

SEARCHING *the* SCRIPTURES



"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me" — John 5:39.

"These were more noble than those in Thessalonica in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so" — Acts 17:11.

"DEVOTED TO THE SEARCH FOR DIVINE TRUTH"

VOLUME XVII

JULY, 1976

NUMBER 7

Special Issue

Morals Under Fire

IRRATIONAL PHILOSOPHY - SPRING OF SOCIAL CHAOS

Ken Green

2920 New Hartford Rd.
Owensboro, KY 42301



It is not uncommon to hear statements of disdain directed toward those who "sit in ivory towers." Yet from those ivory towers small pebbles have started ripples which have culminated in social tidal waves.

The unrest we have witnessed in world events may be traced largely to the "ivory towers" of Hegel and Marx. Turmoil on many fronts found impetus in the serenity of Charles Darwin's "ivory tower." What is happening in government, education, religion, and the world in general, had filtered down to the masses from the ivory towers of philosophy.

"Existentialism" does not lend itself to a concise definition. One begins to feel the drift of this philosophy (more properly, a non-philosophy) only as he reads the novels, plays, short stories, etc., of its proponents.

Nevertheless, let us offer a couple of definitions that may be useful. **The Dictionary of Religious Terms** by Donald T. Kauffman defines it as an approach which "emphasizes one's individual subjective experience and grasp of existence." Hugh J. O'Connell, a Catholic theologian, gives this definition: "A mental approach, a way of thinking, which studies every problem from the viewpoint of the individual human person."

Francis A. Schaeffer defines it as: "A modern theory of man that holds that human experience is not describable in scientific or rational terms. Existentialism stresses the need to make vital choices by using man's freedom in a contingent and apparently purposeless world."

Some existentialists, like Jean Paul Sarte and Albert Camus, are atheists. Heidegger is an agnostic. Others, such as Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, and Reinhold Niebuhr, are theists.

Two General Views

A study of the history of philosophy demonstrates two general views of the world. One mental approach is called **realism**. This philosophy affirms the reality of the world outside man. It stresses the **objective** and asserts that the world is real, consisting of real things, and we can study and know this outside world with our senses.

The other approach is **idealism**. It is concerned with what goes on inside the mind of man. Subjectivism is emphasized. Man's feelings, emotions, thoughts, and sensations, stand foremost with the idealist.

Idealism has held sway in philosophy since the time of Rene' Descartes (1596-1650) and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Although these did not reject moral law and objective truth, philosophers who have followed their influence have done so. The result has been a rejection of any standard of absolute truth. If all is subjective, then all is relative. What is right in one case may be wrong in another.

Irrational Philosophy Manifested

The dominant philosophy of a society is reflected in its art. The great artists of the Renaissance were realists. They believed their models were real and they copied them as closely as possible. Michelangelo became a student of all nature that he might more faithfully capture reality in his work.

Modern art is idealistic, reflecting the modern philosophy that all reality is subjective. Picasso, Mondrian, and Duchamp have not painted the realistic world we see. They paint their own feelings, sensations, and emotions.

Pablo Picasso, the famous surrealist artist, was quoted in the French magazine **Le Spectacle du Monde** (Nov. 1962) to the effect that while young he was enamored of the religion of great art, but "from cubism on," he had satisfied the public with the

"many bizarre notions which have come into my head." He added, "The less they (the public) understood, the more they admired them. . . Today, as you know, I am famous and very rich. But when I am alone with myself, I haven't the courage to consider myself an artist, in the great and ancient sense of that word. . . I am only a public entertainer, who understands his age."

The same thought forms are reflected in literature and other mediums of entertainment. Samuel Richardson, Dickens, Thackeray, and Twain wrote books and stories that made sense. Their works had plots, characters you could identify with, and they came to some ending, satisfactory or not. Movies and plays, a few years ago, were also realistic.

Now it is not uncommon to read a story, or see a television drama which has no plot whatever. Characters as well are often unreal. There is no ending. The conclusion leaves you wondering what happened. Kurt Vonnegut, Jr. is representative of such writers. The back cover of "Mother Night" says: "**In Mother Night** Vonnegut makes fun of sex, sin, and motherhood; of war and peace, of the FBI and Communists; and the Nazis, too. . . it could only happen in the Silly Putty world of **Mother Night** where the only reality is unreality."

Vonnegut ends his novel, **Cat's Cradle** with the words: "If I were a younger man, I would write a history of human stupidity; and I would climb to the top of Mount McCabe and lie down on my back with my history for a pillow; and I would take from the ground some of the blue-white poison that makes statues of men; and I would make a statue of myself, lying on my back, grinning horribly, and thumbing my nose at You Know Who."

Modern music also reflects irrationality. The reason a lot that is called music sounds like noise is because it is noise. Such is not only true of much rock music and modern jazz, but classical music as well.

Francis Schaeffer speaks of Composer John Cage who began to compose his music through the tossing of coins. The result is "noise and confusion or total silence." In *The New Yorker* of Nov. 28, 1964, a Profile of John Cage appeared. The article says that Cage has followed in the tradition of such painters as the late Jackson Pollock in America and Georges Mathieu in France who "sought in the accidents of throwing or dripping paint a key to creation beyond the reach of the artist's conscious mind and will." In the realm of music, "Cage proposes an art, born of chance and indeterminacy." (As quoted by Schaeffer, **The God Who is There**, P. 72,73.)

As one might expect, existentialism has filtered down to the world of theology as well. The best known names in modern theology, Tillich, Barth, Bultmann, Buber, Niebuhr, Bonhoeffer, etc., are existentialists.

The logical end of "Christian existentialism" is "Christian atheism." This contradiction of terms we have witnessed in the "God is dead" theologians. Situation ethics is another necessary conclusion of the new theology, and this has been espoused by Bishop Robinson (Honest to God) and Joseph Fletcher, and

Searching The Scriptures

Volume 17

July, 1976

Number 7

Published Monthly at
BROOKS, KENTUCKY

Second Class Postage Paid at Brooks, Kentucky

CONNIE W. ADAMS, Editor

Office of Publication
52 Yearling Drive
Brooks, Kentucky 40109
Phone (502) 957-2257

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

\$6 per year in advance

Club rate:

\$5 per year for 4 or more

Bundles to one address:

15 for \$ 5.00

30 for \$10.00

Group subscriptions:

15 for \$ 5.00 per month

30 for \$10.00 per month

Address subscriptions and manuscripts to Connie W. Adams, P.O. Box 68, Brooks, Kentucky 40109.

Address supply orders to Religious Supply Center, Inc. P.O. Box 13164, Louisville, Kentucky 40213. Phone (502) 366-9014.

POSTMASTER: Send change of address forms to P.O. Box 68, Brooks, Kentucky 40109.

embraced by a great number.

The Christian's Reply

The story has been told of a new educational toy designed to prepare children for the world. Regardless of how you put it together, it's wrong! The story is supposed to be a joke, but it approaches too close to summing up modern philosophy to be very funny.

The world is not purposeless to the Christian. Existentialism is actually the logical end of atheism. If the universe is not the result of a rational mind, then all is irrational, for the rational must have a rational cause.

As Schaeffer expresses an application of this reasoning: "This little formula, 'If you have A it is not non-A', is the first move in classical logic. If you understand the extent to which this no longer holds sway, you will understand our present situation."

He goes on to describe what he calls a point of tension. Every "non-Christian" has a point beyond which he will not follow the logical conclusions of his non-Christian presuppositions. "The reason for this,"

says Schaeffer, "is simply that a man must live in reality, and reality consists of two parts: the external world and its form, and man's 'mannishness', including his own 'mannishness'."

According to William Barrett, man must choose in the face of absurdity to either "lead an enthusiastic and honorable existence" or lapse into despair. These alternatives are seen in two general groups of existentialists. The "hippy" type has lapsed into despair. He is interested only in "free love", drugs, and any other escape that presents itself. The "active" type opts for "courageous despair." He acknowledges the meaninglessness of existence, nevertheless he chooses to act as if there were some meaning.

But if all is chaos, why make a choice? The very effort is a contradiction to the presupposition. Duncan Williams writes: "Secular activists resemble players in a football game in which there are no rules, no referee, no time-limit and no spectators; for a time a certain physical exuberance will keep the participants occupied, but as their energy becomes sapped, so the purposelessness of the whole game will permeate their consciousness and one by one they will retire, leaving only the totally unintelligent and insensitive to continue the endless race.

". . . when faced with a cosmic inanity which reduces man to an 'impossible nullity', why attempt to reduce such chaos to a system? Why not lie back and scream or indulge in any other maniacal act which has presumably as much or as little significance as philosophical speculation or any other rational activity? Why write plays or short stories? Why not abandon oneself to suicide or an avowed, conscious hedonism? To attempt anything else while holding such views is simply compounding absurdity. . ." (Trousersed Apes, p. 64,65).

The Christian recognizes the truth of both realism and idealism. There is a real world with laws and consequences for violating those laws. There is also a subjective realm which is based on the mind's impressions of the external world. These cannot be separated. They must be harmonized. Our eyes look out, not in. Our ears are designed to hear sounds from without the mind. Our hands reach out, and our legs carry us from one place to another in the external world.

Science bears the marks of its Christian origin. Only where there is a belief that the world is rational and orderly can science grow and survive. It is foolish to seek order when one is sure there is only chaos and irrationality.

God has revealed Himself in the Person of Jesus. He has revealed His will in an objective way. We are told to read and know (Eph. 3:3-5).

One young man told me, "I think you church members are just looking for the big jump."

"Yes," I replied, "but what you call 'the big jump', is not an experience that only Christians are seeking. It's a basic desire of all mankind. In our discussion of the different shades of existentialism, we have made free use of the phrase 'upper story

experience.' What is this but a desire for 'the big jump'?"

"That's something to think about," he agreed.

Revelation describes the big jump in this manner: **"For I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed to us. For the anxious longing of the creature waits eagerly for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will, but because of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groans and suffers the pains of childbirth together until now"**(Romans 8:18-22 NASB).

