

# How Should We Then Live?

## Episode summaries

### Episode I – Roman Age

- What you think determines how you act
- There is violence and a breakdown in society all around us.... Increasing authoritarianism to meet the threat of chaos.  
Should we despair and give in? If not, how should we then live?
- Rome was great, but it had no real answers to the basic problems that all of humanity faces. When a culture tries to build only on its military strength, it will prove to not be sufficient. Without a base of what is right or what is wrong... no military might is sufficient.
- Rome tried to build on decisions of citizens and then upon decisions of emperors. None of this was a sufficient base to build a society. They tried to build on their opinions. Then they turned to their gods. They hoped they had something big enough upon which to rest their society. But this was not enough. Their gods were finite. Limited. They were amplified humanity. Not divinity. So, the Romans had no sufficient base intellectually. They didn't have anything big enough or permanent enough to relate to their thinking or life. So, they had no value system strong enough to withstand the strains of life (individual or political). All of their gods together did not make a sufficient base for life morals or values. When society tumbled, their gods did too.
- Rome turned to chaos. Armed gangs terrorized the city... the government failed... self-interest took the place of social interest. In desperation, the people accepted authoritarian government with Julius Caesar. The Romans made him dictator for life in hope that the government of one person would give peace and stability.
- After his death, Octavian (Caesar Augustus) came to power. He was said to have been divinely appointed. Rome's mission was to bring peace and civilization. Since he offered peace and kept an ordered government and law, the Romans allowed him total power in hopes to restore a functioning political system. He became the head of the state religion. All men were urged to worship the spirit of Rome and the emperor. It then became required and then later, emperors ruled as gods.
- Augustus tried to legislate morals and family life. Later emperors tried impressive legal reform. But a human god was a poor foundation and Rome fell.
- It is important to realize the difference people's worldview makes to their strength as they are exposed to the pressures of life.
- In Rome, when one was a Christian, it meant that he stood in opposition to the surrounding religions and to the entire culture.
- Christians were killed because they were rebels. They worshipped Jesus as God. And they worshipped one God only. Caesar could not tolerate this and it was considered treason. This was a threat to the state. A Christian stood opposed to surrounding religions, and also to the entire culture built on those religions.
- Christians weren't caught in relativism. The Roman world was relativistic, like ours today. This is a weak base for a culture and can only stand when there is little pressure.
- The Romans built many bridges over streams. People and wagons passed safely over for several thousand years. But now, if you drove a large, heavy truck over it, it would break. This is the same with lives and value systems of people. If they have nothing stronger to build upon than their own finiteness and limitedness, then they can stand the pressures if they aren't great. But as the pressures increase, then they crash since they don't have a sufficient

base. If there isn't a sufficient base, then it is only a matter of time before there is a collapse. Culture and the freedoms of men are fragile.

- Christians resisted religious mixtures- syncretism. Christian worldview was strong. God was personal and had spoken to His people.
- Christians had absolute, universal values to live by and judge the state in which they lived. People were unique as being made in the image of God. There was a reason for the basic dignity and value of each person.
- If Christians would have worshiped Jesus AND Caesar, they would have gone unharmed. But they rejected all syncretism. All other gods were false.
- No authoritarian state or totalitarian authority can tolerate those who have an absolute by which to judge the state and its actions. And the Christians had a universal standard by which to judge morals and the state. So, they were counted as the enemy of Rome.
- Christians had the answer that the Romans did not have. Romans tried to build upon the state or their limited gods. The Romans had the Christian answers but turned from it. This would have given their society the answers needed. And their society collapsed. Rome turned to violence and rampant sexuality.
- All of life in Rome was marked by apathy.
- Rome didn't collapse because of outward forces, but because of inward rotteness.
- In conclusion, nothing humanistic provides a strong enough base for society or the individual life. The Romans tried to build society on the people who made up their society. Since this failed, they tried to build on finite gods, which also failed.
- There is no foundation strong enough for society beginning from man alone.
- Christians were able to stand and resist syncretism and the breakdown and face it with certainty because they began from an opposite place- from the existence of an infinite and personal God. They had the truth because God had spoken.

### Questions

- Explain Schaeffer's illustration of the little Roman bridge. What modern value systems or cultural trends could cause a collapse like the pressures on the little Roman bridge?
- Why were Roman gods an insufficient basis for society?
- How did the Roman culture make it possible for Caesar to become a human god?
- What caused the Christians to be labeled as rebels in Roman society?
- How does Roman culture compare to American culture?
- What was the Christian's response to the Roman culture? How does that compare to the Christian's response to today's culture?
- What does Schaeffer mean by the title "How Should We Then Live?"

## Episode II – Middle Ages

- Rome fell. And there was a period of turmoil. Then, a gradual cultural awakening – the Middle Ages. There was a decline in learning in the West. But old manuscripts of Greek and Latin classics, as well as the Bible continued to be copied. However, Christianity gradually became distorted.
- The first century church was a very simple church. They met in homes, and usually not in large numbers. As they met together in these small groups it centered around the singing of songs and hymns, and the breaking of bread (communion).
- The first century church centered around the preaching of the Bible as the absolute infallible Word of God. If you read the book of Acts, you'll find a tremendous emphasis on content. It had to do with Christ rose from the dead. It had to do with the fact that the Old Testament was the Word of God. What these people really believed was in the truth of this, not the religiousness of it; and not even the religious experience of it, but the truth of it.
- Christian catacomb paintings done prior to the Middle Ages portray real people, living in a real world. This vitality and livingness can be paralleled with a living Christianity of the early church, but gradually there was a change from the early Christianity. There was also a change in art. In art, people were no longer real people, but symbols. There was a contrast to the early Christian art. By the 6<sup>th</sup> century the last vestiges of modern realism were abandoned. There is beauty here and these artists work with devotion, looking for more spiritual values. But in doing so their art changed. This came to its climax in the 9th to 11th centuries.
- In the early days of the Middle Ages, the early Christian church had turned away from the old Roman music because of its associations with the Roman social practices and the pagan religious rites. There were strong human elements in some of the music of the early church. We can think for example of Ambrose, Bishop of Milan in the fourth century, who wrote hymns and taught his people to sing them. This was an innovation in his day. Later, under Pope Gregory, there was a change to the Gregorian chant: impersonal, mystical, and otherworldly.
- From the earliest days Christians had struggled with a response to Christ's prayer that they be in the world but not of it. This challenged the Christians attitude to material possessions and style of living. In the early church believers were noted for their open-handed generosity. But in the Middle Ages the pendulum swung back and forth between utter disregard of the command to live modestly, caring for the poor, and the early monastic ideal to have no money at all. The papal court is properly rebuked for its material lust. John of Salisbury told the pope to his face the people thought that “the Roman church, which is the mother of all churches, behaves more like a stepmother than a mother. The scribes and pharisees sit there placing on men's shoulders burdens too heavy to be borne. They load themselves with fine clothes and their tables with precious plates. A poor man can seldom gain admittance.”
- In the midst of all this Francis of Assisi, recognizing the corrupting effects of money, forbade his followers to receive money at all. Side by side there were the luxury and the practical materialism of the papal court and the monastic orders, which gradually became sinners of overwhelming wealth. The church and medieval society, making attempts to curb the economic excesses of society, first trying to prohibit, and then later limiting the interest rates on loans. Then with the support of the secular rulers attempting to enforce just prices.
- Medieval economic teaching exalted the virtue of honest work, well executed.

