and quality of Christian thought that we apply to the problems that face us, and Our righteousness must exceed that of the fathers if we are to stand any hope of success.

### Enter Presuppositional Philosophy

As we have mentioned before, Van Til begins with a very simple idea that has a very far reaching impact on every area of Christian thought. Basically, it is this: all systems of thought or ideas can be reduced to one of two starting points or presuppositions as he called them that must be in the thinkers mind in order for him to say what he does. For example, one does not say 'praise the Lord Jesus,' unless one's ultimate starting point or presupposition is Christian. Or, to put it another way, Non-Christians do not knowingly make statements in support of Christianity, if they understand what they are saying, in the first place.

It is not a matter that some, or only the most important ideas are derived from an ultimate presupposition; all ideas are presuppositionally based, and all Our ideas can only be derived from one of two fundamental starting points or, presuppositions. Regardless of which presupposition one begins with, a specific idea with a specific meaning or content is always derived from the same presupposition. The presupposition behind an idea and its meaning is not arbitrary. Thus, we may speak of law, as an idea, but the meaning of law and its consequence in practice, is absolutely determined by one's presupposition. One kind of law always stems from a particular presupposition and a different kind of law stems from the opposing presupposition.

The presupposition behind an idea and its consequence must be consistently maintained. Often, one may begin with an idea of law based on a very specific presupposition, but while applying the idea, one can be side-tracked, without realizing it, or one may know that one has deviated from his original idea's meaning and still continue without a return to his original meaning. Usually, this is justified by asserting the necessity to be practical, or in the interests of compromise, or some similar excuse. The fact remains that one has contradicted ones self and is now working on a new presupposition that will change the intended consequence of the idea over the long term.

It takes courage to be consistent with one's presupposition and follow it to its logical consequence. There are always influences about us which demand that we go along to get along. But, if one is to be honest to ones self and to his compatriots, he must maintain consistency, and then his presupposition will truly govern the meaning of his ideas and what he believes and how he will act on his belief. In a sense, over time and history, one becomes what

his presupposition is--if the presupposition is maintained consistently and acts as a real check on one's thinking.

As shown last month, all thoughts of all men are predestined by the ultimate, religious presupposition one holds to. In theology (or atheology), philosophy, law, science, biology, education, politics, the family, and all other things, this is the case. And, in the end, one who holds to one presupposition comes to one conclusion as to what these things are, while one who holds to the opposing presupposition comes to an entirely different conclusion as to what they are.

If one knows which presupposition lies behind a thought or idea, one can predict - generally - the consequence of the idea in time and history, if one is consistent. Yet, one must know, self-consciously, what his own presupposition is, how it is put into practice, and what impact to expect from his presupposition over time. And, when we say one must know, self-consciously, we do not mean it in the sense that one 'suspects' or feels good about his presupposition, nor do we mean that the presupposition is held in a subjective, or emotional sense. One must know everything possible about his own presupposition in as much detail as possible, and know how it differs from an opposing presupposition.

To know self-consciously means, to know consciously, to be self-conscious of one's own thoughts is to know what one knows, and why one knows it. Thus, the self-conscious presuppositionalist does not do something because it makes him feel good, or because it gives him gratification, or gives him a thrill, but, because he knows, consciously, that he does what he does because of his desire to be consistent with his ultimate presupposition. He does everything for a specific reason, that he himself knows about, consciously, and believes is true. He is not dependent on other men for his authority and even when men advise him, he will interpret the advice in the light of his presupposition. This will be clearer if we define the two basic presuppositions that Van Til talked and wrote about all his life.

Again, harking back to last month's article, we know that the two basic presuppositions of all men are either; one, God is Who He claims to be in Scripture, and two, the reason of man is autonomous and can know all truth without any reference to God or revelation.

At no point does either presuppositions share a common starting point, as each mutually excludes the other from its own system. Both are religious in the sense that both appeal to an ultimate.

In the discussion last month between Man 'A' and 'B' we also pointed out the importance of presuppositional analysis and how all of us think in terms of Our presuppositions whether we know it or not.

### Theology vs. Atheology

Since all men are created in the image and likeness of their Creator, potentially, all men could think in such a way that their thought would correspond to the way things are, be coherent and consistent with God's view of reality. Further, the concatenation of ideas, i.e., a sequence of, or string of ideas put together, line upon line, would make logical sense and there would be no contradiction.

But, one effect of sin is the corruption of the image of God in man which divides men and introduces confusion and contradiction that is only corrected, potentially, by the regeneration of man's spirit through salvation by the Grace of God.

We use the word 'potentially,' to emphasize the difference between what is possible and what in fact exists at the moment. Man may be saved by God in an instant, but sanctification takes a lifetime. We may plant the seed of an apple and say that it is an apple tree, but, it will take a good many years and considerable care before it actually becomes a tree that produces apples, assuming all the necessary pre-conditions are in place, i.e., good soil, plenty of water, etc.

At any rate, men divide on presuppositions. Yet, all need the same things that are basic to their existence because all are created by the same God. Whether one is a Christian or humanist, the over-whelming need of man is to fulfill the image and likeness of God impressed on his nature. The Christian can fulfill his needs and realize his potential through sanctification, the study of Scripture, and the agency of the Holy Spirit, the humanist cannot because his only tool is his own reason, which is confused by his effort to suppress the image of God impressed on his nature.

Like the blind man, the humanist will grope in the dark, trying to fulfill the image of God within him, but on his own terms and presuppositions, not on Godly terms and presuppositions. Humanists need salvation, sanctification, justification, and fulfillment of all the other God-placed needs within him, but he has no potential to achieve them, in fact and in a way that corresponds to the way things are.

And, while all men have the same needs, two entirely separate means are applied to fulfill them. For the Christian, needs are fulfilled by God, while, for the humanist, needs are fulfilled by autonomous reason.

