

Transcripts of

EDUCATIONAL CHRISTIAN FAITH

A Lecture Series by R.J. Rushdoony



R.J. RUSHDOONY

(1916–2001)

Rev. R.J. Rushdoony (1916–2001), was a leading theologian, church/state expert, and author of numerous works on the application of Biblical law to society. He started the Chalcedon Foundation in 1965. His Institutes of Biblical Law (1973) began the contemporary theonomy movement which posits the validity of Biblical law as God's standard of obedience for all. He therefore saw God's law as the basis of the modern Christian response to the cultural decline, one he attributed to the church's false view of God's law being opposed to His grace. This broad Christian response he described as "Christian Reconstruction." He is credited with igniting the modern Christian school and homeschooling movements in the mid to late 20th century. He also traveled extensively lecturing and serving as an expert witness in numerous court cases regarding religious liberty. Many ministry and educational efforts that continue today, took their philosophical and Biblical roots from his lectures and books.

Learn more about R.J. Rushdoony by visiting: <https://chalcedon.edu/founder>

Mathematics

R.J. Rushdoony

Let us begin with prayer.

Our Lord and our God, we thank thee that thou hast called us to serve thee and given us so great a privilege to educate thy children for thy service and for the command of the things that are of this world in thy name. Give us grace to see all things in terms of thy Word, to exercise dominion in every subject and in every area of life, to the end that all things may be brought into captivity to Jesus Christ. Open our minds and lighten our understanding, and grant that we may behold wondrous things out of thy Word. In Jesus' name, amen.

Our subject this morning is 'Mathematics,' and our approach will be from the perspective of the philosophy of mathematics. One of the first things we must recognize as we approach mathematics, and any and every subject is this; there are no neutral facts in the universe. No neutral facts. There are no facts that men can approach, believer and unbeliever and say: "Here, we both see the same thing." No! Every fact in the universe is a God-created fact. There is not an atom, not a thing in all of creation that is not the handiwork of the triune God. As a result, to look at anything including numbers, from any other perspective than a biblical one is to falsify what you view.

Not only are all facts God-created, but all facts witness to and testify to their maker.

"The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament sheweth his handywork.
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night sheweth knowledge."

And there is no place, we are told by the psalmist: "Where their voice is not heard." Moreover, the psalmist tells us in Psalm 139 that though he fled from God to: "the uttermost parts of the sea;" behold thou art there. thou I make my bed in Hell: "behold, thou art there."

That psalm, incidentally, is the theme, out of personal experience, of perhaps the greatest single poem in the English language, Francis Thompson's The Hound of Heaven, where he describes his attempt to escape from God, but he cannot escape from Him, everything, wherever he goes, witnesses to the sovereign God.

So that, first, we have no neutral facts in the universe, mathematics, no less than biology, is an area where there is no neutrality. Moreover, we have no neutral men. Men are either for God or they are against Him. They are either covenant-keepers or they are covenant-breakers, so that all men when they approach all things will attempt to divorce them from God to abstract them from the world of God's meaning. They want to see the world in a vacuum. No more than trees and people exist in a vacuum, do numbers exist in a vacuum. They are part of a God-created world. To insist that they be viewed in isolation from the fact of God as creator is to falsify them. There is no understanding of mathematics, nor the fact that mathematics has developed to the point it has in human history apart from the context of the Christian civilization. When math has developed, or rather elementary arithmetic in various civilizations, it has gone so far and no further, and it has collapsed because there has

been no ground for it, no foundation. We are told that the Arab scholars developed a great deal of math. And it's true, except what we are not told is that those Arab mathematicians were either Christian captives, or they were the children of Christian captives, so that they brought a Christian understanding of mathematics and when that element dropped out of the Muslim world, their science and their math withered.

There is no idea of two without the idea of one. There is no idea of one without a theistic faith. Why do I say that? The basic problem of philosophy throughout the centuries has been 'the problem of the one and the many.' I have a book on the subject entitled simply *The One and the Many*. It is in the area of philosophy and is not a simple book to read because this is the root problem. What is the idea of the one and the many? Well, mankind through the centuries has wrestled with the problem; what is basic to reality? Is it the unity, the oneness of things or the individuality, the particularity of things? If you stress the unity of things then individuality, particularity, numbers, becomes a problem. In Vedantic Hinduism, one plus one equals one because all is one. And there's no place for individuality. So that although early in Hindu civilization before this type of faith developed, they began to develop numbers; the minute they came to Vedantic humanism and other forms of the same faith, all is one, then one plus one equals one. If you go instead to an atomistic faith, you have no unity. You have only individual things that cannot be related to one another. So you have an endless number of ones but nothing that binds the ones one to another; no unity.

Now let's take it in a practical fashion. When you have no real concept of 'the one and the many,' you will say, as you approach the doctrine of the church: "the church is everything, the member is nothing," and you have Romanism. Or you can say the individual is everything and the Church is nothing, and you have anarchism. You can do the same in the area of the state. The state, the totalitarian state is everything, and the individual is nothing. Or the citizen and his rights are everything and the state is nothing and you have libertarianism and anarchism. You can have the same with marriage. Marriage is everything but the members thereof do not count; their feelings do not matter. There can be no breaking of the bond, as Rome says, no divorce. Or you can have the modern point of view; marriage depends entirely upon the individual's feelings and it is to be broken if the individual is weary of it. Do you get the point? The basic problem whether it's in the scientific sphere, the numeric sphere, the personal sphere, throughout the history of philosophy has been the problem of 'the one and the many.'

No philosophy has ever solved it, and this is why although very early, China had a great civilization, India had a great civilization; you had the Minoan culture of Crete, which incidentally had magnificent buildings with sewer lines, hot and cold running water, flush toilets, very much like that which we've developed in modern times, disappeared. There was no solution to the problem of the one and the many, and therefore life ended up either in meaninglessness or anarchy, and the cultures collapsed. Only one faith has ever solved this basic problem of philosophy; the biblical faith, because in the doctrine of the Trinity, you have the equal ultimacy of the one and the many. One God, three persons. The oneness of God is as ultimate as he threeness of God, so there is both unity and individuality in the godhead and therefor in all of creation there is an equal importance to the oneness of things, and the particularity or the individuality of things, and therefore, there is the possibility of a mathematics.

Let me illustrate the problem a little further on why this trinitarian foundation of mathematics is basic. In another one of my books which is also in the area of philosophy, *The Word of Flux*, I cite the Princeton seminar of a few years ago by the mathematicians and astrophysicists who pinpointed the moon-shot, controlled it and placed a man on a particular predetermined point on the moon. What was the seminar about after they had done this remarkable thing? The whole point of the seminar was what we did was impossible. We cannot explain how it was done. Why? Because, they said, our mathematics which led to the computations that pinpointed a man on the moon are simply the logic of man's mind and have no relationship to the physical universe, to brute factuality.

Now let me explain the term 'brute factuality.' That's the view that the non-Christian has of the world out there, the non-Christian thinker. Brute means meaningless, unintelligent and unintelligible. It means that every fact in the universe is a totally meaningless fact, a product of chance. There is no law, no purpose, no design holding them together. The universe is a 'surd,' a meaningless entity. How then, they said, can you have a realm of brute meaningless factuality without any purpose, order or law to it? And yet the logic of the human mind can place a man on the moon.

Well, one of the scientists remarked that of course there was a simple answer to it; God, but that was a cop-out. Do you see the point? They recognized that the one ground on which they operated is really theistic. If there were no God, they could not have pinpointed a man on the moon, but they wouldn't acknowledge Him, nor that all their thinking depended on the reality of God. You see, we don't prove that God exists, no, we begin with God. If we didn't begin with God who is the foundation of all proof, nothing could be proven. So He is our starting point. We don't begin and say we're going to work our way up to proof of God. No! We begin with faith in God and in terms of that, all things follow.

We believe, therefore, that the logic of the human mind, the mathematics of the human mind, the thought of man, when it is orderly and in terms of God-given processes will have a relationship to the physical world because the order of the mind and the order of the world are God-created. Therefore there is a correlation. You see now why mathematics requires; of necessity, of necessity, a biblical foundation, a trinitarian foundation or it becomes pure fiction; a game that man plays, a mental game.

Now, if you're interested in pursuing this matter further, and doing some really thoughtful reading on this subject, let me recommend to you three things. One, which is the most brilliant essay on this from a non-Christian point of view which says there is no such thing as 'mathematic,' only 'mathematics,' and each particular form of mathematics represents a particular religious faith. But numbers have no reality. It is by Oswald Spengler who wrote the famous work, *Decline and Fall of the West*. I believe in the first volume it is that he has an essay on the meaning of numbers in which you have perhaps the most brilliant presentation of this anti-Christian and skeptical perspective. In other words, he's an atheist not only with respect to God, but also very logically with respect to mathematics. You have to give him credit for that, because most people today want to say: "oh yes, this is valid but I don't believe in God." Spengler knows you cannot do that. He does not believe in God and he says mathematics is pure convention.

Then, two essays from a Christian perspective by Dr. Vern S. Poythress, a Harvard PhD in math. The first is titled; *Creation and Mathematics, or What Does God Have to do With Numbers?* It is in *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. 1, no. 1 (and I'll tell you in a moment how you can get that). And then again by Dr. Poythress, *A Biblical View of Mathematics*, in a symposium edited by Gary North, *The Foundations of Christian Scholarship*. Now these two essays, the first in the journal is an introduction and the one in the symposium goes into higher math from this Trinitarian foundation, are exceptionally outstanding reading. I think you'll find those extremely helpful in understanding how there can be no mathematics apart from our faith.

Now let us go a step further. What is the new math trying to do? Let us turn now to a statement by a very interesting writer, Danielle Hunebelle, *Turning the Tables on Arithmetic* in a French periodical, *Réalités*, for December, 1963. And Hunebelle in this study, deals with Papy, one of the European founders of the new math and a session he was holding with the schoolteachers of Belgium, to instruct them in the new math. Hunebelle writes:

"What is Papy doing? He is trying to create elementary mathematics in harmony with modern mathematics based on sets. For example, he tells beginners 'You are going to create a set.' Then the child

will suggest some kind of odd set: a teacher, a pickle, and a pinch of salt. 'Now look how important my decision is,' Papy told me. 'I call this set S. It now exists because I have created it. In old mathematics, you contemplated a pre-established world. Today it is I, it is the child, who creates this world, who makes decisions, and who is aware of the fact that he is deciding.'"

Do you get the implications of that? Papy says in the new math, we say there is no longer a pre-established world. That is his way of saying there is no longer a God.

It's an amusing fact; I lecture very often on college and university campuses and I find that for them pornography is not in the four-letter words you associate with pornography, but it is in mentioning 'God' and 'Christ.' They almost curl up in shock and die when you introduce the name of God and Christ into a university atmosphere.

