

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

2



AIR WAR COLLEGE

RESEARCH REPORT


No. AU-AWC-85-176

AD-A159 210

RELIGION, NATIONAL CHARACTER
AND STRATEGIC POWER

By COLONEL JAMES E. RAY

DTIC
SELECTE
SEP 17 1985
S A D



85 09 17 10Z
AIR UNIVERSITY
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC
RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION
UNLIMITED

AD-A159210

Unclassified		REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE											
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS											
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT											
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE													
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AU-AWC-85-176		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)											
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Air War College		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) DFR	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION										
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Maxwell AFB, AL 36112-5522		7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)											
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER										
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS. <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width:25%;">PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.</th> <th style="width:25%;">PROJECT NO.</th> <th style="width:25%;">TASK NO.</th> <th style="width:25%;">WORK UNIT NO.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNIT NO.				
PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.					TASK NO.	WORK UNIT NO.						
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Religion, National Character and Strategic Power													
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Col James E. Ray													
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Research		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) May 1985		15. PAGE COUNT 37								
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION													
17. COSATI CODES <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width:33%;">FIELD</th> <th style="width:33%;">GROUP</th> <th style="width:33%;">SUB. GR.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.				18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)				
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.											
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This paper researches and reviews the significance of the faith of the founding leaders of this nation in God. The author focuses on the uniquely Christian character of the psycho-social values which inspired the framers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The study shows that modern, secular humanistic ideology and influence, which claim that religious values and faith in God were never, or are now of no significance to contemporary values are not only false but dangerous. The effort of secularists, during the three decades following World War II, to censor the powerful effect of Christian principles from history and from social issues, political decisions, education and the media, and to segregate religious beliefs behind an absolute wall of separation between church and state has undermined the foundation on which this Republic was built. The weakening of the psycho-social element of national power has and will continue to weaken the other bases of strategic power, the economic, technological, and military, unless we return to what General MacArthur called a spiritual awakening and moral regeneration....													
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified										
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. Robert Bogard		22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (205) 293-7074		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL AWC/DFR									

AIR WAR COLLEGE
AIR UNIVERSITY

RELIGION, NATIONAL CHARACTER
and STRATEGIC POWER

by

James E. Ray
Colonel, USAF

A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
IN
FULFILLMENT OF THE RESEARCH
REQUIREMENT

Research Advisor: Colonel Peter J. Buley

MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

May 1985

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A1	



DISCLAIMER-ABSTAINER

This research report represents the views of the author and does not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Air War College or the Department of the Air Force.

This document is the property of the United States government and is not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission of the Commandant, Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

AIR WAR COLLEGE RESEARCH REPORT ABSTRACT

TITLE: Religion, National Character, and Strategic Power

AUTHOR: James E. Ray, Colonel, USAF

This paper researches and reviews the significance of the faith of the founding leaders of this nation in God. The author focuses on the uniquely Christian character of the psycho-social values which inspired the framers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The study shows that modern, secular humanistic ideology and influence, which claim that religious values and faith in God were never, or are now of no significance to contemporary values are not only false but dangerous. The effort of secularists, during the three decades following World War II, to censor the powerful effect of Christian principles from history and from social issues, political decisions, education and the media, and to segregate religious beliefs behind an absolute wall of separation between church and state has undermined the foundation on which this Republic was built. The weakening of the psycho-social element of national power has and will continue to weaken the other bases of strategic power, the economic, technological, political, and military, unless we return to what General MacArthur called a spiritual awakening and moral regeneration.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Colonel James E. Ray (B.A., Texas A & M University; M.P.S., Auburn University at Montgomery) for many years has been interested in the role of religion in politics and in shaping national character and patriotism. He has flown tactical fighter aircraft, including the F-105 and F-4, has commanded an aircraft maintenance squadron, and, from Headquarters, USAF, managed foreign military assistance programs in the Far East. Early in his career, he flew with the 469th Tactical Fighter Squadron in Southeast Asia, was shot down, and spent six years and nine months as a prisoner of war. His decorations include the Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star (valor), Air Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, and the Purple Heart. Colonel Ray is a graduate of the Air Command and Staff College (1977) and the Air War College (1985).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	DISCLAIMER-ABSTAINER.....	ii
	ABSTRACT.....	iii
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	iv
	INTRODUCTION.....	1
I	HISTORIC FACTS.....	7
	Christian Doctrine Described.....	7
	Christian Beginning.....	8
	Declaration of Independence.....	8
	Constitutional Convention.....	11
	Early Presidents.....	13
II	MODERN INTERPRETATION.....	15
	Secular Humanism.....	15
	Christian Love.....	18
III	SECULAR HUMANISM'S EFFECT.....	22
	Cause and Effect.....	22
	Personal Experience.....	23
	Political Reaction.....	24
	Court Trend.....	24
	CONCLUSION.....	27
	NOTES.....	33
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	36

RELIGION. NATIONAL CHARACTER,
and STRATEGIC POWER

A Christian Perspective
of a Neglected Strategic Element:
The Christian Foundation for the
Psycho-Social Element of National Power

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary study of the power of nations presents the measure of aggregate national power as the summation of five elements of national power: 1. Economic, 2. Political, 3. Military, 4. Technological, and 5. Psycho-social. Tremendous interrelation and synergistic multipliers between and among all these elements have been stated and discussed in contemporary literature sufficiently, in my mind, to accept this basic conceptual model and the vitality of each element without further introduction.

