

OCCUPY!

Volume II, Number 1

19:13

January 1980

THE BATTLE FOR THE FAMILY, PART I

Archio

The continuing spiritual warfare between Christ and Satan is particularly manifested, in our day and nation, in the continuing war between Christianity and humanism. All too often, the war is between humanists and Christians, rather than the reverse. That is, all too often the humanists are on the offensive (Humanism is, in its very nature, offensive.), and Christians are either on the defensive or unaware of the existence of the battle. When confronted with adversaries more intelligent, learned, attractive or civilized than Mad Murray OHair, we often fail to fulfill our biblical duty to "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many **false** prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4:1ff). We fail to exercise our spiritual senses to discern both good and evil (Heb. 5:14; cf. Heb. 5:12-14; 1 Kings 3:9, 11-14).

Often, by the time that many Christians learn that there is a battle, that Christians should be in the fray, or that they have been fighting on the side of evil spirits, the battle is over, at least for the foreseeable future. Sometimes, however, the humanists tip their hands, disclosing their aims by excessive boldness before the tide of battle has shifted in their favor. Then the intent of our adversaries becomes manifest, and it is possible for the army of Christ to take the field.

Such an instance is presented by today's battle for the family. For centuries the fundamental premises of humanistic teaching have warred on the biblical doctrine of the family. For decades "our" humanistic "welfare state" has combined humanistic theory and practice to both intentionally and (let us be charitable) unintentionally undermine and destroy the family. Now the logic of humanism, together with its intended and unintended results, are producing overt, manifest threats to the biblical family's continued existence.

Humanistic Theory vs. the Family

Given the diametrical opposition between the presuppositions of humanism and those of Scripture, it is natural that humanists would sooner or later come out of the closets and openly oppose scriptural doctrine regarding the family. Scripture holds that the Triune God is Creator and Sustainer of the universe and man. Humanism rejects creation in favor of a chance, "evolutionary" beginning of the universe and of man; hence, man's beginning is ultimately meaningless and, as humanists desire, standard less. Scripture teaches that God created man in His image, to fulfill His purposes, by His grace and providence. Humanism's doctrine of evolution leaves man a chance occurrence, happen-

ing in (because out of) the image of the inorganic or the animal, free (in most versions and in practically all humanistic desires) to do his will, by the "grace" of man's will, power, knowledge—and of chance. Scripture begins with God, His word, His creation ordinances, and His immutable standards of law and morality. Humanism begins with chance, silence and chaos: it can supply no objective laws or standards, nor can its faith in a chaos of flux "evolve" them.

Scripture begins with God as the autonomous Standard of all things, and man as His dependent creature. Humanism, philosophically and psychologically, begins with man as the presupposed lyautonomous standard and measure of all things. Biblically, it both follows and is explicitly stated that God's word is law, in regard to both physical events and ethics. Humanistic faith's denial of the Sovereign God of Scripture removes the possibility of any binding physical or ethical laws, and thus leaves no law outside of man's will. Humanists seek to discover "laws" for guiding human action through either empirical observation of things and men or Neo-Kantian intuition, but a chance, evolving "universe" can yield no objective standard of either physical science or ethics, and, of course, intuition can supply no objective standard of ethics, in the absence of the ordinance of the Sovereign God of Scripture.

So, as R. J. Rushdoony has pointed out, modern man is left with nothing other than a word of flux (The Word of Flux: Modern Man and the Problem of Knowledge) to guide his individual and collective actions. Even though he deceives himself that he can discover some standards of action, his evolutionary presuppositions render any supposed ethical standard sooner or later obsolete, even by his own reckoning. Thus, the humanist is left (Politically, it is not inaccurate to say that, with respect to our tradition, he is Left, by self-definition.) with no standard outside the will and power of man or men, the individual or the group. Hence freedom becomes redefined, in modern thought, as the absence of external restraint (Hobbes), as the ability to do what one wills (Rousseau), as the ability to gratify one's desires—any desires (Machiavelli). Humanism's denial of God and His law leads to its affirmation of man and his will, apart from any standard outside of the desires of man.

The only question then becomes whether the particular humanist prefers to deify the desires of the individual or of the group. Some varieties of humanists deify the group: National Socialists (the race), Fascists (the nation), Communists (the proletariat), one-

world "Liberals" (mankind), Others prefer (or say they prefer) the individual's will: Classical Liberals, contemporary "Liberals" (actually, democratic socialists), and various sub-species of Libertarians.