At the bottom of this page is a chart of ideas classified by whether the idea is based upon the Christian or humanistic presupposition. The chart can be extended to include as many ideas and related categories of ideas as one can think of. Additional ideas of a general nature can be added to this list, but enough is shown to illustrate the point. We can now take any of the general ideas and break them down into more specific sub-categories, which can in turn, be broken down into greater and greater detail. In this chart, the impact of the presuppositions are more clearly seen. Since the primary focus of this study is to arrive at a systematic Christian approach to Law and civil government through the right system of thought, some detail has been added to the idea of the State in the chart on Page seven. Note, under the humanist idea of the State, the State takes on the nature and attributes of God. As long as such a State exists, it will seek to fulfill its presupposition as 'the State is God walking on earth,' and it will attempt to emulate in the State, all the nature and attributes of the image of God that is stamped on the humanists nature.

There is a very subtle difference between humanistic States before and after Christ that is worth noting. Before Christ, the principal form of civil government was a monarchy bound to an official state religion that was often polytheistic in its expression. The king was expected to promote and publicly support the State religion and was often the head of both church and state.

The king was more or less deified and autonomous reason dominated, especially with the Greeks who sought to bring the idea of autonomous reason more to the forefront in the idea of philosopher kings. Alexander the Great was typical of this type of ruler. In each state, military



power was essential and since much of this power was drawn from mercenary armies, the king must have a very healthy treasury in order to secure the allegiance of his armies and navies. Since resources within a state are limited, the need to sustain military power meant that kings coveted the wealth of other nations and kings. Thus, for most states in this period before Christ, conquest was a way of life.

After Christ, there began to be a tension between church and state under the growing influence of Christianity. In the Hebrew republics based on Scripture, there was a separation between church and state, i.e., Moses was head of the state and Aaron was head of the church. Both adhered to the Law of God but the church had only the power of excommunication, although it could bring charges from its ecclesiastical courts. This remained true in the Christian West until the 19th and early 20th centuries when the churches sacrificed their authority in these areas for the sake of evangelism.

In humanistic states after Christ, from about 400 A.D., kings justified their authority by right of inheritance and divine right, which was still supported by a very healthy military power.

But, from the time of Wycliffe (1320-1384), Christians began to challenge divine right and the doctrines of primogeniture (the laws of inheritance), on Biblical grounds. Wycliffe asserted that even kings were subject to the Law of God and thus, as in the best Hebrew states, the final authority in both church and state was Scripture, with the result that, humanism declined. It is worth noting that the best Hebrew states existed before the reign of kings, i.e., under the judges, and only rarely after that. Indeed, after the installation of Saul as King of Israel, the reign of kings was erratic and often the reign of one or another was as different as night and day.

With the re-emergence of humanism in the Renaissance and again in the mid-nineteenth century, autonomous reason is disguised because of the recognized power of Christian thought. Autonomous reason, as a general concept implements its ideas in the State, but under the guise of compassion and concern for the welfare of those less fortunate.

Here we must digress a bit to make a very important observation.

First, both the Roman and modern state's begin from the same presupposition, i.e., that the State is god walking on earth.

Second, both engage in bread and circuses, i.e., social welfare. Both even had widespread abortion practiced.

But, the Roman state made no pretenses that its reason for welfare was compassion and concern for the less fortunate. In Rome, state welfare was the only way the masses could be kept in line and not openly rebel against the Army and the Emperors. Yet, the idea of compassion and concern for the less fortunate is an idea that originated in the Old and New Testaments, and nowhere else. In all pagan states before Christ, social welfare was implemented purely as a tactical move by the state, to keep the masses in tow, i.e., to help the masses enjoy their slavery.

The modern welfare state, however, has borrowed an idea from Christianity and incorporated it as a major component of justification for a social welfare state, but the end result is the same as it was under the Roman Imperial powers--high tax rates and only a thinly disguised slavery for both rich and poor.

The point of this digression is simply to provide yet another example of what we have been saying throughout this series of articles. The appearance or form may change from one era to another, but the same ideas, implemented on the same presuppositions, always end with the same consequences. And, it does not matter one whit whether the idea is ancient or modern.

The modern disguises began by borrowing Christian buzz-words, especially in the Abolitionist Movement. By 1860 and Lincoln's War Against Christianity, the disguise didn't have to be very good because already the church had lost its ability to think in a consistently Christian manner and discern the times.

Thus, pre-Christian ideas of the state were manifest as monarchies based on autonomous reason, modern states embody autonomous reason in a President or Prime Minister. Humanistic states still seek to realize the all-powerful, all-knowing, omnipresent god/State. And as with the Pre-Christian states, it can never realize itself fully, because invariably, as the power of the State increases, other factors begin to build that undermine a state's ability to govern.

#### Notes on Income Taxes

While it is not mathematically definable as yet, it is clear that there is a maximum point at which a state may tax--Lawfully. Any tax beyond this maximum Lawful tax rate (MLTR) must be illegal as a form of theft, however it is disguised.

States may tax well beyond the MLTR for years. But, this short term gain solution--if continued--produces long term pain, because the state is consuming so many resources out of a finite potential populace, that it adversely affects the economy as a whole and the entire system just implodes on itself.

The question is, is there some idea of what the maximum Lawful tax rate should be???

At this point, we cannot say. However, Drs. Rushdoony and Young have written a book entitled "Tithing and Dominion," which, with careful study, may bear something more than a mere guideline for taxes. The MLTR for purposes of sustaining civil government seems to be about four percent (4%).

This is based upon a systematic breakdown of how the mandatory Biblical Tithe was distributed in ancient Israel. Roughly, it is as follows:

Four percent for civil government,

Four percent for education,

One percent for the pastor,

One percent for the church or synagogue buildings. This total equals the tithe, or tenth as it was known.

Americans now pay about fifty-one (51%) percent of their income in taxes and the Founding Fathers went to war over an annual per capita tax rate of three percent (3%)!!!