- And when old age or infirmity made it impossible for the people in the Middle Ages to work, the church often provided them with hospitals and other charitable institutions.
- On another level the challenge to be in the world but not of it could raise the issue of God's law as against the law of the state. The early church had no problem in the confusion between church and state because until the time of Constantine the state was definitely built upon an unChristian base, but in the Middle Ages the problem was much more complicated.
- Europe was considered as Christ's Kingdom. Only the baptized person was really a full member of the European society. Thus it could be said that it was as though the state itself was baptized or consecrated. Individually, this meant an even more complex problem in regard to the state.
- Lorenzetti's *Allegory of Good and Bad Government* is in the council chamber of the Town Hall of Siena. It is from the 14th century. Bad government over here, with the devil presiding over all those vices, which destroy community. Good government and the Christian virtues, from which flow all those activities among men which manifest man's oneness under God. The confusion and human government certainly existed in the Middle Ages when the state and church became intertwined. This is the idea of life under good government going on uninterrupted. Look at these ordinary people portrayed in this marvelous fresco, able to pursue their everyday lives protected by good government from chaos and violence. However, as the artist himself knew from the turbulent political history of Siena itself, if the sources of good and evil were distinct, the effects were a jumbled mixture humanly of good and bad intentions. Remembering that the church was everywhere in Europe it was not surprising that the Church worked along with society as a whole and especially through society's leaders.
- A prime example is Charlemagne. He became king in the Franks in 771 AD and gained control over much of the territory of the former Roman Empire. He made tithing compulsory and this supplied funds for church administration. Charlemagne built impressive churches. Church and state power coexisted, as well as feeding each other culturally.
- The time of Charlemagne was a step forward culturally. The art objects were not large, but they were exquisite. To call the period that produced them the Dark Ages, as the humanists of the Renaissance later did, would be totally incorrect.
- Charlemagne encouraged scholars. Learning experienced a restirring.
- Charlemagne and his scholar courtiers laid a base for unified ideas throughout Western Europe aided by the beautiful Carolinian miniscule script, which was widely copied.
- Then gradually came a period of further awakening of cultural thought and an awakened piety, and a slow moving forward to the two great contrasting movements which mark history right up to our own day: first the humanistic elements of the Renaissance and secondly the Reformation.
- With the growing culture in the Middle Ages, architecture was changing. Romanesque architecture was being born; a leap forward in cultural awakening. The rounded arch, thick walls, the dim interiors. This magnificent rib vault ceiling located at Durham Cathedral prepared the ground in a very real way for Gothic architecture.
- The abbey of Saint Denis, outside of Paris, built in 1140 was another leap forward in the awaken culture of the Middle Ages. This is indeed the birthplace of the Gothic.
- Chartres cathedral has pointed arches. Notre Dame gives us an example of the Gothic flying buttresses. Saint Chapell in Paris shows the Gothic high windows, large windows, many windows, and the Rose window.

- But the church was moving increasingly away from the teaching of early Christianity. In the early church the authority rested on the Bible alone, but in the Middle Ages that gradually had come a change with the authority divided between the Bible AND the church. Then came Thomas Aquinas, a Dominican monk. He was the outstanding theologian of that period, and his thinking still has much influence. He had an incomplete view of the fall of man, as man had revolted against God. In his view the human will was fallen or corrupted, but the intellect was not. As a result of this emphasis, gradually philosophy began to act in an increasingly independent, autonomous manner. More and more the teachings of the Bible and those are the classical non-Christian philosophers were freely mixed. He reintroduced the teaching of the Greek philosopher Aristotle. Because Aquinas emphasized Aristotle, a problem was raised which later became crucial in the humanistic elements of the Renaissance. Aristotle emphasized the individual things around us- the particulars.
- This cot is a particular. The molecules which make up this cot are particulars, and you and I are particulars. Beginning for man alone and from the individual things in the world, that is the particulars, the problem then is how to find an ultimate and adequate meaning for the individual things. And most important, how to find a meaning for man and for life, and what will be man's basis for morals, value, and law?
- Later the mixture of biblical teaching and non-Christian philosophy led to the question: is the Bible really necessary since truth could seemingly be reached without it? What has happened of course is that Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages has opened the floodgates. In his emphasis on Aristotle and on the particulars, philosophy is increasingly made free from anything that God has said, and as such we find that man begins to take over replace himself at the center.
- Increasingly the authority of the church took precedence over the teaching of the Bible, and it was emphasized more and more that salvation rests on people meriting the merit of Christ instead of on Christ's work alone. Gradually there grew up a humanistic element and that is - what the church decided was made equal with what the Bible decided. And this just changed everything because then everything can be brought in, and anything can be brought in. For example, it immediately led to a different emphasis on how to approach God, through men's added works to the merit of Christ, as well as the merit of Christ itself.
- But at the same time there began to develop a reaction against these distortions of the original Christianity. John Wycliffe an Oxford professor of the 14th century raised his voice. He said: "the Bible is the supreme authority." His translation of the Bible into English had an important influence throughout Europe. John Huss of Czechoslovakia said: "The Bible is the only final authority. Man must return to God through the work of Christ only." Wycliffe and Huss understood that the deviation had come from the lack of having the Bible as the only authority.
- The heart of the Christian message is that through the substitutionary death of Christ we can return to God and our true moral guilt is removed on the basis of Christ's work. But on the other hand, as far as facing humanism is concerned, the central thing is not the acceptance of Christ as Savior, but the fact that we have absolute truth in contrast to relative truth. And this is the real tension. Are we merely beginning with man as autonomous? Or is the truth from a personal God that gives us real absolutes? And therefore, we're not only dealing with statistical averages; and this has a tremendous impact in the area of morals, and the impact of law, and political life, as well as religious life. It's not minimizing at all the acceptance of Christ as Savior. It's quite contrary. There is no other way to come to God except on the basis of His finished work. But

unless this is framed in the concept that we're talking about, truth, and not just an endless series of relativistic things, merely talking about accepting Christ as Savior will never meet the humanist dilemma.

