

## THE REAL REASON FOR THE OPPOSITION TO THE REESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICA'S FOUNDATIONAL VALUES

by Dennis D. Frey, Th.D.



**Our Founding Fathers** accepted one inviolable premise upon which the development and exercise of law and government was to be predicated. That being, our world, and

mankind in particular, is the consequence of an act by an Almighty Creator, before Whom we shall someday be required to stand and to be judged.

### George Washington

“It is impossible to account for the creation of the universe without the agency of a Supreme Being. It is impossible to govern the universe without the aid of a Supreme Being. It is impossible to reason without arriving at a Supreme Being.” <sup>1</sup>A Life of Washington, James K. Paulding, Harper Brother, NY 1835.

“Daily frame me more and more into the likeness of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, that living in Thy fear, and dying in Thy favor, I may in Thy appointed time attain the resurrection of the just unto eternal life.” <sup>1</sup>1752, Personal Prayer Book, Monday Morning.

### Thomas Jefferson

“We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal. That they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.” <sup>1</sup>The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776

“There is only one God and He is all perfect. There is a future state of rewards and punishment.” <sup>1</sup>Contained in a letter written to Charles Thomson, January 9, 1816.

### James Madison

“It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage...” <sup>1</sup>Religious Freedom, A Memorial of Remembrance, by James Madison, 1785.

“If freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man: To God therefore, not to man, must an account of it be rendered.” <sup>1</sup>From an address to the General Assembly of the State of Virginia, 1785.

### Benjamin Franklin

“I never doubted for an instant, the existence of the Deity; that he made the world, and governed it by his providence...that our souls are immortal; and that all crime will be punished, and virtue rewarded, either here or hereafter.” <sup>1</sup>The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin.

### John Quincy Adams

“Let us then search the Scriptures...the Bible contains the revelation of the will of God. It contains the history of the creation of the world, and of mankind;” <sup>1</sup>From a letter to his son written from St. Petersburg, Russia, 1811.



“I enter into my eightieth year, with thanksgiving to God for all the blessings and mercies which His providence has bestowed upon me throughout a life extended now to the longest term allotted to the life of man; with supplication for the continuance of those blessings and mercies to me and

# P E R S P E C T I V E

mine, as long as it shall suit the dispensation of His wise providence, and for resignation to His will when my appointed time shall come.” <sup>1</sup>Written July 11, 1846 on his 80<sup>th</sup> birthday.

The view that God is Creator and Judge was not unique, but widely held. It formed the philosophical foundation for the great advances in science and government that flourished in the first few centuries following the European Renaissance.

Only 59 years after the opening battles of the American war for independence in 1776, another view of origins and judgment was to compete violently with the Biblical world-view. The degenerative consequences of this other view has only now begun to be fully realized.

In 1859 (a mere 148 years ago), the first publication of The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life, ignited what proved to be the first salvo in a world-wide moral and ethical anarchy more mighty and more hurtful for humanity than any civilization had ever experienced.

It’s author was a most unlikely anarchist. Charles Darwin, born February 12, 1809 (the same day as Abraham Lincoln), studied medicine for two years at Edinburgh, but did not actually receive a medical degree. On the basis of his brief medical studies, and with the supervision of his father, himself a prominent British physician,



Darwin built up a small practice in Shrewsbury. This lasted only a brief time, after which he took up study for the Anglican ministry at Christ College, Cambridge. After graduation in 1831 (having finally obtained his college degree in the study of Bible and Theology), Darwin at age 22, rather than enter ministry took an appointment as ship’s naturalist aboard the HMS Beagle, and the rest of the story is too well known to warrant a further chronicle.

What is worth noting is that the historical icon of modern evolutionism was not a classically trained scientist, but rather a ministerial student who shipped out under the disguise of a naturalist

and returned to secure for himself credentials which may yet be considered curious.

In fact, Charles Darwin did not invent the theory of evolution, but he did serve as the catalyst for what we have been asked to accept as the science of evolution. It is in-point-of-fact, not a science of origins, but a theory of origins. It is a theory that can arguably be understood as a powerful force for social and moral anarchy.

The title of this polemic is, *The Real Reason for the Opposition to the Reestablishment of America’s Foundational Values*.

# P E R S P E C T I V E

Let us then ask the following questions. “Why is there such strong opposition to the reestablishment of the solid and productive moral values



that helped to make American the envy of the world?” Likewise, “Why do we have such a struggle trying to convince those opposed, that the Founding Fathers actually believed what we are trying to prove they did, in fact, believe?”

