

2008

Glenn R. Martin: Prevailing Worldviews Study Guide

Steven Alan Samson

Liberty University, ssamson@liberty.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/gov_fac_pubs



Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Samson, Steven Alan, "Glenn R. Martin: Prevailing Worldviews Study Guide" (2008). *Faculty Publications and Presentations*. 124.

https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/gov_fac_pubs/124

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Helms School of Government at Scholars Crossing. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of Scholars Crossing. For more information, please contact scholarlycommunications@liberty.edu.

GLENN R. MARTIN: PREVAILING WORLDVIEWS

STUDY GUIDE, 2008

Steven Alan Samson

INTRODUCTION

Study Questions

1. Dr. Martin begins with a reference to Richard Weaver's *Ideas Have Consequences* (1948) and Prov. 23:7: "As a man thinketh so is he." If you think about it, a similar expression is "You are what you eat." So much of life revolves around mealtime: the communion we share with others as well as the words of God we consume.
2. Dr. Martin notes that there are few original thinkers or true leaders. These he calls the **prime movers**. What makes them leaders? What are the two intellectual/moral errors into which most people fall?
3. What story does Dr. Martin tell about himself? How did he learn the importance of a Biblical Christian worldview approach to understanding God's world? The political theorist and philosopher J. Budziszewski also tells his own story, very movingly. It may be found in the Preface to *The Revenge of Conscience*, a book that is now out of print, but you may read the classic account of his "Escape from Nihilism" on-line at the following link. Read the first three paragraphs and see if he draws you in. <http://www.leaderu.com/real/ri9801/budziszewski.html>.

Review

prime movers

CHAPTER ONE: WHAT IS A PREVAILING WORLDVIEW OR PARADIGM?

Here Dr. Martin begins to introduce the grammar of a worldview approach. Grammar is the first component of the **trivium** (three ways), a late classical/early medieval curriculum (developed by Boethius) that also included dialectic and rhetoric. Together with the addition of the quadrivium (four ways) – comprised of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music – they composed the traditional **liberal arts** curriculum.

1. What are the three components of a worldview? The first primary question may be called the **cosmological** question. It asks: Why is there something instead of nothing? The second may be called the **anthropological** question. It asks: What is man? (Ps. 8:4; Job 7:17)
2. What are the four subsidiary philosophical questions? a) What are the alternative starting points of the **ontological question**? This question has to do with *Being*: with what is and what is real. More personally, it asks: Who am I? b) What are three ways of addressing the **epistemological question**? This question deals with *Knowing*. What is the difference between rationality and rationalism? c) The **axiological question** deals with ultimate value: What is Good? What are three ways of addressing this question? Pilate expressed skepticism and disdain when he asked: What is truth? Finally, d) what are the two most important approaches to the **teleological question**? This has to do with ends, goals, purposes, and destiny.

3. The third primary question has to do with the **institutional structure and procedure** of the worldview. What are the seven areas (or the dimensions in which operate) within the institutional spectrum? Others can be identified, but these seven are useful to keep in mind. If we are truly free, what are the spheres of authority and action in which “live and move and have our being”?
4. How do the answers provided by a worldview determine its institutional structure and procedure? In specific terms, how does a Biblical Christian worldview differ from a naturalistic one with regard to each of the four subsidiary philosophical questions?
5. What are three characteristics of a worldview? Ideally, they express whatever faith or ultimate concern anchors our lives, but they also prove untrustworthy and ultimately unsatisfying. Both St. Augustine and Blaise Pascal wrote of a God-shaped vacuum in our lives that draws us to Him.
6. Identify four levels of application of a worldview. Practically speaking, these levels represent a hierarchy that begins with the theorists, followed by the implementers, the popularizers, and finally the people themselves.

Review

ontological	epistemological	axiological
teleological	institutional spectrum	civil-social
ecclesiastical	educational	legal
economics	aesthetics	international politics
characteristics of worldviews	levels of application	

CHAPTER TWO: THE BIBLICAL CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW: REFORMATION RESTATEMENT, 1517-1688

Study Questions

1. What made the Protestant Reformation a “counter-revolution?” What is the difference between **heresy** (e.g., Tit. 3:9) and **apostasy** (2 Tim. 2:14-19)? In what did the apostasy (subtraction from doctrine) of Renaissance Humanism consist?
2. What are the three basic **presuppositions**? How may the offices of priest, king, and prophet be distinguished from each other? To which office does the dominion mandate belong? The knowledge of the Truth? Access to God? Epistemological relativity undermines which office? Why does the assumption that everything is normal pose a terrible dilemma? What is the true starting place in order to understand anything? [Despite their differences, Gordon Clark, Cornelius Van Til, and Francis Schaeffer were all noted for their *presuppositional apologetics*].
3. Why is the institutional arrangement of a **holy commonwealth** and a **covenantal order** so important? How does a covenantal order differ from a mere contractual order? [The idea of a social contract may be secular (as it was for Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau) or it may be Christian (as it was for the earlier Puritans)]. Why do we need the Bible? How does Biblical Christianity differ from a mere **religion**? [Religion is derived from a Latin root that means to bind together and refers to a “civil” or secular religion].
4. Identify three covenants, personal or corporate, within the covenantal order. What is the **sovereignty** of God? What is meant by the **depravity** of man? What are some consequences of abandoning the supernatural and absolutizing this age? What is the good news?

