

## Schools and the Future of America

“You are a member of the school board of a medium-sized Western city. It is September and the high school must immediately replace a very fine history teacher who died quite suddenly, since high school starts next week. You must make a choice from among four applicants—Don, Jim, Bill and Harry.” This problem was presented on a spirit-duplicated sheet to my son’s high school speech class. Students were to choose from these four candidates:

1. “Don had an exceptional academic record in teachers college. He is bright and hard-working, well liked and well mannered. However, he is a very stubborn young man—also a confirmed atheist—and does not hide his lack of religious belief. When asked if he intended to teach atheism to his pupils, he replied that he would teach what he believed, and no one had the right to ask him not to.”

2. “Harry had an average academic record at a small church stool [sic]. His recommendations are just adequate, with the clear indication that some question of competence remains in the minds of his teachers. When the principal asked how well his practice teaching has gone, Harry replied that he did not get through all the material he was supposed to cover.”

3. “Jim had an exceptional academic record at a large, well respected, private university. His recommendations were excellent as far as academic training was concerned. Although well-liked and well-mannered, Jim is very uncomfortable around women and definitely seems to prefer the company of men. Jim admitted that this was true and replied that he was a homosexual but had the situation in full control. Jim said that he would not teach any of his homosexual views but if asked would admit that he preferred the company of men to that of women.” Jim contends that “he has his own circle of friends in a town fifty miles away and has never been in trouble with the police, nor was he in any trouble during four years of undergraduate work.”

4. “Bill had a sporadic record from a large public university. The principal reports that he is neat, clean and well dressed. He was a campus radical and took part in several protests, on one occasion spending eighteen days in jail because of his activities. His record also shows that Bill has strong political leanings toward Communism. Upon questioning,

Bill admitted his association with violent factions but assured the principal that he was now ready to settle down and that he would like to teach. Bill said that he would not teach Communist doctrines but would not lie to the students if asked about his beliefs,”

On the bottom of the sheet students were asked, “Which candidate should the board select to fill the teaching position in the high school history department?”

Notice the two applicants favoring humanistic life-styles, the atheist and the homosexual, have “exceptional academic” records and are “well-liked and well-mannered”; the communist radical is “neat, clean and well dressed”; and the Christian is of average ability with clear evidence of being incompetent. This is a subtle undermining of our moral heritage. These humanistic attacks are repeated in countless ways in classrooms across America.

### **Internal Disintegration**

America has faced many crises and survived. Today’s crisis, however, is unique—it is an internal disintegration. The humanistic attack is demolishing our nation’s moral strength, and it is being promoted by government and schools in the name of constitutional liberty. America is vibrant and strong, but no nation is immune from destruction. Unless nations transmit to future generations discipline and moral strength, they will join the graveyard of nations. Though many Americans object to humanistic standards, they are nevertheless forced upon their children. The difficulty in combating humanism is that it comes disguised as love, compassion, freedom, self-determination, and respect for individuality. These concepts have an aesthetic appeal that tends to pacify parents’ fear of a dehumanizing and valueless education. It is therefore necessary to look behind the deceptive mask of semantics and examine the true meaning of these humanistic terms.

Although humanism places man on a pinnacle, in the end it debases him into an animal. Since God is dead, man is God; man is the sole determiner of his own values. As with the pragmatic approach of John Dewey, truth is “what works”; therefore, all values are relative. According to humanists, neither God, Freud, nor Marx makes individuals; man makes himself. But since God is dead and there are no moral absolutes, humanism destroys man’s dignity. Humanists often cry the loudest for a world of tolerance, compassion and humaneness, but they are often the ones who reveal their “noble” behavior—they advocate abortion, suicide, and euthanasia.

Despite high goals of personal freedom and social responsibility, children reared in humanistic fashion have claimed their inherent right to freedom. Yet in the process they have abrogated social responsibility. Selfishness is characteristic of humanism; one can detect a horrible apathy and callousness in youth trained in permissive schools. Why does humanism breed inhumanity? It fails to produce humans with true compassion because, when self-satisfaction is the goal of living, anything that destroys this feeling of satisfaction becomes evil. “No!” cries humanism; our goal is self-satisfaction plus social responsibility. The dilemma occurs when individuals who express social responsibility must often sacrifice self-pleasure. Since humanism debases man into an animal, the moral imperative is lacking. Therefore, social responsibility is rejected for self-indulgence. Humanism repudiates theism, but it is faith in God that provides meaning for life, dignity to man, and love for neighbor. Since man is not an animal but a created being, man has a future, social responsibility is practiced, and morality has meaning.

Take, for example, theistic and humanistic treatment of criminals. The historical creed of man’s fall permitted an insight into both man’s potential goodness and his cruelty. Humanism believes man is born only with the capability of doing good; it therefore excuses man’s cruelty and blames society or environment or both. Consequently, humanism perverts justice because it acquits the perpetrators of crime, and these criminals in turn prey upon the innocent. Theism blames man’s cruelty on his fall but instead of leaving man there it offers him power through faith in God to alter his fallen nature and also offers forgiveness.

