

*Whoever Controls the
Schools Rules the World*

*Whoever Controls the Schools
Rules the World*

Gary DeMar

AMERICAN VISION
POWDER SPRINGS, GEORGIA



**THE MISSION OF AMERICAN VISION, INC. IS TO PUBLISH AND DISTRIBUTE BOOKS
THAT LEAD INDIVIDUALS TOWARD:**

A personal faith in the one true God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit

A lifestyle of practical discipleship

A worldview that is consistent with the Bible

An ability to apply the Bible to all of life

Copyright © 2007 Gary DeMar.

Published January 2007

First Edition

Printed in the United States of America

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except for brief quotations in critical reviews and articles.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are from the New American Standard Version of the Bible.

Cover design: Luis Lovelace

American Vision, Inc.

3150-A Florence Road

Powder Springs, Georgia 30127-5385

www.americanvision.org

1-800-628-9460

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

DeMar, Gary,

Whoever Controls the Schools Rules the World / Gary DeMar—1st ed.

ISBN 0-915815-64-8

1. Education 2. Civilization, Western 3. Religion and science

This book is dedicated to Dr. Ellsworth McIntyre and the staff members of Grace Community Schools, Naples, Florida.

Table of Contents

Introduction	ix
Part 1: Who's In Charge?	
Chapter 1: A Modern History of Educational Control	1
Chapter 2: Schools at Risk	15
Chapter 3: A Good Beginning Gone Bad	23
Chapter 4: By What Standard?	31
Chapter 5: A Comprehensive Biblical Worldview	35
Chapter 6: Why the Future Matters	43
Part 2: The Pitfall of Pluralism	
Chapter 7: Setting the Agenda	53
Chapter 8: Balaam's Donkey Has Spoken	57
Chapter 9: The Moral Heirs of Epicurus	65
Chapter 10: In the Name of Tolerance	75
Chapter 11: My Genes Made Me Do It!	79
Part 3: Dispensing with Educational Mythology	
Chapter 12: Turning Away from Myths	89
Chapter 13: They Never Said It	97
Chapter 14: History as Theater	105
Chapter 15: It Started with Aristotle	113
The Story of Two Buses by Gary North	125
Index	131

Introduction

WHOSOEVER CLAIMS SOVEREIGNTY¹ expects his subjects to govern his realm in terms of his name and law. Sovereignty, therefore, brings with it the inevitability of control.² The beast of Revelation 13 claimed absolute sovereignty when he required his subjects to operate in terms of his law and name.

And he causes all, the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free men and the slaves, to be given a mark on their right hand, or on their forehead, and he provides that no one should be able to buy or sell, except the one who has the mark, either the name of the beast or the number of his name (Rev. 13:16–17).³

The Lamb, the true sovereign, expects sovereignty to be exercised in His name (14:1–5). All others are usurpers and competitors.

The denial of one sovereign assumes the sovereignty of another. There are no exceptions. If God is denied as the only true and independent sovereign, man will claim this attribute for himself. For example, when Jerusalem was plundered by Nebuchadnezzar and his army, certain young men were brought to Babylon “to enter the king’s personal service,” that is, to further the kingdom of Babylon (Dan. 1:5). This was partly accomplished through education. Keep in mind that *religion* was at the foundation of it all. First came the plundering of the old religion,

the introduction of the new sovereign, and finally capturing the best and the brightest to be indoctrinated into the ways of the new religion controlled by the State (1:1). The prevailing religion of a nation determines the educational curriculum as controlled by the civil magistrate.