So, when he speaks of pre-established harmony, he's talking about God and the fact that He has created all things by His sovereign will. So the new math says: "there is no God, there is no world, there is no pre-established order. We create this world. We create this world. It's a realm of brute factuality. It has no order. It has no purpose. It has no meaning. But it needs a divine word to brood as it were, upon this chaos and to bring order and meaning out of it, and this is man, the scientist, man the mathematician, who will create his own order and make himself god over it."

Now this is the heart of the new science, of the new math. We find this not only in mathematics but in other areas. You want to pursue it, Thomas Kuhn does this with science in general. He was the editor of The Encyclopedia of Chemistry and he wrote an introduction to it which was regarded as so important and has become extremely influential that it has been published separately as a paperback by the University of Chicago Press entitled, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.

Now, what does Kuhn declare in that book? Well in a sense, he's doing the same thing that Papy is doing, only he is broadening his base to include all of the sciences. He said in that book that we have long had theories and hypotheses in science from the old theory of the Greeks about the four humors explaining man's physiology and psychology. The Phlogiston Theory, on through Darwin and we've believed with all these theories that somehow we were getting to the truth of the world out there. But that assumes there's a truth out there. And now we know better. So what are our hypotheses and our theories now? They are 'paradigms.' They're handles, with which we deal with brute factuality. We know that our 'paradigm' has no truth to it; the truth does not exist, but it's a handy tool to deal with something for a while. And he goes on to describe how the paradigm of bloodletting in medicine worked so well for generations. When people believed that if you had some bloodletting that was going to cure you of sickness, it cured you. But when they began to lose faith with it, they had another paradigm, and that paradigm works, and now people believe, although he doesn't dare put it that baldly, that penicillin will cure you, so they're cured by it. So he announces a virtual relativism, he draws back from a total one as the new scientific stance. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions is his title. You no longer deal with truth, truth does not exist.

Of course, some other scientists have dealt with this problem not so optimistically. Dr. Gunther Stent, a molecular biologist at the University of California at Berkeley has dealt with this in his book on The Coming of the Golden Age; a view of the end of progress. Dr. Stent deals with the fact that for generations, men believed that once we've dropped the God concept, again, like Papy, he doesn't use the word 'God,' they somehow fight shy of that. And he says that we have dropped that. We thought we would be free, that the golden age of mankind would emerge when we abandoned God. But what happened? Everything has lost its meaning. We now have random notes played as though they were music, and artists who will take paint and put it on their motorcycle wheels and drive back and forth across the canvas and there's no meaning anywhere and we're losing men in the sciences because no

one is interested in a discovery of truth; they don't believe in truth! So they go into physics or biology or math just the way they collect cigar bands or rock records. It just happens to be their thing. And he said before long no one will be interested in studying because the pleasure principle is taking over mankind. We'll all become Polynesians living for pleasure and in a couple of centuries mankind will disappear.

Well the reaction of the Natural History Magazine Review when it was reviews, I believe in April or May of 1971, was this: he praised the book thoroughly but when he came to Stent's prediction that mankind would disappear in two centuries, he said I cannot buy Dr. Stent's optimism.

Now this is the end result, you see, of the new math and of the new science as they themselves see it. It means meaninglessness. But we believe God is the creator. There is a given order in all of creation and one form of that order is mathematically expressed. The key issue is, as Papy saw it; is there a pre-established world, a God-created world? or does the mind of man bring order out of a world of chaos?

Spengler, whom I cited earlier, says:

"Every philosophy (and he also say every religion) has hitherto grown up in conjunction with a mathematic belonging to it. Number is the symbol of causal necessity. Like the conception of God, it contains the ultimate meaning of the world-as-nature. The existence of numbers may therefore be called a mystery, and the religious thought of every Culture has felt their impress."

The most, you see, that Spengler can say for mathematics is that it is a "mystery." Why the quest for order? Why the feeling of man that there is a necessary logic and numerical concept that relates to reality? He cannot answer that. He only denies that there is such a thing. No mathematics is true for Spengler.

But of course, we must say that he is right in condemning many of the mathematics that have existed, just as we condemn all religions that have existed but one. The fact that there is error does not eliminate truth. Poythress says, on the other hand, in his Biblical View of Mathematics and The Foundations of Christian Scholarship,

"It may surprise the reader to learn that not everyone agrees that '2 + 2 = 4' is true. But, on second thought, it must be apparent that no radical monist can remain satisfied with '2 + 2 = 4.' If with Parmenides one thinks that all is one, if with Vedantic Hinduism he thinks that all plurality is illusion, '2 + 2 = 4' is an illusory statement. On the most ultimate level of being, 1 + 1 = 1.

What does this imply? Even the simplest arithmetical truths can be sustained only in a world-view which acknowledges an ultimate metaphysical plurality in the world-whether Trinitarian, polytheistic, or chance-produced plurality. At the same time, the simplest arithmetical truths also presuppose ultimate metaphysical unity for the world-at least sufficient unity to guard the continued existence of "sames." Two apples remain apples while I am counting them; the symbol '2' is in some sense the same symbol at different times, standing for the same number.

So, at the very beginning of arithmetic, we are already plunged into the metaphysical problem of unity and plurality, of the one and the many. As Van Til and Rushdoony have pointed out, this problem finds its solution only in the doctrine of the ontological Trinity. For the moment, we shall not dwell on the thorny metaphysical arguments, but note only that without some real unity and plurality, '2 + 2 = 4' falls into limbo. The "agreement" over mathematical truth is achieved partly by the process, described so elegantly by Thomas Kuhn and Michael Polanyi, of excluding from the scientific community people

of differing convictions.”

Thus, for us, we have the key to mathematics as we do to every area of life and thought in our faith, in the doctrine of God as creator, in the God who in His infallible Word declares He is the Lord, that He is one God, three persons: “I am the Lord and beside me there is none other.” So there is no other key to truth, no other key to meaning. Thus, we do not deny the pre-established world of God in order to play god. We think God’s thoughts after Him and our knowledge is gained in that manner. The issue of mathematics thus is a religious one.

It has amused me lately that some of the hostility I’ve encountered on a couple of campuses in the last year in view of my, *The One and the Many*, and the influence it has had, has been from mathematicians who are atheists. They see the point. It is time we did also.

ENDNOTES:

1. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Ps 19:1–2). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.
2. Poythress, Vern. “Mathematics.” In *Foundations Of Christian Scholarship: Essays In The Van Til Perspective*. Vallecito, Calif: Ross House Books, 2001.
3. Danielle Hunebelle, “Turning the Tables on Arithmetic,” in *Realities*, no. 157, December, 1963, p. 42.
4. Oswald Spengler: *The Decline of the West*, 1, p. 56. New York, N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, (1926) 1944.
5. Vern Poythress, “A Biblical View of Mathematics,” in Gary North (ed.), *Foundations of Christian Scholarship: Essays in the Van Til Perspective* (Vallecito, California: Ross House Books, 1976), pp. 159-88. 161.
6. Isaiah 45:5

History as a Theological Science

R.J. Rushdoony

Our Lord and our God, we thank thee that our times are in thy hands, who doeth all things well. Give us grace day by day to take hands off our lives and to commit them into thy keeping, knowing that we are thine. Thou hast saved us, thou will do yet more and care for us. Make us strong in thy word and zealous in instructing thy children, in Jesus' name, amen.

Faith is a total thing. A man's faith, if it is real, will alter the totality of his life. It will alter everything that he is and does. Out of the heart, Scripture tells us, are the issues of life. And so it is that as men come to a faith, they begin, if they truly hold to the faith they profess, to reorder every area of life and thought in terms of that faith. As a result, education, in the hands of the humanists becomes a radically different thing than it is in the hands of Christians. Faith makes a total requirement of man. No more than it is possible to be half-way pregnant is it possible to be half-way a Christian. It's an all-or-nothing commitment. As a result, it is necessary for us as Christians to marshal every fact, every area of life into conformity with our faith and to view it in terms of that word.

Now history in our time has disappeared really, as a subject. Some years ago at one university, I was told of a younger historian who was teaching, I believe, the required Western Civilization course who began the session by declaring to the class, there is no such thing as history. To say that one believes that there is, is to have a theological premise, to believe there is an order and a direction and a meaning and a purpose in events. History, he said, is a myth. Those events that we call history are without direction, purpose, or any kind of pre-established purpose or meaning. However, he said, the board of regents of this university pay me a tolerable salary to teach history so let us begin.

Now in one respect, he was right; there is no such thing as history if you are a humanist. Instead, you have the social sciences. Why is there no such thing as history except on a Christian premise? Because history means an ordered sequence of events moving in terms of a purpose, beginning with an act of God (Creation), having its focus in another act of God (the Incarnation), concluding in still another act of God (the second coming). Now that's history. It means there is a movement through all of that, that in spite of everything man does, God's purpose prevails: "Even the wrath of man shall praise Him." Paul says: "For we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose." That means that there is a tremendous power and purpose and design using even our worst errors and our sins to make them work together for good.

Now there are various names given to that. I like the biblical term, 'predestination,' which means that God is in control. That's what it means, it's God's law, God's government that governs all things. If you deny that, as the humanists do, what do you have? Social science. What is social science? It is control, predestination and planning, not by God's plan, but by man's plan. So what do you have? The alternative to the government of God is the socialism of man: social science. Social science is about the planning and control of man by man, so it is directly and totally against what we believe, because all of us believe, no matter what variations of theology we may have, we believe I trust that it is plan-

ning, government, and control by God. So the two perspectives are totally hostile.

History is an area of accident. Because it is an area of accident, it means that man (accident in the old-fashioned philosophical sense of meaningless events; chance occurrences), it means that man must force his will upon those events. This is why we have had books such as one which said that man must take control of evolution (biological, cultural evolution) so that man now controlling will guide his social evolution (his history, we would say) and his biology and reshape himself. You have tremendous experimentation today with not only society but with the idea of 'clonal man.' What is clonal man? Supposedly you can take a few cells out of the human body and out of that, recreate your total twin. They're working on it.

Why is it so important? It is important because they are rejecting history and therefore the God of history and they want to be creators totally of man. Think of the beauty of it from the humanistic point of view. No longer are you people out there who were born in God's way, you're going to be born out of the test tube. You're going to be born as man's creature, and history is going to be man's creation. This is the goal.

There's a story I like to tell because I think it sums up so powerfully the difference between our perspective and that of the social scientists. About ten years or so ago I was on a forum in Northern California. It was a forum on education, and I was representing the Christian perspective, Christian schools and freedom in education. The other participants were Mr. Paulson and Dr. Dragovich of the Hoover Institution. The moderator was the state senator, Clark Bradley. It was a huge auditorium, packed. And the questions were hot and furious during the question and answer period, and there was one young woman in the back who I learned when she came up was a schoolteacher, who kept waving her hand to be recognized and was not. There was just too many and the hour was getting late. So as soon as the meeting was adjourned by Mr. Bradley, she came charging up at me to accuse me of being a quack and teaching all kinds of superstitious nonsense, and I was doubly a quack for talking about freedom in education. Why? These were her exact words: "In the modern world freedom is obsolete." In the modern world, freedom is obsolete!