Our founding fathers in uniting God and state recognized that, since help was available for individuals to change their deviant behavior, anyone who refused to change and engaged in criminal misconduct was guilty and deserved punishment. Rather than constantly looking for excuses for criminal behavior, theism punishes criminals and offers programs for reform. Our historical criminal justice system is based on this Judeo-Christian ethic. Departure from these concepts has produced the escalating crime wave. We need a new understanding of man’s guilt and the right of society to insist on proper moral behavior.

In a Judeo-Christian culture lawmakers and judges do not just look into their own minds to formulate the laws for a safe and just society; they also look into the Bible to determine principles of justice. In 1963 Supreme Court Justice William Brennan stated, “Nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle

or inspiration.”<sup>1</sup> Many of the evils in today’s society can be traced to a breakdown of law. Increasingly we hear of political leaders who advocate law and order, yet upon being elected effect little change. Why? They are not necessarily using law and order themes as political ploys to get elected. Rather, it is often permissive laws and judges that prevent effective criminal procedures from being implemented. This humanistic trend of excusing the guilty has brought about much of the grave criminal crisis in the schools and nation.

### **Theism and Human Rights**

Along with the equitable punishment of the guilty, the theistic heritage has held proper human rights in highest regard. Although theists have often failed to obey the precepts of their faith, yet the potential was there. Humanism, in contrast, is not a protector of human rights; its libertine concepts protect debauchery, lawlessness, and immorality. Believers in the historic Judeo-Christian ethic support human rights and emancipation for the human spirit within the concepts of decency and justice. These rights give dignity to man, along with liberty and happiness.

Carl F. H. Henry says the United States Declaration of Independence “identifies the divine Creator as the transcendent source and sanction of human rights. To a radically secular society, this may seem to be a bit of quaint poetry. But the fact remains that the insistence of the classic American political documents on a transcendent source and sanction of human rights (whether it was ventured on theistic or deistic principles or both we need not argue here) is of immense importance.” The writers of the Declaration of Independence did not hesitate to declare God’s transcendent claim upon mankind, Henry notes, and “the fact that we today are less disposed to say so indicates how deeply naturalistic secularism has penetrated our own society.”

Henry relates how “at a Bicentennial education conference in Philadelphia last year, a key speaker commended the historic American political documents for their distinctive emphasis on human rights. But when I asked whether the philosophy department of any great public university in America today espouses the supernaturalistic world-and-life view presupposed by the Declaration of Independence when it asserts that there are inalienable rights grounded in divine creation and preservation, the answer was crystal clear. What now dominates the intellectual arena is a naturalistic evolutionary philosophy or a radically secular view of reality and life.

“This antiscientific, anti-God development ought to chill our souls. Neither a utopian evolutionary philosophy nor a radically secular alternative can persuasively maintain the case for human rights. A merely evolutionary view of human origins and development cannot vindicate either the permanent or the universal dignity of mankind.”<sup>2</sup>

## **Constitutional Democracy**

It is important to understand the structure of the United States government so one can intelligently promote the national wellbeing. America does not have a pure democracy; it has a constitutional democracy. In a pure democracy 51 percent of the people rule; if the majority decided that all blacks should be lynched, this would be law and considered right. Pure democracy can become mob rule. Though Pontius Pilate knew Jesus was falsely accused and was innocent, he employed the principles of democracy to escape the unpopular reactions of the multitude by asking them what he should do—the crowd roared, “Crucify him! Crucify him!”<sup>3</sup>

Effective democracy must have some sort of inner control, for democracy by itself does not contain a moral force. For this reason our national founders did not formulate a simple democracy; instead, they formed a constitutional democracy based on theistic faith, which gave America a strong moral cohesiveness. Thus they established certain laws that no simple majority could change.

From what source do America’s concepts of human rights come? Not from democratic concepts, but from the Constitution, which provides all citizens the right of freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition. Because of the Constitution, individuals can stand against the majority, expose its evils, and succeed, and without this right, minorities would be defenseless. Where did the principles of the Constitution originate? In the consciences of the people, who used the Bible as the framework for their values. They could confidently state in the Declaration of Independence, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.”

The reason freedom of speech, religion, and press was so liberally provided in the founding of our nation was that moral values were well established. When our forefathers spoke of separation of a national church and federal government, it never entered their minds that prayer to God would one day be declared illegal in a public institution; otherwise they would have rejected Benjamin Franklin’s proposal. When freedom

of speech and press were established, profanity and pornography would never be included because of the moral standards of that day. They would have been universally considered a perversion of freedom.