This paper will focus on the uniquely Christian character of the early foundation of the psycho-social base on which the Constitution of the United States of America was established. I will document evidence of the

Christian basis on which the Constitution and early amendments were adopted, and show that modern discourse alleging that religion was never, or is no longer important to contemporary values and issues, is a dangerous misinterpretation or deliberate attempt at revision of historical realities.

Why is this subject of significance to professional military officers?

First, my oath of office is to the Constitution, to support and defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic...so help me God! That the Christian concept of God was the inspiration and guiding power behind the independence of the USA and its Constitution is historically significant (which will be further discussed below). Any revision of history to deny or diminish this reality, or which denies the existence or relevance of God, or the spiritual and practical vitality of the (Christian) Holy Bible as a source of religious, moral, and educational values, may be seriously undermining both the foundation of the Constitution, and the entity to whom we swear our oath of office. It is no strain on the process of logic, therefore, to conclude that those secularists who counsel such revision may well be (albeit unwittingly, though some perhaps knowingly) "domestic" enemies, whose assertions bear very careful analysis, if

not outspoken rejection.

Second, as confirmed by pollster George Gallop, millions of American citizens (over 90 percent) believe in God, 85 percent profess Christian denomination church preference, and 60 percent of all US citizens are members of established churches, and seek spiritual/religious instruction and motivation in their lives. Over half of US citizens participate regularly in formal religious worship (40 percent at least weekly, 60 percent at least monthly), continually reinforcing Christian concepts of spiritual and secular moral values.¹ A proportionate number of these Christian citizens are members of US military units. Therefore, it is fundamental to principles of leadership that we who protect and defend the heritage and values of all citizens, and who lead forces comprized in greater part of Christian citizens, should understand the Christian principles which have contributed to and still influence the "American" psycho-social ethic, as a part of the study of our people, their motivators, culture, and moral and ethical values. This is valid even for those officers, soldiers, and citizens who feel no personal interest in the "spiritual" or the "divine" aspect of religion in general, or Christianity in particular. It is sufficiently important that we know what teachings influence, motivate, and

restrain human behavior among those we lead and those we serve. But I also feel it is a grave mistake not to understand and appreciate the extent to which the founders of our nation relied upon their faith in the power and protection of God, and the extent to which their obedience to His guidance was rewarded.

Third, there are several contemporary issues which impact directly on military preparedness on which religious personalities and institutions have taken public position. Among these topics of concern are the morality of nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament, government distribution of economic wealth (including views which could be detrimental to funding adequate military forces), conscientious objection to military service, and the wearing of religious symbols or clothing on military duty. Military leaders need to know the religious bases for these issues and the relevance of arguments which some would (often erroneously or falsely) attribute to "religious" values. The better our understanding of the basic Christian principles on which our forefathers based their "firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence,"² the better prepared we will be to see through false or shallow religious assertions, and to build and maintain a military establishment that is fully consistent with the reality of the threats we face and the

Christian values embodied in the Constitution and in the people of the nation we serve. It is relevant that every American President (and Commander in Chief), from George Washington to Ronald Reagan, has publicly expressed faith in God and has credited Him as the source of both religious and civil liberties.³ It is especially relevant that religion as a source of values, motivation, and self-discipline is under serious secular attack.

Fourth, summarizing and re-emphasizing the above three reasons for this pursuit, is the following observation from the first-prize "Ira C. Eaker" essay by Lieutenant Colonel Dennis M. Drew:

War is more than battle. War is more than the panoply of military and industrial actions that prepare and bring armed forces to battle. Rather, war is an all-encompassing struggle between societies, and battle is only its most obvious and deadly manifestation. America's experience in the Vietnam War illustrated that the impact of war on the fabric of society (and, I would add, vice versa) rivals the importance of events on the battlefield. In this sense, the Vietnam experience confirmed Clausewitz's most famous dictum that war is a continuation of political activity with the addition of other means.⁴

I believe, as did our forefathers, the assurance in the Judeo-Christian Scriptures that God rules in the affairs of men; and that without a return to and a re-emphasis of faith and trust in God and a recommitment to Christian principles, every element of national power, including the military, will continually decline in

strength and effectiveness. While chastizing immoral behavior (cursing and swearing) by his officers, George Washington exclaimed, "How can we expect the blessings of Heaven on our arms if we continue to insult It by our impiety and folly."⁵

More recently, General Douglas MacArthur warned:

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."⁶

The following review of some historical precedents is dedicated to stirring that spiritual awakening which will strengthen the moral (psycho-social) fiber, and thereby, the strategic power of the United States of America.