To symbolize the change in sovereignty, new names were given to these young sons of Judah. The names of Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah reflected the majesty and sovereignty of the God of Israel. The suffixes of their names reflect either the general name for God (*el*) or a form of His personal name (*yah*). Daniel means *God is my judge*. Hananiah means *Jehovah has favored*. Mishael can be translated *Who is what God is?* Azariah means *Jehovah has helped*. In each case, Babylonian names were substituted that reflected the attributes of the Babylonian gods, Marduk and Nebo. Babylonian religion remains a potent force in American public education as humanist John Dunphy makes clear:

I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being. These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level—preschool day care or large state university. The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new—the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism, resplendent in its promise of a world in which the never-realized Christian ideal of “love thy neighbor” will be finally achieved.⁴

The goals of the humanists are clear and forthright. They hide nothing and demand everything. The humanist agenda has been relentless in its efforts to remake man and the world in the image of autonomous man. There is no compromise or lack of vision on their part. The humanist

worldview is comprehensive. A concerted and planned effort has been made by humanist thinkers to “capture the robes”⁵ of society by working for an ideological monopoly in the areas of education, law, science, and religion. For too long, Christians have believed that an arena of neutrality and immunity exists where humanists and Christians can discuss issues based on an “objective” study of the facts. Unfortunately, the humanists never adopted the neutrality myth while they sold it to us at a very high price. While Christians have been sold the spoiled goods of neutrality, fair play, objectivity, toleration, and pluralism, the humanists have been promoting and implementing their worldview in every area of life while denying what they tell us we should believe. It’s unfortunate that many Christians still believe that neutrality is possible and that humanists strive to pursue objectivity in education. Nothing could be further from the truth. All facts are interpreted facts, and humanists want them interpreted without any regard for God and His Word.

Contrary opinions regarding the facts are not considered. The State has determined what the standard will be to interpret the facts. The humanists have understood this for a long time, so they made it their business to capture the robes of civil government so they could control the means of perpetuating their worldview. Humanist social theory has turned education into a god, a god that they now control. Laws are written and legislation enacted, all in the name of the misreading of the First Amendment, to shut out all rival religions. Taxes—civil government’s tithe (1 Sam. 8)—are paid to the State in support of the State church: schools. Rousas J. Rushdoony has described the process as *The Messianic Character of American Education*.⁶ Consider the ruling of the Ninth Circuit Court on what role parents have in the education of their own children once they are in the hands of state educators:

Parents have a right to inform their children when and as they wish on the subject of sex; they have no constitutional right, however, to prevent a public school from providing its students with whatever information it wishes to provide, sexual or otherwise, when and as the school determines that it is appropriate to do so. Neither *Meyer* nor *Pierce* [two earlier Supreme Court

rulings] provides support for the view that parents have a right to prevent a school from providing any kind of information—sexual or otherwise—to its students.... Perhaps the Sixth Circuit said it best when it explained, “While parents may have a fundamental right to decide *whether* to send their child to a public school, they do not have a fundamental right generally to direct *how* a public school teaches their child.”⁷

There you have it. The State, through the agency of the courts, has declared that it is the sovereign ruler over your child’s education. Did you notice how the court describes the relationship between your children and the schools they attend in the use of the phrase “*its* children”? They are *your* children. Will you continue to allow your children to be indoctrinated in what is an ungodly educational system, or will you make the choice, while you still can, to put them in an educational setting where the God of the Bible is recognized as the true sovereign? The decision remains with you.

Notes

1. “Supreme power; supremacy; the possession of the highest power, or of uncontrollable power. Absolute *sovereignty* belongs to God alone.” (Noah Webster, *American Dictionary of the English Language* [1828]).
2. The biblical system of government is decentralized, therefore, its control factor is not concentrated in any one individual, group, institution, or civil jurisdiction.
3. Revelation has often been interpreted as referring to events that are still in our future. A number of commentators hold the position that Revelation was written prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the beast of Revelation 13 is a first-century figure. For a study of Revelation, see Steve Gregg, *Revelation: Four Views—A Parallel Commentary* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1997).
4. Quoted in John W. Whitehead, *Stealing of America* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1983), 95.
5. Robes are a symbol of authority in the West. Three groups wear robes to identify their profession and as an indication that each profession has been invested with a degree of formal authority: judges, university professors, and ordained ministers.
6. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of American Education: Studies in the History of the Philosophy of Education* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1963).
7. Stephen Reinhardt, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, *Opinion: Fields v. Palmdale* (Nov. 2, 2005), 14–15. Available online at <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/data2/circs/9th/0356499p.pdf>

Part I

1

A Modern History of Educational Control

“One of the most useful tools in the quest for power is the educational system.”