But the main thrust of modern political thought is clearly the achievement of the freedom of the individual to gratify his desires, to do as he wills. This is the common ground-motive of humanistic individualists and collectivists, anarchists and totalitarians. All agree that man must be free of God's moral commandments. The catch is that most deifiers of the group prefer to achieve ultimate individual freedom by comparatively short-run violations of that freedom (and, natch, by continuous violation of God's law).

We should not lose sight of the fact, however, that the modern definition of freedom makes all things legitimate for those in power. If one cannot distinguish between liberty and license, then force and deceit become desirable means to gratify one's desires. It is not only humanistic glorifiers of the great individual (Machiavelli, Nietzsche) who teach this, but also glorifiers of the group (Hitler, Mussolini, Marx, Dewey). Where there is no objective moral law, anything goes, for the Individual or the group. Moreover, this holds true for personal relationships, as well as for political ones.

What has all of this to do with the family? Precisely this: The family is, historically speaking, not only one of the three fundamental institutions ordained by God, but it is the first institution established by the Creator. God's law explicitly ordains and protects the family, by prohibiting and punishing murder, the dishonoring of parents, adultery and covetousness, and by binding the protection of private property ownership to the family, in His prohibition of theft, covetousness and the bearing of false witness against a neighbor (Cf. Ex. 20:12-17, and, for a fuller exposition of God's law-requirements for the family, R. J. Rushdoony's massive and stimulating *The Institutes of Biblical Law*). As Rev. Rushdoony has pointed out in "The Family" (Chalcedon Position Paper No. 8; CHALCEDON, P.O. Box 158, Vallecito, Ca. 95125), Scripture gives the family power over the control of children, power over property, power over the inheritance, the power of education, and the responsibility and power of welfare—all of which are under attack by the humanist "welfare state." Few biblical teachings are clearer than God's establishment of the monogamous family, with the father as human authority and his wife as his helpmeet, and with the two given the duties of love, worship, study, fellowship, work, obedience and the godly nurture of children.

The presuppositions of humanistic faith, however, point apostate man in the opposite direction from the way of God. If there is no sovereign Lord of Scripture, then there can be no objective moral law. If man lives in a chance, irrationally changing environment, there can be no objective knowledge of anything, much less of moral law. If man is or should be free to do as he wills, then no moral law is or can be binding. If man can neither know nor be bound by any objective moral law, then he has no valid reason for honoring the biblical institution of the family, or for obeying any of the commandments which ordain, establish, sustain and require the family, should his desires or the desires of the group command the **contrary** of biblical law. For that matter, if man can neither know nor be bound by any objective moral law, he has no valid reason for remaining in the family, regardless of his or the group's desires. And even if we have traditionally honored the family, in a supposedly evolving world what is here today maybe gone tomorrow! Is it any wonder, given the pervasiveness of these humanistic notions in story, script, text and song, and given the modern exaltation of the desires, that the family is in trouble? Is it any wonder that a spiritual reformation and much activity by Bible-believing Christians is necessary to a restoration of the family?

Applied Humanism vs. the Family: the White House Conference on Families

Any halfway intelligent person today can see that the family is in serious trouble. Even the TV commentators have noticed it. We shall subsequently see that both the intellectual pillars of humanism and the application of humanistic doctrine via the "welfare state" have combined to undermine the family. But for the present, let us notice three things. First, the "welfare state" is based on faith in central governmental planning. Governmental planning is believed to be the means of solving all social and economic "problems." The clear history of planning is that it a) fails to achieve its stated goals, and b) produces unintended adverse consequences. The historic response of planning devotees to these failures is to demand further government interventions, programs and restrictions on liberty-further plans—to remedy the ills caused by prior planning.

Second, planning in the "welfare state" is based on pragmatism, which follows from the evolutionary presuppositions of humanism. A changing "universe" requires changing responses on the part of man. In terms of what criteria? Humanistic man cannot objectively answer this question. What he does in practice is to substitute his socio-economic desires, or those of the rulers or the majority, for objective criteria. In the humanistic state the failures of planning produce not the abandonment of planning but the substitution of new plans for old ones.

Thirdly, the **antinomian** (anti-biblical law) relativism of humanism requires the abandonment of biblical norms of the family. Antinomian relativism combines with evolutionary pragmatism and faith in central planning to produce plans to abandon the family. Since the premises and practices of humanism have produced a threat to the family, the government must "solve" the socio-economic "problems" by intervention and planning. Since relativism requires the abandonment of the biblical norms for the family, the family must be pragmatically redefined, and a new set of plans, calculated to establish the new form or forms of the family, must be imposed by messianic government.