Review

heresy
three offices
religion

apostasy
holy commonwealth
sovereignty

presuppositions
covenantal order
depravity

CHAPTER THREE: THE BIBLICAL CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW: INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURE

Study Questions

1. Beginning with a mastery of the rudiments, what are the three objectives of a Biblical Christian **education**? What does it mean to say that “the law of God is written upon our hearts?” (Prov. 3:3, Jer. 31:33, 2 Cor. 3:2). What makes government a gift of God? Why is the dichotomy between sacred and secular a false distinction? What worldview is characterized by **reverence**? By **relevance**? Why is a separation of institution important? Church and state are both ministries [both are under God’s sovereignty; magistracy implies mastery and majesty].
2. What are the two alternatives if there is no sovereign God? This is illustrated in the following:

ROUSAS J. RUSHDOONY: THE RELATIONSHIP OF MAN TO LAW

- I. Law is enacted morality or procedural thereto.
- II. Morality, and hence law, rests upon religion.
- III. The source of a culture’s law is its god.

Possible relationships of man to law:

<i>Man Under Law</i>	<i>Man Over Law</i>	<i>Man Apart from Law</i>
1. God is the source of law. Man and all his institutions are under law.	1. Man in the state is the source of law. The state is the divine expression of man’s law.	1. Anarchism. Man recognizes no law apart from himself. Man is his own god
2. Law is ministerial, not legislative.	2. Law is man’s creation. Constitutions cannot bind man.	2. Man’s responsibility is to break the shackles of law.
3. Liberty is under law. God fulfills law.	3. Liberty means state law.	3. Liberty means no law. Antinomianism.
4. The purpose of law is justice.	4. The purpose of law is salvation. The state is man’s savior.	4. Lawlessness means salvation.
5. The state is restricted to justice, and government is more than the state.	5. Government equals the state.	5. Government equals man alone.

-- Rousas John Rushdoony, Politics of Guilt and Pity. Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1976 [1970], pp. 151-52.

What are the consequences of denying the sovereignty of God? What are the two logical conclusions of state sovereignty? Where does despising and denying government lead?

3. If Biblical Christianity favors the development of Constitutional Government and Free Enterprise, what important qualifications must be added to this observation? How should the **Eighth Commandment** guide our thinking? Who is responsible for establishing just prices? How do unjust prices and unjust wages distort the market? In the reading from Bastiat's *The Law*, we will see illustrated how injustice can be compelled as a way of life, as in the case of a **planned economy**.
4. How has the concept of work (*weorc*=act, deed, work) evolved from worship (*weorthscipe*=honor, dignity, reverence) to a form of slavery? How have Rationalism and Process Philosophy demoted the value of work? What are we to seek first before we may expect to be blessed by the overflow (superfluity) of God's abundance? What is the place of punishment for a refusal to work? What is the place of Christian **charity**? What are **tithes** and **offerings**? What are the consequences of substituting a welfare state for Biblical Christian charity? Why is the Biblical Christian unalterably opposed to the welfare state system? According to Tom Rose, would we need one if all professing Christians tithed?
5. Identify some of the consequences of institutionalizing the Biblical Christian worldview?

Review

objectives of Biblical Christian education

reverence and relevance

Eight Commandment

planned economy

charity

tithes

offerings

CHAPTER FOUR: THE RATIONALIST WORLDVIEW: ENLIGHTENMENT FORMULATION, 1600-1800

Study Questions

1. Where are the intellectual roots of the **Enlightenment** (the so-called Age of Reason in France, England, and Germany in particular)? What was the epistemological shift that Enlightenment thinkers promoted? How does the Biblical Christian view differ? What did **Copernicus** get wrong? What do the Biblical concepts of **eternity** and **infinity** reveal?
2. What did Sir **Isaac Newton** do following his work on the laws of nature governing the motions of heavenly bodies? What did **John Locke** believe to be the source of knowledge and truth? It should be added that Locke, like Newton, devoted much of his attention later in life to studying the Bible and theology, culminating in *The Reasonableness of Christianity*.
3. The next step made by Rationalists was the ontological shift into **deism**, which is ultimately non-theistic. [Rationalism is also evident in Unitarianism, which, in the form it took in the work of William Ellery Channing and the Transcendentalism of Ralph Waldo Emerson, was very similar to Stoicism and various types of Eastern mysticism].
4. What is the Rationalist view of the Bible? Of Christ? Why is the Rationalist emphasis on morality misplaced? Even so, 18C Rationalists took the Bible more seriously and attempted to live by it more consistently than Bible-believing Christians today. [For example, Louisa May Alcott, who

wrote *Little Women*, spent part of her childhood at a Transcendentalist community near Boston called Fruitlands]. In what way were the Rationalists half right?

5. What are the rationalists' triune presuppositions? How do they answer the four philosophical questions?

Review

rationalism
eternity and infinity
deism

Enlightenment
Isaac Newton
view of the Bible

Copernicus
John Locke
rationalist presuppositions

CHAPTER FIVE: THE RATIONALIST WORLDVIEW: INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURE

Study Questions

1. Dr. Martin appears to believe that **natural law** is contradictory to and irreconcilable with “Biblical law” rather than possibly being supplementary or something that may be reasoned from God’s creation in light of God’s Word. Yet one Christian natural law theorist, J. Budziszewski, writes:

... Most modern ethical thinking goes about matters backward. It assumes the problem of human sin is mainly *cognitive* – that it has to do with the state of our knowledge. In other words, it holds that we don’t know what’s right and wrong and are trying to find out. But natural-law theory assumes that the problem is mainly *volitional* – that it has to do with the state of our will. It holds that by and large we know what’s right and wrong but wish we didn’t, and that we try to keep ourselves in ignorance so we can do as we please.

