***Lights in the World - PH46-02  
  
Advanced Bible Doctrine - Philippians 2:14-15***

We are studying the book of Philippians in the form of an advanced Bible doctrine study. We've been examining how Christians can be lights in the world as Paul calls upon us to be. We have been examining this via the group of principles which are known as the Ten Commandments which are found in Exodus 20:1-17. We are currently studying the fifth moral principle, which requires children to honor their parents. This, of course, is part of the divine institution of the family. God has established such a thing as a family unit for the organization of society.

To honor your parents is an attitude which is unnatural to a child. It is something which he must be taught, just as he must be taught other things. The basic hindrance to honoring one's parents is the stubbornness which is innate in a child. The Bible tells us that the first and number one way of weeding out stubbornness, the resistance to constituted authority, is the use of the rod, physical punishment. This is by actual application of the rod, but it is in most cases simply by the fact that the child knows the rod is there potentially to be applied. So most of the time, once this has been established, you don't have to actually use the rod on the child. He will respond to the orders and directions given to him.

**The Family**

All of this is in contrast to modern child rearing techniques which are based on non-biblical Freudian psychology which assumes that a child is basically good. It rejects the concept that he has a basic evil nature that he is born with. The family institution itself is under severe attack because it has lines of authority. When you think about a family, you think about these lines of authority: from God; to father; to mother; and, to children. This is a hindrance to Satan's control of society. This is why Satan uses various agencies and various social organizations to destroy the family organization as it is found in the Word of God.

When you have a functioning family, you have lines of authority. We have wives who are subject to their husbands, and finding fulfillment in the roles that God has called them to perform as mothers and homemakers and wives; we have fathers who are exercising the authority that God has given them in carrying out the responsibility of caring for their family, and of clearing what their children do and do not do; and, we have children who are not using that rebellious word "why" to their parents, but they are doing what they are told. They are being subject to the right things that their parents insist they do, and they are discovering that these right things are the line of blessing in their lives.

This is kind of a family that is hard to get to. If Satan is going to come in with sin and put a scar; a big scratch; or, a big slash on a life of any member in the family, he has first to get that person to reject authority. Once a wife has rejected the authority of her husband, Satan can slash her to ribbons. Once a child has rejected the authority of his parents, Satan can slash that child to ribbons with all kinds of sin. You are a pathetic fool who falls into a pathetic trap if you reject the family institution, and if you reject the lines of authority that God has established. It is not a wise woman who does not respect her husband's authority. It is not a wise child who does not respect the authority of his father and mother. It is not a very wise man who does not respect the authority of God over him, to whom he must someday account.

So this is the setup; it is a working setup; and, it is the only setup by which human society can work. But the modern view of the family rejects all this. Some of the things you may have heard us say in the course of this study may seem wrong to you. You may find resistance rising within your own thinking against some of these things simply because you have been brainwashed and disoriented in the course of your studies and in the course of your own education because of the way Satan operates in distorting the concepts of the family.

**The Modern View of the Family**

So now let's take a look at the modern view of the family. It is, first of all, Freudian, and it is humanistic to the core. It is considered entirely an evolutionary product. It is not of divine origin. That's the first thing to remember. The family is viewed as something that just sort of evolved--not something which is the result of a divine institution. The idea goes something like this:

Originally there was a violent, primal father. He dominated the mother and the daughters sexually. Sons who were born into the family, at a certain point, were driven out so they would not be of sexual competition to the father over the mother and daughters. The sons, in turn, feared and envied the father; they banded together; they killed the father; they ate him; and, then they possessed the mothers and the sisters sexually. You can just read this in the Freudian books that explain to you the concepts of where the family originated.

Well, the sons themselves reacted to what they had done with remorse and with guilt. Then out of this, consequently, evolved three basic taboos. These were things which were now forbidden in human society. One was parricide which means to kill your own parents; a second was cannibalism which was the eating of human beings; and, the third was incest which was sex with blood relatives. These three things became established as taboos, and laid the groundwork for what evolved, the Freudian psychologists say, into what we know today as the family.