This is essentially the philosophy which underlies the White House Conference on Families." Note that the organization's title refers not to the family, but to families: its purpose is not to strengthen the biblical family, but to redefine it by making it only one among many possible family forms. The WHCF claims to have no definition of the family, which would render it unable to diagnose the family's problems. The relativistic and radical intentions of the WHCF organizers, however are revealed in their fashionable equal opportunity, anti-discrimination statement:

"every individual interested in the WHCF should have an equal opportunity to participate. This applies to all people, whatever their race, sex, religion, political affiliation, sexual orientation, age, or ideological orientation." (emphasis added)

Moreover, states participating in the WHCF are required to "develop an affirmative action plan to insure adequate representation of racial and ethnic groups, men and women, handicapped individuals, low income families and (the kicker:) diverse family forms." (emphasis added)

In light of these considerations, it is no surprise that the WHCF is being run by the Department of HEWS Office of Families: it is being run by humanistic, self-interested bureaucrats, who stand to profit, ideologically, economically and powerfully through the new federal and state legislation which is supposed to be the outcome of the WHCF. Nor, as was the case with the infamous IWW, which was used by the President and the bureaucrats to push the ERA and its attendant lesbianism, should it be surprising that the organizing personnel in the states just hap-

pen to be state welfare-type bureaucrats. And was it coincidental that the Virginia Conference on Families, the pilot state-level WHCF, adopted the American Home Economics Association definition of the family, which "describes" it:

"as a unit of two or more persons who share resources, share responsibilities for decisions, share values and have a commitment to one another over time. Family is the climate that one 'comes home to' and it is the network of sharing and commitments that most accurately describes family, regardless of blood, legal ties, adoption or marriage" (emphasis added)?

No wonder the VCF organizers spoke of their definition of the family as permitting "the association to accept dramatic changes in families" (emphasis added).

The WHCF is to be preceded by state conferences on families, each of which will select a designated number of WHCF delegates (the remainder will be appointed by each state governor). The humanistic planners control the pre-conference organizational machinery, and can be expected to withhold information about the conferences from pro-family people. The WHCF itself will consist of three "regional" conferences, to be held in Minneapolis, Baltimore and Los Angeles. Guess which region the L.A. conference is for! people from Texas the West and the Southeast will have to travel across the continent, not merely a few hundred miles, to attend—if we can get enough pro-family people to attend. It just happens that the most remote conference is for the country's most "conservative" regions, the "Bible Belt" and the Southwest. So much for equity in planning!

Victory in Virginia

Mrs. Jo Ann Gasper, whose newsletter on Congressional action regarding women and the family, *THE RIGHT WOMAN* (from which we derive the right quotations and WHCF information) contains an account of the VCF, has supplied us with a valuable report on the pro-family group's stunning victory over the humanistic bureaucrats in Virginia. Pre-conference organization, coalition-formation, a thoughtful pro-family petition and statement of principles, and pre- and post-conference attention to the news media (telling them what to expect from the bureaucrats, then getting the pro-family view of the proceedings presented to the media) paid-off pro-family forces elected 90% of the delegates and received favorable media coverage. Those committed to the preservation and strengthening of the biblical family should acquire, study and act on the information contained in this special report on the VCF. (*THE RIGHT WOMAN*, 919 18th Street, N. W., Wash-

ington, D.C. 20006; phone 703-534-0252; single copies \$1; 5-50 copies .80 each; 51-99 copies .50 each; over copies .40 each; bulk rate). The report contains names, addresses and telephone numbers of WHCF State Coordinators, from whom you may be able to obtain information on your state's "Conference on Families." The Virginia Plan of action can be followed in your state to win a victory for the Lord.

The victory, however, will not be easily won. There are more of us than there are humanists, but they control the conference organization and information machinery and they are not particularly scrupulous. The Virginia victory has stimulated them to intensify their organizational efforts and turn out more of their clientele and ideological supporters. They avidly desire to acquire the political power with the media and the state and national legislatures that victory in the state and national conferences will bring, for such is the way to legislation, the lifeblood of applied humanism. However, their desire is not for a godly legislation, but for a family-destroying, culture-deadening, judgment-bringing radical legislation. And without political action by Christians, they—and we—shall have it.

