

Standing for the
Christian Faith in College

By

Ryan M Marks

Standing for the Christian Faith in College

Copyright © 2014 Ryan M. Marks

First Edition

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other—except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Scripture quotations marked KJV are from The Holy Bible, KING JAMES VERSION. Public

Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter 1 Feminism	7
Chapter 2 Addressing Perversity	24
Chapter 3 Addressing “Standardization” Indicators	31
Chapter 4 Self-Esteem	39
Chapter 5 A Defense of Homeschooling	42
Chapter 6 Ethics	67
Chapter 7 Culture	89
Chapter 8 Immigration	98
Chapter 9 Worldview	105
Chapter 10 Creation & Evolution	118
Chapter 11 Discernment	121
About the Author	125

Introduction

I started some college courses as a Dual Enrolled high school/homeschooled student at 17. I knew that I wanted to stand for the Faith and share the Gospel, but I also knew it would be hard. I really wanted the Holy Spirit to use every paper to influence my professors and even classmates. I knew that if I was really going to seek the Lord about how to write each paper and leave a “nugget” of scripture in it as well as weave in the Gospel I would have to spend a good deal of time and could not give up.

I had been homeschooled since first grade and was raised being taught everything from the perspective that God is sovereign. God designed languages, God designed mathematical laws, God created the universe around us, God is sovereign over His-story, and the truth of the Bible is meant to be worked into every view and position we have on science, literature, philosophy, history, politics—you name in. In college, many times I know I was told to leave “religious texts” out of academic writing. I had a choice—would I obey this censoring of the Bible or accept a few points off automatically and labor hard to earn a good grade by writing an excellent paper....

This book gives examples of how I endeavored to share the Gospel and defend Truth (Jesus is the way, **the truth**, and the life) while in college. I pray that *while my efforts are imperfect* that other students will be inspired to stand for their Christian Faith both on the secular and Christian campuses across the land which have all alike, it seems, been tainted somehow by unbiblical philosophy and liberalism. All college students who are Christians have a choice to be silent, compromise their Faith, or stand for the Christian Faith and Truth of the Gospel while in college. And to choose the right way is a challenging, narrow road.

My Own Experience in College

My two semesters of earning fourteen credits during high school taught me that I did not want fund the liberal agenda of the college business as much as possible. After looking at a Christian university and not having peace, I ended up going with [CollegePlus](#) and completing my BA in two years. I still had some clashes with professors not liking that I took the Bible as the absolute source of authority. Surprisingly though, I can't really say that I ever remember having experienced any heat over that from online and distance learning from the secular institutions from which I earned credit. When I was dual enrolled at the local college I sure did, although even then my liberal

professors were pretty kind about it. But during my accelerated distance learning, opposition came from a place that I was not expecting: some Christian colleges and institutions.

The battle for the Faith is real. While it is a reality on secular campuses, sadly, it is also a battle on many Christian campuses that while Christian in name and statement of Faith, believe and act virtually identically to the secular. I have one exhortation to any college student:

May you testify of Christ, hold fast to the Word, stay connected with Believers in a local church, and have like-minded Christian mentors who you can talk to when the stresses come. Don't go it alone if you don't have to, this is a battle!

Chapter 1

Feminism

Feminism: Its Effects on the Family

Women's voting rights, female independence, better job opportunities, and gender equality ("The Women's Liberation Movement: Its Origins, Structures and Ideas")—these are the subjects with which feminism has come to identify itself. Although, feminism has a wide range of supporters, they are not all underneath one banner. Some are called radicals because of their push for the abolition of gender distinctions, and others may be considered conservative because they hold that women should have equal job opportunities and that there are distinct gender differences in men and women. All in all, feminism's origins has had a wide range of supporters: from the passionate "radical" leaders to the single mother who is struggling to provide for four children and just wants to have a better chance to the mistreated women of every class. These supporters have aided feminism in gaining ground as a movement. While better job opportunities and equal voting rights have been achieved, there been some negative

effects on the family unit as a result of feminist's push for individuality and gender distinctions' eradication.

According to "True or False: Family is the Basic Unit of Society," the family is the basic unit of a culture; so if a wide number of mothers and fathers teach their children to pursue their own gain, pride and ego, then a generation of stuck up, greedy, and self-centered individuals will dominate that culture because of that family's teaching. However, if the mother and father teach their children to treat others with respect and discipline them when they whine and complain about not getting their way or refuse to get along with others; then a generation of kind and temperate (mild-mannered) people will result. A nation built on the backs of these individuals will prosper naturally because the friction among the people will be much less. But in a greedy, self-centered culture, people will always be trying to benefit themselves and will not care about hurting other people in the process. Lawsuits will abound, reconciliation will be rare, and people will struggle for survival amidst the jungle of ferocious beasts. On the other hand, a nation of kind and mild-mannered individuals will not pursue gain at the intentional harm of others, will reconcile more often, and will be less likely to propose a lawsuit out of hate or envy—there just won't be that many hateful individuals around.

In the analogy of self-centered individuals is an illustration of what feminism, intentionally or unintentionally, has done to the family. It has pumped some

women full of the idea of pursuing their own selfish interests. Now, nothing is wrong with a woman working hard at something that she wants to. Proverbs 31 makes that very clear when it says, “She...worketh willingly with her hands. She considers a field, and buyeth it,” and “her merchandize is good” (Proverbs 31:13,16,18 KJV). Women should be allowed to work and have a chance to try what they dream to do; however, when this work becomes so consuming that it replaces her family and she hatefully looks at men as an evil domineering bunch, one must wonder if she has gone crazy. I am not saying that all feminists are like the hateful woman described in the preceding sentence. For instance, Valeria, a woman in my composition class at college, said that she was a feminist, but against the destruction of sex roles. She believed that women were to be helpers, but should also be given equal opportunities to work (Personal interview).

In the family unit, many mothers now work (“Women Employed: Facts About Working Women”), some out of necessity and some out of choice. Nothing is wrong with working and enjoying one’s work, but a problem arises if one develops a mindset of being part of an elitist. This is what feminism appears to do. Its ranks are filled with those who want to be respected and want to have an equal chance, which is fine. But there are also some power-hungry, radical individuals who are only there to aggressively push their agenda on everyone else. For example, is not a feminist angle presented from the classrooms across this nation; not

just taught, but preached? Dr. Christine Hoff Somers, in an radio interview by Kevin Swanson at Generations with Vision, said that modern education is designed for girls (“Generations With Vision—The War Against Boys”). Women should be allowed to work in a wide range of fields, but should the idea of female mistreatment continually be restated to children? It appears that a battle against the mistreatment of women has turned into an agitated group of political revolutionaries.

When women decide early on that they want to be successful in the workplace, they may develop a hesitancy to get married for fear that their career will be jeopardized. If they have a family, the fear that they will not be able to do everything that they want to do with their lives may develop. These women are probably correct; having a family requires time, investment, and self-sacrifice, but are not children and a loving husband worth self-sacrifice? I mean, yes, one might not be able to accomplish everything on one’s dream list, but are not those closest to a woman more important than money or massive success in the corporate world? When these fears arise they not only delay a marriage or the willingness to have children, but they encourage small families.

Another effect of feminism on the family is the push for gender equality. That statement, gender equality, seems great at first. Yes, women should have equal shots at job opportunities as men and be able to choose to go to college;

but based on history, there is more to that gender equality statement than meets the eye. “The Women’s Liberation Movement: Its Origins, Structures and Ideas” says that “Egalitarian Ethic means...The sexes are equal; therefore sex roles must go.” This notion is pretty absurd because there are some general, distinct differences between men and women. Aside from chemical and anatomical differences, there are mental differences. Most women think in a pattern that is best described as one big wad, all their thoughts are interconnected. When she thinks of breakfast she may think of the letter that she didn’t open and then of an instance when her mother lost a letter, and then on and on until she remembers that she has an appointment in half an hour and better hurry up. However, men generally tend to think in a compartmental fashion. Everything is in its specific box and box A never crosses over or mixes with box B. According to “Men Are Like Waffles, Women Are like Spaghetti” by Bill and Pam Farrel, “a man is like a waffle (each element of his life is in a separate box) and a woman is like spaghetti (everything in her life touches everything else).” Trying to change gender differences is not possible. Men are generally and biologically stronger than women, while women are generally weaker than men, plus they think differently. Nothing is wrong with this truth it is just a result of the different chemical and hormonal make up that God has given each gender; we were designed to be different. We are equal as human beings, but our roles and functions are somewhat different (Gen. 1-3, Titus 2).

In all, feminism may indeed have started for amiable purposes; but there have been consequences on the family, whether they be intentional or unintentional. Families are now smaller in size, largely because many women delay marriage until later in life due to career aspirations. Complete equality in every area of life is actually detrimental, even dangerous. Gender differences are innate: being biological, mental, and anatomical. Feminism is dangerous when so much emphasis is placed on the individual woman that she neglects kindness and resorts to radical hate and malice towards those who stand in her way: whether it be to men or to other female advocates of gender distinction. All of these areas: gender distinction, selfishness or love, and marriage delay truly do effect the family.

Works Cited

Espinosa, Valeria. Personal interview. 7 Nov. 2011.

Eyre, Richard. "True or False: Family is the Basic Unit of Society." *Deseret News Publishing*

Co. Provided by ProQuest Information and Learning Company. Find Articles, 14 Dec.

2003.Web. 8 November 2011.

Farrell, Bill and Pam. "Men Are Like Waffles, Women Are Like Spaghetti." *Love-Wise.com*

n.d. Web. 11 November 2011.

Freeman, Jo. "The Women's Liberation Movement: Its Origins, Structures and Ideas."

JoFreeman.com. 1971. Web. 4 November 2011.

King James Version of the Holy Bible (KJV).

Swanson, Kevin. "Generations With Vision—The War Against Boys." *Kevin Swanson's Blog*,

Generations with Vision. November, 2004. Web. 4 November 2011.

"Women Employed: Facts About Working Women." *Women Employed*. n.d. Web. 11 November 2011.

Katha Pollitt's "Why Boys Don't Play with Dolls"

In "Why Boys Don't Play with Dolls," Katha Pollitt says, "It's twenty-eight years since the founding of NOW, and boys still like trucks and girls still like dolls." But further on, she says that "Instead of looking at kids to 'prove' that differences in behavior by sex are innate, we can look at the ways we raise kids as an index to how unfinished the feminist revolution really is." This statement appears to reveal that Pollitt believes that the feminist movement can go further, and that, it is the parents who

teach their children, not a movement alone. I believe that the parent's side of this is true. For instance, if a parent teaches his son to be polite to women, his son will live that out. However, a parent cannot make their son into a daughter or vice versa; there are inherent differences between boys and girls: most little boys want to kill the bad guys and play war, but most little girls want to play house and play with a baby, whether it be a doll or an animal.

Pollitt states, "Theories of innate differences in behavior are appealing. They let parents off the hook." While innate differences in behavior due to gender are accepted by many people, I would not agree that those beliefs are appealing or let parents off the hook. If anything, those who believe in gender differences have a harder time teaching their children how to be little ladies or gentlemen than those that teach their child to conform to the popular feminist ideals of today. Gender differences are a blessing, not a curse. History and the Bible have shown men as the warriors, strong leaders, and fathers and women as mothers and virtuous examples of kindness, diligence and love.

"The paradox is that the world of rigid and hierarchical sex roles evoked by determinist theories is already passing away...Biological determinism may reassure some adults about their present, but it is feminism, the ideology of flexible and converging sex roles, that it fits our children's future."

This quote seems to be a bash of traditional values. And while I would agree that gender distinction is the unpopular belief at this time, I do not believe that it is wrong. The most disturbing aspect of Mrs. Pollett's essay is her claim that gender is not really important, and that it does not necessarily mean anything about you or comprise any part of your identity. While it is true that both men and women can do well at a corporate job, when women completely abandon the home, her family suffers. Likewise, when a man completely leaves work, his family suffers, the man rejects his role as the leader of his home, as a provider; and resorts to the role of an effeminate. Therefore, I have to argue that an evolving view of gender is detrimental, not beneficial.

Pollitt concludes that we all give messages to children, she says that we naturally impose our ideas and opinion upon them; however, "The question, as always, is what do we want those messages to be?" Despite the messages that we unconsciously give, I still believe that little boys will be little boys and littler girls will be little girls. No one can ever totally erase that. There are innate sexual characteristics that cannot be ironed out merely by what society or parents teach. God has designed boys to grow into men and girls into women, these sexes are different in many respects and both are needed in our society. Women, mothers, wives, and sisters are needed just as much as men, fathers, husbands, and uncles. Gender roles are different.

Why Women Should Not Participate in Combat

Imagine an army filled with men and women engaged in ground combat. In the heat of battle, a small group of servicewomen get separated from the rest of the army and are just about to be captured by enemy forces that are known for raping and torturing female captives; however, their fellow male soldiers realize what is going on and rush to protect the women from the advancing enemy. In the course of this action, several men fall down, wounded, near where the female soldiers are now hiding behind a mound of dirt; however, the women are not able to bring the fallen men near to them so that the wounded heroes might obtain some safety amidst the fray. Many of those who are wounded nearby are shot to death in front of the women's eyes. The women mourn, guilt-stricken, that they were not able to help their chivalrous comrades; that they just were not strong enough. In the midst of the effort to save the women from capture, the mission's overall purpose is abandoned because of insufficient living personnel. Women do not belong in combat because they are physically disadvantaged and upset unit cohesion.

