is to exploit a problem in society and then condition people to believe that the answer lies with the federal government. In America, the news media plays an important role in this conditioning process.

For example, virtually every news story about poverty in America places the blame for it on Washington. In the dozens of times I have seen such an analysis, I cannot recall once hearing that some of the responsibility should be shared by the spiritual and moral behavior of people. Yet no government on earth can wipe out poverty as long as alcoholism, immorality, and drug abuse are practiced on a wide scale. Regardless of how much money is spent for public housing or the creation of jobs, children will starve while their parents indulge their lower appetites.

Let me be quick to say that the government must do whatever it can to help the poor, and in many instances poverty is not the result of personal failure—but there must be a recognition that such problems have a spiritual dimension. By solely blaming the American government, people are conditioned to believe that the state bears full responsibility for all the needs of society. The next step is to get people to believe that the answer to our economic and social difficulties is to have a socialistic state where the rich will be forced to share their wealth with the poor by the abolition of private property.

Even the problem of child abuse, which receives so much attention in our newspapers, is used by humanists to try to show that we must allow the government to have a more direct hand in the rearing of our children. Feminists argue that the rise of child abuse is proof that parents do not know how to raise their children. They extol the virtues of communist countries where children are reared by teachers who provide day care twenty-four hours a day if necessary.

Perhaps the clearest indication that we are moving in the direction of a secular state with its arbitrary morality and devaluation of human life is the **Roe v. Wade** decision of the Supreme Court in 1973. As Hitler redefined **personhood** so that Jews would be excluded from the protection of the law, so preborn babies have been reclassified as nonpersons for the convenience of women. Secularism's disrespect for human life becomes apparent when we realize that nearly 20 million unborn babies have been mercilessly killed in the United States.

As already indicated, teachers in our public schools must use curriculum that is prescribed and prepared by secularists. All other religious convictions must be set aside in deference to the god of humanism. As humanist John Dunphy said:

> I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classrooms by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity...the classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new—the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism.[15]

The erosion of moral decency is evident throughout society. Once again, the media has contributed to the myth that premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexuality are on the same moral level as chastity, monogomy, and heterosexuality. Under the banner of "equality" homosexuals want their sexual mores taught in our public schools as simply an alternate sexual preference. The Playboy philosophy that has influenced so much of our culture teaches that any and all forms of sexual expression are legitimate just as long as they are pleasurable. The goal of many sex education classes taught in our schools is to teach teenagers how to have sex without guilt and without having a baby.

Given the growing intolerance of humanism, it is doubtful whether this nation can survive as a democracy unless there is a return to absolutes, a belief in God, and morality. If, as Arnold Toynbee has said, democracy is a leaf from the book of Christianity, our freedoms are in jeopardy when the influence of Christianity is extinguished. It is the Judeo-Christian belief that influenced the founding of this country and its assertion that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Without a belief in the Creator and accompanying inalienable rights, democracy cannot exist. As B. F. Skinner understood so well, if a man is the product of evolution and hence evolved through the animal world, he has neither freedom nor dignity. Yet those are the two qualities that must be present for the survival of democracy.

In a smear campaign aimed at what Norman Lear calls "the new right," Christians have been painted in the same hues as the Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan. Because Christians believe in the freedoms that America has had for two hundred years, they are considered the lunatic fringe. Make no mistake about the intention of these secularists: It is to discredit the voice of Christians so that America will tolerate only **one** religion, secular humanism.

The Supreme Court acknowledged that humanism is a religion in the 1961 **Torcase v. Watkins** case, so the battle lines are between two religions: humanism and Judeo-Christian beliefs. The religion of humanism sees Christianity as a threat to secularism, **and it is.** In those countries where secularization is complete, the state has tried to exterminate all religion. Clearly, two world views are on a collision course.

If as Francis Schaeffer has said, humanism has now replaced Christianity as the consensus of the West, our freedom is in jeopardy. The myths of humanism could destroy America.

Perhaps it will come as a surprise that the pastor of a well-known evangelical church should address the topics raised in this book. After all, my primary responsibility as a minister is to preach the gospel. How can I justify writing a book dedicated to exposing the philosophical myths of humanism?

My calling is to preach the gospel in light of the trends around us. As Karl Barth rightly observed, the effective preacher is the one with the Bible in one hand and a newspaper in the other. In his book *Save America!* Edward Rowe asks why the Christians in Germany were oblivious to Hitler's methods and intentions. A Christian who lived through the war told Rowe, "Most of the Bible believing Christians of Germany were right on Hitler's bandwagon at the time of his rise to power...these Christians were so busy with their Bible studies, their prayer meetings, their worship services, and their Christian fellowship that they were almost totally unaware of the controlling realities of the time."[16]

America is, as Elton Trueblood has said, "the cutflower generation." We still have the semblance of life because of the momentum of the past. But if we are cut off from the source of life, we will eventually wither and die.

I pray it is not too late to arm ourselves with truth so that we can maintain the freedoms we enjoy. We are not shadow boxing—the battle is real and cannot be wished away.