Why? For her there was no God. Now that young woman was brilliant, superb thinking, and I wish our Christian school teachers would learn to think as sharply on our side because there is no God, no government in the universe, but we have to have government, total government, such as people once believed God provided. How are you going to have that total government? You're only going to have it in the scientific socialist state. Society is therefore a scientific experiment and you can have no freedom in an experiment, all factors have to be controlled. Therefore: "in the modern world, freedom is obsolete."

Now remember that little episode, and remember that girl. Because her perspective is the perspective of the educators you are working with when you deal with the state. They believe that you are trying to hold on in your teaching to this myth. How are your children going to understand the problems of our time? How are they going to be prepared to cope with our world if they still go on and believe in this myth of God as the government of the universe? They're not being taught social science, they're being taught history, history that comes right straight out of that 'hopeless book,' the Bible. But if they had a public education and studied social science they would know the only government that exists is by the state and therefore the state must govern everywhere or you will have anarchy. And this is what your social science textbooks are teaching.

At the beginning of the sixties I attended a Christian school conference of some eleven hundred Christian school teachers, although perhaps I shouldn't call them Christian school teachers; they were denominational parochial school teachers of a Protestant denomination. I didn't have a very good

reception there; they didn't like what I had to say. But I picked up a world history textbook that was being used in most of the schools, and was regarded as a very conservative one. And as a humanist book, it was, so that most people who are non-Christian conservatives would be satisfied with it. But I read through that book carefully, and made many notes, and what it taught and however conservative its political position was on the whole, essentially that perspective, the social science perspective, because it didn't believe in God. Therefore, instead of having God and His government and history as the handiwork of God, you had the scientific socialist state, well no, let's say a conservative state that where necessary gets involved in welfare policies, but basically follows a conservative policy. But it's the only government there is, God is left out. And the logical conclusion from that is precisely scientific socialism, so they might as well have taught it from the beginning because that's where their pupils would end up.

When you teach history as a social science, it's a story of man's struggle to liberate himself from God and from superstition and to take charge of his own destiny. But history is not a social science, it is a theological science. It is a theological science. It means that God, having created all things, has ordained what history is. He is the focal point of it; creation, incarnation, second coming. Those are the three main events of history: the beginning, and the end: "The Alpha and the Omega," our Lord said. That's how He identified Himself and when you say alpha and omega, you're saying the A to the Z. So our Lord said I am the A to the Z. I am the Alpha and the Omega, I am the everything, the beginning and the end, the controller, the determiner, the Lord! I am He who was and is and is to come.

Very interesting that our Lord said that. Do you know there was an inscription on an Egyptian temple in almost those words? The Temple of Isis at Sais. Plutarch records it. And it said:

"I am the one who was and is and is coming and no man has lifted my veil."

There's a little difference there, isn't there? And is to come, is coming, and no man has lifted my veil? In other words, the future is unknown. What was the theology of Isis? An evolutionary philosophy. So the future is unknown, it doesn't really exist yet. It's a mere potentiality. What may evolve tomorrow, who knows? No man has lifted my veil.

But we know the beginning, the middle and the end. And He was and is and is to come, the Lord Almighty! The Lord Almighty! History is a theological science. And we must teach it as such, in terms of God and His purpose. Our basic textbook in history, therefore, is the Bible because it gives us the framework of history.

It also gives us the only valid chronology for antiquity. I take biblical chronology very, very seriously. There is a good older book on biblical chronology by Philip Mauro which is again available, I believe, in paperback. It's well worth reading. There are others which unfortunately are out of print. Philip Mauro. But if we did not have biblical chronology, no one would be able accurately to date Babylonian, Assyrian, or any other ancient history. It's all dependent on Scripture. It's ironic that they try to persuade us in universities that it's such a hopeless mess in its chronology.

[Audience] Are these talking about order of events or like [Archbishop] Ussher's dating?

I'm talking about the actual dating of the Bible. There is a very interesting book (I can't find a piece of chalk but I'll spell it out for you) by Thiele. It's a rather technical book but it's one you ought to be familiar with or at least look into it, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. For years scholars had said, oh the chronology of kings is a hopeless mess, it's absurd. Well this scholar went to work and tried to decode the chronology. And he said obviously (it was a very good assumption), obviously they were not counting reigns and dating the same way we think. But they must have had some orga-

nized structure for dating, and if we know what that structure was, why we will have a perfect chronology for that period. Well, once he began to approach it from that perspective, he very quickly came to an understanding of it and he's developed a chronology that is now the masterpiece for that era, and is used by secular historians. As a matter of fact, his book was first published (it's now in a reprint) by the University of Chicago Press. I do not know who has published the reprint, but it is again available.

Moreover, there's a term used in the early church with regard to history that we need to adopt again: the Dark Age, or the Dark Ages. Now Plutarch and the Renaissance men said that everything back of them to the Fall of Rome was the Dark Age, then they pushed it back a couple of centuries. But those centuries were not a dark age, they were times of political upheaval, but they are ages of tremendous light. Why? Because the great early Christian thinkers were laying down foundations for Western freedom, because in that time, the missionaries were fanning out and converting all of Europe, because in that time, you were having as much inventiveness and technological development as in any age until the Industrial Revolution. If you want a good book on that, written by someone who is not a Christian, Lynn Townsend White, *Medieval Technology and Social Change* it's one of a number, but that's available in one of those university paperback series.

Think of one invention that was applied to everyday life at that time; the horse collar. How could a horse pull much freight or a wagon prior to that with no horse collar? It was pulling against its windpipe and choking itself. So, horses had very slight utility. But when the horse collar was developed, you could move freight, you could break ground and plow in a way you never could before. Tremendous invention came in the so-called Dark Ages.

What constitutes light, moreover, and what constitutes darkness? Plumbing? Well, you had hot and cold running water and flush toilets in ancient Crete in the Minoan Era. The Early Church fathers said that any age outside of Christ or any people outside of Christ were living in the dark ages. They coined the term. You have people living in the Dark Ages all over Akron and Dayton and Cleveland and Cincinnati. They're in the dark ages. Now that's the biblical point of view. And the schools you're fighting, the government schools, are in the dark ages. They're teaching dark ages studies.

History, you see, is a theological science because God, not man, is sovereign, Lord of all creation. And anything outside of Him is in darkness. And we are called to go out as missionaries in that darkness, not to carry it to our pupils.

Moreover, Christian historiography rests on an idea, a concept of absolute truth. There is an absolute right and wrong. Now there are absolutes in every faith including humanism. But in humanism, man is absolute. Therefore, nothing outside of man can be used to judge man, nor nothing outside of man can be used to judge what he does. So you cannot have a history, because how are you going to discern what is right and wrong, what happened that was of value, if nothing outside of man can judge him? Man is the absolute.

You see, God is our absolute. He is absolute truth for us. Our Lord said: "I am the truth!" You cannot take something outside of God and judge God or something outside of Scripture and use it to judge Scripture. You can't go to the Bible as some people do and say well, now the New Testament gives us a God of grace and love but the Old Testament gives us the God of law and judgment and wrath who's not on the same level as the Lord we meet in the New Testament. No! Then you're abstracting an idea and using it to judge the Word of God which must be the means of judgment for all things. God and His Word are the standard. They're the yardstick. They're not to be judged. They're not to be measured. We do not pass judgment upon it, we use God and His Word to pass judgment on all things else. So God cannot be judged, nor His Word be judged. They must be obeyed.

Now, when you abandon God, you abandon history for social science and you say the absolute is in man. You cannot judge man, man judges all things, man is the lord, man is the standard.

We heard from Mr. Raminge, about the case in New England about the child suing his parents. We have a very dangerous movement now to pass some kind of bill, a Children's Bill of Rights, children's civil rights, which would limit the power of parents, in fact destroy it, over their children. Why? Because man as god says no one could judge him. We had an associate chief justice a few years ago who applied this idea very rigorously, William Douglas. Douglas held that you cannot judge the cannibals. That's their practice, it's their way of life. There's no standard outside of man whereby you can condemn any man. The only thing you can condemn is a practice that says there is a principle of condemnation; Christianity. You either stand in terms of the Lord and His Word or you're condemned. But there is a Heaven and a Hell.

John Dewey, of course, was emphatic; Christianity was anti-democratic because it insists on the difference between good and evil, the saved and the lost, the sheep and the goats, Heaven and Hell. And he held that education and history would not be free until you abandoned those concepts. You equalize all things. Then you could have social science, the control of man by man.

All things are relativistic in any faith, moreover, in terms of your absolute. Our faith says God is the absolute, and all things are relative to Him. Humanism says that man is the absolute and so all things are relative to man, and between the two positions, there is total war.

Now as we deal with historiography, we have to recognize that the very terms (I've mentioned 'Dark Ages' but it's not alone) reflect this humanistic point of view. Renaissance—that means rebirth. Rebirth from what? Why, the rebirth of man from Christianity. That term, 'Renaissance,' by the way, was not coined until 1815, after the French Revolution. And it was a part of man's new way of looking at things and de-Christianizing the world. Before that, the Renaissance was seen as a time of tyranny. Moreover, when we look at history from that perspective, in terms of its own self-definition (Renaissance), we begin to realize the direction of modern history; the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the UN, it tells us a story.

There's a very brilliant scholar whose book deals with this. He doesn't share our point of view, but he certainly documented it from his perspective. And he says that the movement of history beginning back in the medieval era has been from Christ to Adam, from the supernatural man to natural man. And he says this is the basic revolution of modern history. His book is a rather difficult one to read, but it's a brilliant analysis of history. Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy, and the title, *Out of Revolution, Autobiography of Western Man*. It's a superb analysis. He wouldn't agree with us, but he's told us exactly what the direction of history from the standpoint of the humanist is. Let us get rid of supernatural man! In other words of God, of Christ, of redeemed, regenerate man. We want natural man as the foundation for society, for the future! Isn't this what public school education is about? To recreate natural man; to encourage him, to bless him by means of the state. He's the key to the future.

But it is also at the same time designed to destroy supernatural man. That's what you are. I like the language that sometimes the ungodly invent concerning us. Rosenstock-Huussy didn't use that term, 'supernatural man,' another scholar did; but I love it. You and I are 'supernatural man,' born again supernatural. And we're part of a story, history, that is supernatural. So between our story and man's the difference is between Christ and fallen man. One glorifying Christ, and one glorifying fallen man, and saying the whole goal of revolution, the whole goal of our social sciences must be the glorification of this man.

Psalm 2 is a philosophy of history in a nutshell. What is it?