How then shall we uncover the text [of natural law] and the devices of the heart [the problem of sin]? Through self-examination? No. Not many of us are honest enough for that. Of course all hearts do have the same text. But just because they also practice the same devices, something more than self-examination is necessary to bring either the text or the devices fully into the light. Our analysis must be anchored in God’s Word, which has the power to explode self-deceptions. “Test everything,” says Paul (1 Thessalonians 5:21).

Christians then have a standard for the philosophy of natural law: as to the goal, uncover the text and devices of the heart; as to the test, rely on the Word of God. Even among Christian philosophers the doctrine of natural law often fails to measure up. Either it focuses on matters peripheral to the text and the devices of the heart, or it wanders from its scriptural foundation. To one degree or another these have been flaws of almost all previous natural-law theorizing, including my own – and nearly all books about it, probably including the present one.

– J. Budziszewski, Written on the Heart: The Case for Natural Law. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997), pp. 185-86.

What is Dr. Budziszewski’s point? The Puritan theologian William Ames opposed natural law thinking because man has been utterly corrupted by the Fall: “Therefore is there nowhere found any true right practical reason, pure and complete in all parts, but in the written law of God (Psalm 119:66).” Budziszewski answers this *rejectionist* position on page 111 by replying: “First, if the mind is so fallen that it cannot figure out what clues to the divine design have survived its own corruption, how can it figure out what flows from this corruption?” For example, how can we know whether the Bible is or is not the only valid source of moral law? How then should we understand the meaning of Romans 1:18-20?

2. How does Dr. Martin distinguish between **democracy** and **democratic procedure**? John Locke (1632-1704), who was an empiricist rather than a rationalist, largely preceded Enlightenment

Rationalism but certainly did influence it. Modern democracy grew out of the 1789 French Revolution. As my late friend Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn commented in *Leftism Revisited*: “Democracy is the concept of the totally politicized nation; it is a populism, like ethnicism (nationalism) or racism, and therefore leftist – and consequently totalitarian (p. 21).”

- How is democracy to be philosophically understood and defined? What have been its effects on marriage? How does the civil institution of marriage differ from **holy matrimony**? What accounts for the disintegration of the family today? What replaces the will of God in democracy?
- Who was **Adam Smith**? What is meant by the “law of supply and demand?” By “enlightened self-interest?” An example of absolutizing the market may be found in Mandeville’s 1705 poem *The Fable of the Bees*.

Review

laws of nature	John Locke	democracy
democratic procedure	social contract	John Cotton
holy matrimony	communion	Adam Smith
absolutized market	absolutized state	

CHAPTER SIX: CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND THE RATIONALIST WORLDVIEW

Study Questions

- Identify three major expressions of the Enlightenment. What is the significance of the Declarations of the Rights of Man and Citizen (1789, 1793)? [NOTE: These were early ancestors of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1948]. Why was the French Revolution largely abortive in Europe? Literary reactions against the French Revolution were penned by Edmund Burke’s *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), Alexis de Tocqueville’s *The Old Regime and the French Revolution* (1856), Charles Dickens’ *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), and Baroness Orczy’s *The Scarlet Pimpernel* (1904)].
- Identify four consequences of the Rationalist Worldview in America. [NOTE: Locke, who wrote *The Reasonableness of Christianity* late in life (1695), could be called a Christian-Rationalist in this respect]. What made the War for Independence a counter-revolution? [Peter Drucker called it a counter-revolution as early as 1941 in *The Future of Industrial Man*]. What was the **Great Awakening**? It was a series of spiritual revivals that began with the preaching of Theodorus Frelinghuysen (1726), the sermons of Jonathan Edwards (1734), the establishment of George Tennent’s log college (1736), and the first visit of George Whitefield to Georgia (1738). It continued at least up until the French and Indian War (1754-1763)
- What was the reason for the American colonies’ *de facto* independence? Edmund Burke referred to Britain’s **salutary neglect** of the colonies. Who were the Whigs and Tories? [NOTE: The first opposed the claim of James, the Catholic Duke of York, to the throne; the second supported it, at least until the new Catholic Queen produced a son and heir to the throne].

Here a more lengthy explanation is in order: The **Glorious Revolution** of 1688 actually set in motion events and circumstances that would lead to American independence because it dramatically changed the character of the British Constitution. The colonies were chartered by the king and were not, historically, answerable to Parliament. Under the revised British Constitution, sovereignty was now claimed by the King-in-Parliament, a new-fangled beast that the colonists did not recognize. Instead, the King (without Parliament) was still regarded as their

lord and protector. The colonists throughout America were unwilling for Parliament to lay an internal tax on them because they were not represented. The Boston Tea Party coincided with similar protests in New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. The Second Continental Congress, which was called in response to the outbreak of fighting near Boston in April 1775, sent the Olive Branch Petition to the king in July of 1775. But George III refused to acknowledge it. Instead, despite the protests of Edmund Burke and a minority of the Parliament, the King demanded passage of the **American Prohibitory Act**, which finally permitted him to abjure his protection of the colonies in December 1775. In other words, the King-in-Parliament now renounced the office of ruler and declared the Americans to be an “enemy people” (just as Philip II of Spain had done to the Dutch people two centuries earlier), thus effectively declaring American independence six and a half months before the Continental Congress did.