One other thing I mentioned to my young friend. You have to get a foothold on something if you want to jump. Modern secular thought offers no ground for a foothold. The Christian has a foundation from which to hope and jump. He has a God who has revealed Himself and who gives assurance to those who will hear His voice.

ABORTION

The Personal Dilemma

by R. F. R. Gardner

Seldom has a more explosive issue burst upon a society than this one. Mr. Gardner is an English Minister and Consultant Obstetrician and Gynecologist, Sunderland Hospitals. He deals not only with the medical aspects which compel him to oppose abortion, but with the moral and ethical problems as well. Gospel preachers must come to grips with this issue. We believe Mr. Gardner's book will provide much help.

Price — \$5.95

Order from: **RELIGIOUS SUPPLY CENTER**
P.O. Box 13164
Louisville, Ky. 40213

The

Smith-Lovelady

Debate

This debate on divorce and re-marriage was held this past spring in Long Beach, California between J. T. Smith and Glen Lovelady. It was a representative debate on this live issue. *Searching the Scriptures* will publish the debate. We plan to print it in paper back. **Price will be \$2.95.** Advance orders will be accepted. These may be obtained from **Religious Supply Center** when the book is ready. We predict a good sale for this book.

Editorial

Connie W. Adams
P.O. Box 68
Brooks, Kentucky 40109



GOD'S MORAL STANDARD

When Jesus stood before the Roman governor, Pilate, he said "I came to bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice." Pilate then framed the question which cynics, relativists and situationists have always raised, perhaps with the same degree of scorn, when he asked "What is truth" (John 18:37-38)? In common with those of like doubt today, Pilate turned away without waiting for an answer. Indeed, many are convinced that there is no definitive standard by which truth can be ascertained and measured. It is our settled conviction that truth can be discovered and that all of life's choices can be measured by revealed truth.

What Is Truth?

John wrote that "the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. . ." and that he was "full of grace and truth" (John 1:14). In verse 17 he said "For the law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Jesus said "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John 14:6). Jesus was the revelation of Divinity to humanity. Since it is impossible for God to lie (Heb. 6:18) and since Jesus Christ possessed all the qualities of Deity while dwelling in the flesh, then no falsehood was to be found in him. All that he taught was truth. His actions were truth in motion. Peter said he left an example "that ye should follow his steps" (1 Peter 2:21). When Jesus told Pilate "everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice" he thereby made himself the standard by which truth is measured.

Jesus promised his apostles that when he went back to heaven, he would not leave them comfortless but would send "the Spirit of truth" to guide them into "all truth" (John 16:13). As Jesus prayed for the apostles he said "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:20). The great work of the Holy Spirit was to reveal "all truth." That does not leave out anything necessary to the spiritual and moral direction of humanity. When the Galatians turned aside to a perverted gospel Paul said they did not "obey the truth" (Gal. 3:1). Truth is what Jesus taught by word and example and what the Holy Spirit revealed to the apostles. That revelation was written and addressed to human understanding, intended to result in obedience of life (Eph. 3:3-4).

The Divine "Ought"

Paul wrote to Timothy to instruct him as to how he "ought" to conduct himself as a part of God's household (1 Timothy 3:15). The word "ought" suggests a moral imperative. It is what must be done if God is to be pleased.

The New Testament abounds with instructions designed to make the Christian aware of what God expects of him in the moral realm. We are challenged to present our bodies "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" and to "be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God" (Rom. 12:1-2). The works of the flesh are listed in Galatians 5:19-21 including sins involving sexuality, rejection of God, disposition, and closing with "murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." These things ought not to be practiced for it is stated that "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Joseph Fletcher and other advocates of situationism tell us that there are no fixed rules ahead of time and the act of fornication, and sometimes even murder, may be ethically right, depending on the situation. God's word, the standard of truth, says otherwise.

The Gentile world without the gospel was given over to lasciviousness because it was "past feeling" and had allowed its heart to be blinded. Then Paul said "But ye have not so learned Christ; If so be that ye heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus, That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:17-24).

There are some things we ought to do and some we ought not to do.

The Completeness of God's Standard

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:16-17). Notice that the scriptures are intended for "instruction in righteousness" and that we are completely equipped thereby. Peter said "his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue" (2 Peter 1:3). When theologians abandoned the inspired scriptures as the norm by which religious issues are to be settled, they also destroyed faith in what the scriptures say on moral issues.

The Standard of Judgment

Not only did God give us in scripture a perfect guide but we are told as well that we shall be called to judgment by that very standard. Jesus said "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48). "For we must all appear before the judgment

seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10). One of the most sobering passages in all the Bible is found in Revelation 20:12 when John said "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."

It is because of our conviction that the Bible is God's moral standard, that the writers of this special issue will refer again and again to what the Bible states. Morals are under fire in today's mixed up world, we believe largely because people have stopped studying and obeying what the Bible teaches. Even among Christians there are evidences of greater regard for the standards of this world than for God's moral standard. It is our prayer that this special effort will prove helpful in this time of moral crisis. We urge readers to make a special effort to see that their teenagers and college students read this issue of the paper. It would be a good thing if congregations would secure enough copies to see that every young person in attendance has a copy. We believe it will also be useful as a piece to hand to those you are trying to convert to Christ. Many of them may be greatly concerned about the declining morals in our nation and will appreciate this help. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the good men who have spent much time in research and in writing this material. May the Lord help us all to honor his moral standard.

THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Marshall E. Patton

806 Muriel Dr., S.E.
Huntsville, Ala. 35802



The title of this article identifies a significant contributory cause of today's immorality. This is true because the concept, claims, and actions of the movement itself undermines the home. Since the home is the foundation unit of society (Gen. 1:18-24), a subverting of it necessarily results in a corrupted society. The home is undermined when the character, relationship, and equally significant roles of the partners therein, namely, husband and wife—male and female—are distorted. The Women's Liberation Movement does just this.

Those who believe the Bible should remember that God is our creator, and that he ordained the home and authored the Bible. Furthermore, with infinite wisdom he designed each with a view to the very ultimate in joy, happiness, and fulfillment. The Bible, then, is the **instruction book** on how to attain all of this—the quest of men and women alike.

Man and woman were created equal in the sight of God, and with Him there is no such thing as the superiority of one over the other—so far as their worth either to Him or to one another is concerned (Gen. 2:23,24; Eph. 5:28-31; Gal. 3:28). However, he did create each with essential differences.

Contrary to the claim of the liberation movement, these differences are not produced by a difference in education, training, culture, or one's environment. These differences are basic. Man and woman differ anatomically, biochemically, and emotionally. God created them that way. This means that each has a different capacity for service. Furthermore, this difference enables each to serve with excellence in the different roles designed for his or her fulfillment. While these different roles involve one over the other in some relationships, such does not mitigate against their equality in worth, honor, and fulfillment in life. Each serves in his respective role with honor and distinction and is a complement to the other. "Women's Lib" makes competitors of the two.

Woman was created to be man's complement (Gen. 1:18; 1 Cor. 11:9). It takes woman to fill this role—there is no substitute! It takes woman in all of her glory to fill it. However, when done, there is no other role, however respected among men, that brings her greater fulfillment. For further reference on the basis differences cited above, I suggest Dr. James Dobson's book, **What Wives Wish Their Husbands Knew About Women**. He is a licensed psychologist in the State of California, associate Clinical Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Southern California

New for Teens

The Belly Button Brigade

By Mimi Tate

For girls' classes, lessons on modest apparel for women. \$.75



Let's Sit This One Out

By Mimi Tate

A classbook on the Christian teenager and the dance.

Teacher's Manual \$1.00
—Pupil \$.60



Is Your Family Turned On?

(Coping with the Drug Culture) Charlie W. Shedd
How you and your family can cope with drugs. Why do some people take drugs? To find the answers, ask those who don't. That's what Charlie Shedd did—he asked teenagers all over the country why drugs were not for them. The replies were fascinating—a positive gold-mine of practical everyday help for concerned parents. \$4.95

Order from RELIGIOUS SUPPLY CENTER

School of Medicine, and Director of Behavioral Research in the Division of Child Development, Children's Hospital of Los Angeles. Here is a quote from the book: "In truth, they are unique in every cell of their bodies, for men carry a different chromosomal pattern than women. There is also considerable evidence to indicate that the hypothalamic region, located just above the pituitary gland in the mid-brain, is 'wired' very uniquely for each of the sexes. Thus, the hypothalamus (known as the seat of the emotions) provides women with a different psychological frame of reference than that of man. Further, female sexual desire tends to be somewhat cyclical correlated with the menstrual calendar, whereas males are acyclical. These and other features account for the undeniable fact that masculine and feminine expressions of sexuality are far from identical. Failure to understand this uniqueness can produce a continual source of marital frustration and guilt. . . . Dr. Katherina Dalton, in *The Premenstrual Syndrome* (Springfield, Ill., 1964) summarizes many studies of behavior change that show a large portion of women's crimes (63% in an English study, 84% in a French) are not distributed evenly over time, but clustered in the premenstrual period along with suicides, accidents, a decline in the quality of school work, decline in intelligence test scores, visual acuity, and response speed. In the United States, she calculated that absenteeism related to menstruation costs about five billion dollars a year, but accidents, absenteeism, and domestic quarrels are only part of the social repercussions of symptoms that affect everyone. A book might be filled with discussion of other biological differences between the sexes, that are of great importance in one way or another, in everyday life, . . ." (pp 114, 131, 132).

These biological and other differences account for God's assigning them different roles in life. Hence, women are not to serve as elders and evangelists—they are not to be teachers of God's word so as to exercise authority over man (1 Tim. 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-11; 2:15; 1 Tim. 2:12; 1 Cor. 14:34,35). Man has been ordained to the position of headship in the home (Eph. 5:22-33; Col. 3:18-21). While they are not equal in all of life's relationships, they are equal in God's sight so far as their worth to God and to each other is concerned. Furthermore, each finds his greatest possible fulfillment in life as he serves in his respective role. It is not commensurate with woman's nature to serve best in fighting battles, commanding armies, controlling kingdoms, or in making laws. Her best is not to be found in braving the way and bearing the responsibilities of leadership. Man is best suited for this role. Woman's throne of glory is in the home.