What is more interesting is, once upon a time, Americans paid income taxes that amounted to 21% of the Federal Budget when the tax rate was about 18% per capita.

Now, the tax rate exceeds fifty percent, but, only accounts for about eleven percent (11%) of the total Federal Budget. In other words, the tax rate goes up by nearly sixty percent (60%), but accounts for only half of what it once took care of in the Federal Budget! What's going on here!!!

Most people believe that without income taxes the government would go belly-up, but as these numbers (available from government sources) show, as the tax rate goes up, the effective percentage of the Federal Budget paid by personal income taxes goes down. Imagine that!!!

Knowing these things, it should surprise no one that the modern states under the old Roman Imperial system (still supported by a vast military power) can never collect enough taxes or power to have enough to meet their needs as the humanistic state begins to crumble from the vacuum of its own presuppositions.

Over time, humanistic states become less efficient, failures become more obvious, the consumption of resources cripples a states economy, corruption rises, it is more and more arbitrary, and so on. But, as with Pre-Christian states, so also with the modern states with respect to their military power which is always considerable, and conquest continues and expands until the bitter end of it all.

Thus, all Non-Christian systems of civil power must become tyrannies supported by military force for a state that has no Law.

The will in humanism is the glorification of man whose principal agent in achieving this is always a state of Godly proportions and powers that can never be realized. They must centralize power in the One (the State), at the expense of the Many (the people) because the humanistic state never has enough power to make certain that it will not fail.

A tyrant merely seeks to realize the alleged potential of his presuppositions. The irony is, that such can never be realized in fact and reality over the long term, but the tyrant's presuppositions blind him to this fact. The situation is further aggravated by the fact that no matter what the humanistic state does, it cannot erase the image of God in man that always lies in the background as a latent conscience, as a thorn, to annoy and remind the humanist that he is failing to realize his presuppositional fantasy.

The Christian on the other hand knows the state is not God and that it must be controlled by laws rigidly defined according to Scripture. The Christian knows that all the Laws of the state must conform to God's Law, or, as Blackstone has said, they are no law at all. The Christian knows that when the state is properly defined and its nature and purposes limited by Scripture, that its goal of justice for the poor, the widowed, and the orphaned and the protection of life, liberty, and property is achievable to such an extent that the Spirit of truth will lead the people into all righteousness and prosperity and that the Glory of God will be manifest where ever man casts his eye.

Then all men will know that Christ is on His throne and all is right with the world above and the world here and now. Then peace will walk among us in the Spirit of Him in Whom We live and move and Our being.

## Chart 'A'

### General Ideas

Christianity	Humanism
Theology	Atheology
Philosophy	Autonomous Reason
The Christian state	The secular State
The Family	The Resource Unit
God's Law	man's law

In next month's issue, we will begin the task of defining the details of Chart B and thereby bring some substance in Our system of thinking.

### **Let This Mind Be In You, Part Three**

#### The Characteristics and Attributes of the State

All states, Christian or Humanist, share certain characteristics that seem to be a necessary part of the state's existence. This series has focused on the application of presuppositional analysis and its use, and now, we will narrow Our focus to examine only the state, its characteristics and attributes. These will then be included in an expansion of Chart 'B' from the previous Issue, and published next month. Our object is to show that the presupposition behind the definition of the state determines all of its characteristics and attributes and also determines the consequence of the states policy in history.

What is most compelling about this study is that if one consistently maintains the implementation of a given presupposition, then the laws that accompany the presupposition are determinative in the sense that one cannot implement a Humanist presupposition in the state and end up with a Christian consequence. Humanistic consequences follow Humanistic presuppositions and the same is true for Christianity.

A characteristic phenomenon that accompanies the Humanist view of history is that all Christian presuppositions involved in the definition and implementation of Christian states, are *ipso facto* wrong. That is, from the Humanist perspective, the Christian state is an absurdity, is always repressive, a threat to freedom or liberty, and a whole host of other attributes which we will not catalogue here.

The truth of the matter, as true history shows, is exactly the opposite. But, in Humanism, it is not enough to merely say that a Christian state is all bad; the whole of history must be re-interpreted

to make history appear to support the Humanist idea of the Christian state. Even the meaning of the words used to define the Christian state must be re-defined by the Humanist so that the words themselves do not say what they obviously appear to say.

In this study, as we have seen that the terms, words and phrases used by the Humanist to describe the terrors of a Christian state, actually apply to the Humanist state, in fact. This is because when the Humanist interprets reality about him, he has only his own categories of thought to use as a reference for meaning, whereas the Christian has the Scripture. The process of the re-definition of reality in terms of autonomous reason in Humanism, thus, cannot see the truth, even when it is right in front of his eyes.

At any rate, the characteristics that seem to be shared by all states are as follows:

One. States are designed to control the flow of force and power to a particular object. From this we get the idea of government, or governing. It is like a governor on a large truck which controls the application of power to the truck's wheels to control the truck speed on the highways.

And, like the truck, we must first know where we want to go before we apply the power to the governor. That is, for what object does the state exist? This is where the definition of the nature and purpose of civil government becomes important.

In Christian states, the purpose of civil government is clearly defined. That is, to protect life, liberty, and property; not to provide or take life, liberty, or property, without the Due Course of Law. This definition is the same as that adopted by the founding fathers when building this nation and writing the Constitution. The only point of disagreement between them was, how to achieve this end, or object.

The only point of clarity that we could add to this definition would be to include some statement respecting the authority of Scripture and Christian Common Law.

Thus, we could define the nature and purpose of civil government as: The protection of the life, liberty, land, and property; not to provide or take life, liberty, land, or property, without the Due Course of Law in accordance with Scripture and the Customs and Usages of the Christian people.

Now, in a Humanistic State, the nature and purpose of the state is never clearly defined nor limited in the scope of its power. This is because all Humanistic States attempt to take on the nature and attributes of God. In Humanism, the State is, as Hegel said, 'God walking on Earth.'