Beyond Virginia

Most of the important things we can do, in the battle for the family, are (as usual) not strictly political: prayer, evangelism, reasoning from Scripture with Christian brothers and sisters, reasoning from Scripture, history and the consequences of ideas with others, establishing and maintaining a godly family life of worship, study, work and love. But humanism is a crusading faith, and its WHCF follows the classic pattern of humanistic "welfare" action: identify a real or supposed problem; "trace" the origin of the "problem" to inherited ideas and institutions (certainly not to inherited Original Sin); "study" and propagate humanistic "solutions" to the "problem;" demand political action; . . . study the problems generated by the humanistic "solution" to the original "problem;" demand further governmental action and bureaucracies to "solve" these problems. As we shall see, applied humanism has further assaults on the family. Those who would occupy for Jesus—and even those who would just "hold the line"—must do more than just talk about how bad our political situation is becoming, or how great is the peril of the biblical family. The family was ordained by God to be an area of love and duties apart from the state, not to be under, manipulated and redefined by men in governmental power. For the good servant of the Lord, educational and political activity in the battle for the family is a divine mandate.

PRAGMATISM AND PLANNING

The Idea of Central Planning and America's Fuel Crisis, Part III

Archie

When Americans and professing Christians listen with favor to the President and other politicians prescribe more governmental controls, programs and taxes for energy shortages which the DOE's own report admits are results of the D. O.E.'s activity, it must be because they either seriously or unreflectingly share the humanist's antinomian faith in salvation by government. But it is also because they share the humanist's related view of the world and life.

Americans have always had a proclivity to do what works. Our experience as a colonial and frontier people, our cultural emphasis on the importance of the individual, and our traditional political,

economic and personal liberty have fostered and preserved this "pragmatic" proclivity. This "pragmatic" characteristic, however, was not truly pragmatic, for it was not based on a pragmatic world-view.

True pragmatism is a philosophy—an apostate, humanistic philosophy—not a mere attitude. It is a world-view based on evolutionary assumptions. Pragmatism assumes an essentially Godless, evolutionary, evolving "universe" and world, a work of continuous change, in which change is the only constant and man is on his own, free from any binding law-word of a Sovereign Creator and Sustainer of man and the universe.

Politically, as an analysis of the philosophies of John Dewey, the Facists, the National Socialists, the Communists, and the new totalitarian "Liberals" of our day will show, this pragmatic philosophy seems to open the possibility of, and has led to, a faith in some sort of pseudo-salvation of man on earth by the state. If everything is changing and man is autonomous, then, this faith holds, man may be saved by a government which attunes individuals to the changes produced by history. Provided, of course, that governmental power is in the hands of those who know where evolutionary history has taken us. . . or where it is going. We who are not in possession of this *gnosis* (secret knowledge), must have our lives conformed not to Christ but to the image of the man or men who know the requirements of the times. Communist leaders supposedly know where history is going; "Liberals" supposedly know either where history is going (one-world socialism) or where history is now—what "History" requires us to abandon or destroy. Accordingly, the politics of Pragmatism requires that government "save" men (as Rushdoony has noted, a denial of the Incarnation) by manipulating them, by continuously remaking their institutions, lives and even beliefs, through applied governmental power.

Philosophically (as Gordon H. Clark, Cornelius Van Til and Rushdoony have shown), Pragmatism is nonsense. If everything is changing, then it is impossible to know anything. In an evolutionary world, history is a tale told by an idiot. In a world of flux there are no objective standards by which to guide individuals or governments: no laws of physics, history, or ethics. The

Pragmatist seeks to continually adjust his plans for others' lives to the changes produced by evolutionary chance. But in a chance world there can be no objective standards in terms of which to formulate any plans, individual or governmental, long-run or short-run. Having rejected the Sovereign God of Scripture, the Pragmatist logically has no valid reason for preferring government coercion to individual freedom, since he has no valid criterion in terms of which to formulate governmental plans.

It is no wonder that Pragmatist's vainglorious plans do not work: in terms of his own assumptions, the planning Pragmatist cannot know what works, for he cannot know objectively either what is or what should be. Pragmatists cannot know what "what works" should work for!

But the failures of Pragmatism's plans do not lead most Pragmatists (or their intellectually schizophrenic Christian devotees) to abandon their plans to plan new plans to remedy the failures of their old plans. For Pragmatism is a variety of humanistic faith, not a mere attitude of openness to change.

Pragmatic Planning is a faith that cannot work. Americans of past generations could do "what works" because, in general, they operated from a set of cultural assumptions which enabled them to know or discover "what works:" Christian assumptions. And what Americans did did work, generally, precisely because—and to the extent that—Americans generally worked within the boundaries of a world which they knew was created and governed by the law-word of the God of Scripture. He who has ears to hear, let him hear!