Freud taught that these taboos are expressed in Christianity. The son makes atonement on the cross for killing the father. This taboo of parricide is expressed in that way. The son is dying on the cross because he killed the father. Cannibalism is transformed into the communion service, and it is called a sacrament. All of this is wrong. There is no such thing as sacraments. There are only ordinances. But Freud said what the churches call a sacrament to get them up to God (steps to God) are actually this business of cannibalism transformed into the communion service. Then there were laws against illicit sex that evolved out of the incest taboo.

The result of all this was the evolution of religion with the power of the parents and with the family unit as a refuge for a hostile environment based upon these three basic taboos in the family. Then the father becomes a god, and the mother becomes a goddess. The mother creates life. The father makes history. This resulted in primitive forms of religion which exalted the family unit. The concept of God evolved in this way, Freud said, and the concept of a family evolved in this way. The father was a god within the family; the mother was a goddess; and, over them was some kind of Supreme Being who reacted against parricide, cannibalism, and incest.

The belief in God (or religion) is thus seen by Freud to be a product of the family unit which had evolved. First you have the family, and then because you have a family, you have to have a religion. Consequently, Freud said that that's the order: family; and, religion. If you want to get rid of religion, what do you want to get rid of? To get rid of religion, get rid of the cause of religion which is the family.

This is exactly what the communist world understands. This is why the communist world is so antagonistic against religion. The principle is if we can get rid of religious ideas, that there is a God out there, then we can get rid of the family, because communism always zeros in on the destruction of the family in various ways. Free and open sex is one of the ways of destroying the family. Causing mothers to have to work in a factory, and taking their children away from them to be reared in a state nursery is another way to destroy the family. Until the family is destroyed, the state cannot break the lines of authority that are within the family which influence the child's thinking. This is because children will believe what their parents tell them. So faith in God is seen as a barrier to collectivist goals. So the communist conspiracy says, "We are atheists. We'll get rid of religion. Then we can get rid of the family."

Also, to get rid of the family, we'll get rid of another problem for the collectivist mind, and that is private property. Private property is seen as the outgrowth of the family concept. Private property provides the family unit with independence of choice. When people have money, they can choose to do what they please to do, and they are not dependent upon the state. The family functions around a common base of property which holds it together, and the communist world recognizes this. If you have ever read the Communist Manifesto, you will have read this phrase out of the Communist Manifesto: "On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital. On private gain. In its completely developed form, this family exists only among the bourgeoisie, but this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians and in public prostitution."

Karl Marx thought that the family was the result of private property. Private property gave the family a cohesive unit. It was among the bourgeoisie, who supposedly had property, that the family idea was promoted. Among the proletariat, those who were poor and did not have money, the family concept was not strong, and consequently, prostitution flourished among the proletariat.

So the family, because it is the economic unit of society, is a problem for the state which wants to control the economic life of the society. So to abolish private property, it is necessary, first of all, to break up the family unit with its biblical concept of private property.

Frederick Engels, who was the associate of Karl Marx, attacked the idea of marriage where one man was married to just one woman. That's called monogamous marriage. He says this actually evolved from the time of group marriages where several people were married to each other in a communal relationship. Of course, the hippie weirdo delusion and degradation has simply picked up this old idea. It was popularized a few years ago during the 60s. You heard a lot about communal groups. What they were doing was going back to what Engels said was the original relationship. He said that the sole purpose of identifying paternity (that is, the sole purpose of identifying whose child belonged to whom) was so that that child could inherit the father's property. So Engels said that after a while, because of the problem of private ownership, people began to team up one man to one woman in monogamous marriage so that that father's possessions would clearly go to those who were his own offspring.

Engels said it is unnatural for one man to be married to one woman, and for one woman to be married to one man. What is natural is communal group marriage. Engels says this has reduced women to the place of subjection to men, and to domestic slavery, when she could be married to only one man. Of course, this is the claim of the Equal Rights Amendment proponents. The ERA proponents claim that this is the problem. They want equal rights for the sexes, and it sounds innocent enough, but their claim is that this is to relieve women from the domestic slavery to which they have come. Communism, in other words, wants to emancipate women from the Bible role that God has appointed for a woman, which is marriage, homemaker, and mother. They want to make her an industrial worker with other people rearing her children in state nurseries.