The answer does not appear to be complicated. It is because those opposed are not interested in being convinced. They do not need to be convinced, because they already know what that what we are trying to document is historically accurate. Yes, they know it, yet they reject it. That is to say, they know that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, and Adams believed in the special creation of the world, and a final judgment in the life to come. The point is, they do not believe in it. Furthermore, they believe that if these men (and most of the others we know as Founding Fathers) were alive today, they would not believe it either.

Going a bit further (and here I risk speaking on their behalf), it is probably accurate to suggest that they whom we will now refer to as secular humanists, would admit that in the nascent period of the modern scientific age (about 1700 through 1850), such beliefs as were held by the Founding Fathers were useful to the establishment of the nation. That is, it helped to forge a national consensus and keep the largely unsophisticated illiterate masses in check. The Christian religion

was, for a time, a useful tool for social and national development.

That period of development being long behind us, the secular humanist fervently believes that a fiat *ex-nihilo* world-view has outlived its usefulness. Not only is it antiquated, it is unscientific and dangerous...dangerous to collective and individual civil rights; dangerous to scientific and social progress.

Some have naively considered Teddy Kennedy’s now widely disseminated description of "Robert Bork's America" as a country of "back-alley abortions" and "segregated lunch counters" as being nothing more than the wild raging of a radical leftist, but I think this is a mistake. Even though Kennedy probably spoke too sharply for many of his fellow travelers, to most secular humanists he nevertheless spoke truly.

In a very real way, Kennedy was projecting an attitude toward Christian conservatism shared by Marx and Mao. In 1958, China, following disappointing results with the first few years of the communist revolution, announced the “Great Leap Forward.” It was not surprising that



religion, and most especially the Christian religion, was viewed as a dangerous obstacle to progress. Therefore, as with Marx who viewed religion (the Christian religion in particular), as the “opiate of the people,” the great repressions and persecutions that were officially undertaken, were done so in the name of national progress.

# P E R S P E C T I V E

Oddly, it does not seem to matter to the secular humanist of today that both the Soviet and Chinese communist experiments were total failures. In fact, they were not so much failures in that they were social experiments, but failures of religion, the religion of what may be rightly defined as scientific humanism.

Herein lies the root of the conflict. The secular humanist is convinced that the moral and social values of the Founding Fathers, were based upon an unscientific world view, a world view that if allowed to resurface would not bring about moral and social good, but would throw our nation back a hundred years with "segregated lunch counters" being the least of the disasters. They see this as a fight for the very future of America, a fight they are eager to engage, and a struggle that they are willing to wage with every resource available.

In a word, the secular humanist believes with all the religious fervor of a Pentecostal street evangelist that there is no Creator and no future judgment. That every notion based upon such beliefs has within it the potential to send the world back seven hundred years...back to the Dark Ages.

Conversely, if the Bible is indeed a Word from God, and if the universe is a consequence of His creation *ex-nihilo* by fiat, then quite the opposite must be true, a question that the Bible itself anticipates, indeed answers with terrifying bluntness in the Book of Revelation.

Does this make any sense to you? Can you accept it? Will you accept it? And what will you do about it? What ought we to do about it? We ought to do what we are doing, and we ought to do it with all of our might. That is, if we believe as deeply in the rightness of our cause as they do their own.

What is at stake is the future of our Nation. What lies in the middle, between these opposing world views, are tens of millions of our fellow Americans who, in their own crucible of paying bills and raising babies, have not thought deeply about this, have not reckoned with the odds, and have not yet understood that the personal value of their very selves is the true prize for which we must contend.

"There is a way which seemeth right unto a man: but the ends thereof are the ways of death."  
Proverbs 14:12 KJV

*Dennis, D. Frey, Th.D., President, Master's International School of Divinity*

<sup>1</sup>Quotes taken from *America's God and Country*, by William J. Federer

---

## *Thought Provoking...*

### **Free Will and an Omniscient God**

Most Christian denominations and groups and Islamic sects believe in an omniscient God who knows every future event. If this is true, can our will be truly free? And if we do not have free will, then how could we be morally responsible? Why would God punish us if we were bad, as he does throughout the Old Testament?

Theologians like Maimonides (Moses ben Maimon, 1135-1204AD), Augustine (354-430AD) and Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274AD) believed that God is outside of time and can see all history at once. It is from our own limited perspective that we are making choices. But still, they are our choices. However, if an omniscient God sees all time at once, does the future exist even now for him, and do you think our decisions are truly free?

**TELL US WHAT YOU THINK...**

**EMAIL US AT: [Editor@mdivs.edu](mailto:Editor@mdivs.edu)**

---