In *Feminist Fantasies*, Phyllis Schlafly historically recounts that Israelis and Soviets have tried putting women into combat and have since changed their stance because of problems (161-162, 175). The Soviets had a female army in World War II, but have since changed their stance to only

allowing women in office and medical roles, and the Israelis don't allow women to have fighting roles on land and sea ("Feminist and War"). John Luddy, from the Heritage Foundation, points out that in Israel, because many men naturally want to protect women, if a woman is in their unit and in danger of capture, the male soldiers will become distracted trying to defend her (qtd. in "Debunking the Israeli 'women in combat' myth"). Luddy continues to mention a study in which "unit morale was damaged when men saw women killed and maimed on the battlefield (qtd. in "Debunking the Israeli 'women in combat' myth)," these adverse affects lead only to the weakening of a military, not its strengthening.

Besides the historical evidence, women in a military unit cause cohesion problems. Men just don't bond like they do with a unit made entirely of men when women are present. Instead, they battle with trying to impress the women or from growing too close to them. Because of this, sexual immorality arises and it can be a particularly bigger problem than one thinks since such physical relationships cause a male soldier to strive to protect his significant other instead of doing his duty and mission. A Navy Special Warfare commander, whose name is unmentioned, tells *The New American* that "Even if some women are strong enough to handle the physical demands of combat, the introduction of factors such as sexual entanglements and jealousies...would make the forward commander's job more difficult (qtd. in "Feminizing America's Fighting Force")." In addition, a

Center for Military Readiness, or CMR, report recounts that military leaders bear witness that “because of unparalleled physical demands and forced intimacy, even in training, women would degraded the readiness, cohesion, and effectiveness of their units (qtd. in “Feminizing America’s Fighting Force”).”

Amidst all the problems with unit cohesion, sexual problems are the most dangerous of consequence of placing women in the military. The “USS Enterprise Video Scandal: Navy Commander Revealed as Mastermind Behind Raunchy Videos” relates that in 2006 and 2007 sexually perverse videos were made by servicemen and women for entertainment. This incident is just one of case of sexual problems among a military unit. Another instance of sexual problems is when 20 women got off the *Yellowstone* pregnant and 36 on off the *Acadia* (Schlafly 171). Additionally, Jack Anderson, a journalist, testifies that when interviewing Saudia Arabian physicians that “their most frequent visitors where women [soldiers] asking for pregnancy tests” (qtd. in Schlafly 171). Pregnancy results in the inability to participate in military operations, thus a resignation or temporary leave is given (Schlafly 170-171).

In another case, U.S. Airman Gayla Zigo said that “Less than a week after we arrived on the base, Kelly [Flinn] was in bed with my husband having sex” (qtd. in Schlafly 183). These examples clearly show that women in the military are causing cohesion problems among service members. All

this could be avoided if women were simply prohibited from the military. And even though women are allowed on ships and in the air force, these roles should also be prohibited. The Kelly Flinn mentioned above was the U.S. Air Force's poster girl (Schlafly 182) and the pregnant women that got off the *Yellowstone* and *Arcadia* undoubtedly prove that servicewomen in the air and sea forces are causing problems.

In addition to sexual problems, there are physical differences between men and women that can make all the difference on the battlefield. Also, in modern warfare there is still a huge demand on the body and its capacities: soldiers have to carry heavy gear and protective equipment, in addition to having to be able to fight in hand to hand or close encounters at a moment's notice. Colonel Ron Ray, a veteran of Vietnam, tells *The New American* that "Men and women are profoundly different and those differences have military significance" (qtd. in "Feminizing America's Fighting Force"). He continues to relate how women and men are split up in athletics while they grow up, the reason only being based of the physical differences between the genders (qtd. in "Feminizing America's Fighting Force"). It has been estimated that women have much lower body strength than men. The CMR, states that women have "45-50% less upper body strength" than men ("Center for Military Readiness: Women in Combat"). In addition, women are more susceptible to injuries and generally cannot carry a fallen male soldier to safety whereas most

men can (“Feminizing America’s Fighting Force”). This inability will cost lives and can keep valuable military resources from protecting the people or fulfilling the military mission at hand. For example, women are generally not strong enough for military tests. *The New American*, referencing the CMR, says,

1) ‘Women are shorter, have less muscle mass and weigh less than men’; 2) ‘Female aerobic capacity is approximately 70-75 percent that of males’; 3) women are at twice the risk for injuries to their lower extremities and at nearly five times the risk for stress fractures, according to a 1988 Army study (qtd. in “Feminizing America’s Fighting Force”).

In another instance, the CMR states that “Of the 103 women recruited for infantry training after Canada repealed its combat rules in 1989, only one woman succeeded in meeting the physical requirements necessary to complete the training (qtd. in “Feminizing America’s Fighting Force”).” Although, the United States military does not allow women to fight on the ground at this time (“GI Jane, Again”), they are allowed to fight in aircraft, boats, and submarines.

However, because of the physical demands of ground combat, it is prohibited for the women in the United States. The CMR states “The ground combatant relies heavily on his physical strength and stamina to survive, fight, and win (“Feminizing America’s Fighting Force”),” because of

these demands, women should continue to be barred from combat.

Not everyone agrees with this evidence though. For example, the feminist push for equality has spread to combat issues. Colonel Ron Ray states that

This [push for women in war] is really the culmination of a 60-year effort to promote the...equal opportunity for women, so that it predominates of the vital traditional and uncompromising American military effectiveness. And the ultimate consequences of this campaign will be the uncompromising of America's historic ability to defend her vital national interests in peace and war (qtd. in "Feminizing America's Fighting Force").

In light of the evidence against women being in combat, it is reasonable to conclude that female presence in combat only weakens a military, not strengthen it. Opponents claim that women can do just as well as men in combat and that they have just as much ability to fight, however the evidence aforementioned shows that women are at serious physical disadvantages in hand to hand combat. Another argument is that women have a right to serve in combat if they want; however, some of the women currently serving in the United States Navy and Air Force have gotten pregnant on board a vessel or engaged in adulterous acts when not in the cockpit. Because servicewomen have done these things, what assurance can be found in letting them fight and live

next to their male soldiers in war? The stakes are too high, and even if women did have the right, few can pass the military requirements set for men, as mentioned in the CMR report on Canada.

In light of the facts, people must conclude that women are not designed for war physically, while men are created for such purposes. The historic role of men as defender and warrior is actually factually based and will protect us the best.

Works Cited

Bohon, Dave. "Feminizing America's Fighting Force." *The New American* 21 February 2011.

Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center. Web. 29 Nov. 2011.

"Center for Military Readiness: Women in Combat." Center for Military Readiness. CMR, 22

Nov. 2004. Web. 2 Dec. 2011.

Doughtery, Jon. "Debunking the Israeli 'women in combat' myth." *World Daily Net*. World

Daily Net, 2 Aug. 2001. Web. 3 Dec. 2011.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. "Feminism and War." *Progressive* Sept. 1991. *Points of View Resource*

Center. Web. 29 Nov. 2011.

Owens, Thomas Mackubin. "GI Jane, Again." *National Review* 6
June 2005. *Opposing*

Viewpoints Resource Center. Web. 29 Nov. 2011.

Schlafly, Phyllis. *Feminist Fantasies*. Dallas: Spence, 2003. Print.

"USS Enterprise Video Scandal: Navy Commander Revealed as
Mastermind Behind Raunchy

Videos." *huggingtonpost.com* Huffington Post, 25 May
2011. Web. 5 Dec. 2011.

Chapter 2

Addressing Perversity

My Response to *This American Life* and the Class Discussion on Invisibility versus Flight from a Biblical Standpoint

The *This American Life* audio program and the classroom discussion, both based on the question of whether invisibility or flight would be the more desirable single power to possess, was similar in some instances and different in others. For example, in regard to the power of invisibility, many in the audio responded very graphically that they would instantly become thieves, perverts, spies, or murderers; whereas, the class discussion agreed only with pilfering and spying. The same was true of in regard to the power of flight, the audio had a few more perverted graphic details such as an interest in sleeping with someone that could fly to helping people and cutting travel costs. Again, the class discussion aligned with the audio on many points, but it was not as perverse as the audio's "groupie club." In addition, my own original purposes were closely tied to the

class discussion of flying. However, as can be seen from my description, a fair portion of the responses were morally wrong and some even grossly perverted!

My original choice of flight in my response to the question was not altered or doubted as I listened to the audio. I realized that I wanted flight all the more, for the ability to be invisible seemed to have especially dark connotations tied to its use.

After musing on the more troubling and perverted responses in the program and discussion, I remembered the following Scripture that aptly applies: "...out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." (Matthew 12:34 KJV) This Scripture gave me a clearer perception of why the perverse comments were made in the interviews. Matthew 24:34 provides the answer for why humans respond to questions the way that they do—they respond in words that reflect what is already in their hearts! This realization struck me as it never had before. How I speak reflects what is in my heart! As I began to understand this overwhelming truth, I understood why such responses had been given. People speak out what is already in them, the mouth is the merely the broadcasting system of heart.

In short, the interviews probed me to muse the most on the question topic, but my decision was not swayed. In addition, my remembrance of Scripture led me to expand my conclusion from merely choosing to be able to fly or to be invisible, and showed me that people really do put into

words what is in them and that we need the forgiveness of the Savior.

Accommodate Homosexuality?

In her contribution to *Bridges Not Walls*, Letty Cottin Progrebin wrote a section entitled: *The Same and Different: Crossing Boundaries of Color, Culture, Sexual Preference, Disability and Age*. I will be responding to pages 563-566 where Progrebin addresses the issue of homosexuality.

Progrebin says, “Since gay men and lesbians have to function in a straight world during most of their lives, it’s not too much to ask a straight a straight friend to occasionally accommodate to an environment defined by homosexuals” (p.565). I must disagree with Progrebin’s worldview in this statement. The Word of God teaches that homosexuality is a sin; therefore, it cannot just be accommodated. In Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, God says that engaging in same sex intercourse is an abomination worthy of death. Romans 1:16-32 goes on to describe how those who have already rejected God in their hearts are given up to a depraved mind to succumb to unnatural and vile affections for the same sex. Scripture also makes clear that those walking in a lifestyle of homosexuality are not going

to heaven even if they think they are (1 Corinthians 6:9-10). I take the viewpoint of Scripture as my standard of truth. Homosexuality is wrong, a sin, an abomination and detestable. It is not right, ethical, or moral to accommodate a homosexual lifestyle.

Now, I do not hate the homosexual person. I hate the sin because God hates the sin and He will judge and punish that sin. But God is not only just and holy, he is also loving and merciful. Scripture says in 1 Timothy 2:4 and 2 Peter 3:9 that God desires that all will be saved from eternal separation from Him in hell through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross that provides for all people to come into close, intimate, personal fellowship with God. God is mercifully, and patiently giving people time to come to Him. Scripture clearly teaches that men and women have come to Christ and been set free from the bondage of homosexuality (1 Corinthians 6:11), it is not a lifestyle that cannot be changed. In addition, Jesus was a friend of sinners (Mark 2:16-17, prostitutes and the lowest of society) to share His eternal love and compassion with them and to give them hope of a better future—one with Him, free from the addictive habits in their life and the feeling of worthlessness and un-fulfillment.

In conclusion, I agree with Progrebin that the walls between homosexuals and Christians need to be demolished in the sense that both should be kind and loving to each other. However, just as a loving parent will always love their

child, yet not condone their child's wrong choices, I am to love everyone; and yet also share the truth with them. I applaud Progrebin for recognizing the need for love between gays and straights, but her view is a little too accommodating. It does not allow for an absolute standard or true love. Because someone who truly loves is like a parent I mentioned: they do not just make you feel good and encourage whatever you choose, instead they are there to walk with you through life and to confront you when you are out of line.

A Summary and Response to “A Clack of Tiny Sparks”

In “A Clack of Tiny Sparks” Bernard Cooper presents his ninth grade experiences regarding his homosexual and heterosexual identity struggle which eventually culminates in his acceptance of homosexuality.

The essay begins, with Cooper in algebra class with Theresa, a mature classmate. After algebra on day she asks him, “Are you a fag?” Cooper responds by asking why she thought he was and receives the response, “Oh, I don't know. I have lots of friends who are fags. You remind me of them.”

As the essay continues, Cooper relates how he has his friend Grady Rogers over to swim and becomes attracted to

him. However, Cooper conceals this homosexual feeling because of his mother's aversion to homosexuality, and as a result, tries to force himself to have an attraction for girls instead. He decides, "What I needed to do . . . was kiss a girl and learn to like it."

As Cooper sets about this resolution, he attends a make-out party and while trying to make-out with multiple girls he continually has "an image of Grady erupting from...[the] pool, rivulets of water sliding down his chest." With this mental obstacle, Cooper gives up on trying to be heterosexual and decides that he must embrace homosexuality as his identity. He declares this conclusion by saying, "I have a few regrets. . . . one is that I hadn't said to Theresa, 'Of course I'm a fag.'"

Personally, I believe in the Bible and its command "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination." (Leviticus 18:22, KJV) Homosexuality is wrong; therefore, as I read Cooper's essay I was very disappointed to see him reach the conclusion of embracing homosexuality.

Further, I believe that Cooper failed and gave up on trying to be heterosexual because he really did lack the power to change himself. However, if he would have turned to God and asked Him for the help to be the heterosexual that he should be, I believe that Cooper's conclusion would have been completely different. The Lord would have given

him the strength to overcome homosexuality and become the heterosexual that he was created to be.

In short, Bernard Cooper ends his account of experiences culminating in personal acceptance of homosexuality. However, I still disagree with Cooper's final decision of embracing homosexuality and believe that with God, he could have reached a different conclusion.

Chapter 3

Addressing “Standardization” Indicators

ISTJ—Truth or Tall-Tale?

The Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator is a personality test designed by Katharine Briggs and her daughter Isabel Meyers. Their work was based on Carl Jung’s psychological theories (“MBTI: Myers Briggs Type Indicator History”). The test took over 20 years to develop and has a high accuracy rate according to “MBTI: Myers Briggs Type Indicator History,” which says that “The test/retest measurement is very accurate, in 75% of cases, individuals will test the same in 3 of the 4 dimensions” (“MBTI: Meyers Briggs Type Indicator History”). The test has sixteen personality types which are each identified by a combination of four letters which each stand for a certain predominant trait of that personality type (“Online personality test based on Jung and Briggs Myers typology”). One of these types, Introverted Sensing Thinking Judging, or ISTJ, is a personality type based on a strong belief in law and traditions, honesty, self-motivation, dependability and

duty (“Portrait of an ISTJ”), I think that I am an ISTJ because of my strong belief in these things.

ISTJs have a high regard for laws and traditions going against the rules is not going to happen (“Portrait of an ISTJ”). “ISTJ, The Myers-Briggs Personality Type” further says that an “ISTJ is apt to be involved in community service organizations that transmit traditional values to the young, such as Boy Scouting. They understand and appreciate the contributions these groups make in preserving the national heritage.” This respect for tradition extends into their family lives where ISTJs are

Traditional and family-minded, they will put forth great amounts of effort at making their homes and families running smoothly. . . [ISTJs] care deeply about those close to them, although they usually are not comfortable with expressing their love. The ISTJ is likely to express their affection through action, rather than through words (“Portrait of an ISTJ”).

To begin with, I believe that sin is sin and that I, a guilty sinner, need the forgiveness of Jesus Christ and need to know Him intimately. Because of this, I place a high value on following the Scriptures’ teachings and thus try to follow their exhortations on maintaining friendships and family life. Although, I don’t claim to be perfect, I consider family and friends to be very important and believe in protecting and sticking by them in hard times. I am very loyal and take the initiative in keeping up with close friends; however,

with family I often find myself struggling. I just don't have a buddy-buddy relationship with my parents and siblings, yet I do go to my parents for counsel and play with my siblings from time to time. In addition, I struggle with showing my love to my family in the ways such as playing with them, talking about life, and remembering encouraging them every day. However, I do show my love to them by the things that I do. For example, I create personal birthday cards on my computer or compose poems to express my thankfulness for my parents or siblings' birthdays, I help accomplish a task or chore that needs to be done, I do the dishes for my mom without being asked, or I pick up around the house when everybody else is out running errands.

Because I strongly believe in the traditional values of the Bible and teach them to others, I place a very high value on mentorship and teaching. I have taught in the Royal Rangers (similar to Boy Scouts) ministry at my church for about two years; led a Biblical manhood Bible study and co-lead a wilderness survival class at the CHECK homeschool group; facilitated and led the *Truth Project* study in my home; and have personally mentored a couple of individuals, namely, my friends Roy and T.J. Mentoring and teaching are very important to me because I love to be mentored and it is a powerful relationship which allows me to invest in another person's life, plus I get to learn a lot as I counsel and teach someone else. Mentorship has taken place to some small extent in the classes and Bible studies that I have taught, but the one-on-one mentoring approach I

have found works much better, having utilized it with my friends Roy and T.J. both of whom have grown spiritually and mentally since I started mentoring them. Roy is much more thoughtful and analytical than he was before I taught him about the importance of applying the Bible to his life and seeking the Holy Spirit's direction through prayer, and T.J. has developed some "tough skin" and reliance on Jesus Christ for taking the verbal attacks of his school mates who mock him for his faith and personality.

Another trait of an ISTJ, is that as they engage in life they are bound by a sense of duty. According to the "Portrait of an ISTJ," "[ISTJs] have a strong-felt internal sense of duty, which leads them to a serious air and the motivation to follow through on tasks. Organized and methodical in their approach, they can generally succeed at any task they undertake." In addition, as "ISTJ, The Myers-Briggs Personality Type" says, "ISTJs are extraordinarily persevering and dependable. The thought of dishonoring a contract would appall a person of this type. When they give their word, they give their honor." According to Joe Butt's "ISTJ Profile," "[ISTJs] are noted for devotion to duty" and "Punctuality is a watchword of the ISTJ. The secretary, clerk, or business (wo)man by whom others set their clocks is likely to be an ISTJ."

Being an ISTJ, my high regard of duty causes me to believe strongly in standards of right and wrong, namely, maintaining honesty and integrity in one's life. This strong

belief is made even stronger by my faith in God and the Bible, whose many verses praise honesty and integrity in a person's life but condemn lying and cheating. Because of these things, I strive to be honest in my life and to maintain the best example that I can of a godly man and expect the same others. If I can do something with integrity, then I expect others to be capable of doing it as well. This mindset can cause problems if I think in terms of achievements or personal habits, but in regards to honesty and integrity it is always correct: everyone is capable of being honest.

In regards to personal motivation, I am nearly impossible to stop when I set my mind to a task or when I believe that God has called me to do something. For example, I worked for some three and a half to four years to earn my Gold Medal of Achievement (equivalent of Eagle Scout) with very little help and even the doubtful comments of my leadership during the first year or so, but I accomplished it. In another instance, I felt that God had called and told me to write a devotional book. Although a long project (this book has taken some two years of work to write), the first volume composed of close to two hundred and ten pages will be self-published very soon.

Like other ISTJs, I am punctual, and it is a trait that I am known for. I am almost never late for anything, and clocks are one of my most used and beloved instruments. When working for my neighbor, Mr. Price, I always have arrived on time and he has remarked that "being on time shows that

[someone] is dependable.” During the years of my childhood, I remember one acquaintance coming up and asking me what time it was even though I wasn’t wearing a watch. Being on time, and often ahead of time, is very important to me because it shows respect for what I am attending or going to do and does not give me a bad reputation of always being late, behind, and slothful.

As said by “Portrait of an ISTJ,” “ISTJ’s are very loyal, faithful, and dependable. They place great importance on honesty and integrity. They are “good citizens” who can be depended on . . . While they tend take things very seriously, they also usually have an offbeat sense of humor and can be a lot of fun – especially at family or work-related gatherings.”

I like to think of myself as dependable I mean, I stick to the tasks that I have and try to do a good job. What’s more, I try to never miss a deadline for school or work and usually do not. In regard to being a good citizen, I do my best to obey the laws of the land and to live honestly and with integrity, as aforementioned. However, I want to shift to my “offbeat” sense of humor. I have been told by acquaintances, friends, and my friends’ parents to lighten up more often because I am so serious. But when I am around close friends and family, I crack jokes and laugh along with theirs. For instance, while my parents hosted their annual homeschooling party this September, I talked with a good friend and mentor, Ken Zimmerman, about college

struggles, spiritual issues, and politics as well as my personal dreams and business endeavors. I enjoyed the time talking with him. The reason why is that Ken is a very balanced and godly man; he is not perfect, but he has a great deal of wisdom, and laughing along with a few jokes of his jokes and listening to his counsel lifts me up and challenges me to stand firm as a godly man.

In a nutshell, an ISTJ (Introverted Sensing Thinking Judging) is dependable, traditionally minded, honest, and duteous. Based on how I see myself, I am an ISTJ. Because the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator seems to depict my personality very well, it thus proves a truthful source—not a tall tale, at least in my case. Although I do not take any psychology tests at face value because of my analytical and traditional mindset, I do believe that it has given an accurate description of my general personality; thus I encourage others not only to take the test but also to carefully analyze and weigh the descriptions of their personality to their own character. Do not to just accept what the test says you are at face value; instead examine it.

Works Cited:

“ISTJ, The Meyer-Briggs Personality Type.” N.p. n.d.
Web. 18 Oct. 2011.

<http://www.davidmarkley.com/personality/istj.htm>

Butt, Joe. "ISTJ Profile." *TypeLogic*. Joe Butt, 27 Feb. 2005. Web. 14 Oct. 2011.

"MBTI: Myers Briggs Type Indicator History." Adventure Associates Teambuilding. 2010.

Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

"Online personality test based on Jung and Brigs Myers typology." Humanmetrics. Web. 1998-

2011. 20 Oct. 2011.

"Portrait of an ISTJ." *Personality Page*. BSM Consulting, Inc. 2011. Web. 14 Oct. 2011.

Chapter 4

Self-Esteem

What's Up with Self-Esteem?

In “The Trouble with Self-Esteem” Lauren Slater addresses the unhealthy yet popular mindset of self-esteem. Using an informative style, she shows the reader why self-esteem is not the best way to go; instead encouraging self-control, discipline, responsibility, and humility. As she says, “...researchers are saying, pride really is dangerous, and too few of us know how to be humble.” Self-esteem teachings are recommendations to be prideful and have coined little phrases like “believe in yourself” and “follow your heart.” Such notions are rooted in dangerous the dangerous principle of I-am-better-than-you and must be disregarded because pride ultimately, as Slater alluded and the Bible has already warned, destroys people.

Self-esteem is supposed to help a person excel, to feel better about himself, to give a sense of contentment or

satisfaction in life, and to give him an internal identity. However, Slater points out that

“Maybe self-control should replace self-esteem...there is something to be said for discipline, which comes from the word ‘disciple,’ which actually means to comprehend. Ultimately, self-control need not be seen as a constriction; restored to its original meaning, it might be experienced as the kind of practiced prowess . . . muscles not tamed but trained.”

“Mental health is not necessarily a comfortable thing” (862), so why do so many psychologists advertise it to be so? Reynolds, one of Slater’s research references, offers a different approach to the helping others with unhealthy minds when he says, “Cure is not defined by the alleviation of discomfort or the attainment of some ideal state (which is impossible) but by taking constructive action in one’s life which helps one to live a full and meaningful existence and not be ruled by one’s emotional state” (862).

As the Bible declares in 1 Peter 4:7, “Therefore be clear minded and self-controlled...”; in 1 Peter 5:5, “God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble”; in Prov. 18:12, “Before his downfall a man's heart is proud, but humility comes before honor.” and in Romans 12:3, “Do not think of yourself more highly than you ought, but rather think of yourself with sober judgment” (NIV). These are just a few bites of Scriptural truth on the matter of pride, humility and self-control; yet they are clear enough to say with certainty

that the Bible has had the answer all along to whether or not self-esteem (pride) is beneficial for a person, even though researchers and psychologists like Slater may just be gathering the evidence to believe so.

In short, Slater's informative essay lines up with the Bible by stating that pride is harmful to a person, not beneficial. The teachings of self-esteem have been a gigantic lie or at least, a great misunderstanding in many professional minds until recently. Self-esteem is overrated in our society and we must beware of it because pride won't really get us anywhere, however, humility, responsibility, self-control, and integrity will.

Chapter 5

A Defense of Homeschooling

Is Compulsory Schooling Needed?

John Gatto addresses the issue of compulsory schooling in his essay “Against School.” Interestingly, Gatto reveals that when he says he is against schooling, he is not referring to education but mandatory schooling by writing, “Do we really need school? I don’t mean education, just forced schooling: six classes a day, five days a week, nine months a year, for twelve years.” Gatto continues by addressing the success of homeschooling when he says, “Is this deadly routine really necessary? And if so, for what? Don’t hide behind reading, writing, and arithmetic as a rationale, because 2 million happy homeschoolers have surely put that banal justification to rest.” Is Gatto right, is education really different from schooling, and what does homeschooling have to do with the issue?

Personally, I am one of the homeschoolers that Gatto talks about. In our home, my mother taught me how to do the basics: reading, writing, and arithmetic. As I got older,

she gradually taught me how to teach myself. I had to do this in a variety of ways, such as, homeschool group classes, assignments, textbooks (and their accompanying tests and quizzes), extracurricular activities, and distance learning.

While undertaking accredited distance learning via DVD courses from *A Beka Academy* I had to move beyond just teaching myself from a textbook and learn how to apply myself to my studies by taking notes during the lectures and by completing hours of class assignments each day. As if the challenges of developing those skills was not enough, my studies were further applied in merit paperwork that I had to do for Royal Rangers, a ministry similar to Boy Scouts that I was heavily involved in at the time. In addition, I had to utilize the aforementioned skills of studying and self-teaching when I taught and wrote the curriculum for a seven week course at a Homeschool group I attended every other Friday. In this manner, I developed self-teaching abilities and applied what I had learned not only so that I could teach others, fulfill my course requirements, and complete merit work, but to obtain a personalized education. This unique educational path helped me to learn much more than course assignments themselves could, and I enjoyed the learning process as I applied and utilized what I was learned in practical ways.

In addition, as a homeschooled student I was able to take part in a variety unique of learning experiences because of my flexible schedule. For example, I was given the

opportunity during high school, on short notice, to go to the capital of Missouri with a Pastor from my church and meet one of our state representatives, as well as, tour the capital during the swearing in of new state representatives. I took the trip and put all my assignments on hold for the day. While there, I was able to learn some of the History behind the capital and the museum located there, as well as, enjoy spending time with a friend of my Pastor's: Representative John McCaherty. In another instance, I was able to attend a *Get Motivated* seminar, again on very short notice, to hear such famous figures as Collin Powell and Laura Bush speak. This was another great opportunity which I might never have had again, yet because of my flexible schedule I was able to seize it. Both of these examples were opportunities that I might never have been able to take advantage of again, thus my schedule flexibility helped me to embrace these learning ventures.

As Gatto says,

...a considerable number of well-known Americans never went through the twelve-year wringer our kids currently go through, and they turned out all right. George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln? Someone taught them, to be sure, but they were not products of a school system...Unschooling perhaps, but not uneducated.

This bit of American history backs homeschooling and other forms of un-standardized learning. It also shows that

without mandatory schooling children can still obtain an education. I mean, who can deny the education of the great men that Gatto listed? I have not attended a compulsory school, yet I have obtained an education, I have learned how to learn and apply the things that I study. Compulsory schooling is not needed to get an education, rather a diligence in learning and applying oneself, in essence, the integrity of character. It is character: being respectful, attentive, and diligent that will give a person an education.

In short, I agree with Gatto that compulsory schooling is not needed. The success of my homeschooling and the historical figures that Gatto points out have proved that schooling does need to be compulsory and that an excellent education can be gained without the twelve year system. In addition, while many may not think of education as character training and real life application, that is what real education is—far from memorizing the many facts and figures that we are told to. I mean, sure facts and figures can be beneficial, but how will they be if we never apply them?