- There is only one real solution. The early church believed that only the Bible was the final authority. The truth of the Bible as the absolute infallible Word of God is the answer.

### Questions

- What were some of the ways the early Christian church established community?
- What influence did the combination of church and state have on the Christian church?
- What does Schaeffer mean by the “universals” and “particulars”? What is the consequence when one is considered apart from the other?
- What was the subject matter of the art of the Middle Ages? Why was it a common focus?
- How does Berlinghiero's *Madonna and Child* represent the view of God and man in the Middle Ages?
- Does the story or character of *Beowulf* exemplify the medieval view of God and man?

### Episode III – The Renaissance

- Renaissance was one of the greatest period in history, and the artwork was one of mankind's glories
- Humanism was the flow of thought. This brought problems for man still today.
- Throughout history, artists have done 2 things: they have reflected their culture and they often provide the way for the next step that's coming in culture.
- The artists exhibited the culture of their day. The change that came with the Renaissance can be seen in the art.
- Before this new style, the art like Byzantine in style (flat, without depth, and people were not portrayed realistically as real people)
- Then came Giotto and radical change to art. Nature was given its proper place... because nature is important, as God made the world. And also proper in the sense that nature is portrayed as it really is. But his figures were way too large for the world they were in.
- Masaccio painted real-life faces in his figures which gave a lifelike quality to his work. This was unique in his day. Masaccio also figured out how to paint the feet of his figures planted firmly on the ground (rather than on tiptoe like prior artists). He was also first to use perspective. This helped his figures to actually be in a realized space. For Renaissance men,

it was something more. It placed man in the center of that space. A space subordinated to the mathematical principles that came out from the mind of man.

- Jan van Eyck in northern Europe wrestled with the same problems in art. However, he understood the biblical emphasis on Christ. He painted Christ as the lamb of God – a sacrifice. He mastered light and air, and he was the first great master of landscape painting.
- Nature has its proper place in the world which God has made.
- Dante followed the influence of Thomas Aquinas who mixed the Christian and classical world in his divine comedy. In his own life, the problem of individual things versus meaning and values was clearly demonstrated. He married a woman who had no place in his poetry. But her job was to cook and raise children. Writers of the time divided love into two parts- the physical love and the idealized spiritual love. One view of love was the idealized, spiritual love directed toward a disembodied phantom. The other was simply a woman who kept her man's house and shared his bed.
- Brunelleschi's dome in Florence was an amazing feat of engineering. More emphasis was placed upon man in Renaissance architecture. We know little about those who built Gothic cathedrals. But now the artist himself became important. Portraits and self-portraits of the artists began to be made.
- At the beginning of the Renaissance, it could have gone either way. Nature could have had its proper place. Man could be in his proper place and would be beautiful. But man put himself at the center completely. This opened the door completely to the destructive force of humanism that followed down through the Enlightenment and into our own day.
- Music was another important part of the Renaissance. The composers of the Renaissance invented the art of orchestration. Each instrument played a different voice and melody line. Music was printed with moveable type for the first time.
- There could have been an emphasis on real people living in a real world, which God had made... in which all individual things had importance because God had made the whole world. Or, humanism could have taken over with its emphasis on the individual things being autonomous. Man made himself increasingly independent. He made himself his own measure. He tried to make himself autonomous. The humanistic man of the Renaissance thought of the time before him as dark and something to be forgotten. It was the Dark Ages and he thought of his own age as a great leap forward into his own period of rebirth or Renaissance. A rebirth of the pre-Christian Golden Age of ancient Greece and Rome.
- Thomas Aquinas had opened the door for this with his emphasis on the teaching of Aristotle.
- Raphael, *School of Athens* – he painted the hands of Plato and Aristotle to represent their philosophic emphasis. Plato pointed up, emphasizing absolutes, ideals, meaning, value. But Aristotle had his hand spread downward, emphasizing the individual things, the particulars, nature, man. But what is the meaning of particulars, including me and you, if they have no final thing to be related to so that they have meaning. How do we know if our actions are right or wrong if there is no absolute to give certainty?
- The dilemma between any form of humanism and biblical Christianity is the question of whether we have to begin from man alone as autonomous, and then build everything from that. Or whether there's truth from another source, which is an absolute truth, which therefore is not relative. If we begin from the humanist truth, well... they don't have truth. It ends with statistical averages and then leads to the place where humanism has brought us in our own generation.
- Fouquet's *Red Virgin* shows this dilemma. Those who saw this painting at the time knew that this woman was the king's mistress (not a holy virgin Mary). Before this, Mary was considered high and holy. She was thought of so highly and different from people that she was painted as a symbol before. Painting Mary as a real person was an advance over earlier

paintings because the Bible tells us that Mary was a real girl, and Jesus was a real baby. This was the good side: nature was given its proper place. On the other hand, meaning was being destroyed. The king's mistress was now painted as Mary. It might seem that only religious values were being threatened, but gradually the threat spread to all of knowledge and all of life. All meaning for all of the individual things, the particulars, was removed. The individual things were made independent; autonomous, with nothing ultimately to relate them to. Nothing to give them meaning.

- Michelangelo's statues of man tearing himself out of the rock. Mankind will be victorious.
- Michelangelo's *David* isn't the biblical David, but the personification of the humanist ideal of the greatness of man. But toward the end of his life there were signs that humanism wasn't enough.
- Leonardo da Vinci was the embodiment of the true Renaissance man.
- He also understood the problem of modern man. He anticipated where humanism would end. He understood that humanistic man beginning only with individual things, the particulars, had no unity by which to give them meaning. He understood that being left with only the individual things, one could never come to universals or to meaning. Instead one is left with mechanics... and man is viewed as a machine. He tried to portray the soul. He tried to capture visually the universals from the particulars, but failed.
- Thomas Aquinas' teaching led to man trying to be independent, autonomous. This led to Renaissance humanism. Da Vinci felt the problem and struggled to find universals. Da Vinci and all of humanism had been so sure that man beginning from himself could solve every problem. In his old age, da Vinci saw the defeat of humanism. As man thinketh, so is he. The natural conclusion of humanism was pessimism.
- The Renaissance was great and brought beautiful art. But, in the Renaissance, as man increasingly tried to make himself autonomous, there was weakness. Humanism ends in despair. If you begin with that which is finite, no matter how far you project it, you can never come to an absolute. Never. This is the humanist dilemma. And there is really only one solution- to turn to the truth of the Bible. It speaks to the culture of that particular day. It is rooted in the existence of the infinite, personal God, and man's need for Christ.

