

The Intellectual Death toward which Secularism is taking Society

Scientifically-minded people may appreciate science *fiction* as a means to *retreat from* the pressures of everyday life, or as a catalyst to assist their imaginations in thinking outside the box; but they won't ordinarily¹ seek from it the *details* for solving *concrete* problems concerning the *actual* world (e.g. getting to the moon and back or building a bridge from both ends). Human beings cannot create our own reality. Neither can we even *manipulate* it in violation of the laws of physics and nature in general. For example, despite our perception of light at the quantum-level in physics that implied to renowned physicist Dr. Niels Bohr that we by our very *observation* of light actually *makes* it behave differently than it would if we weren't watching it, further *scientific* analysis has concluded otherwise.²



The 41 story, 514 foot *Rainier Tower*³ in Seattle, Washington rests on a base that is far narrower than are the building's horizontal dimensions. On first sight it seems to be very vulnerable to toppling, especially in the midst of the earthquake-prone Puget Sound region. Yet despite its apparent defiance of the laws of gravity when observed at ground level,⁴ the *extensive* cement base that extends downward 87 feet below grade and is surrounded by the appropriate rock and gravel fill, has ensured that it would stand secure, just as it indeed has for over 40 years. It is certain that no contractor would ever seek to construct a *structure* (as opposed to compose a *fiction*) that ignored the facts of nature. Yet our increasingly autonomy-driven⁵ culture imagines that it can ignore time-tested rational principles in its determination to create a new utopian society.

From the initial rupture of *public* sexual boundaries in the 1960s, all the way to the denial in certain cases⁶ of even a semblance⁷ of boundaries, including both personal⁸ and society-wide ones⁹ in a span of just six decades, we are witnessing the disintegration of both the glue and the discriminative¹⁰ tools that are absolutely vital for holding civilizations together.¹¹ Our culture is currently entangled in two fundamental self-contradictory errors; the first of which commits internal *logical* inconsistencies, while the second seeks to create "new *realities*" on the basis of conceptually-impossible **incongruities**.

As for the first error, it is ironic that at the same time that secularists are casting off so-described "hindrances" derived from *moral* statutes grounded on traditional *religious* authority; with the same fury as the "religious fanatics" that they decry, they are imposing a very different set of imperatives onto

¹ There are exceptions. See <https://www.brainpickings.org/2013/02/08/jules-verne-prophet-of-science-fiction>

² Hugh Ross. *The Creator and the Cosmos: How Latest Scientific Discoveries Reveal God*, 3rd ed. (RTB, 2018), pp. 153-4.

³ https://www.google.com/search?q=rainier+tower+seattle&source=lnms&tbn=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjms7vNxlXiAhXqguAKHdT9AncQ_AUIDigB&biw=1366&bih=657#imgrc=1yHiqJsRMKyJM:

⁴ <https://www.malcolmdrilling.com/projects/rainier-square-tower/>

⁵ A self-guided conscience and will that is independent from either from God or His moral standards.

⁶ With respect to certain perspectives on sexual identity and "identity politics."

⁷ As of February 13, 2014, ABC News writer Russell Goldman identified 58 gender options for Facebook users (<https://abcnews.com>).

⁸ In the 60s the societal plea was for acceptance of homosexuals (HS). In the 70s the demand was shifted to affirming HS as a valid lifestyle. In the 80s it was demanded that HS couples be *treated* as married couples if they so desired, which then led to the insistence that HS marriage be *declared* the equivalent in both status and privilege to heterosexual marriage.

⁹ Vocal advocates of the *Democrat* political party, with virtual unanimity, decry the concept of controlled borders between the U.S. and Mexico.

¹⁰ The very fact that popular culture decries the notion of discrimination is in itself an indication that our society is in the process of intellectual disintegration. Although popular culture takes the term to stand for employing a double-standard as to how separate parties of people can be treated unequally, the term actually stands for employing both a fair and thoughtful standard for picking between options on the basis of the best available evidence that is independent of personal preferences. In the absence of such reflection, mistakes are sure to follow.