What could you ask that could be nicer? Isn't that a wonderful liberation for a woman to take her out of her home and out of the place where she can rear her own children; train her children; and, influence her children, and where she can have the care and the provision of her husband? She can be taken to a factory glowingly knowing that her little children are being reared in the state nursery. Wouldn't that excite you to know that you could have that kind of freedom? Well, that's one of the things that the ERA wants. It wants to liberate women from what they call a puritanical concept, but they mean biblical concept, of marriage, homemaker, and mother.

So the family is to be eliminated with its need for private property and parental authority to rear the children. This is the reason for the attack upon the family. It's all part of the world's system, folks, of removing authority from the lines that God has established to putting authority into a dictatorship totalitarian state, which socialism and communism both promote.

Actually, the family is God's institution for the liberation of women. The family, as the Bible sets it up, liberates a woman from the necessity of selling her labor in the marketplace to support her children. The feminists say that a woman has to sell her labor in the marketplace to support the family. The biblical concept liberates a woman from abandoning the rearing of her children, and turning them over to other people to rear. There can be nothing more horrendous, more offensive, or more loathsome to the heart of a sensitive understanding mother than to turn her children over every morning to some stranger to rear while she goes off to sell her labor in the marketplace. It is wrong. A woman with any sensitivity at all will react against that and will get out of that as fast as she can. This is not God's order. It is Satan's order to the hilt. When you do this, you may be sure that your children are going to learn a lot of bad things; they're going to develop a lot of bad attitudes; and, they are going to be the kind of kids that will go off to college and be sitting ducks for all the inane disoriented radicalism and resistance to authority that permeates our institutions today.

The Bible says that a father (a husband) is divinely responsible to provide for the feeding and clothing of his family. A man who takes a wife is responsible to feed and clothe that wife and to care for her. When she goes out and works, it is wrong, wrong, wrong. There comes a time (comes a state in life) when that wife is free to work. The family has moved to a certain situation of life, and her time is available from the children to be able to engage in some other pursuit. But that is a secondary pursuit. She is not engaging in that because the family has to have her paycheck to live. I'm talking about a situation where a wife's paycheck is essential for the family to survive. That's out of line from the Word of God. This is tolerated and promoted widely today. I want you to understand that it is an attack on the family, and an attack on a family is an attack on the fifth biblical principle because it undermines the training of children to be able to respect and to honor their parents. The women who are enslaved in our day are those who cannot pursue their natural biological need and desire to better and to care for children, and to rear them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. That's the woman who is not liberated.

**The Equal Rights Amendment**

Actually, mothers and fathers today have unequal rights. That is true. Men and women in our country, thank God, have unequal rights. A father is legally obligated to work and to provide for his wife and children. Even if the parents should divorce who have children (which God says, "I hate and I loathe when anybody does that, and they are under my dire condemnation for it"), even when people do that legally, the law says that the husband must care for that wife and child. Our laws recognize what God's book says. A husband has to provide for his children and his wife. They are not equal.

What the Equal Rights Amendment wants to say is that a husband and a wife are equally responsible for providing for the material care of the family. So then a husband could go to a court of law and say, "Listen, I'm earning $600 a month, and my wife isn't earning anything. I'm not going to support her until she gets out and earns $600 a month." Under the Equal Rights Amendment, some judge someplace along the line is going to say, "That's right, ma'am. Get yourself a job. You have to help support the family. Take your children down to mama's nursery, and you get a job." Under the Equal Rights Amendment, the father could escape the duty of supporting his wife and children. This would cripple the entire family structure, you can see. That's why communists are promoting the Equal Rights Amendment to the hilt. If you don't believe me, start reading the Daily Worker, and you'll see how they're supporting it, because Communism has recognized that the ERA amendment is tailor-made for the destruction of the family, which is critical to the establishing of communism over any society.