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF the above quotation is self-evident: Whoever controls the educational system will set the goals for the nation, define and establish its moral values, and ultimately rule the future in every area of life. Children and the worldview they embrace are the future. Much can be learned from a study of the historical record of social movements and political regimes that have made their goal to extinguish any glowing ember of a Christian worldview.

The Third Reich

Many of Adolf Hitler’s atrocities are well known because of their heinous character and thorough documentation. Because of this, many philosophical or *worldview* atrocities get little notice when compared with the violent images that have shaped our understanding of Nazism. Nazism destroyed body, mind, and soul. By capturing the youth through education, Adolph Hitler believed that his dreams of a Nazi State could be realized. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler stressed “the importance of winning over and then training the youth in the service ‘of a new

national state.”² His words and subsequent actions were a prelude to understanding what the world would have been like had he succeeded. William L. Shirer, an eyewitness to the rise of Hitler and the Nazi worldview, offers an objective but chilling prospect of what was in store for Europe and possibly the world:

“When an opponent declares, ‘I will not come over to your side,’ [Hitler] said in a speech on November 6, 1933, ‘I calmly say, ‘Your child belongs to us already . . . What are you? You will pass on. Your descendants, however, now stand in the new camp. In a short time they will know nothing else but this new community.’” And on May 1, 1937, he declared, “This new Reich will give its youth to no one, but will itself take youth and give to youth its own education and its own upbringing.”³

Educational control was taken away from parents and local authorities and “Every person in the teaching profession, from kindergarten through the universities, was compelled to join the National Socialist Teachers’ League which, by law, was held ‘responsible for the execution of the ideological and political co-ordination of all the teachers in accordance with the National Socialist doctrine.’”⁴ The State was to be supported “without reservation” and teachers took an oath to “be loyal and obedient to Adolf Hitler.”⁵

The nation that birthed the Reformation and made the Bible the center of all that was right and good was now swearing allegiance to a new savior. “Heil Hitler” became the public declaration that the voice of Hitler, like that of Herod nearly two millennia before him, was perceived to be “the voice of a god and not a man” (Acts 13:23).

Nazism is a comprehensive ideology that sees no boundaries or exclusions. Hitler’s goal was to remake the social, cultural, political, educational, and moral climate of his day in the image of the Nazi worldview. “In Germany there was Nazi truth, a Nazi political truth, a Nazi economic truth, a Nazi social truth, a Nazi religious truth, to which all institutions had to subscribe or be banished.”⁶ All competing worldviews were expunged from the State educational curriculum. Neutrality

was never an option for Hitler. In fact, neutrality is not even possible. Not to take a side is to acquiesce to the competition.⁷

Christianity's Destruction

Religion was not exempt from the plotting Hitler. Under the leadership of Alfred Rosenberg, an outspoken pagan and anti-Christian, "the Nazi regime intended eventually to destroy Christianity in Germany."⁸ Martin "Bormann, one of the men closest to Hitler, said publicly in 1941, 'National Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable.'⁹ While we hear a great deal about the suppression of Jewish thought, little attention is given to Nazism's most formidable rival—Christianity. War correspondent Shirer wrote, "We know now what Hitler envisioned for the German Christians: the utter suppression of their religion."¹⁰ The internal intelligence agency of the Nazi SS "regarded organized Christianity as one of the major obstacles to the establishment of a truly totalitarian state."¹¹

When Martin Niemoeller used his pulpit to expose Hitler's radical politics and its comprehensive worldview implications, "He knew every word spoken was reported by Nazi spies and secret agents."¹² Leo Stein describes in his book *I Was in Hell with Niemoeller* how the Gestapo gathered evidence against Niemoeller:

Now, the charge against Niemoeller was based entirely on his sermons, which the Gestapo agents had taken down stenographically. But in none of his sermons did Pastor Niemoeller exhort his congregation to overthrow the Nazi regime. He merely raised his voice against some of the Nazi policies, particularly the policy directed against the Church. He had even refrained from criticizing the Nazi government itself or any of its personnel. Under the former government his sermons would have been construed only as an exercise of the right of free speech. Now, however, written laws, no matter how explicitly they were worded, were subjected to the interpretation of the judges.¹³