### **Perpetuating America's Heritage**

America needs to be awakened to the concepts of our constitutional republic that have so greatly prospered the nation. Moreover, our children need to be educated to understand that form of government. Unfortunately, because of humanistic forces many schools are not perpetuating the American heritage. Unless America regains its spiritual basics, it will be wrecked on the rocks of its own freedom. Freedom without control breeds license, for under the guise of freedom, libertarians pedal their degenerate behavior and concepts. At the same time they suppress religious freedom and speech under the guise of separation of church and state.

The Senate Judiciary Committee had a hearing concerning school prayer. Seventeen-year-old Bonnie Bailey, chosen as the 1982 YMCA Governor of Texas, joined Secretary Terrel Bell and others in stressing that schools should permit voluntary Bible study and prayer before or after school hours, just as they do extracurricular sports, dramatics, and other activities. "We can picket, demonstrate, curse and take God's name in vain, but we can't voluntarily get together and talk about God at school," said Miss Bailey, a high school senior from Lubbock. "I can decide if I want an abortion or use contraceptives, but I can't decide if I want to come to a meeting to talk about religious matters before or after school. To me, that just isn't fair."

Previous to the hearing the ACLU won a court case against the Lubbock school board for permitting high school students to gather during nonclass hours for religious purposes. Terrel Bell asked, "If a public school allows students to meet before or after school to discuss or engage in politics, social activism or athletics, why should the rule change just because the students happen to be religious?"

Other students testified before the committee. William F. Kidd, of Anoka, Minnesota, and 11 other students were told that they may be suspended from school and also have their senior diplomas withheld. Their crime? They distributed a self-published Christian student newspaper in school.

Miss Scanlon told how her Christian club could not meet at school during lunch because of school board orders. Yet her school had a special smoking section. Moreover, when one of her teachers was talking about

alternative life-styles, a prostitute was invited to speak to the students.<sup>4</sup>

Professor Norval Morris, dean of the University of Chicago Law School, coauthored a book with Gordon Hawkins, *The Honest Politicians Guide to Crime Control*, which outlines ways to “curb” crime. One is “total abolition” of capital punishment. “Capital punishment is irrelevant to the murder, or attempted, murder rate. . . . If, therefore, we are to be sincere in our efforts to reduce violence, there is one type of violence that we can with complete certainty eliminate. That is the killing of criminals by the state.”

All drugs are to be decriminalized, including cocaine and heroin. “Neither the acquisition, purchase, possession, nor the use of any drug will be a criminal offense.” Remove police units dealing with organized crime. The authors want “to exorcise the myth of organized crime,” and they propose that “all special organized crime units in federal and state justice and police departments shall be disbanded.” They want drunkenness to “cease to be a criminal offence” and stipulate the eliminating of disorderly conduct and vagrancy laws, removing all criminal statutes against gambling and prostitution, and ending jail terms for the performance of abortion and statutory rape. The abolition of all criminal penalties for sexual behavior, including “bigamy, incest, sodomy, bestiality, homosexuality, pornography and obscenity,” is called for. And it is unjust to put anyone in prison for “failure to support one’s family.” Amazingly, in 1978 the president of the United States of America wanted Professor Morris to head the federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which distributes yearly 847 million dollars to combat crime.<sup>5</sup>

*Time* reports the unveiling of a new humanistic bill:

While the Vatican was anchoring age-old religious views on sex, those who make a religion out of non-religion were decreeing the opposite in the name of freedom. In the current *Humanist*, a bi-monthly magazine published for the American Humanist Association and the Ethical Culture movement, 34 sexologists have unveiled their “New Bill of Sexual Rights and Responsibilities.”

The humanists celebrate “responsible” freedom after centuries of “bondage to church or state.” Marriage “where viable” is “a cherished human relationship,” but “other sexual relationships also are significant.” The 34 signers predict a growing acceptance

of premarital, homosexual and bisexual relations. Though prostitution, sadomasochism and fetishism are gently tut-tutted as “limiting,” the humanists state that if they are to be discouraged, it should be through education, not laws.<sup>6</sup>

Jefferson rightly stressed that democracy needs an educated populace, but democracy also needs an inner moral force. Education alone can produce intellectual beasts. It was educated Nazis who massacred six million Jews and atheistic communists who slaughtered untold millions. The majority of Americans want transmitted to their children, not only an education, but also their historical theistic culture; and this culture is in direct opposition to the aims of humanism.

Humanism under the guise of human betterment promotes issues that make schools a primary agent of societal change, rather than a primary agent to develop student’s intellectual capabilities. These two views are demonstrated by the following statements. The National Education Association says:

The most controversial issues of the 21st century will pertain to the ends and means of human behavior and who will determine them. The first educational question will not be “What knowledge is of most worth?” but “What kind of human behavior do we wish to produce?”<sup>7</sup>

In contrast, the Policy Book of the Arizona State Board of Education states,

The schools have neither the chief responsibility nor the means for dealing with all aspects of personal development. . . It is not the job of the schools to create a new social order. . . . Students can develop the competency necessary to carry on the jobs of society only through the mastery of the skills, knowledge and thought which embody the major achievements of civilization.<sup>8</sup>

Many educational leaders operate on the basis of the concepts of the National Education Association; they believe they have the *right* to change children’s values and behavior for whatever they consider the “better.” W. W. Harmon, director of educational research policy at Stanford Research Institute, states, in *The Forward Edge of Education*,



“As we enter the third half of the 20th century, it is now feasible not just to predict the future but to *DESIGN* the future . . . we can no longer view education solely as the passing on of the culture to the next generation, it is in addition the PRIMARY TOOL for SHAPING the future.”<sup>9</sup> But who provides educators the right to change our children? When parents send their children to schools, they expect the schools to educate their children and educators to uphold the common values of society. Parents do not give the schools the license to remake their children into new humanistic social beings.