The division of roles in the family of men as breadwinners and women as homemakers is vital to the nature of each person. It's vital to the nature of a woman to be a homemaker. It's vital to the nature of a man to be a breadwinner. Men need the family unit in this way to assert their masculinity, and to motivate them to settle down to a stable relationship. Men, by their very sexual nature, are transients, whereas women by their sexual nature are permanent. They want to settle down. It is God's design that women are to help men to settle down. The family makes men feel important and needed as the provider, the defender, and the leader. The woman's place is to influence the men into a stable social relationship, making plans for the future. Men are transient, but if women are going to bear children and rear those children, they can't be roaming across the countryside in covered wagons. They can't be living as nomads in tents from here, to there, to yonder. That is not the best condition under which to bear and rear children.

Therefore, while men are transient, and they want to go to every place under the sun to do the next big thing that comes along, the women are inclined to say, "Listen, we want to settle down. We want to build a house out here; then a fence; then a garden; then paint the fence; and, then we're going to put some curtains on the windows. We're going to have someplace for the kids to come home after school to. That's the whole nature of a woman because God built women that way. It is in contrast to men who are the adventurers; who are the history makers; and, who are out there moving, but who have to have the restraining guidelines of the family unit for the responsibilities that God has placed upon them to get these two together in the most marvelous relationship for the rearing of children, and for the rearing of human beings who have a whole set of capacities to offer society in their own right, because they have been reared on biblical principles. So a woman finds fulfillment in being needed as child bearer and homemaker. This asserts her femininity.

The biblical family institution is indeed at the core of civilization. There's a book by a man named George Gilder. He is not writing it from a Christian frame of reference. The title of the book is Sexual Suicide. It was first published in 1973. It comes out in a paperback edition by Bantam Books. In that, he has very amply demonstrated the thesis that the attack on the family is an attack on civilization itself, and that the destruction of the family has always led, and always will lead, to the destruction of the civilization in which that family resides. The thing that's interesting about this book is that he bases his arguments, totally as a non-Christian, on just anthropology. He just shows what has happened to civilizations where the family has been destroyed, and how that civilization then collapses. But the conclusions that he reaches on the basis of anthropology are almost identical to the conclusions you read in the Bible. In other words, he has struck upon the basic principles built into the human race by God. Whether you find them from the Bible, or you find them from other studies, when you discovered the principles, they work. They work every time.

So in passing, I call your attention to the fact that the feminist movement is the prime enemy of women's freedom and of women's liberation, because it denies the women her divinely structured biological role, and it induces men to indulge their natural irresponsibility toward providing for their wives and their children. Men who struggle for sexual identity in the face of competing females are the men who run off and desert their families. There are thousands of men who just one day never show up again at home. Do you realize that? Pretty soon they put out a missing persons bulletin, and they just disappear one day. They just don't come home.

Why? Well, they're at work. They go to the office, and there's a woman in charge. So all day long, their boss is a woman. They get home, and their wife also works. She earns more money than he does. All of these things eat away and destroy the natural order within the family. Pretty soon, his natural inclination to be a transient rises to the surface, and he just disappears and leaves it all behind. It is because of the very things that the feminist movement is so championing. Most of the things that feminists and the ERA promote are for the dissolution of the family. It demoralizes society; it diminishes the role of the male as provider and defender; and, it weakens the ties of the husband, consequently, to his family. I'll tell you this, that the lower income level the family is on, the more they are hurt by the feminists. It is the people at the lowest income levels that are finding husbands and fathers who are disappearing; not showing up; and, leaving wives to be abandoned with their children.

Again, even our law recognizes that women have unequal rights with men. In terms of Social Security, our country's laws recognize that a woman as a homemaker and a mother is not out in the marketplace selling her labors. She's at home, bearing and rearing those children, and providing for her husband and family, as per the biblical principle. Therefore, she cannot be out there earning money to be setting money aside for Social Security. So what does the law say? The law says that that wife is entitled to the full benefits of her husband's Social Security, because it is his business to be out there earning a living for the family. It is his business to be putting aside the money that the law requires in Social Security, but the wife has full benefits. They're unequal. Thank God that the law does not say that a wife can only get what Social Security that she herself has earned in the marketplace. Where would that put them? But if ERA is passed, sooner or later, some man is going to come along and challenge that. You can just see how some judge on the court is going to say, "That's right. That man has equal rights. That wife can only get what she herself has invested and earned."