CHAPTER I
HISTORIC FACT

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE DESCRIBED: Although many in the major news media, academia, and liberal churches have adopted tenets of secular humanism (which denies the existence or significance of God in human affairs; discussed below) and would have us forget or ignore clear facts of history, a direct cause and effect relationship existed between the founders of the United States of America and Christian doctrines, and this fact is well established. In this context, Christian doctrine refers to Biblically documented principles taught by, and exemplified in the person of Jesus (widely believed to be the "Messiah" of the Old Testament prophecy, and called "Christ," the root of the title "Christian"), as distinguished from any institutional or sectarian traditions of Catholic, Protestant, or any other "church" establishments. This distinction is particularly important since, contrary to Jesus' own teachings, some so-called "Christian" institutions added many un-Christian requirements to their dogma, such as claims of exclusive religious authority, and the right to punish or persecute infidels (those who professed no belief in Jesus) and those who did profess faith in Jesus but not according to the established church dogma.

CHRISTIAN BEGINNING: A major impetus for settling the early New-World colonies was the desire for Protestant and independent Christians to escape the hostility and persecutions of authoritarian, exclusivist, state-established churches. Such persecutions and coercions are clearly contrary to Jesus' teachings, e.g., Matthew 7:15-27 & chapters 23 & 24; Mark 6:10-11, 9:38-42; and Luke 9:49-56.

The Pilgrims were an especially devout group of Christians whose Mayflower Compact and settlement experience at Plymouth Rock has been widely taught. The prayer of William Brewster of the Massachusetts Bay colony on the occasion of the first Thanksgiving celebration and the declaration of a public holiday by Governor Bradford clearly specified that they looked to God for guidance and spiritual strength. They celebrated their survival and successful harvest by giving thanks to God for His gracious blessings.¹ This Christian event was adopted and approved later by our government as an official national holiday.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE: Later, as settlements and colonies began to succeed and prosper, larger numbers of Christian believers, including Catholics and Anglicans, came to seek new opportunities in America. Their

continued success was threatened by excessive colonial taxation and non-representation. The oppression by England became so unbearable that they declared a God-given right to independence. Strengthened and emboldened by their faith in God, and their perception of the status and dignity of all men, according to their understanding of the life and teaching of Jesus, they were prepared to confidently declare:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights...and to secure these rights, firmly relying on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.²

By elevating and defending the dignity of all persons against the power of institutional tyranny, be it authoritarian government, oppressive imperialism, or exclusivist church dogma, they paralleled Jesus' example (when He employed His own physical violence to throw "religious" extortionists out of the Temple) and His teachings:

But whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many (Matt. 20:26-28). And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted (Matt. 23:11-12). Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me (Matt. 25:40). And this is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends (John 15:12-13).

Patrick Henry exemplified this spirit in the familiar and stirring words:

For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth, to know the worst and to provide for it.... Is life so dear or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains or slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!☞

Because some early patriots, including Thomas Jefferson, were of Unitarian association and labelled "Deists," some historians have alleged that they could not have been Christians. But a valid case could also be made that they were falsely labeled "anti(or non)-Christian" by pro-sectarians of various denomination. Jefferson made many political as well as religious enemies for his strong insistence on the institutional separation of church and state. He fought for years to disestablish the Episcopal sect as the church of Virginia, which was done in the 1780s. Thus it would be easy for one who equates "Christianity" to the institutional authority and interpretation of an established sect dogma to label its critics "non-Christian." On the other hand, if one uses the criterion used by Jesus, a case could be made that Jefferson was an independent (of any established sect) Christian. Admittedly, this is a debatable speculation, but it is consistent with Jesus answers to the question of the proper place and method of worship: "God is a spirit;

those who worship must worship Him in spirit and in truth," and "Whatsoever you do for one of the least of these ... you have done it unto me." Jefferson's sworn hostility to any form of tyranny over the mind of man included the tyranny of state-supported sectarian dogma that interfered with or was not consistent with the Christian principle of individual responsibility for religious belief.