### **Collapse of Civilization**

Today, our nation is facing its worst crisis because humanism is destroying not only our children, but also America’s moral foundation. Furthermore, children trained in today’s humanistic educational system will become tomorrow’s parents and leaders. In the *New York Times News Service* Edward B. Fiske reports, “A group of 41 governors, corporate leaders and other prominent figures asserted here that the poor quality of U.S. public schools was threatening the military, economic and social well-being of the country.”<sup>10</sup>

Concerned leaders, seeing the unparalleled deterioration of moral responsibility, raise the terrifying question: Is Western civilization on the verge of collapse? General Douglas MacArthur said, “History fails to record a single precedent in which nations subject to moral decay have not passed into political and economic decline. There has been either a spiritual awakening to overcome the moral lapse, or a progressive deterioration leading to ultimate national disaster.”<sup>11</sup>

Arnold Toynbee, author of the six-volume, *Study of History*, stressed the role of religion in major civilizations. Nations encounter and overcome a physical, moral, or military challenge. From this victory a creative minority emerges that offers moral and spiritual leadership, causing the civilization to prosper. Disintegration occurs when either the creative leadership loses its vision or the people refuse to follow.<sup>12</sup>

Traditional moral standards have been eroding in America for decades, but they suffered a devastating blow when the Warren Court ruled unconstitutional state rights allowing teachers to pray and read the Bible. In addition, the Warren Court removed many state laws protecting society from exploitation of sex for mercenary ends. Encouraged by these permissive decisions of the Supreme Court, newsstands began blatantly to expose their porno magazines, theaters and TV exploited

sexual perversions, and massage parlors and topless bars emerged in many cities.

Dr. James Dobson, in his book *Dare to Discipline*, states:

Not everyone in our society has allowed passion to overrule judgment. There are those who still believe, as I do, that sexual irresponsibility carries an enormous price tag for the momentary pleasure it promises. Despite the reassuring philosophy of Hugh Hefner and his Playmates, sexual “freedom” is a direct thoroughfare to disillusionment, emptiness, divorce, venereal disease, illegitimacy, and broken lives. Not only do promiscuous individuals suffer adverse consequences; history reveals that entire societies begin to deteriorate when free love reaches a position of social acceptance. This fact was first illuminated by J. D. Unwin, a British social anthropologist who spent seven years studying the births and deaths of eighty civilizations. He reported from his exhaustive research that every known culture in the world’s history has followed the same sexual pattern: during its early days of existence, premarital and extramarital sexual relationships were strictly prohibited. Great creative energy was associated with this inhibition of sexual expression, causing the culture to prosper. Much later in the life of the society, its people began to rebel against the strict prohibitions, demanding the freedom to release their internal passions. As the mores weakened, the social energy abated, eventually resulting in the decay or destruction of the civilization. Dr. Unwin stated that the energy which holds a society together is sexual in nature. When a man is devoted to one woman and one family, he is motivated to build, save, protect, plan and prosper on their behalf. However, when his sexual interests are dispersed and generalized, his effort is invested in the gratification of sensual desires. Dr. Unwin concluded: “Any human society is free either to display great energy, or to enjoy sexual freedom; the evidence is that they cannot do both for more than one generation.”<sup>13</sup>

America is being destroyed by the new standards of sexual license, but we should not be shocked at what is happening to American youth—schools have trained children in this behavior. Instead of being a bulwark for morality and faith in God, schools promote immorality and

atheism. E. M. Blaiklock, who held the chair of classics at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, for 21 years and taught Latin, Greek, and ancient and biblical history for 42 years, said:

I am now going to be positive. As a historian, I assure you that Toynbee was right in this: all human cultures grow round a central core of moral ideas and ideals that command obedience, respect, and general observance. There is right and there is wrong, both unquestioned. This is what is called the “ethos” of a people, of a culture.

Early Rome had something called *pietas*. We have borrowed the word twice, as “piety” and “pity,” neither of which represents the old Roman virtue and mainstay of society: a loyalty to family and state, a courageous sense of duty, trustiness. Try the truth of this in all societies. Some central core holds all together. . . .