### Questions

- The Renaissance is defined as a "rebirth." What was reborn?
- What does the word "autonomous" mean?
- What is the effect when particulars are made autonomous?
- What impact did striving for autonomy have on the artists (or their work) of the Renaissance?
- What does Schaeffer mean when he says that "nature was given its proper place"?
- How does the biblical view of nature compare with the Renaissance view of nature?
- Is nature given its proper place in the works of van Eyck and Michelangelo?
- What were the positive and negative aspects of the Renaissance? How did the works of van Eyck, Michelangelo, and da Vinci demonstrate these aspects?



- What is humanism?
- Compare the humanistic ideas of the Renaissance to Genesis, Chapter 3.
- Was this thinking really a rebirth? Is a rebirth in art likely to recur?

#### **Episode IV – The Reformation**

- The Reformation- the breaking away of the reformers from the churches of the Middle Ages- the Roman Catholic Church. They turned away from humanistic elements that had entered into the church during the Middle Ages.
- They objected to the corruption of the church (from indulgences... to trying to add to the work of Christ for salvation.... to having a Pope or priest have power over their conscience... and distortion of scripture)
- A layman (regular person) who is armed with scripture is far more powerful than the mightiest Pope without it.
- As the High Renaissance was ending in southern Europe, the Reformation exploded in northern Europe.
- Martin Luther nailed his 95 Theses to the church door
- John Calvin wrote the Institutes of the Christian religion
- Martin Luther translated the Bible into German... leading the way to other translations in other languages. And now people could read the Bible for themselves for the first time. The Bible showed them that individual people could come directly to God by faith based on the finished work of Christ. It was grace only.
- The teaching of the Bible opened the way for all people to come to God directly. A screen had separated people in the church from the altar and focus of worship. This was removed during the Reformation. And the Bible was placed on the altar in place of the screen.
- In the Reformation, some of the paintings and statues of saints and Madonnas were destroyed. They didn't see them as objects of art, but as objects that were to be worshiped and as obstacles that came between them and God. The Reformers had discovered the stress in the Bible that there is only one mediator, Christ Jesus. The art had come to represent that which they had rejected religiously.
- The Reformers rejected that the church had made its authority equal to the authority of the Bible. They also rejected that the church had added human works that must be done to the finished work of Christ for salvation. Since the time of Thomas Aquinas, the church increasingly mixed biblical thinking and Pagan thought. (Aquinas- the will was fallen but the mind was not... and this thinking led to the Renaissance of the south which was based on the humanistic ideal that man had made himself the center and measure of all things.)
- This was seen in the artwork. For example, in the Sistine Chapel, Michelangelo made pagan prophetesses and prophets equal to Old Testament prophets
- People needed the answers given by God in the Bible to know how to be right with God. They also needed God's answers concerning the meaning of life and what is right and wrong.
- Romans 1:17 – by faith man lives and is made righteous. Not what he does for himself. God already did work for him through Jesus.
- People are finite and limited. With the Bible, we have truth about God. Truth about morals and meaning and values. The Bible also tells us about why things exist and why they have the form they have.

- Men of the Reformation had no problem deriving meaning of universals from the individual things, the particulars like the humanistic men of the Renaissance did. This is because the Bible gives unity between the universal and individual things (particulars). It gives knowledge about God (as the ultimate universal) and man.
- The Reformation wasn't always consistent to biblical teaching. But for the most part they returned to biblical teaching and the example of the early church. So a new door was opened in the church, culture, and society.
- Johann Sebastian Bach is a great example of a composer than came out of the Reformation. In his hymns he wrote - to God alone be the glory.
- People are made in the image of God. Therefore, they have dignity. In the Reformation, this meant that all vocations had dignity (whether a merchant or housewife or a king)
- The Bible also teaches that man is fallen. He has rebelled against God. This is how Reformation men had an explanation of greatness and dignity in man, and also his cruelty.
- Art was an intimate part of life. The Reformation had a close relationship to culture.
- Albrecht Durer was a man of the Reformation. Huss and Wycliffe were an influence on him.
- A man's creativity shows his worldview. Art that came from the Reformation shows the good marks of its biblical base.
- To Durer the world had real value. But not value in itself. It was the creation of God.
- Much art came from Reformation culture. Rembrandt is another example. In his *Raising of the Cross*, he paints himself, as he is one who raised Christ up on the cross. Showing the world that his sins had sent Christ to the cross. Nature wasn't low, or a thing to be idealized. It was a thing to be enjoyed as a creation of God.
- Dutch Reformation painting is one of the high points of painting in history (also for music).
- With hymns and music, the congregation was allowed to approach God directly by singing for the first time in many centuries.
- Humanism of the Renaissance had no way to bring forth meaning for the individual things, the particulars. Or absolutes for morals. Humanism which began with man being central eventually has no meaning for man.
- Men in northern Europe, with the Reformation, standing under scripture, regained direction.
- Humanism of the Renaissance centered on autonomous man. The Reformation centered on the infinite personal God
- The Reformation brought freedom from having to work your way to God. You no longer had to merit the merit of Christ. They were freed from the bondage of working their way to God. It is such bondage for man to have to act as God and make their own absolutes. But when we have the Bible itself, which gives us the absolutes, we are free.

### Questions

- What was happening in northern Europe as the High Renaissance was fading in southern Europe?
- How did the Reformers define the relationship between the universals and the particulars?
- Compare the Reformers' view of man with the Renaissance view of man.
- Does John Bunyan's work *The Pilgrim's Progress* reflect the ideas of the Reformation? If so, how?

