relationship in marriage receives such emphasis in the Scriptures that we begin to see it was meant not only to be a wonderful, continuing experience for the husband and wife, but it also was intended to show us something wonderful about God and His relationship with us. Ephesians 5:31-32 spells it out: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church." **Thus, the properly and lovingly executed and mutually satisfying sexual union is God's way of demonstrating to us a great spiritual truth.** It speaks to us of the greatest love story ever told—of how Jesus Christ gave Himself for us and is intimately involved with and loves the Church... In this framework of understanding between two growing Christians, the sexual relationship can become a time of intimate fellowship as well as delight."[7] Lest there be any question as to the sanctity of sexual fulfillment in marriage, the writer of Hebrews refers to the marital bed as "undefiled." (Hebrews 13:4)

Scripture teaches that sex outside marriage is wrong, sinful and destructive. However, sex in marriage is wonderfully right. It is not enough to bemoan and bewail the wrong. It is not enough to attack the hedonistic values of secular humanism. Certainly we must stand against evils of immorality rampant in society. But we also need adequate models. We need to teach that Christian couples who are totally committed to Jesus Christ find security in physical oneness. But we must also show the world that Christian marriage works. There is no substitute for happy, fulfilling marriage relationships which serve as beacons of hope in a lost world.

QUESTION: *What things are you and your Church doing to promote Christian attitudes toward human sexuality?*

THINKING IT THROUGH
WHEN SEX IS DIVORCED FROM CHRISTIAN MORALITY

When advice about sex is given to teenagers in a context other than Christian morality, the message almost always turns out the same: "being responsible" means contracepted sex rather than abstinence. This was the message of one edition of ABC's ***20/20****.*

The program operated on the premise that teenagers are sexually active. As proof of the premise, ***20/20*** *introduced a normal, beautiful, all-American, sexually active teenager from New York. Her name was Ann. In glowing, cheerful tones, Ann described her first sex experience as something wonderful and special, a day to remember the rest of her life.*

Following the testimony of the teenager girl, ***20/20*** *correspondent Tom Jarrold remarked "how times have changed. In the 50's, the mere suggestion of a 15-year-old girl having sexual intercourse was shocking." Jarrold implied that today the thought of a 15-year-old girl having sex is considered normal and not at all shocking.*

In fact, viewers were led to believe that Ann had been emancipated rather than embarrassed by her history of sexual promiscuity.

Another segment featured the Youth Expression Theatre of the Planned Parenthood League performing at a high school in Massachusetts.

One typical skit involved two teenagers becoming passionate and talking about having sex. When they decide to act on their lust the girl quickly exits in order to get her contraceptive. The message? Prevention of pregnancy, not abstinence, is the desirable social goal. And nowhere in the production is there a hint that such graphic, explicit portrayals could be a moral issue for some parents—parents who see it as a violation of the children's privacy and vulgarizing of a beautiful gift of God.

Jarrold said in his summary, "The point is very important. Because of fear of the possible side effects of the most effective means of birth control—the pill—teens are increasingly using ineffective methods..." Either Jarrold is naive or his bias was showing. For "the most effective means" of birth control is not "the pill" as stated by Jarrold. The most effective means of birth control for teenagers has always been, and will always be, abstinence. But as the subject was not considered worthy of mentioning, traditional sex-within-marriage morality was effectively censored out of the production.

Chapter 5: *Law and Government*

Purpose

The purpose of chapter 5 is to examine humanist ideas on law and government.

Humanist Manifesto: "**The separation of church and state and the separation of ideology and state are imperatives.** The state should encourage maximum freedom for different moral, political, religious, and social values in society. It should not favor any particular religious bodies through the use of public monies, nor espouse a single ideology and function thereby as an instrument of propaganda or oppression, particularly against dissenters...People are more important than decalogues, rules, proscriptions, or regulations. We look to the development of a system of world law and a world order based on transnational federal government."[1]

A. Humanists believe in state minus religion.

Humanists of our day argue a doctrine of "separation of church and state" which would remove all Christian influence from government and private life.

Franky Schaeffer, in *A Time For Anger*, summarized well the problem generated by a humanist approach to law and government.

Schaeffer stated: "The Judeo-Christian influence on American Society through the legal system and politics has declined to such an extent and so rapidly that we, as Christians, ought to be enraged. We find ourselves in a nation in which the law and indeed the so-called justice system is in such disarray as to be a mockery of the very words "law" and "justice." Today, to put it bluntly, we find a nation that often frees its vicious criminals, and on the other hand, sanctions murder of the innocent unborn."[2]

The modern doctrine of "separation of church and state" called for by the humanists is used to silence the church. When Christians take a public stand on issues, humanists counter with arguments of "separation of church and state." The separation doctrine argued by humanists calls for a total separation of religion from civil government—quite the opposite of the original intent.

B. Humanists affirm a system of arbitrary law.

Humanists believe that man is basically good, and if given the right environment and social context, by reason and intelligence can formulate laws which are in his own best interest. He needs no theological or supernatural sanction for his actions.

Conversely, the Christian believes that he is to apply the principles of God's law and God's revelation to all of life. Why? Because basic to Christian beliefs is the fallen nature of man. He is **not** inherently good. He is imperfect, his nature flawed by sin. Not only does he need the atonement of Christ, but also he needs the absolutes of the Bible to give order and direction to his life.

Man is a sinful creature, and therefore cannot be his own lawgiver and judge. Law must come from God. Christians understand that God is the ultimate governor and lawgiver. Absolute standards exist whereby all decisions affecting a society are to be measured. The founding fathers of America understood these principles.

The American colonies were greatly influenced by *Lex Rex*, a book written by Samuel Rutherford. Rutherford's basic premise was that law and government must be based on the Bible, the Word of God, rather than the word of man. All men were under the law and not above it.

John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian minister, helped to weave the principles of *Lex Rex* into the writing of the Constitution. Witherspoon was the only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence. He was also a member of the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1779 and from 1780 to 1782. Many of Witherspoon's students were profoundly influenced by him and reached positions of prominence in the early years of the United States. They included a president, James Madison; a vice president, Aaron Burr; ten cabinet officers; twenty-one senators; thirty-nine congressmen; and twelve governors.[3]

Our founding fathers took for granted that God was the source of all laws, and was the ultimate governor of the affairs of men. They believed that man was bound to obey the laws of his Creator.

Humanist law, however, is sociological law—law which has no fixed base, but is determined by what a group of