Educational Christian Faith
RJ Rushdoony

“Why do the heathen rage and the nations, the kings of the earth take counsel (or conspire) together?”

It says we have a world conspiracy against the Lord and against His anointed. That clearly is underway. What is the psalmist's declaration?

“He that sitteth in the circle of the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision.”

So God laughs at the pretensions of men. So you're going to take over history? You're going to convert it into a social science? No! It remains mine. So He calls His Son and commissions Him. And then the summons to the nations, kiss the Son. Now, that's not in modern American terminology. That meant, as with an oriental potentate, you fell down at his feet and kissed his feet, acknowledging that you are under His submission. You were an enemy and now you are pleading for mercy. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry and ye perish in your way; tremendous psalm and magnificent statement of the biblical doctrine of history.

The Psalms are full of it. Psalm 149 is a magnificent one to read in the same vein, because there again, you have a hallelujah psalm about what God is accomplishing in history and how we are to rejoice and how it is our privilege to sit in judgment.

ENDNOTES:

1. Psalm 76:10
2. Romans 8:28
3. Martin Vincent. Word Studies in the New Testament. Vol. Two. Three vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902, 418.
4. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Ps 2:1-2). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.
5. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Ps 2:4). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.

The Biblical Approach to Economics

R.J. Rushdoony

Let us begin with prayer. Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank thee for the joy of salvation and for the certainty of victory in Jesus Christ. We thank thee that in Him we are more than conquerors, and we pray, our father, that we may with boldness, with faith and with a knowledge that thou wilt never leave us nor forsake us, serve thee faithfully all the days of our life. Bless us now in our studying, in Jesus' name, amen.

Our subject this afternoon is 'The Biblical Approach to Economics.' As Christians, it is necessary for us to look to the Word of God in every area of life and thought. Whether our subject be economics or law, or mathematics or biology or civil government, we look to the Word of God for the guidelines.

The Bible not only gives us the Word of God for every area of life, but it tells us what man's guideline is. Because in Genesis 3:5 we have summarized the very charter, the constitution of humanism, of the entire anti-God movement, the tempter's words: "ye shall be as god, knowing..." (That is, determining for yourself what constitutes) "...good and evil." This is the basic sin of man. This is Original Sin. This is man's fallen nature, his desire to be his own god, to determine for himself what constitutes good and evil, in every area of life to say: "it will be my word that will determine all things."

Now in Genesis 1, we have the six days of creation and we have clearly set forth, six times, God's declaration of "Let there be..." and there was. In the Latin Vulgate, for example, when it says "God says 'Let there be light'", it reads "fiat lux," let there be light, fiat. Now that word has a very interesting role in the English language as well as in other languages, coming right out of the times when Latin was the language of learning. Because that word has been plucked out of Genesis 1 by humanistic man and made the basis of his approach to every area, whether it be mathematics, and we studied this morning, one or two of you were here at the time; fiat mathematics, man-made math, modern math. Today we have 'fiat law.' Fiat law is man-made law that has no relationship to the Word of God. It used to be said: "ignorance of the law is no excuse." That was when law was biblical law, because God's law is written into the heart of every man born. St. Paul says all men know God (Romans 1:17-21) but he says, they are without excuse therefore, because they know it, even the invisible things, but they hold it (or literally hold it down, suppress it) in unrighteousness. Man tries to be god, so he says: "I will imitate God's fiats." And so whereas once law every man knew, it was the stamp of God in his being, now who knows what regulations the government creates?

I heard a businessman say on the plane back of me one seat, talking to one of his junior executives, two days ago as I was flying into Pittsburgh, and said: "I am a Liberal. I don't object to the basic ideas of government today, but I can't keep up with all these regulations, every time I turn around, I've broken some rule, and none of them make sense." Those are fiat laws. Fiat laws.

Our money today that you have in your wallet is fiat money. Fiat money is basic to modern civil government because it is anti-God. When the Bible says just weights, or just measures shall ye have, the

word for weights there means in the Hebrew, money, because money used to be a weight of gold and silver. That was real money. Originally our gold money and our silver money, the silver was by so many grains of silver to the dollar, the gold was an ounce of gold, ninety percent fineness constituted the double eagle or the \$20 gold bill. And originally we didn't even write 'dollar' on it, because in biblical fashion, it was by weight, a just weight. But now our money is checkbook money: "payable to the bearer on demand," it used to say, so much with gold and silver. Now it says: "Payable to bearer on demand," what? another check! That's why we have inflation. And that's why inflation will continue, because you see, if you take paper and print it, it's counterfeiting. But when the government does it, it's legal. It's fiat money, money created out of nothing. It's pseudo-wealth, and therefore it erodes.

Thus, in economics today what we have in Washington, Moscow, in Johannesburg, and every capital of the world, though some of these countries still have a semblance of Christianity is really fiat economics, fiat economics, an atheistic premise that man can legislate in the area of economics, and by his own word, create wealth.

Now the basis of biblical economics in Scripture is Genesis 1:26-28. God created man and said that man should exercise dominion and subdue the earth; that the whole of the earth was to be brought under the dominion of God through man. God created an estate, the Garden of Eden, and set man in it. That was to be a pattern whereby man was to learn how to develop things under God, and then the whole world was to be subjected to that pattern. So that outside the gates, that wilderness was to be subjected the same way. Man was set to the task of developing science, of naming the creatures and to name in the Bible means to define. So that man was to define the animals, to understand, to classify, to know them scientifically. But he had an economic task through all of this; exercise dominion, subdue the earth.

Now economic progress depends on certain things. First of all, basic to economic progress is faith and the obedience of faith. I tie the two together because no more than you can separate faith and works can you separate faith and obedience, faith without works is dead. And there is no such thing as faith without character. And this is basic, because without this, the cornerstone of economics is gone. We read a great deal about how in many cultures, the people work long hours. Some places in Asia, twelve, fourteen, sixteen hours. Well, in India many of the people will put in twelve, thirteen, fourteen hours, sometimes during certain seasons of work. But they accomplish only as much as an American worker will accomplish in about twenty minutes. In about twenty minutes! Why? Because they begin with the wrong faith, and therefore have a wrong character and they are not productive. Oh, but you say it's very easy to go into Africa or into Asia and show these men (and the Peace Corps has tried to do it) mechanization and how to improve their productivity. But it doesn't work that way. If you want to read a very important book on this subject by an economist, although it's a moral theme, he's not a Christian, but it's a tremendous sermon in spite of the occasional anti-Christianity, it is by Helmut Schoeck and the title is simply, *Envy*. What does Schoeck tell us? It's been confirmed by anthropological studies again and again. Supposing you show a native how to gain ten times the yield he is out of his little plot of land through modern methodology, without having tractors and all, but how to improve his methods, and you tell him, and the clincher is you'll have ten times as much, or at least double as much the first year in productivity. That in itself will destroy your plan for him, and he will refuse to follow it. Why? Oh, but why do that? I will be the object of envy of everyone in the village or in the community, and they'll put the evil eye on me. Or if I do that, all my relatives are going to move in on me and they'll wipe me out. I can't afford to do too well, and one hundred and one other reasons, all going back to a false faith and a bad character.

This is why you cannot change the economic condition of the people apart from character. This is why the Soviet Union now is facing as it has over the years, if you chart the graph of their productivity, it's a downward slide. Why? Because they began with people that had been trained by however defective

the Old Russia was, nonetheless it was more or less Christian in its emphasis, Christian in its teaching, a lot of superstition mingled with it, a lot of false doctrine, but there was a form of Christianity and it was a blessing. The older generation knew how to work, their children did not work as well, and now their grandchildren, the new workforce have a very low productivity; a very low productivity and they have no solution for it. They have tried everything. Today they are trying to get into the production of automobiles for consumers so that they can tell the younger generation: "Look, you too can have a car like the youth of the West. Work hard! Save your money and you can have a car!" But productivity is still declining because there is the wrong faith and a bad character. Thus, economics from a biblical point of view begins with a godly faith and a character grounded in the Word of God.

Then second, there is knowledge which is basic. Adam was to know the animals. Very early we find that man made use of animals. He was to know the garden and the trees, because only so could he develop their utility. Knowledge is an aspect of the image of God. In its narrower sense, the image of God in various passages of Scripture is defined for us as; knowledge, righteousness, holiness and dominion. Knowledge, righteousness, holiness and dominion; those are the communicable attributes of God as they exist in us. God has both incommunicable attributes which are His alone, but he has communicable attributes which He has given to man, and these are four of them.

Now, knowledge is basic to economics. With knowledge, man is able to develop himself, to extend his dominion over the earth, to develop its resources and to develop tools for the development of resources. It's not an accident that our modern technological world is a product of Christian culture and civilization. Other cultures have again and again in history developed so far and then crumbled; but not so with ours, because of the Christian character, we have developed the modern world of science and technology and if you go back and study the origins of modern science, you will find it came right out of the Puritans and up until the past generation or two, the Puritan evangelical influence was basic, basic.

Incidentally, let me digress here for a moment to go into something about faith and the obedience of faith and its relationship to man. There was a scholar who died a few years back, an unbeliever, JD Unwin. He did not believe that there was any truth to anything in the Scripture and he especially denied the correlation that Christian theologians made between godly morality and a culture and the idea that Rome became ungodly and it fell, and so on, he felt was a myth. So he started out to disprove that on the basis of the anthropological evidences. He spent his lifetime collecting data on every known culture, including the most primitive tribe in the ancient world, the most primitive tribes of Africa and South America, South Pacific, all the nations. And he charted the relationship between cultural level and sexual regulations. He found a mathematical correlation; a mathematical correlation. Those peoples who had neither premarital and post marital chastity had a dead level of culture, could not count beyond the fingers of their two hands. The highest number they could conceive of was ten. They lived the most wretched and primitive kind of lives. Their tool-making ability would be exceedingly primitive. But where you had the development of a certain amount of chastity, pre-marital or post marital (in some instances only post marital, in other instances only premarital), then there would be a rise culturally, until when you had premarital and post marital chastity, then and then alone would you have a high culture in science and the ability to grasp abstract thought. So he found a mathematical correlation. Then he spent the rest of his life trying to figure a way out of the bind he put himself into.

His classic work which is out of print, a huge volume is Sex and Culture. However, he wrote two preliminary monographs on that which will be reprinted in the next issue of our Chalcedon Journal of Christian Reconstruction, on the family, two of his studies. So that if you write to our organization, Chalcedon, and order the Journal of Christian Reconstruction issue on the family. It will be out I think, by the end of December and it's \$4 per copy. You'll get that plus about one hundred twenty or so pages of other studies on the family. I have one in there and there are a number by a number of other

writers.