Unfortunately, The Women's Liberation Movement equates this position with serfdom and talks loud about boredom and how unfulfilling such a role is. True, such involves doing the laundry, washing dishes, cleaning house, nursing babies, tending children, planning menus, shopping wisely, etc.

Properly viewed, however these are important responsibilities and are very rewarding. She shares equally with her husband (though doing different things) in providing a home atmosphere that is a haven of rest. Likewise, she shares equally in the growth and development of the children. Furthermore, she thereby becomes the object of the deepest respect among men, the recipient of the tenderest love known from all other members of the family. The deep satisfaction and gratifying results of such a role is clearly pictured in Prov. 31:10-31.

Man's role, too, may be viewed as routine, boring, and frustrating. He faces competition from nearly every viewpoint—among fellow workers, sales, contracts, and merchandise. He must pay "the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker"—bills, bills, and more bills. He must deal with and try to solve the problems of his company, listen to complaints of employees, supervisors, et al. But, again, when properly viewed, such a role is rewarding. When self is forgotten in service to others satisfaction fills the soul. Honor, esteem, and distinction become his crown. He is the recipient of appreciation from among his associates, and of the greatest possible measure of love from those who know him best. When both man and woman fill their God-ordained roles, they find bliss and fulfillment for both time and eternity.

This does not mean that there is no place, time, or circumstance that would justify a woman serving in public life. The pressure of circumstances, even tragedies, sometimes necessitate it. Furthermore, in our modern society there are some positions in public life that can best be filled by woman. This, however, is a far cry from opening the doors of every relationship in public life to men and women alike. Such is subversive of divine wisdom. When mothers forsake their God ordained role for that of the man, the consequent evils are manifold. The marital relationship is frustrated, children suffer psychologically, juvenile delinquents increase, and the problem of immorality is multiplied many times over. God's way is the only way for true happiness now and forever.

Those Impossible Years

By Bob Buchanon

Ideal study for high school class on topics of great interest and importance to them. Contains lessons on such subjects as:

Drinking	Petting
Dancing	Immodest Dress
Smoking	Profanity
Drugs	Obscene Literature

19 lessons 42 pages
\$1.50

Order from: **RELIGIOUS SUPPLY CENTER**
Ky. residents add 5% sales tax

IMMODESTY — INDECENT EXPOSURE

J. Wiley Adams

103 Ridgeland Drive
Warner Robins, Georgia 31093



Introduction. This writer remembers very well an incident back in the mid-thirties which shocked the rural neighborhood in Chesterfield County, Virginia where we lived. Though but a lad at the time, the memory is very clear until now. The incident involved two "wild girls" who "lived up the road". They delivered the newspaper for a week in the summer in the absence of the regular paper boy. The brakes squeaked on their bicycles as they pulled up to the back porch and my mother came out to get the paper. All those girls had on was a two-piece things called "shorts and halter"! My mother told them they needed to go home and get some clothes on. Later on Great-Grandma said they needed to "have the hide beat off them" and Grand-mammy declared they did not have enough on to "wad a shotgun". Truly they were all three correct.

But, this happened forty years ago and things have changed so drastically that it literally makes the head swim to think about it. Actually, those girls had on a great deal more than many are wearing today in public.

What Does God Want?

Let us address ourselves to the above question. What does God want? What is immodesty? The word itself is not in the Bible but its definition most certainly is. Modesty is its antithesis. The word modest is found in 1 Timothy 2:9 in connection with "apparel". It means "orderly, well-arranged, decent, modest". Vine says "the well-ordering is not of dress and demeanor only, but of the inner life, uttering indeed and expressing itself in the outward conversation." In the passage it is used with the word "adorn" which means "to arrange, to put in order." Its noun form, "adorning", denotes "a harmonious arrangement or order" thus showing a strong affinity between the words "modest" and "adornment or adorning." A third consideration is the word "apparel" in the some text which means "clothing". Therefore, the text is saying that women should order or arrange themselves in decent clothing or attire. It is obvious from the context that this ordering is primarily an "inner arranging" of the heart in that which is seemly as is also true in 1 Peter 3:3,4 where the emphasis is that of the proper adorning of "the hidden man of the heart." In the one case, the apparel is "shamefacedness and sobriety" and "good works" while in the other it is "a meek and quiet spirit."

What Is The Connection?

Some may wonder what this has to do with outward clothing and appearance. In both 1 Timothy 2:9,10 and 1 Peter 3:3-5 the emphasis is on the inner person, the heart. But the allusion is clearly made from the **outer man**. As the outer man is to be well-ordered, decent, modest in behaviour and dress, so let the inner man have on appropriate, well-ordered and modest dress, clothing or apparel of the heart. It is certain that th3 comparison would be meaningless if the inner man must be modest in his heart but not in outward conduct and appearance. It is also clear that the heart must be modest first and this will be reflected in the conduct and clothing of the outer man. Inappropriate conduct or dress is a clear sign that there is nakedness of the heart which needs immediate attention.

Sin, Shame and Clothing

From Gen: 3:7-21 it is evident that the introduction of sin caused an awareness of nakedness and a resultant shame, thus creating a natural desire to cover up or to be clothed. At first man improvised with aprons of fig leaves and God later gave them more substantial clothing of skins. From this time forth God has intended for mankind to cover up his physical nakedness with adequate and appropriate clothing or apparel.

In Genesis 9 we can learn that it was shameful for Noah to be publicly exposed and equally shameful for his son, Ham, to look upon the nakedness of his father. Compare this, if you will, to the practice of some fathers who bath in the nude with their sons and some mothers and daughters who do likewise. Is this in harmony with Biblical principles of modesty?

In Luke 8:27 a man "which had devils long time, and ware no clothes" later, after having the devils removed, "was sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind." Those who want to run around publicly naked (streakers) or nearly so (the majority) need to think about this.

The Laodiceans were spiritually "naked" and the Lord told them to put on spiritual garments (white raiment) "that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear" (Rev. 3:18). Again the spiritual application would mean nothing unless physical nakedness was also a shame. Add to this the spiritual lesson of Revelation 16:15, "Behold, I come as a thief, Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." God does not intend for us to be indecently exposed whether spiritually or physically.

Temptation and Lust

Jesus teaches that it is a sin for a man to lust after a woman in his heart (Matt. 5:28). In this he has already committed adultery with her in his heart. David so lusted after Bathsheba. Although God expects a man to control himself, he expects a woman to not display herself in immodest, provocative, and seductive attire so as to invite the lustful look. Of course, it is also possible for a woman to lust after a

man as she might flaunt himself in such a manner and dress so as to invite the fantasy of a woman toward him in base desire. Many who would not do such things otherwise seem to think that the sports arena changes everything. Brethren, whether it is basketball, volley ball, or tennis, boys and girls should observe the proprieties of modest dress. There has been a let-down in this type of thing. It needs to be stopped. (Yes, even some of you preachers, elders, deacons and families.)

Why So Much Immodesty?

In today's setting of an utter lack of shame it is not surprising that some seemingly do not realize or care in this regard. We have been flooded with the philosophy of situation ethics, free love, the new morality (?), the breakdown of the home, evolution, the "do your own thing" craze, etc. etc. Add to this the mass media such as TV with its attendant risqué approach to everything (whether programming or commercials), the sex-oriented movies and books, pornography, and it is not surprising that men and women of today not only do not care if the others see their nakedness but in fact it is obvious that many actually want you to see it and are disappointed if you do not notice. This writer is convinced that immodest apparel is wrong for both men and women.

Is It Relative?

Some say that decent or indecent exposure is largely determined by the times and circumstances. Does this sound like situation ethics a little bit? My friends, modesty and decency is not and can never be predicated on such a flimsy platform. It is true that some garments are more appropriate to one occasion than another such as a wedding garment or the casual attire for the picnic or lounging garments in the home. Surely we would agree that a housecoat that reached to the floor would not be appropriate attire to go to the grocery store but would be proper around the house. This is not to say that we may ever abandon principles of decency and modesty wherever we are. Nakedness is only appropriate in the marriage bed and the shower. Never is it in order to be naked or nearly so in public.

What About Custom?

Some say that concepts change therefore modesty and immodesty must be considered in view of this. May we candidly say that any concept that changes so as to violate God's regulations governing decency and modesty is the wrong concept and should be abandoned. Lest some think that we are hinging immodesty only on going stark naked or nearly so altogether, let us clarify. A person, man or woman, may also be immodest by the design or cut of a garment which has ample material. Filmy, transparent material that you can see through does not cover nakedness though it may contain yards and yards of fabric. Whenever any garment is so constructed, though the amount of cloth is adequate, that the organs of the body that pertain to one's nakedness are actually brought more into emphasis, that garment is both indecent and immodest.

Immodesty Among Church Members

The problem of immodesty is bad enough among worldly people but, brethren, it is a very real problem among church members. Add to this the milk-sop attitudes of some elders, deacons and not a few preachers and their families and you have some mighty poor examples for the brethren to follow. Mini-skirts, shorts (shorts, short shorts, hot-pants), bikinis or the non-bikini, mixed swimming, the so-called backyard pool that is supposed to be private (who can believe it), are commonplace among some so-called Christians who "see no harm in it" and think those who oppose it are loco. Even now we see some who have sowed this wind and are reaping the whirlwind. There are some mothers and fathers who themselves would not engage in these things but their convictions are not sufficiently strong to insist that their children observe proper modesty. They let their children run around and dress as they please and become offended if someone rebukes them for this. God will hold them responsible for such.

Conclusion

It is not only time, but it is high time, that Christians set the standard for the world instead of the world setting it for the church. We need to be **transformed** and not **conformed** (Romans 12:1,2). We resemble the world entirely too much (any is too much). We need to clean up our minds as a forerunner to cleaning up our behaviour, not the least of which is to clothe ourselves adequately, discreetly, and with all due reverence for what God would have us do. Let Christians not be guilty of indecent exposure!