References

1. Ethel Barrett, *Chronicles of Mansoul* (Glendale, CA: Regal, 1980), p. 5.
2. David Bollier, "The Witchhunt Against Secular Humanism," *Humanist* 44(September/October 1984): 12.
3. David Bollier, *Liberty and Justice for Some* (New York: Frederick Unger, 1982), p. 99.
4. Quoted by Henry M. Morris, *Education for the Real World* (San Diego: Creation Life, 1977), p. 82.
5. Paul Kurtz, ed., *Humanist Manifestos I and II* (New York: Prometheus, 1973), p. 16.
6. Paul Kurtz, *A Secular Humanist Declaration* (New York: Prometheus, 1980), p. 18.
7. Kurtz, *Humanist Manifestos,* pp. 16-17.
8. Ibid., p. 17.
9. Ibid., p. 19.
10. Ibid., p. 21.
11. Quoted by Kirby Anderson, "About Pluralism and Religion," *Dallas Morning News,* 22 October 1984.
12. Kurtz, *A Secular Humanist Declaration,* p. 21.
13. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism,* trans. Philip Mairet (london: Methuen, 1948), p. 33.
14. Carl F. H. Henry, *The Christian Mindset in a Secular Society* (Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1984), p. 94.
15. Anderson, "About Pluralism."
16. Ron Jenson, *Together We Can* (San Bernardino: Here's Life, 1982), p. 166.

Hollywood promotes anti-Christian film, opposes true film about Belushi

From *Los Angeles Daily News*

This is a story about two kinds of pressure.

There is the sort of pressure John Belushi felt—to succeed, to be ever more outrageous, ever more popular. That contributed to his drug-overdose death at age 33, and it is chronicled in **Wired,** the film adaptation of Bob Woodward's Belushi biography.

And then here is the sort of pressure felt by Ed Feldman that was, in a sense, pressure not to succeed. He is the producer who brought **Wired** to the screen against the wishes of some of Hollywood's top figures. Directly and indirectly, Feldman got the word: It was not a good idea to be involved with this picture. Powerful people did not want it made.

The chilly reception made Feldman feel kind of alone.

"Everybody came to the defense of Martin Scorsese when he made **The Last Temptation of Christ,"** he said. "I certainly believe he had a right to do the story of how he saw the life of Christ."

So it's easier to make a movie about Christ...

"Than it is about John Belushi. In this community, no question," Feldman said.

Woodward, one of the investigative reporters who uncovered the Watergate scandal, came to Hollywood after Belushi's death in 1982 at the invitation of the comedian's widow, Judy.

In Hollywood, the bottom line is always whether it will make money.

Many insiders who freely talked to the journalist about the Hollywood drug scene were shocked by what they read when the book came out in 1984.

Wired was quickly denounced by such people as Judy Belushi, John Belushi's partner Dan Aykroyd and his former manager Bernie Brillstein. They claimed Woodward over-emphasized Hollywood's drug problem and simplified the actor's complex problems and personality. Not surprisingly, a film adaptation was an unpopular prospect in Hollywood.

But Feldman, whose films have ranged from **Witness** to **Hot Dog...the Movie,** "thought it was an interesting idea." Belushi's memory was strong and his story had an important moral.

Feldman began a frustrating year of putting together financing packages, which subsequently fell apart. He finally got backing for the $12 million picture from a New Zealand brewery, which figured sponsoring an anti-drug film would be good for their image.

Then, Feldman said, he got a call from Michael Ovitz, president of Creative Artists Agency, the high-powered talent agency that represented Belushi.

"He said: 'I don't think you should make this picture. I don't think it's good for you.' But I didn't take it as a threat."

Undeterred, director Larry Peerce began filming, using an unknown actor named Michael Chiklis in the title role. Chiklis could relate to the role; he was a heavy cocaine user in college when his parents' marriage fell apart.

But Chiklis started hearing names he had never heard before—names of important people who opposed the film. They were hearing his name—and associating it with a project they detested.

"It's a h--l of a way to enter [the film industry]," he said.

The supposed pressure failed to let up even after the movie was completed. In March, New Visions, which had been negotiating for distribution rights, unexpectedly pulled out.

The filmmakers then hooked up with Atlantic Releasing Corp., which was subsequently beset by financial problems. It recently declared bankruptcy.

This summer, Feldman finally found his distributor, Taurus Entertainment. It opened the film in close to 800 theaters across the United States.

No one will confirm the stories of harassment on the record.

"There's a great deal of evidence that Dan Aykroyd and Bernie Brillstein would have been happy if the film had never been made," said Anne Thompson, who writes a film-industry column for the *Los Angeles Weekly.* "But in Hollywood, the bottom line is always whether it will make money."

The irony is that Hollywood has nothing to fear. Unlike the book, the film does not name important industry people who are involved with drugs.

"They really were not important in the story of this man's inability to deal with life," said Peerce, who sees Belushi's story as symptomatic of a problem that extends beyond Hollywood.

"[Belushi's] manager says it in the film: 'This isn't a story about John Belushi. It's a story about America.'...The whole drug craziness we're going through in this country...he was very representative of that situation."

Turner network censors program with Christian values

By Dr. D. Diane Preston-Reilly
President, Challenger Films, Inc.

The Winning Edge project for television not only represents a program that presents good role models on television for our youth, but also represents the need to challenge the media system that has maintained a strong anti-Christian practice for some time. Most of us are tired of the fund-raising appeals by television evangelists. The Winning Edge represents a fresh approach. First, this program features real life stories of young people who have overcome adversity and achieved their goals because of their faith. They are not preaching, they are shown in real life settings. Christianity is illuminated as a practical and fulfilling life style in this series. The second main feature of this program is that it is sponsored by national advertisers; therefore, there will not be any fund-raising appeal on the show. It was difficult to secure advertisers who would align themselves with an overtly Christian program but we did get companies such as Coca Cola and Domino's Pizza who were willing to associate their products with the Christian philosophy expressed by these kids.

To overcome the bias which I knew from past experience, at Turner Broadcasting System, I worked for over three and a half years to put together a comprehensive strategy that would help us to overcome any objections that might be raised by the network executives. I developed the concept for the show and conducted the audience testing of that concept. It also required that the production quality be excellent and competitive with that which is already seen