

KING'S MEADOW

HUMANITIES CURRICULUM

American Culture



Midterm Answer Guide

By Dr. George Grant, Ph.D. Lit.

KING'S MEADOW



Since 1993

King's Meadow Humanities Curriculum: American Culture
Midterm Answer Guide
Copyright © 2011 George Grant

Editing, layout, and design by Lynne Spear

Audio editing by Aaron Johnson

Published and Distributed by King's Meadow
P.O. Box 37065
Franklin, TN 37065

Tel. (615) 594-8818

Send requests for information to the above address.

All rights reserved

Identify the following:

1. **hegemony:** Greek; total cultural domination
2. **hamasantal:** A worldview based on *hamas*, senseless and brutal violence.
3. **The Black Legend:** The idea that Hispanic peoples are untrustworthy, manipulative, cruel, and destructive. The black legend was perpetrated because of France, England, and Holland's attempts to stop the onward march of Hapsburg hegemony.
4. **ziggurat:** Step-pyramids built in Meso-America
5. **Mayans:** A Central American people whose society emerged about A.D. 300
6. **stele monuments:** Carved monuments in stone; built by Olmecs and Chavans
7. **Eric the Red:** In 982, Eric the Red and his young family were forced to leave their home on the coast of Norway. It seems that Eric had killed five men, which resulted in a warrant of banishment. Kill two men and you can stay, but five is just a little too much. He was sent into exile and put under the ban; literally, he was cut off from his village and from his people. So he began to do what so many Vikings had done before him; he went exploring for new opportunities and new lands, and it was on one of his great adventures that he made his way all the way to Greenland. He spent some time in Iceland prior to that, but not finding good pastureland, he decided to go to Greenland instead.
8. **Ultima Thule:** The now-Christianized Vikings established a diocese for the Church in a place they called Ultima Thule. In medieval mythology, Ultima Thule was the land on the farthest edges of the world, a land across a great sea, a land that often was bound by ice and snow but at other times of the year abounded with remarkable fruitfulness. Where Ultima Thule actually was, no one is certain, although a number of the ancient seafaring maps put Ultima Thule right where Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and northern New England are today.

There were actually churches established, a bishop installed, communications back and forth between the Ultima Thule diocese and Greenland and Iceland as early as 1120. Those Vikings who set out on these uncharted seas began to chart the seas. It is from some of the Viking portolan maps that we have remarkable descriptions of the coast of North America. And, of course, now we've got good archeological evidence of villages and settlements and trading centers, and some scholars even believe they have found some of those early primordial log churches on the North American shores.

9. **Shabaka:** As early as the second century B.C., we have the story of Shabaka, who ventured from western Africa across a vast expanse of sea. According to the legend and the chronicles, which are sketchy to be sure, but according to the stories and the legends, the seas were very rough for the first ten days or so and then suddenly the ships of Shabaka moved into a vast, flat, waveless sea filled with seaweed. They believed that they were approaching the very edge of the world and would be swallowed at any moment by sea monsters. It's a remarkable description of the Sargasso Sea, which sits right in the middle of the Atlantic. It's something that people who cross back and forth across the Atlantic say is very disconcerting. From either coast, from Europe or Africa or the Americas, you have rough seas until you reach the middle of the Atlantic, and all of a sudden everything goes flat and still and there's dense seaweed. The Sargasso Sea almost foiled Christopher Columbus's trans-Atlantic crossing because his navigators were so frightened by the absence of wind and the absence of waves that they were certain that they would be quickly swallowed

up. Shabaka describes this but then goes on to describe a land of lush, dense forests and crystalline springs pouring out into the waters and a whole line of islands guarding the coastline, probably the North Carolina coastline.

10. **St. Brendan:** There was St. Brendan, whose great chronicle is one of the wonderful treasures of the early Christian age. St. Brendan describes his journeys at the beginning of the sixth century to Wales and the Isle of Man and Iona and then either he or his followers onto the Canaries, the Azores, the Faroes, and then what he describes as his great journey across the sea and beyond the sea into the wilds of what can only be taken as America. His great prayer, the prayer of St. Brendan, which has been passed onto us in Celtic lore by the followers of Brendan, describes fierce, fierce struggles on high waves in the deep ocean and long, long weeks alone in the darkness before arriving at a green and verdant land waiting for the message of Christ to be brought to the heathen, distant peoples.
11. **Portugal:** a unique nation in that it was a nation by the fourteenth century; had become the international center of nautical experience; became the vortex of navigational discovery and enterprise; had the liveliest and most progressive ports in the world; an enterprising, brash, and ambitious realm where ideas and ideals alike abounded; a culture that reveled in books and maps, azimuths and globes, almucantars and compasses, planispheres and astrolabes, sextants and portolans, and all the other things that went with the maritime, technological world.
12. **honed compass:** magnetic needles set inside nautical instruments; first used in twelfth century; first actual mention of a honed compass in literature was in 1187.
13. **portolan:** map of coastal landmarks; one of the earliest stages of map making; a map that observes the world from a horizontal perspective, not from a vertical one; will describe what a mariner might actually see on the coast and then draw it out; a horizontal map, sort of an elevation view of a coastline. As the ancient world passed into the realm of Christendom, portolans became more and more complex, more and more accurate, and more and more helpful. But it still required that the mariners stay within sight of the coastline in order to make their way.
14. **astrolabe:** invented in about the seventh century or so; a disc-like instrument —almost like a slide-rule; an incredibly complex mathematical instrument designed to enable a mariner to determine where his ship is; a disc of metal that is held suspended by a small ring; has a scale with a series of degrees embossed upon the face of the disc and a ruler for measuring the height of an astronomical body. Essentially, a mariner would create sightlines to, say, the North Star, or in some cases the sun or the moon depending upon the time of the year, and then with a sightline first to the astronomical body and then perhaps to land or a fixed point or a known point, then make some calculations in order to determine just precisely where they were in terms of latitude. Astrolabes can't measure longitude, but only measure latitude. The astrolabe was a huge advance and enabled mariners to get out of sight of land for periods of time.
15. **dead reckoning:** dead reckoning is where you estimate a ship's current location based upon a previously determined location or fix and then advance that location forward along a predetermined trajectory. In other words, I know where I was and so based upon how long it's taken me from where I was when I knew where I was, I'm guessing that this is now where I am. That's dead reckoning and that's all fine as long as you've got calm seas and the sun is shining and everything is wonderful. But in the North Atlantic, that's about four days out of the year.

16. **caravel:** a small, very stable, highly maneuverable sailing ship utilizing multiple lateen sails. The greatest single development bringing together all these other technologies was the development of the caravel, the first great advance in the maritime design of ships since the time of the drakkar and the knorr of the Vikings. The caravel was a very small but very stable and highly maneuverable sailing ship with multiple lateen sails, a deep pitched keel, a strong multiple rudder system with castles — literally fortresses — set upon the deck, and large cargo holds. It was the ship that opened the door for exploration across the Atlantic.
17. **Sagres School:** an observatory in southern Portugal established by Prince Henry
18. **The Sargasso Sea:** It was just a couple of days after that that he ran into his first serious trouble when he entered the Sargasso Sea. Most people are fairly unaware of the Sargasso Sea today, but for centuries it has been the bane of many a navigator. The phenomenon of the Sargasso Sea makes trans-Atlantic journeys quite difficult if you're not aware of its peculiar difficulties. The Sargasso Sea is a sea within a sea. It's this open section in the heart of the north Atlantic where all of the major tidal systems and weather systems move around, leaving this kind of still lake in the center of the sea. It is a place where there is thick, thick seaweed and unusual ocean life. It's probably the source of all the myths of early mariners who described horrific and dangerous seas, not because they had huge waves, but because they entered into this stillness where there was no wind and where the seaweed was very thick and the animal life was frighteningly unusual.
19. **Aragon and Castile:** two Spanish kingdoms on the Iberian Peninsula ruled by Ferdinand and Isabella; after the Reconquista succeeded, Isabella reversed her previous rejection of Columbus
20. **Queen Isabella:** queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, supporter of Columbus
21. **Reconquista:** The reconquest of Granada from the Muslim Moors, succeeded in January of 1492
22. **Fra Antonio:** while Columbus was wrestling with some of these things, a Franciscan friar came into his life, Fra Antonio, who began to mentor Columbus in the hope of the gospel, in the calling upon his own life, and the uniqueness of his own vision. This gave to Columbus a tenacity that he had not had before. He had always had spunk and adventure, an insatiable appetite to learn more, but he didn't have the strength of his convictions to see them through.
23. **The Grand Enterprise:** what Columbus called his idea to sail west to reach the East
24. **Giovanni Caboto (John Cabot):** a Genoese explorer hired by the English to search for the Northwest Passage; discovered the Cape Breton Islands in 1497 and laid claim to North American lands for England.
25. **Walter Raleigh:** a well-connected Elizabethan courtier, Sir Walter Raleigh, began to make noises about the possibility of establishing colonial possessions in the southern New England territories called Virginia. Sir Walter Raleigh and his friend, Sir Francis Drake, had brought great wealth to themselves and to Queen Elizabeth through what today we can only call piracy. They had determined that the best and fastest way to bring wealth into the English domain was to go and steal it from the Spanish, so every time a Hapsburg ship would leave Latin America, like a swarm of bees, little privateers and pirates would attempt to take all their Peruvian or Mexican gold for themselves. Francis Drake and Walter Raleigh were particularly proficient at this pirate's trade. But both of them were also courtiers in the queen's circle. Both of them were chivalrous and dashing. They were celebrities in London because they were adventurous, bold, wealthy,

and well-positioned. Sir Walter Raleigh began to appeal to the queen for her good graces in commissioning colonial charters to establish trading as well as raiding centers along the North American coastline.

In 1584, he was given permission to establish a colony in what today is the outer banks of North Carolina. There were two attempts to establish this colony. In 1585, the first group of settlers determined that there was not sufficient hunting, timber, or security for them to stay. So after just a short attempt, they went back to England.

The second colony was much more disastrous because it involved some one hundred seventeen settlers, including women and children. This time, Sir Walter Raleigh's attempt to establish a colony took off, it seemed. The colony established itself on Roanoke Island. The colony disappeared, leaving very few clues and a mystery that remains unsolved to this day. Sir Walter Raleigh's piracy was far more successful than his colony.