For five thousand years, this has been the dominant characteristic of all Non-biblical states. The reason why such states attempt to take on the character, nature, and attributes of God is, as the Apostle Paul said, "All men know God."

Thus, because the Humanist will not honor God, as God, they must still manifest his attributes in the next best thing: the almighty, all-knowing, everywhere present State, who has its own doctrine of providence in State welfare. The State becomes the source of salvation and the end-all and be-all, alpha and omega, of all that is.

Such a State can have no Law because its presuppositions will not permit it to enact the real Law and only true Law, of God. Such States are invariably dominated by commercial interests

whether they are Communist, Socialist, or Fascist, because they seek to control all that is within their realm of influence or control, the same as God does.

A word must be said here about the omniscience (all-knowing), omnipresence (everywhere present) and omnipotent (all-powerful) characteristics of the Humanist State.

As to the Humanistic State's will to omniscience, we see examples of this in the endless forms, applications, and information gathering aspects of the State in permits, licenses, tax forms, etc. The Humanist State must engage in such activities because it can never know when some new piece of information may turn up that will scuttle the State. It must also collect this information because it must know where everyone and everything is, in order to tax or seize it.

As to the Humanistic State's will to omnipresence, the State must be everywhere because God is everywhere, and it must watch everyone and everything, because the State must know of anyone propagating the wrong ideas or information. The State must know these things because the State is in constant danger of being over-thrown. Examples of this are seen in the postmen who act as agents in the field, local police, sheriffs, and state police, the 'Special Agents' of the I.R.S. and D.E.A., the Amtrak railroad police, the F.B.I., the C.I.A., the F.A.A. and countless other alphabet soup agencies, departments, bureaus, and service groups, all of whom are generically known as 'peace' officers.

As to the Humanistic State's will to omnipotence, the State must control all power as God does, because the State can't trust the people with power, because the people may want something contrary to the will of the State. This is the real need for the 100,000 Man Police force of current infamy. This is also the reason why all forms of transportation must have a police force to watch them, and why all major government buildings and agencies must have the same type of police forces.

As to the Humanistic State's will to providence in State welfare, it does this because God is in fact the real source of Providence. It does it also because the more people it has on welfare the fewer people there are who will join a reform movement. Humanistic States engage in welfare because they have a heart and compassion, etc., *ad nauseum*; in truth and reality all such States are fictitious entities and cannot, therefore, have no heart.

There is also a legal reason for the welfare, in that they must grant some forms of welfare because without the welfare, there is no Lawful justification for their employment.

Today, four out of every ten people in America are on the dole in one form or another. Forty percent (40%) of the people are living off the other sixty (60%) percent of the population. And, ninety-eight (98%) percent of those working to support the forty percent, are engaged in commerce controlled by the State.

Two. States are consumers of resources, not producers. This fact is important to remember because so many politicians talk of creating jobs with various programs. But, what's forgotten is, the State only creates jobs at the expense of others who are working. Individual enterprise and not the State, is where all real, new jobs are created.

In states where the people do not directly control the State's consumption of resources, the State is out of control.

In Christian states, the power of the state is highly de-centralized and rests primarily within the county and township. This makes it easy for the people to keep an eye on the spending of local governments. The flow of tax money in Christian states is from the bottom up and was once collected at the county and state levels before it was sent on to the Federal government.

But, in Humanists States, the need is to centralize power in one state, which in America, is the Federal government.

In such a State, the people never control the flow of force and power in the State and yet, the propaganda of the State attempts to make it appear that they do. In Humanist States, the people do not control the tax rates. Instead, the government itself controls its own tax rates that are always levied to protect the states interests, not those of the people.

In simple terms, the further away the tax collector is from the people, the more likely there will be corruption and lawlessness in the tax system. And, there is more room for smoke and mirrors and sleight of hand and deception by the State.

Three. Related to Item Two above, the major form of resource consumption by the state is that of taxes, at least in Christian states.

But, in modern states the situation is significantly different. The Federal government in America, for example, along with one hundred fifty-seven other countries declared joint bankruptcy in September, 1944, at the Breton Woods Conference, in Breton Woods, New Hampshire. Since that time, the consumption of resources by the member states of the Breton Woods Conference have embarked on consumption programs that are unparalleled in the annals of recorded history.

The United States government not only consumes trillions of dollars in tax money every year, it also 'employs' millions of people that would otherwise be gainfully working in the production of real goods and services, and it also consumes millions of tons of raw and manufactured goods, not just in weapons systems it buys for its armed forces, but in automobiles, building materials, office machines and computers, and a whole host of other items.

The United States government is the largest single consumer of the taxes and work output of the American in history. Many people believe that this consumption is good for the nation's economy, but in fact, it is a drain on the nation's economy because none of the goods and services consumed are ever used in the production of new wealth and real jobs for the people as a whole.

Most of this consumption is for the creation of bureaus, departments, agencies, and services not authorized by the original Constitution, as we all know. It is this consumption of resources of all types that contributes to the massive inflation in this country over the last century, because such consumption represents a false stimulus to the nation's economy. A typical example of the current government's interference in the nation's economy is seen in the billions spent to support prices of farm goods. In this case, the government consumes massive resources to pay others not to produce.

In Christian states, such consumption by the civil powers does not happen for the simple reason that the nature and purpose of civil government is defined in such a way that the civil

government never exceeds its proper limits and thus, always constitutes a very small part of the nation's total economy.

Four. States have at their disposal some means of enforcing the acts of the state.

Every state needs some means of enforcing the law of the land and protecting the people from evil. Such forces can be classified as either civil or military.

The civil force in Christian states is normally small because in Christian states there are fewer laws to break. The Law of the land is well known and the punishments for breaking the Law are well known. Indeed, everyone has a copy of the Law in his home; that is The Bible.