There is thus, as we have seen, as the basis of economics, faith and the obedience of faith, and second, knowledge, knowledge. And that is a product only, as Unwin's work makes clear, of a culture that is grounded on the Word of God. When it loses that faith, it will decline. Unwin found that in three generations you could come from a high civilization to a point where you couldn't count beyond the fingers on your two hands, if you had for three generations total breakdown. Startling, isn't it? And it was not a Christian who said it. It was someone who was emphatically not Christian.

Then third, basic to economics is work, or labor. You cannot have any progress without work, without labor. You know we have a horrible myth that clutters our minds today and which the eco freaks or the ecology advocates exploit to our ruin. The idea is that this continent was a paradise before the white man came. And of course those of the humanists who settled here believed it, even when they were starving to death. Some of the first pilgrims and puritans described it as a 'howling wilderness.' Why? Well there were about three hundred thousand Indians here (don't believe the nonsensical figures scholars have been inventing lately) and most of them were starving to death. Winter after winter they were resorting to cannibalism. The very word 'cannibal' comes from the American. Originally it was 'carribal' and gradually the word 'carribal' became corrupted to 'cannibal.' (Carib from the Caribbean Indians), but the Caribbean Indians were not the only ones who were cannibals. A very large percentage of the tribes of what is now the United States were cannibals. They don't tell you that. The land couldn't support them. You had from Western Illinois to the Atlantic nothing but huge forests—very little game. The forests were so thick, sun wouldn't hit the ground and so there was no grass growing so there were no animals. Only where you had a river or a lake, around the edge of it there'd be a little grass and a few deer and a few rabbits and a few turkeys, because there the light would hit. The Great Plains? Why huge herds of buffalos, each of them numbering tens of thousands. What did they do? Well you could see a buffalo a day's journey away because it was a continual dust bowl. When you had a herd of buffalos that big, chopping up the ground with their hoofs, eating every last blade of grass and then passing on, all that remained was dust. The buffalo had to go by the way, sentimentalists to the contrary, man and the buffalo could not coexist. You know that when buffalo overran a settler's farm and his house, the fences disappeared, the trees disappeared, the log cabin disappeared and if you found a piece of it equal to a toothpick, you did well. And the people disappeared. If you found so much as a red smear, that was remarkable, because those huge animals, tens of thousands of them passing over people, reduced them to nothing—nothing—not enough to bury, not enough to locate. They had to get rid of them. But of course, some people would prefer to get rid of man. The humanist ends up as a hater of man.

And when it came to farming, well consider what your situation would have been if you had landed on the shore of the Atlantic in New England or in Virginia or anywhere else. You would have had to clear that ground. That in itself was a huge task, believe me, mostly by hand work, getting those stumps out of those giant creeks. Then that soil instead of being a rich soil was a soil on which nothing had grown because the sun hadn't hit it. Only leaves had fallen on it and the leaves had been of one variety, only one kind of thing put into that soil and it often would be a sour soil. The richest soil is one that a farmer has worked and developed and built up over the generations. All right, then you would plant it. Well, you know a population explosion always took place wherever the white men made a settlement. Why? Because the sun would hit the ground and the grass would begin to grow and there things would begin to grow. And every porcupine and every deer and every rabbit would experience a tremendous population explosion and they'd all concentrate on this place; it was the only place where there was food. The Indians would come there too because that's where the game would be. Dogs were very important to those settlers to keep out the animals, because you would have a ground riddled with gophers that would eat up the roots of your trees and vegetables and what they didn't get, animals above the ground got. It was hard work, believe me. It was back-breaking, discouraging work.

The West is young enough that I knew some of the first settlers before they died. In fact, when I was a missionary among the Indians, I could remember, oh I could hear tales of their memory of seeing the first white man cross the plains and the officers in our little congregation would tell me stories about the early days. In fact, they told me exactly the method of scalping, so without having any practice, I know all the details thereof. The West is young, and I talked to those men, and what a discouraging thing it was to be a pioneer. And it took long hard work, long, hard work.

And finally, it took capital. You could not go out on empty land and start, you had to have capital to do it. Faith and the obedience of faith, knowledge, labor, capital. It was rare that any man got a crop, even from a garden, in less than two years, or no, let me say, in two years, not less. And very often it took ten, fifteen years to subjugate that land, to build it up to make it productive, to get rid of the animal menace. How did you live until you did that? Why, you had to save up to do it! A lot of people came to this country as bondservants, and they worked out their passage and worked seven years to gain some capital so they could go out on their own. And if a young couple got married, they were given capital by the parents, the bride normally brought with her a milk cow from her parents and the groom brought something, and he worked and then they went out and settled. They had to have capital, and many an immigrant came over with a dowry, ever heard of that word? It's a wonderful system, and the dowry was the capital of the family. And it enabled them to go out and to survive until they could break new ground. Pioneering was not easy, you see, it required faith and the obedience of faith. It required knowledge. It required labor and it required capital.

In the Garden of Eden, God provided the capital. It was ready-made, but Adam had to supply the faith and the obedience. He had to develop the knowledge, and he had to dress and to keep the garden, which means to till it, to cultivate it, to prune it; Adam worked. Never, never say that work is a curse. Work is a privilege under God, but work was cursed, as everything that man is and does, by his sin. And the glorious picture in Revelation is that His servants shall serve Him in the New Creation and there shall be no more curse. Work is a privilege under God. There's no work in Hell. But the Fall has put a curse upon work and as we become redeemed, the curse progressively is removed and we are blessed. In the New Creation there is no more curse on work, only blessing.

Now you see the idea that wealth and progress are ready-made is nonsense. We got a late start and our time is drawing near to an end so we'll hasten to give the other picture of how humanistic economics works, what its presuppositions are. I should say how it does not work. First of all, basic to humanistic economics, is a faith in man's lordship. Man is Lord. Man by his fiat 'let there be,' will create out of nothing, so that we have men like President Johnson declaring, as he did a decade ago, that poverty, ignorance, disease and possibly even death were to be abolished by the government. Marvelous! What are they waiting for? Let them get rid of it tomorrow! If the government can do it, let's get Congress working and get rid of a lot of things. Let them abolish sin, declare it illegal! But this is basic to humanistic economics. It puts its confidence not in faith and the character of faith, or of knowledge, work and capital but in man's lordship, man as god saying: "let there be," when lo and behold, supposedly there is! And as a result, it sees as its basic capital; power. Humanistic economics thus wants to capitalize society not by wealth but by power. And the result is destructive.

Then second; its idea of works, of labor, is works of law. See how that ties in with your theology? Salvation by works of law! Now let me give you an illustration of that; the minimum wage law. How terrible that some people make so little! Let's have a minimum wage law to make sure that everybody does well. Well, you know, when we passed the minimum wage law we created massive unemployment? We created the Civil Rights revolution, the negro unrest. There had never been any problem with the negroes before. Why? Well, how previously was a poor unskilled young man, black or white, going to get a job? By being an apprentice at low wages where he could be taught, where he could acquire a

skill. And so it was that any youth could, a generation ago, get a job. He might be paid very little, he might be paid fifty cents or seventy-five cents an hour, but it was an opportunity to learn on the job. The telephone company has a real problem nowadays. It has to go on functioning, but do you know when it hires a girl as an operator, she has to work a minimum of two years before they break even on their training, their investment of time and money in her training? A minimum of two years! Well, what in the world are you going to do with the millions of youth who have no skills and you have to pay them minimum wage? You can't afford to train them, you lose money, especially when there's nothing that will hold them to the job. You can invest in them and they can quit on you tomorrow. Therefore you can't afford to do it. If you don't come with the training, I can't take you. The result has been massive unemployment among black youth and increasingly among white youth and a chronic problem of delinquency and crime and disturbances among these people. And it has been demonstrated that if they aren't among the ranks of the employed by twenty-five, they never will be. It's a rare instance that they will be, because between the ages of about seventeen and twenty-five, if they are workless, they will develop habits and attitudes that make a life of working and being under the authority and discipline of a working situation impossible for them. So our humanistic economics is destroying a sizeable percentage of our black and white youth today because it replaces work (in a biblical sense) with works of law.

Then a third, a goal of humanistic economics (to hurry on so that we finish on time) is a kingdom not of God, but of man; the kingdom of man, man as his own god, reigning, sitting enthroned.

And fourth, the concept of knowledge, in humanistic perspectives and in humanistic economics is state control of all knowledge for state purposes. This is where you come in because what you represent is a threat educationally and economically and politically to the state. The state wants to control education as a basic tool, to create the right outlook religiously and economically in the people. To make them look to the state for their physical welfare, and hence education which under God is a basic of economics, in the hands of the modern state, whether it's economically mercantilist (which is the proper definition of our economic order in the United States) or Socialist or Fascist, education has to be controlled by the state to serve the ends, the political-economic ends of the state.

Thus, economics is a very thoroughly necessary area for us to study and to study biblically.

ENDNOTES:

1. "Dixitque Deus: Fiat lux." Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam. (Ed. electronica, Genesis 1:3). (2005). Logos Bible Software.

Prophet, Priest, King, and Education

R.J. Rushdoony

In the 1950s when I began to speak on Christian education, there were times when a minister or a layman stood up in an audience to denounce me for deflecting Christians from the gospel. That sort of thing is rare now, although occasionally I'm taken to task by someone for my emphasis on Christian schools. As a matter of fact, of late, the kind of approach I meet is somewhat different. Especially in recent months I find that people talk to me dripping with love as a Christian brother to set me straight on things. I had a letter not too long ago from one of these dear brothers in Ohio telling me the horrible things about the Christian schools of Ohio that I should know, and I should not lower myself to associate with them. In the course of his letter, he made some astounding statements about the truth of the Canal, Winchester Case and the fact that David Gibbs was a totalitarian, did you know that? I sent a copy of my answer to him, which was a call for repentance to your offices.

More recently in one of my journeys I encountered one of these dear Christian brothers, who lives not too far from this area, who told me very gently and with a voice dripping with love that it was time that men like Roy Thompson and I did some thinking and realized how we were leading godly people astray, teaching them to break the law, to go to jail. And this certainly was not preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ, he said. And he went on to say it was a fearful burden we were assuming to lead people so badly astray, and he went on to assure me, don't you know that the state of Ohio is ready to let every Christian school teach the Bible? How can you counsel anyone to break the law?

Now of course, what I said in return was whose law is being broken? Who is Lord, Christ, or the state of Ohio? Now I said, Jesus is Christ, according to Scripture. The word 'Christos' literally means 'anointed.' To be anointed is to be king, to be Lord. The very word 'Lord' (curios in the Greek) means 'absolute owner and god.' And the Lord insists on control of His property, of all His property. This means that not only this house belongs to God, but I do. He owns me; lock, stock and barrel, every atom of my being. It means that the school belongs to Him. And if the school is in rebellion against Him, as Roy Thompson told you, it is a sin to have your child there. It means that medicine belongs to Him.