26. ***Peter Stuyvesant***: the West India Operations Director in the Caribbean and was so successful that he was promoted to governor of the Caribbean Isles in 1643. Three years later, he was promoted to become governor of the New Netherlands. The New Netherlands were all the territories that Henry Hudson had claimed for the Dutch which included all what is today New Jersey, all of the Hudson Valley, and parts of New York, Long Island, and Manhattan. He was a successful governor and helped to establish New Amsterdam, the city on the southern tip of Manhattan Island as the model settlement in all of the New World. He built a huge dyke along the riverside of the settlement, a kind of retaining wall, and a long street beside it that became the center of marketplaces and commerce in the town. It was called Wall Street. He dug a broad canal, a drainage ditch, that connected the farms in the north, approximately where Central Park is today, with the town settlement in the south, and this broad way became Broadway. He made the whole of the colonial possession prosperous, fair, and tolerant. In fact, it was so tolerant that many of the refugees from Europe who had nowhere else to go flocked to the New Netherlands and to New Amsterdam. It was here that the first of the refugee Jews came to America, both Ashkenazi Jews and Sephardic Jews — those who came from central Europe and those who came from the former dominions of Granada. In addition, it was to the New Netherlands that many of the Swedes went when they were harassed by the English. So that, by 1664, New Amsterdam had more people of other nationalities than they had Dutch.
27. ***Henry Hudson***: an Englishman who worked for the Dutch. He was hired originally as a navigator for a new company called the Muscovy Company in 1607. The whole point of the Muscovy Company was to try to find a Northwest Passage so that open trade could be conducted between England and Moscow via a shortcut across North America. The Muscovy Company was eventually swallowed up by the Dutch East India Company, which, in the end, became the Dutch West India Company.

But in 1609, Hudson began to put together a fleet of ships for the first of three exploratory expeditions along the North American coast. He discovered Hudson Bay and the Hudson River. He circumnavigated the island of Manhattan and went all the way up as far as present-day Albany, New York, and there established Ft. Orange.

On his third voyage, he got into a bit of trouble with his crew and they decided they had had enough of his exploring and, perhaps, his surly ways, so they put him in a little rowboat in the middle of Hudson Bay and they sailed away. And that was the end of Henry Hudson. Most of the stories of these explorers wind up being stories of grave complications like that.

28. **Samuel de Champlain:** a great French explorer who was sent out in 1603 by Henri IV, the French king who had formerly been a Protestant, but, in order to inherit the crown of France, renounced his Protestant convictions and was readmitted to the Roman Catholic Church. Henri IV commissioned de Champlain to work on the possibility of a Northwest Passage. In the process of exploring, de Champlain discovered the St. Lawrence Seaway, the river that flows into the Great Lakes. Champlain, on a series of expeditions, explored the whole region of southern Canada and the region of the Great Lakes.

By 1608, he'd founded a fort at Quebec. In 1609, he discovered Lake Champlain, which he nobly named for himself. In 1610, he discovered the Green Mountains or Vermont and staked claim for the French in each of those territories.

29. **Jamestown Settlement:** in 1607, some very impatient adventurers decided to establish themselves at the mouth of the James River. If they had been wise, they would never have selected that spot. It was swampy, filled with mosquitoes, in the summertime excessively humid, the water was tepid and undrinkable, it was indefensible, and there was very little room for farming and no timber available. But, because these English adventurers thought they were going to the New World to make loads of money and it was going to be easy, these second and third sons of nobility got to America, pitched their tents, and thought, *Okay, bring on the wealth.* The problem was that they almost starved because none of them knew how to work. These weren't craftsmen and tradesmen, they were lazy second and third sons of nobility. And in the first year, Jamestown almost failed because of starvation and indolence.

In 1608, a new governor, John Smith began to demand that the settlers work. Some of them didn't like this and twenty-three left. *Work? We came here to get rich, we didn't come here to work!* Over the course of the next few years it was very difficult to carve out a living.

By 1610, the settlers were calling their season there at the mouth of the James River the starving time. But, under Smith's able leadership and because of alliances that were forged with the local Powhatan Indians, including the marriage of John Rolfe to an Indian princess, Pocahontas — who later became royal celebrities back in England when they went on tour there — the colony was finally established, and by 1619 the first colonial institution of democracy was established — the House of Burgesses.

30. **Conquistadors:** The Hapsburg explorers and conquerors of Mexico and Central and South America.
31. **Charles V:** Hapsburg emperor who aimed at worldwide hegemony
32. **Ferdinand Magellan:** First to circumnavigate the world, however he died in the Spice Islands
33. **xenophobia:** from Greek and Latin origins; a hatred of outsiders.
34. **War of Jenkins' Ear:** 1739-1743: a war that revolved around pirates and privateering, when Robert Jenkins, an English sailor, presented himself and his severed ear to Parliament and demanded that his ear be avenged.
35. **mercantilism:** The marriage of big government and big business so that big business serves the interests of big government and big government serves the interest of big business. They cooperate for the purposes of elevating their peculiar and particular causes. Thus we have government-created monopolies, government-created sanctions, government-created incentives, and government-created stimulus packages. This squeezes out the small businessman; this squeezes out the guilds and the various tradesmen. This

squeezes out the smaller businesses that drive the economy from the bottom up, because now the economy is controlled from the top down. Government sees, as its primary responsibility, driving the economy.

36. **letters of marque:** A government sanction to exercise piracy in regulated areas and against specific targets (your opponent at war, for example).
37. **The French & Indian War:** The Seven Years' War, 1754-1763; in 1754, France and England declared war on one another again, this time launching what is called the Seven Years' War, which was fought on four continents in at least nineteen different theaters, but in the American theater it's called the French and Indian War.

It really began in 1754 not far from where Pittsburgh is today, in the Battle of Great Meadows where the French and their Indian allies overcame the American and the British placement. Calling for a great congress of all the New England colonial powers, the Albany Congress appointed Ned Braddock as the commander of the militia forces and the British forces. This was confused to some degree by Quakers who refused to serve in the militias because of their pacifist convictions and the heavy-handed application of conscription by the new Prime Minister of England, William Pitt. The great battle for regency in Canada which led to the terrible struggle between Generals Wolfe and Montcalm at Quebec. The French and Indian War ended with the Treaty of Paris.

This led to the efforts of Great Britain to raise revenue through taxation on the colonies, which led to the American War of Independence.

38. **Henry VIII:** in 1509, Henry VIII married his brother's widow. His older brother Arthur, who was the heir to the throne, died before he could take the throne. Because of a series of alliances that Henry's father, Henry VII, had made, particularly with the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, it was incumbent upon the young Henry to marry the older Catherine of Aragon, his brother's widow. So in 1509 he did so and, in short order, succeeded his father to the throne.

Henry was one of the most remarkable humanists — a romantic renaissance man, a fine musician, a good writer, an excellent thinker. He was, with Francis I of France, one of the great learned men of the age. He embraced the Renaissance and wished to bring it to England. He was also an ardent Roman Catholic and a fierce opponent of the reforms of Martin Luther, so much so that in 1521, he was awarded the papal Defender of the Faith medal for a paper he'd written about the heresies of the Reformation.

However, there were dynastic concerns for the Tudor House. The concerns involved the inability of Catherine, at least in Henry's mind, to produce for him a son. Though she had given birth to children, only one of those children succeeded in making it outside of infancy and that child was a daughter, and Princess Mary wasn't sufficient for the dynastic ambitions of Henry VIII. So he began to work with Cardinal Wolsey, the archbishop of Canterbury and his close confidant to somehow obtain an annulment of his almost twenty-year-long marriage.

There were multiple concerns that went back and forth between Rome and London, between Westminster and the Vatican, along with a tremendous amount of diplomacy. But here's the problem: Charles V was the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and who was Catherine, but his aunt.

So, he fought hard to protect Catherine's integrity in the marriage. The result was that Cardinal Wolsey was unable to persuade the pope to annul the marriage, and so in 1533, Henry decided to divorce his wife

and marry his lover in order to produce heirs to the throne and protect his dynastic ambitions. It was a nasty mess. That was the beginning of the break of the Church of England. It wasn't about doctrine: *sola scriptura, sola fide, soli deo gloria*, or *solo gratia*; it was about authority. As a result, when Henry VIII died, the English church was an autonomous church, but it had not actually been reformed. Theologically it was virtually identical to the Roman Catholic Church. The difference was that it was a national church rather than an international church.

39. **The Mayflower Compact:** The Pilgrims decided to compact together, to covenant together for a vision that would represent the highest ideals of the Reformation. They wanted to make certain that what they were about would be the advancement of the faith, the honor of king and country, and most of all for the glory of God.
40. **John Winthrop:** John Winthrop wrote the sermon, "A Model of Charity". In 1630, the largest and best organized group yet, with the strongest leadership yet, under John Winthrop, some seven hundred six made their way across the Atlantic, well-provisioned with lots of communications back and forth across the Atlantic. They came, and just across the river from Charlestown, they established their little village on a series of three hills that they called Trimountain. *Trimountain* was an awkward name, and in honor of one of the pastors that they had brought with them, a man by the name of John Cotton who was the pastor of St. Boltoph's in the village of Boston in England, they renamed Trimountain Boston; thus was established this great establishment. Winthrop helped to establish the Massachusetts General Court; became the governor of the entire Massachusetts Bay Colony and writing its laws and gathering its legislature and founding all of the essential infrastructure of a flourishing society. He was, in many ways, the founding father of the American experiment; one of the governors of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the early years — reelected twelve times because of his strong leadership
41. **Anne Hutchinson:** a gifted Bible teacher who grew a home Bible study to a point where there were about eighty people in it. She was charismatic and thoughtful, but she also had an antinomian perspective. *Antinomian* simply means anti-name or against the law. Her basic premise was that the doctrine of the security of the saints means that after Christ has redeemed a person, he can just go do whatever he wants. He can sin however he wishes and his salvation is not placed in jeopardy. She did not recommend that this be taken to the extreme. In fact, she was quite prim and proper, but the doctrine itself the Puritans believed was sowing seeds of disaster and created a tremendous amount of disruption.

a remarkably brilliant and articulate woman. She began to gather what we would today call a home Bible study following sermons on Sundays to discuss the ideas in the sermon with a number of women in the village. Over the course of months and years, she began, like Roger Williams, to form strong theological opinions. It was said in the early years that she had remarkable theological discernment. She was also opinionated and began to take an issue with various things that were said in the sermons, so much issue that she began to undermine the authority of the local church. The church would come to her and work with her and see if there were issues of merit that were involved. She became more and more and more contentious, began to polarize members of the community. She also began, during this time, to have some bizarre visions and revelations. Eventually she too was sent into exile. She made her way to Rhode Island, although Roger Williams was not sure of her salvation and therefore she was forced to go to live outside the secured walls of Providence and eventually established her own little farm elsewhere where she got into a bit of trouble with the Indians, whom she also disturbed greatly. Eventually the Indians came and scalped her and all of her children, though she survived — I'm not sure I'd want to survive a scalping, but she did — and one of her daughters did as well.