Two gay men or two lesbian women can now have weddings, and adopt children. Don't kid yourself. The Bible is in the forefront of freedom and liberty for women. But God who made us knows how we can secure freedom and liberty within our own natures, and how we are. When we fit that relationship, then we have freedom indeed. It's the old story: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." This is not some distortion of the truth, but the truth shall make you free.

So the feminist movement and the gay movement and the Equal Rights Amendment are all part of Satan's plan and program for the victory of communism and for the destruction of liberty.

**The Bible**

The Bible does not leave us in ignorance of what we should do in this business of rearing our children. Proverbs 1:7-9 tell us very specifically what God's order is for the rearing of children, so that when they're grown, and in the process of their growing up, they will honor and respect their parents. Here you have summarized the doctrine of authority in the family. Proverbs 1:7 says, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, but fools despise wisdom and instruction." The point of this is that the first source of divine authority is the Bible. That's what verse 7 is saying. The word "fear" here means "a restraint against displeasing God." That is sin. A person should be reared to be afraid of sin. A person should be reared to fear evil.

Please remember there is a difference between evil and sin. Out of our old sin nature flows things that the Bible calls our righteousness. We look upon them as good. We call them human good, but they are evil in God's sight. Human good is evil in God's sight. There are things that the Bible calls sin, the violation of moral principles. That too is evil. So we may say that what the Bible is speaking about here is to be afraid of being guilty of evil, whether they are your human good righteousness or our outright sins themselves--violation of moral principles.

The fool is the one here who is negative to divine viewpoint. That is, he won't apply it. The word "despise" means "to walk on it" or "to kick it." The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge. That's the first step to getting smart. But the fool, the one who is negative, who despises doctrine, he kicks or walks upon what is called wisdom, which is Bible doctrine, which you learn from repeated hearings. The fool has heard it all before in instruction, and instruction is teaching by disciplining with authority. It is what your parents do to you when they punish you. You are learning and you are being instructed by the punishments which they impose upon you. Teaching children what is good for them, and then forcing them to do what is good for them, whether they want to or not, is receiving wisdom and instruction. Did you get that?

It is telling your children what is right to do. That's wisdom. Then it is seeing to it that they do what is right. That's instruction. In time, they discover the benefits themselves of what you have told them and what you have forced them to do. So when they are on their own, they do not depart from that path. The blessings of the right attitudes and of right actions have a way of bringing their own convictions.

**Parents**

The second source of authority, we are told, are the parents. You have this in Proverbs 1:8. My son, hear, the instruction of your father, and forsake not the law of your mother. So listen to the instruction of your father. This means to learn the lessons of discipline which he imposes upon you. To continue following the instructions of your mother is to follow in the ways that she has taught you. Both parents are necessary for the training of a child. They provide different factors. You cannot fully rear a child in divine viewpoint authority if you do not have both parents. It's a disadvantage. It's done, and the grace of God comes through where one parent has to do it alone. But God's normal setup is that a father has certain things which he delivers, and a mother has other things which she teaches. A mother is a big teacher to her children. She's constantly teaching.

By the way, don't forget that the biggest way you teach is by talking. Your biggest instruction is things you're saying when you don't intend to be teaching anything. Suppose that your husband comes and says something you don't like, and you say to him, "Oh, shut your big mouth." You have just taught a lot to your children, in case you didn't know it. It is the times when you are talking, that you don't intend to be teaching, that they're learning the most. It's their little ears that are listening in and taking it all in. Those are the most interesting classrooms to them.

This is why mothers have to learn to put their emotional nature under God's doctrine. They need to develop spiritual maturity in their souls so that emotions do not dominate the soul. You have to learn as women not to be screaming and yelling. That means a soul which has never been brought under the control of doctrine. Parents are the second source of information, and fathers, as mothers, teach most when they don't think they're teaching. You do it by talking.