But this anticipates. The “ethos” of Western civilization, once called Christendom, is the Christian faith, its central beliefs, its ethics. Hence the love of liberty of which we boast, the reverence for human life, the old stabilities of marriage, honor, care for the weak. They derive from the deep truth that Christ died to save lost human beings. This moral core, the heart of it all, the strength by which it stands, is embedded in the Bible, the book that transformed Britain when it was let loose upon the people in the days of the first Elizabeth. All this is history. It is thus that Britain, indeed the English-speaking peoples, rose to stature, leadership, and strength. It is thus that nations rise and serve their era, and make their contribution to mankind.

And thus they pass away, for commonly in the story of a nation’s rise and fall comes the time when the authority of the ideal is questioned. There comes a moment when, in the phrase of the great and mordant historian, the Roman, Tacitus, a group discovers that “what authority had kept hidden” can be challenged and outfaced. There comes “permissiveness.” It is the beginning of the end, unless, intelligent enough, frightened enough, dowed sufficiently with courageous leadership, or swept by a revival of faith, a people rallies and returns to strength.

Unless that happens, “as surely as water will wet us, as surely as fire will burn,” that people dies. There is always another race, disciplined, moral, rigid in its attitudes, waiting to apply its strong

thrust to the crumbling structure.<sup>14</sup>

While the moral core of our nation falters, America is faced by an organized force whose stated goal is to conquer the world. Nobel Prize-winner Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the noted former Russian political prisoner and author of *The Gulag Archipelago*, said, “The communist ideology is to destroy your society. This has been their aim for 125 years and has never changed; only the methods have changed.”<sup>15</sup>

There are two ways to destroy a society: by overpowering it from without by the use of superior military might, or by overpowering it from within by encouraging such forces as will foster internal moral decay. Communist Lenin realized how to conquer a nation without force when he wrote, “Demoralize the youth and the revolution is won.”<sup>16</sup> Today’s schools are doing an efficient job of demoralizing youth.

How long can the nation survive when permissive leaders are allowed to destroy students with their humanistic values? Representative democracy is an excellent concept, but it is only as good as its people. When youth become immoral, then democracy will lead to disaster. Look at today’s society with its rapid mushrooming of divorce, broken homes, pornography, sexual license, unwed mothers, disrespect for authority, juvenile delinquency and crime. It can only lead to national destruction.

### **Three Value Systems**

When as a parent I objected to a high school sex education program because of its lack of moral direction, I was offered the argument “Whose morals shall we teach?” This is a legitimate question, and one that must be answered.

There are three basic value systems for establishing morality:

1. Humanism—man determines his own value system.
2. Communism—the state determines the value system.
3. Theism—God determines the value system.

Let us examine these value systems in the light of a situation that occurred while I was a substitute teacher in an eighth-grade class in a Lower East Side junior high school in Manhattan. I questioned some boys about their life goals in hopes of stimulating them to strive for a good education. Their immediate reaction was that they aimed at an easy life as criminals and pimps. How would each value system answer these pupils?

1. Humanists could not categorically say that crime was wrong; only

if the crime injures another is it wrong. They would discourage crime; however, certain humanists could easily rationalize stealing, in view of unemployment and if only the rich were victimized. Humanists are against sexual exploitation, yet working as a pimp could be considered beneficial: Men are made happy, the pimp is making a living, and prostitutes have an income. Humanists favor decriminalization for such “nonvictimless” crimes as using drugs or engaging in pornography, prostitution, incest, and homosexuality. The fact that such acts may destroy a society is unimportant; human happiness is the criterion for morality.

2. Communists would first evaluate whether the state would benefit from crime or prostitution. If they are in the minority, they favor freedom, like the humanists, knowing it will benefit their cause. However, once communists obtain power, they reject crime and immorality because they recognize that these evils harm society.

3. Theists categorically condemn engagement in criminal behavior or prostitution because of God’s commandments against stealing and immorality. A theistic culture passes laws that reflect its beliefs and punishes offenders. America’s theistic heritage has provided our nation with such a moral framework, yet humanism has become the dominant educational philosophy and has rejected these absolutes.

In pursuing its goals humanism has deified man by making him free to determine his own values, even to the point of his own ruin. In contrast, communism has deified the state instead of man. Nevertheless, the basic concept of communism is humanistic; it concentrates on man’s interests and values in his world. The favorite maxim of Karl Marx was: “I believe nothing human to be alien to me.”<sup>17</sup> Though this Marxist concept fits perfectly into the humanistic philosophy that “moral values derive their source from human experience” and “ethics are autonomous and situational,” in communism the state supersedes man. Because the state is deified, communism has produced a rigid moral system: whatever does not benefit the state must be suppressed.

How can communists be both humanistic and strict moralists? To overcome a nation, communists are the greatest champions for personal freedom and permissive policies. They know that in this atmosphere they can freely propagate their views to cause internal decay. They realize that a strong and vibrant society does not turn to communism; therefore, a nation must first be disrupted for communism to succeed. But once communists gain power, their schizophrenic nature emerges; they become ultra-authoritative and repressive. In order to promote their

humanistic utopias, communists have used police spies to control their people, instituted vicious religious persecution, utilized concentration camps, drugged dissidents in mental institutions, used torture chambers, and murdered millions of innocent victims.