Home Bible Lessons
By Gene Frost

Five lessons designed for personal work: Attitudes toward authority (Law and Lawlessness); the Bible as the word of God; old and new testaments; the gospel of salvation: the New Testament church. Two flip-page books of charts and Scriptures (ARV). (Page format designed for overhead projection transparencies.)

Plastic spiral binding \$5.00

Sanctity of Marriage
By Gene Frost

Outline of a lecture series. Topics: Morality in an Immoral World, Marriage, Divorce, Circumventing God's Will, The Adulteration Theory. Eighteen charts. Thirty pages, 6X9.

Paper cover \$.50
Ten or more \$.35

Order from: RELIGIOUS SUPPLY CENTER

DRINKING AND DRUGS

H. E. Phillips

P. O. Box 17244
Tampa, Florida 33612



I have been assigned the subject: DRINKING AND DRUGS. I gratefully approach this subject with a firm conviction of what I say and shall write to be understood. I am not concerned about pleasing the brethren; I am concerned about speaking the truth and pleasing Almighty God.

I have found that no set of statistics is really complete and up to date. There is a constant increase in the figures of alcohol and drug use and a greater variety of destruction. Psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, social workers, educators, and Mr. John Q. Public all try to excuse the growing abuse of all drugs by calling it "an illness" or "disease." I suppose in a broad sense that is so. But so is the sex pervert, the thief, the rebel, the foul mouthed slanderer, and many other criminals. To call it an illness does not eliminate the fact that alcoholism and other drug addiction are SIN! Those guilty of this abuse of their bodies and minds will go to hell if they do not repent and quit their sinful practice!

Some years ago I stood before a group of young people and held in my hand a beautiful, fresh, red rose, with its delicate petals glowing in graceful slender. I called attention to these attractive qualities that it possessed as it came from God. I then took an eye-dropper and put one drop of acid on one petal. It immediately began to curl and twist as if in extreme pain. After a few more drops of acid this once beautiful rose was now a putrid mess of ugly, wrinkled ashes. I was illustrating the effects of alcohol and other drugs upon the human body, and especially upon the beauty of youth. The power of the illustration was observed upon the faces of each one of them as they beheld the death of this beautiful creation of God by the acid put upon it.

All statistics and authorities report that America's No. 1 problem today is the alcohol and drug abuse. This is the life of shame. The reasons why people drink alcohol, "pop pills," "smoke pot," "get a fix," or "take a trip" may vary, but the end result is always the same: shame, disease, prison, and death. Youth may begin this life of shame for the excitement of a new experience, or to dull the conscience while engaging in other immoral and illegal acts. It could be the influence of their peers, or rebellion against parents, the establishment, school, or just simply an effort to escape the reality of a hypocritical, affluent and materialistic society. Among some the reasons may be to hide shame and failure, to avoid responsibility, to escape loneliness and insecurity, and simply to avoid facing themselves as they are. Whatever the

reason, the end result is a shameful life and an untimely death without hope in eternity.

Alcohol, and Drugs — Why?

The efforts to stop the flow of hard drugs into this country by organized crime are a failure, in spite of the ever enlarging police force and the billions of dollars spent annually to stop it. The absurd philosophy expressed in the local, state and national legislative bodies in overwhelmingly passing laws to legalize alcoholic beverages and some other drugs is seen in the same legislative sessions passing bills that allocate billions of dollars of tax payers money to stop drug addiction among children as well as other offenders. In addition, they build larger prisons to keep those who turn to crime in order to feed the habit.

Sex, pornography, rape, armed robbery, murder and drugs of all kinds, including alcohol, go together. It is almost axiomatic that if we could stop the alcohol habit, we could stop all the rest. I say that because the social drink leads to drunkenness, which leads to various crimes drunkards commit because they are drunk! Social drinking leads to alcoholism, which finally leads to other drugs. The hard drug addict will commit any crime without compunction of conscience to pay for the habit, and it gets to the point that it takes large amounts daily to supply them. It must come by theft, murder, prostitution, gambling, organized crime, etc., because these drug addicts are non-productive.

But how does all this get started? It is probable that the fast changing life-style of the day has a great influence upon drug habits. It all can begin so innocently: with both parents working in the mad race to "have and to hold" what wealth they can get, their children are untaught and exposed to any number of avenues to alcohol and drug addiction. The parents who want a "little drink" to relax the tensions after a hard day's work, soon find themselves alcoholics and their children following in their steps, and to go on to more serious involvement with drugs. Television is constantly advertising dope in one form or another as the happy and successful way of life. It makes no difference what kind of movie you see, at theaters or on TV, somebody is always drinking to something! A baby is born and all in the family will pour a glass of whiskey or "champagne" and drink to the baby. Some tramp is shot to death, and everyone gets a glass and drinks to celebrate the good riddance. A young couple gets married and everyone "drinks a toast" to their happiness. Usually most will keep on "toasting" until they are unconscious. Foreign dignitaries come to some political agreement and the newspapers, magazines and TV will show the heads of state "sealing" the agreement with a "round of toasts" until some are pretty far out from reality.

It is important to be "accepted" by those of the "in" crowd. Many young men and women become drug addicts because they do not want to be ridiculed by their peers, and do not want to become unpopular with others of their age group. Most people are "followers" and they fear rejection by society. This is

true in business, school, sports, family, and society in general. It is true in the church. It may seem to these "rejected" people that some form of drug, usually beginning with alcohol, will give them the courage to dispel that fear of rejection.

Self escape from reality, family fusses, financial problems, and even the fear of aging or some other problem leads many to take their first drink of alcohol and then on to the stronger means of escaping reality. Indulgence in all forms of immoral and illegal practices may follow this numbness of consciousness.

The Problem of Alcohol

The Bible plainly condemns the use of alcohol and drugs for intoxication. Many "social drinking" brethren will cry that the statement is not so, but there is not one instance in the New Testament where the Holy Spirit authorized the use of alcohol in any form for the purpose of intoxication to any degree. Contrariwise, the Bible condemns drunkenness as a work of the flesh and those guilty cannot enter heaven (Gal. 5:19-21; 1 Cor. 5:11; 6:9,10; Rom. 13:13).

The repulsive picture of the facts about alcohol and other drugs is nothing when compared to the sin-sick condition of a hopeless nation and the billions who will go to hell because of the deception and addiction of those who left the truth or never knew it, all because of alcohol and other drugs.

The Mental Danger of Addiction

The Bible condemns drug abuse by the word "Sorcery" (Witchcraft, KJV) in such passages as Galatians 5:20; Revelation 9:21; 18:23; 21:8; 22:15. The Greek term is **pharmakia**, from which we get the English "pharmacy." W. E. Vine says "sorcery" primarily signifies the use of medicine, drugs, spells; then, poisoning; then, sorcery, Gal. 5:20. This is classified as a work of the flesh. The word signifies the use of drugs, generally accompanied by incantations and appeals to occult powers, and the purpose was to take away one's power over his own mind, will and judgment. Drugs are usually taken with a view to alter the mind, emotions, will and judgment. While one is drunk he is not responsible for his language and conduct, but he is responsible and accountable to God and man for GETTING drunk. He could avoid that. But once he is under the influence of alcohol or any other drug, he does not have control of his own mind, thinking, reasoning and judgment. This is sinful and wrong.

"Sober" or "Sober-minded" is the very opposite of mind affecting drugs or influences. The original word denotes "of sound mind" which is self-control. It signifies "to be free from the influences of intoxicants," and "denotes to cause to be of sound mind, to recall to one's senses" (W. E. Vine). (1 Tim. 3:2; 2 Tim. 4:5; Titus 1:8; 2:4).

Some Frightening Statistics on Alcoholism

America is literally committing suicide. The liquor and drug problem is costing this nation an unbelievable figure in terms of money, loss of work hours, mental and physical health problems that will

go on to future generations, and mounting crime that has reached such proportions that no police force can keep it down. No citizen is safe anymore, day or night. If this trend keeps on this civilization will pass away in this generation unless by some means our younger people can realize just how dangerous this menace is to them and their children.

Almost any set of figures on drug abuse will be out of date by the time it is quoted. However, by comparison of several reliable sources and surveys I can give some idea of the terrible state of moral decay and corruption that is in epidemic proportions in this nation and throughout the world.

In **Alcohol & Health** Notes, Rockville, Maryland, September, 1973, a survey of drinking problems of the Army and Navy were compared. An article on the front page contained these statements:

"Alcohol-related absences from duty cost the Army an estimated 2,200 man-years with \$17 million in pay and allowances in fiscal 1973, says Dr. Richard S. Wilbur, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment.

"Furthermore, Dr. Wilbur says, a substantial amount of Army duty time in fiscal '73 was affected by reduced efficiency caused by drinking."

In a survey of 5,579 enlisted men in the Army and 895 enlisted men in the Navy the following was reported by Dr. Wilbur:

Army	Navy		
Problem Drinkers		39%	39%
Heavy or Binge Drinkers		31%	22%
Drinkers, Potential Problems		19%	16%
Drinkers, No Problems		8%	20%
NON-DRINKERS		3%	3%

Notice that only 3 men out of every 100 in both the Army and Navy do not consume alcohol. This is the condition of the defense force of our nation! But note that in the Army 89 out of every 100 men are impaired by drinking, and in the Navy 77 men out of each 100 are impaired by drinking! And some "pious" brother or sister will cry, "There is nothing wrong with social drinking; the Bible does not condemn it." Nearly all these in the Armed Forces started with a "little social drink" somewhere with the belief that it will do no harm and there is no wrong in it.

Some data collected from the National Council on Alcoholism, Inc. is:

Alcohol is a mood-changing drug, as are marijuana, heroin, cocaine, barbiturates and amphetamines.

57.4% of all car accidents involve alcohol.

50% of all fatal car accidents involve alcohol.

The FBI reports that every third arrest in the USA involves public drunkenness.

More than 95% of short-term prisoners serve time in jail because of alcoholism.

The ratio of alcoholics to non alcoholics committing suicide in the USA is 58 to 1.