A historical parallel may be drawn with the English Civil War of the 1640s. Here is what the Rev. Samuel Rutherford, a Puritan, wrote at the time in *Lex Rex*:

Royalists say, a private man against his prince hath no way to defend himself but by flight; therefore, a community hath no other way to defend themselves but by flight. 1. The antecedent is false. Dr. Ferne alloweth to a private man supplications, and denying of subsidies and tribute to the prince, when he employeth tribute to the destruction of the commonwealth; which, by the way, is a clear resistance, and an active resistance made against the king (Rom. xiii. 6, 7) and against a commandment of God, except royalists grant tyrannous powers may be resisted. 2. The consequence is naught, for a private man may defend himself against unjust violence, but not any way he pleaseth: the first way is by supplications and apologies, -- he may not presently use violence to the king's servants before he supplicate, nor may he use re-offending [attacking, retaliating], if flight may save. David [king of Israel] used all three in order.

-- Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex, or the Law and the Prince* (Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle Publications, 1982 [1644]), p. 160.

This is essentially the procedure followed by the patriot leaders in America.

4. Why does Dr. Martin call the American Constitutional Order and System dualistic? [NOTE: Although this is a fair judgment, and the label “Christian Rationalism” is useful in many ways, Dr. Martin fails to relate Locke’s rather vague approval of resistance to tyranny back to earlier, specifically Christian, precedents, such as the Dutch Act of Abjuration. In addition, he exaggerates the influence of John Locke on American thinking at the time of the Declaration and, later, the framing of the Constitutions. According to Donald S. Lutz, who did a content analysis of American writings between 1760 and 1805, rank-ordered citations of European writers. Montesquieu led with 8.3%, Blackstone was second at 7.9%, followed by Locke (2.9%), Hume (2.7%), and Plutarch (1.5%). By contrast, these secular influences were far exceeded by references to the Bible: 24% in the 1760s, 44% in the 1770s, and 34% in the 1780s. All told, the references during this 45 year period were: 34% Bible, 19% Enlightenment, 21% Whigs (including Locke), 11% Common Law, 9% Classical, and 6% Other. SOURCE: Donald S. Lutz, *A Preface to American Political Theory*, pp. 135-36. There are numerous commentaries on and collections of this literature, including B. F. Morris’s *Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*, Alice M. Baldwin’s *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution*, Donald S. Lutz’s *Colonial Origins of the American Constitution*, and Ellis Sandoz’s *Political Sermons of the American Founding Era*].
5. What was John Locke’s **natural rights** thesis? Despite some unusual humanistic rhetorical flourishes by Thomas Jefferson (“life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”), the substance of the **Declaration of Independence** is much the same as that of the Act of Abjuration (1581), which was a product of the Protestant Reformation rather than the later Enlightenment period. As to the charge that the Declaration is based on the natural rights thesis of John Locke, it must be understood that both Locke and the committee that drafted the Declaration drew on the same earlier precedents, which included Reformers and Puritans. Indeed, Dr. Martin is compelled to acknowledge that there is “an evident ‘hangover’ of Biblical Christianity which holds that

government must be limited in power because God is sovereign.” At best, the criticism of the Declaration creates a misimpression. But what follows next is unfair and inaccurate, particularly when he says: “The long list of grievances against the King listed in the Declaration makes it appear that the colonists were the most oppressed people who ever lived, when the truth is just the reverse.” Why is this sentence inaccurate? The colonists were not making a comparison with other tyrannies; they were stating their judgment that taxation without representation, among other things, is the epitome of tyranny. Why is it unfair? The charges are not misrepresentations, although there is room for some dispute. Yes, it is true that the colonists were self-governing and virtually independent. But that is the point. If they could not be represented in the Parliament, and if the King could not govern them apart from Parliament, then the logic of the situation required either a loosening of their connection or a final separation. The ancient Greek colonies, such as Syracuse, Neapolis (Naples), and Massilia (Marseilles), for example, did not remain dependent upon their founding metropolis (mother-city). Dr. Martin acknowledges this problem on page 110 when he writes that the Americans “were rebelling to preserve and perpetuate the freedom and independence which they had long since enjoyed.”

6. How does the Constitution divide and diffuse power? What is meant by the **separation of powers**? What is the proper role of the courts? How do differences in the mode and manner of elections (House, Senate, President) reflect the division and diffusion of power? Why does Dr. Martin object to *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) and the practice of **judicial review**? Whether or not that decision was a step in the wrong direction, the Supreme Court did not strike down any part of a law passed by Congress again until 1857 with the Dred Scott decision). Has the Supreme Court subsequently arrogated too much power to itself?
7. What is **federalism**? [NOTE: Federalism is more accurately defined as a division of power between national (or central) level and the state (or provincial) level of government. As James Madison shows in *Federalist*, no. 39, the Constitution created both a federal government *and* a national government. Most Americans do not know the difference. The House was created as the national legislature; the Senate was created as the federal legislature (since it represents the states). The election of the president through an electoral college is federal in character. In case of a tie or dispute, the House (a national body) is given the final decision]. Why is the Bill of Rights really a Bill of Prohibitions? The first ten amendments restrict the power of Congress by stipulating what immunities or rights the central government cannot abridge. How does federalism resemble feudalism?
8. Why is the American constitutional order and system a republic rather than a democracy? Where does final authority reside? Why did the United States shift from a federal to a national government in the mid-nineteenth century? The sharpest and clearest break with Biblical Christianity comes after 1800 with the rise of Transcendentalism (a form of Unitarianism or Arianism), which is discussed in chapter seven. NOTE: It is important to know that the word **sovereignty** is nowhere used in the Constitution, which is a political document rather than a formal covenant. Some scholars have concluded that the Declaration of Independence is the covenant or the “articles of incorporation” that calls the American people into existence as a single civil body politic. The Articles of Confederation (1783) were the first set of by-laws (including the “organizational chart”); the Constitution of 1789 is the second version that “We the People” (who were themselves already constituted as a people) ordained and established “to form a more perfect Union.”