One of the reasons the revolutionaries were so conscious of the power of God is that public education, as well as church sponsored studies and worship, was centered on the Holy Bible and Christian principles. While John Adams was a student at Harvard, the official Student Handbook for Rules and Precepts stated:

Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well (that) the main end of his life and studies is to know God, and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life. And therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning.*

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION: A skeptic toward this thesis of predominant Christian inspiration could attempt to discredit this presentation of evidence as being "selected" from a few religious fanatics or from politicians catering to a few additional allies and not really representative of the feeling of most citizens. But the availability of evidence is overwhelming to those

willing to do objective research. The most compelling single example is from a speech given by Benjamin Franklin to the Constitutional Convention in 1787. The war was over and won. The "foxhole" Christians had had ample time to revert to peacetime pursuits and, if so inclined, to forget prayers and promises to God made in fear or desperation. The Articles of Confederation were not proving satisfactory for the newly developing nation, so the delegates were attempting to forge a new, better document with which to govern themselves. After several weeks of wrangling and frustrating debate in which little or no progress was evident, the convention was about to adjourn in disagreement and confusion. Franklin rose and said

In the beginning of the contest with Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for Divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor.... And have we now forgotten this powerful Friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance?

I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: "that God governs in the affairs of man." And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the Sacred Writings that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. I firmly believe this. I also believe that, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little partial local interest; our projects shall be confounded; and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to

future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, or conquest.

I therefore beg leave to move that, henceforth, prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessing on our deliberation be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business.⁵

Franklin then proposed that the Convention recess for two days to seek divine guidance. The delegates agreed, and when they returned, their sessions were opened with prayer, and a new spirit guided their deliberations toward the establishment of the Constitution which, to this day, we are sworn to protect. Not long thereafter, George Washington proclaimed

No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency.⁶

EARLY PRESIDENTS: Most of us are familiar with the famous painting of General Washington kneeling in prayer during a campaign. We may not be as familiar with his first inaugural address in which he urged all citizens of the new nation to religious commitment: "The propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which heaven itself has ordained."⁷ This echoes Proverbs 14:34: "Righteousness exalteth a nation: But sin is a reproach to

any people." Washington later signed into law the Congressional approval to institute military chaplains.⁸

Once again Washington displayed his steadfast commitment to Christian principle in his Farewell Address when he admonished his successors and the people of the nation not to neglect religion and morality. "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."⁹ Subsequently, John Adams, in his inauguration as President on 4 March, 1797, stated that one means of preserving our Constitution was to "patronize every rational effort to encourage schools, colleges, universities, academies, and every institution for propogating knowledge, virtue, and religion among all classes of people."¹⁰ Thomas Jefferson continued the theme emphasizing the need for all citizens to be educated in religious issues:

The relations which exist between man and his Maker, and the duties resulting from those relations, are the most interesting and important to every human being, and the most incumbent on his study and investigation.¹¹

The intensity of Jefferson's belief in this subject is reflected in the Act he signed which "earnestly recommended" that officers and enlisted men attend Divine worship services. Irreverent behavior by officers at these services was to be punished by court marshal (sic) with Presidential reprimand.¹²

CHAPTER II
MODERN INTERPRETATION

SECULAR HUMANISM: Many in the contemporary media, academia, education, and even some in "Christian" churches would have us believe the Constitution requires an absolute wall of separation between religion and politics, and that even if there were no Constitutional constraint (which many would not concede), God and religion are no longer relevant to modern social and political issues. For years that attitude was relatively unchallenged in the public media. As Christians, in complacency, ignorance, or apathy toward public policy, concentrated their activities in their churches and their own families and immediate neighborhoods, the number of active and outspoken Christians being heard in public affairs diminished. With the decline of Christian influence in public policy formulation, the humanist philosophy infiltrated more and more institutions, including political parties, government bureaucracies, the courts, education, the media, and even some churches.

Humanism, as defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, is "a doctrine, an attitude, or way of life centered on human interests or values; a philosophy that asserts the dignity and worth of man and his capacity for

self-realization through reason and that often rejects supernaturalism." The rejection of God and Christ Jesus (the denied supernaturalism), and the assertion that man is basically good (or perfectable) rather than sinful (needing divine inspiration and redemption) distinguishes "secular humanism" from Christianity.

Both Christianity and Humanism claim to assert the dignity and worth of man and seek to promote harmonious human relations and maximum freedom. But secular humanism accepts no revealed, divine, higher authority on which to base fundamental moral principles. It must, therefore, evaluate the behavior of masses of individuals in an attempt to derive generalizations about mutually acceptable and beneficial collective behavior, while emphasizing a minima of self-constraining rules. Self-realization, or self-gratification, is one of the highest tenets since man, by humanist definition should command his own destiny. Humanism asserts that, in order to resolve interpersonal conflicts and social problems, modifications to man's environment, his attitudes, and his behavior can bring about an ultimate heaven on earth (or utopia).¹

In order to resolve, or really, to gloss over the philosophic dilemma of this internal contradiction between individual freedom and collective enforcement of "desired"

norms, the concept of flexible moral behavior evolved. Situational ethics, also known as the new morality, states that the particular circumstances of the moment provide the only criteria for determining right or wrong...each situation is unique, without precedent. "Situation ethics keeps principles sternly in their place, in their role of advisors without veto power."² What then keeps an individual (or group), doing its own thing, unconstrained by "divine" moral authority, and that is stronger, smarter, richer, and more powerful, from dominating and hurting lesser mortals?