Among Federal civil employees the estimated annual cost for alcoholism in the Federal Government runs between \$275 million and \$550 million. Savings from alcoholism programs in the Federal Government could run from \$135 million to \$280 million a year.

The National Council On Alcoholism, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. published a tract in 1974 called "The Alcoholic" in which some vital information is given. The definition of an alcoholic: "He's one of the dozen men or women you'll see taking a drink at your next party or in your local bar. . .one of the 9 million alcoholics among our nation's drinkers.

This tract says that the majority of Americans drink alcohol, but the alcoholic is an addict to the drug alcohol. Now when I speak of an alcoholic I am speaking of about one tenth of the alcohol consumers in the nation. With that in mind, hear another statement from "The Alcoholic":

"On his job, one of 4 million alcoholic workers, he costs at least 10 billion dollars annually in absenteeism, sick leave, wasted time and material, and accidents. If an executive, he costs an incalculable sum in time spent recovering from last night's hangover, sleeping off today's martini lunch, making wrong decisions that may involve millions of dollars."

The tract continues: "No. 3: Where does he suffer? "Alcoholism destroys his health. Physically he becomes more susceptible to infections, anemia, disease of the liver, heart, brain and other organs and to cancer, particularly of the liver and throat. He may need permanent institutionalization because of brain damage; 40 percent of all male admissions to state mental hospitals suffer from alcoholism.

"Alcoholism disrupts his home; it accounts, directly or indirectly, for 40 percent of the problems brought to family court. The alcoholic's failure as a parent makes it hard, often impossible, for his children to develop the trust and confidence in themselves and others which they need for successful living. Between 30 and 40 percent of delinquent youths come from alcoholic homes."

"When does he know what hit him? He usually doesn't. Most commonly, he progresses into alcoholism after 5 or 10 years of social drinking, with no immediate, dramatic change to dispel his illusion that he drinks like everyone else."

But most people today insist that there is nothing wrong with "social drinking." The problem of Alcoholism, the No. 1 drug problem of the nation, begins with the "social drinker." If there were no social drinking, there would be no ALCOHOLISM!

Drinking drivers and pedestrians cause more than 25,000 traffic deaths and 800,000 crashes in the United States each year. One tenth of the nation's drivers, men and women, are alcoholics. 24% of alcoholic deaths are violent: by fire, poisoning, suicide, accidents, and falls.

The Fruits of Alcoholism and Drug Addition

It is hard to find the most effective demonstration to impress the horrible consequences of drug addiction in any degree. From a number of sources the following information was gleaned. The figure is probably higher now because some of it was published two or three years ago. But just think about these consequences of the drug problem:

1. There are more than 2 million girls and more boys who have venereal disease, and most of it

connected with drugs in some way.

2. Nearly five times as much tax money is spent on alcohol and other drugs as on education.

3. All forms of crime have risen sharply in the United States in the past ten years as the result of the drug problem.

4. From 1.5 to 2 million illegitimate children were born annually, until the Infant Murder Law (abortion) was passed and upheld by the High Court of the land.

5. There are many children between ages 7 through 17 who are addicts on hard drugs, and are hardened criminals whose usefulness to society will be nothing and who will likely die some miserable death before reaching age 36.

6. Alcoholism is responsible for more homes breaking up and more neglected and abused children than any other single thing.

7. More deaths from alcohol than from war. ABC's Of Drinking & Driving, published by Channing L. Bete Co., Inc., Greenfield, Mass., 1971, stated the problem this way:

"Drunken Drivers kill 6 times as many as Vietnam War. Fact: In the 10* years of the Vietnam War, 45,000 U.S. Soldiers have been killed by the enemy. In this same 10* years, 274,000 U.S. Citizens died in crashes involving alcohol. * 1961-71

8. There are 112 million drivers and 100 million drinkers: results — about +55,000 deaths in U.S. highway accidents EACH YEAR, (as per National Safety Council).

9. I saw and heard the following warning presented by the president's Committee On Mental Health, on NBC Television on May 5, 1976. The warning stated that two ounces of alcohol or ten cigarettes per day is the danger zone that threatens your child's mental health. Millions of babies are born each year with painful problems of withdrawal from tobacco or alcohol because of the indulgence of the mothers before the birth of the children.

When one takes drugs to "blow my mind" he will do just that. I recall the many newspaper reports of students of various ages jumping out of windows to fly like a bird and falling to their death several stories below. One poured gasoline over himself and set himself on fire and burned to death. Many young men and women are in mental hospitals incurably deranged from various drugs, including alcohol. One cut himself to death with a knife. It is a daily routine for rescue and paramedic squads in fire departments across the country to answer from one to twenty OD's (over dose) and many of them die without regaining consciousness.

10. Alcoholism will ruin the life and influence of a man in a split second. A classic example is the traffic accident involving M. Norvel Young while he was drunk. From the Los Angeles Times, Wednesday, September 17, 1975 there appeared the headlines:

"Pepperdine's Chancellor Held in Fatal Crash" by Grahame L. Jones, Times Staff Writer. The sad story begins:

"Pepperdine University Chancellor M. Norvel

Young was jailed on suspicion of manslaughter and felony drunk driving after being involved in a traffic accident in which one woman was killed and two others were critically injured, the California Highway Patrol reported."

On page 7 of the March, 1976 issue of **Contending For The Faith**, Ira Y. Rice publishes the account of Young's activities that dreadful day in September when he caused the death of two elderly ladies and another to be crippled for life, as reported in the **Los Angeles Times**, Wednesday, January 28, 1976, by John Kendall, Times Staff Writer. On page 24 Young is reported to have said, speaking of his conflict between his work at Pepperdine and his desire to please the brethren:

"This profound conflict between my head and my heart has gnawed away at my very sense of self worth. By the evening of September 15, I was in the most deeply depressed state of my entire life."

"Then, Young wrote, he went out and did something 'out of character.' He bought a fifth of vodka, drank about two-thirds on the evening of the 15th and finished it off the next morning before noon.

"Young, 60, left his Malibu home at about 11:30 a.m. or 11:40 a. m., after taking a Librium capsule, he said, and about seven miles down the coast he ran into a car driven by Mrs. Fritsche."

"On Sunday, Dec. 14, Young's confession to members of his church was read at a Sunday meeting in Malibu. . ."

"I come before you in a spirit of contrite confession of sin. . .I must live with the awful realization that my grief cannot bring back a human life or erase the injury to so many. **I confess to you that my use of alcohol was involved in this accident.** (Emp. mine-HEP) To say that I am profoundly sorry is such a feeble and inadequate expression of my stricken conscience. . ."

"I want to go further in explanation, but not to make any excuse. There can be no excuse. For 50 years I abstained from alcohol and taught against its use. As President of Pepperdine, I attended thousands of functions where it was served, but did not partake. In a mistaken attempt to relieve stress, I began to use alcohol occasionally. . ."

As the consequence of Norvel Young's intoxication, two women are dead and one crippled for life, and Young was sentenced to four years probation and one year in jail, which was suspended conditionally, and fined \$2,000.00. He is ordered by the court to take a leave of absence from Pepperdine and devote full time to research and lecturing in a drinking driver project at USC's safety center. He was ordered not to drink any alcoholic beverage for four years, and he cannot drive any car for the four year period of probation.

He has lost self-respect and must suffer the painful shame and disgrace of the entire nation. Not only did he lose what he had, but he lost what he could be as in the past. On September 20th, four days following the accident, Norvel Young was to have presented a Pepperdine honorary degree to President Gerald Ford. Alcohol destroyed all that and ruined his public life forever.

Now tell me one, just ONE good thing that comes from the drinking of alcoholic beverages or the consumption of any drug except for medical use prescribed by a physician. Drunkenness and drug addiction is spiritually, mentally, physically and socially fatal. It will destroy this life and all hope of the life to come. Now is the time to completely abstain.

THE SIN OF DANCING

Julian R. Snell
4724 E. Manslick Road
Louisville, KY 40219



Dancing finds expression in two basic types. There is the type which requires close body contact and sometimes the entwining of the legs of the partners as expressed in the waltz and such. Then there is the more modern expression which places the partners apart and engages each in the body movements which to him or her interprets the music. This type has been identified by names which change as often as the season but it has one thing common to each, suggestive body movement. Most if not all of our readers understand the activity but we differentiate between the two types because one has its effect primarily through touch and the other through sight.

Before an indictment can logically be lodged against dancing we must establish what threatens spirituality and jeopardizes one's faith. An objective consideration of any threat to spirituality and the purity of mind and life which such demands, must begin by establishing the basis of the threat. The apostle John wrote, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world, And the world passeth away and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever" (1 Jn. 2: 15-17). Dancing as broadly defined in the above paragraph labors under the three count indictment of this passage. It has its appeal to the fleshly nature of man through what he sees and what he touches and is touched by. For a large number the third avenue of appeal cannot be discounted, "pride of life," as we equate this to the need for being accepted by one's peer group and being identified as one of the crowd.

While older and mature Christians are not immune to the threat posed by the dancing pleasure, youth is particularly vulnerable. The vulnerability lies in their susceptibility to temptation. Temptation is not the problem however, succumbing to it and the resultant sin is. "Let no man say when he is

tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished bringeth forth death" (Jas. 1: 13-15). When one engages in those things which appeal to his sensual nature he jeopardizes the spiritual. Wisdom, real love for the Lord and the things of the spirit demand refraining from all such.

Why does dancing pose such a threat to spirituality? It caters to the lust of the flesh in that it stirs the partner or partners to unholy thinking if not actions. In the first avenue of appeal attributed to Satan, noted from John, "lust of the flesh," dancing must be indicted. The contact of bodies in the close embrace and rhythmic movement stirred by the soft music generates a desire, maybe only an elementary one in some, for sexual gratification. The desire itself may suffice for the moment (just to be stimulated may for some be enough) but for other than husband and wife this is sin. Lest one jump to the conclusion that it is right for husband and wife to engage in public dancing, I hasten to negate. The power of example and influence upon others would certainly be sufficient deterrent to this.