42. **Solomon Stoddard:** a prominent pastor in one of the western cities of the new Massachusetts Bay Colony, a place called Northampton. It was there that he wrestled with the peculiar trouble of second and third generation Puritans who might not have had any evidence of a conversion experience. Here's the question: if you have covenantal succession, if you have a society that's built around the life of the church, if everybody goes to church and everyone's expected to go to church — if you don't go to church, and if you don't tithe, you're probably some sort of a renegade and you might even be prosecuted in the law — everybody goes to church but obviously not necessarily everybody is actually converted. What happens if you have a second and third-generation Puritan, a young man who marries a young woman, neither one of them have ever expressed or shown evidence of conversion experience and they have children. Do you baptize those children? How do the parents take vows? Do you wait until they have a conversion experience? Solomon Stoddard wrestled with these things, and he came up with something called the Half-way Covenant, which allowed non-Christians to become members of the church without conversion but with only essentially half the privileges that come with church membership. This created a huge amount of turmoil and great confusion going forward because it was neither a covenantal view nor a Baptist view, and it created a governmental structure where non-Christians could gain control of the apparatus of the church. Therefore, the ground was laid for apostate churches, not just apostate individuals.

Solomon Stoddard was a pastor in Northampton, Massachusetts. He was the grandfather of Jonathan Edwards. He devised a theological system called the Half-way covenant. The Half-way covenant essentially said, You can be a member of the church. You can have some of the privileges of the church, but not all of them. And if you have been a member of the covenant, even though you're not a professing Christian, you can have your children admitted into the covenant. This created a kind of category of Christian in the church that could create all sorts of havoc within the church. A group of unbelievers in the church with power, but not with the full privileges of life in the body was a rather large mess.

43. **Anne Bradstreet:** the first American poet. Her poetry provided a vision for the Puritan ideal, the ideal family, the ideal hunger for productivity and opportunity, the Puritan ideal of living under the rule of law, raising up godly seed, and sending forth succeeding generations; wife of governor Simon Bradstreet
44. **Jeremiads:** warnings like the warning the prophet Jeremiah issued, warnings that God's judgement was imminent.
45. **The Great Awakening:** a revival of religious faith that took place in the New World; began in Georgia in 1738 with the preaching of George Whitefield, and in Massachusetts with the preaching of Jonathan Edwards
46. **Jonathan Edwards:** Edwards, the grandson of Solomon Stoddard, was trained at Yale University, had the opportunity to have a fine classical education, became an intern to his grandfather, and eventually the assistant pastor at the Northampton Church there in Massachusetts.

Edwards' impact upon the town and upon the fledgling colonies was remarkable. Many historians believe that he, to this day, remains the finest mind — philosopher, scientist, theologian, thinker, writer — that America has ever produced. If we were to make a top ten list of the most brilliant Americans ever, right at the top of the list would be Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather. They were stunningly brilliant. Cotton Mather wrote more than four hundred thick volumes during his life and ministry, besides pastoring the Old North Church in Boston. Jonathan Edwards was an expert in science. He wrote a number of important science textbooks, including one of the most remarkable textbooks on spiders that has ever been produced in the United States — still in print; it's been continuously in print since he first wrote it — as well

as encyclopedic works on theology, history, biography, across the wide span of history. His was a remarkable mind.

He learned from the nascent renewal movement the methodology of revival preaching and calling for conversion.

Because of a whole series of conflicts which started with a series of exhortations to the youth group at the Northampton Church. (Watch out for choirs and youth groups, there's always trouble there.) He gave a series of strong exhortations to the youth to live in a pure and chaste fashion that rubbed some of the parents the wrong way, and they started a kerfluffle which went from being a kerfluffle to a hubbub, eventually moving from kerfluffle and hubbub straight to crisis. Jonathan Edwards — who, over the course of his ministry, was responsible for the conversion of virtually every person in that congregation, who had had a wide effect all across the colonies, who was one of the most esteemed thinkers in theology, who had been offered positions at Cambridge and St. Andrew's in Scotland — was voted out of office. He was fired by the church. So, he went back home to the parsonage where his wife and his children were and informed them that they would have to move. Of course, they had nowhere to move and no money, no means. They were on their way out when the committee that had just fired him realized that it was Thursday and they didn't have anyone to preach on Sunday. So they came back to Jonathan Edwards and asked him if he would fill the pulpit that he was just fired from in a church that he had pastored for the past twenty years. He said yes. He filled the pulpit for the next six months and never once mentioned the controversy. He picked up in his preaching exactly where he'd left off the previous Sunday and made no mention of it whatsoever.

Eventually, he went out to the far western frontier, to Stockbridge, Massachusetts, to minister among the Indians and was shortly thereafter appointed the new president of Princeton, which was then called the College of New Jersey. He never took his post as president of Princeton because, ever the scientist, he was experimenting with a smallpox vaccination, and, in the experiment, he succumbed and died — a remarkable man, a remarkable impact.

His one sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,"

47. **George Whitefield:** Jonathan Edwards' friend and partner in the proclamation of the glorious truths of the gospel was George Whitefield. He was from England and only visited America for preaching tours. He came seven times.

He was the son of an innkeeper who came first to Georgia in 1738 to establish an orphanage, which exists to this day. In order to raise funds for the orphanage, he'd go forth and give the vision for caring for orphans and widows in their distress, and inevitably he would preach the gospel. The purpose was to give the vision and take an offering, but eventually preaching the gospel became the center point of his work.

His open-air preaching caused great disruption back in England. His friends and protégés, whom he greatly influenced and brought into his open-air preaching movement, the Wesleys — John and Charles — eventually took over the work in England, and Whitefield focused on his work in America.

48. **Presbyterian Parsons' Rebellion:** what George III called the American War of Independence because of the influence of the Scots Covenanters.
49. **Peyton Randolph:** scion of a great Virginia family; first president of the First Continental Congress

50. **epistemology**: the study of how we learn, how we know what we know.
51. **ontology**: the essence of being
52. **repentance**: acknowledging that I don't know everything that I need to know, I have not yet become everything I ought to become, I haven't done everything I ought to do, I don't know what I need to know.
53. **mercantilism**: the marriage of big government and big business; You have two cows, the government takes them both, then sells you the milk at a premium.
54. **salutary neglect**: the neglect of the mother country in the internal affairs of the colonies; salutary because this neglect left the colonies to develop structures of self-government.
55. **Boston Tea Party**: The Sons of Liberty dressed as Indians and threw the tea that was to be taxed into the harbor.
56. **The Boston Massacre**: What Samuel Adams called the incident where the Redcoats in Boston, having been heckled and possibly threatened, shot into the crowd, killing five and wounding six.
57. **Samuel Adams**: a Boston brewmaster and tavern owner, leader of the Sons of Liberty, the man who named the Boston Tea Party and the Boston Massacre; truly conservative, not ideological at all; just wanted to mind his own business, focus on his family, tend his garden, and brew his beer; worked with Patrick Henry on the Declaration of Colonial Rights; initiated the Committees of Correspondence in 1773; helped draft the Stamp Act Resolutions; helped call together the first Continental Congress in 1774; the British were looking for Adams and John Hancock in Lexington and Concord the night the first shots of the war were fired.
58. **Patrick Henry**: argued the Parsons' cause in 1763; worked with Sam Adams on the Declaration of Colonial Rights; helped call together the first Continental Congress in 1774; delivered the great "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" speech before the House of Burgesses, meeting just outside Richmond in the St. John's Parish in 1775; first governor of the state of Virginia; member of the first Continental Congress
59. **lex rex**: the law is king, as opposed to the king is the law. This means that the king is also under the law and everyone is accountable to God.
60. **Sons of Thunder**: Samuel Adams, Roger Sherman, Patrick Henry
61. **Forgotten Presidents**: the men who served as presidents of the Continental Congresses and under the Articles of Confederation from 1776-1789, when the current Constitution was ratified.
62. **Olive Branch Petition**: a petition sent to the Crown and Parliament in July of 1775; one final attempt at a peaceful settlement with England.
63. **magistratal interposition**: the idea that lower magistrates should interpose themselves between the people they serve and higher magistrates when those higher magistrates begin acting tyrannically.
64. **sphere sovereignty**: the idea that the four spheres — self, family, church, government — each have specific areas of authority which must be respected by the other spheres. Sphere sovereignty essentially argues that, because man is inevitably a sinner, there are no perfect, unquestionable, unassailable institutions or offices that men or nations can erect. Therefore, it's important to recognize the various spheres of authority that God puts into place to check and balance them. So, for instance, God gives to the family certain

rights, privileges, and authorities that the state does not have. And God gives to the state certain rights and authorities that the church does not have. God gives to the church certain rights and authorities that neither the family nor the state have. These spheres are to operate in the realm of their jurisdictions with a level of sovereignty, so that if one of the other jurisdictions gets out of line, steps out of bounds, exerts authority that does not belong to it, then the other spheres can check and balance, correct and bring back into line, that other jurisdiction.