Review

French Revolution
Edmund Burke
Thomas Jefferson
counter-revolution
John Locke
separation of powers

Reign of Terror
Charles Darwin
Benjamin Franklin
de jure independence
natural rights thesis
judicial review

John Wesley
Karl Marx.
Great Awakening
de facto independence
Declaration of Independence
manner of elections

Marbury v. Madison (1803)
federalism
constitutional republic

Roe v. Wade (1973)
feudalism
system of perpetual tensions

Bill of Rights (Prohibitions)
democracy
sovereignty

CHAPTER SEVEN: ROMANTICISM-TRANSCENDENTALISM, 1800s-1860s

Study Questions

1. Identify the two conflicting intellectual traditions of the early nineteenth century. Neo-Evangelicalism is not a term used during that period. Who was **Karl Marx** and what did he believe? How did the **Fabian Society** differ? Why were the Marxists dependent on the inside work of other revolutionaries, such as the Fabians (see chapter 11) and the Utilitarians?
2. Who was **Jeremy Bentham**? What was the nature of his systematic form of ethical hedonism known as utilitarianism? How did **C. S. Lewis** effectively answer Bentham's pleasure-pain calculus?

Bentham was an English philosopher, a child prodigy, and a legal and social reformer whose considerable influence continues to the present day. He was a major critic of natural rights philosophy, which he called "nonsense upon stilts." Late in life he was also the mentor to a group of younger disciples known as the Philosophical Radicals who helped found the University of London, which was open to all. In accordance with his wishes, Bentham's mummified remains are preserved in a display case. Bentham's students and disciples included James Mill (the father of the child prodigy, John Stuart Mill), John Austin (the patriarch of an intellectual circle and advocate of the theory of legal positivism), and the industrialist Robert Owen, who established two utopian communities, New Lanark and New Harmony, and became a major advocate of socialism, public education, and social reform. As for Bentham himself, he was, even as a young man, a pioneer in prison reform as well as legal philosophy and reform. He advocated animal rights, equal rights for women, liberal divorce rights, separation of church and state, the abolition of slavery and corporal punishment, the decriminalization of homosexual acts, and later influenced the development of welfare reforms. In 1785 he proposed a new kind of penitentiary; the **Panopticon**, a prototype for which was scheduled to be built but subsequently defunded by the English government. Nevertheless, it became a model for later prison reforms and other social experiments. Other important utilitarian philosophers include John Stuart Mill, who was the leading English philosopher of the mid-nineteenth century, a founder of neo-liberalism, an advocate of feminism, and, later, a socialist. Peter Singer, who now teaches ethics at Princeton, is a leading advocate of animal rights. Bentham's utilitarianism, which he traced back to the influence of Joseph Priestley and Cesare Beccaria, is based on a hedonistic or **felicific calculus** (not a pleasure-pain equation) that weighs relative amounts of the pleasures (he identified 14) and the pains (he identified 12). The bottom line, practically speaking, is to produce the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Even so, Bentham qualified this by saying that he opposed the sacrifice of individuals for the sake of some notion of the common good, which is certainly a pitfall of this kind of Rousseauan "general will" or majoritarian idea. Dr. Martin cites **Alexis de Tocqueville's** idea of **democratic despotism** as a danger of **majority rule**.

3. What **five-pronged program** does Dr. Martin discern in the work of Jeremy Bentham? In what ways did he anticipate **Karl Marx** (Marx later mocked Robert Owen as a "utopian socialist") and **John Dewey**?
4. It should be noted that **David Hume** was a religious skeptic, an empiricist philosopher, and a political conservative. The closest he came to Romanticism was providing some assistance to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which he came to sincerely regret. American Transcendentalism was

an outgrowth of German Transcendentalism (also known as Idealism). Its distinctive ideas and concerns were introduced to an American audience chiefly by sons of the New England Unitarian social and intellectual elite who had visited German universities. A few German scholars, among them the political scientist Francis Lieber, came to New England in the late 1820s. By the way, an itinerant former German professor figures in Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women*.

What follows is excerpted from my twenty-year-old old American history lecture notes on the origins of American public education in Massachusetts in the mid-1830s. The younger Ralph Waldo Emerson, who moved from the pulpit to the lecture hall, launched American Transcendentalism during this same period:

1. Massachusetts followed the example of the highly centralized **Prussian state school system**, which had been influenced by ideas of the utopian socialist, **Robert Owen**.
 - a. The genesis of modern American public education may be pinpointed to the European adventures of two young Bostonians, George Ticknor and Edward Everett, that began in the Spring of 1815 after they had read a book about Germany by Madame de Stael, who was also an admirer of the French Revolution. They visited the **University of Goettingen** already predisposed to admire it and were awed by the prodigious regimen maintained by its scholars. They were later joined by another Harvard man, Joseph Green Cogswell, who later founded the modern library system. For twenty months they kept rigid eighteen hour a day schedules. Occasionally they called on the great German poet, Johann von Goethe, at Weimar.
 - b. Two decades later, the campaign for public education was conducted by prominent members of the Harvard-Unitarian political elite of the state, including now Gov. **Edward Everett**, the first American to earn a Ph.D. from a German university, and Horace Mann, who as the president of the Massachusetts senate steered the legislation through to passage. Mann was afterward chosen to serve as first full-time secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, a post he held for twelve years before he left for a teaching position at Antioch College.
 - c. **Horace Mann** was a crusading Unitarian who had earlier supported the takeover of local congregational churches by Unitarian factions. As secretary of the board he centralized control over the curriculum, banned textbooks he regarded to be "sectarian," clashed with the Calvinist ministers of the Association of Boston Masters, and attacked his opponents as bigots and vandals. He believed that public education provided the key to solving society's problems and even wrote in one of his annual reports:

"This institution is the greatest discovery ever made by man: we repeat it, the common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man. In two grand, characteristic attributes, it is supereminent over all others: first, in its universality, for it is capacious enough to receive in its parental bosom every child that comes into the world; and, second, in the timeliness of the aid it proffers,--its early, seasonable supplies of counsel and guidance making security antedate danger. Other social organizations are curative and remedial: this is a preventive and an antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this, to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine-tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete. . . ."
 - d. Because of the character of its origins and **ideological tendencies**, the public education movement reflected the agendas of humanitarian reformers. Its penchant for faddism was revealed even at this early juncture by Mann's friendship with **George Combe**, who promoted social reform based on **phrenology**, an early pseudo-scientific system of psychology based on the study of the skull.

- e. Ironically, Catholics protested what they considered the Protestant character of these schools and set up **parochial schools** in the face of stiff opposition.
5. What were Romanticism and Transcendentalism revolts against? Some of the key figures to note are Kant and Hegel, Rousseau, Herder, and Goethe. The last three are early Romantics. NOTE: For background, Garth Kemerling discusses the rise of Idealism in www.philosophypages.com. The idea of a Transcendental Ego was developed by **Johann Gottlieb Fichte** called for a new systematic educational system. Fichte's *Speeches to the German Nation* (1808) preceded the founding of the University of Berlin by Wilhelm von Humboldt and represent an earlier instance of German nationalism. Confronted with Immanuel Kant's dualism (or dilemma) between the Noumenal and Phenomenal worlds (these words loosely mean "mental" and "material"), Fichte broke with the Kantian synthesis and chose one side of the dialectic:

Noticing that the Kantian account of experience creates a vital tension between the roles of pure intelligence and pure object as noumenal realities, Fichte argued that the balance between the two cannot be maintained. We are, instead, driven to choose one of two alternative views: to emphasize the knower and ignore the known as a thing in itself [*Ding an sich*], or to ignore the knower in order to focus on the reality of the known. Fichte chose the former, idealistic course, believing it alone capable of securing the freedom required for an adequate account of morality.

Karl Marx's later dialectical materialism (the road not taken by Fichte) cannot be understood apart from the Idealism of Fichte and Hegel. What were the new ontology and new epistemology of Transcendentalism? What does Emerson's poem, "The Oversoul," suggest? The German philologist and philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche, who wrote of the *Übermensch* (the Overman or Superman), was influenced by Emerson.

NOTE: The passage on page 133 is inaccurate; it appears to be a conflation of sentiments expressed in various passages in Emerson's writings. The irony is that the pantheism and "word mysticism" of Emerson lends itself to this kind of confusion. Robert J. Loewenberg captured some of the character of the man in his 1984 book entitled *An American Idol*. So did Otto J. Scott in *The Secret Six: John Brown and the Abolitionist Movement* (1979).

6. The idea that "sovereign man has unlimited potential" anticipates what came to be called the "human potential movement" – and associated with George Leonard and Abraham Maslow – in the 1960s. **Libertarianism** and **egalitarianism** are the twin but contradictory poles of the Transcendentalist part of our heritage. The Transcendentalist poets and essayists, which included Henry David Thoreau, were an integral part of the educational curriculum in public schools well into the 1960s. My American history lecture notes on the Transcendentalists are posted on Blackboard). This literary movement also played a role in the social reform movements of the mid-nineteenth century.
7. Why did the United States divide into two antithetical cultures? What are the three stages of revolution? The best known model of revolution is that of Crane Brinton in *The Anatomy of Revolution*. A summary follows. James Chomning Davies developed a theory of political violence, the J-Curve theory. Davies emphasizes that violence breaks out when recent gains are reversed and people are afraid of losing what they had won with so much difficulty.

I. THE OLD REGIME BEGINS TO LOSE CONTROL

- A. The state is economically weak
- B. The central government is ineffective and cannot enforce its rules
- C. New ideas circulate which challenge the older traditions
- D. A vocally powerful and influential opposition arises

II. THE OLD REGIME LOSES CONTROL

- A. The old social elites attempt to reassert their privileges

- B. Some disaster rallies the forces, who oppose the revolution
- C. Some short-term event sparks a conflict
- D. Government is too divided and weak to suppress the revolt

III. THE MODERATE PHASE OF THE REVOLUTION

- A. The moderates come to control and initiate changes
- B. Electorate expanded, constitution liberalized, reforms initiated.