I drove my wife three hundred miles recently because we don't know (possibly there is one, but we haven't learned of him yet) of a Christian doctor in our area. We're only two years in our present location. I didn't want her in the hands of an abortionist, a murderer, a man who's anti-God. The Lord insists on absolute control of His property and I don't know of any area that is outside His government. Biology, botany, physics, chemistry, mathematics, they're all aspects of His creation, ways of understanding His handiwork. There is no way of escaping God's fences, the limits of His property, because they exist as far as creation, to the outermost limits of the universe and throughout all of heaven. As a result, what we have begun is indeed only a beginning. Through education, through the Christian school, we are declaring that the Word of the Lord applies to every area of life. So we begin with the subjects and then we go out and we say to the Christian, to the state, you have a duty to obey Jesus Christ! We say this to medicine. We say it to the arts and to the sciences. And if there is anything in your town or com-

munity or in our country that isn't Christian it has no business operating.

God's claims are total. "All things were made by Him and without Him...." there was nothing. In the beginning, nothing but God. All things came into being by His sovereign Word and nothing can be understood apart from that Word. So you begin with that Word to understand any subject.

The curriculum of the schools right on through college is the 'liberal arts curriculum.' That's the traditional name. Last year those of you who were present at the conference will recall, I touched on the meaning of the liberal arts curriculum. 'Liberal arts' means the art of being a free man. We heard in the previous hour from Mr. Reminger, the definition of a 'free man' that the humanists give. The free man is a man who views the world and every subject and every area of life apart from God, without the supernatural. How can we view any subject in the curriculum or any area of life that way? We are then humanists. For us, the art of a free man is taught in Scripture: "If the Son make you free, then are ye free indeed." No other way!

But Humanism has another program. Now in Alabama last week, Mrs. Loudon was a bit disappointed that I didn't go into the contrast between humanistic and a Christian education. So let me do it briefly now.

humanistic education tells us first of all that all problems are social problems, not theological. And with this, we disagree. All subjects are theological because God is creator of all things, and Christ is Lord over all things.

Then second, Humanism tells us that all social problems are solvable by man. Man is savior. And therefore you study the subject as Lord so that you might have the answers for every area of life as Lord. This we cannot believe as Christians. Nor can we allow the child to feel, whether it is chemistry or any other subject, that that can be known apart from the Word of God. Nothing has meaning apart from Him.

Then third, the humanist holds that the school, or education is the panacea for all social problems. This is why I titled one of my books, *The Messianic Character of American Education*. humanistic education is messianic, it is salvationist, and the schools are the 'salvation army' of the humanists. They mean business, they're dedicated, theirs is a program of salvation, and you cannot adopt their perspective in any subject without promoting a rival doctrine of salvation.

Then fourth, the humanist schools openly declare that the goal of education is not knowledge nor information, but self-realization. Again, think back on what Mr. Reminger was telling you. The Humanist Manifesto, speaking of the happiness of man, the fulfillment of man, the self-realization of man. This is the purpose, not the glory of God, not our calling in Him.

But as Christians, what is our purpose? God created Adam and set him on earth and gave him a task. He gave him a calling that had a three-fold focus; to be priest, prophet and king unto the Lord, and under the Lord. The first Adam failed. So the second or last Adam came, as very God of very God and very man of very man, truly God and truly man. And as the head of the new humanity, became priest, prophet and King faithfully unto the Father. And in Him we are priests, prophets and kings.

What does this mean, practically? It means that, as priests, we dedicate every area of life and thought to Christ our Lord. So that we bring every subject, every aspect of our life, our homes, our children, our calling, our church, and every kind of study we are engaged in and dedicate it to the Lord. You have a priestly calling as teachers. Instruction was the function of the Levites. It is still a Levitical calling. Thus, we cannot approach the subject as though it was neutral. There is not a neutral fact in all of

creation, because every fact, as I told some of you in the workshop yesterday, is a God-created fact. It has a given interpretation, a God-given interpretation. It can only be truly known in terms of the Lord and His Word. Thus, our priestly calling is to dedicate every area of life and thought, every subject, every institution, every vocation, every person to Christ our Lord.

Then we are called in Christ to be prophets. What is the work of a prophet? A prophet is one who speaks for God. And so we declare the Word of the Lord; God's purpose in terms of every area of life and thought. We interpret mathematics in terms of it. It is an instrument to be used for the glory of God.

I pointed out yesterday how mathematics is an area where man says: "there is no pre-established universe, we make our own universe." And someone in the class pointed out how the professor at the university had said mathematics is fiction. For us it is an aspect of the God-created order of the universe.

And the same is true of chemistry. We find God's order everywhere. Dr. Walter Lammerts, one of the founders of the Creation Research Society which is made up of scientists, most of them research scientists who believe in six-day creationism and their journal is simply research papers by creationists, has won, I believe, eleven international prizes in genetics. And he said it was very easy because he began with a firm, literal belief in Genesis 1. And he said as a result, I wasn't wasting my time trying to accomplish things that I knew were impossible. And he said the evolutionary scientists didn't believe that each thing was made after its kind and he was trying to do things endlessly that were impossible.

Those of you who teach science will find that the Creation Research Society's journal is excellent resource material, and they have reprinted some of their articles in two volumes which I think are exceptionally enjoyable reading.

One article, if I may digress for a moment, which I like especially. It amused me. Of course, they have the carbon-14 dating method, so these two men took and analyzed some of the trees around a major airport in terms of that dating method. The trees had been planted about eight years before and were being replaced. The trees tested out at about twenty five hundred years old and older. Why? Well of course they had absorbed a considerable amount of carbon from the jet landings and take-offs. And as they pointed out, the uniformitarian method makes no allowances for anything like that.

Now to return to the subject, as priests we dedicate every area of life and thought to our Lord. As prophets, we declare the Word of the Lord to every area, and we develop the implications thereof, and we apply that to our subjects. So that the Christian part of the curriculum is not Bible, it's chemistry, mathematics, physics, geometry, algebra, geography - everything. Priest, prophet and king. We are as kings under Christ, to exercise dominion, to rule every area of life and thought in His name.

When I was a student at Berkeley, one of the ways I made money to put myself through was grading examination papers. I think I've graded more papers than some of you will in your lifetime because I would grade as many as four and five thousand students in a semester. It was a hard way to earn a living and at finals time, I was up all night two or three nights during those closing ten days. But I graded, among other departments, the papers for the linguistic courses. And I was thrilled when I sat in class one day and I heard the professor of linguistics speak about linguistics, and to say that there was a peculiar group of people who were the leaders, the world leaders in linguistics and there wasn't a university anywhere to equal them, and the very strange thing about these people was that they believed in the Bible, literally, from cover-to-cover. Their name, he said, is the Wycliffe Bible Translators and their material in linguistics is without equal. Well, that was the happiest moment in my university career, and I thought to myself proudly: "here, in one area we Christians are number one!"

Well, I think we can now say in another area, schools, we are number one. And what it means to be kings in Christ is to be able to go on then and say in one area after another: “we’re number one!” because this is what God requires of us. We are to be kings unto our Lord.

I was delighted, let me add, when I was at the Pensacola College’s Summer Institute this summer teaching, to learn of their school of nursing, and I told Dr. Graff that I hoped they would go on soon to start a medical school. Because we Christians need to go out into the area of medicine now and to be number one there and then number one in one area after another. And you know one of the things that’s going to produce that? Your schools, your schools.

I told some of you yesterday that at one university of fifteen, seventeen thousand (I’ve forgotten the exact number of students), a professor bitterly claimed that there weren’t a half a dozen students who were fit to teach, whose minds were not blown either by narcotics or the public schools. Now that’s a good evaluation coming from their own ranks!

What’s happening? I know one major university that a few years ago was quietly going through and trying to eliminate Christians, Bible-believing Christians, from graduate school applications. Why? They were a nuisance. They were arguing with the professors. They believed things that made the university feel ashamed to think that somebody was actually working for a master’s or a doctorate who believed that nonsense. I asked one person, not a Christian, why this quiet and unannounced change of position? And this person laughed and said, well, those Christian students won’t try to burn the university down! And that was no joke! They had had their graduate students lead in the violence.

What is the end result of all this going to be? Why, some of the best men of science and some of the best engineers, the best scholars in a few years are going to be your graduates. And if you think this doesn’t scare them, you’re assuming they’re not intelligent and they don’t see what’s happening. They are frightened by the picture of the future that looms with the growth of the Christian schools. They may talk about you being inferior, but they know better

It is important for every subject in your school to be approached in terms of the Lord as creator, and in terms of the teacher as a priest, prophet and king committing that area to Christ and speaking from that area in the name of the Lord. Otherwise, it will pass on humanistic education and humanistic faith.

I wonder if you have been aware of the fact that so many of the leaders of Africa today, where we are having a new kind of barbarianism, are not cannibals out of the jungle (although a few of them have practiced cannibalism), they’re university graduates. The majority of the leaders of the new Africa who are leading in this new barbarianism have degrees from Oxford and Cambridge and a lot of American universities. This is why they’re so dangerous. If the leaders of the new Africa were some uneducated cannibal out of the jungle, their problems wouldn’t be as severe. It’s because they bring the knowledge and the education and the power that goes with it out of the humanism of our day to bear on those countries that they are so deadly.

And of course, our problem is that we have the same kind of barbarism, the new barbarianism, in our state capitols and in Washington and in Moscow, London, Paris, Berlin, Madrid and elsewhere. Sometimes it masquerades under the name of Christ. But it is still barbarianism and humanism leads to barbarianism. And of course, this is what is overwhelming us today. Our cities are becoming jungles more dangerous than those of Africa because of the products of humanism and humanistic education.

Now David Gibbs spoke about the difference between preference and conviction. Let’s use another word for ‘conviction;’ necessity. “Necessity is laid upon me...,” declares the apostle. “Woe is me if

I preach not the gospel.” Now, I submit every subject that has any place in the Christian curriculum should have a sense of the same kind of godly necessity. It is a means of declaring that God is God, that Christ is the Lord, and that every area must be brought into captivity to Him. Without that sense of necessity, we cannot prevail in the days ahead. But we are told that when we stand fast upon Christ as the Rock, when we move in terms of that sense of necessity being laid upon us, when we as Christ’s Church, His Kingdom, His property are so grounded, the gates of Hell cannot prevail against us.

That word ‘prevail,’ in the Greek, has the meaning of ‘hold out.’ It means that we’re not the defenders—they are! We are the army on the march! And it is our duty therefore in every subject to recognize that we are creating an army on the march, we are creating the leadership for the battle. We do it out of a sense of necessity because we are the ones who are going to prevail. We are going to break the barriers of the enemy because Jesus is Lord.