## **Episode V – The Revolutionary Age**

- The Bible gives a basis for morals and for law
- The Reformation emphasized that the Bible is the only final authority. The freed people from arbitrary governmental power.
- In 1644 Samuel Rutherford wrote a base for effective political control in Lex Rex (Law is King). This put order to the king's rule and prevented chaos. This was a concept of law much different from arbitrary governments of men – because the Bible was the final authority.
- Rutherford's work had a huge impact on the American Constitution. John Witherspoon, a member of Congress and a signer of the Declaration of Independence also followed Lex Rex. And Thomas Jefferson followed this Christian teaching, but in a secularized form, from John Locke, the English philosopher who stressed inalienable rights, government by consent, separation of powers, and the right of revolution. Not all who laid the foundation for America were Christians. But many of the writers of the Constitution built it on the Lex Rex tradition.
- On the basis of the Bible as the final and unique authority, it's possible for a society and government to know form and freedom, to the extent to which that society allows the biblical teaching to come to its natural conclusions.
- The Reformation in northern Europe have a strong impetus toward the system of checks and balances in government.
- The men of the Reformation strongly emphasized the fall of man as man revolted against God. They understood that every man is a sinner, and so there needed to be checks and balances, especially for men in power.
- In the U.S. – the checks and balances are divided by the executive administration (The White House/presidency), the legislative branch in the Congress & House, and the judiciary in the Supreme Court.
- Reformation brought political reform... Bloodless Revolution of 1688 in England
- But when the French Revolution tried to create the conditions from the revolution in England, without the Reformation base which gave freedom without chaos, the humanist enlightenment base resulted in a bloodbath and the authoritarian rule of Napoleon. The National Assembly of France promised to make a constitution in June, 1789. In August, they issued the Declaration of the Rights of Man. But this also had nothing to rest upon. There was no base. The supreme being was the sovereignty of the nation and the general will of the people. Quite a contrast to the Bloodless Revolution and the American Declaration of Independence (both had a Reformation base)... the French Declaration of the Rights of Man didn't. Human reason was made supreme, and Christianity was pushed aside.
- 40,000 people were killed, including the revolutionary leader. This was the product of the humanist enlightenment base. The men of the Enlightenment thought that both man and society were perfectible. They believed this even during the terror.
- Then they had the authoritarian rule of Napoleon in France. In Russia, the revolution ended up with communism. Communism functions on the basis of internal repression. The communist base didn't bring the freedoms seen in northern Europe by the Reformation.
- The biblical base gave an absolute upon which to combat injustice. In contrast, the Humanist has no way to say that certain things are right and wrong because the final thing that exists for the Humanist is the impersonal universe, which is silent and neutral about right and wrong or cruelty. They have no way to have absolutes, so they are left with the arbitrary (for private life, political life, and morals).
- Weaknesses developed over time in the countries that had a Reformation base. People didn't act consistently upon biblical teaching. The most effective apology is for today's Christian to act more consistently upon the biblical teaching at the crucial points where the Bible wasn't followed. Two glaring areas where the Bible wasn't followed as it should have been are the

twisted view of race (which led to slavery and racial prejudice) and the uncompassionate use of accumulated wealth. The church did not speak out against these things.

- The industrial age brought a stream of better things and goods. But it wasn't accompanied with a compassionate use of accumulated wealth. If there would have been an emphasis on the dignity of individual man and the compassionate use of accumulated wealth (both which are stressed in the Bible) – then the Industrial Revolution would have been good.
- The church was silent on the Bible's command for the compassionate use of wealth
- Slums grew in London and industrial towns. Average working day was 12-16 hours. Women and children were exploited. The Bible commands the church to speak out against such things, but the church did not speak out clearly against utilitarianism - a teaching that the measure of all ethical questions is that which is useful.
- Many who called themselves Christians weren't Christians at all in the biblical sense. It was fashionable to bear the name.
- The church was silent, but many individuals did stand up against the abuses and fought for truly Christian teaching. John Wesley spoke out against slavery. William Wilberforce in England fought against slavery and for the basic recognition of the humanity of the black men under God. And slavery was finally abolished in England in 1833. George Whitefield and John Wesley revived biblical Christianity in England. This had a strong impact that inspired political education and economic reform... and probably helped England escape its own version of the French Revolution.
- The Reformation did not bring perfection. But it did bring a unique improvement – a tremendous freedom and society without chaos. The biblical absolutes provided a basis for a consensus of values, which allowed for freedom without chaos. The biblical teaching meant that there was something by which the society could be judged (the biblical absolutes). Man, with the Bible, could say that the majority is wrong.
- To the extent in which the biblical teachings were practiced the despotism of the 51% vote, the despotism (absolute power/dictatorship/authoritarianism/tyranny) of an individual, or the despotism of a group, could be controlled. The basis by which there could be this tremendous freedom without chaos was the fact that the Bible gives a base for law.

### Questions

- What does it mean to have “freedom without chaos”? How is this reflected in the Reformation? In the U.S. Constitution? In Scripture?
- Compare the Reformation's view of man with the Enlightenment's view of man. Which view of man does the character of Robinson Crusoe represent?
- What was the relationship between God and man according to the Reformation? According to the Enlightenment? Is this something that can be communicated through art?

## Episode VI – The Scientific Age

- In 1609 Galileo began to use the newly invented telescope and what he saw and wrote indicated that Aristotle had been mistaken in his basic ideas concerning the makeup of the universe. When the Roman church attacked Galileo and Copernicus it was not because their teaching contained anything contrary to the Bible. But Copernicus and Galileo's teaching did deny the Aristotelian elements, which had become a part of the teaching of the church.
- Copernicus taught that the earth went around the sun and not the sun around the earth. Galileo defended the compatibility of Copernicus and the Bible. Condemned by the Roman inquisition in 1632, Galileo was forced to back down, but his writings continued to testify that Copernicus was right, and that Aristotle was wrong.
- Blaise Pascal invented the first barometer. He was also one of the greatest French writers. He also believed that man was special because Christ died for him on the cross (we weren't just specks lost in the universe).
- Newton's *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* became one of the most influential books in the history of human thought.
- It has been said that the 17th century scientists had an interest in the how, but not the why. This is not true. For Newton and many scientists of that period, there was no problem concerning the why because Newton began with the existence of a personal God who had created the universe. Newton had an interest in the Bible because in his view the same God who had created the universe gave men truth in the Bible. Newton and the other men of that period would have been utterly astounded at anyone who had an obsession with the how without having a professional interest in the why.
- To the founders of modern science, man is not on his own. He should take seriously the teachings of the Bible concerning history and the cosmos.
- Francis Bacon
- Finding out about the world was worthwhile because it is investing God's creation.
- There is no separation between religious things and the arts and sciences.
- Michael Faraday, a Christian scientist, believed that the secrets of God's creation are for all of us to enjoy. He gave famous, public demonstrations.
- The physical world is an open book to explore because God gave it order and gave us the desire to investigate it. It is not just for a clever scientific elite. Christians have a base from which to explore.
- Knowing that the universe was created by a reasonable God, Christian scientists could move with confidence, expecting to be able to find out about the universe by observation and experiment. Without this base and foundation of modern western science would never have been born.
- Because Chinese science didn't have this base, it never came to maturity. There was no confidence that the code of nature's laws could be understood because there was no assurance that God created it all and formed this code.
- Rather than hindering science, the Christian base made modern science possible.
- The universe was created by God. A reasonable God.
- The world view of relativity says that there are no absolute values and that everything is relative. Some say this is supported by Einstein's theory of relativity. But this is not so.
- We live in a universe much more complex than scientists once thought. This is a far cry from the concept of a random universe.
- Later, the Christian base was lost. There was no longer a place for God. Laws of cause and effect were now applied to man and society. There is no place for the freedom of man or significance of man in a closed cause and effect system. There is no place for morals. Life becomes pointless, devoid of meaning. Man was no different from nature now.