IV. REACTION ARISES TO THE MODERATES

- A. Moderates stop reforms at some point having achieved what they sought
- B. Radicals feel the moderates are not moving far or fast enough
- C. Radicals mobilize their supporters

V. THE RADICALS SEIZE CONTROL

- A. The radicals take control of the state and revolution
- B. The radicals initiate sweeping changes eliminating old institutions completely

VI. RADICAL REIGN OF TERROR (THE REVOLUTION EATS ITS CHILDREN)

- A. Opposition both foreign and domestic arises to challenge the radical control
- B. The radicals remove their opposition through violent methods
- C. Radicals seek to institutionalize and spread their ideologies

VII. THE MODERATE REACTION

- A. Moderates overthrow the radicals and reestablish a moderate regime
- B. Moderates repress the more radical elements
- C. Moderates abandon many of the more radical reforms of the revolution
- D. Moderates return some of the privileges and policies of the old regime
- E. Moderates lose touch with the majority of the population

VIII. THE RISE OF A STRONG LEADER

- A. A leader, usually from the military arises and focuses opposition to moderates
- B. The leader seizes control of the government, often ruling through the army
- C. The leader blends better conservative, moderate, and radical policies
- D. The leader establishes new, effective, stable, and general popular institutions
- E. The revolution ends

8. In contrast with the manumission movement and **William Wilberforce's** campaign in the British Parliament to abolish slavery, why does Dr. Martin argues that abolitionist movement to end chattel slavery in America was a pretext that enabled American Transcendentalists to come to power in the United States? NOTE: Some members of the Radical wing of the Republican Party, notably Charles Sumner of Massachusetts, may have been influenced by the Transcendentalists, but that is not the same as saying that the Transcendentalists came to power. The social reform impulse of the period was complex, as was the reaction against it. Transcendentalism was by no means the only source or necessarily even the most important source of what Alice Felt Tyler called "freedom's ferment."

Review

Jeremy Bentham
 Fabian Society
 felicific calculus
 majority rule
 Transcendentalism
 Robert Owen
 Ralph Waldo Emerson
 libertarianism

neo-Evangelicalism
 George Bernard Shaw
 Alexis de Tocqueville
 C. S. Lewis
 Romanticism
 Edward Everett
 pantheism
 egalitarianism

Karl Marx
 John Stuart Mill
 democratic despotism
 five-pronged program
 David Hume
 Horace Mann
 sovereign man
 chattel slavery

manumission
unconditional surrender

Nat Turner
William Wilberforce

total war

CHAPTER EIGHT: PROCESS PHILOSOPHY, 1870s-PRESENT

Study Questions

1. **Background** The question of whether Romanticism/Transcendentalism led to the Revolutions of 1848 is a complex one. The word Romanticism is chiefly associated with literature, music, the arts, the preservation of folk culture, and the rise of national self-consciousness. To paraphrase Jane Austen, the “sense” of Rationalism began to yield to the “sensibility” of Romanticism. But what exactly did Romanticism mean for politics. In some cases, such as England, the connection is not very obvious. Yet Romanticism is still with us in many respects. The ‘48-ers in Germany had often been imbued with the Idealism associated with Hegel. By then, Left Hegelians like David Friedrich Strauss and Ludwig Feuerbach had long since broken with Transcendentalism and turned to materialism. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who were still in their twenties, published the Communist Manifesto on behalf of the League of the Just, but this tract was published too late for them to play a leading role. On the other hand, utopian socialism and romantic nationalism played a large role in 1848 revolutions, as they did subsequently with the ultimately successful unification of Italy in the 1860s. Yet much the same can be said of subsequent events. The sort of inflated romantic hopes were expressed by the followers of Sartre, Levi-Strauss, and other radicals about the failed revolution of Paris in May/June 1968. The veterans of ‘68, who call themselves *soixante huitards* (‘68-ers), recently celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the general strike in the sort of fond afterglow well captured by William Wordsworth’s description of the French Revolution: “Bliss was it that dawn to be alive, But to be young was very heaven. “ The ‘68-er slogans included “It is forbidden to forbid” and “Live without limits, and enjoy without restraint.” We might ask: how is this appreciably different from the romanticism of many of the ‘48-ers? Although worldviews are complex, fluid, and often antagonistic, they often evoke the same sorts of emotions. Every generation has its defining moments.

In the decade following the suppression of the 1848 revolutions, many of the revolutionaries, such as Carl Schurz, migrated to the United States. Usually, they supported the Whigs and then Republicans. By then, the Transcendentalists had been a vital force in America for more than a decade and remained so for some time after the Civil War. The first Prussian-style graduate program in the United States was established in 1870 at Johns Hopkins. John W. Burgess started a graduate program in political science at Columbia University soon afterward. But the advent of Darwinism in higher education shifted the terms of debate toward process philosophy. What Andrew Dickson White of Cornell called the “Battle-Fields of Science” (1869) came to the forefront. White later wrote the *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology* (1896).

2. By the time the radical theologian **Ludwig Feuerbach** published *The Essence of Christianity*, he was no longer associated with Berlin, where he had studied under Hegel. Feuerbach held that the concept of God is an act of self-alienation, an idealized projection of man’s own essence. But even though Feuerbach abandoned historic Hegelianism by moving from Idealism to atheistic materialism, he kept Hegel’s emphasis on the centrality of the State as the living unity of men. By contrast, his Dutch contemporary, **Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer**, adhered to the Christian faith. Groen helped lead an evangelical renewal movement in the Netherlands and the Anti-Revolutionary caucus in the Dutch parliament (before Abraham Kuyper founded the Anti-Revolutionary Party in 1879). He also introduced the idea of sphere sovereignty, which recognizes that a variety of institutions – church, state, family, and others – are under God’s authority. Groen is best remembered for the series of lectures he gave during the winter of 1845/46: *Unbelief and Revolution*. As he noted:

At bottom the Revolution is the world-historical *war of religion* (Gen. 3:15), the battle against the living God. – Piety and politics melt together before the supreme question: if there is no *sin*, there is no *Saviour*; if there is no *sin*, the cause of evil lies not in man, who is good, but in the *form of government*, in the lack of popular rule, in the corruption of society through priestcraft and tyranny. . . (Lectures VIII-IX, p. 32).