Some will charge communists with being inconsistent and criminal, but to themselves they are not. Morality has to do with what benefits the state, and, all morals being relative, any act benefiting the state is good and therefore moral. Human rights mean nothing when they interfere with communistic designs. Humanism is a perfect tool for communists; we need to be aware that such deceptive forces are active in our society to “destroy the establishment.” The former leader of the Black Panther party, Eldridge Cleaver, spent several years abroad to avoid a possible prison term. After visiting many communistic countries he turned against communism and voluntarily returned to the United States, even at the risk of serving time in prison. The communists, he said, have a three-way plan to defeat the United States: (1) Isolate America by alienating the developing nations. (2) Achieve military superiority. (3) Promote subversion from within.<sup>18</sup>

An excellent strategy to destroy America internally would be to weaken the foundation of morality by insisting on separation of church and state until every concept of God is eliminated from our national life as it is in communist Russia. Next, slowly begin to attack every vestige of morality by allowing every divergent culture and lifestyle to exist in the name of freedom. Advocate freedom of the media for violence and pornography. Champion the cause for homosexuals, lesbians, and prostitutes. Break down the moral traditions of virginity, marriage, unity of the family, and authority of parents. Promote easy divorce and excessive children’s rights. Insist on extreme criminal rights even at the expense of the innocent. Concentrate on supporting school issues that will have the effect of producing ignorant, degenerate, and undisciplined youth. Then, when the nation has become demoralized and defenseless, attack, either by threat or by force.

Dr. Bob Simonds gives this report in his article on “How Humanism Took Over American Thought-Life”:

To augment the educational take-over of America’s mind, the Humanists founded the *American Civil Liberties Union* as the Humanist’s legal arm. The ACLU was founded by the Humanist Society, and the Ethical Culture Union by Dr. Harry Ward. Dr.

Ward's positions on socialism perfectly paralleled those of the Communist Manifesto. William 2. Foster, former head of the U.S. Communist Party, was the founder of the ACLU, along with John Dewey, Clarence Darrow and Corliss Lamont. The U.S. House of Representatives' Committee, investigating communist activities, wrote: "The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the communist movement in the United States, and fully 90% of its efforts are in behalf of communists who have come into conflict with the law."

The Humanist Society and the ACLU, declared the 60's as "The Battle for Racial Rights" (to win the support of the common man); the 70's were "The Battle for Sexual (homosexual) Rights and Freedom"; and the 80's "The Battle Against Religious Rights."

The ACLU has fought vociferously against the use of the Bible or the religious study of our American heritage in the public schools. They have tried to remove prayer from government functions (even congress). They have fought the rights of religious freedom of speech, especially on campus. They have fought for sexual freedoms of homosexuals, deviates and child molesters and against the religious rights of students. They have misinformed school administrators across America on every major Supreme Court decision in favor of religion.

They even sent out "U.S. Guidelines" to all the school administrators over the "prayer ban" case, totally twisting the court's rulings. Even though the ACLU has been sternly corrected by the Congress and the courts, many school administrators still use them as law.<sup>19</sup>

George F. Will, Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist, gave this report on how far the ACLU will go to remove any vestige of faith in God in a public institution:

The U.S. CONSTITUTION has, according to a New Jersey judge and the American Civil Liberties Union, been ravished. The instrument of this outrage is a New Jersey law which the judge says "is unconstitutional on its face and as applied, in that it violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments. . . and that immediate and irreparable injury will result to plaintiffs. . . ."

Whoa! The law that is pregnant with such awfulness says: “Principals and teachers in each public elementary and secondary school . . . shall permit students to observe a one-minute period of silence to be used solely at the discretion of the individual student, before the opening exercises of each school day, for quiet and private contemplation or introspection.”

According to the ACLU, that violates the constitutional guarantee against “establishment” of religion.

What is the injury—the irreparable injury—that a minute of silence will cause to anyone? No doubt a few children and parents will find it offensive that someone may use the minute for prayer. But since when is it an “injury” to be offended by what might be going on in someone’s head? Such chaos is what a society comes to when it believes that every grievance should be expressed as a conflict of individual rights, and that every conflict should be adjudicated.

The ACLU’s bullying litigation is designed not to protect the plaintiff (a student) but to compel others to behave as the plaintiff prefers. A lawyer for New Jersey’s Legislature argues that the law is constitutional because it is “neutral with respect to any religious content.” The legislator who sponsored it says: “All we did was provide the opportunity for contemplation,” and regarding the possibility that someone might silently pray, he says: “Who has the right, in this day and age, to determine that any thoughts someone has could violate the Constitution?”