Argumentation and Debate, LSU

Using the instructions in chapter 12, prepare a brief on the advocate's side only for the debate proposition that you chose earlier for class use.

Advocate Brief format listed in textbook

Proposition: Homeschooling is successful.

Definition of Key Terms

1. Homeschooling is defined as parental guidance and active involvement in their child's education.
2. Successful is defined as effective, thoroughly preparing the student for life, and education tailor made to fit the individual student's needs and personality.
3. Public education is defined as the tax funded, government directed schools that provide education free of charge to the children of US citizens.

Primary Inference: Parents teaching their children and determining whom and how much time that individual will train their child in their absence provides an effective, tailor made education that more thoroughly prepares a student for life than one-size-fits-all public education.

Overview: While I am biased to homeschooling, having been homeschooled by self 1st through 12th, I have endeavored to thoroughly study out the subject of education and see the positives and negatives of both sides. What I have largely found is that most homeschoolers are homeschooling because of convictions of Faith. Christian groups make up the majority of homeschoolers, with small

groups such as wiccans as a sparse minority. While homeschooling employs a number of approaches to education, some notable leaders such as Kevin Swanson a national leader and director of Christian Home Educators of Colorado (CHEC) will be referenced.

Contention I: Homeschooling provides a more well-rounded, practical, and student-centered education than public schools.

A. Claim: Homeschooling employs mentorship which establishes a long term relationship that cares more about a young person's development of character than just merely cramming facts into one's head.

1. Grounds: Paraphrase—discipleship, mentorship focuses on developing a students' character. However, in college, and even seminary today, no one really cares on the character of student. Yet, the most successful business men in the country, when surveyed said that honesty, diligence, and integrity—character issues—are what sets the successful apart from the failures. Homeschool allow parents to help their children develop character not only at home when teaching them, but in mentorship relationships with others that the parent helps them form. ---Power of Mentorship talk, Kevin Swanson, CHEF Homeschool conference, St. Louis, MO 2010

2. **Warrant:** Since having solid character is an invaluable measure of an individual's true life preparation, education must include mentorship(s).
3. **Backing:** "In 1986 I was sitting in the office of a fully tenured professor at a major United States public university, discussing an engineering project assigned in the senior year of the program. I asked this professor if we could meet on a regular basis concerning this project. I sat, stunned, as he answered, 'No, no, If I had my druthers, I'd just as soon sit here and contemplate my navel.' Years later I realized why almost everyone who took this man's classes produced Ds and Fs. This teacher manifested zero interest in the content of his instruction and even less interest in the students he taught."—Upgrade: 10 Secrets to the Best Education for Your Child by Kevin Swanson, Broadman and Holman, Nashville, Tennessee, p. 85

B. Claim: Parents are not qualified to teach their own children is a farce.

1. **Grounds:** "Several years ago, our family received a brochure from a local private school, authored by a gentleman whose doctoral credentials in the field of education were prominently displayed. The good doctor explained,

‘There is a misjudgment among some circles that a teacher does not need to be university trained or carry the appropriate credentials. . . unqualified persons should not perform brain surgery.’

Such statements imply that the education of a child is a highly technical affair that must not, under any circumstances, be placed under the purview of an uneducated parent. Ergo, whatever you do, don’t try this at home!

.....

Never mind the data collected over the last 25 years by those who study the homeschooling movement where this sort of thing is done at home!”

--Mom, You’re Not Qualified. . .to Perform Brain Surgery! By Kevin Swanson

<https://generationswithvision.com/article/mom-youre-not-qualified-to-perform-brain-surgery/>

2. **Warrant:** If parents are not qualified to teach their children, but only those with credentials, then why is there only opinions to back this claim?
3. **Backing:** “Back in the last 1990’s the Rudner study found homeschoolers scoring head and shoulders above their counterparts from public and private school. It wasn’t until last year that Dr.

Brian Ray from NHERI, conducted another significant study on the academic performance of home educated students in this country. To tell you the truth, many leaders were a little nervous about what he would find, since the movement has changed dramatically over the last ten years. In this new study, Dr. Ray included a wider variety of testing services, and covered a sample size in excess of 12,000 students. Amazingly, Ray found that the homeschooling is performing substantially better than they did 10 years earlier! The results are contained in the chart below.”

	Average Percentile (National Average – 50 percentile)	
	2009 Ray Study	1999 Rudner Study
Reading	89	85
Language	84	73
Math	84	77

--Mom, You're Not Qualified. . .to Perform Brain Surgery! By Kevin Swanson

<https://generationswithvision.com/article/mom-youre-not-qualified-to-perform-brain-surgery/>

C. Claim: Life integration is the Biblical and historical foundation for education.

1. Grounds: “ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.” --Deuteronomy 11:19 (KJV)

Paraphrase: public schools teach conformity to make everyone the same and predictable.....it trains children to be employees and consumers –
Against School by John Gatto
<http://www.wesjones.com/gatto1.htm>

Paraphrase: The Founding Fathers’ education primarily consisted of writing essays, taking extensive notes, verbal reports and tests, and apprenticeships –America’s Providential History by Mark Beliles & Stephan McDowell, p. 100-101

Paraphrase: For 6,000 years of human history prior to the Industrial Revolution, homeschooling, mentorships, and apprenticeships were the main form of education. In early America, schools only went to 8th grade. With the rise of the Industrial Revolution, Rockefeller, Morgan, and Ford

funded and pushed to have compulsory education and high schools. The reason why they wanted high schools with bells dingling every hour, was to 1) get individuals tired of education and not pursue higher learning and 2) to condition them to the bells of the factory so that they would desire to be part of the large workforce required to power factories. –Education the Founding Father’s Way, Woody Robertson, CHEF Homeschool Conference, St. Louis, MO 2010

2. **Warrant:** It is clearly seen from history and the Bible that life integration is the purpose of education. Education is more than just a preference style, it is a social and even political issue.
3. **Backing:** “From Time to time I will hire a teenage intern to perform routine office functions in one of the ministries I oversee. Several years ago, I brought a teenage girl into the office. She turned out to be the most competent young person I had seen in a work setting. I was a little apprehensive at first because I knew something about her educational background. She had been home educated almost her entire life, but that was not what bothered me. Her education was extremely informal. It included reading a lot of books and doing an occasional math program. The rest of time she spent helping in the raising of her nine

younger brothers and sisters and running her father's business. I had never seen such an informal program of instruction in my life. But the skills she had learned in this method of instruction were invaluable and put her head and shoulders above any peer I had ever seen work in that office. Her strength was not so much her intelligent quotient, it was her capability. She had learned a resourcefulness to problem solving in real-life situations. She had learned how to learn and how to integrate what she had learned in the past to what she needed to know in a new situation. It was obvious to me that this young lady could adapt quickly almost anywhere. Later she went on to work as a supervisor at a dental office, making twice the money that an average teenager her age would make. Evidently the free market is in aggressive pursuit of such productive employees.”
–Upgrade: 10 Secrets to the Best Education for Your Child by Kevin Swanson, p.125-126

Conclusion: Although, I may be a little biased, the evidence clearly shows that homeschooling is and has been an effective and successful method of education.

Argumentation and Debate, LSU

Advocate's Case

An issue that has long been debated in the United States is homeschooling. Back in the 60s when it was first beginning to rise from its hundred plus year sleep, it was sneered at. As time has progressed it has grown to more than 4 million adherents in the United States alone. The first question many ask is, "What about the socialization of children that have been homeschooled?" Analysts have shown that homeschoolers indeed are well socialized and good citizens.

For 6,000 years of human history prior to the Industrial Revolution, homeschooling, mentorships, and apprenticeships were the main form of education. In early America, students only went to 8th grade and then would venture on to college or the workforce. With the rise of the Industrial Revolution and its leaders Rockefeller, Morgan, and Ford, all of that changed. These giants funded and pushed for compulsory education and high schools. The reason why they wanted high schools with bells dingding every hour, was to 1) get individuals tired of education and thus not pursue higher learning and 2) to condition them to the bells of the factory so that they would desire to be part of the large workforce required to power factories.

Homeschooling is simply a return to the way that education has been conducted for millennia.

It has also been very successful. It has prepared students for real life in that Homeschoolers tend to be more responsible, entrepreneurial, and politically active than their public school counterparts. Just look at the facts that one HSLDA study revealed: homeschoolers are significantly more likely to enjoy life, be politically active, and go to college. A Canadian study revealed that a high percentage of homeschoolers go on to own their own businesses and none of those surveyed received any form of government welfare. But that is not it. Homeschoolers are known for being people who learn how to learn and integrate their learning into their life—a far cry from the traditional brick and mortar schools education where largely lectures take place in a classroom with twenty five other bodies, boredom abounds, and integration of learning into the students life seldom occurs.

In contrast, homeschooled students typically study for four to five hours a day as opposed to sitting in a classroom for eight or more. The rest of the day is employed in helping in the family business, serving in the community, or studying areas of interest and testing out ideas based on those studies.

If one listens to any of the leaders of the movement or attends one of the many yearly held homeschool conferences, it will not be long before you hear

Deuteronomy 11:19 which serves as the cry of the movement. It says “ye shall teach them (that is the laws of God, to) your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.” With the basis of instructing their children in the Bible, most homeschooling parents approach education as instruction in the fear of God and character development. They employ mentorship methods which establish a long-term relationship where a young person’s development of character is more important than cramming facts into their heads. When is the last time that public schools were known for caring about and molding solid character in young people? Perhaps our grandparents can remember those days....but we certainly can’t.

The most successful business men in the country, when surveyed, revealed that honesty, diligence, and integrity—character issues—are what sets the successful apart from the failures in business! It had nothing to do with the institution they were trained at or how great their instructors were.

Some claim that homeschooling parents are not qualified to teach their children. But in light of history and the data that modern studies have revealed, nothing could be further from the truth. As Kevin Swanson, one of the contemporary leaders of the movement, says, “Back in the 1990’s the Rudner study found homeschoolers scoring head and shoulders above their counterparts from public and private

school. It wasn't until [2003] that Dr. Brian Ray from NHERI, conducted another significant study on the academic performance of home educated students in this country. To tell you the truth, many leaders were a little nervous about what he would find, since the movement has changed dramatically over the last ten years. In this new study, Dr. Ray included a wider variety of testing services, and covered a sample size in excess of 12,000 students. Amazingly, Ray found that the homeschooling is performing substantially better than they did 10 years earlier!" The national average for reading, language and mathematics was in the 50th percentile. In 1999, Homeschoolers were in 85th percentile for reading, 73rd for language, and 77th for mathematics. Just ten years later in 2009 they jumped to the 89th percentile for reading, the 84th for language and the 84th for mathematics. In contrast, public schools are only going down or at best remaining constant.

In light of these facts, homeschooling has shown that it can stand on its own—without government support or professionally trained parents. Homeschooling is successful because it focuses on the thing that matters most in raising our kids—molding their character. In the years ahead, will homeschooling continue to work or is it simply a thriving but dying rarity? I bid you to remember that homeschooling has been around for 6,000 plus years. In Aristotle's day to the ancient Egyptians, to Jewish antiquity—parents have

been the primary preparers of their children. Homeschooling has a bright future.

Argumentation and Debate, LSU

Opponent's Speech

Although homeschooling may have been the educational system of the past, we live in modern times—in the information age and on the cutting edge of global integration. Most public schools want parents who are actively involved in the education of their children, just like Homeschool parents desire to be actively involved in helping their children in school. But we must remember why public education exists in this country. In the early days and in antiquity, there was not much cultural or ethnic diversity in any one given area or country. The populations were largely alike with the diversity only being among the slave section. There would be a few small minority groups in addition, but for the most part the traditions and lifestyle of society was passed on by parents to the younger ones. In this great nation, the United States, it has developed and become a melting pot throughout its' existence. Early one room school houses were initiated to make sure that each child could be properly educated. We as a nation have since

our early years endeavored to provide education to all children regardless of race, ethnicity, or language barrier.

Early educators taught Native American children how to read and write. The Native American parents of those children did not know how to read or write! They needed someone else to teach their children. If homeschooling had been strictly followed in this particular case, we would still have Native Americans in the United States living off the land, speaking another language, and being cheated left and right. But education did not let that happen, no, they reached out to everyone—to the general public and made education available so that all people could be helped and succeed.

It is true that character is probably not given as much emphasis in public schools as it should. Our nation is in a crisis of what to teach due to the turmoil among so many people groups being present. We have so many small groups huddling in their own corners and only believing what likeminded fellows believe today that America has become a land of lawsuits and social action organizations. If one educator believes that everything on the planet is ruled by absolutes and a particular god and tries to teach character based on that, he would offend too many who do not believe in absolutes. Tolerance must exist when it comes to what we teach.

Homeschooling is largely made of people of Faith—Christians. It is not wrong that they have broken off from our public schools and dedicated themselves to teach their

children, but they are trying to force homeschooling on everyone. Public schools cater to more than just one Faith or people group; therefore, the character traits that my opponent has described likely do not align with every Faith. However, it must be remembered that education at its root really does not have anything to do with character, but everything to do with teaching skills to individuals. Yes, a person's character will affect them and their success in life. But remember the Native American children we mentioned a little while ago? The educators who set out to teach those children how to read, write and do arithmetic taught them *skills*. They did not say, "you must stop sacrificing to the spirits and following your parent's traditions." Instead, overtime changes came within the Native American people's lifestyle and religion because they were educated. They could understand and make their own decisions based on what they believed. Isn't that still the goal? We want to train children how to think for and take care of themselves as adults.