Groen recognized that if the Biblical doctrine of man's sin is rejected, then we are left with Rousseau's idea that our problems are at root societal and political in nature. A bit later he commented on the ramifications for our understanding of Law:

Freedom is submission to the Law. We agree, if the law rests upon recognition of the highest Lawgiver and upon submission to His commandments. But we disagree if by law is meant the will, the approval, the good pleasure of the majority: we should, even if we had rejected the Bible, be put to shame by pagan wisdom [Cicero calls this view "the most foolish notion of all"]. If freedom means unconditional obedience to the good pleasure of men, then freedom is a fiction" (pp. 54-55).

New ideas about law that rejected any divine (or natural) basis for the law had by then arisen in connection with the utilitarianism of Bentham and the legal positivism of his student, John Austin.

3. What are the four presuppositions of process philosophy? How did Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, John Dewey, Sigmund Freud, Francis Crick, and Marshall McLuhan differ? The Marquis de Sade (sexual perversion and violence), Max Stirner (individualist anarchism), J. B. Watson (behaviorism), and B. F. Skinner (*Beyond Freedom and Dignity*) could easily be added to the list. What Dr. Martin is criticizing is their "reductionism:" that is, their reduction of behavior to a single dominant cause.

Review

Ludwig Feuerbach Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer
presuppositions of process philosophy

CHAPTER NINE: THE MARXIST ANALYSIS OF HISTORY, 1870s-PRESENT

Study Questions

1. Hegel's dialectic (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) grows out of his Idealism and is contrasted with what Francis Schaeffer called the "propositional revelation" of the Bible (Dr. Martin calls it "linear"). German Idealism started with the epistemological question: How do we know? As Francis Lieber notes in his *Encyclopaedia Americana*, German philosophy "is distinguished by an incessant striving for a systematic character, and the deduction of scientific conclusions from the simplest and most comprehensive principles." Idealism, which held that "the world in its entirety had to be regarded as the product of creative thought or reason" [Copleston, VII: Part I, 19], opposed itself to Locke's emphasis on sense experience (sensualism). Immanuel Kant "showed that, instead of inquiring what the world was in itself, we ought to first inquire how we perceive it." Kant's philosophy was dualistic. On the one hand is the **noumenal** world, which consists of things-in-themselves but which is unknowable. On the other hand is the **phenomenal** world, which consists of things-as-perceived. This distinction is meant to show the limits of the human mind. But Kant's successors went off on various tangents. "Fichte rejected the idea of [a relation between the mind's own notions and realities] by admitting the absolute existence only of the thinking individual, by which he considered the objects of thought to be produced." A practical problem that arises is whether (and to what extent) reality is mirrored by language or whether

language actively creates an image of reality. The first corresponds to what Adam Schaff calls **copy** theory and the second to a **convention** theory in which our language and culture shape our *Weltanschauung* (worldview). The first view is the traditional one and is typified by the inductive and empirical character of English philosophy. It presupposes the existence of an objective reality that is independent of the mind. The second approach, suggested by J. G. Herder and developed in later German and French philosophy, leads us to postmodernism and such ideas as the social construction of reality and deconstruction.

NOTE: The University of Berlin, the first German University (1810), has been renamed the Humboldt University after its founder, Wilhelm von Humboldt, and his brother Alexander. Political Science is offered by the faculty of Philosophy. Francis Lieber, the first political science professor in America (Columbia University, 1857), had studied at the university in 1819 but was banned following the assassination of the playwright August von Kotzebue by a theology student who was associated with the gymnastics circle (*Turnverein*) to which Lieber belonged.

2. What are the presuppositions of Marx's dialectical materialism? What are the stages of the Marxist analysis of history? What makes Marxism a (secular) religion?

Review

Karl Marx	Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel	Ludwig Feuerbach
Friedrich Engels	presuppositions of dialectical materialism	
stages of Marxist analysis of history		Marxism as a religion

CHAPTER ELEVEN: MARXISM IN AMERICA AND THE WEST: FABIAN SOCIALISM, 1883-PRESENT

Study Questions

1. What are some of Marxism's touching points with most Western and American intellectuals? NOTE: **Andrew Klavan** discusses the presumptive atheism of intellectuals like Christopher Hitchens. For many such people, their atheism resembles what psychiatrists call a reaction formation (a defensive response to a fear), which may become quite obsessive – in the sense of overcompensating for it.
2. What is the origin of the Fabian Society? Who was Fabius Maximus? How did Fabian socialism come to the United States? What organizations sprang out of it? A separate reading on Fabianism will be added to Blackboard.
3. In Russia, the February Revolution of 1917 (February in the Julian calendar but March in the Gregorian calendar) overthrew the tsarist regime. The bloody October Revolution (in November) was led by Vladimir Lenin. As the Soviet Union later teetered on the edge of economic and political collapse, Mikhail Gorbachev introduced such ostensible reforms as *perestroika* (restructuring of the system) and *glasnost* (openness) in order to salvage the regime. It did not work.

Review

Fabius Maximus	Intercollegiate Socialist Society	Americans for Democratic Action
Students for a Democratic Society		Mikhail Gorbachev
<i>perestroika</i>	<i>glasnost</i>	