An ACLU lawyer says New Jersey must “prove that nowhere among the purposes of the law is the opportunity for prayer.” Opportunity? Perhaps the ACLU will soon say that a state “establishes” religion unless its schools make contemplation impossible for even a minute. (Many schools do make it difficult.) But even today, after some bizarre Supreme Court rulings, the ACLU lawyer may be correct about what New Jersey must prove.

...  
The ACLU is a political organization pursuing its agenda primarily through litigation rather than legislation—often an authoritarian shortcut around the democratic process.<sup>20</sup>

## **Rebuilding America**

For a strong America, our nation needs to return to its spiritual heritage.



It must be decided whether we will accept the theistic ethic upon which the founding fathers built the United States or the religion of humanism. In addition, the courts must reflect our constitutional heritage as found in the Judeo-Christian ethic or else we are in deep trouble. National survival depends on perpetuating the moral values upon which America was founded. Abraham Lincoln wisely said, "The only assurance of our nation's safety is to lay our foundations in morality and religion."<sup>21</sup>

John Witherspoon, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, declared, "He is the best friend to American liberty who is most sincere and active in promoting true and undefiled religion. . . . Whoever is an enemy to God, I scruple not to call him an enemy to his country." He concluded, "God grant that in America, true religion and civil liberty may be inseparable."<sup>22</sup>

George Washington clearly brought out the importance of uniting God and state to produce a national morality:

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports.—In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens.—The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them.—A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity.—Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion.—Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure—reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.<sup>23</sup>

Alexis de Tocqueville was a French statesman and political philosopher, whose studies of American democracy and the French Revolution were two of the most original and perceptive books of the nineteenth century. He came to the United States to investigate the American penal system. However, in the beginning of his visit he intended also to study American democracy. His observations resulted in a report on the American penal

system, and then he published his first masterpiece: *De la democratie en Amerique (Democracy in America)*. The work was an immediate success, winning him a seat in the Academie francaise. In his observation of American democratic institutions Tocqueville said that, unlike despotism, liberty cannot “govern without faith.”<sup>24</sup>

## The Blackout

Many colonial leaders firmly believed that religious faith was essential for the proper working of our government. However, many Americans today reject its principles and embrace atheistic humanism as their guiding force. An example of this rejection of our civil faith occurred the night of Wednesday, July 13, 1977, when a bolt of lightning triggered a chain reaction that produced a massive 25-hour blackout for New York City. The power loss also triggered a moral catastrophe. Widespread looting and rioting caused 18,000 merchants to suffer losses costing 310 million dollars; 23,722 fire alarms were sounded, involving 900 fires, in one of which 22 firemen were hurt; 3,776 arrests were made; and 123 policemen were injured.

The *New York Times* commenting on the blackout reports: “Throughout the city, groups of 30 to 40 people, mainly teenagers, gathered outside the vandalized stores, urging one another: ‘Lets do it, let’s do it.’ After breaking into a store, they fled upon hearing a police siren. But, soon after, if not arrested they would smash another window or pull apart a protective door grating.

“Officer Gary Parlefsky of the 30th Precinct in Harlem said that, while trying to arrest looters, he and other officers came under fire from guns, bottles and rocks.

“‘We were scared to death,’ said the 30-year old policeman. ‘Anyone who says he was not is lying—but worse than that, the blue uniform didn’t mean a thing.’”

“‘They couldn’t understand why we were arresting them,’ continued Officer Parlefsky. ‘They were angry with us. They said: ‘I’m on welfare. I’m taking what I need. What are you bothering me for?’”<sup>25</sup>

Some looters felt no guilt. “We’re doing right,” insisted a teenager. “I got a whole bedroom and living-room set. I got a wardrobe. And what I don’t need or what I can’t wear, I’ll give to people who do need it. There’s no real big thing about it.” A police lieutenant commented, “I’m not surprised at what happened. Here was an opportunity of something for nothing. There was no concept of a moral issue involved. The spirit was

carnival.”<sup>26</sup> *Time* notes, “A number of looters were robbed in turn by other thieves, who clawed and wrenched away their booty. When two men in Bushwick wearily set down a heavy box of shoes, a band of youths swooped in like vultures and made off with the prize. A teen-age girl on Manhattan’s upper West Side complained to friends that some boys had offered to help carry away clothes and radios, then had stolen them from her. Said she, with the skewed logic of the looters: ‘That’s just not right. They shouldn’t have done that.’”<sup>27</sup>

Some people blame the looting on poverty, but of the 176 individuals indicted for looting, nearly 50 percent had full-time jobs, and less than 10 percent were on welfare. One columnist said, “Nor was this an example of people driven by desperation to reach out for necessities. They took toasters, not bread; liquor, not milk; more sports shirts for the sporty than shoes for the shoeless. One of the participants aptly called the evil carnival atmosphere ‘Christmas in July.’”<sup>28</sup>