The military force in Christian states is also very small in terms of a standing army, yet it is very large in the number of troops that can be mobilized to repel invasion by an enemy. The military is small because Christian foreign policy is defensive, not offensive. That is, the Christian only goes to war to defend a just cause or after another has declared war on the Christian state. Mobilizing the people in a Christian state is relatively easy because all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 55 are already a part of the militia which is always kept in a high state of readiness. A militia force is the most cost effective means of providing a military force to protect the nation.

In Humanist States, both the civil and military forces are always a larger than necessary percentage of the total population.

The civil law enforcement forces of a Humanist State are nearly always tied into the standing army, or military force, and is usually as large as, or larger than the military force. Thus, in America, city police, county sheriffs, and the state police or highway patrol, forces that guard transportation and communication, though paid by their state and local governments, are always tied into the standing army and often funded by them in part. This is the plan currently used by the Federal government of the United States.

It is common in Humanist States to find them waging war against other states in foreign lands, if they have the resources to do so. The aggressive nature of Humanism itself permits this in the treaties created between States. Very large standing armies are the norm in such States, in part, because the state must protect itself from its own people, because in no Humanist State do we find real Law. All the sources on Humanist States admit that their law is arbitrary and capricious and even among Non-Christians, when this is perceived by the people, unrest is born which the Humanist leaders are keenly aware of.

Thus, the first American President to use the Secret Service as his bodyguards was A. Lincoln. Some have suggested that the real purpose of the Service today is, to protect the bondholders' interest in the nation's debt. If the President does any act that adversely impacts the bondholders' interests, what better security can the bondholders have than to be the very ones who guard the President. It is worth noting that the Secret Service is a branch of the Treasury Department under the Secretary of the Treasury.

One of the purposes of forming the United Nations was to share the cost of making war. Recently, we have seen in Viet Nam, Desert Storm, and Bosnia, this policy in action. In part, this policy has been used to keep some war partners in the game by re-imbursing them for the costs



of waging war. In simple terms, we ask, is the United States in such a poor cash flow position that it can no longer afford to wage foreign wars?

Five. States legislate, which means, states can either make law, or extend existing law derived from some authority.

In Christian states, the legislative functions of civil government are minimized. This is because the authority for all Law is the Scripture and the Customs and Usages of the people, sometimes called the common law. Thus, legislation in Christian states is usually done by extending the existing Law of Scripture or the common law, to new situations as they arise.

Legislatures may also enact into law the decisions of juries who are the final arbiters of what constitutes the Law of God.

The only other form of legislation in a Christian state is that of organizing the existing Laws into a convenient system that is easily understood and accessible by the people and the courts.

In Christian states there is little rule-making and regulations because the state can not interfere with the Sovereignty and Word of God. There are no permits and licenses for any Lawful form of activity, no subsidies, and the use of commercial law is practically prohibited.

Currently, in the United States government, the Congress makes no law without the prior existence of an Executive Order from the President, as Commander-in-Chief of the military side of the government.

On the administrative side of the Federal government, Congress, as Trustee's of the Chapter Eleven Bankruptcy of the United States are really responsible to the Bondholders of the United States debt. Congress controls the purse strings in such a way that the Bondholders always get the interest payments. By this means, some measure of the balance of power still exists between the Congress and the President.

Congress is also involved in the ratification of treaties because such may affect the rights of the Bondholders of the debt.

Six. States must have the capability to enforce the laws.

It is the function of the chief executive in every state to execute the laws against the lawless.

In Christian states, this is the primary function of the chief executive, whether he be called President, Governor, or Mayor. His secondary purpose is to protect the people from invasion by other states. The chief executive may also negotiate treaties or other arrangements with foreign states, but only on the terms and conditions of the Law of Scripture.

In Humanist states, especially since the Breton Woods treaty, the vast majority of the power of the State is kept in the hands of the chief executive, usually under some form of military or international law and this power is wielded through Executive Orders which then permit Congress to make an addition to the Codes to implement the E.O., which is also published in the Federal Register. The E.O. binds the Congress in all matters except those that would infringe on the Trusteeship of Congress and the bondholders.

Seven. States must have some means of determining whether or not the laws enforced by the state are lawful or legitimate, as well as the means to declare the same in Judicial proceedings.

In Christian states, the court only hears violations of God's Law and common law. Equity is not permitted because it gives discretion to the court to decide matters and such courts could rule in a manner contrary to Scripture. In other words, courts in equity grant too much power to the judge and are normally prohibited.

Juries in Christian court proceedings have the power to determine both the Law and the facts, and thus may decide that a law implemented by the state is bad law and over-turn it. In short, the jury may decide that the facts show the guilt of the defendant, but the law on which the defendant is charged is bad law, according to Scripture. The defendant is then released.

In Christian courts, attorneys are not allowed to argue the case, although they may advise a client who is either a defendant or demandant.

The court system in Christian states is usually very simple because the Law of God and the common law are simple. Jurisdictions and venues are relatively few in type. Proceedings are short with very few delays. In most cases, trials in Christian states last only a few days. It is rare to find a case that lasts for several weeks. In such courts, the Law of Evidence and Process is strictly adhered to.

And, since the common law is technically very precise, the vast majority of questions between Demandant and Defendant are resolved before going to trial. The object of process and the preliminary proceedings in Christian courts, is to reduce the Pleadings to the simplest possible set of issues for adjudication.

In Humanist court systems, on the other hand, we find a very complex system of adjudication. In America, the courts all serve the needs of the Chief Executive and are his agents in the field under military law. For example, the American Bar Association, incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1873 is the body that regulates the agents in the field. Further, the Department of Justice, created in 1870, regulates U.S. attorneys in the field. Anyone who expects justice from such a system truly is *non compos mentis*.