In a June 27, 1937 sermon, Niemoeller made it clear to those in attendance that he had a sacred duty to speak out on the evils of the Nazi regime no matter what the consequences: "We have no more thought

of using our own powers to escape the arm of the authorities than had the Apostles of old. No more are we ready to keep silent at man's behest when God commands us to speak. For it is, and must remain, the case that we must obey God rather than man."¹⁴ A few days later, he was arrested. His crime? "Abuse of the pulpit."

Shirer paints a depressing picture of the state of the Christian church in 1938. The "Special Courts" set up by the Nazis made claims against pastors who spoke out against Hitler's policies. Niemoeller was not the only one singled out by the Gestapo. "Some 807 other pastors and leading laymen of the 'Confessional Church' were arrested in 1937, and hundreds more in the next couple of years."¹⁵ A group of Confessional Churches in Germany, founded by Pastor Niemoeller and other Protestant ministers, drew up a proclamation to confront the political changes taking place in Germany that threatened the people "with a deadly danger. The danger lies in a new religion," the proclamation declared. "The church has by order of its Master to see to it that in our people Christ is given the honor that is proper to the Judge of the world . . . The First Commandment says 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' The new religion is a rejection of the First Commandment."¹⁶ Five hundred pastors who read the proclamation from their pulpits were arrested. "Not many Germans lost much sleep over the arrests of a few thousand pastors and priests."¹⁷

A recent discovery of a confidential U.S. government report that was prepared by the Office of Strategic Services, a forerunner of the CIA, for the International Military Tribunal at Nuremburg, Germany, documents how the Nazis wanted to "take over the churches from within, using party sympathizers." The usurpation of ecclesiastical authority would be accomplished by discrediting, jailing, or even killing Christian leaders and then re-indoctrinating the members of the congregations to "give them a new faith—in Germany's Third Reich." The ultimate goal was to "eliminate Christianity." The 120-page official document titled *The Nazi Master Plan: The Persecution of the Christian Churches* reported the following to the Military Tribunal in 1945:

Important leaders of the National Socialist party would have liked to meet this situation [church influence] by complete extirpation [removal] of Christianity and the substitution of a purely racial religion. . . . The best evidence now available as to the existence of an anti-Church plan is to be found in the systematic nature of the persecution itself. . . . Different steps in that persecution, such as the campaign for the suppression of denominational and youth organizations, the campaign against denominational schools, the defamation campaign against the clergy, started on the same day in the whole area of the Reich. . . and were supported by the entire regimented press, by Nazi Party meetings, by traveling party speakers.¹⁸

Churches were “confined as far as possible to the performance of narrowly religious functions, and even within this narrow sphere were subjected to as many hindrances as the Nazis dared to impose. Implementation of this objective started with the curtailment of religious instruction in the primary and secondary schools with the squeezing of the religious periods into inconvenient hours, with Nazi propaganda among the teachers in order to induce them to refuse the teaching of religion, with vetoing of . . . religious text books, and finally with substituting Nazi *Weltanschauung* [world-and-life view] and ‘German faith’ for Christian religious denominational instruction. . . . At the time of the outbreak of the war . . . religious instruction had practically disappeared from Germany’s primary schools.”¹⁹

Hitler knew that to secure the future, he had to take hold of the present and reshape the worldview of a new generation with his Nazi-constructed worldview. By controlling the schools and churches and hijacking the educational process in both institutions, Hitler had eliminated competing transmission belts of ideological resistance.