The proponents of secular humanism do not clearly specify who is to decide, and by what authority and method, the "desirable" modifications are to be decided, financed, implemented and enforced. Neither do they specify by what standard of morality or human values such modifications are to be justified; and they must be justified, because any prescribed modification restricts individual freedom, and that contradicts basic principles of humanism: self-realization, and self-gratification. The implication is that an elite group of thinker/evaluators will study the problems and convince an electorate to agree to legislated solutions which would be implemented and enforced by a world-state power. And if an electorate cannot or will not agree, and stalemate or

anarchy results, the "elites" would need to assume control and both prescribe and enforce the "best" behavior norms of all people.³

CHRISTIAN LOVE: Christianity teaches that man's basic tendency is to selfishness (sin), and that he has free will to choose between good (God's law of love) and evil (self-centered pursuits). God, the Creator, is the absolute authority from which fundamental principles derive; the most fundamental principle is Love, for God's spirit is Love (I John 4:8,16). The two Christian Commandments encompass and fulfill the Ten Commandments given to Moses, specifying 1. To acknowledge and love God the Creator; this establishes all men as moral and spiritual equals as His children, and 2. To love your neighbor just as you love yourself; this re-emphasizes that both you and any other person have equal dignity and are worthy of both the love of God and each other's love and respect. Jesus both taught and exemplified these principles, making very clear the spirit and intent of the law. He provided an understandable, consistent, fundamental standard by which the letter of the law could be applied. He emphasized the spirit of love so that people would not need to resort to the endless legalism of spiritless interpretations, manipulative distortions and institutional abuses of the letter of the law. Jesus gave

us the Golden Rule (of thumb) which all could comprehend and apply, even simple folk: Do unto others that which you would want them to do unto you, for this fulfills all the law and the Prophets (Matt. 7:12). With faith in this spirit of love, truth, and mutual respect, the problems man faces can be fairly resolved. The fundamental reason for rules and behavioral constraints, under the spirit of Love, gives meaning and purpose to the letter of the law: enhancing the worth, dignity and freedom of every individual, and restraining that which diminishes the worth, dignity, and freedom of other individuals.

Secular humanism totally excludes Christianity, calling it an obstacle to human progress and a threat to its (humanism's) existence. The Humanist Manifestos (version I in 1933, and II in 1973) openly deny the existence of a creator, urge abolition of national sovereignty in favor of a world government, and encourage complete sexual freedom, abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia.* In an effort to neutralize the Christian influence, humanists began to rewrite history to fit their concept of morality and ethical behavior. Author James Hefley documents one example of revisionism in his book Are Textbooks Harming Your Children?, in which he cites a report from the National Council for Social Studies, an affiliate of the National Education Association:

The report, "The Study and Teaching of American History," helped to explain the changes in recent history texts. It said: "Our principle for selecting what is basic in...history involves a reference to its predicted outcome. Our 'emphasis' will be determined by what we find going on in the present.... Most of us have pledged our allegiance to an organized world community.... The teacher who adopts this principle of selection is as intellectually honest as the textbook author - and far more creative...."5

This secular humanist principle is frightening in that it prima facie is an open invitation to propagandize history by selecting or distorting facts and events to fit whatever philosophy is being advocated. Such an approach is not only intellectually dishonest and academically irresponsible, it invites either anarchy, if practiced by advocates of a variety of diverse philosophies, or mind control, if practiced by a single dominant clique. George Orwell eloquently and satirically condemned such an approach to the teaching of history in 1984 and Animal Farm.

In promoting their efforts to facilitate the acceptance of man-centered (rather than God-centered) values, the humanists have managed to force the Bible and prayer out of public schools by court order, claiming the Constitution guarantees them, not freedom of religion, but freedom from religion. They were aided in this achievement by some Christian as well as non-Christian groups who want religious beliefs taught and interpreted only their way and only in their church institutions.