The results of parental trainings are in Proverbs 1:9: "For they shall be an ornament of grace unto your head, and chains about your neck." They are the principles of doctrine taught to the child. "Upon his head" means as a crown, a symbol of leadership and success for the man. The man who learns (the male child who learns Bible doctrine) and responds to the instruction (the disciplines of his father) and the teachings of his mother will be like a king. He will have a crown on his head. In the case of the daughter, her beauty will be enhanced, and that's what it means by the "chains about the neck." This means a necklace. The woman's beauty (her inherent internal beauty) will be greatly enhanced by doctrine. Both sons and daughters require doctrine and the mental attitude that it gives them. This is only secured by submitting to these lines of authority. First: the Bible; and, secondly, the parents. Then you get the results of blessing. The most important contribution, therefore, that we as parents make to our children and to their success is by giving them doctrine in a way they can respect and receive it. The material things are not the most important things you give them: the education; the social graces; or, anything else.

**What Children Should Learn**

There are certain lessons which you are to learn under parental authority. These are:

1. Children are to learn the respect for self-discipline. The basis of all learning and divine viewpoint living is that you can control yourself. You control your natural desires to reach desirable goals. You sacrifice something at this moment in order to gain something out there in the future that is of greater value to you. You learn to act in terms of long-range goals rather than immediate temptations and gratification. A splendid example of this in the Bible was Moses who would not indulge in the matters of sin for a season, but preferred to take the long run sufferings and glories and blessings by casting his lot with the people of God. It is permissiveness and indulgence which has spawned the pathetic hippy cultures with all the weaklings and weirdos involved in that.
2. A child has a right to learn (from his parents) respect for private property of others--to observe the right of ownership of that which other people own, and their right to possess that which they own. They must learn to connect possession with working and earning. That's what parents must teach their children. If you want something, then start working for it. If you want something, then go out and earn it. Stealing and freeloading is to be condemned. Teach a child respect for the things that his parents provide.

I am really amazed when we go on these campouts and I see how kids sometimes handle the things that their parents have provided, and the indifferent way in which they let something get damaged or leave something behind because parents have not taught them the respect for the things that they have earned for their children and provided them with. Their parents have not made it painful for them when they are destructive of material things that their parents have provided them.

1. The next thing a child needs to learn is respect for the privacy of others. You must teach your child not to intrude where he's not invited; to be polite in his conversations and actions; to knock on your door before he comes barging in; and, not to monopolize the time of other people. You must teach your child to mind his own business, and not to be a gossip like you are. It is important to teach your child to mind his own cotton-pickin' business, and not to go rooting around in the business of other people. Don't let your home turn into the gossip-gathering center and exchange of the world, because your children will pick up that bad habit.
2. Your child has a right to be taught respect for life. That means not to take another person's life. You say, "Oh my child isn't going take anybody's life." Unless you teach your child not to do this, someone's going to make him awfully mad someday. In that moment of anger, he may just take somebody's life. He may haul off and hit somebody. He may haul off and shoot somebody on the spur of the moment in terms of indignation, because he has never really been taught a respect for human life. He will not even mind entering the realm of abortion, and destroying a soul.

Can you think what it's going to be like to get to heaven someday and meet the child, if you happen to be a believer, that you aborted, and you're going to meet him in heaven? That's when you're going to see your son or your daughter the first time. Don't you kid yourself that it's not murder? The Bible is very clear that it is indeed. You better teach your children respect for life. Only God has the right to take life. Only those legally appointed by God have the right to exercise his vengeance in terms of capital punishment. Romans 13:1-7 make that clear.

So I suggest that you punish very severely the habits of assault and battery that are inherent in your children. When you find a son or a daughter that reacts with muscle in dealing with people, you begin to curb that tendency and teach him a respect for the life and the physical person of other people.

1. The next thing is a respect for freedom of others. Do not coerce the volition of other people. Teach him to maintain the freedom of other people while he pursues his own happiness, and not to run roughshod over other people's freedom. He is to be fair in his dealings, and to be honest as he deals with other people in doing that which does not deny them their freedoms.
2. Next is respect for constituted authority of all kinds. That includes the Word of God. When the Bible speaks on an issue, that settles it. Parents, don't defend yourself or debate with your children. You are the authority. You have sometimes stepped out of line, and all parents do, sooner or later. We may punish our children when they were not guilty. Then you express your regret and you apologize to your children. You admit that you misunderstood the situation. Your child will never hate you for that. Your children will grow up hating you for not having punished them when they realize you should have punish them. They will grow up hating you for the fact that you did not make them be where they should be. I'm talking about kids who are all the way through high school, because they're all children to me. They will hate you for not making them be and do what they should do, and be where they should be. You know, and they don't. Parents don't need to defend or debate.