Marxism

The Marxist worldview, as put forth by Lenin, had similar aspirations. Education had to be centralized. The State would become the educator, the new parent. While in a Christian context, schools act in a delegated

capacity as *en loco parentis* (“in place of the parents”), under communism, the roles are reversed so that homes and schools reflect and perpetuate the agenda of the State. Like its future Nazi rival, the goal was to indoctrinate the youth with an alien worldview. Marxism’s optimistic secular eschatology allowed for an ideological purge of remnants of the older Christian worldview from the newly established materialist State religion based on Darwinian principles. To speed up the process, systematic exterminations were the order of the day:

A large percentage of the generation that knew Joseph Stalin died as a direct result of his directives. These were purely political killings, “exterminations,” “liquidations” of “the enemy class” and “undesirable elements.” How many were involved? Solzhenitsyn’s estimates reach as high as sixty million. Robert Conquest, author of *The Great Terror*,²⁰ fixed the number at well into the millions. It is doubtful if we will ever know the true total—God alone knows.²¹

Like Hitler, Lenin saw the value in monopolizing education and bringing it under the exclusive control of the State. He believed that time was on his side. The old order would pass away along with its outdated ideas regarding religion, family, and education. The process for change, however, had to begin with the children. The sooner they could be taken from their parents and broken from their links to the past, the sooner the reprogramming could take place. In his *Principles of Communism*, published in 1847, Engels had advocated the “education of all children, as soon as they are old enough to dispense with maternal care, in national institutions and at the charge of the nation.”²² All facets of society must conform to the new ideology:

We are bringing the women into the social economy, into legislation and government. . . . We are establishing communal kitchens . . . infant asylums . . . educational institutions of all kinds. In short, we are seriously carrying out the demand of our program for the transference of the economic and educational function of the separate household to society. . . . The children are brought up under more favourable conditions than at home. . . .²³

Education was centralized. The “separate household” was transferred “to society.” Mothers would be encouraged to enter the work force in ever greater numbers. This would allow the State an opportunity to care for the children in “educational institutions of all kinds.”

The Long March Through the Institutions

The oppressive nature of the older Communism was noted by Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), a committed Marxist with a new approach to bring about cultural and social change. In order to capture democratic nations, a new model would have to be developed. Like the revolutionary Marxists before him, Gramsci considered Christianity to be the “force binding all the classes—peasants and workers and princes, priests and popes and all the rest besides, into a single, homogeneous culture. It was specifically Christian culture, in which individual men and women understood that the most important things about human life transcend the material conditions in which they lived out their mortal lives.”²⁴

Gramsci broke with Marx and Lenin’s belief that the masses would rise up and overthrow the ruling “superstructure.” No matter how oppressed the working classes might be, their Christian faith would not allow such an overthrow, Gramsci theorized. Marxism taught “that everything valuable in life was within mankind,”²⁵ but this unbridled secularism was rejected by Christians. Perceptively, Gramsci realized that in the long run what people did not ultimately believe in they would not fight for. Was Gramsci right? “The only Marxist state that existed” in Gramsci’s day “was imposed and maintained by force and by terrorist policies that duplicated and even exceeded the worst facets of Mussolini’s Fascism.”²⁶ The building of the Berlin Wall was the most visible evidence of Gramsci’s early critique of traditional Marxism. Walls had to be built to keep people from escaping the “Workers’ Paradise.”

While Gramsci was still a committed Marxist and “totally convinced that the material dimension of everything in the universe, including mankind, was the whole of it,”²⁷ he believed that the road taken to “utopia” by traditional Marxists was one lined with formidable obstacles. Gramsci began his re-imagining of Marxism by dropping the harsh slo-

gans. “It wouldn’t do to rant about ‘revolution’ and ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ and the ‘Workers’ Paradise.’”²⁸ Instead, Marxism would have to put on a new face and talk about “national consensus,” “national unity,” and “national pacification.” The democratic process rather than revolution would be used to bring about the necessary changes. At first, pluralism would be promoted and defended. Further, Marxists would join with other oppressed groups—even if they did not share Marxist ideals—to create a unified coalition of voting power. After building their coalition “they must enter into every civil, cultural and political activity in every nation, patiently leavening them all as thoroughly as yeast leavens bread.”²⁹ To change the culture, Gramsci argued, “would require a ‘long march through the institutions’—the arts, cinema, theater, schools, colleges, seminaries, newspapers, magazines, and the new electronic medium [of the time], radio.”³⁰