James McClellan documents with scholarly research and eloquent commentary in Joseph Story and the American Constitution that this court action is contrary to the preponderance of evidence concerning the intent of the Constitution and of the States and citizens which adopted it.*

CHAPTER III

THE EFFECT OF SECULAR HUMANISM

CAUSE AND EFFECT: Conservatives, Christians, and other pro-moral forces became alarmed at the signs of moral decay so evident in the 1960s and 1970s. Evidence such as rising crime rates, rising suicide rates (especially among young people), higher divorce rates, single parent families, sexual permissiveness (promiscuity), children born of unmarried women, legalized abortion, the drug culture, declining scholastic achievement, multi-generational welfare dependency, mushrooming government programs which promised and spent much with little or negative results, runaway inflation, bankrupt economics, lack of integrity among prominent leaders, loss of public trust in fundamental institutions, and on and on. Once again the truth of Jesus warning was self evident. " Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits....every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit (Matt. 7:15-17). The fruit of humanism and other non-Christian ideologies is not hard to identify. Another example of rampant decadence is the open advocacy of homosexual and lesbian relationships as an alternate life-style. These relationships also bear

fruit, called AIDS (Acquired Immunity Deficiency Syndrome). Once again the moral warning was clear to those who would listen and hear:

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth of the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting (Gal. 6:7-8).

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE: As a maintenance squadron commander in the late 70s, I witnessed the effect of the humanist educated young people as compared to those who had received religious instruction. The Biblical analogy of darkness vs light was never more obvious. The former in much greater numbers than the latter had problems with discipline, appearance, productivity, initiative, drugs, sex, marital turbulence, human relations, and attitude in general. The general summation is that they were self-centered, expected everything to be made easy for them, and lacked a sense of accountability, responsibility, and self-discipline. The latter tended to be self motivated, polite, eager to learn and achieve, and not reluctant to seek new challenges and responsibilities. If for no other reason than a greater abundance of quality force personnel with which to fulfill the defense mission, military leaders will benefit from the return of the Bible and the teaching of Judaeo-Christian principles as a foundation for moral, ethical, patriotic, and humanitarian values.

POLITICAL REACTION: Perhaps the trend toward secular-humanist domination of educational and political goals has peaked and is being reversed. The late 1970's witnessed a resurgence of groups urging a return to traditional Judaeo-Christian values in an effort to reverse the self-destructive effect of the various policies of humanism and other anti-Christian ideologies. The general elections of 1980 and 1984 saw the emergence of both religious values and religious personalities in the political debates. Political action groups like Moral Majority, American Coalition for Traditional Values, National Right to Life Committee, Christian Voice, and Biblical News Service have struck a responsive chord with enough voters to influence many local and national election results.¹ Pollster Lou Harris credited the Reverend Jerry Falwell and his Moral Majority organization with a significant impact on the margin of victory for many conservatives in 1980. The 1984 election had even more religious themes:

From the Reverend Jerry Falwell's benediction at the GOP convention to the sight of Democrats swaying to a gospel singer's strains at their own, religious images have filled the political landscape this year - strange sights in a nation where commentators not long ago pronounced God dead.²

COURT TRENDS: The tide may be turning in the Supreme Court as well. From an activist court which banned prayer and Bible reading from the public schools in the 1960s,

the court seems to be reconsidering the validity of its decisions in light of the improved historical scholarship and the effect of the earlier decisions. Pro-religion lawyers are better prepared with evidence of the contemporaneous intent of the First Congress when it approved the Bill of Rights. The "Establishment Clause" is being reaffirmed in the courts as intending only the prohibition of state (national) recognition or establishment of a religion as an institution of government, not the separation of religion in general from moral and spiritual education and training nor from influencing societal values nor political objectives.³ The clearest evidence of this intent is found in the language of The Northwest Ordinance (which provided for the settlement of Federal lands northwest of the Ohio River):

Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.⁴

This Act was passed by the very same Congress which debated and approved the Bill of Rights amendments to the Constitution. In laying out townships, lots were specifically designated for "public education" and for "the purposes of religion."⁵ Congress frequently enacted encouragements for the public schools to teach religion. Prayer and Bible study were common to virtually all public

schools. When the first school district was organized in Washington, D.C. in 1820, on federal land and under congressional supervision (Thomas Jefferson was the school board president), the Bible and the Watts Hymnbook were the primary (perhaps the only) textbooks.⁴ Thus it is patently absurd to contend that the phrase "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof"⁷ was intended in any way to exclude religious training and instruction, including prayer and Bible reading from the public school classrooms.

CONCLUSION

The evidence of history is clear that the Christian religion was the dominant influence among the psycho-social ideals and values which inspired and empowered the Declaration of Independence, the success of the Revolutionary War, and the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights. Modern secular-humanist philosophy and principles have achieved widespread acceptance in academia, the media, and political decisions, to the detriment of traditional societal values based on Judeo-Christian principles. Modern humanist principles lack a comprehensive philosophical or practical base from which to provide universal absolutes which would inspire harmonious human relations. Nor do humanist principles provide comprehensive meaning to the existence of the world and its form, nor to the origin of living matter, nor to the distinctiveness of man from other life forms. Yet humanists would attempt a priori to censor from public education and public debate the Judeo-Christian philosophy which does provide answers to these and other fundamental questions of life.