Not only did the looters steal, but what some could not carry they destroyed. A chandelier was smashed to pieces, couches were slashed with knives, glass-topped tables were smashed, bookcases were pulled over, and stores were set on fire. Emit M. Bernath, a Rumanian who survived the Nazi concentration camps, had a furniture and lumber store in Manhattan. He delighted in helping neighborhood schools by providing lumber for the children. His walls were lined with pictures of first- and second-graders and thank-you notes from recipients of his generosity. On the night of the blackout a mob broke into his store and stole thousands of dollars’ worth of bookcases, beds, cabinets, tables, and other furniture, leaving his store in shambles. “For 25 years I’ve helped all the children—black children, white children, Catholic and not Catholic, colored and not colored and all kinds of children,” Bernath said. “I went through Aushwitz and Buchenwald—the only difference is that there they wore boots and here they wore sneakers.”<sup>29</sup>

The looting was not racial revenge; many of the victims were themselves minorities. *Time* reports, “Stores owned by blacks and Hispanics suffered the same fate as those operated by whites. In Brooklyn, the Fort Green cooperative supermarket—set up by low income blacks after the 1968 riots—was stripped bare. The store had no steel window guards because, said Manager Clifford Thomas, ‘we thought we were part of the community. We were wrong.’”<sup>30</sup>

Throughout this book it has been stressed that lack of discipline and the humanistic permissive policies were destroying the youth of America.

The *New York Times* notes that most looters were teenagers;<sup>31</sup> thus they either were still in school or had recently left. The *New York Times* also reported that “the heaviest hit areas were the primarily black and Hispanic neighborhoods of Harlem and East Harlem, the South Bronx, the Bedford-Stuyvesant, Bushwick and Crown Heights in Brooklyn and Jamaica, Queens.”<sup>32</sup> It was quite coincidental that prior to this blackout I was a substitute teacher in each of these neighborhoods except East Harlem and Crown Heights (however, some of the schools were very near these areas), and it was in these same schools that I experienced the shocking undisciplined conditions.

The discipline breakdown in the schools has shown itself in a breakdown of neighborhood discipline. These teenagers put into practice the humanistic concept of situation ethics: There are no moral absolutes—each situation determines whether an act is right or wrong. As William Safire points out, “The looters looted because of the spreading non-ethic that stealing is O.K. if you can get away with it, as you usually can; that only a jerk passes up an opportunity to rip off his neighbor: that society not only owes you a living, but the good life.”<sup>33</sup>

What transpired was a moral breakdown. New York City has been a bastion for liberal humanism for decades; the seeds just sprouted and bore fruit. Can America continue to sit back and watch as more and more of its cities and youth are destroyed? Will we wake up and learn and take action?

## **The Silent Majority**

When George Gallup took a survey on the religious faith of Americans, an overwhelming 94 percent of the respondents stated that they believed in God.<sup>34</sup> It is time for this silent majority once and for all unashamedly to declare their faith in God and return America to its foundational strengths. Atheistic humanism has clearly taken over the schools, and the guiding light of our theistic heritage has been snuffed out. A few atheists have destroyed in children’s minds the principles that made our nation great. No longer can we rightfully say we are “one nation under God”; rather, we are now “one nation under Man.”

We have yet to reap the disastrous effects of this permissive immoral education that has been implanted in the hearts and minds of our youth. New York City’s blackout was a mere token of future disasters. Much of the good left in America results from the inertia of our historic faith, but this borrowing from the past cannot continue. There must be a renewal of

faith to keep America strong.

Since the overwhelming majority believe in the historical Judeo-Christian ethic, it is imperative that they uphold its standards as a code of conduct and resist the small band of humanist educators who try to make us believe we are supporting church and state. Our earlier constitutional democracy inspired nations to emulate us. In recent years, however, since humanism has become the standard for American morality, many nations reject our form of government. Freedom is cherished worldwide, but our present brand of freedom, which results in broken homes, violence, drugs, crime, juvenile delinquency, and perverted sex, is spurned by world leaders.

If the full implications of humanism were evident to the American people, they would overwhelmingly oppose it and our historical theistic faith would be restored. To counteract atheistic humanism, all Americans who believe in our theistic heritage should boldly proclaim their faith in God to revitalize our spiritual roots. Many have felt ashamed to declare their faith in God in a public institution because they themselves have been the victims of the progressive educational experience in which that faith as the foundation of our government was either repudiated or ignored. Humanism has now been exposed. No longer do Americans need to be ashamed to declare their faith in God publicly.

The philosophy of humanism vs. theism is not only an issue for our schools but the major issue of how our country is governed. The future prosperity of America hinges on which philosophy gains ascendance. It is crucial for the dedicated minority who understand that our national values are based upon a theistic heritage to go forth and stir the American people to action. The substitution of humanism for theism for our guiding light has caused the massive deterioration in schools and society. There needs to be a moral cry from every hamlet, town, and city for the restoration of the historical values as provided by our founding fathers to bring our youth and nation out of moral chaos and disintegration.