This means then, that we have to have a sense of priorities. A good many years ago, at the beginning of the fifties, I heard a very fine elderly pastor preach to about fifteen-hundred pastors at a conference, a sermon which I’m afraid very few heeded, but it moved me profoundly. The title of it was ‘Majoring in Minors.’ And what he did was to say that most ministers today were majoring in minors, in trifles and occupying themselves endlessly in the pulpit and out of the pulpit with trifles and that that was comparable to putting away the dishes before you leave the house when the house is on fire. And he summoned them to major in majors, to know they were in a battle and to fight as good soldiers of Jesus Christ.

As a result, when we as Christian educators teach our children, we must major in majors. We must recognize that we have a battle and you haven’t seen anything yet. If in any state or in any area the enemy for a moment has pulled back, it’s only to regroup for a major attack. But in the face of that attack, we must have this confidence: “if God be for us, who can be against us?” And so, it is imperative for us then, to be clearly unequivocally, and without compromise, for the Lord.

I began by telling you of this dear, dear brother who felt that Roy Thompson and I were leading all of you astray and making jailbirds, or potential jailbirds out of you people. When I spoke to him about whose law, how about the law of the Lord? How about obedience to Christ rather than to the state? And he said: “well if you want to look at it that way, I suppose you can. But when you can preach the gospel in the school and use the Bible and there isn’t a state in the country that’s barring you from that, why bother?”

I’ll conclude with my words to him. I told him that he was selling fire insurance, not preaching Jesus Christ the Lord. And I submit that we are called to do more than to preach just fire insurance, that we are called to proclaim Jesus Christ as Lord or prophet, priest and King and we are called and required and necessity is laid upon us to be His priests, prophets and kings wherever we are.

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank thee for the joy that is ours in Jesus Christ and for the victory that is ours in Him. We thank thee that nothing can separate us from His love, neither life nor death, nor powers nor principalities, nor this state nor any other state for thou hast called us, thou hast empowered us with thy Spirit and thou hast declared that the very gates of Hell cannot stand up against us when we move in thy Spirit and in thy Word. Make us ever bold in this faith, zealous in thy service, faithful to thy Word and joyful in thy service, knowing that we are priests, prophets and kings of the Most High God. Our God, we thank thee, in Jesus’ name, amen.

ENDNOTES:

1. John 1:3
2. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Jn 8:35–36). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.
3. 1 Corinthians 9:16

The Biblical Doctrine of Civil Government

R.J. Rushdoony

Twice in recent weeks, I have had the same question asked of me during question and answer periods after speaking. And the question in both cases was virtually identical. It was this: are you an anarchist? Don't you believe in government?

And my answer is that I am emphatically not an anarchist, I am a Christian, but I don't believe in government. I believe in God the Almighty and in His government.

To believe in government is something different from having a government under God and our problem today is that too many people believe in government. As a result, they surrender to Caesar where they should bow the knee instead to the Lord God of Hosts. As a result, at the request of Mr. Grover, I'm speaking this day, or this evening, on "The Biblical Doctrine of Civil Government."

Every time I talk about 'the government,' I feel ashamed of myself because I know that I'm using the wrong kind of language. Now I don't mean that I should use bad language with regard to Washington, DC or Columbus or Sacramento. But the Puritans would have been horrified by our use of the word 'government.' When we talk about 'the government,' we're talking about Washington and the state governments and the city governments. And that's wrong. After all, remember that the Puritans often spoke of God as the supreme governor. Government in essence was of God. Government, law, order, all things were from God. When they spoke about government on the human level, when they said 'government,' they meant first of all, the self-government of the Christian man. That's government. That's the kind of government we are all called upon, in terms of Scripture, to practice. When the Bible speaks, it does not address itself to the United States or to Governor Rhodes or to Governor Brown. It addresses itself to you and to me, to the seat of government. Someone has said, unfortunately, that for most Christians, the seat of government for them is where their seat is! And it should be in their heart. Thus, for the Puritans, the basic government was the self-government of the Christian man, man having been redeemed by the grace of God through the atoning work of Jesus Christ, now turned to the infallible Word of God and found therein. God's Word, God's law. Every word of God is law, because every word of God is binding upon us. It never says: "thus suggesteth the Lord," but: "thus saith the Lord."

Then second, when the Puritans talked about 'government,' they meant the family. The family is a basic area of government; the most basic. The family is a government in which the father as the head of the household is under God, the ruler. His wife is his prime minister and the children are then governed. The family is the basic church, school and state of man. This is where individuals learn their basic religious, civil and educational matters.

A few years ago, the federal government, at the time of the integration crisis, ordered a study of integrated and segregated schools. The report was quite a dramatic one and was generally neglected and was an embarrassment to the people who did it. It was simply feeding all the available information into computers. What did they find? First, there was no correlation between the success of black and

white children, and the fact that the school was integrated or segregated; that had nothing to do with it. Second, there was no correlation between the amount of money a state spent and the results. In fact, the more money that was spent, there was a somewhat negative correlation. Third, there was essentially no difference in the aptitudes of the children; black and white, segregated and integrated. And so on down the line. Only one place did they find a correlation, and a dramatic one and that was with respect to the family. Where there was a stable family background, the child, irrespective of race, was stable and able in the school. Where that strong family background was absent, then in the overwhelming majority of cases, the child was a problem in school; both in his behavior and in his ability to learn. Thus, the real correlation was with regard to family life. And the sad fact is that they found a very high degree of black homes unstable and an increasingly higher and higher number of white homes that were unstable. And this they found to be the determinative factor. The family is an extremely important government, it is basic in God's plan.

I shall try later to return to the family again, but suffice it to say that first we have the self-government of the Christian man and then second, we have the government of the family and the third basic form of government is the church. The church is a government, or at least it should be. Nowadays, of course, they're twisting your arm to get you in and it's very hard even if you're a flagrant known sinner to get kicked out. Of course I was perhaps a little extreme, but my attitude towards members when I was in the pastorate (or possible members) was that I didn't ask them to join. I took them in only when they asked me, when they felt the Holy Spirit compelled them to come in, not me. But the church is an important government. Many of us can witness to how much our church upbringing governed us, instructed us, guided, fed us.

Then fourth, the school is a government, a very important government, and the Puritans were strong on education. They believed in it and they said in the Old Deluder Act, lest that old deluder, Satan, lead our children astray. Christians have always been, in past generations, leaders in education. But in the past century, they have fallen behind to their own destruction. Now it is an area of government that the Christians are recapturing. The school, therefore, functions not only to educate but to govern.

Then our work, our calling is an area of government. Your job governs you. If you're a teacher, you're governed. If you're an administrator, you're governed. If you're a pastor you're governed. Make no mistake about it. And a great many of the rules and regulations, the laws of our everyday life come right out of our job. It's a government. This is why the Puritans wrote so many books about vocations and godly government therein. This is why Scripture speaks to 'masters,' 'employers' we would say in modern language, and employees.

Then again, our community is a government. Where we live makes a difference as to how we act. Now I have lived in both Southern California and Northern California. I am now in the mountain areas of California. I can tell you that you're governed by either place. You dress very, very informally in Southern California most of the time and very formally in San Francisco. You know it's a peculiar thing; San Francisco is so extremely radical and liberal but so very proper about clothing. Why, up until a few years ago, there were some very prominent businessmen there who still (and they were the last ones in the United States to use them and they were made exclusively for them) had shoes that used button hooks, buttoned instead of laced. Some of you who are about as old as I am may remember that type of shoe. It was the last place in the United States where they were used. Now, you certainly were governed by that sort of thing in San Francisco. You couldn't hope to function and be a prude, people would govern you by their disapproval if you didn't conform to the rules and regulations. So a community governs you, and if you live in an ungodly environment, it's going to influence you. If you work at a public school, it's going to govern you. But if you live in a Christian community, it's the government of that Christian community and the degree of its growth that will influence and govern you.

Now we've gone through six forms of government that the Puritans thought were basic to man's life. A self-government of the Christian man, the family, the church, the school, the community, one's calling and finally there was another form of government they spoke about, but only with this term; 'civil government.' They never called it 'government.' And why do we call it 'government' now? The government? Because it is taking over the government of the individual, of the family, the church, the school, the job, the community. It's the government as though it were God.

Now as I said, I often talk about 'the government' and I feel ashamed every time I do. And it's time we started correcting ourselves and one another and say, oh, you mean the state or the civil government, because it is not the government and its claims to be so are godless. They go against everything that the Word of God teaches. I do know that the Word of God speaks to the state, the civil government at times through the prophets, but as I recall it reading the prophets, and right through the New Testament, what they had to say to the civil government was not always very complimentary, because in those days, kings and governors were trying to take the government out of the Lord's hands, and to place it upon their shoulders. But the government shall be and must be upon the Lord's shoulders. And when we believe that, we are going to govern ourselves by His Word in our personal lives, family, the school, the church, our calling, our community and the state because the state must be under the supreme governor, Almighty God.

And so, as we approach the idea of government, we must remember that because no area of this world is outside of God, no area can chart its course apart from His Word. Now of course, this brings me to a point, and I know there are some of you who may differ very radically from me. I believe strongly in biblical law. Let me take about two minutes to explain my belief then go on to deal with what Scripture teaches about civil government and government in the community.

I believe that when St. Paul speaks of the law and condemns it, because he uses the term 'law' in several senses in Romans, one sense is that of the Pharisaic use as a way of justification and: "by works of the law no man can be justified." That's an impossibility. The Pharisees held to that and even then they took and twisted the law and made the Word of God: "...of none effect through their traditions." Then St. Paul speaks of the law as a death penalty against us, an indictment, and in Christ we are dead to the law in that sense, it's not the law that's dead, but we are. When a man pays the death penalty for a crime, he's dead to the law, literally. And we are just as literally 'dead to the law' as an indictment, as a death penalty. The sentence is passed. The old man is dead. And so the law has no claim upon me as a death penalty, as an indictment. What is my relationship to the law now? It's written on the tables of my heart. It's God's way of holiness, way of righteousness. And so I must say with my Lord: "lo I come to do thy will, O Lord." And so I look to the law as the way of life, as the healing of my life and of society, as a means of growth.

Now as we look to the law, let me say the Hebrew word for law is 'Torah,' torah. It is usually applied to the whole of the Old Testament and in the early church we find that it applied to the whole of the Bible. Now the word 'Torah' means 'law,' but at one and the same time it means 'instruction,' teaching. This is why the psalmist, in Psalm 119, in which every verse is about the law, speaks of it as a light and a lamp, as commandments, as instruction. It is all of those things.