Dancing, the loose jointed, no bodily contact type now, caters to the "lust of the eye." In the line of Flip Wilson's "Geraldine," "what you see is what you get," is something of the effect from such modern dances as the "bump," "shrug," and what have you. The suggestive body movements, the lewd gyrations to the rhythm of "rock" music, which sometimes by the lyrics leaves nothing to the imagination, presents a picture only the most naive or blind could ignore. In such an expression the animal nature is obviously in control and any thought of the spirit and the spiritual is cast to the wind.

Dancing must also be considered in relation to the third avenue of appeal noted by John, "the pride of life." Some are willing to cast caution and better judgment out in order to be accepted by their peers. "Everybody does it" has become a "security blanket" for the justification of anything many want to do. "Proms" and "school dances" are the "in" thing and to keep from being anything but "cool" one must go. Pride becomes a greater goal, acceptance by friends a more important consideration than relation to Christ.

Dancing has a proven destructive effect upon spirituality and reverence. Observation has established that it is next to impossible to maintain a strong spiritual attitude and engage in worldly pursuits and activities. There is a deadening of spirituality, a dimming of the brightness of faith and an indulgent attitude toward all things of the same general class which invariably develops within the individual who flirts with and engages in the things of this world. Dancing is a case in point. Invariably, members of the church who dance and condone activities of this class are weak and indifferent in matters of faith and spirituality. Young people who are caught up in such activities generally manifest a disinterested, if not an insubordinate, attitude to

worship. Someone has aptly expressed the inconsistency between spirituality and sensuality as evidenced in dancing like this, "a dancing foot and a praying knee are not found on the same leg." Quite possibly the explanation is in the truth of Jesus' statement, "No man can serve two masters: for he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (Mt. 6:24).

In the cataloging of the "works of the flesh" in Galatians 5: 19-21 Paul lists two things which are expressed in dancing, "lasciviousness" and "revellings." The dictionary defines "lasciviousness" as "lewd, lustful, that which is tending to produce lewd emotions." In the New Testament usage of the term we have this idea according to Thayer's Greek Lexicon, page 80. "Unbridled lust, excess, licentiousness, lasciviousness, wantonness, outrageousness, shamelessness, insolence. . . Wanton (acts or) manners, as filthy words, indecent bodily movements, unchaste handling of males and females." "Reveling" is defined as "a spectacular dance." Liddell and Scott, eminent Greek scholars translate the original word for reveling, "dancing."

Does dancing fall within the scope and meaning of these two things? Quotations from some who have engaged professionally and socially in the practice seem to leave no doubt and, if there is any, a passing glance at the programs on television which propagate this sort of thing should remove it. One renowned champion dancer and originator of many noted society dances says, "I will say that I do not believe a woman can waltz virtuously and waltz well, for she must yield her person completely to her partner." Another says, "The modern dance is the fine art of covering with music, indelicate, immodest and oft times indecent attitudes and postures between men and women. It is too bad for reformation. Its remedy is extermination." Another describes it as a "wrestling match with no holds barred." Remember the words of Paul in Galatians Chapter 5? "They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

Jesus laid down a principle which, though not primarily applicable to dancing, has some bearing. "Every tree is known by its fruit" (Lk. 6:44). There is no good fruit from engaging in dancing, it is all bad. Spirituality is not cultivated in this activity, only sensuality. Purity of heart and life is not the result, only temptation, the stirring of unlawful desire and a lusting of the flesh. It results in a blending of the Christian with the world which can only produce, at best, a worldly Christian of lukewarm love and faith who will ultimately be "spewed" out by the Lord.

I, as a Christian, a parent, do not want my children engaging in this expression of worldliness and as long as they are under my control and scrutiny will not tolerate it. Being responsible for their instruction and development spiritually in their formative years the responsibility weighs heavily upon every parent to properly enlighten and explain in these areas. May God help us to realize that between the Christian and the world there is a great

gulf. The dance belongs to the world, the Christian to Christ. This means that when and if one dances, you do so not as a Christian but as one who has turned his back upon Christ. May God help us all to maintain the high level of spirituality that sets us above and apart from the world.

THE SIN OF PREMARITAL SEX

Earl Kimbrough

2212 Malibu Dr.
Brandon, Florida 33511



The strong sexual desire that is part of every normal person is not sinful in origin or presence. It is rather a natural instinct bestowed upon mankind by the Creator for the good of the human race. Marriage was divinely ordained to provide the intimate relationship between a man and a woman wherein sexual desire may be properly gratified and may fully accomplish its intended purpose. Therefore, marriage is to be held in honor among all people and the marriage bed kept free of defilement (Heb. 13:4).

The Practice of Premarital Sex

When man "changed the truth of God for a lie," it was inevitable that marriage would be degraded and sexual desire subjected to corruption. Wicked hearts invented every conceivable form of sexual abuse. The sexual instinct that was meant to be a binding force blending two lives into a beautiful, complete, and happy union thus became an instrument for evil. Sex ceased to be man's servant and became his master. It has remained so wherever Satan controls the hearts of men.

Premarital sex is but one form of unchaste behavior, but it is one that has always found popular approval with the young people of the world. Its increasing prevalence today is due to the permissiveness of society toward sexual freedom in general. Those who advocate and defend premarital sex fall into two camps. First, there are those who hold that intercourse prior to marriage is right under certain conditions, as when a stable relationship with a strong affection, or an intent to marry, is present. Second, there are those who claim that premarital intercourse is right regardless of the circumstances, providing there is physical attraction and mutual consent. The first view is more dangerous because it seeks to justify the act with the conscience and to give it a cloak of respectability.

Young people are told there is no fixed standard of morality. They repeatedly hear it said that what really counts is "the law of love." "Love determines the course of action in any given situation." If a young couple has a strong affection, what is the "loving" thing to do? That is the only standard.

Aside from this being wrong on its basic premise, what it really boils down to is that each person makes his own subjective decision as to what he is to do in any situation. Most young people in a romantic situation where sexual desire is straining at the leash could hardly distinguish between intent to marry in December and aroused passion in July.

Premarital Sex Is Fornication

Premarital intercourse is wrong regardless of the circumstances. Paul says: "Nevertheless, to **avoid fornication**, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband" (1 Cor. 7:2). This necessarily places all sexual relations outside of marriage under the heading of "fornication." The only way one may engage in sexual intercourse without sin is to be married and confine his sexual relations to his companion. It doesn't matter how deeply a couple may be in love, nor how firm their resolve to marry, if they cohabit outside of marriage it is sin.

It is a serious mistake, therefore, to suppose there is no harm in premarital sex. It certainly harms one's fellowship with God. Fornication is a work of the flesh that will keep the guilty from inheriting the kingdom of God (Gal. 5:19-21). Many in Sodom and Gomorrah may have been convinced there was no harm in fornication, but they suffered "the vengeance of eternal fire" because they were "giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh" (Jude 7).

Yet, many young people who know that premarital sex is wrong go ahead and practice it anyway. Some of these don't care that it is wrong, but others are self-deceived. They think their case is exceptional and God will not hold them accountable for the sin. They forget that there is no respect of persons with God. Or they rationalize their sin by telling themselves that there will be time to repent later. There may be, but they have no promise of it (Jas. 4:19). This is a dangerous attitude. One who seeks to justify sin on the premise that he may sin now and pray for forgiveness later manifests a condition of heart that could very well make genuine repentance impossible (Heb. 3:12).

Other Harm in Premarital Sex

In addition to the spiritual harm caused by premarital sex, there are other harmful consequences involved. There is the danger of pregnancy which may bring open shame upon the innocent child, godly parents, the church, and the guilty parties themselves. There is the possibility of a "forced" marriage which according to statistics has little chance of success. Venereal disease is also a distinct possibility. But there is another harmful effect that may not be immediately apparent. This is the loss of self-respect that frequently follows the sinful act. This may be present even if there is no pregnancy, forced marriage, or venereal disease, and nobody finds out about it. The individual knows what he has done and he knows it is wrong. It is this knowledge that often produces the keen sense of shame that results in a

loss of self-respect. This can be so severe as to interfere with one's future happiness in marriage. "Indeed, near the top of the list of the costs of unchastity is a very much lowered self-esteem—yet the power to love another rests upon the ability to respect oneself," (Dr. Evelyn Duvall, quoted in **Reader's Digest**, January, 1968, p. 84).

Depth studies, such as one made by the late Prof. Lewis M. Terman, of Stanford University, have concluded that "of those men and women who have had premarital sexual intercourse, the more promiscuous they have been premaritally, the less likely they are to be happily married" (Ibid.). Dean Ernest Gordon, of Princeton University Chapel, says: "From my experience, I am forced to conclude that chastity and marriage are twins," (Ibid.). Addison H. Leitch, writing on the "new morality," observes that: "The laws of God are the directions of the package of life. We may mix up the ingredients any way we want, but what comes out will not be what is pictured on the package" (**Christianity Today**, September 2, 1966, p. 58).

The Course for the Christian

Paul dealt with problems of sexual origin in writing to the church at Corinth. The saints in that city were surrounded by a sexually debased society, but the apostle made no compromise with popular practices. Nowhere does he refer normatively to premarital loss of virginity. His solution for those in love who "can't wait" is simple. He said "let them marry" (1 Cor. 7:5). Marriage is the only alternative he offers to total sexual abstinence. The Biblical view is that premarital sex is wrong for both men and women regardless of the circumstances. A woman's sexual duty is to "her own **husband**," not to a **husband to be**, and a man's sexual duty is to "his own **wife**" (1 Cor. 7:3,4).

Young people who want to please God and who want their marriage to begin and to thrive on sexual purity will not engage in premarital sex. They will avoid all the spiritual, physical, and emotional consequences of sexual freedom before marriage by refusing to take part in it. Nor will they engage in unchaste petting. This is not only wrong within itself, but it can break down the resolve to abstain from premarital intercourse. Half a century ago Brother C. M. Pullias very wisely said: "Any young girl that permits the opposite sex to fondle and handle her has pitched her tent toward Sodom, and as a result may find herself ruined and forever disgraced" (**The Life and Works of Charles Mitchell Pullias**, p. 111). One who doesn't plan a trip to Sodom has no business camping in that direction.