One of Clauswitz' fundamental political/military principles is that of defining the objective. If our stated goals are no better than "moral relativism", "value free education," "personal freedom from responsibility or accountability," or "pursuit of personal affluence and

self-gratifying pleasures," then the psycho-social element of national power is on a foundation of sand. Political and military pursuits are doomed to failure. Yet this is a logical end of secular-humanist principles.

A far more worthy alternative is to return to the conclusion of the first Congress: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." WE SHOULD RETURN TO THE INTENT OF OUR NATION'S FOUNDING FATHERS TO TEACH THE HOLY BIBLE AND JUDEO-CHRISTIAN (and if desired, other religions') PRINCIPLES IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS. It is neither desired nor intended that schools or teachers advocate or promote, and certainly not require individual acceptance of the supernatural, spiritual, nor religious aspects of the religions taught. That is a matter of individual conscience, with or without the involvement or participation of an established church. It is sufficiently relevant to general education for all citizens to know that Biblical principles exist, for the following reasons: 1. They have had a significant influence on the history and development of man, especially in Western culture; 2. The Bible is the source of numerous important themes which recur throughout classical cultures in art, history, law, philosophy and literature, themes which cannot be comprehended in

ignorance of its content; 3. Biblical principles and beliefs continue to have a significant influence on the culture and values of a predominant percentage of the American population (as documented by the Gallop polls); 4. The behavioral, moral, and ethical value outcomes desired and taught in the Bible are worthy societal goals; and 5. It seems absurd to have national beliefs such as "In God We Trust," and "...one nation, under God..." and national holidays of Christian origin, such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter, and make no effort to introduce or explain their origin and meaning in general public education.

Although this study has not elaborated on how to deal with the fear of non-Christians (and even Christians) of future abuses to individual freedoms by "Christian" institutions, or by "Christian" majority political decisions, the answer should be implicit: My advocacy of the study of religion in public institutions and in professional military education is based on this same concern. And it was this same concern which motivated the framers of our political system to separate our political institutions from our religious institutions (establishments), while simultaneously promoting and encouraging all citizens to acknowledge God and study the Bible and its Judeo-Christian principles. This was yet another of the many checks and balances which are the

genius of our republic. The more the people know about Jesus' teachings, for example, the less likelihood for a radical religious sect to make and enforce errant or false practices in the name of "Christianity." The same applies to Judaism, Islam, or any other religion. Allow me one final illustration: If a pacifist religious leader claims that it is a moral or spiritual sin to join or participate in military service because "Christians can only employ peaceful means to advance their causes," those who know the Holy Scripture can ask in reply why Jesus used physical violence to throw merchandisers and money-changers out of the temple. Did He not establish that it is legitimate to use force when necessary to protect people from abuse and extortion or other immoral threats to their security? (Matt 21:12-13; Mark 11:15-17; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-16)

I believe it is a matter of serious philosophical and social responsibility for Christian people and all others who value the practical benefits of Judeo-Christian principles to aggressively debate the issues raised in this paper. We have a moral duty to challenge institutional, political or judicial error, just as the Dred Scott decision on slavery was challenged until it was reversed. Christians have the right under freedom of speech and as payers of taxes that support public schools to campaign until the Supreme Court receives an

appropriate case for review which will give it proper occasion to reverse the error of judicial activism by which secular-humanism's activists banned the Bible and prayer from the classroom. Then the false myths of "separation of religion and politics" and "separation of religion from education" will be clearly separated from the true intent of our first Congresses and Presidents: the institutional separation of church and state. There should be renewed opportunity to teach and to learn, among those who prefer not to attend organized church instruction, the historical reality and cultural benefits of the Judaeo-Christian moral and ethical value system. This is a seriously needed alternative to the egocentric, self-serving, irresponsible and self-destructive principles of secular humanism.

The return of the teaching of Judaeo-Christian principles in public schools, universities, and all institutions of learning, including professional military education, as encouraged by Washington, Adams, Jefferson (and many others not included in this limited review) is overdue. The spiritual awakening and moral revival prescribed by General MacArthur will receive a great impetus toward restoring moral greatness and purpose to this nation. This would also inspire a renewed patriotism and rebuild the deteriorated psycho-social element of national power, the foundation element which supports and

permeates the economic, political, technological, and military elements. The Bible both warns and promises:

Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain (Psalm 127:1). If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land (2 Chronicles 7:14).