65. ***federal theology***: the word *federal* is actually just another word for *covenantal* and means taking many parts and bringing them together so that they do not lose their distinctiveness and yet, they're pulled into a coalition that allows them to cooperate. So *many* function as *one*, but they remain distinctive as *many*. The idea for this theology of the one and the many is derived directly from the Scriptures, where we see it not only in the Godhead, in the Trinity, one and many, but we see that applied to society, when we come to nations like Israel, which is both one and many. The governance of institutions in the Bible is always one and many, so that there are always ways to appeal. There are always ways to come to some sort of council or tribal meeting or to stand before judges, to have causes of justice prevail.
66. ***Benjamin Franklin***: 1706-1788, American polymath; born in Boston, ran away to Philadelphia; founder of countless societies, the first circulating lending library in America, inventor, writer, publisher, diplomat
67. ***Silence Dogood***: the pseudonym Benjamin Franklin chose in his letters to the editor of his brother's paper
68. ***Poor Richard's Almanac***: a little almanac of wit and wisdom published beginning in 1733
69. George Whitefield: 1714–1770; the first American celebrity; a British preacher who founded an orphanage in Georgia in 1738; while on a preaching tour to raise funds for the orphanage, revival broke out — the beginning of the Great Awakening
70. ***The Holy Club***: a collection of like-minded searchers, some of them skeptics, some of them Deists, some of them Enlightenment thinkers, none of them actually Christians. But they desired something far more substantial. It was there at the Holy Club that George Whitefield, in studying the Bible, was converted.
71. ***Bethesda Orphanage***: The orphanage founded by George Whitefield in 1738 which led to his preaching tours in the colonies
72. ***Watauga Territory***: In 1769, the Whitefield and Franklin got together — they'd been corresponding for some months about an idea. *What if we took all these ideals, brought them together, and established the ideal town?* It was long before nineteenth-century utopianism would shake the Western frontier. Franklin was fascinated by the notion that perhaps Whitefield understood how a culture could be reformed. So why not go out to the West, establish a little colony, and bring all these principles together. Franklin said that he was on the verge of receiving the Christ that Whitefield proclaimed. He made note of it several times in their correspondence back and forth. Franklin, the great skeptic, the great intellect, the engine of productivity and creativity, had met his match in Whitefield and was ready to relent his heart. He was ready to throw in his lot to establish a new colony in the West, over the mountains from Virginia and North Carolina in the lush valleys of the Watauga province. They began to pursue the possibility of getting a land grant for the territory.

Alas, they were never able to speed their vision to fruition. Having traveled his entire life cross the ocean and on horseback and in rugged conditions, Whitefield's body finally just wore out. While on a preaching

tour of New England, he died in 1770 in Newburyport, Massachusetts, where he was buried in the crypt of the First Presbyterian Church. Whitefield's instructions to Franklin, concerning that ideal Christian community, were never altogether lost. Some of Franklin's associates, who had likewise been greatly influenced by Whitefield's preaching, journals, and sermons, decided to pursue that vision themselves. They brought that vision to the Watauga province — among the men who fought at the Battle of King's Mountain, men like Gideon Blackburn and Sam Houston. Ultimately, though much diminished in its form, the idea of that ideal community, now named for one of the great men just recently departed, was established, but the vision has yet to be realized.

73. **Psalm 97:** Psalm 97 outlines a vision of how the world works. You know, from personal experience, that if you do something that is out of concord with the way the world works you get hurt. “You don’t tug on Superman's cape. You don’t spit into the wind,” to quote a great American philosopher.

If you do something stupid, you’re going to get hurt. Doing something stupid is doing something that is out of sync with the way things actually are. Psalm 97 tells us how things are. “The Lord reigns.” God is sovereign. It doesn’t matter what Rahm Emanuel or Emma Thompson say. God is sovereign. He is there; he is not silent. He rules and reigns over all of the earth. If you try and live as if that is not true, you will stumble and fall. Your policies will fail, you will be hurt, the economy will falter, the military will have setbacks, families will be disrupted — if you don't recognize this basic reality.

74. **Will Rogers:** His epitaph would one day read, “I joked about every prominent man in my lifetime, but I never met one I didn’t like.” Will Rogers was the great American humorist of his day, and he was a practical, some would say, cowboy, philosopher. This cowboy philosopher would often stand in front of crowds doing a starched lariat rope trick while he told his jokes, capturing the nation’s attention at a time of great crisis. He was the voice of reason through the worst of the Great Depression. He was the voice of practical concern throughout the whole season of disruption when, by various terms, the Socialists and the Communists seemed ready to seize power in several states in the United States, when wild-eyed ideas of utopian design from Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points all the way to FDR’s New Deal seemed to be a harbinger of bigger and bigger government, more and more intrusion, and design of life by the experts. Will Rogers was a voice of restraint and of reason. It’s amazing that during that time between the death of Teddy Roosevelt and the rise of the conservative movement under Robert Taft, there was virtually no strong voice of reason — Calvin Coolidge perhaps being the one great exception, other than a humorist named Will Rogers.

He was a man of astonishing perception and reach. His wisdom carried the day with a large part of American society and life. Will Rogers clearly understood those lessons that we saw last time from Psalm 97, the basic principles of statesmanship and politics laid out in Psalm 97, broadly arranged in the two great categories of God’s sovereignty over all the nations. Remember Psalm 97 begins by saying, “Our God reigns. Let the nations be glad.” It outlines essential principles of a global kingdom of absolute rule and reign by a sovereign God whose purposes cannot be foiled or flustered and whose end is to bring truth, justice, and righteousness to all of the earth and to cause the worthless idols of men to be exposed and to crumble under the weight of their own absurdity. But God exercises this sovereignty through the responsibility and faithfulness of his people, as he delegates authority to them in certain jurisdictions — the jurisdiction of the church, the jurisdiction of the family, the jurisdiction of the wider community, and the jurisdiction of the civil sphere.

Will Rogers understood that ultimately tyranny is the result of the spheres violating one another's jurisdictions and that biblical reason results in justice and truth when the natural and normal inclinations of sinful men and institutions are checked. In other words, the genius of Psalm 97 is that it portrays for us separation of powers, checks and balances, accountability, and the rule of law. It's an astonishing notion. The experiment in liberty known as the American Republic is such an anomaly in American history because our foundations were laid with these essential principles.

75. **John Quincy Adams:** John Adams' son; candidate for president in 1824; won the election when it was thrown to the House; possible participant in the "Corrupt Bargain".
76. **Andrew Jackson:** Candidate for president in 1824; lost when the vote was taken in the House even though he had won a plurality of the popular vote; accused Adams and Clay of conspiring together to throw the election to Adams; began his campaign for the 1828 election the week after Adams' inauguration
77. **Henry Clay:** Candidate for president in 1824; allegedly threw his votes to Adams in exchange for the vice presidency; also became vice president under Andrew Jackson in 1828
78. **List the four major areas of biblical jurisdictionalism:**
 1. Ecclesia
 2. Familia
 3. Communitas
 4. Civitas
79. **List Daniel Webster's seven principles of leadership:**
 1. Leaders are always controversial.
 2. To affirm one thing is to deny another.
 3. Accept the nature of the struggle.
 4. If we have to fight, fight fairly.
 5. Admit the mystery and complexity of the world.
 6. Run toward the roar.
 7. Leadership is an inherently dangerous affair.
80. **List the "forgotten" presidential administrations:**
 1. Peyton Randolph (two terms)
 2. Henry Middleton
 3. John Hancock (two terms)
 4. Henry Laurens
 5. John Jay

6. Samuel Huntington
7. Thomas McKean
8. John Hanson
9. Elias Boudinot
10. Thomas Mifflin
11. Richard Henry Lee
12. Nathaniel Gorham
13. Arthur St. Clair
14. Cyrus Griffin

81. Put the following events in chronological order:

- a. The Battle of Bennington**
 - b. Washington lost New York City**
 - c. Lexington and Concord**
 - d. Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty" speech**
 - e. The ride of Dawes and Revere**
 - f. Washington crossed the Delaware River**
 - g. Winter at Valley Forge**
 - h. The Battle of Bunker/Breeds Hill**
 - i. The Battle of Princeton**
 - j. The Battle of Ticonderoga**
- a. Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty" speech
 - b. The ride of Dawes and Revere
 - c. Lexington and Concord
 - d. The Battle of Ticonderoga
 - e. The Battle of Bunker/Breeds Hill
 - f. Washington lost New York City
 - g. Washington crossed the Delaware River
 - h. The Battle of Princeton
 - i. The Battle of Bennington

j. Winter at Valley Forge

82. ***The Sons of Liberty***: a group founded by Samuel Adams that focused on the righteousness of the cause; produced pamphlet after pamphlet, communicating with people, reminding them that their cause was just.
83. ***Committees of Correspondence***: put together by John Hancock; a network so that communities could communicate with each other, understand what the needs and concerns were, and build bridges of support and reconciliation throughout all the colonies
84. ***magistratal interposition***: drawn from the biblical directives for magistrates in Romans 13 and the call to submit to authorities, but authorities who themselves are under God and have only delegated powers in the face of rights that are given to the people. When those delegated powers are abused and those rights are subverted, then it's necessary for justice to be done by lower magistrates interposing themselves between the abusers and the abused.
85. ***John Dickinson***: called the Penman of the American War of Independence, drafted a number of the most important documents, worked on the draft of the Declaration of Independence, and worked on the initial Declaration of Rights beginning in 1765. He wrote *Letters from a Pennsylvania Farmer* that opposed the Townsend Acts. He ultimately was the penman who drafted the first draft of the Articles of Confederation, the first constitution of the United States. It was Dickinson who coined the most widely distributed slogan of the American War of Independence, "No taxation without representation."
86. ***John Paul Jones***: great naval hero, who fought many a battle on the Great Lakes and prevailed against the mighty British Navy — "I have not yet begun to fight," he declared, when the British asked if he wished to surrender.
87. ***Benedict Arnold***: a great American commander who had contributed to the Battle of Saratoga, as well as the capture of Fort Ticonderoga. He decided, because he had not been promptly promoted through the ranks, because he did not believe that Congress properly appreciated his genius, to surrender a strategic fort on the Hudson River to the British and turn sides. With the promise of a large stipend, six thousand pounds immediate payment, as well as a lifetime annuity of three hundred ninety pounds a year, he decided to go over to the Tory cause.

He had been given command of this fort on the Hudson, strategically overlooking the entire Hudson Bay. It was perhaps the most important troop placement in all the northern theater of the war. It was a fort called West Point.

But a British agent was captured by George Washington's scouts and a dispatch revealed the plot. George Washington went in hot pursuit to capture the traitor, Benedict Arnold.

The news of Arnold's traitorous turn somehow electrified the American troops. They suddenly saw how treacherous and how wretched the life that they had faced under the British and the life that they might face under a conquering British force might be, and they were stirred to action.

88. ***Marquis de Lafayette***: a French nobleman, became a commander under Washington.