While many Homeschool students have done well on national tests, it is important to note that the quote that my friend gave about the survey of homeschoolers only included around 12,000 students. Public school statistics are based on millions of students! Yes, studies have shown that many Homeschoolers are entrepreneurs and never take one dime of welfare, but that does not mean that they are more successful than their counterparts. Plus, just because they are more political active does not indicate a better education.

On the contrary, it could simply show that they want to push their agenda.

Henry Ford, Andrew Carnegie, and John Rockefeller did support the implementation of public education through instituting public high schools and mandatory education in this country, that is historical fact.. While the evidence does show that they may have had some ulterior motives to also employ those who went through the system, in the grand scheme of things the Industrial Revolution educated many people and funded the rise of the information age. Students seeing their parents working in the factory their whole lives motivated them to study harder and go to college and make something of themselves. Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller launched this nation on to greater heights than it had ever seen before! America is the most educated nation of the world because of public education. Everything from free K-12 to government grants for higher education continues to help students gain the skills they need for life.

The main reason why I believe Homeschooling has been effective in training students is because the majority of parents that choose to Homeschool are very dedicated to educating their children. The current facts indeed show that parents have been effective in educating their children although they have not been certified or trained professionally. But we all know that a good teacher is not made, they simply are a good teacher. Skills can be taught, but if you are naturally wired for something, you just excel

at it; those who are not good teachers, generally lack motivation to teach and give up after trying. It is because of this that Homeschooling has been effective in modern times. However, there is still no way to get around the fact that all the talk of home schools is still only a debate about less than 2 % of the population. We are simply not talking about the majority of our nation's students; the issues are micro, not macro. Of course, some things will look better when just looking in the corner of the room—it may be quite clean, but there is an entire room of students, not just the corner, that must be considered!

The majority of American students still are going on today to enter the workforce and live successful lives. Business is expanding; solutions are being made to international trade problems by graduates of Harvard, Yale, and other schools who went through public education. And these successful leaders come from every nationality. Home schools typically only are dealing with Caucasians and little if any cultural diversity takes place on a daily basis. Again, the issue is that we are debating about a small portion of the students in the country—it could be compared to debating about why the small percentage of A students are better than vast majority of B students.

Public education endeavors to give equal opportunities to each and every student in the diverse population of today. If we were to do away with it, we would have a largely uneducated population. The children of those who are living

in poverty do not have the time to home educate their children—they are just battling for survival. Plus, their children statistically have made the best use of a public education of the years. Those who come from poverty just tend to value their education more than those who are doing fine in the middle class. Dr. Benjamin Carson whose own mother could not even read but encouraged them to learn so that he could be successful is a modern example. We must continue to put our efforts as a nation behind helping everyone we can and especially those in need. The best way to do that is to offer equal opportunities for education to everyone through public education.

Argumentation and Debate, LSU

Advocate's Defense

Homeschoolers are not trying to force their convictions upon everyone. But when we look at the facts, it is simply not true that public education best educates a child. Just learning skills produces an unbalanced individual. Character must be addressed. That is why all the evidence of studies and history has revealed that a student is mostly likely to succeed academically and practically when a long time tutor is in their life. Parents are definitely the best and

first choice for each child to be trained by for they are their parents. However, there are instances where this is not possible due to untimely death or irresponsibility of a parent. In those cases, a child is still proven to benefit most by having a mentor in their life who cares about them and endeavors to teach them character—right from wrong, how to be kind, and to seek the truth as opposed to just teaching them skills.

We all have had different degrees and amounts of opportunities in life, but the truth is that we have not all had an equal amount, and no structure can guarantee that it will ever be 100% equal. Those who desire to simply live in fantasy land all day will not heed their studies and those who harden their necks to discipline will close the door to having an opportunity to grow. You have likely seen this in family members and friends. We all know people who just do not want to learn not only skills, but from their wrongs, even when others loving try to tell them. Education must endeavor to mold character.

While homeschoolers are a minority today, that does not mean that the data that has been revealed is all together useless. There are reasons why homeschooled students tend to score higher on tests. Yes, there is another 98 plus percent of the population. Yes, public education surveys have included far more substantial numbers of students, but the data still shows that public education is not climbing above the 50th percentile on nationally standardized tests.

Homeschoolers are far beyond the 50th percentile and have significantly improved over just one decade.

I close my defense with a story taken from Kevin Swanson, a homeschooler leader today's, book Upgrade:

“From Time to time I will hire a teenage intern to perform routine office functions in one of the ministries I oversee. Several years ago, I brought a teenage girl into the office. She turned out to be the most competent young person I had seen in a work setting. I was a little apprehensive at first because I knew something about her educational background. She had been home educated almost her entire life, but that was not what bothered me. Her education was extremely informal. It included reading a lot of books and doing an occasional math program. The rest of time she spent helping in the raising of her nine younger brothers and sisters and running her father's business. I had never seen such an informal program of instruction in my life. But the skills she had learned in this method of instruction were invaluable and put her head and shoulders above any peer I had ever seen work in that office. Her strength was not so much her intelligent quotient, it was her capability. She had learned resourcefulness to problem solving in real-life situations. She had learned how to learn and how to integrate what she had learned in the past to what she needed to know in a new situation. It was obvious

to me that this young lady could adapt quickly almost anywhere. Later she went on to work as a supervisor at a dental office, making twice the money that an average teenager her age would make.”

Chapter 6

Ethics

Ethics Relies on Moral Law

Can ethics exist in the relative, postmodern culture we live in? Odell states that “A society without ethics is a society doomed to extinction... . ethical principles are a necessary precondition for the existence of a social community...” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 5). Ethics, particularly moral law, relies upon absolutes. In a culture of relativity one person may say that adultery is permissible under certain conditions; however, God’s Word stands in contrast to such ideals of relativity. Jesus says that not one jot or tittle of the Law of God will pass away (Matt. 5:18) and that He has elevated the letter of the Law to the Spirit (the motive, the heart condition behind) of the law (Matt. 5-6); therefore, no longer is committing adultery the only sin, but also lusting (Matt. 5:28). It is because of Biblical absolutes, that Christians are despised by the world—we preach sin and the “foolish” and offensive message of salvation and life through the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ on the Cross (1 Cor. 2:2, Gal. 5:11). Ethics

cannot exist without absolutes, and those absolutes must be grounded in the Word of God.

I would initially define freedom as the ability to follow the Lord freely and live by your convictions; however, this definition is without responsibility. For if everyone does what they want to, but harms another there is no true freedom. **True freedom sacrificially limits personal privilege for the betterment of others, not by legislation or rule of law, but by the posture of the heart.** Perhaps this statement puts the balance between freedom and responsibility: “Respect for the word—to employ it with scrupulous care and an incorruptible heartfelt love of truth—is essential if there is to be any growth in a society or in the human race. To misuse the word is to show contempt for man. It undermines the bridges and poisons the wells. It causes Man to regress...” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 8). As a communicator, a Christian must recognize the freedom that he or she has received from Christ and not condemn others with legalism. Christian communicators must stand by the absolutes of Scripture, but with gentleness offer grace for as Nilsen says, “we must always expect a gap between ideals and their attainment, between principles and their application” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 3). Even those who want to live for Christ are not going to live perfectly; there is a gap between the Law and a perfect lifestyle (James 3:2,8).

References:

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Christian Ethic Paper

Ethics for the Christian Communicator

Ryan Marks

Regent University

Ethics can sometimes have a shifting standard, there is a “tension [between what] potentially exists [and] between ‘is’ and ‘ought,’ between the actual and the ideal. What everyone is doing and what we judge they ought to do, what the majority says is ethical and what a few argue ought to be ethical, may differ” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p.2). This paper will not be about a relative system of ethics in which one evaluates every angle of an idea to determine what action is best; instead it will be based on the everlasting principles of God’s Word which are absolute and are guaranteed to serve the Christina communicator

well. I have attempted to first outline some good plans for Christian communicators that I have heard and then progress into a thorough, yet Biblical explanation of my own list of Biblical practices for Christian communicators which include: spending time with the Lord and in His presence, being diligent, maintain a good name, following the Holy Spirit's guidance, being guided by and rooted in a balanced view of the Word of God, being passionate, and pursuing your God-given design and calling. My purpose in this paper is best summarized by Christopher Steck's quote:

What we need to *explain* is people living their lives; the terms in which they cannot avoid living them cannot be removed from the explanandum. ... We cannot just leap outside of these terms altogether, on the grounds that their logic doesn't fit some model of "science" and that we know a priori (sic) that human beings must be explicable in this "science" (Steck, 2013, p. 336)

In Kevin Swanson's book *The Second Mayflower* he outlines a list of training points for pastors which apply to any communicator: 1. Having ability, 2. Being blameless, 3. Being temperate, 4. Being sober-minded, 5. Being hospitable, 6. Being able to teach, 7. Not being violent, 8. Not being covetous, 9. Not being given to [dependent on] wine, 10. Being gentle, 11. Not being quarrelsome, 12. Being a man of truth, 13. Being a righteous man, and 14. Being a man who rules his house well (Swanson , 2008,

p.262-263). Larry Stockstill also outlines an additional 10 traits will serve each Christian communicator well in his book *The Remnant: Restoring the Call to Personal Integrity*. His ten commandments are as follows: 1. Prayer, 2. Bible Study, 3. Integrity, 4. Purity, 5. Example, 6. Relationships, 7. Philosophy, 8. Faith, 9. Spiritual Warfare, 10. Wisdom (Stockstill, 2008, p. ix-x). These books are good resources for the Christian communicator to purchase and thoroughly study.

The first in my list of Biblical principles for the Christian communicator is that spending time with the Lord and in His presence must be a priority of the communicator. One will only find their strength in the Lord, not the strength of one's weakness (2 Corinthians 12:9-10). David testified that "Thou [God] wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence *is* fullness of joy; at thy right hand *there are* pleasures for evermore" (Psalms 16:11 KJV)—God's presence is a place of joy, yet also where we gain true wisdom (Proverbs 9:10). Personal growth occurs as one spends time with the Lord (Romans 12:1-2), and time with the Lord is the one priority that must be above all others (Matthew 6:33).

The second principle is that the Holy Spirit is the Christian communicator's guide and teacher (John 14:16-18, 1 John 2:27). The Christian communicator need not forget that the Holy Spirit is not only around to help us in "religious" matters, for with God there is not boundary of our Christian life; the Holy Spirit is meant to help us grow

Biblically and personally. He will guide us in the practical and in the spiritual. A communicator must not falsely blame his or her faulty actions on “the Holy Spirit’s guidance” or “God told me to do it.” The Holy Spirit will not act independently of the Word of God (Genesis 1:2-3); therefore His direction will always be in line with Scripture and give one zero room to blame. The Christian communicator must strive to live a life in tune with Holy Spirit to convey the message that the Lord wants conveyed. If a communicator restricts following the Holy Spirit’s guidance only to his or her church life, then one will miss out on the fullness of the Holy Spirit’s guidance that is displayed so vividly in the book of Acts.

The third principle is that a Christian communicator must be guided by and rooted in a balanced view of the Word of God. The godly man avoids all extremes (Ecclesiastes 7:18), he searches diligently into a matter (1 Peter 1:10, Deuteronomy 13:14) and seeks counsel (Psalms 1). Each Christian has a responsibility to be ready to give answer for the hope that lies within them (1 Peter 3:15), this is not dependent on one type of environment or questioning. At all times, the Christian communicator is to be ready to answer; no matter what the topic may be, one must be rooted in the Word and not in the hollow and deceptive philosophy of their age (Colossians 2:7-9).

The fourth principle is that a Christian communicator must be diligent. Scripture is very clear that the slothful will

be punished and in poverty for their sin (Proverbs 10:4, 20:4, 20:30-34). The communicator must strive to not only communicate well, but be diligent in their personal life as well. Maintaining accountability, church fellowship, civil responsibilities, vocational labor, and familial community must be factored into one's schedule. A Christian communicator will not truly be successfully unless he or she has lived their communication out on a personal level; therefore, any Christian who gives a reason why they believe what they believe about marriage, family, church, salvation, Christian living, or a host of other topics is bound to live that way if he or she is diligent in their personal life.

The fifth principle is that Scripture is very clear that maintain a good name is important. Proverbs 22:1 says that “a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor rather than silver and gold” (KJV). In times past, a man's word meant that he would do something. Sadly, today this is passing away; but the Christian communicator is to raise up the banner once again by being someone whose word is trusted and respected—by being one who has a good name.

The sixth principle is being passionate about what you are communicating. Jesus, Paul, Peter, and John were passionate communicators; likewise the Christian communicator should have a passion for what he or she is communicating; the reason why is our seventh and last principle: pursue your God-given design and calling. In *Life*

Purpose Planning by Dewey Novotny and *Finding a Job You Can Love* by Ralf Mattson and Arthur Miller this point can be contemplated much more thoroughly, but the overall principle that these men teach is that God has specifically designed every person the way that they are (their giftings, talents, interests, dreams, and passions) for a reason. Discover your calling and your God-given design. And once you understand it, serve. As *The Serving Leader* By Ken Jennings and John Stahl-Wert says, “upend the pyramid,” that means serve as if you are on the bottom; not the top as you lead. And as Dr. Jeff Myers says, “you only have one Master, serve Him... and out of your service to Him, serve others.”

In conclusion, spend time with the Lord and in His presence, be diligent, maintain a good name, follow the Holy Spirit’s guidance, be guided by and rooted in a balanced view of the Word of God, be passionate, and pursue your God-given design and calling. Christian communicator, you have a great responsibility, gift, and stewardship as you communicate following the Lord. Draw close to Him and set the example for other Believers (1 Timothy 4:12)! “Buy the truth, and sell it not; also wisdom, and instruction, and understanding” (Proverbs 23:23 KJV)!

References

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Steck, Christopher. (July 2013). *Journal of religious ethics 41.2: re-embedding moral agency: Linking Theology and Ethics in Blake*

The Holy Bible, King James Version. Public Domain.