The system is complex because there are so many laws extant, the rules of evidence and process are usually determined by the judge during the trial. This makes for long, involved, and expensive adjudication that is fraught with errors that call for appeals, again and again. The jury has no real power to determine anything beyond the facts as they are instructed by the judge. If the jury violates the judge's instructions or makes a ruling on the law, the entire trial can be voided on the spot, or appealed on the grounds that the jury violated its instructions.

In Humanistic courts, the only real law in the court is that which comes out of the judge's mouth. Attorneys are agents of the court and may only use the law of the court in which they practice. The client is normally *non compos mentis*, i.e., declared not mentally competent to defend himself.

In other words, the current court system does not exist to defend anyone's rights except those of the Humanistic state.

Last, the reason why Humanist states declare that no man can take the law into his own hands is because the people they are talking to, being Humanists as well, have no law. When one takes the law into his own hands he is determining the civil relationship between himself and another by usurping the Civil Rights Act for himself. Such is an impossibility under God's Law, because God has already determined the relationship between one man and another by writing His Law on the heart of Good and Lawful Christian Men and Women.

Eight. States have relations with other states, foreign and domestic.

Among Christian states, the Law by which all have relations with one another is, of course, the Scripture. The foreign policy of Christian states is thus predictable and certain, which makes for a very stable and long lasting foreign policy.

In terms of domestic policy between the states of the union, there is no need for a commerce clause, nor a comity clause, or good faith clause, since, between Christian states the Law between them is again, identical to the foreign policy Law between nations.

We note with interest that the Byzantine Empire lasted for nearly 1100 years as a strong and independent state, until it began to engage in commerce. It fell within 100 years.

In Humanist States, the situation is very different, usually chaotic and confused, which often leads to war unnecessarily.

In part this is because the language of treaties is virtually impossible to understand between Humanists because of the relativistic nature of meaning in Humanism.

In part it is also because all Humanist States are militarily and commercially based and, in theory, are supposed to harken to international law, which is constantly changing in its meaning and scope of authority.

In short, there is no good reason between Humanist States for anyone to get along unless it's in their best interest to do so.

In the U.S., the Federal law used to control what were once individual states, is municipal law, a limited version of international law.

For an example of how international law is converted to use in municipal situations, see the article "That Knock on the Door" in this Issue on 'Searches and Seizures.'

### **Let This Mind Be In You, Part Four**

#### *Conclusion*

We now come to the last part of this series on the application of presuppositional analysis to the problem of defining the nature, attributes, and characteristics of civil government. We began with an overview that looked at several areas of life, generally, then narrowed the focus to the ideas of civil government and Law, and we saw that only on Christian presuppositions is true and Lawful civil government possible.

Conversely, all attempts at civil government on Humanistic presuppositions are doomed to failure, and that such systems rely totally on commerce and a massive military machine, which has been true of ancient kingdoms, of Rome, and of modern America and the Western world.

Humanistic systems of civil government are predestined to self-contradiction, self-refutation, and self-destruction. When Mercury and Mars are the gods of civil government and such a government is given enough time, the outcome is a foregone conclusion. This has been the course of history for over four thousand years.

Ironically, Humanism recognizes its own short-comings and the superiority of God's Law, which is why Christian Law today, is still the only real, supreme Law of the Land.

Thus, we find in "*Corpus Juris*," 59 C.J. 20, under 'States,' sub-heading [g] Extent of sovereign characteristics of state, where it speaks of the American system - "The state is a sovereign having no derivative powers, exercising its sovereignty by divine right. It has bound itself by compact with the other sovereign states not to exercise certain of its sovereign rights, and has conceded these to the Union, but in every other respect it retains all its sovereignty." *Lowenstein v. Evans*, 69 F. 908, 911. 59 C.J. 20.

The 'state' here is distinguished from the State, and STATE, or State of, etc., or, as in the above example, 'the Union.' All of which are organized, specific forms of civil government. The state (lower case spelling) is entirely general and refers to a large group of people within the total population, but not all the people.

"By the word State (capitalized) is meant one of the States of the American Union. Spelled otherwise, it refers to political societies or states in general." Robinson's Elementary Law (1882), note, p. xxxiv [insert added], which is consistent with the rules of English usage, as well.

"In the sense of the constitutional guarantee of a republican form of government, the term 'state' is used to express the idea of a people or political community, as distinguished from the government;" and, "The [Good and Lawful Christian] people, in whatever territory dwelling, either temporarily or permanently, and whether organized under a regular government, or united by looser and less definite relations, constitute the state." *Texas v. White*, 7 Wall. 700. Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1914), State, p. 3124. [the State, and state are not the same, insertions added.] "It may mean an organized political community." *Silver Bow County v. Davis*, 6 Mont. 306, 12 P. 688, 690, aff'd. 139 U.S. 438, 11 S.Ct. 594, 35 L.Ed. 210. 59 C.J. 18.

Since Christianity is the presumed basis of real Law in this country by the Supreme Court of the United States, by the Federal, State, and County governments, both before and since Lincoln's War Against Christian States, its recognition also applies to the law and international relations of the current governments, and "until such recognition it has been said that the courts must assume that the former government continues without change." 33 *Corpus Juris*, 394, under the heading "International Law."

In other words, the existence of Christianity and the Christian state (a body of people distinct from the State) is recognized by international and municipal law. This explains why Non-statutory Abatements work if properly written and served by Good and Lawful Christian People.

Further, the Christian people (state) are cloaked with sovereignty as in a divine right from God by virtue of the fact that God has written His Law on their hearts. Where ever the Christian goes,

he carries all his rights, privileges, and immunities, from God and always retains the Perfect Law of Liberty to exercise them at every moment he is called upon to do so, as the Holy Spirit and Scripture leads.

It is this fact that gives the Christian authority to re-establish Christian civil government, i.e., Christian Jural Societies, in order that we can begin again to execute the testament of Our Sovereign Lord and Savior Jesus Christ who gave us such authority in the Dominion Mandate (Genesis 1:28) and in the Great Commission, which is sealed by the Holy Spirit until the Day of Redemption and the Lord has returned for His Bride.