89. ***Put the following events in chronological order:***

a. The Marquis de Lafayette arrived; the French joined in the war.

b. Benedict Arnold and West Point

- c. *The Treaty of Paris was signed.***
- d. *The Battle of Cowpens***
- e. *Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown.***
- f. *The Battle of King's Mountain***
- h. *Winter at Valley Forge***
- i. *The Articles of Confederation were ratified.***
- j. *The Battle of Guilford Courthouse***

- a. The Marquis de Lafayette arrived
- b. Winter at Valley Forge
- c. The French joined in the war.
- d. Benedict Arnold and West Point
- e. The Battle of King's Mountain
- f. The Battle of Cowpens
- g. The Battle of Guilford Courthouse
- h. The Articles of Confederation were ratified.
- i. Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown.
- j. The Treaty of Paris was signed.

90. ***The Annapolis Convention:*** called by Alexander Hamilton to discuss the weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation and a replacement

Essay Questions:

1. ***Why is George Washington considered the American Cincinnatus? What effect did Washington's resignation from the army have on the development of the fledgling United States?***
Like Cincinnatus, Washington laid down his arms and power instead of seizing the reins of government when he had the opportunity. This set an example of and precedent for the rule of law instead of the rule of man. This also set the precedent of the military under the authority of civilians.
2. ***Explain why victories don't stay won.*** The battle against greed in the human heart, the battle against injustice in society, the battle for the freedom of the least, the despised, the rejected, the marginal, the unloved, and the unlovely, those battles never stay altogether won. They have to be fought in every succeeding generation, and often they have to be fought over and over and over again every single day. Don't think you are exempt from that. You walk down this hall this afternoon and those battles are going to be before you — the battle for the purity of the heart and the mind, the battle for the integrity of your fellow students. These are battles that are not just fought in the Supreme Court and in Congress. These are the battles of life. And when we forget how they have been fought, upon which principles our forefathers have stood, as we forget the way they untied the difficult Gordian knots, when we forget these things,

we paralyze ourselves and incapacitate ourselves in dealing with the problems before us. The Psalmist said it well, "Righteousness cannot be done in a land of forgetfulness." This is why over and over and over again Moses says to the people of Israel, "Remember. Remember how the Lord your God delivered you out of slavery, out of the hands of Pharaoh and Egypt and brought you forth into this freedom."

That's why James says there are only two kinds of people: forgetful hearers and effectual doers. May God be gracious to us and enable us to remember that which is obscure but vital.

3. Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:

- a) ***Explain how each of the Contents and Realities of early Meso-American culture manifested themselves, and then contrast these with the Contents and Realities of Christendom and its culture.*** So the Meso-Americans believed that all of life was somehow connected in a chain of being. There's a kind of hierarchy, the higher you rise on the chain of being. There's an ascent of man to the top of the chain of the being. This chain of being connects all of life. This chain of being is thrown into the midst of a world of unexplained phenomena. This phenomenism marks the mysteries of the world and sparks the curiosity of man's mind. But the cosmos itself is stable and solid. It has stasis. This leads to a series of realities.

Because there is a chain of being, it is in the natural order of things to stratify society, to recognize the philosopher kings, the elites, and to recognize those who were simply by the fate of their birth or the nature of their genetics or the strength of their mind or the strength of their back, to be a part of a lower caste. Because phenomena occur, great mysteries, they leads to the realization that we live in a very impersonal world where forces are at work around us that are not controllable by us and often-times not knowable by us. That means that nothing is really personal. Everything, in the end, is practical. So, societies can literally say, This is not personal. I can like you as a person, but I can still kill you for the utility of the action. This leads to a kind of cultural catastrophism, where you see sudden rises and sudden falls and revolutionary impulses.

The consequence of these contents and these realities is that they create a sociological system rooted in tyranny. There are disincentives imposed upon both the elites who are already at the top, therefore they need no incentives to achieve, creating stability in the hierarchical system, and disincentives for those in the lower castes — they can't improve themselves, they can't go anywhere, and so you have disincentives all across the whole course of the society, leaving the people with a kind of fatalism. That's why Egyptian civilization could last for some two thousand years without much change, despite tumult and disarray and despite the fact that it doesn't function very well, because the people are trapped with no exit from their fatalistic ideas.

When you compare that kind of worldview with the worldview that emerges out of the gospel, out of Christendom, you have a very stark distinction. In the pagan worldview, there is a chain of being that connects all living things, but in Christendom there is a clear Creator/creature distinction. That distinction extends to the whole of our being. Everything about us is altogether distinct from everything about God himself, thus, creating very distinct realms for us to understand calling, purpose, and destiny under a sovereign God, the ultimate authority. Everything is not just a mad scramble to climb up or down a ladder.

Secondly, Christendom presupposes that we are made in the image of God — *imago dei*. In the pagan worldview of Meso-America, things just sort of happen. Phenomena just occur. So, somehow or

another, because the jaguar and the warrior are connected in the chain of being, it's very possible that man came from the jaguar; it's phenomenalism.

But these forces are altogether impersonal. In the Christian worldview, because we're made in the image of God, by his providence, for a purpose, we have clarity about why we're here and what we are to do. That, in turn, gives clarity to our condition, our fallenness and need of redemption.

This leads to a whole series of realities. For the Christian, we understand that there is a God, he is not silent, and he does act. He is sovereign, and he exercises his divine decrees in accordance with his providence. For the pagan, there is just a kind of social stratification that necessarily occurs based upon power and authority. Societies are organized in a Christian worldview according to relationships, because we're connected to one another and to God by covenant. That means that there are some things that are right and they're always right, in the fourth century and in the fourteenth century or at four o'clock this afternoon — it's always right. And there are certain things that are always wrong. Thus we have real clear division and antithesis between those things which are moral and those things which are immoral.

As a result, we can know the difference between right and wrong, and we can begin to understand a sense of calling and responsibility. For the pagans, there are disincentives to calling and responsibility. The antithesis between right and wrong means that change can be incremental and reformational rather than a culture that is stuck in fatalism or left to revolutionary impulses.

Here's the bottom line: the reason Meso-America looked so much like the pagan civilizations of antiquity was not because of visitors from outer-space or even the transfer of blueprints by Carthaginian sailors at some point on a lost voyage or trading mission. There's a convergence because paganism always looks pagan; it always builds pagan; it always acts pagan. Paganism is a worldview that has certain manifestations in art and music and literature and ideas that have strong convergence. Of course there are going to be differences based upon, as Barry Fell says, the elapsing of time and the development of ideas and the peculiarities of climate and geography, but almost all of those are incidental. What Columbus discovered was the ancient world. The great contrast that existed was the contrast between the captive peoples of antiquity and the emerging peoples of Christendom. This laid the groundwork for the clash of cultures that would occur over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and set the stage for the whole complex of human relations that is the birth of the American civilization.

- b) ***What three great lessons can we learn from examining the myths and legends of early America and its discoverers? In your answer, provide specific examples from the tales of Norse, Carthaginian, Sudanese, and Monastic explorers.*** First, I've introduced all of this to you to cause you to remember that sometimes legends and myths are more reliable than the scientific inquiries and the long line of footnotes of the supposed experts. Just when we think we know what we know, we run across something that causes us to say *hmmm... who'd a thunk it?*

The Christian idea of knowledge and of learning about our world is one of constant discovery. We ought to have restless imaginations. We ought to be constantly saying, *Okay, the evidence seems to be pointing in this direction, but could it be that another hypothesis could be proven correct instead?* The great achievement of Christian learning is *not* having arrived at a settled conclusion. The real mark is a heart full of repentance, a heart that says, *I don't know everything that I ought to know. I've not yet done everything that I ought to do. I've not yet fully arrived at all that I am to journey towards.* The problem with settled conclusions is that

they leave very little room for us to say, *I could be wrong*. Or, *I don't know*. Or, *this could be a mystery that we'll never solve*. Historians hate mysteries. They want to solve them all, kind of like theologians. We want to put God in a box. We want to say we know everything that we need to know — we know all the profiles, we've got the dogmatic schema in our minds — when, in fact, the Bible constantly tells us what Isaiah reminds us of: God's ways are higher than our ways and his thoughts are higher than our thoughts. The world is a marvel of mystery awaiting discovery. That's what these stories tell us. We don't know for sure if Celts and Carthaginians and Sudanese made their way here. We don't have solid evidence. We have a lot of interesting clues and a lot of peculiarities that we don't have solid answers for, but this much we do know: we don't know. And that kind of humility in a scholar is really what leads to great discoveries. If you're hungry to learn and you don't think that you've got all the answers and you're never satisfied with what it is that you do know — in other words, if you have a heart of repentance, that will serve you far better than a loaded portfolio and transcripts with straight A's.

There's a second reason I wanted to introduce these ideas. When we look back at the shrouded myths and legends and fables of the past, we're reminded that we live in a world full of stories and not all the stories have been told. This ought to stir our imaginations and cause us to wonder *what if...*? As we wonder *what if...*, we are sent on journeys of discoveries, both within our own hearts and minds and in this wide world that still has much to tell us about God's glory, God's majesty, and God's splendor, that we don't yet know. The worst thing that can ever happen to a historian is for the historian to be satisfied that he knows it all, that there's nothing left to challenge his pet theories. The whole history of science, of medicine, as well as of the social sciences so-called — like history and sociology and anthropology and archeology — is that the expert opinions of the past become laughable in days to come because they're so short-sighted and so presumptuous and so certain about things that are absolutely false. It was just one hundred fifty years ago that doctors were still using leeches for people who had colds.

Stories like these remind us that in our pathway of learning, we have a lot more learning to go, and we have a lot of great stories that have yet to be told.

Thirdly, they remind us that sometimes the historians think they're absolutely right, and given the shreds of evidence that they're relying on, they have good reason to hold that, but there may be lots of evidence out there that contradicts their whole pet theory, and that sometimes whole cultures can believe untruths for so long and with such fervor that they ultimately lead them astray and undermine the very thing they value the most. That can be particularly true in American history, where the facts that we think we know or the facts that we've forgotten lead to the undermining of the very fruit that we most cherish — fruits of freedom and liberty and opportunity. Who was the first president of the United States? Most Americans would say *George Washington*, and of course most Americans would be absolutely wrong, missing the first president by fifteen administrations, for goodness' sake! How can we get stuff so wrong that's patently obvious? George Washington didn't take office until 1789. Why doesn't the historian say, *1776 to 1789, there's a gap here! We've got Continental Armies and Minutemen running the country?* Those are the questions that we have to ask with humble hearts, questions that push us to a discovery of what *is*, so that we can grow in grace, so we can preserve the truth and so we can stand for right.