Following Gramsci’s paradigm, the mind had to be stripped of any notion of the transcendent—“that there is nothing beyond the matter of this universe. There is nothing in existence that transcends man—his material organism within his material surroundings.”³¹ The pagan notion of the separation of the two realms (spiritual/material, heaven/earth)³² that has dogged orthodox Christianity since the first century had to be reintroduced and reinforced:

In the most practical terms, he needed to get individuals and groups in every class and station of life to think about life’s problems without reference to the Christian transcendent, without reference to God and the laws of God. He needed to get them to react with antipathy and positive opposition to any introduction of Christian ideals or the Christian transcendent into the treatment and solution of the problems of modern life.³³

The here and now must be absolutized and made the reference point for everything we think and do. “Everything must be done in the name of man’s dignity and rights, and in the name of his autonomy and freedom from outside constraint. From the claims and constraints of Christianity, above all.”³⁴ Has Gramsci been successful? You be the judge:

- What a person does in his private life does not affect his ability to govern.
- It's just about sex, even if it's adultery.
- Religion and politics don't mix.
- You can't impose your morality on others.
- You can't legislate morality.
- Religion has no business in the classroom; it's a private affair.
- There's a separation between Church (God) and State.

The transcendent is no longer a viable reference point in American public schools. All of life is immanent, that is, all that counts is this world. America is haunted by the ghost of Antonio Gramsci, and the specter of his image roams the halls of every public school in America.

The Secularists

The above examples from Nazism and Communism might seem like extreme examples of educational tyranny, but modern-day “Brights,”³⁵ as they like to call themselves, have some equally startling things to say about education. Daniel C. Dennett, a high priest of the evolutionary dogma, encapsulates the character of a self-professed secular³⁶ worldview:

If you insist on teaching your children falsehoods—that the Earth is flat,³⁷ that “Man” is not a product of evolution by natural selection—then you must expect, at the very least, that those of us who have freedom of speech will feel free to describe your teachings as the spreading of falsehoods, and will attempt to demonstrate this to your children at our earliest opportunity. Our future well-being—the well-being of all of us on the planet—depends on the education of our descendants.”³⁸

Coercion is the name of the game. If Dennett had his way, parents could not make educational choices for their children. The Nazis had their “Hitler Youth,” and this evolutionist wants to have his “Darwin Youth.” Educational coercion is not a relic of the past. In Germany today, Christian parents are denied the right to educate their children at home.³⁹

The modern-day public school has adopted the opening line of Carl Sagan's *Cosmos* as its operating assumption for learning: "The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be."⁴⁰ Every fact, experience, and piece of scientific evidence that is gathered must be filtered through this man-made, indefensible, and improvable interpretive grid. All that follows in the *Cosmos* worldview is measured by this one-sentence interpretive yardstick rather than "according to Christ" (Col. 2:8) who "made the world" and "upholds all things by the word of His power" (Heb. 1:2, 3). Where the Bible presupposes God and His creative activity (Gen. 1:1; Heb. 11:3), Sagan presupposes the cosmos and nothing else.

For Sagan, the cosmos was god, a glorious accidental substitute for what he believed were ancient, pre-scientific beliefs about God and the origin and nature of the universe. The very idea of a *personal* God is, in Sagan's worldview, simply "the dreams of men."⁴¹ Even so, Sagan's worldview is just as religious as that of the Christian's worldview:

When Sagan excludes even the possibility that a spiritual dimension has any place in his cosmos—not even at the unknown, mysterious moment when life began—he makes accidental evolution the explanation for everything. Presented in this way, evolution does indeed look like an inverted religion, a conceptual golden calf, which manages to reek of sterile atheism. It is little wonder that many parents find their deeper emotions stirred if they discover this to be the import of Johnny's education.⁴²

Sagan worshiped an eternal cosmos that he *presupposed* is an evolutionary substitute for the eternal God of the Bible who gives life and meaning to everything. Sagan said it like this: "It is the universe that made us. . . . We are creatures of the cosmos. . . . Our obligation to survive and flourish is owed, not just to ourselves, but also to that cosmos, ancient and vast, from which we spring."⁴³ God's personal attributes are imputed to an impersonal cosmos. The "primordial biotic soup"⁴⁴ nourished our ancient ancestors as they emerged from that first ocean of life. These memories, according to Sagan, are eternally etched on our evolved psyche.