Stockstill, Larry. (2008). *The remnant: restoring the call to personal integrity*. Not listed. Charisma House.

Swanson, Kevin. (2008). *The second mayflower*. (3rd ed.). Parker, CO: Generations with Vision.

Jennings, Ken and Stahl-Wert, John. (2003). *The Serving Leader*. (1st ed.) San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

A Journalist's Ethics are Governed by His or Her Personal Beliefs

A journalist is ultimately be governed by his or her definition of what is right or wrong. Some journalists may believe it is wrong to show death on the screen because they

believe in the sanctity of human life and another may believe that everything, even the ugly should be shared with the public. The world will obviously have many differing opinions on what is right or wrong, but the Christian journalist should have a Biblical conviction about such things. While facts must be presented, a journalist can present them in such a way that it graphic media or obscene speech is not used or a warning given of the upcoming content. The question is, is broadcasting “a bank robber killing himself and a man shooting himself in the head on the freeway” right or wrong (Ethics Bowl 2001). Each Christian journalist should follow their Biblical convictions about what to do when such things must be reported.

Reference

Case #13 Ethics Bowl 2001 from

www.ethics.sandiego.edu/index.asp

Dialogical Perspectives and Situational Ethic

“Dialogical perspectives...focus on the attitudes toward each other held by the participants in a communication transaction” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 51). Jesus dealt with Dialogical perspectives quite a bit in His

sermon on the mount. For example, Jesus said that hating someone was the same as murdering them (Matt. 5:21-22); forgive or you will not be forgiven (Matt. 6:14-15); lust is the same as adultery (Matt. 5:27-30); and love your enemies: yea, bless them (Matt.4:43-44). Certainly, Jesus taught that the attitude and posture of one's heart are very important as you interact with others. Therefore, it is essential for the Christian communicator to maintain the right heart attitude while conversing; however, he or she must never condone sin, but love the sinner (Luke 19:10, Rom. 3:23, 5:8, 7:15, 1 Tim. 1:15-16, 1 John 4:19, John 8:11, Jude 22-23, Psalm 45:7, Heb. 1:9).

I do not believe that there is a Christian situational ethic. The Scriptures show people being punished for their "situational" moral violations (2 Sam 6:6-7, John 18:15-18, 25-27, 2 Sam. 11-12). Philip Lampe appears to believe that situational ethics applies when he says that

Teachers, administrators, coaches, and all who are part of the educational system should serve as role models, making sure they are always impartial, consistent, and reflexive in their decisions and treatment of others. In this way students may learn that all human behavior is moral, immoral, or amoral, and all our actions have social consequences that must be taken into consideration. (Lampe, Philip, 2010, web)

I take Lampe's remarks to mean that ethics will be taught by the situations that students see their teachers set an example in. While I believe that it is true that many students make ethical guidelines for themselves from this example, it is a shifting standard and not an absolute source. We need an absolute reference to base our ethics and our morals and that standard is the Word of God. Thus, I likewise disagree with Joseph Fletcher's Situational Ethics because they seem too narrow: he focuses only on loving others and God (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 74). and does not base his view on the Scriptures as a whole.

References:

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Lampe, Philip. "Ethical education." *Teaching and Learning* 24.2 (2010): 48+. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 20 May 2013.

Religion or Relationship?

The text says that "Religious perspectives on communication ethics are rooted in the basic assumptions of a religion about the relation of The Divine/The Eternal to

humans and the world about the relation of humans and the world to The Divine/The Eternal.” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 81). While this statement is true, oftentimes Christianity gets grouped in with Islam and Hinduism as a “religion.” I am of the opinion that Christianity is not a systematic religion, where one tries to appease a god, but a relationship with one’s Savior and Lord, living a life of becoming conformed to the image of Christ in every aspect of life. Biblical Christianity makes absolute claims about Heaven and Hell, Christ and Sin, and Redemption and Bondage to name a few, but its claims, grounded in the Word of God are 100% true and set, not an opinion and not relative to the era or culture: God’s Word is the same throughout all generations and His standards clear (Psalm 119:89, 2 Timothy 3:16-17, 2 Peter 1:21). Therefore, Christians should conduct themselves Biblically, this does not mean as a religion or an ideal which imposes legalism, love, justice, or goodness, but a lifestyle grounded in the basics of Christianity—that all mankind is loved by God and should be respected as such (2 Peter 3:9, Genesis 1:27); however, all are also on a path to Hell and must be warned (Jude 1:23, Matthew 10:28). A Christian must balance love with justice, God’s goodness with His coming judgment and wrath. To only lean to one extreme is to teach only one side of the truth (Ecclesiastes 7:18). Utilitarianism is a false idea which the text defines it as “an ethical standard which holds that ‘actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of

happiness” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 87). This is a dangerous mindset and a Christian communicator can have nothing to do with it. Telling people the truth of Hell does or telling them of a Savior who died on a bloody cross for their evil sin is not something that makes people happy. We must teach the truth and stand for what is right (Ephesians 6:13) as communicators whether or not it always makes people happy. Our Lord Jesus Christ did this (Matthew 10:38, 12:34, John 8:44), and we as His followers should do no less. If we simply talk about theories, without recognizing Biblical absolute truth and the principles which God Himself has given us in His Great Book, The Bible, as supremely true, then we are in a quest of futility. We cannot learn truth apart from God’s Word and the Principles contained therein. It is a sad thing that so many in our culture turn to professor whoever or the latest study to prove their point without ever looking at what God’s Word says. May we not follow the way of mere happiness, but the pursuit of Truth, ever growing closer to the Lord and in understanding of His Word; taking a stand for revealed, Biblical Truth in an age of wickedness and deception.

It is never ethical to lie. We are told in scripture to not make a vow rashly (Ecclesiastes 5:2, 4), and Jesus Himself says that our yes must be yes and our no, no (Matthew 5:37). We will be judged for every careless word (James 5:12). To permit lying in some rare or special circumstance is to deny the validity of the 10 Commandments (Exodus 20:16), and the Word of God (Colossians 3:9, 1 Corinthians 6:9-11). On

the other hand, ambiguity or secrecy in one's communication brings a whole host of ethical considerations along with it. Obviously the U.S. government cannot tell us everything the military is doing for national security reasons, but when issues like the current tax scandal surface, much has to be evaluated and considered. I do not believe there is a single answer to this entire question, for it is a large question, but I will try to give my best response: as a communicator, one should seek to have a good name (Proverbs 22:1, Ecclesiastes 7:1), this means that after evaluating how to approach a subject in regard to the Word of God and your personal, Biblical convictions (Matthew 22:36-38), one should consider how you can love your neighbor as yourself (Matthew 22:39-40) through your communication and through what you disclose to your audience. Certain details of your study and preparation may not need to be disclosed. For example, when preparing a sermon, or a lecture, the communicator rarely gives a sheet listing every resource they consulted to their audience; however, this does not mean that they are unethical. Gulcimen Yurtsever makes a summary statement that provides an excellent illustration to contemplate on this issue:

Understanding the manager's belief is critical in the business world since the business philosophy depends, to a large degree, upon the beliefs held by the management. Particularly when business situations are ambiguous, managers tend to rely on

their belief systems to make decisions (Yurtsever, 2000, p. 142).

In all things, Christian communicator, I “beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Ephesians 4:1-3 KJV).

References:

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Yurtsever, Gulcimen. *Social behavior & personality: an international journal*. 2000, Vol. 28 Issue 2, p141. 8p.

The Value of “Groupthink” Always Positive?

The text describes groupthink as “the collective label used...to describe characteristics of small groups whose processes of problem solving and policy determination

typically result in ineffectiveness, low quality decisions, and failure to attain objectives” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 151). When a small group of people are selected in the Senate to form a committee on a given issue, they typically get little done as groupthink says. However, when my Dad gets together with his small group of 4-5 Christian men that discuss business ideas, they encourage each other and help each other to succeed in each of their respective fields. The two examples show the effectiveness of small groups. In the political realm, many times people who do not know each other very well and are not like-minded are stuck in a group and; therefore, do not really accomplish very much. But in my Dad’s small group, the men are like-minded and help each other; therefore, when they get together groupthink is proved false.

If one is in an organization where they feel the culture is immoral or unethical, they, first of all, should go to their authority and talk to them. If the authority is clearly just dismisses or even condones immoral or unethical acts one should consult with co-workers and take them with them to talk to their authority. If the authority still does not truly listen and do something, then whistle blowing to the civil authorities is the next step. “Whistleblowers are people who expose negligence, abuse or danger such as professional misconduct or incompetence that exists in the organization in which they work.” (Ray, 2006, p. 438). Scripture teaches three steps when dealing with conflict: first go to the person alone and present your case, second take 2-3 others with

you, and finally present it to the whole group—this is based on Jesus statement in Matthew 18 where He says “Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee*, *then* take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican” (Matthew 18:15-17, KJV).

References:

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Ray, Susan L. *Nursing ethics*. Jul 2006, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p438-445. 8p.

The Holy Bible. *King james version*. Public domain.

Response to Case Study on Debt

Kevin should not loan Shawn the money. For one, loaning money to friends and relatives has a proven record

of destroying relationships because one feels like he owes the other (which is true). Second, Scripture teaches that the borrower is servant (slave) to the lender (Proverbs 22:7) and that Christians are to **owe** no man anything but a debt of love (Romans 13:6-8). Therefore, Kevin should take his stand and say that he will not lend the money and explain Scripturally why. This will completely dismiss the issue of discussing repayment. As the text describes Candon's Interpersonal ethic, Kevin should "be candid and frank in sharing personal beliefs and feelings" (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 137).

References:

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Is it Ethical to Remain Silent when your Friend Is in a Questionable Relationship?

Mary should say something to her friend Jane. The man Jane is dating appears to have horrible character: he is not a

leader, not able to provide, and always taking. A real, godly man should be giving; a humble, servant leader (Ephesians 5); and able to provide for a family (1 Timothy 5:8). Jane is involved with a man that is pretty clearly not ready to leave and cleave (Genesis 2:24) and that is likely not very committed to anything. Although Jane may be sensitive, Mary needs to approach Jane with the gravity of the situation. **Blind “love” is destructive and emotional based; but true love is committed (1 Corinthians 13).** In this situation, Mary should be careful how she says what she needs to say and with what body language she conveys her concerns to Jane—this is the “ethic of care.” Mary should apply “compassion, empathy, and nurturance to help resolve conflicting ethical responsibilities to all concerned” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 205).

Reference

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Ethic of Respect/Equality

Perceiving human life as valuable and people as equal, carefully listening, the Golden Rule, and seeking understanding are ethical standards that should be universal among all cultures (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 224,226,230). Human life must be perceived as valuable and each human being as an equal. This ethic is rooted in a Biblical worldview because Scriptures says that man was created in the image of God (Genesis 1:27). Carefully listening to another party for the purpose of truly understanding their position should be sought by all. The Bible talks about this in Luke 8:18 where Jesus says “Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have” (KJV). In addition, Proverbs emphatically says that understanding should be bought: “Buy the truth, and sell *it* not; *also* wisdom, and instruction, and understanding” (Proverbs 23:23, KJV)! But ultimately, all cultures must practice the Golden Rule: doing unto others as they would want done unto them (Matthew 7:12).

Respect, “the term respect dates back to the 1300s and has its roots in the Latin term ‘respectus,’ which refers to the ‘act of looking back at one,’ or ‘look back at, regard, consider.’ The verb originates from the noun and means to ‘treat with deferential regard or esteem’” (Cutcliffe &

Travale, 2008, p. 275). We can respect our history by looking back at our heritage (Hebrews 13:7, 2 Timothy 2:5, Deuteronomy 5:15). But, we also need to respect each other. This does not mean that we embrace all that someone says and never disagree, but that we “disagree without being disagreeable.” We can stand for the Truth without compromising our beliefs and as Christians, we have the responsibility to live our lives as a peculiar people, teaching the Truth of the Word of God no matter what the culture is like (1 Peter 2:9, Matthew 28:18-20, 2 Timothy 3:16-17, Proverbs 23:23 Ephesians 6).

References

- Cutcliffe, John R & Travale, Rodger. (2008) *Nursing Ethics: respect in mental health: reconciling the rhetorical hyperbole with the practical reality*. May2013, Vol. 20 Issue 3, p273-284. 12p.
- Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- The Holy Bible. *King james version*. Public domain.

Chapter 7

Culture

Culture is made up of the environment, standards, and influences that surround you. You can have a different culture at home, work, and school. Culture can be a good thing or a bad thing. Morality, personal choices, and education will all be influenced by the cultures that you pay attention to. For example, I try to listen closely to my parents, mentors, and Bible teachers that make up my familial and church cultures, while I distance myself from popular culture. The reason I do this is because I realize that where I devote my attention and time listening, I will be influenced and the cultures that I separate or distance myself from will have little impact on me. I personally do this because I love the Lord Jesus Christ and believe that His Word and commands are the most important; therefore, I want to live a life pleasing to Him. That means that I want to stand for what He stands for; thus, I believe in absolute right and wrong, in forgiveness and restoration, in depravity and hope, in Hell and in Heaven.

Cultural Application Paper

Christian Culture in a World of Relativity?