- Darwin and his Origin of Species... evolution and survival of the fittest... all based on time and chance... but these ideas don't answer the how or why that preoccupied earlier Christian scientists such as Newton.
- Statistical math studies have proved that chance could not have produced the complexity of our world out of chaos in any amount of time suggested so far.
- No one has shown how man came from nothing.
- Sadly, after people accepted the survival of the fittest, all restraints are removed. The opened the door for 20<sup>th</sup> century racism
- Hitler stated that Christianity and the concept of charity should be replaced by the ethic of strength over weakness (survival of the fittest). This concept of survival of the fittest sanctioned what happened under Hitler.
- Humanism had set out to make man autonomous, and it turned out poorly.
- Without the absolute line which Christianity gives of man being totally unique, things which are good in themselves can lead to an increasing loss of humanness
- For modern man there is no boundary line between what he should do and what he should not do, and this leaves him with what he can do. Any sense of morality is only what is sociologically accepted at the moment.
- Christians have a reference point. Something to judge things by. But if we are left without a fixed point by which to judge things, then we have no basis for judgement at all.
- Once the borderlines based upon the biblical absolutes are removed, then humanness can be and is lost increasingly.
- The determinist has no way to derive his values from what exists, and hence his values and his morals must be chosen arbitrarily. Once this way of thinking is accepted, it is much easier to impose arbitrary absolutes.
- Science has become our new religion. We have been conditioned to accept the objectivity of the scientists without realizing that often their views are very clearly shaped by their philosophy or by their world view. Accepting this objectivity, people just believe what they are told without any critical analysis.
- People have increasingly been conditioned to be treated as machines. And even treat others as machines.
- The line between what a man can do and should do has been obliterated.
- If man is only a conditioned machine, then what is the value of the continuation of mankind?
- The thing that made the difference between the view of the early scientists and that which marks man today, who sees man as being only a part of a cosmic machine, is not something science has demonstrated. It simply was a shift in the philosophic outlook of the scientists turning away from the early base that science had of the world having been created by a reasonable God, and the only way that we could return would be to go back to that which the early scientists believe – A god who exists, and is not silent, and has spoken in a way we can understand, who gives us truth. It tells us the origins of the universe. It tells us why man is great- made in the image of God. It tells us why man is cruel- because he has turned away from God and put himself at the center.

### Questions

- What was the relationship between Christianity and modern science in the Scientific Age? What is the relationship now?
- Compare wisdom and intelligence. How do wisdom and intelligence affect one's view of science?

- What is the difference between what one “can do” and what one “should do” with regard to scientific discovery?
- What is the difference between viewing man as a product to be measured and a soul to be nurtured? Which characters in *Jane Eyre* view man as a product to be measured? As a soul to be nurtured?

### **Episode VII – The Age of Non-Reason**

- Non-Christian philosophers began from man himself and on the basis of man’s reasoning alone... They couldn’t agree on what true knowledge of the universe was.
- The humanistic ideal failed. They went from optimism to pessimism... they wanted freedom from any type of restraint... and they placed man at the center of the universe. This led to the bohemian ideal where the hero was the man who fought all standards and restraints and values of society.
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau (mid 1700s) applied this concept of autonomous freedom to society.
- Paul Gauguin followed Rousseau’s ideas. In his hunt for freedom, Gauguin abandoned his family and went to Tahiti... in search for freedom, the primitive, and the exotic. But he found death and cruelty in Tahiti. And then he tried to commit suicide.
- If nature is all, then what *is*, is right, and nothing more can be said. There was no basis for morals or law. They made nature the measure of goodness. When you do this- no distinction can be made between cruelty and non-cruelty.
- The Dutch Reformation painters painted the everyday and simple things of life. They knew that nature was created by a personal God. They knew that because of the fall- nature and man was broken.
- The philosophers’ two concepts of total freedom and then man being part of one big machine collided and couldn’t be kept together.
- Emmanuel Kant and other philosophers wrestled with the problem of unity and also meaning and values. But they couldn’t solve the problem. Humanistic man, beginning only from himself, concluded that he was only a machine. They had no place for God, and also no place for man’s significance... no place for love... no place for freedom. They thought man was a machine, but they couldn’t act like a machine. They had to abandon reason to try to find something that brings meaning to their lives. Humanism and beginning from himself lead modern man to this end.
- Existential philosophers such as Jean-Paul Sartre believed that one can give validity to his existence by an act of the will. Reason was not involved. But he couldn’t live consistently with his own position.
- Karl Jasper believed we could have an experience to give us hope that there is meaning to life, even though our reason tells us that life is absurd.
- Along with existentialism, reason leads to pessimism, so they try to find an answer in something totally separated from reason.
- Then they tried drugs... to get to a truth within your own head.
- Some went with Eastern religions- which at the heart is the denial of reason.
- They couldn’t find a meaning to life through using reason.
- The church with its liberal theology has left a vacuum.... So many people have searched elsewhere for truth and meaning. In the Renaissance, men tried to mix Plato and Aristotle with Christianity. This new theology was an attempt to combine the rationalism of the

Enlightenment with Christianity = religious liberalism. It was embarrassed by the supernatural. They tried to hold onto historical Jesus and sift out supernatural elements of Jesus.

- Theological form of existentialism... they believed the Bible had many mistakes... it wasn't true as far as science or history... and for them, it also didn't give absolutes for right and wrong.
- There are 2 ways to read the Bible:
  - o Just a religious thing among thousands of other religious things
  - o Or to understand that the Bible is Truth
- The Bible answers the questions that humanistic philosophy can't answer
- Liberal theologians have no answer for the existence of evil. And they are left with the problem that everything that exists is part of God. For them, God has not given us truth about Himself. So, with the Bible, all they are left with are religious words. These religious words are separated from the content that the Bible originally gave them. And these words are now used for manipulation (in areas such as changing sexual ethics).
- If the content, knowledge, and truth of God is dead.. and the meaning and answers that God gives is dead... yet people cry out for meaning and values... we are stuck in this tension
- We have a personal relationship with God. Jesus connects himself with what the Bible teaches in his teachings.