The ocean calls. Some part of our being knows this is from where we came. We long to return. These aspirations are not, I think, irreverent, although they may trouble whatever gods may be.⁴⁵

Sagan makes it clear that there are no “gods” in the usual sense in his universe, only “accidents”⁴⁶ that somehow developed into designed and meaningful entities. At times, however, Sagan muses rhapsodic over a seemingly benign reverence of the cosmos that hints at a deep religious commitment to atheism and elements of paganism. “Our ancestors worshipped the sun,” he reflects, “and they were far from foolish. It makes good sense to revere the sun and the stars, because we are their children.”⁴⁷ But who made the cosmos? How did the cosmos get here? Why are there order and complexity in the cosmos? Sagan never answered these questions. He could not as long as the cosmos is all that is ever was or ever will be.

So then, the Christian, the pagan, and the atheist interpret the world by an appeal to a set of essential materialistic, this-world-only presuppositions that cannot account for non-material entities like reason, logic, love, compassion, good, and evil. All worldviews—even those espousing atheism—are presuppositionally religious. “This means that many people may rightly call themselves atheists meaning that they do not believe there are any gods (‘a-theist’ means literally ‘no-god’), but they will still have a religious belief if they regard anything whatever as the self-existent on which all else depends.”⁴⁸ Those beliefs “on which all else depends” are presuppositions, and everyone has them, from the bushman and the astronomer to the philosopher and the classroom teacher. While many teachers might not believe this radicalized secular worldview, they are increasingly obligated to teach it.

Notes

1. Herbert Schlossberg, *Idols for Destruction: Christian Faith and Its Confrontation with American Society* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, [1983] 1993), 209.
2. William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), 248–249.
3. Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 249.

4. Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 249.
5. Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 249.
6. C. Gregg Singer, *From Rationalism to Irrationality: The Decline of the Western Mind from the Renaissance to the Present* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979), 28.
7. Randy Thomasson, president of the Campaign for Children and Families, explains, "It's because Christian colleges and churches have ignored the political process for so long. Now the political process, absent religious values, is coming back to assault the church." ("Gov. Arnold tosses school moral codes" [August 29, 2006]: www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=51732).
8. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 240.
9. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 240.
10. William Shirer, *The Nightmare Years: 1930–1940* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1984), 156.
11. Donald D. Wall, "The Lutheran Response to the Hitler Regime in Germany," ed. Robert D. Linder, *God and Caesar: Case Studies in the Relationship Between Christianity and the State* (Longview, TX: The Conference on Faith and History, 1971), 88.
12. Basil Miller, *Martin Niemoeller: Hero of the Concentration Camp*, 5th ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1942), 112.
13. Leo Stein, *I Was in Hell with Niemoeller* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1942), 175.
14. Quoted in Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 239.
15. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 239.
16. Quoted in Eugene Davidson, *The Trials of the Germans: An Account of the Twenty-Two Defendants before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, [1966] 1997), 275.
17. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 240.
18. Quoted in Edward Colimore, "Papers reveal Nazi aim: End Christianity," *Philadelphia Inquirer* (January 9, 2002). http://inq.philly.com/content/inquirer/2002/01/09/front_page/JNAZI09.htm
19. The report is available online at www.camlaw.rutgers.edu/publications/law-religion/nuremberg/nurinst1.htm
20. Robert Conquest has done a major revision of *The Great Terror* using newly available evidence from the *glasnost* era: *The Great Terror: A Reassessment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). Also see Mark Kramer, ed., *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).
21. Lloyd Billingsley, *The Generation that Knew Not Josef* (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1985), 37. During the era of *glasnost*, Stalin's past had literally been dug up. "A government commission has found that thousands of skulls and bones buried in a mass grave outside Kiev were those of victims killed during dictator Josef Stalin's repressions, not by Nazi soldiers, Tass, the state-run news agency, has reported." ("Mass Grave Near Kiev Holds Stalin's Victims, Panel Says," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* [March 26, 1989]). Under Stalin, "more than 600,000 death sentences" were meted