Ryan Marks

Regent University

How should the Christian communicator reach other cultures evangelistically in light of cultural differences? Ethicist Deni Elliott lays out five principles for communicating ethically in various cultural settings. The five principles are 1) “Recognize needs and interests held in common. 2) Begin agreement by recognizing what both groups consider to be tolerable. 3) Value diversity over assimilation. 4) Listen to and value the nondominant culture.” And 5) In those instances where everyone’s needs cannot be met, favor the vulnerable” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 255). In this paper, I will attempt to answer the following questions: How can Ethicist Deni Elliott’s five principles be applied to cross-cultural evangelism? Are there any dangers of applying his views, and if so, how can a Christian respond without “watering down” the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

- 1) Recognize needs and interests held in common

Christian evangelism efforts can include preaching in the midst of a crowd like Peter in Acts 2:14, but many times evangelism will be personal, one-on-one conversations where a Christian can truly see the needs of those without Christ. First and foremost, the Christian must remember that all are lost without Christ (Isaiah 53:6), but through the preaching of salvation from sins in Jesus Christ, everyone can have new life (John 8:24, 1 John 5:12). In our American culture, which is very diverse, many are bound by a cycle of welfare and need. A Christian can share the Gospel with the culturally diverse groups represented in this category by meeting their needs. Jesus befriended sinners and compassionately met their true needs (Luke 4:18-19). Christians are not to give handouts or simply conform to the culture to reach people (Romans 12:2)—Elliott’s principle is dangerous if we do this. Instead, the Christian is to help the poor that are truly in need because of physical or mental handicap by providing for their needs, but those who are able bodied or able minded are to be encouraged to work by our offer of gleanings. In the Old Testament, a Jew was not allowed to harvest the corners of his field, but was to leave them for the poor to come and gather (Leviticus 23:22). Only those who were paralyzed or blind or stricken with some other infirmity that kept them from working were given money. The Christian must be careful not to give money to people, but to truly meet the need and then help people provide for themselves. For example, a Christian may find a man who is hungry and feed him and then ask

him to go chop some wood or do some yard work in exchange for a place to stay and another day of meals. This is not cruel when the person is able bodied and is Scriptural—if a man does not work, he shall not eat (2 Thessalonians 3:10). Christians must stand against the welfare/entitlement/allowance mentality in all cultures, and encourage productive work, because God Himself ordained and established work as mankind’s task before the Fall (Genesis 2:15).

2) Begin an agreement by recognizing what both groups consider to be tolerable

This principle can be flawed, although it can also be beneficial. For example, when a staunch evolutionist like Richard Dawkins comes up to debate with John Lennox, a staunch creationist, no matter how much each party tries to begin with what each other agree on, there is essentially nothing that they agree on because they have different worldviews and value systems—different Faiths—that are woven into everything they do and believe. However, when discussing with a small group of people about political issues, it may be possible to reach some type of conclusion on what is tolerable; however, that again will be a daunting task because there will always be someone in the group that will not want to agree with a member of another political party on anything. Therefore, if one tries to take Elliott’s 2nd

principle literally, one will open them self up to being all-accepting and shallow in an effort to seek “agreeableness.”

3) Value diversity over assimilation

This is another dangerous principle. Should Christians value pagan rituals like tattooing one’s body to communicate with the dead or killing twins because they are believed to be “fathered by Satan,” or burning a wife alive because her husband passed away and she “needs” to be with him? Christians cannot morally value this diversity. A Christian must encourage assimilation to God’s absolute standards of right and wrong—His Law. Therefore, while valuing a discussion of viewpoints in a classroom setting may not have very many consequences, one with a pagan culture might.

4) Listen to and value the non-dominant culture

This, again, is a dangerous principle because it feeds the postmodern assumption that minorities are oppressed. While it is true that we should understand the disdain that some Hispanics experience in our culturally diverse country simply because of their ethnicity, we also must realize how much better their quality of life is compared to their people in other countries. In addition, many Hispanics work much harder than “Americans” and put us to shame in how

dedicated and hard working they are. We must not allow political issues or perceptions to hinder our evangelism efforts and preaching a message that all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23) but that there is redemption and new life in Jesus Christ (Ephesians 1:7, Romans 6:4). But we must also balance this principle, because this principle can very easily be understood to mean that one must value groups such as the tree huggers, the homosexual movement, Islamic extremists, and Hindus. While the Christian should seek to share the Gospel with these cultural groups, one can find few things to value in some groups which are deeply bound in sin. We need to develop an understanding of these cultures enough that we can know what their values and needs are and show them how God talks about their them. For example, Muslims believe that they have to live out their Faith in their everyday lives. This is a true, Scriptural principle that Christians can begin a conversation with; however, we cannot value a Muslim belief in Mohammed being a prophet and denying the divinity of Christ. Christ came to bring unity to the Church (Ephesians 2:14-22), but division to the world because of His message (Matthew 10:34-36).

5) In those instances where everyone's needs cannot be met, favor the vulnerable

This principle is also a very dangerous statement by Elliott. Should homosexuals be given preferential treatment

because everyone else's needs cannot be met and because they are more vulnerable to criticism than other groups represented? The Christian should know that sodomy is a sin that God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah for—it is abhorred by God and called in Romans the result of being given over to a depraved mind (Romans 1:16-32).

In conclusion, Deni Elliott's 5 principles of 1) recognizing needs and interests held in common, 2) beginning with agreement by recognizing what both groups consider to be tolerable, 3) valuing diversity over assimilation, 4) listening to and valuing the non-dominant culture, and 5) in those instances where everyone's needs cannot be met, favor the vulnerable (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 255) can loosely be utilized by Christians in evangelism, but must largely be discarded as a rule because of the implications of Elliott's claims. I believe that Elliott is simply trying to motivate communicators toward being more understanding instead of one sided in their communication which is admirable. In support of that claim, here is a final quote from Elliot from one of his articles:

Governmental rhetoric, in the United States, as elsewhere around the world, has the primary agenda of promoting the governmental position. When news media repeat governmental rhetoric rather than reporting on it, citizens are robbed of the opportunity

to think critically about what is being said (Elliott, 2003, p. 19).

John Paton, a missionary of the past was a great example of a Christian missionary (communicator and evangelist) who stood for truth by consistently resisting cannibalism and the specific practice of a chief eating his favorite wife when she died. Yet, he also consistently preached the message of salvation in Christ and a Christian Faith that is not without works and dead (James 2:14-26), but vibrantly integrated into every facet of one's life (Swanson, 2010). For the Christian, evangelism in every culture must continue to preach the central message of Christ and Him crucified for our sins. Unless everyone is a sinner, there is no need for a Savior.

References

Elliott, Deni. (2003) *Balance and context: maintaining media ethics*. Phi kappa phi forum. Spring, Vol. 83 Issue 2, p. 16-20. EBSCO Publishing.

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

The Holy Bible, King James Version. Public Domain.

Swanson, Kevin. (2010). *Great Christian classics: five remarkable narratives of the faith: the story of John G. Paton or thirty years among south sea cannibals*. Parker, CO: Generations with Vision

Chapter 8

Immigration

Political Media Analysis

Immigration: the Present Debate and its Ethicality

Ryan M. Marks

COMM 416: Communication Ethics

Regent University

Immigration: the Present Debate and its Ethicality

Immigration. It is what the United States of America was founded on as a nation. It began with the Pilgrim's and the thirteen colonies. It progressed with westward expansion. And it has continued with those who have journeyed overseas and even right next door from Mexico. The issue of immigration is important because immigration is what built this country and will continue to build it as the melting

pot of the world. However, questions are raised when talk about the immigration of Latino's from Mexico. In this paper, the intention is not to discredit the important issue of immigration, but evaluate the political media's approach of addressing the questions that immigration raises.

The debate on immigration is heated. When someone says, "immigration" in America the topic is now almost synonymous with the number of Hispanics that have come here because current immigration reform is primarily about the illegal Hispanic population in the United States. The debate is heated and politicians are fighting back and forth. Some Americans are very hostile toward Latinos and others just want to make all of them citizens. As Linglu Lu and Sean Nicholson-Cotty say,

Immigration is among the most salient and contentious policy areas in the United States. Opinions are highly polarized, with those who support more open borders arguing that immigrants are the foundation for America's unique character, and those who favor more restrictive policies suggesting that they pose one of the most pressing threats to the nation's cultural and economic health. Additionally, the intensity of opinion on immigration has remained consistently high in recent years... (Lingyu & Nicholson-Crotty, Sean, 2010, p. 1312).

Personally, I have heard President Obama, as far back as his 2012 presidential race address the issue of immigration by proposing that he would make Latinos citizens. Many conservatives are not keen on this idea; however, because many Latinos would be declared citizens who have illegally gotten into this country and those Latinos who are declared citizens would not be required to know about our country as those who legally seek citizenship currently do.

Ethics in Human Communication outlines the following characteristics which will be addressed in this paper in relation to the immigration debate: the grounded rationality of the communication, public confidence in the truthfulness of the communication, civility, toleration, reflexivity, reciprocity, and moderation (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 29-30,32).

First, both sides of the debate have their own opinions, but a true standard of rationality is one where the evidence has been communicated and the communicator has addressed a logical series of solutions and steps to solve the current issues. I have seen Fox 2 News present Senator Rubio of Florida as having a very rational response to the current Immigration debate. However, they present President Obama as a visionary speaker that continues to frustrate listeners who want grounded, rational plans laid before them. An ethical communicator will strive to truly

study out the issue laid before them and present a well thought through plan to his or her audience.

Second, what about the public confidence in the truthfulness of the communication on the issue of immigration? Well, there appears to be a 50/50 split. Immediately following the 2012 presidential reelection of President Obama, I watched, as did many other Americans, reporters from both mainline political parties saying that the United States was essentially a divided nation: composed of about 50% who trusted President Obama and 50% who did not trust him at all. That fact has carried over to the issue of immigration. Partly because many people do not trust what the President says and he is the one trying to lead the nation on the way to immigration reform so they resist his ideas and partly because immigration is simply a highly controversial issue.

Third, because of the division amongst the nation and among those serving in the civil government issues of civility, toleration, reflexivity, reciprocity, and moderation all come into play both on the political scene and in civilian political conversation. Opposing sides of an issue constantly have to be on guard to remain civil. Civility means “listening to the arguments made by others in public discussion, trying to understand them, and responding as if they were made in good faith by making reasoned responses even to incoherent or transparently self-interested views” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 32). It also must

be born in mind that “civility ‘does not mean that all perceptions and insights are equally valid, but that all equally deserve to undergo the test of sincere public discourse.’” (Johannesen, Valde & Whedbee, 2008, p. 32). Sadly, most Americans I have talked to in civilian conversation believe that our Senators are not civil with each other at all, but rather caught up in their own agendas. This many times is the sad reality of our political leaders, which leads to further problems in toleration, reflexivity, reciprocity, and moderation. When each “side” pits themselves against the other, they do not tolerate one another, but attack each other; they do not re-examine their own position to see what may be lacking (reflexivity), but remain stuck in their chosen mindsets; they do remember that what they dish out will be dished back (reciprocity), and lash out in strife and anger; and they get caught up in each of their extremes instead of together pulling together to form the most balanced and moderate decisions that they can. The discussions on immigration are only just beginning, but there is already evident tension in each of these areas if one watches the news.

Fourth, Scripture teaches “thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt” (Exodus 23:9) and “love ye therefore the stranger: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt” (Deuteronomy 10:19). No matter what politicians debate about, they must practice loving kindness toward immigrants. Real people and their lives are being influenced

so the Christian communicator must be cautious of excluding the “elephants” or the “donkeys” and instead address the real issues at hand, all the while, trying to seek the good of the people involved and striving to be balanced in all things and avoid extremes (Ecclesiastes 7:18).

There is a great debate on the issue of immigration, but this paper has not gone very in depth on the specifics of the issue, but rather has evaluated the ethicality of what the American people are dealing with from political media. The test of rationality shows that the debate is lacking because vision is being elevated above solid plans. Public confidence in the truthfulness of politicians is very low and perhaps even hostile. There is a general atmosphere of lack in civility, tolerance, reciprocity, and moderation in the eyes of the public amongst the civil government’s leaders which are trying to come to a decision on immigration reform. Yet, a contrast has been shown and a vision cast of the difference between the ethical communicator and the unethical. Hopefully, this will prove to make some impact on someone in the political eye so that they may conduct themselves with integrity and ethicality.

References

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S., & Whedbee, K.E. (2008). *Ethics in human communication*. (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Lu, Lingyu & Nicholson-Crotty, Sean (2010). *Reassessing the impact of hispanic stereotypes on white americans' immigration preferences*. Social Science Quarterly (Blackwell Publishing Limited). Dec2010, Vol. 91 Issue 5, p1312-1328.

The Holy Bible, King James Version. Public Domain.

Chapter 9

Worldview

This chapter is based on assignments from the Comparative Worldviews course by John Stonestreet which CollegePlus offers.

Assign #1

1. Response to Plato's "Allegory of the Cave."

There is a big, dark cave that contains in it all the people of the world. It is always cold, always dark, and the people are always bound with chains. None of them have ever been outside of the cave. One day, however, one of the prisoners, a man, breaks free of his chains and slowly crawls till he finds his way to the mouth of the cave. He quivers in fear, but bolsters up the courage to leave the cave and stand in the light. As he does, he feels the warmth of the sun. He sees fruit trees in the distance and runs up to them to try their dainties. Somehow he knows that the taste he is experiencing is what food is supposed to taste like: delicious, flavorful, and satisfying. After a few hours of

discovering the outside world, the man remembers the others in the cave and turns around determined to free them all and bring them out in a few hours. However, when he arrives and starts trying to free them of their bonds they band against him and beat him. He responds telling them his tale and all the wonderful things he has discovered—including the warmth and delicious food. They tell him he is crazy and that the cave is all that the world is, there is nothing else. He keeps pleading with them, but they will not listen. At this point the man leaves the cave, despondent that he was not able to bring the others out so quickly; but after his emotion wears off a bit, he decides to go back with food and things to let the others taste and feel in the darkness. He wins a few followers and brings them outside. Then he takes his little band back to try to get some of the others the same way. But when they get there. The man, like a missionary is killed by those in the dark cave who will not believe that there is any other reality than the cave. The other few the man had led to the light flee outside and remain there while those in the cave continue to stay in their darkness.