¹¹ Social critic C.P. Snow once stated, "*Civilization is hideously fragile and there's not much between us and the horrors beneath, just about a coat of varnish.*" Cited in the *American Family Journal*, (November, December 1991), p. 19.

society. These strictures can only consist of rules naively grounded on auto¹²-inspiration¹³ which carries no metaphysical weight.¹⁴ Also they can be upheld only by threats from unaccountable leaders clinging to absolute authority who, as Mao Zedong conceded, maintain their power by “*the power of a gun.*”¹⁵ The notion that autonomous humans can evade this dilemma out of a belief that we are objective thinkers and morally sound, is entirely untenable in view of the bleak track-record of the human race.¹⁶ In sum, those who would cast aside morality in order to achieve an idealized freedom seem to be utterly **oblivious** to the reality that they are merely *replacing* a *moral* code with a *self*-derived one for which they force their power and agenda onto the rest of society by means of unnamed and unelected people.

Furthermore, secularists commit the *double-standard* fallacy by imposing alternative absolutes onto others with a level of conviction that resembles *moral* authority, while they at the same time deny moral absolutes on their allegation that they are not a rationally-valid category of argumentation.

Equally bewildering is the propensity of secularists to subordinate scientific data to a merely pragmatic¹⁷ (as opposed to *absolute*) role, thereby betraying their true indifference toward the authoritative role science ought to play before us all. It is after all because of its long-acclaimed deference to science as the ultimate arbiter in *scientific* truth matters, that secularism derides “*religious*” people for elevating creeds *above* scientific facts. I actually affirm the privilege of scientists to identify as *scientific*¹⁸ *truth* what is discovered by following where evidence leads, independent of religious dogma.¹⁹ So it is galling for secularists to then deride Christians for opposing scientific evidence²⁰ when the former ignore it too when (because?) it conflicts with, to give but one example, the transgenderism (TG) movement.²¹ TG persons insist not only on the right to use whichever showers they desire; they also demand that society as a whole identify TG people by the gender they each prefer, irrespective of their anatomical and genetic constitution. Furthermore, bureaucrats have recently legally obligated citizens to ignore these facts under the threat of debilitating lawsuits. At bottom, biological facts concerning **genetic and anatomical realities are officially being suppressed**²² to the end that ideology is now trumping science.

Furthermore, it isn’t only members of TG, but public educators too, who although mandated to instill critical-thinking skills in the light of reality, instead propagandize students *away from* the facts of life (in the larger sense). This ploy undermines the very consciences of the latter. In addition, sadly, the scientific community, despite the guidance our society expects it to provide; by its failure to rebuke these falsehood instead encourages the intellectual travesties to continue unchallenged. None of these errors are complex to such a degree as to require formal training in philosophy in order for lay people to discern their flaws, provided they aren’t badgered into silence. Both errors violate the golden rule of

¹² The term, “auto” appears frequently as a preposition in this paper. It basically means “self,” just as automobile means “self-mobilized.”

¹³ That is to say that, at the same time that they may be idealistic, they evade the notion of being accountable to a higher judge.

¹⁴ A chief tenet of secularism is that humans are *solely* physical entities who possess neither soul nor psyche that is separate from pure matter.

¹⁵ “Every Communist must grasp the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun” and, “Our Principle is that the Party commands the gun, and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party,” are statements from Chairman Mao Zedong in his message, *Problems on War and Strategy* found at the website: *Mao Zedong on War and Revolution*. http://afe.easia.columbia.edu/special/china_1900_mao_war.htm.

¹⁶ Reinhold Niebuhr. <https://www.christiancentury.org/article/2014-06/unoriginal-sin>. It is vital to clarify here that our society one need NOT take the term “gun” literally for the reason that threats of lawsuits are equally as threatening or constricting!

¹⁷ Pragmatism considers whether a given proposition seems beneficial as opposed to whether it is actually true.

¹⁸ That is, *scientific* conclusions only. Theological conclusions are based on revelation which is manifest through the Bible.

¹⁹ See my essay, “Defusing the Alleged Conflict Between Scientific Fact and the Text of Genesis 1,” which can be accessed, together with all of my essays, at my website: www.christianityontheoffense.com.