There are several valid reasons why premarital sex should be shunned, but the most important reason is its sinfulness. Young people should possess the attitude of Joseph in this regard. When Potiphar's wife tried to lead him into premarital sex with her, it was not fear of conception, infection, or detection that kept him from it. He rather said: "How then **can** I do this great wickedness, and sin against God" (Gen. 39:9)? To those who want to do right this is reason enough.

ADULTEROUS MARRIAGES

J. J. Smith

3433 Studebaker Rd.
Long Beach, CA 90908



Gibbons, in his book, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 1788, said one of the reasons for the fall of the Roman empire was: "The rapid increase of divorce: the undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home, which is the basis of human society."

If that is any indication of what it takes for a nation to fall, then according to the following statistics, we had better beware. In 1975 there were approximately one million divorces. And, it is projected that there will be somewhere in the area of 10,000,000 divorces in this present decade. Of course the reason for giving these statistics will be apparent as we proceed in our lesson.

The word "adultery" is a word that is used in the Bible to describe, for the most part, the illicit sexual relations of one who is, or who has been, married. However, it is also used in the Bible to describe those who involve themselves in illicit sexual acts in general (Matt. 5:28; 2 Peter 2:14).

The word "marriage" as it used in the Bible, is used in two different senses. It is used of a relationship that is approved of God and of a relationship that is not approved of God (see chart below).

"MARRIAGE" APPROVED OF GOD Matt. 19:8		"MARRIAGE" NOT APPROVED OF GOD Matt. 19:9	
Men's Actions	God's Actions	Men's Actions	In God's Sight
1. AGREEMENT	1. DIVINE SANCTION	1. AGREEMENT	FORNICATION
2. COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL LAW	2. A BINDING TOGETHER (One Flesh)	2. COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL LAW	(Adultery)
3. VOWS		3. VOWS	NOT SANCTIONED
4. COHABITATION		4. COHABITATION	NOT SOUND

By reading Matt. 19:5,9, we see the distinction that is made by Christ and how he uses the word "married" in an accommodative sense. Paul also used it that same way in Romans 7:2-3, and it is so used in the world today. When two people have met the requirements of man, (see lower part of chart) they are "married" in the eyes of man. However, this is one of the reasons I have been asked to write on this subject. For even though men accept these "marriages" as both legal, and sometimes scriptural, in the sight of God they are "adulterous marriages"—and are, in fact, nothing more than two people committing fornication (adultery) in God's sight. It is obvious from the statistics in the second paragraph that this presents a real (not imaginary) problem for those who are in the world and are married and divorced a number of times and then desire to become Christians.

Many do not believe that God's laws are applicable to the alien sinner—therefore if he marries and divorces **before** becoming a Christian, he is not living

in adultery. However, Paul specifically points out the fact that the Corinthians were fornicators and adulterers before they obeyed the gospel (1 Cor. 6:9-11), thus amenable to the law of God.

Jesus plainly points out in Matt. 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11-12; Luke 16:18; that if one puts away (divorces) his spouse for any reason other than fornication and marries another, he commits adultery. And, the one who marries the "put away one" (whether she is "put away" for fornication or for some other reason) commits adultery.

The word "commits" adultery is a present active indicative word that describes a continuous action. Hence, since God only allows two reasons for those who are married to receive freedom to remarry (fornication, Matt. 19:9; death, Romans 7:2-3) then divorcing one's husband and/or wife and remarrying is nothing more than legalized adultery in the sight of God; and those who are in this condition are "living in adultery" and will continue to do so as long as they commit the sexual act with this unlawful partner (Col. 3:5-7; Romans 7:2-3).

Since therefore, those who are involved in "adulterous marriages" are not in fact married in the sight of God but simply living in adultery, we warn them to get out of such a relationship. For Paul said that the adulterer "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21).

the light of Gospel teaching" (Birmingham News, Jan. 28, 1976, page 1). "The 2-million-member United Church of Christ" granted "an acknowledged homosexual in San Carlos, California" to be ordained to the ministry of that denomination (Gospel Truths, June 29, 1972, page 2). "Dear Abbey" said "The fact that homosexuality is morally condemned by most people in our culture makes it seem abnormal. In other times and in other cultures it has not always been so judged. Much of the maladjustments seen in homosexuals is due to rejection, persecution and guilt imposed upon them by an intolerant and unenlightened society" (Newport Daily Independent, July 18, 1973). The Philadelphia Inquirer of Dec. 27, 1975, said, "The Episcopal Bishop of New York says that many clergymen in his church have been homosexuals and that the ordination of an avowed lesbian as a deacon in the church is a sign of a healthy change." A tract published by The Church of God of Prophecy entitled "Sodomy" says on page 2, "Certain national magazines have mentioned the establishment of a Sodomy church in Hollywood and similar type congregations in Chicago, San Diego, and San Francisco."

An Ancient Sin

Fourteen of the first fifteen Roman emperors practiced this sin. Nero had married in open ceremony a eunuch made so by surgery and lived with him (Barclay on 1 Corinthians, page 60). Further, Barclay says, "From the highest to the lowest society was riddled with homosexuality. This was the vice which Rome learned from Greece. J. J. Dollinger calls it 'the great national disease of Greece'" (Flesh and Spirit, page 26). Inspiration tells of this (Rom. 1:26-27).

What Is Homosexuality?

Another name for homosexuality is sodomy. Sodomy is a Biblical word. "A sodomite is one who practices sodomy, sexual relationship between males" (The New Smith's Bible Dictionary, page 364). It is "an unnatural crime, consisting of the defilement of man with man. . . The name is derived from Sodom, in which city the crime was frequent" (McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia, Vol. 9, page 859). Simply defined homosexuality or sodomy is sexual relationships between a man and another man. Sexual relationships between a woman and another woman is lesbianism, which Webster defines as "homosexual relations between women" (New Collegiate Dictionary, page 482). Both homosexuality and lesbianism are condemned in the Bible.

God Speaks

"Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination. . . Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you" (Lev. 18:22,24). "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them" (Lev. 20:13). God said of Jerusalem and Judah, "they declare their sin as

**HOMOSEXUALITY —
A SIN AGAINST NATURE**

J. G. O'Neal
1729 5th Avenue
Bessemer, Alabama 35020



The sin of homosexuality is nothing new. It is now openly discussed, admitted, and practiced.

The Pope Paul VI has been accused, but denied, being a homosexual (Birmingham News, April 5, 1976, page 4). "A minister of the Church of God, Anderson, Ind." admits to being a homosexual and says there are "thousands of gay believers" (Birmingham News, April 3, 1976, page 5). "One of every 20 male athletes was homosexual" and "up to 20" per cent of women athletes were such (Parade Magazine, March 7, 1976, page 24). Children are often abused by homosexuals to fulfill their perverted desires (Birmingham News, Dec. 10, 1975, page 18). The Catholic Church say homosexuals who are "such because of some kind of . . . a pathological constitution judged to be incurable" must be treated by the Church "with understanding and sustained in hope of overcoming their personal difficulties and inability to fit into society" (Birmingham News, Jan. 15, 1976, page 27). On the other hand "a French priest-physician, the Rev. Mark Oraison, claims that love among homosexuals can be fully acceptable in

Sodom, they hide it not" (Isa. 3:9). Call it whatever you please, God said it was "S I N."

The men of Gibeah said unto one "Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him" (Jud. 19:22). The "men of Sodom" said to Lot, "where are the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out that we may know them" (Gen. 19:5). The word "know" in these two passages has the same meaning as in other Old Testament passages such as Gen. 4:1, 17. When men "knew" other men God said it was "sin" (Gen. 18:20; Lam. 4:6) and "iniquity" (Gen. 19:15).

In the New Testament God has spoken. Paul said "women did change the natural use into that which is against nature" (Rom. 1:26). That is lesbianism. Further, Paul said, "likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly" (Rom. 1:27). That is sodomy or homosexuality. Paul said some of the Corinthians had been before conversion "effeminate" and "abusers of themselves with mankind" (1 Cor. 6:9) and in that condition they were "unrighteous" and "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 6:9). Paul said of "them that defile themselves with mankind" (1 Tim. 1:10) that they were sinners. Defining "effeminate" Thayer says, "a male who submits his body to unnatural lewdness, 1 Cor. 6:9" (page 387). Of the expression "abusers of themselves with mankind" and "defile themselves with mankind" Thayer says it comes from a compound word that means "a male" and "a bed" and is defined "one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite, 1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10" (page 75).

Against Nature

When God created Adam, God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18). God "made a woman, and brought her unto man" (Gen. 2:22). God decreed "a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife" (Gen. 2:24; see also Mt. 19:5). God made man a woman, not another man. For women to cohabit with women and men with men is against nature. The word "nature" (Greek — "phusis") is used in several ways in the New Testament. Thayer says in such a passage as Eph. 2:3 it means "a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature" and in such a passage as 1 Cor. 11:14 "natural sense, native conviction or knowledge. . . the native sense of propriety." However when the Holy Spirit said some women did change the "natural use into that which is against nature" (Rom. 1:26) and that men were "leaving the natural use of the woman" (Rom. 1:27), they were leaving "the nature of things, the force, laws, order, of nature; as opp. to what is monstrous, abnormal, perverse. . . that which is contrary to nature's laws, against nature, Ro. 1:26" (Thayer, pages 660-661). Vine says "the regular laws or order of nature, Rom. 1:26" (Vol. 3, page 103).

Homosexuality (or lesbianism) is not a sickness but rather a sin against nature. Those guilty cannot be saved unless they repent (1 Cor. 6:9-11; Gal. 5:19-21).

MIND POLLUTION — PORNOGRAPHY

Weldon E. Warnock
491 E. Woodsdale
Akron, Ohio 44301



"Pornography has become as American as apple pie, Mom, and the Fourth of July. It is now everywhere." 1. What a contrast to only a few years ago when pornography was suppressed and was the preoccupation of only a few disturbed individuals.