2. How this story illustrates how a person's worldview affects the way they look at life

I understand this story best when I think of the man who found the light as finding Christ and the people

in the cave as those caught in the bondage of the Devil—in the darkness and ferociously calling it reality. The worldview of each party drastically effects their actions. The man who finds the light of and life in Christ tries to share it with others. Those in the world, though a few listen to the man’s cries, largely beat him up, mock him, and perhaps even kill him for his views.

3. Multiple answers to each of the ultimate questions based on different worldviews.

a. Origin: Where did everything come from?

A big bang

Nothing

God

The gods

Aliens

b. Identity: What is a human being?

A person created in the image of God

Someone with a soul

Someone with a mind and rationality

An evolved animal

A monkey that can talk

c. Meaning: What is the purpose of life?

To serve God and enjoy Him forever

To follow God and the calling He has placed on your life

Pursue pleasure

Have sex and gratify yourself

Make the most of life, you only get one shot

To help others

To get wealthy

To look “beautiful”

To be “intellectual”

d. Morality: What is right and wrong? How do we know?

Right and wrong are defined by God's Law. We know that the Law is true because God spoke it and He is truth.

There is no right and wrong, we cannot know absolute truth

Right and wrong are relative to the situation. We can only know in our heart what is wrong or right for yourself, not what is wrong or right for others.

e. Destiny: What happens when we die? Where is history headed?

We go to heaven or hell. History is headed toward physical and complete redemption by Jesus Christ.

Nothing, we cease to exist. History is heading toward greater knowledge and technological advancement.

If you are really good, you go to heaven. If you are really bad, you go to hell.

You are reincarnated 23 times (this is an actual theory I heard from a college student). History is headed nowhere in particular.

4. Referring to question three: 1) Explain how the worldview families are reflected in your answers and

2) explain how certain answers influence the way a person answers the other ultimate questions.

Many of my answers reflect a Naturalistic worldview: we are here today and gone tomorrow and life is simply founded on biological processes. This worldview causes people to look to nature and the here and now with no regard for eternal consequences or absolutes. Because of this, people with this worldview have only this earth and its processes to answer the ultimate questions with.

Transcendentalism is reflected in a few of my answers such as “what is right for me, isn’t necessarily right for you.” This worldview simply opens the door for its possessors to see the world as they want to see it. Therefore, they will answer each ultimate question however they want to answer it.

Theism is reflected by most of my answers because they assume that God is a part of every ultimate question. People with this view will have their religion give them answers to each ultimate question.

Lastly, postmodernism is seen in a couple of my answers such as “pursue pleasure.” Postmodernists answer the ultimate questions by what they have experienced.

5. Pick one significant, positive event in your life, and interpret it from each of the worldviews of

Naturalism, Transcendentalism, Postmodernism, and Theism.

The Event: earning my Gold Medal of Achievement (equivalent of Eagle Scout) in Royal Rangers.

Naturalism:

The medal was earned, but is worthless. It has no lasting meaning because I only have one life to live and I could spend it many other ways than working hard on merits and requirements in a “Christian program.”

Transcendentalism:

This medal represents the development of my spiritual nature. I grew closer to Jesus, the universe, and my relationships with others. I am fulfilled, feel great, and have achieved something that will benefit me in this life and the next.

Postmodernism:

This medal took a lot of hard work to earn. I guess it was worth it, but I wonder what else I could have experienced with that time...I experienced many camps and training events, as well as many different life skills through the merits. Overall, I guess I had a good time.

Theism:

God helped me earn this medal, built lasting relationships with my peers and leadership, learn life skills, learn to speak in public and implement being a leader. I could not do this alone, it was God who gave me the strength. I believe that He will use this experience to benefit me in the future as He continues to guide me.

Assign #2

1. How do Eastern expressions of Transcendentalism (i.e. Hinduism and Buddhism) differ from Western expressions.

Hinduism and Buddhism each are old and even somewhat ritualistic religions of the East. However, in the West, we see the New Age that Oprah popularizes. It teaches that good feelings and “knowing” are of supreme importance and that each individual is a god. Life is meant to be enjoyed and pleasure pursued because we are all “one with the universe.” This mindset is very appealing to the American people who crave entertainment and chase pleasure. In contrast, Hinduism offers a strict system of rules and many reincarnations and Buddhism is about living a life of suffering. In the past, people pursued the types of religions the East has to offer; today, however, they are beginning to look for

an all embracing and low commitment religion like the New Age.

2. What “The Secret to You” video by Opra emphasizes and neglects.

“The Secret to You” emphasizes tranquility, rest, accomplishment, happiness, individuality, success, and love. But it neglects to show any personal responsibility: there is no representation of the hardship that one must go through to accomplish, achieve success, and experience true happiness (by accepting Christ’s sacrifice—there is no other way). Love is only shown as an emotionally attracted couple, not the realities about the hardships of life three years down the road with kids. Individuality is praised, but it is neglected that loneliness is the bi-product of being alone, while true fulfillment is found in interdependence with friends, family members, mentors, and a church family.

Assign #3

1. Metanarrative and why postmodernists hate it.

A metanarrative is the “big picture story.” Postmodernism teaches that stories should be abandoned

because they are oppressive. For example, one postmodernist claims that language is oppressive because words' meaning is dependent upon one's own experience. This is a preposterous notion, though, since we know that words in fact do have specific meanings, otherwise there would be no dictionary. Likewise postmodernists claim that religion, intolerance, traditional values, and free speech (they teach this in principle) are oppressive.

2. Two strengths and weaknesses of postmodernism.

Postmodernism is very strong in standing for what it believes without compromising its beliefs, this is admirable. In addition, postmodernism is very good at viewing the world as being oppressive, which is largely true. Post modernisms weaknesses, however, are 1) that it holds to its claims, even when they can be logically and factually proved false. 2) Postmodernism falsely claims that one cannot know truth and that any claim to know anything absolutely is oppressive on others. The contradiction is that postmodernism claims that its' view is absolutely right and, therefore, is oppressive on others.

3. A book which is an example of postmodernism.

Postmodernism for Beginners by Jim Powell teaches postmodern thinking as a solution to the spiritual and philosophical problems that have come as the result of the Enlightenment's failure. He claims that postmodernism will help people as a series of maps in the midst of our changing world. The problem with his view is that postmodernism offers no real map, it only offers illogical and intolerant views for its possessors to cling to. In addition, he tells the truth that postmodernism offers solution to problems related to the Enlightenment's failure; however, he appears to neglect the fact that postmodernism is also a "solution" to the failed Modernism era as well.

Assign #4

1. What are the most compelling evidences that God exists?

The world around us—the universe, the stars, the complexity of the earth and cell are compelling evidences of God's existence. How could such a complex world just happen by chance? It defies logic to say that it did. Logic demands that a Creator must have created things the way that they are. In addition, why does man feel guilt inside when he sins? Universally, there is a moral feeling that is

innate inside of mankind. This evidence teaches that man is not an animal, but is above an animal; and thus the Bible's teaching that man is created in the image of a God whose Law is composed of moral absolutes makes sense.

2. What are the implications for the world if God exists....and if He does not?

If God exists, then what He says is true. If He says that there is a Heaven and Hell, then there is. If He says that we must not sin, it is Law. If He says that Jesus is the only way to salvation, then He is. But if God does not exist, then salvation is a joke. The Bible is just a bunch of stupid letters. There are no absolutes, we can just do whatever we want. Human life is not important or sacred, it is just like an animal: no value if you kill it or let it live. Euthanasia is fine. Abortion is great. Robbing people by "redistributing wealth" the Robin Hood way is permissible. Sex is fine without being marriage, and so is sex with animals or your mom, or your friend of the same gender. A world without God would be chaos.

3. Contrasted differences between Islamic, Jewish, and Christian views of God.

Islamics view God as a distant, God who created the universe and sent His Word through the prophets, the Koran, and Mohammed. God causes everything that happens and is meant to be obeyed. Jews view God as the Creator and personally involved in their lives. The Law of God is meant to be rigidly obeyed, and because they are the chosen people, they separate themselves from others and do not proselytize. In contrast to both, Christians view God as a *redemptive* God who has not only provided redemption for us through Jesus Christ death, but will one day redeem the entire world and restore it to the glory of Eden. Christianities' view of a loving God who wants to have a relationship with all mankind, causes them to proselytize and get involved in charitable endeavors to love their neighbors as themselves.

Chapter 10

Creation & Evolution

This chapter is based on an assignment in the Comparative Worldviews course by John Stonestreet which CollegePlus offers.

1. How David Noebel's article "Worldviews of Destruction in the 20th Century" impacted the 20th century toward naturalism?

The greatest consequence of the naturalistic worldview in the 20th century is that more people have died in this century than any other. Hitler slaughtered many in his quest to preserve the "Arian race." Millions of Jews were murdered in concentration camps. Women and children were cruelly killed on the battlefield. American theorists saw Hitler implement their ideals of euthanasia, class genocide, and abortion on a large scale and applauded him! In addition, Lenin murdered millions of his own people in a quest to establish "the greatest good": communism. In all,

the 20th century showed the depravity, hopelessness, and destruction that a naturalistic (man is a product of the earth and is no more important than an animal) worldview leads to.

2. What are the strongest arguments against God's existence that you have heard or read?

“A loving God would not let people suffer, starve, and die.” That is the strongest argument I have ever heard against God's existence. At first, it is a very drawing argument: one's emotions are on high about the evil in the world. Despair, not hope is used to motivate you toward a decision against God's existence. This is one of Satan's most cleverly taught “doctrines of demons” (1 Timothy 4:1-2). However, this view is logically flawed. Even a casual reading of the Scripture teaches that God allows men to choose their actions; that, mankind has a freewill. The reason there is suffering, starvation, and horrific death is usually from man's evil choices which affect others. The other reason is that unfortunate accidents take place: such as the drowning of a child or a fatal car crash. Therefore, though appealing, the argument of “a loving God would not let people suffer, starve, and die horrific deaths” is not solid.

3. Who did you find more compelling: Richard Dawkins or John Lennox? Why?

I found John Lennox most appealing. The greatest reason, was that he was thoroughly prepared and had facts, logical arguments, scripture, and proof to back up his arguments. Richard Dawkins merely stated his opinions as fact without even citing studies, books, or other data to claim his point. At one point, Dawkins said something to the effect of “we now know that man is the product of millions of years of evolution and that life began from simple life forms,” but he neglected to give any backing for his theory. From a logical standpoint (even though, by Faith I am already a creationist), Dawkins loses: he does not give any support. But Lennox thoroughly answers each question and has logic and proof about why he is right. If this were a court room, Lennox would be the lawyer that would win the case.

Chapter 11

Discernment

Obscene or Indecent

Obscene materials differ from indecent ones. To start with, obscene and indecent have two different meanings. Obscene means “foul, filthy, offensive, disgusting, impure, purity and decency forbid [it] to be exposed” (Webster 1828). Whereas indecent means “unbecoming, unfit to be seen or heard, offensive to modesty and delicacy” (Webster 1828). The examples that follow will be given with these definitions in mind.

Indecent activities are often a matter of opinion due to their offensive nature. Those offended acts that they deem indecent are often disgusted on something that is crude but not necessarily wrong. For example, some people hate hearing about any form of bodily humor. So when a comedian makes jokes about someone breaking wind or having to relieve themselves, some are offended because of his “indecent” comments. Another example is how animals are butchered on live TV on the popular A&E Duck Dynasty series. Some people, are offended because the butchering of an animal made in onto the show. However, anyone who

eats meat is eating an animal that has been butchered so butchering is not in itself a shameful activity. Rather, people are offended because they deem it “unbecoming, unfit to be seen or heard, offensive to modesty and delicacy” (Webster 1828).

Obscene activities differ greatly from indecent ones primarily because obscene actions are shameful. For example, nudity and the images portrayed of two people engaging in sexual intercourse on an Agents of Shield episode are obscene. It is shameful to show such things (Ephesians 5:12, KJV). In addition, Joseph Dominick gives several examples of obscenity. The first is the 1957 case of *Roth vs. United States* in which the court ruled prurient (“lewd or tending to incite lust”) materials to be obscene (377). The United States has also taken actions to protect children from pornography (378). However, the Dominick errs in labeling obscene content as indecent. For example, he cites an example in which men “licked whipped cream off of strippers” which was fined on the grounds of indecency (281). Indecent, really? Or obscene? Remember Webster’s definition: foul, filthy, offensive, disgusting, impure, purity and decency forbid [it] to be exposed.”

One’s moral guidelines largely influence what one will believe is obscene or indecent. This analysis of indecency and obscenity upholds the Holy Scriptures as sufficiently describing moral absolutes (1 Timothy 3:16-17, KJV). One example where the Bible labels obscenity is in Leviticus

18:23 which says, “Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it *is* abomination. Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it *is* confusion” (KJV). In addition, anything that hints toward obscenity should be forsaken: “But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks” (Ephesians 5:3-4, KJV).

In summary, obscenity and indecency are different. Webster adequately defines them as obscene meaning “foul, filthy, offensive, disgusting, impure, purity and decency forbid [it] to be exposed” and indecent meaning “unbecoming, unfit to be seen or heard, offensive to modesty and delicacy” (Webster 1828), and the Bible is sufficient for revealing what should be considered obscene.

References

American Dictionary of The English Language: Facsimile First Edition. Webster, Noah. Foundation for American Christian Education. Not listed.

The Dynamics of Mass Communication. 10th ed.
Dominick, Joseph. McGraw-Hill. New York, 2009.

The Holy Bible. King James Version. Public Domain.

About the Author

Ryan M Marks is the author of a [number of books](#) including [Hope for When the Storm Hits, 1 Timothy, Multiple Streams of Income](#), the 3 volume [Thoughts devotional series](#), and [A Collection of Thoughts on God, Relationships and True Love](#). In addition, Ryan serves as the Founder and Director of [Focusing on the Mark Ministries](#), a DBA of his company [Marks Enterprises, LLC](#) and Chief Editor of [Devo Blast](#).