### Questions

- Compare the biblical view of man to Rousseau's view of man.
- What effect did the age of Non-Reason have on philosophy? And on theology?
- What is the explanation for evil in the absence of Jesus Christ?
- Compare Charles Darwin and Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
- Does *A Tale of Two Cities* support Rousseau's assertion that man is basically good?
- How does Rousseau's philosophy of man compare to Caesar's philosophy of imperialistic rule?

### Episode VIII – The Age of Fragmentation

- Impressionist artists (Monet, Degas, Renoir...) – they painted nature... what their eyes saw... what they thought was reality. But reality became a dream... and Impressionism began to fall apart. With Impressionism, the door was opened for art to become the vehicle for modern thought
- Post-Impressionists (Van Gogh, Seurat, Gauguin) saw the problem of the loss of meaning. They set out to solve the problem and find the way back to reality – to the absolute behind the individual things... but they failed. Their worldview was often reflected in their work.



- Cezanne reduced nature to what he considered its basic geometric forms. He was searching for a universal which would tie the individual things in nature together. His paintings had a broken, fragmented look.
- Their art became the vehicle of modern man's view of fractured truth and life.
- As philosophy moved from unity to fragmentation, so did painting.
- In 1912 Kandinsky said that a unity of knowledge had been lost, and only 2 possibilities remained: extreme abstraction or extreme realism.
- Picasso took the technique of fragmentation further in his paintings. This technique of fragmentation fits well with the world view of modern man. Man and the world was fragmented. There was a complete break from the art of the Renaissance (founded on man's humanist hopes). In Picasso's paintings, man became less than man. Humanity was lost.
- As modern art advanced, humanity was increasingly fragmented.
- Old philosophers thought they could bring unity from a humanist base... but they gave this up. Modern thinking accepted fragmentation as a defeat. (A defeat of trying to find unity beginning from oneself)... a unity of thought and life.
- A unity of thought and life can be achieved through God... We can't find it for or from ourselves. There is a unified place for life and values in God.
- The Dada movement (art and philosophy) believed everything was a matter of chance. Their logical conclusion was that everything is absurd, even humanity. Art was also absurd. They created art called *readymades* – where they didn't actually make or create anything, but take objects already made around them and sign it.
- Philosophers from Rousseau on had given up hope of a unity of knowledge and life and came to a fragmented concept of reality... and then artists painted in this fragmented way.... And the end of this view is that all things are absurd.
- Jackson Pollock, with his drip paintings, was a great example of painting in a way that says all is chance.
- But the universe is not random. It has order.
- The bankrupt humanistic philosophy first taught that reason leads to pessimism, and that optimism is only found in non-reason. This filtered down to art and music. There was a shift from previous music with Beethoven's quartets. Then Claude Debussy opened the door for modern music. There was a sense of fragmentation and concern for the element of chance. This influenced following composers... to jazz and rock. There was perpetual variation, but never resolution.
- John Cage believed the universe was a universe of chance. He produced music by chance... which was basically just noise. But he ended up being another one who couldn't live with his concept of a universe of chance because it doesn't fit our universe (which has order). His theory of the universe didn't fit the universe that exists. The universe wasn't random and by chance like Jackson Pollock and John Cage said it was. John Cage's music was quite a contrast to Bach – who had much diversity in his music, but always resolution. Bach, as a Christian, believed that there was resolution for the individual.
- The worldview of modern man shapes modern music
- John Cage's music is more of an intellectual statement (rather than a work of art) separated from the fullness of who man is and what the universe is.
- In the area of non-reason, there is no way to distinguish between right and wrong... or even between what is objectively true and that which is illusionary or fantasy. There is no category for moral or human values.
- If people begin only from themselves and think that they live in a universe in which there is no personal God, then they have no final way to distinguish between reality and fantasy or illusion.

- The Christian knows why music speaks. He knows that people aren't a product of chance... that people are made in the image of God. Because God spoke in the Bible, there are certainties concerning moral values and human values... and categories upon which to distinguish between reality and fantasy. For people from a humanist position, this is not so... there is no base for knowing.
- Christians are not romantic in their thinking. They know that man has fallen. Christians aren't pessimist either. We know history is going somewhere... and that Christ is coming back. This is the final solution. We do what we can to see individuals become Christians and hope to see the culture touched by these individual Christians.

### Questions

- What is fragmentation? Does it focus more on the particulars, the universals, or both?
- How does fragmentation affect one's view of humanity? What is the opposite of fragmentation, and how does it affect one's view of humanity?
- What is reality? What is fantasy? How does worldview affect how one interpret reality and fantasy?
- Schaeffer presents each period of art or music as a reaction to the period that preceded it. How has today's music, art, literature, and cinema reacted to the age of fragmentation?

### **Episode IX – The Age of Personal Peace and Affluence**

- In the 1960s the same message came toward people from every side (philosophy, art, music, literature, movies, etc.) – on the humanist basis – reason leads to despair and pessimism... to no answers... and people should try to find answers in the area of non-reason. And there were no fixed values. And the majority of people came to the place where they had only two horrendous values: personal peace and affluence.
  - o Personal peace means- I want to be left alone and I don't care what happens to other people. I want my lifestyle to be undisturbed, regardless of what it means to my children and grandchildren.
  - o Affluence means things... stuff.... More things... success... and abundance of things
- People were being taught and believed that life had no meaning and there were no fixed values
- 1964 revolution at Berkley – 2 things arose to escape the horrible values of personal peace and affluence: the drug scene and hippie scene (drugs to find truth inside of their own head); and then the free speech movement. This was at first just a demand for freedom... but then became very left. They had the wrong solutions.
- After the drug culture died down, the new left movement brought forth violence. Bombs were planted around the country. And now... both new hopes – the drug culture and the new left were gone... and they were left with apathy. Apathy, affluence, and personal peace