The controversy rages as to what constitutes pornography and how much censorship should be imposed. The highest courts have had difficulty in defining pornography that is uniform and which conforms to the constitution of the United States. However, for the Christian, he should not have any difficulty in identifying pornography and determining what his attitude should be toward it. God has spoken plainly on the matter, which we will get to, shortly.

Webster defines pornography, "A depiction (as in writing or painting) of licentiousness or lewdness; a portrayal of erotic behavior designed to cause sexual excitement." The American Heritage Dictionary states, "Writing, graphic, or other forms of communication intended to excite lascivious feelings." Pornography is from Greek derivation. *Porno* means filthy or dirty and *graphos* means writing. Originally, it meant to write of or about harlots in order to arouse a man's lust so that he would consort with one. Today, however, it means to evoke a sexual response, lascivious in nature, by various forms of communication, such as erotic books, pictures, movies, etc.

Dimensions of Pornography

America has been bombarded on a massive scale with pornography. A Chicago alderman, who is also a Catholic priest, said, "Our society has outdone Sodom and Gomorrah, thanks to printing presses and color photography." 2

Senator Margaret Chase Smith wrote, "Consider Los Angeles, which now produces and exhibits so much live, printed and filmed filth that a police authority recently dubbed it 'the pornography capital of the world.' . . . In one particularly ripe section of Hollywood, an area of less than 4 1/2 square miles, a reporter recently counted 74 such bars, bookstores, peep-show arcades and theaters, all pandering to the worst in public taste.

"New York City and San Francisco also rank as large-scale producers and exhibitors of filth. Washington D.C., follows close behind. The nation's capital now boasts 37 'adult' bookstores (90 percent of which feature peep-show machines), eight movie theaters specializing in X-rated shows, and 15 topless bars..... The picture is increasingly similar in

smaller cities."3

The rapid spread and growth of pornography gives us a gauge of the moral degeneracy of the American people. If there were no market, there would be no pornography. But our society likes to revel in lust, so the pornocrats are exploiting human failures and weaknesses and pandering the sick (sadists, masochists).

James K. Barrett, a former Mafia operative and FBI undercover man, wrote in Reader's Digest, Nov., 1973, that smut was a billion-a-year operation for the Mafia. "The Mob exacts its take every step of the way. . . at manufacture, at distribution and during retail operation of the machines" (peep-show machines, wew), he said.

To further show how lucrative pornography is, the movie, "Man and Wife," cost \$32,000 to produce and grossed \$4,500,000. The movie, "Deep Throat," reputedly cost \$25,000 and earned over \$3,000,000. The production, "Oh! Calcutta!," being staged in an old burlesque house in New York with the performers almost entirely in the nude and all forms of sexuality, attracted large crowds month after month. They waited in long lines, seeking tickets for as much as \$25.00 each.

Playboy, the magazine for those who like sophisticated porno, made Hugh Hefner, its publisher, a millionaire. Millions of copies are sold per issue. Other magazines, such as Hustler, got into the racket and are doing well, financially, too.

Neighbor, pornography is indeed a gigantic operation. These purveyors and advocates of smut are endeavoring to thrust it upon us whether we want it or not. We are told it is good for us, that we are more healthy with it than we are without it. Psychology Today Magazine said it may have a salutary effect. Some tell us it can save marriages, prevent sexual crimes and liberate us from sexual hang-ups. Phooey!! The following will show the dangers and pitfalls of hardcore pornography.

Effects of Pornography

In 1967, Congress, recognizing the perils of pornography, established the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Its task was to study the problem and recommend how to deal effectively with the matter. Three years and two million dollars later, a majority (12 of 18) of the Commission recommended repealing all laws that restrict obscene materials from adults and that even children be permitted all but pictorial pornography. Many Congressmen were appalled and repudiated the Commission's finding.

Charles H. Keating, Jr., a Cincinnati lawyer on the commission, said the report was incompetent and biased. He stated, "(1) The Commission conducted meaningless experiments of questionable ethical nature. (2) The Commission held no meaningful public hearings, and by and large reported only scientific 'facts' that supported its preconceived notions. (3) The Commission unduly rushed into its final report." 4 He also said in the same article that the Commission majority chose to ignore a number of results of its own studies which showed ill effects of

smut. In my estimation, the Commission's report should be taken with a "grain of salt."

Under Editorials, Christianity Today, Oct. 23, 1970, the editor quoted Keating as saying, "To say that pornography has no effect is patently ridiculous. I submit that if pornography does *not* affect a person that person has a problem." Mr. Keating knows human nature, something the majority of the Commission obviously does not know.

Psychology Today, Dec, 1970, reported, "We recently completed a research project that strongly indicates that these fears (fears of erotic materials twisting young minds, leading to depravity and encouraging sexual crimes) are groundless, and that some exposure to pornography may be salutary."

However, Gladys Denny Shultz, a professional writer, interviewed sex offenders in Atascadero State Hospital of Calif, where the experiment reported in Psychology Today was run. (Psychologists used 60 of the patients for their test and matched these with 62 male Caucasians of the Los Angeles area.) Mrs. Shultz also interviewed inmates at Waupun Prison in Wisconsin. She gave a different picture than the one Psychology Today gave. She said that about half of the men, the better educated, denied that pornography had anything to do with their crimes. But those who claimed they were affected, reported, "You want to practice what you've been reading." "The prevalence of sex material definitely makes it harder for men with a sex problem because it gives them a distorted impression of women and of the relations between men and women." Mrs. Shultz went on to say that this explanation with only slight variations, was given her by several other sex offenders. 5

Dr. Victor B. Cline, a University of Utah psychologist, taking issue with the Commission's report, said, "We are not suggesting that pathological experiences in the family or elsewhere in the environment may not be significant contributors to sexual deviations, crime, delinquency, or other assorted ills, but pornography should be considered a causal instigator." 6 Dr. Cline cited, among other things, reports of 254 psychotherapists of cases where pornography was found to be an instigator or contributor to a sex crime or other antisocial acts. I quote Dr. Cline to show that Psychology Today is not to be taken as law and gospel, that even psychologists disagree on the issue.

Alexander M. Bickel, Professor of Law and Legal History, Yale university Law School, said, "What it (obsenity, wew) does produce is a moral atmosphere, and the moral atmosphere is the ultimate regulator of conduct. If something can be *said*, if it can be *shown*, if it is obviously *permitted* by society, then that society begins to think it is do-able. Deviance aside, we all tend to act within the range of what we think is tolerated by our society." 7. If Dr. Bickel's observation is true, and I believe it is, then we need to have strict control and censorship in our communities, yea our society, or eventually pornography will have an adverse effect on the great majority of us.

Perry Cotham, professor at David Lipscomb College, Nashville, wrote that pornography has four major effects. (1) It offends the right of privacy and man's sense of individuality. (2) It is diametrically opposed to the Christ-like attitudes we are expected to possess. (3) It degrades and dishonors human dignity. (4) It has a deleterious effect upon group units in society, such as homes, schools, churches, yea, society as a whole. 8

Ladies and gentlemen, whether it be physically, morally, spiritually, socially, or psychologically, pornography has no redeeming value. The only ones who profit from this moral filth and slime are the Mafia and other moral degenerates who are financially exploiting human frailties. But their end will be according to their works. Those who sow to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption (Gal. 6:8).

The Christian and Pornography

The Christian is regulated by the Word of God when it comes to the consideration of pornography or any other subject. His position on the matter should be just as narrow or broad as God allows him. It is not a question of what the Supreme Court says or psychologists or anthropologists say, but what does God say.

God is most explicit about this issue in Col. 3:5-6. The verses state, "Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience" (ASV).

There are three words in the preceding text that are related to our study. They are: (1) **Uncleanness** (akatharsia). It means "the impurity of lustful, luxurious, profligate living" (Thayer). (2) **Passion** (pathos). The Greek scholars tell us this word means erotic and depraved passion. It is the diseased condition of the heart that produces lewd acts. (3) **Desire** (epithumia). This is modified by the word, "evil." Thayer says this is "desire for what is forbidden, lust." It includes the whole world of active lust and desires (Trench). All three words, as they are used in this text, depict pornography exactly, and verse 6 shows what God will do to those who are guilty.

In Gal. 5:19, and other passages, God vehemently denounces the sin of lasciviousness (aselgeia). God says that those guilty of it cannot go to heaven. Thayer defines the word "aselgeia" to mean, "unbridled lust, excess, licentiousness, lasciviousness, wantonness, outrageousness, shamelessness, insolence. . . .wanton (acts or) manners, as filthy words, indecent bodily movements, unchaste handling of males and females." As you can see, lasciviousness embraces every aspect of pornography.

Christians are the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Mt. 5:13-16). They are to wield a savory influence on society and point mankind to high and noble principles. Pornographic material, therefore, has no place in the life of a Christian.

The child of God's to think on things that are pure, lovely, etc. (Phil. 4:8). His mind has been renewed, having put on the new man which is created in righteousness and true holiness (of. Eph. 4:17-24). He is to have "no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them" (Eph. 5:11).

Conclusion

"If we indulge pornography, and do not allow censorship to restrict it, our society at best will become more coarse, brutal, anxious, indifferent, de-individualized, hedonistic; at worst its ethos will disintegrate altogether." 9

"Citizens can sit back, do nothing and let the moral bankruptcy continue. Or they can join the crusade to stop the flood of pornography—at this time when there is such desperate need for enlightened; intelligent control of the poisons that threaten us and the generations to follow." 10 Footnotes

1. PTA Magazine, Oct., 1973.
2. U.S. News & World Report, May 7, 1973.
3. Reader's Digest, Oct., 1972.
4. Ibid., Jan., 1971.
5. Ibid., July, 1971.
6. Intellect, Jan., 1975.
7. Reader's Digest, Feb., 1974.
8. Obscenity, Pornography & Censorship, pp. 54-78.
9. The Case Against Pornography, p. 168.
10. Reader's Digest, Jan., 1971.