- out and “at least five million” people were arrested “in the worst years of 1937–38. He destroyed children as well as old people, nobodies and party favorites. . . . In the countryside in 1932–33, as many as eight million starved to death in accordance with an agricultural policy based on killing *kulaks* (farmers) outright or just wasting their lands.” (Peter Keresztes, “Murder of Millions,” *The Wall Street Journal* [August 31, 1989], A13).
22. Quoted in Francis Nigel Lee, *Communist Eschatology: A Christian Philosophical Analysis of the Post-Capitalistic Views of Marx, Engels and Lenin* (Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1974), 351.
 23. Quoted in Lee, *Communist Eschatology*, 350.
 24. Malachi Martin, *The Keys of This Blood: The Struggle for World Dominion Between Pope John II, Mikhail Gorbachev and the Capitalist West* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990), 245.
 25. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 245.
 26. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 248.
 27. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 248.
 28. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 249.
 29. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 250.
 30. Patrick J. Buchanan, *Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization* (New York: St. Martin's Press/Thomas Dunne Books, 2001), 77.
 31. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 251.
 32. See Peter E. Gillquist, *Why We Haven't Changed the World* (Fleming H. Revell, 1982), 43.
 33. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 251.
 34. Martin, *The Keys of This Blood*, 251.
 35. See Gary DeMar, “A Bright Responds” (August 16, 2006): <http://americanvision.org/articlearchive/08-16-06.asp>. Also see Regis Nicoll, “Putting on a ‘Bright’ face” (August 11, 2006): <http://www.americanvision.org/articlearchive/08-11-06.asp>
 36. The adjective secular comes from the Latin *saeculum*, which means “time” or “age.” “To call someone secular means he is completely time-bound, totally a child of his age, a creature of history, with no vision of eternity. Unable to see anything in the perspective of eternity, he cannot believe God exists or acts in human affairs.” (James Hitchcock, *What is Secular Humanism?* [Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Publications, 1982], 10–11). A secularist denies special revelation, not only the “absurdity” of God addressing man but the impossibility of it.
 37. On the “flat-earth myth,” see Gary DeMar, *America's Christian History: The Untold Story* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, 1995), 221–234; Gary DeMar and Fred Douglas Young, *To Pledge Allegiance: A New World in View* (Atlanta, GA: American Vision, 1996), 75–82; Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Inventing the Flat Earth: Columbus and Modern Historians* (New York: Praeger, 1991). This topic will be covered in more detail in Chapter 14.
 38. Daniel C. Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meaning of Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 519.

39. "Homeschooling Illegal' Declares German School Official" (January 7, 2005): www.hslda.org/hs/international/Germany/200501100.asp
40. Carl Sagan, *Cosmos* (New York: Random House, 1980), 4.
41. Sagan, *Cosmos*, 257.
42. William R. Fix, *The Bone Peddlers: Selling Evolution* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1984), xxiv.
43. From the 13-hour television presentation of *Cosmos* aired in the fall of 1980. Quoted in Richard A. Baer, Jr., "They Are Teaching Religion in the Public Schools," *Christianity Today* (February 17, 1984), 12.
44. Prebiotic means "before life." It refers to the hypothesis put forth by the Russian scientist A.I. Oparin who claimed that life began in a sea of chemicals called a *prebiotic soup*. The chance occurrence of chemicals and compounds eventually led to molecules. The theory does not explain where the chemicals and compounds came from and how they organized themselves into complex life.
45. Sagan, *Cosmos*, 5.
46. Sagan, *Cosmos*, 30.
47. Quoted in Baer, "They Are Teaching Religion in the Public Schools," 13.
48. Roy A. Clouser, *The Myth of Religious Neutrality: An Essay on the Hidden Role of Religious Belief in Theories* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 26–27.