What does the law say to us about government? Now it's very interesting. One of the most important questions in the history of America was raised by Indian converts, the 'praying Indians' of John Eliot. John Eliot converted whole tribes of Indians. They were formed into what people called 'praying villages,' and so the leaders of the Indians came to John Eliot and they said: "how shall we govern ourselves in terms of the Word of God?" Marvelous question! You know, it takes grace to ask the right questions. And John Eliot went to the Word with the Indians and he wrote it up in a little book of about thirty, thirty-five pages, A Christian Commonwealth. And he said God, when He calls His people and

redeems them, then uses in Scripture, His basic institution, the family. And so he said, we are told Jethro first brought it from the Lord, but then Moses says he, directly from the Lord had the same in Deuteronomy 1 he tells us this, that every family is a government. And then over ten families in both church and state, there is to be one elder, then over fifty families out of the leaders of the ten, there is to be one. Then out of the leaders of fifties, for every hundred there is a one, and so on up until they form a church council or a state council or a national council, depending on whether they are elders in church or in state. And so, the Indians set about to reorganize their life in terms of that. But the minute Charles II learned of what they were doing, he ordered all of that work destroyed and the book burned by the public hangman. A very rare book now, very difficult to read in the surviving copies. If the Lord provides the funds, we hope to reprint it with a note about John Eliot's work.

Now as you go on from that to what God requires in society and in the state, we find that as the Scripture deals with crime, its basic principle is restitution and restoration. So that when a man steals \$100, he must restore that \$100 and be fined another \$100 and for some offenses it can be four-fold and five-fold. Remember Zaccheus. He said he would restore if he had defrauded any man four-fold and five-fold and our Lord said: "This day is salvation come to this house." If the man could not restore it, he was sold as a bondservant until he had worked it off and made restitution. If he were an incorrigible criminal or an incorrigible juvenile delinquent, as Deuteronomy 21:18-21 makes clear, he was executed. "So shall ye put iniquity out of the land." There was no prison system. The only references we find to prisons in the Old Testament are to places where you were held in custody until trial. Then you were executed or you were compelled to make restitution. And when you made restitution, you resumed your place in society. God's order had to be restored. In fact, if a murder took place between two communities and they could not find the murderer, the city to which the body was closest had to make restitution to the family. God's order had to be restored.

I've taught that over the years and when I was in the pastorate I taught it and I used a very simple illustration to bring it home to a very everyday level. And I used it out of a very real experience. I brought it down to this level, and I said, now if you women are having a meeting and you bring some cakes and cookies and what-not and during the clean-up period, some other woman while washing the dishes, breaks your plate, or if you break the plate, and the other woman says: "O, never mind, it was an old dish, forget about it!" I said: "don't you forget about it, you go out and buy a plate that's twice as good and take it and give it to her." Because, I said: "I've known people that when I've come to a church, ten years after something like that has happened and you ask them about Mrs. so-and-so, oh, well, she's all right, but she broke a good plate of mine once." They won't forget!

But when you make restitution, restoration, then there is forgiveness. You see, we are built according to God's specifications, which means we were built to conform to His Word. And when we don't, we're out of joint. It's that simple.

Now to continue, the family is a basic area of God's government so a great deal of Scripture gives us family law. The basic powers in society are in the hands of the family. The most important power in any society is control of children. When you control children, you control the future. And Scripture very clearly gives that power to the family alone, to the family! The family under God is to control the future, and I believe therefore parents are judged by God when they abuse that high calling and put their children in government, civil government schools and do not instruct them in the home nor pray with them. It's the basic power in any society; the basic power and no parent dare treat it carelessly.

Then second, Scripture places control of property in the hands of the family; and not just the immediate family, but the family before and after us. Remember Naboth? Naboth felt very strongly that he didn't have the power to sell that property. It had been given to him by his forefathers as a trust to be passed down to the generation to come.

I know my father felt very strongly about that, because he came from an old country background and in fact he could trace my first and last name back to the 8th century BC (and he could rattle off the grandfathers back into the Middle ages and name a good many of them going back to 800 BC) lived in the same place all that time where they'd passed on a family inheritance always. And he was a poor preacher, and he grieved when he was on his deathbed that he had no material inheritance to give me. And I told him, you've given me the richest inheritance any American has had because you've given me an inheritance of faith. And you've given me an inheritance of a lifetime of being surrounded every day, wherever I've been, by his prayers. So I was born rich, I was born into a Christian home.

The third great power is inheritance; property, inheritance. The control of inheritance is given by God to the family. The eldest son was to get a double-portion if he was godly. If not, he was to be disinherited because he had the responsibility for the care of the parent. I believe that. My mother is a widow, she is living with us, she's eighty-seven, it's our privilege. I'm not under any pension plans, I have no security monetarily in terms of the future. I haven't a savings account even. I have six children, six godly children. I have my pension plan. So inheritance, a tremendous power, is given by God to the family. But what does the state now say? It claims to be the first-born. It takes the first and the double-portion before anyone else can lay a finger on it. And this is another evil that we must contend with.

Then of course, education is another basic power given to the family. Do you see how important the family is as a government? Education, even today with all the state schools, more money is put into education from kindergarten up through the university by the family, Christian and non-Christian than by civil government. And every year, the strength of the family in this basic area of government is growing by leaps and bounds.

But, to pass on quickly, finally, another great and central power of the Christian family is welfare. Again, more people are cared for by families than by government, civil government welfare, and better care. I was very deeply moved a couple of years ago when I was in Alabama to read a survey conducted by someone at one of the black colleges there of two counties in that state. There was not a single black child in those counties receiving government aid, civil government aid, not a single one, nor a single delinquent. Why? Because those people still believed the old-time religion and they took care of their own. But of course, in the cities, we've become too civilized, black and white, to do that sort of thing.

But this is a great power. And you can see why the family is regarded as an enemy by the state. John Dewey said the Christian faith was an enemy. Conant, the high-commissioner of Germany, professor of chemistry, I believe, at Harvard and president of Harvard, and then doing endless reports for the National Educational Association, had said the family has to go, if we have democracy. And of course, he's right. The family is the great roadblock. And family apart from Christian faith is nothing, it collapses. The family has the basic powers given to it by God. And it must assert those powers and do battle for them.

Then because our time is short, I want to deal with another area of the biblical doctrine of government. Now, as far as a civil tax is concerned, the Bible gives it very little. We read in Exodus 30:11-16 of the 'atonement tax,' or covering tax which was really a tax for the maintenance of the courts, of civil government. It was called an atonement tax (or covering tax, literally) because it was for the civil covering and protection of society. That was the same amount for all males over twenty, and no more, no less.

The basic government was not in the hands of the civil government, but the people of God. And the basic tax was and is the tithe, the tithe. If you're not tithing you're sinning. You're defrauding the su-

preme governor, Almighty God. You're robbing Him, he says so. That tax or tithe (because the word tithe means tax also) went for the support of the priests, the church, the Levites. They got nine-tenths of it, one tenth went to the priests. The other nine-tenths went to the Levites who took care of health, education and welfare. Isn't that something? They had to help with the welfare, another tithe every third year, the poor tithe, a second tithe. But they took care of instruction. In Deuteronomy 33:10 we're told that this is the function of the Levites, to instruct Israel, to instruct the people of God.

At one time, we Christians still took seriously enough the health aspect of it, that all hospitals until about a hundred years ago or less were Christian, and they should be again. We need Christian hospitals which will receive no federal funds and no federal control so that instead of making them a place of murder, or for abortion, a place of healing. Where instead of 'mercy killing' (What a horrible expression! 'mercy killing'), they're a place of healing under God.

George Washington felt very strongly about the tithe. He recognized that when people stopped tithing, then the government would start (the civil government; I'm a sinner in that respect, like all of you) would start taxing. And that's what has happened. Instead of paying ten percent a year, with another ten percent every third year, we're now paying about forty-five percent aren't we? And that forty-five percent of our income in the form of federal, state and local taxes is being used to destroy us, is it not? Because it begins with a godless premise.

Well, the real way to do battle against it is not to complain about the federal government or the state or the county government. I know Christians who are conservatives all over the country. The problem is they don't bring their Christianity and their conservatism together biblically. So they complain endlessly about the government and they want to do this, and they want to do that, and I tell them it's useless. God has given you the power to do something, very simply. And if you do it, and a few million Christians across the United States do it, you're going to gut the state; federal, and local branches of civil government. What is that? The tithe. What do you do when you tithe? You give the government back to the Lord. You create missions, schools, hospitals, all kinds of agencies. You take care of your own sick and needy. You take the government back under God, where it belongs.

You see, God's way is very simple - if we would but follow it. Nobody is going to prevent you from tithing. You've got the power in your hands there and you'd better start tithing. The enemy knows the power of the family, knows also the power of the tithe. You have legal decisions coming from every front and they're going to increase. I believe we're going to win the battles if we can stay the course, and that takes money, the CLA need money. The people in Kentucky and elsewhere need money. They can't fight those battles in the courts without money. And more money than we can begin to use would be available if the people of God put their money where their mouth is, if they started tithing. There's no excuse for not tithing.

When God promises a curse for disobedience and a blessing for obedience, it takes a pretty ungodly disposition to go in the face of that. Moreover, what God says is: "bring your tithes and offerings." In other words, you're not giving a gift to the Lord unless it's above and over your tithe. Have you thought about that? In other words, we just don't sit there and get the showers of blessing, we get them when we stand in terms of God's Word.

I've told you what the biblical doctrine of government in its broad outlines is. Very briefly, you can see two areas of power; the family, the tithe. In both areas, you can act. In both areas, you can if you obey the Lord, exercise vast powers. Will you do it?

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, thy Word is truth, and thy Word speaks plainly to our needs, to our problems, and to our hopes. Give us hearing ears, O Lord, and obedient hearts that we may render thee thy due, full measure and heaped up and pouring over, that in like manner, we may receive thy blessings. Teach us to look at our homes, our families in terms of thy Word so that we might know how rich we are, what great power, authority and responsibility thou hast given to us in Jesus Christ. We thank thee, O Lord for these, thy saints, for their stand and for their service, for their willingness to stand up before the kings and governors of the Philistines of today to fight for thy namesake. Bless them, we beseech thee, strengthen and prosper them, cause thy face to shine upon them and make them a mighty witness unto the ends of the earth so that men and nations may rally to that standard reared here by this group in this state. This we ask thee in Jesus' name, amen.

ENDNOTES:

1. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Ro 3:20). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.
2. Mark 17:3
3. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Heb 10:9). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.
4. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Lk 19:9). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.
5. The Holy Bible: King James Version (Electronic Edition of the 1900 Authorized Version., Dt 21:21). (2009). Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Transcriptions brought to you by

Rushdoony Radio



www.rushdoonyradio.org

Rushdoony lectures, audiobooks, and transcripts

These professional transcriptions were made possible by permission of the Chaldedon Foundation and the support of Nicene Covenant Church and Grace Community School.

A special thanks to Nathan F. Conkey, whose unparalleled dedication and labor made these professional and polished transcripts a reality.

Additional thanks to the “Mount Olive Tape Library” and “Christ Rules” who participated in the recording, storing, and digitizing of RJ Rushdoony’s lectures as well as the creation of the original lecture transcriptions.