In other words, a Christian already has all the power and authority needed to do the job he has been called to do in a *de jure* sense. It is time for the *de jure* state to become the *de facto* Christian State.

There are, however, many nay-sayers in the Christian camp. Some say there are not enough Christians who obey God's Law to restore and reconstruct the Christian State, i.e., turn the state into a State. But, in law, numbers and resources mean nothing. The "equality of states is an incident of sovereignty; for, if one is in right subject to another, the former is not sovereign. But equality in this sense means "equality before the law," and not in strength, resources, and influence." "Nor does it require equal voting power in world affairs, for differences of international value are obvious." See Corpus Juris, 33 C.J. 397, Section 18, 2. 'Equality.'

This point is made forcibly in Scripture. Gideon did not need numbers for his great battle?

Others argue that we do not have the recognition of existing governments, but the above cites say that 'recognition' is not important. Does this mean that because Humanists recognize us that we must also recognize them? Of course not!

Recall that in the earlier parts we stated that the ultimate presuppositions behind Christianity and Humanism are 'mutually exclusive ultimates,' and that as such, each must deny the other's validity. To recognize the opponent's right, is to give legitimacy to the opponent that he has no right to. This we must not do or else we will suffer the judgments of God for compromising His Law.

This is also why we do not acknowledge the knock on the door by a stranger who may be from the opposition. To answer the door is to recognize the opposition, and concede jurisdiction to them to try us in their courts.

You can argue all day that you are a sovereign, and it will do you no good, because your actions betray your words. By your fruits are you known, even by the enemy. Remember how often Scripture tells us that Christ knows His sheep. To open the door is to say that the enemy is Our shepherd, not Christ.

To have a driver's license or social security card or any other token of a benefit, privilege, immunity, or opportunity from the opposition contradicts and nullifies the Christian witness. The reason is, the name on all such instruments, being a *nom de guerre*, is a fiction. Such is certainly not a Christian name or appellation. You may profess to be a Christian all day long, but the evidence of your actions, the bitter fruit in your billfold or purse, says that you're not a Christian, but a Humanist looking to the State for approval.

The same is true of the number on your house, your Post Office Box number, the VIN and Registration numbers on your car, the parcel number on your house and land, and so on, *ad infinitum, ad nauseum*. The use of such numbers and fictitious designations has destroyed the power of the Christian church in America.

Look at any church on any block in your home town. Perhaps, even on your own church you will see the name of the church in all capital letters, which designates a 501(c)3 commercial corporation, that is advertising for business.

But, you say, "I still haven't accepted the mark of the beast on my wrist or forehead!" Hogwash!!! Can you buy or sell without the numbers and fictitious names, add or remove anything from 'your home' without a permit number, conduct any transaction without an account number, send your child to a public school without a Social Security number, get your plumbing, electrical wiring, or TV fixed, or do even the most mundane thing, without it all being numbered and tracked commercially? The answer is obviously, No!!!

What is worse, most Christians don't know there is another way to do things.

Some of you may panic because you've been told by your commercial church leaders not to accept the mark or you won't go to heaven. Think for moment! You've already accepted a mark without which you cannot buy or sell anything! Do you really need a mark on your wrist or forehead when you have already volunteered to carry one in your own pocket??? No one forced you to take it. You volunteered for it, because the same commercial church leaders you've always listened to told you to obey all authorities and both you and they thought that meant obeying even ungodly laws, codes, ordinances, rules, and regulations.

Is this the attitude of Christ who did His Father's will even when it contradicted the laws of the Jews and Romans and sent Him to the Cross? Does this idea fit with the Scripture when it tells us to 'seek first the Kingdom of Heaven?'

Yes, there will be many nay-sayers who don't want to rock the boat. So be it: let the dead bury the dead.

But, there are some, including those in The King's Men, who believe that we are on the verge of a new advance of the Christian church, that we are on the verge of a new reformation and reconstruction.

Thus, as a fitting end to this series, we will close with a short dissertation on the general nature and characteristics of the new era of Christian dominion that is to come. After all, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

From the theoretical standpoint, the course of history is interpreted by Humanists as cyclical. But, from the Christian standpoint, history may appear to be cyclical if Our understanding cannot get beyond the mere form of history and see the deeper and more subtle meaning that is available only to the mind and heart of one guided by the Holy Spirit.

The form may appear to repeat itself because Humanist thinking is itself repetitive, in the sense that it vacillates from one apparently polar opposite to another and then swings back again. We say apparently polar opposite because in fact, the pendulum swing in Humanist thought is not really from one pole to its opposite. There can be no polarization in Humanist thought because

the Humanist leaves out of his view of reality the Christian idea and interpretation. Again, the mutually exclusive ultimate arises.

At any rate, if we begin with the Garden of Eden, we can see how we began with a perfect world, then fell into total depravity, which gradually became more and more extreme until God destroyed the world by the Great Flood of Genesis. Since the Flood, we have seen a major reformation or reconstruction in the work of Moses, Ezra, Christ, and the Great Reformation that began with Wycliffe and eventually gave birth to this nation.

Each of these reformations brought with them eras in which more men and women came to a knowledge of God and Christ. Each was marked by advancements in all areas of life. Thus, from the crude systems of commercial dictatorship before Christ (except for the Hebrew Republic) we now have the simple and profound forms of local self-government by the Christian Man, such as The Hundreds of England. In art, we have progressed from stone carvings to film and television. In communications we have gone from clay tablets to the personal computer. From cutting holes in a man's head to relieve headaches or demons we have come to the aspirin.

And, man is beginning to live longer as he once did before the Flood. Fewer women and babies die in childbirth. The ability to cover vast distances in a short period of time is staggering. Man's inventions are becoming more sophisticated by day. And, his potential for good or evil has grown by leaps and bounds.