- c) ***Explain the significance of Henry the Navigator's influence on the world of navigation and exploration. In your answer provide specific examples of how his work demonstrated the motivation of a gospel vision.***

The man who brought all these technological developments together was Prince Henry the Navigator. Prince Henry was the fourth son of King John of Portugal. Future generations would call him Prince Henry the Navigator because of his almost single-handed efforts to coax nautical advancement toward modernity. At the tip of Cape St. Vincent, he built a marine observatory and hydrographic laboratory that transformed the enterprise of discovery from happenstance and accident into science. There he gathered the greatest pilots and navigators, cartographers, shipbuilders, geographers, astronomers, mathematicians, cosmographers, and mariners in all the world, and he accumulated a vast library of sailing charts, portolans, and *roteiros*. He investigated the ancient tales of St. Brendan, of the Norsemen, Ultima Thule, Antipodes, of Prester John and Marco Polo, with the objectivity of an academician. He sponsored the discovery and colonization of innumerable far-flung islands including Madeira, Porto Santo, the Verdes, and the Azores. He advanced the design of the ocean-going vessels by building and then perfecting the caravel. In fact, he's an almost perfect picture of the modern scientific man except for one thing; he was a medieval anomaly of purposefulness, logic, and moderation set in the context of his great and overriding motivation which was to confront the Islamic horde that held the Mediterranean in thrall and boxed Christendom off in isolation. As a result, his great passion was to launch a new crusade.

Prince Henry began to dream of establishing a real scientific school of discovery. Remember, North Africa had once been the jewel of Christian civilization. It had produced some of the finest minds of the early Church — Augustine, Tertullian, Anthony, Clement, Cyprian, Origin, and Athanasius. But throughout the seventh and eighth centuries it was put to the scimitar and vanquished. Almost every trace of Christianity was swept away. Churches were destroyed, libraries were burned, cities were pillaged, treasures were plundered, fields were salted, men were slaughtered, women were raped, and children were enslaved. Europe watched helplessly as their brethren were tyrannized. *Jihad* and *di'himma* swept across the land. Henry wanted more than anything else to remove what he believed was this great shame, and, in the process, he launched the world's greatest adventurers, discoverers, and mariners. It was all for the sake of what he believed was the honor of the gospel in the world.

So in 1421, he established an observatory in southern Portugal called Sagres. At the Sagres school, he began to assemble a great library and brought the finest minds of the day to work on the problems of exploration. Almost immediately they bore great fruit.

All the great adventurers — Dias, Vasco da Gama, onto Columbus — had this passionate vision that combined adventure, mystery, and gospel mission.

4. ***Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:***

- a) ***Briefly dispel three or four Myths about Columbus. What do these myths reveal about how history and success are remembered? And what do these myths reveal about what is required for true progress?***

Myth: The "Enterprise" was about "glory and gold".

Columbus's primary motivation was, according to Kirkpatrick Sale in a bestselling book published in 1992 on the quincentenary of Columbus's discovery:

His primary interest in the great enterprise was not glory for the Church but rather it was for his own glory. It was for gold and it was for gluttonous imperialism.

When you read Columbus's own works, you discover that he says absolutely nothing about wealth, and when any question of commercialism comes up, he confesses little interest in the subject apart from "the necessary and vile aspects of financing further enterprise". Over and over again, what you find in Columbus's book is that he desired for the gospel to go to the ends of the earth. He desired for the oppression that he encountered in various places to come to an end, that the hope of the gospel would bring justice and freedom to ends of the earth, that Islam would be overcome by the grace and the mercy of Christ. That was his motivation. The enterprise was not about glory and gold.

Myth: He sailed for Spain.

He most assuredly did not sail for Spain. There was no Spain at the time, merely a loose collection of culturally Spanish kingdoms on the Iberian Peninsula. He sailed for Aragon and Castile.

Myth: Queen Isabella financed the expedition.

Queen Isabella didn't sell her jewels and she didn't finance the enterprise. She didn't have to talk Ferdinand into anything. There were, as Ridley Scott posited in his film *1492*, no romantic sparks going off between Columbus and Isabella. All that is just flap-doodle.

Myth: He was an incompetent navigator.

He most assuredly was not an incompetent navigator. He was one of the great scholars of the age. He had more maps and more technical prowess than virtually any other navigator at the time. His mathematical wizardry was beyond compare.

Myth: Fifteenth-century sailors believed the earth was flat.

Fifteenth-century sailors did not believe that the earth was flat. Henry the Navigator had disproven that old myth — which, by the way, was not believed by the Phoenicians or the Greeks, either — it was well-known in the ancient world that the earth was a globe. Any of the Portuguese navigators who had sailed up and down the Gold Coast of Africa had easily witnessed the curvature of the earth as they watched ships disappear over the horizon. There was no question whatsoever among most navigators that the earth was indeed a globe. The question was how big a globe is it and how dangerous is it when you sail out of sight of land. At this point, there was still no mechanical device capable of measuring longitude. They could measure latitude with astrolabes, and they could measure the passing of time with nocturnes. They had rudimentary sextants so they could find themselves, but there was still the problem of longitude and that wouldn't be solved for another two centuries, until the Harrisons. The fact is they didn't believe in a flat earth. They just believed in a dangerous earth, and they were right.

Myth: He did introduced slavery to the New World. He forcibly indentured a number of Native Americans.

Columbus did not introduce slavery into the New World. In fact, if you read his *Book of Prophecies*, about half the book is about the need to bring the gracious hope of Christ to all of those who lived in darkness. He talks about the native peoples of Africa, of the East, and, most particularly, of the Indian peoples he had encountered in the New World with the utmost tenderness, compassion, and missionary zeal. He did not take captives back to Spain; this is a myth. There is no corroborating evidence for this — there's no primary source evidence for it — and yet it is constantly propounded and has become a propaganda point over and over again.

- b) ***Define hegemony, hamas and hesed, and explain how the Hapsburgs intentionally employed these ideas to justify and succeed in their conquests. How should our understanding of these three terms shape the way we see our own world?*** *Hegemony* is a Greek word. It was devised out of several smaller words in Greek during the time of the Athenian League in antiquity. It literally means total domination by one small group over a vast number of diverse groups. It's domination culturally, politically, and militarily with a centralized control. It was used by the Greeks to describe the *ma'at* governmental system of ancient Egypt and the *hamasantal* worldviews of the Babylonians and the Assyrians. The idea of hegemony was that one very cunning and resourceful power could gain control over the whole world.

Tears for Fears may say that everybody wants to rule the world, but it is just not true. Only people like Charles V want to.

There's another word that we need to have in our arsenal before we launch too far into this discussion and that is *hamas*. It's a Hebrew word, used in the Old Testament several times, particularly in the minor prophets. It's a word that describes a particular kind of senseless violence. The kind of brutality that is imposed seemingly for no other purpose than to intimidate or to make a point or to exercise bravado with absolutely no concern whatsoever for the consequences of the victims. It was the word that the Hebrew prophets applied to the Babylonians, to the Assyrians, and to the Egyptians when they exercised totalitarian imperial control over the conquered peoples of the ancient world.

The third word is also a Hebrew word, also used often in the minor prophets. It's the word *hesed*. *Hesed* means lovingkindness or overwhelming mercy, unwarranted, undeserved, unmitigated mercy.

What's interesting is that, for the Hapsburgs, there was a peculiar combination in their drive for hegemony of *hamas* and *hesed*. They attempted to justify their *hamas*, their brutal violence, their conquests on the basis of *hesed*, that it was actually a mercy for all of the peoples of the earth to come under their control. Why? Because *they* were the experts, *they* understood better, *they* had a better plan, *they* would force people against their wills to be free.

Sound familiar? It should because the peculiar combination of *hamas* in the name of *hesed* is the propaganda line always used by every dictator, by every oppressive government, by every attempt to force people to do what they don't want to do, supposedly for their own good.

- c) ***What were the three major motivations for colonists to settle in the new world? How did these motivations differ from the French and Hapsburg explorers? What does this reveal to us about what is at the root of America's success?*** Now, there were wide differences among many of these colonies, but we can say with certainty that the biggest differences came between those Huguenot, English, Swedish, Scottish, and Dutch settlers who came to farm and make their homes and the French and Hapsburg settlers, who came primarily to establish some sort of imperial or mercantilist control.

The former came as tradesmen, to establish commercial trade companies, and to build homes that were given wide autonomy by their home governments. They were governed by a policy of salutary neglect which we'll look at in some detail in a couple of weeks, but they came to establish families and communities.

The latter were more interested in establishing themselves as privateers and creating vast commercial plantations than they were in establishing families and communities. They were more interested in state-owned monopolies than they were in commercial trade companies. They wanted control from the mother country. They were committed to imperial governance as opposed to the autonomy of salutary neglect of the Huguenots and the English. They were adventurers, soldiers, and traders. They weren't farmers or settlers. They weren't there to pioneer, they were there to clean up. That's the difference. It's always been the difference.

Did you know that Haiti was, in the first hundred years of the colonial era, far and away the richest and most successful colony? But when they exhausted their resources, it collapsed into disarray, and it's been in disarray in the two hundred and fifty years since. The issue was never resources. It's always worldview. What are you here for? What are you trying to do? What are your goals? What drives you? What makes you think? What makes you love? Those differences and the wide disparity between them will steer the course of the next two hundred and fifty years of history and bring shape to the world of the Americas.

5. Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:

- a) ***What were the causes of perpetual war in the two hundred fifty-year span from 1566-1815?*** When you survey the constant warfare from 1566 to 1815, you'll see that the English-speaking peoples were in conflict with the Hapsburgs and the French constantly, for two hundred and fifty years. Reformist movements over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries led to the new dawning of the Renaissance in southern Europe, the Reformation in northern Europe, and the Counter-Reformation in the Hapsburg territories.

The Hapsburg-Tudor Wars and the War of Dutch Independence, from 1566-1604,

were quickly followed by the Thirty Years' War and the genocidal removal of whole people groups like the Moravians. This bled over into the wars of Hapsburg hegemony and then the Anglo-Dutch wars which led to the War of the League of Augsburg, sometimes called the War of the Grand Alliance in the American theater — King William's War which led quickly to the War of Spanish Succession and Queen Anne's War.