- There was a new leap in the area of non-reason – a jump into the Marxist thoughts. This was bad because anywhere Marxism has come to power – always meant oppression. But the young generation chose to close their eyes to the fact that oppression is part of the communist system. Marxist Leninism is a leap in that its foundation is the philosophy of materialism.
- Humanism- man beginning from himself – cannot generate any real values or meaning or dignity to man
- Communism is built on materialism, and there is no place for the dignity of man in the materialistic system
- Young people in non-communist countries are caught by the idealistic Marxist Leninism. They condemn what’s wrong in the world... but their materialistic philosophy
- With Marxism and communism always comes oppression. Dignity of the individual ceases to exist, and the will of the majority doesn’t have meaning either.
- Arbitrary law... law demanded to be autonomous from God. This resulted in relativity in personal and public morals, and also in law. And so the nature by which man tries to build laws is not sufficient. We end up with sociological laws where a group of people decide what is good for society at a given moment. Oliver Wendell Holmes opened the door for this more than anyone else. He said- the ultimate question is – what do the dominant forces of the community want? And do they want it enough to disregard whatever stands in their way?
- Modern law is not consistent with the law that preceded it
- The Constitution of the U.S. today can be made to say almost anything on the basis of sociological variable law.
- Arbitrary law dominates in communist countries, but it was swept over into our world as well. We can see this with the abortion law of 1973. All unborn children were stripped of their constitutional protection for their lives, liberty, and property. This ruling in the Supreme Court was an arbitrary absolute. It is also arbitrary medically. Most people accepted this law even though it was legally and medically arbitrary... because it was considered sociologically helpful.
- The unborn child is considered not to be a person. Yet in the past black people were not considered to be people. This arbitrary absolute doesn’t work...
- In this day with no fixed values... why can’t other people be declared non-persons on the basis of arbitrary law if the courts thought it was helpful sociologically.
- Things that are unthinkable today, probably won’t probe unthinkable in a few years
- As Christianity dies as the basis of our culture, society doesn’t really have a basis upon which to build
- One theoretical basis for building society is hedonism – everyone just do their own thing... but you can’t build a society upon this
- We have the 51% dominant vote in our society... but in our society there is no absolute by which to judge the 51% vote. There was a time in Christian culture where someone could stand up with a Bible in their hand and say- “you’re wrong” even though the majority voted the other way. But the Christian consensus is gone and there is no absolute by which to judge the 51%
- If there is no absolute by which to judge society, society is absolute.
- The heart of humanist thinking is making the individual man and mankind the center of all things.
- If we are going to live and escape death, we must turn from the humanist way of making man autonomous, and we must put God back at the center of all things. When we turn from the wickedness of placing created things in the place of the Creator, we turn from paths of death to paths of life.

## Questions

- How does Schaeffer define personal peace and affluence?
- Schaeffer repeatedly states that the humanistic view believes that “reason leads to pessimism.” What examples from literature, history, or Scripture support or deny this?
- What is the effect when sociological laws are separated from biblical laws or principles?
- “If there are no absolutes by which to judge society, society is absolute.” What does this mean? What examples from literature, history, or Scripture support or deny this? How does this idea compare to Plato’s definition of citizenship?

## **Episode X – Final Choices**

- There is only one alternative left after the Christian consensus is gone. And that is that a single individual or group will come forth as an elite to give arbitrary absolutes to society.
- And several have already said that there must be a competent elite group
- Daniel Bell warned that the lack of a rooted moral belief system is the cultural contradiction of the society. The deepest challenge to its survival
- But how will this elite group generate any absolutes or real meaning? Any real ethic?
- In such a society (with an elite group taking over) there is no absolute ethic to accompany the absolute power
- Humanism has found no way to deal with morals, ethics, and values.
- This elite group won’t be in the model of Hitler and Stalin, but they will be a manipulative authoritarian elite group
- Genetic engineering will be a problem... where they want to determine what kind of people we want genetically in the future
- When people believed that we were made in God’s image, there was a real basis for humanness. But this has largely been removed, and there is now no reason.. once we see people as machines... and people are no different from non-people... then there is no reason that we shouldn’t tinker with them (genetically) or manipulate them or control them.
- TV is used to manipulate us. We often look at what we see on tv as objective truth
- The mass media can be used by the elite authoritarian group for manipulation
- Many people will feel uncomfortable with the increased control and manipulation. But there is a dilemma- many of the people who speak out for civil liberties are committed to the fact that the government has the responsibility to solve every problem.
- In contrast, the Christian consensus had freedom. The individual was right with God only based on the works of Christ. This carried a huge range of freedom with it. A freedom that didn’t lead to chaos. But without this Christian foundation, these freedoms lead to chaos.
- Authoritative manipulating government doesn’t only come from the president/executive branch. We must look at congress and other branches. Legislative dictatorship is no better than executive tyranny.
- Then there’s the danger of the variable sociological law. The courts generating laws is dangerous. Right and left lose their meaning. There is a deeper problem. Right and left are simply two roads that lead to the same problem. This problem being the authoritarian elite

leaving a vacuum by the loss of the Christian consensus. They try to fill the vacuum and force a form on society. Most people are filled with apathy... and committed to affluency and personal peace.

- The weak humanistic ideals have not been able to provide a base that is needed. Humanism is man demanding to begin autonomously from himself and turning away completely from anything God says. The pressures will collapse the humanist base. The first problem is economic breakdown with inflation. There is no solution to control inflation. This will eventually lead to economic breakdown. Terrorism and the threat of war add to the pressures. A shortage of food and natural resources will bring a redistribution of wealth and a redistribution of power. Modern man with his apathy and values of personal peace and affluency will be crushed under these pressures. There are two alternatives: imposed order or that we return to a Christian foundation.
- Christianity cannot be merely a means to an end... as a superior utilitarianism. Christianity's truth means there is an infinite and personal God... and we live under the moral absolutes God gives, which sets us apart from the rest of the world. This truth gives us a unity to all knowledge and all life.
- We have a responsibility to influence society. And Christians do not have to be in the majority to influence society.
- The humanist worldview does not explain the existence of the universe or the uniqueness of man. And they reject the answer that Christians have. God has revealed himself through Creation. And this truth is within man. God has made it plain to man. We are without excuse. (Romans 1:18-23)
- People act upon the basis of what they think.
- The problem is not outward things. The problem is having the right worldview and acting upon it.

### Questions

- What is the "arbitrary elite"? Why do many intellectuals find the idea of an arbitrary elite appealing?
- How does media bias affect the way the public perceives a news story? Did media bias play a role in *Animal Farm*? If so, how did it affect the way the characters received the "news"?
- Schaeffer mentions "Christian consensus" frequently in this episode. What does it mean? How does it compare to a humanist consensus?
- What would need to happen before Christian values could be seen as the means for freedom without chaos? How can Christians influence society without being the majority?
- The title of this last episode is "Final Choices" and the theme of the Challenge II program is "Choices." With that in mind, how would you answer the question, "How should we then live?"