²⁰ I do concede that Christians partly contribute to the secularist’ impression I just described by their misinterpreting Scripture. See my essay, “Does the Bible Permit Denigrating Science in order to Maintain our Faith?” Op.cit. (19).

²¹ I am NOT passing on persons experiencing sexual identity confusion, but on the irrational ways this matter is treated by societal leaders.

²² See my letter to the editor of the Everett Herald, “Self-Contradictory Policies of ‘Liberal’ Transgenderism Public Policy.” Op.cit. (19).

“doing unto others what you would wish to be done unto you” (Rom. 2:1-3), while the second error also entails “cherry-picking” which facts to embrace and which to ignore based purely on **their own private wishes**. Notice that St. Paul’s very first reference to sin in his *Letter to the Romans* entails *suppressing* evidence that, in his context, pertains to *confronting* and thereby *convicting* sinners that there must be a Creator of all things (Rom. 1:18-20). In addition, the rest of that chapter prophetically narrates the path toward self-destruction which logically follows from denying God’s rightful lordship in the first place.

Take notice also of the wholesale failure of *secularism* to, by rational means, achieve the very autonomous freedom it is seeking *on its own terms*. Indeed, no potential grounds exist for expecting its *ultimate* success for the reason that the challenge which lies in its way doesn’t consist of a few missing pieces to a puzzle that will surely soon be discovered. The problem is rather of a *systemic* nature which forces the choice between either embracing rationality *wholesale* and consequently following the facts where they lead,²³ or settling for increasing disintegration of the foundations which societies have depended on for their security. My worldview (based on Scripture) is that nature is not a *chaos* but very demonstrably²⁴ a *cosmos* (the Greek word meaning “orderly arrangement”). That the created order is, as the term suggests, a *cosmos* means logically that the current secularist posture of playing loose with rationality cannot endlessly continue, for the reason that our *rational*²⁵ Creator (John 1:1-3) has infused into his handiwork inviolable laws extending from physics all the way to morality. Consequently, in today’s contention between theocentrism and autonomy, one of these viewpoints cannot prevail!

In Isaiah 59:14, the prophet spoke during one bleak period in Israel’s history of rebellion against the authority of God in terms of violating the concept of truth by mourning, “*Truth is fallen in the public square.*” Although the Bible doesn’t define truth, it everywhere employs that concept in a manner consistent with Aristotle’s views that: 1) truth is an assertion of fact which *in fact* harmonizes with the state of affairs that it describes, and 2) truth is a concept which one is obligated to obey.

Nevertheless, the absence of truth that Isaiah bemoaned was (and is) limited in scope. Truth has in actual fact NOT fallen in either heaven or God’s creation. In addition to the truthful character of His own Being, He has also instilled order into his creation both morally and ontologically.²⁶ Nevertheless, whatever *we* do in defiance of his will results in chaos in our every interaction with it. It is out of God’s love that He designed us to live in harmony with His will. Just as symphonic orchestra players must follow their conductor to produce beautiful music together, so we are called to be reconciled to our Maker and Redeemer through His Son Jesus Christ. God invites each and every person to turn away from our independence *from* Him and take the step of receiving His salvation and forgiveness (2 Cor. 5:17-6:2). It by this course **alone** He can set us into both a harmonious relationship with Himself and restore us into a functional relationship with His created order. Yet this is also the **only** means to know harmony with God’s creation and redemption, both individually and across society. I fully acknowledge that my forthcoming conclusion may broadly be received with ridicule. Yet in fact, the present course of our culture yields no indication that it is progressing toward the better. Nothing less, then, is called for than turning from our present course and participating together in Christian salvation and reformation.

Pastor Gary Jensen, © July 4, 2019
Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA

²³ Former atheist Antony Flew employs Plato’s words to describe his journey into deism in his book, [There is a God](#). (Harper 2007), p. 56 .

²⁴ See my pamphlet, “His Prints are Everywhere!” Op.cit. (19).

²⁵ The Greek word designating the creator in this passage is *logos*, from which our word “logic” (and rationality) is employed.

²⁶ Ontology is a branch of knowledge which considers the very nature of existence in all its material aspects.