There was the war that revolved around pirates and privateering, the War of Jenkins' Ear, when Robert Jenkins, an English sailor, presented himself and his severed ear to Parliament. *See what these barbaric Hapsburgs have done to me and to the English people. Avenge my ear, my brothers! Avenge my ear!!!* Not exactly a great campaign speech, but it did cause a war.

Then the War of Austrian Succession, which, in the American theater was called King George's War, and then the Seven Years' War, which in the American theater was called the French and Indian War

Then came the American War of Independence, which was actually a widespread colonial war that was fought in multiple theaters, as we'll see in a moment. It wasn't just the thirteen Atlantic coast colonies that were fighting for their independence, there were other colonies fighting at the same time

in the same war allied with the thirteen. For instance, we'll learn the story of Ethan Allen and the Green Mountain Boys from Vermont, and you'll remember that Vermont was not one of the thirteen colonies; it was a separate, independent republic called the Republic of Vermont under President Thomas Crichtenden. Ethan Allen fought for Vermont, not for the thirteen colonies, but he was allied with them in this wide-ranging colonial war for independence.

That led to the series of continental wars that began first in France, then spread beyond France to the Italian peninsula, leading into the Napoleonic Wars and the War of 1812 in the American theater, which was really just a part of those same Napoleonic Wars.

- b) ***When war came to the twenty-one American colonies, how did the ideologies of imperialism and mercantilism drive the colonies to their bold declaration of "liberty or death"?*** The American theaters of each of these wars were affected because there was a rise of a series of global ideologies. The causes of these perpetual wars were these strong ideas. We need to understand these ideas so that, as we make our way through the founding era, we can understand why it is that men like Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams would react so stridently to Parliament and to king. What was it that they were standing against? Obviously, there was disarray in the once-cohesive civilization of Christendom. Christendom was never a united whole. It was never one country or one culture, but it had one credal foundation, one essential principle that bound all the kingdoms and fiefdoms together. But, with the disarray — first in the fourteenth century and the Great Schism and the Babylonian Captivity of the Church and the Avignon papacy, and rival popes excommunicating each other and their supporters — we start to see a breakdown of that unity and that led to the greater schisms that came in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, making a confusing and divided world in Christendom where rivalries became the pitting of one nation-state or people group against another — the beginning of xenophobia. We start to see outbreaks of various pogroms, persecutions of Jews, Huguenots, and other minorities, gypsies, etc.

That created the reemergence of the old pagan ideal of *hamas* — violence for violence's sake, violence as a tool of political pressure, violence as a tool of ideology, terror. This fed the ambitions of imperial hegemony. Remember what *hegemony* means, right? Absolute control over everything, the desire to embrace and control everything.

If you've got disarray and confusion, conflict at every turn, and manifestations of senseless violence, then it's going to be a very easy step for someone to come along and say, *It's time for change, change that matters. Rally around me and I will bring hope to the world, again.*

As a result, you have the rise of these great figures who cannot be questioned because they have a messianic character about them. It's the rise of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings — kings like Louis XIV of France who declared that he was appointed by God directly, that, in fact, his birth was nearly as miraculous as Christ's, therefore he was an unquestioned sovereign over all. He ruled with an autocratic hand and he ruled over everything, which led to economic mercantilism.

You know what *mercantilism* is, right? *Mercantilism* is the wedding of big government with big business so that big business serves the interests of big government and big government serves the interest of big business. They cooperate for the purposes of elevating their peculiar and particular causes. Thus we have government-created monopolies, government-created sanctions, government-created incentives, and government-created stimulus packages. This squeezes out the small businessman; this squeezes out the guilds and the various tradesmen. This squeezes out the smaller businesses that drive

the economy from the bottom up, because now the economy is controlled from the top down. Government sees, as its primary responsibility, driving the economy.

Mercantilism has had many forms. Socialism is a form of mercantilism in all its forms — there's international socialism, which follows a Marxist model, and there's national socialism, which is what we in the modern world refer to as *fascism*. But it's all varying forms of mercantilism. This policy creates disincentives for small businesses and dries up the bottom two-thirds of an economy, which necessitates government providing benefits for those who no longer can run their businesses and that means that new tax burdens have to be imposed in order to pay for these benefits.

So you have the imposition of these overbearing tax burdens in order to pay for programs that are designed to relieve the miseries that have been created by the government itself. This became the basis for, not colonialism — colonialism can be simply the scattering and settling of a diaspora, of a people out across a wide range of the earth — but of colonial imperialism, where the colonies essentially become supply stations for the centralized authority back home.

With the lower two-thirds of the economy dried up and the overbearing tax burden upon those who try to stay in the economic marketplace, there becomes a sort of fringe desperation that drives people to piracy and privateering. Because piracy and privateering become such an important part of the economy, the government gets involved in regulating the piracy and the privateering and providing the pirates with letters of marque or sanction to exercise their piracy but only in regulated areas. It's like getting a taxi medallion, but you're only allowed to drive in Manhattan. So the government says to Sir Francis Drake or Sir Walter Raleigh, *Sure, we'll give you a letter of marque. You can function, in a sense, as an arm of our foreign policy as long as your piracy only targets Hapsburg ships. You can't ever raid an English ship, but as long as you're making life miserable for the French and the Spanish, go to it and here's a letter of sanction. Bravo. We'll knight you if you bring back enough gold.*

That's the situation that created a two-hundred-fifty-year-long period of warfare. It became a vicious cycle. The wars became necessary in order to protect the ideologies and the economic policies. The economic policies needed war in order to drum up more support at home for the overbearing tax burdens. Because the benefits went to those who most directly affected the ongoing efficacy of the day to day operations of the government, it's the people who were on the fringes, often those in the colonial possessions, who paid the price for the cost of the government's programs and ambitions. That's the world as it existed when the American founders started carving out a home for themselves on the shores of the New World.

- c) ***Provide a brief account of the English Reformation and its influence on migrations to the Americas. Why is it fair to say that the English Reformation was not about doctrine, but about authority?*** There were multiple concerns that went back and forth between Rome and London, between Westminster and the Vatican, along with a tremendous amount of diplomacy. But here's the problem: Charles V was the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and who was Catherine, but his aunt.

So, he fought hard to protect Catherine's integrity in the marriage. The result was that Cardinal Wolsey was unable to persuade the pope to annul the marriage, and so in 1533, Henry decided to divorce his wife and marry his lover in order to produce heirs to the throne and protect his dynastic ambitions. It was a nasty mess. That was the beginning of the break of the Church of England. It wasn't about doctrine: *sola scriptura*, *sola fide*, *soli deo gloria*, or *solo gratia*; it was about authority. As a re-

sult, when Henry VIII died, the English church was an autonomous church, but it had not actually been reformed. Theologically it was virtually identical to the Roman Catholic Church. The difference was that it was a national church rather than an international church.

The English Reformation was not a reformation about doctrine, it was a reformation about authority. It wasn't a fight about whether or not the Roman Catholic Church taught what was true. It was whether or not the pope had authority over the affairs of local kings. This is one of the reasons why, by the time we get to the seventeenth century, there were many English reformers who believed that the work of the Reformation had never been done in England, even though the Anglican Church had broken away under King Henry VIII.

Edward VI succeeded Henry when he was only nine years old in 1547. He was an ardent believer in the doctrines of the Reformation. He immediately set about putting in place real reforms in the English church, including, in 1548, a call for radical reforms of the prayer book that was used in English worship services.

In 1550, exclusion statutes were ratified which essentially put into place bans on Roman Catholics from holding high office or from succeeding to the throne in England.

Alas, Edward was a sickly child. He was succeeded by his older half-sister, Mary, who was the daughter of Henry and Catherine in that first marriage. Mary was determined to avenge her mother's shame. While she didn't reunite the Anglican Church — the English Church — with Rome because of a series of impediments along the way that were both political and personal, she did unleash a horrific persecution against the Puritans, those who had brought about the reforms of Edward.

In 1553, Mary I successfully overthrew the claims of her cousin, Lady Jane Grey, and had her executed at the Tower of London.

By 1554, she had arranged an alliance with Philip of Hapsburg, and by 1556, she had unleashed a fierce persecution — one that earned her the name *Bloody Mary* — launched against those English Protestants who were attempting to reform the English church along the lines of the Reformation in continental Europe under Calvin, Luther, and Zwingli.

Mary died after only five years on the throne and she was succeeded by her half-sister, Edward's still older sister, but the only remaining child of Henry VIII, Elizabeth I.

Almost immediately Elizabeth, who was sympathetic to the Protestants but who desired the dignity and the glory of the Catholics, signed an agreement called the Settlement Policy, or the *Via Media*, the middle way. In 1562, she issued a series of royal injunctions that consolidated authority and power. Elizabeth was the consummate politician, regal presence. She ignited the land, settled the disputes between warring factions to a remarkable degree and the Anglo-Catholics and the Puritans settled into an uneasy peace during *Pax Virginia*. She was known as the great Virgin Queen, and the peace that reigned during her time on the throne was quite remarkable. Alas, because she was the Virgin Queen, she died without issue. She never married.

In 1603, the crown was passed to her Scottish cousin, James VI of Scotland, James I of England.

In 1605, he imposed the Decree of Conformity requiring all Dissenters, all Puritans, all Non-Conformists to submit to the decrees of a centralized Anglican Church. That decree sent all these various groups into reaction mode.

6. Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:

- a) ***Explain the significance and impact of the Great Awakening in America.*** The effects of the renewal were widespread. For the first time, there was real unity and cohesion in all the colonies. George Whitefield was the first American celebrity, the first person who was known in all of the colonies. Those colonies that, heretofore, had been isolated from each other, were now united because of a common faith, a common vision, and a common renewal, a Great Awakening.

Because of the Great Awakening, there was a renewed interest and emphasis on missions to the Indians and those Africans who had been brought as indentured servants to the Americas.

There was a widespread new emphasis on the establishment of schools and training colleges, on Christian education and the spread of classical education. It was really the beginning of the movement that, today, we broadly call evangelicalism, that crossed denominational boundaries, that tied together those conservative, Bible-believing Anglicans, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, and that provided the basis for a whole new kind of culture that was the essence of the American culture.