Teachers of the Bible should be respected. Negative volition toward the instruction of the teacher of the Bible is negative volition toward God. This is the same for church officials; the same for government officials; the same for teachers and academics at school; the same for military leaders; the same for the chain of command and the lines of authority; and, for business officials. Personal volition of all kinds respect constituted authority.

I realize that some kids are going to go negative in spite of all this kind of instruction. While you may very carefully try to teach your children these things, the time comes when they will say, "No." But having taught them, you will give them a chance not to have to learn through suffering. I guarantee you that your children are going to learn every one of these things because God is going to override with discipline. All the way down the line. God is going to win out.

What does secular education do? Well, secular education authority teaches a breakdown of the family. The family, remember, is the child's first environment, thus it's his basic life influence. The first school your child goes to is your family. The first church he attends is your home. The first state where he understands law and order and rules is the family. His first vocation where he's given a job with responsibility and reward is in the family. Parents are to a child, his god; his providers; his protectors; his lovers; his teachers; and, his law givers. Everything that constitutes a child's world are his parents.

That's why the family is critical in God's setup. But the destruction of parental authority is the road to anarchy in a society. The youth revolution of the 60s was basically an attack on the authority of parents. That's why you heard so many dishonoring remarks from these young people toward parents. They claimed the right to control and govern the property of other people. They claimed the right to make the rules of the schools they attended. They bewailed the coercion that was being imposed upon them, but they didn't mind coercing anybody else, and imposing their views upon anybody else. If you don't like the way your employer treats you, then quit your job and go get another one. If you don't like the way your school is run, then open your own school. Anarchy is inevitable in a generation which has not been taught within the family unit the lines of authority.

One thing more: It may cost the life of your child not to respond instantly with obedience to your commands. Just remember that. It may cost the life of your child to fail to respond instantly to your command on some occasion.

One time our family was in Yellowstone National Park. My number one son was about 11 or 12 years old, and we were all awed by these steam founts and the geysers shooting up in these hot pools. Somebody would say, "Look at this one here," and "look at that one there." There was a road. At the road was a hill, and then was a blind spot. A car couldn't see anything until it came up over the hill. We were right down at the bottom of that hill. My number 2 son was on the other side of the road and he found a real guzzling churning hot water spout. He yelled across the road and said, "Look at this one, John." John turned around and started dashing across the road.

I turned and looked. As he came across the road, a Volkswagen came over the top, and he was barreling just as fast as he could go. I could see that that Volkswagen and that kid were on a collision course. I yelled out, "John, stop." He was not even looking. He had no idea that car was coming, but he screeched to a grinding halt. You can go to this day at that point and you see two grooves caused by his heels in the pavement right there. He put his hands out instinctively in front of him. The Volkswagen whipped by, and John slammed his hands on the side of that car and bounced back a foot. That was all because he instantly stopped. Had he not stopped, who knows?

He could have said, "Why?" And there would have been just two tread marks, and he would have known why. They're not always obedient. But there are times when their very lives and their very physical well-being might be involved in instant reaction. But you can't train him when the time comes to need it. It has to be done ahead of time.

So I caution you to remember that your child totally lacks experience and judgment. You want to know how long? For a long time. The thing that is going to deceive you is that your child's body gets big, and you're going to say, "Oh, here is a person with judgment." My experience has been, through extensive clinical observations that I have made, and experiments conducted, that the bigger the body, the dumber the brain. It's almost axiomatic that the bigger the body, the dumber the brain. You can just count out it, I'm telling you. So the larger your child's body becomes, the less confident you should be about the judgment. And when you know they don't have experience, there should be unquestioned obedience to you. Why? Because you represent God. That's why. So the really free human being is the one who is disciplined in the restraints of the Word of God to hold back the natural inclinations of his old sin nature, and to learn how to function on divine viewpoint principles.

Dr. John E. Danish, 1973
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