The point is, each reformation has brought with it incredible advances in man's knowledge and understanding but, the reformation is not self-sustaining, and usually within three or four generations, the reformation dies. What was once inspired and led by advances in Christian thought begins to wane when the Christian does not keep pace with the developments of ideas and their consequences that the Christian himself gave to man as he tried to bring more and more of the Word of God to bear on the world about him.

Herman Dooyeweerd, a Dutch philosopher described this phenomenon as a kind of convergence and divergence of ideas.

What he meant was, man may start in the Garden of Eden, but after a while, his ideas begin to diverge into implications or consequences that he never saw in his original vision. This period of divergence we would call the declining phase of Christian thought. As ideas become more diversified the original Christian motive behind them is lost and the advances spawned in Christianity, are soon taken over, or co-opted by the Humanist, who promptly begins to re-interpret them according to the god of Humanism, autonomous reason.

Eventually, the decline reaches a point at which, even to Christians, the situation is so bad that something must be done. This factor drives the Christian back to Scripture and his knees. The Humanist has now become the rod that drives the lazy Christian forward and compels him to re-think his position. In the plan of God, the Humanist has always been God's rod to wake the sleeping Christian and get him back on course.

In very simple terms, when the pain level gets high enough, the Spirit of God begins to move in the hearts and minds of Christians, the process of convergence begins, and a new reformation is born.

Convergence is a process in which man does a complete re-thinking of his ideas either generally, or specifically. It begins in the heart and then becomes conscious in the mind, sometimes slowly, and sometimes quickly. The process does not usually come upon all the people at once, but gradually. It begins with a few people, called of God and gifted by the Holy Spirit in such a way that they can read the real implications of an idea and not the pretended ones. That is, they see through the smoke and mirrors.

Gradually, a new understanding of things begins to come upon the Christian, at first in only a few areas of life, then later, more and more of a man's ideas are re-thought in terms of the new vision of things that is emerging in his heart and mind.

At some point in the process, the Christian Man must put his new found truth in Scripture to work. He cannot help himself for he is the tool or agent of God. He may become one of the new shock troops in God's plan, or a general of the army, a behind-the-scenes strategist and planner, or fill a whole range of other needs in God's plan.

Over time, an army of these reformed men and women is formed. At first, they may be unaware that there are others who think the same way they do. Eventually, however, the Spirit of God brings them together and an organization is formed and the task of bringing together new minds and hearts to the fight, begins. What was once fragmented and disjointed, now becomes an organized movement on the march, at first in an almost underground sense and later, it becomes a phenomena which catches the attention of the powers that be.

If the Humanist powers detect this new movement, they may attempt a variety of tactics to deal with it, that range from outright persecution, to subversion. No matter, because what God has started, no power on earth can stop. Eventually, as more and more Christians join the struggle, the balance of power begins to shift. Like a rain storm that begins with only a few drops in the dry dust, it becomes a raging flood that washes away all that stands in its way. And when the flood subsides, the new top soil brings forth sweet fruit and the land becomes green with righteousness and prosperity.

Before you know it, a new power is in control and Christians are once again advancing on every front until at last, the Humanist realizes that its time to retreat and go underground.

The reformation will then solidify its power and re-chart a new course for the nation that will bring many new advances and developments just as in previous reformations and just at the point where the Christian gets comfortable with the way things are, the process of divergence sets in again.

For those who wonder why we must go through the process of reformation and decline, or convergence and divergence of ideas, the only answer we can give is; "... so that no man should boast..."

As to where we are now in the next reformation, it is Our belief that we are somewhere in that period where the army is being formed. Networking and organization is taking place in more and more areas every day. We are not yet an army, for we are still in training, in basic training or boot camp, if you will. As the pain level rises, more and more Christian men and women are volunteering to join what is by now, a nation-wide movement.



The Humanists know we are out here and that Our numbers are growing. They also know that their own system is in major trouble. It doesn't take a genius to see that when the I.R.S. begins to offer discounts for advance payment of income taxes that there is a problem. It does not take a Harvard Business School graduate to see that when foreclosures and bankruptcies begin to accelerate across the nation the entire economy is undermined. Foreclosures and bankruptcies in Los Angeles County alone, in 1996, reached nearly 5,000 a month (up 64% from 1995) and this number is climbing at an unbelievable rate. Nationwide, this means more than 600,00 bankruptcies and foreclosures a year!!!

In the last five years, the Federal budget has been cut more than in any previous period in history, not because of the genius of the President, but because he and the Congress have no choice in the matter. It is safe to say that such cuts will become more drastic in size at an accelerated pace over the next decade.

Scandal is running rampant in the Federal and State governments because the politicians and their cronies are being forced to more and more drastic means to raise campaign funds, while at the same time, key members of the President's Cabinet and members of the House and Senate, are abandoning ship.

Anyone with the eyes to see and the ears to hear knows about the hand-writing on the wall. The problem is, those in power are not gifted with the ability to translate it.

All this is merely the prelude, the birth pangs, of a new era and these events are typical of all previous reformations. Yes, for those in the Christian law reform movement things are still very tough and there are many questions we have yet to answer, but each and every day we are making progress as we bring more and more of Our thought captive to the mind of Christ.

We may not live to see the fruit of what we do here and what you, Our readers are doing every hour of their lives, but Our posterity will. When things get tough, it's time to toughen up the knees and burn the midnight oil and this is happening now, even as this is written at 4:12 a.m. on a Saturday morning. Our reward may not come in Our lifetimes, but, no matter; for We have a greater reward coming in Heaven, when at last, we may sit down and take Our rest in the enjoyment of the Lord and His Presence forever.

And, let us hope, that the generations after Us will be able to speak of Us even as We have spoken of the Founding Fathers.

"And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of the paths to dwell in." *Isaiah 58:12*.