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. George Gallop, Religion in America, The Gallop Report, Report Number 222, March, 1984.
2. Billy Graham, "Inaugural Sermon, National Day of Prayer," Washington Cathedral, 20 January, 1985. (Printed in Religious Freedom Alert, February 1985, p.10.)
3. The Declaration of Independence.
4. Lieutenant Colonel Dennis M. Drew (USAF), "A Matter of Principle," Air University Review (January-February, 1985), p.24.
5. Source unknown, but part of a quotation which USAFA Cadets were required to memorize in the 1960s.
6. General MacArthur was quoted in Falwell, Listen, America, Doubleday, New York, 1980 (Bantam edition, 1981, p.21).

CHAPTER I

1. Daniel J. Boorstin, The Exploring Spirit, Random House, New York, 1976, pp.21-22.
2. The Declaration of Independence.
3. Jerry Falwell, Listen, America, Bantam Books, New York, 1981, pp.18-19.
4. Ibid., p.177.
5. Ibid., p.37.
6. Ibid., p.38.
7. Ibid., p.40.
8. Act of 3 March 1791, ch.28, paras. 1,5, 1 Stat. 222-23. Cited in "Brief of Appellants Douglas T. Smith, et al" in Wallace v. Jaffree and Smith v. Jaffree

on appeal to the Supreme Court, October Term, 1983 (herein referenced as "Smith Brief"), p.27.

9. Washington Irving, Life of George Washington, 1860. Cited in "Smith Brief." p.19.

10. Falwell, op.cit., p.177.

11. Ibid.

12. Act of 10 April 1806, ch. 20, art. 2, 2 Stat. 359-60. Cited in "Smith Brief," p.27.

CHAPTER II

1. Chaplain Colonel Samuel D. Maloney (NC ANG), "Ethics Theory for the Military Professional," Air University Review, (March-April, 1981), p.64.

2. Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics: The New Morality, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1966, p.55.

3. Francis A. Schaeffer, How Should We Then Live, Fleming H. Revell, Old Tappan, New Jersey, 1976, p.224.

4. Falwell, op.cit., p.56

5. Ibid., p.183.

6. James McClellan, Joseph Story and the American Constitution. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 1971, Chapter III, "Christianity and the Common Law," pp. 118-159.

CHAPTER III

1. "Religion and Politics: Furor Keeps Building," U.S. News and World Report, Sept. 17, 1984, p.29.

2. Ibid.

3. Joseph Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, para. 1871, at 728 (1933). Cited in "Smith Brief," p.28.

4. Northwest Ordinance, art. III, 1 Stat. 52
(August 7, 1789). Cited in "Smith Brief," p.18.

5. Ibid.

6. J. Wilson, 1 Public Schools of Washington 4-6
(Records of the Columbia Historical Society of 1897).
Cited in "Smith Brief," p.23.

7. First Amendment, Constitution of the United
States of America, 1789.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Act of 3 March 1791, ch.28, paras. 1,5, 1 Stat. 222-23.
Cited in "Smith Brief".
- Act of 10 April 1806, ch. 20, art. 2, 2 Stat. 359-60.
Cited in "Smith Brief."
- Boorstin, Daniel J. The Exploring Spirit. Random House,
New York, 1976.
- Declaration of Independence, United States of America,
1776.
- Drew, Lieutenant Colonel Dennis M. (USAF). "A Matter of
Principle." Air University Review (January-
February, 1985).
- Falwell, Jerry. Listen, America. Bantam Books, New York,
1981.
- First Amendment, Constitution of the United States of
America, 1789.
- Fletcher, Joseph. Situation Ethics: The New Morality.
Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1966.
- Gallop, George. Religion in America. The Gallop Report,
Report Number 222, March, 1984.
- Graham, Billy. "Inaugural Sermon, National Day of Prayer,"
Washington Cathedral, 20 January, 1985. (Printed
in Religious Freedom Alert, February 1985, p.10.)
- Irving, Washington. Life of George Washington. 1860.
Cited in "Smith Brief."
- Maloney, Chaplain (Colonel) Samuel D. (NC ANG). "Ethics
Theory for the Military Professional," Air
University Review (March-April, 1981).
- McClellan, James. Joseph Story and the American
Constitution. University of Oklahoma Press,
Norman, 1971
- Northwest Ordinance, art. III, 1 Stat. 52 (August 7,
1789). Cited in "Smith Brief."
- "Religion and Politics: Furor Keeps Building." U.S. News
and World Report, Sept. 17, 1984.

Schaeffer, Francis A. How Should We Then Live. Fleming H. Revell, Old Tappan, New Jersey, 1976.

"Smith, Douglas T, et al, Brief of Appellants," in Wallace v. Jaffree and Smith v. Jaffree on appeal to the Supreme Court, October Term, 1983 (herein referenced as "Smith Brief").

Story, Joseph. Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, para. 1871, at 728 (1933). Cited in "Smith Brief."

Wilson, J. 1 Public Schools of Washington 4-6 (Records of the Columbia Historical Society of 1897). Cited in "Smith Brief."

REPRODUCED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

END

FILMED

10-85

DTIC