- b) ***What does the Great Awakening reveal about the nature of the American Vision?*** There's controversy among some scholars who wonder whether or not America really was ever established as a Christian nation, who wonder whether or not the Christian influence was ever really very strong. They question the legitimacy of Christians today speaking into civic affairs, saying that the founders of the American experiment in liberty had always intended a strong separation between church and state. They've obviously not read the Cambridge Resolves. They've obviously not read the Connecticut Constitution. They've obviously not read any of the orders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. They obviously don't know a thing about John Witherspoon or Arthur St. Clair. Because the fact is that America, its uniqueness, its vision, the creation of its remarkable documents, the establishment of its remarkable civilization is not impossible, it's inconceivable, can't be thought of, imagined, dreamed about apart from the distinctive work of the gospel in this land.

Cotton Mather said it well in *Magnalia Christi Americana*, when he said, "If a hope of freedom is to endure, it will endure as the fruits of the gospel, for only the gospel proclaims liberty to mankind." He understood. From the very beginning, the renewal of hearts in Christ was intimately tied to the renewal of the idea of liberty and freedom. To look at the unique providence of God to stir a great awakening with Dutch, American, and English preachers, to fill churches with Scots Presbyterian elders and pastors at just the right moment to lay the foundations for an unflinching commitment to liberty. This is not possible apart from the truth that America can only exist as a Christian experiment and its influence around the world has only been as powerful as it has been because it is indeed a Christian vision.

- c) ***Describe the relationship between a specific English act (or set of acts) and either mercantilism or Salutary Neglect.*** Answers will vary

7. Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:

- a) ***In what ways did the founders of American culture use their substantial heritage as learned English citizens to resist oppression?***

Because they understood the world around them, because they had the insights, the discernment, and the discretion of ages and ages of wisdom catalogued in their hearts and their minds, they were able to establish for themselves a worldview that was rooted in the faith. The more well-informed they became, the more thoroughgoing in their faith.

The more informed they became, the more they realized the value of covenantal connectionalism, the more passionate they became in the protection of families and the more committed they were to put first things first.

Obviously the more they read, the more they understood and recognized how important it was to work hard, to labor diligently.

Their substantive preparation enabled them to risk everything — their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. They were bold in their defense of truth, they understood the cost of freedom, and they were willing to suffer through controversy for the sake of a greater cause, a cause greater than they were.

- b) ***What made America's founding fathers so extraordinary? In your answer, provide details about one person in particular.*** Answers will vary

- c) ***What is a covenant lawsuit sequence? In your answer, list and explain the four major principles Jefferson depended on in his writing of the Declaration of Independence.*** So, Jefferson and his committee began to work. The work that they did was really quite remarkable. They understood that the liberties that we enjoy in America have been secured against the arbitrary and fickle whims of men and movements by the rule of law. Our social system was not designed to depend upon the benevolence of magistrates, the altruism of the wealthy, or the condescension of the powerful. Every citizen, rich and poor, man or woman, native born or immigrant, hale or handicapped, young or old, is equal under the standard of unchanging, immutable, and impartial justice.

This is what Thomas Paine talked about when he wrote a little booklet that helped spark the thinking of so many in the American War of Independence, *Common Sense*, "In America, the law is king." This was derived directly from the English common law tradition. Essentially, those who forged this covenant lawsuit understood that if left to the mere discretion of human authorities, even the best intended statutes, edicts, ordinances, and laws inevitably devolve into some form of tyranny. That's because they will always serve somebody else's interest rather than the interests of the people. There must, therefore, be an absolute against which no encroachment of prejudice or preference can ever interfere. There has to be a foundation that the winds of change and the waters of circumstance cannot, ever, erode. There has to be a basis for law that can be depended upon at all times, in all places, and in every situation. They understood that, apart from this uniquely Christian innovation in the affairs of men and nations, there can be no enduring freedom. There never has been before, there never will be again. Our Founding Fathers understood that only too well.

So, the opening refrain of the Declaration of Independence affirms the necessity of that kind of absolute standard upon which the rule of law can then be established — "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." To secure these rights, we elect representatives so that they

don't kill babies, and when we elect magistrates who do with profligacy, our freedom is lost. Appealing to the Judge of the world for guidance, relying on his divine providence for wisdom, the framers committed themselves and their posterity to the absolute standard of the laws of nature and of nature's God.

They're not ambivalent about this, they're not namby-pamby, they're not dancing around all this stuff. They're as clear as they can possibly be. When these just powers are turned to some other course, they become destructive of the ends for which they were established, and at that point, it becomes the right and the duty of the people to throw off the shackles. A just government exists, they argued, solely and completely to provide guards for the future security of that unchanging standard. Take away those guards and the rule of law is no longer possible. That's precisely why they felt compelled to so boldly declare their autonomy from the British Crown. The activist government of the Crown had become increasingly intrusive, burdensome, and fickle, and thus the possibility of the rule of law had been thrown into jeopardy. The founders merely protested that the fashion and the fancy of political, bureaucratic, and systemic innovation, change that people can believe in, had alienated that which was inalienable.

So they followed that Old Testament pattern. They said that the king's government had erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance. In other words, the government had become essentially a series of bureaucratic rules where the people had to stand in line to get one thing after another stamped by officials, and in so doing they had to pay at every turn, thus eroding all their prosperity.

It had called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with the king's measures. It had refused assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary to the public good. It had imposed taxes without consent, taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our government. It had plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, destroyed the lives of our people, and so excited domestic insurrections among us. They enumerated all the ways that the Crown and Parliament had broken covenant. It was a covenant lawsuit.

Thus they acted boldly to form a more perfect union. They launched a sublime experiment in liberty, never before surpassed and never again matched. The founders believed that no one in America, no one, in fact, in Britain could be absolutely secure under the king because absoluteness had been thrown out of the constitutional vocabulary. Because certain rights had been abrogated for at least *some* citizens by a smothering, dominating, political behemoth, *all* liberties of *all* the citizens were at risk because suddenly arbitrariness, relativism, and randomness had entered into the legal equation. The checks against petty partiality and blatant bias had been disabled.

8. Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:

- a) List the first fourteen presidents of the United States of America who served prior to George Washington. Below your list, write a few sentences about why we often ignore these men in our study of history.**

1. Peyton Randolph
2. Henry Middleton

3. John Hancock
4. Henry Laurens
5. John Jay
6. Samuel Huntington
7. Thomas McKean
8. John Hanson
9. Elias Boudinot
10. Thomas Mifflin
11. Richard Henry Lee
12. Nathaniel Gorham
13. Arthur St. Clair
14. Cyrus Griffin

One is simply that we're really sloppy when it comes to doing history, and we are very prone in every generation to rewrite the history books to suit our present fads, fashions, and fancies. That's what's happening right now as textbook committees are rushing after political correctness to try to rewrite the history books to suit the mood of the day. That's just sloppy history.

A second reason is that we always remember the things that we think are important, and we're quick to forget things that are inconvenient truths. We have selective remembrance. We all do this. We all have highlight reels in our minds of those events that are great and are always surprised when someone who was at the same event notices something that we didn't see. They remind us of it, and we say, *Really? I don't remember that.*

The trouble is that when selective remembrance is combined with political correctness, you come up with a myopic, out-of-focus view of the events of the past. This is largely due to the fact that in the nineteenth century, particularly in the middle of the nineteenth century, all around the Western world there was a new ideological fashion that gripped the minds of the intelligentsia, the academics, the politicians. It was the idea of ideological nationalism, a peculiar idea that arose in the nineteenth century. It's why all the fiefdoms, kingdoms, principalities, and duchies of once-diverse lands like the Germanies and the various Italian Republics in the middle of the nineteenth century were forged into multilingual, often multicultural, amorphous entities called nation-states. You'll recall that before the nineteenth century, there was no such thing as a place called Spain, no such thing as a place called Italy, no such thing as a place called Germany. These were forged through a series of civil wars that afflicted virtually all of the Western world. We have to understand that the Russian Revolution was essentially a civil war fought over various factions of ideological nationalism. We can understand the Napoleonic wars in terms of ideological nationalism. Bismarck's uniting of the Germanies is a hallmark of ideological nationalism. Garibaldi's reunification of the various Italian kingdoms was ideological nationalism. The last and perhaps the most grotesque was the unification of all the Spanish

kingdoms under Generalissimo Franco in the twentieth century, creating modern-day Spain. These are all manifestations of an ideological movement that has afflicted us as well.

So, men who did not fit in with that notion of ideological nationalism were left out of our remembrance, and those who fit conveniently in became a part of our civil religion, and we give it sanctity and the blessing of our historiography.

So, political correctness and incorrectness created this rift. When you start talking about men like Elias Boudinot and John Jay, there's a lot of political correctness there. You don't want to talk about John Jay very much because you can hardly find a quote where he's not talking about Jesus and why it is that, apart from Jesus, the American experiment in liberty cannot long endure or survive.

That leads to the whole question of anti-federalism and federalism, which was a raging controversy at the time. We, in these postmodern times, talk about it in terms of Tea Party principles versus progressive principles or states' rights or nullification, but these are all part and parcel of the question of anti-federalism versus federalism, covenantalism versus anti-covenantalism, and these are things that we just don't talk about, so we think that George Washington was the first president. It's just easier that way. It's also wrong and gives us a false impression of the founding of the nation and the principles that our nation was founded on and the principles that might yet ensure freedom for our children, our grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

- b) ***Why was a skeptic like Benjamin Franklin drawn to a friendship with a pious man like George Whitefield? How did they share the ideals of virtue, vision, and freedom?*** Both Whitefield and Franklin greatly valued virtue. They both believed that the transformed life, living in accordance with that which is right, good, and true, can change the world. They believed that virtue could transform lives, cultures, and communities, and that that was the only hope for the future. They both believed that the virtuous man was always able to claim the moral high ground in any battle, in any struggle.

The difference, of course, was that Benjamin Franklin believed that virtue could be achieved by the sheer pluck, the hard work, the diligence, and the unflinching, visionary purpose of man himself. Benjamin Franklin believed in works righteousness. George Whitefield believed that grace and grace alone could produce the virtuous works necessary for the transformation of culture. Benjamin Franklin had never heard anything like that in all his life and he was stunned by it. He became absolutely fascinated with Whitefield and thoroughly investigated his life and his works.

Franklin was fascinated by this man. He began to read his books, listen to his sermons, and he became smitten by this idea that there was a God, that he had spoken, that he extended his grace, and that lives could be transformed not by just the sheer energy of man but by the mercy and kindness of God.

Both men also shared a great vision. Both men were able to see the connections between different disciplines and ideas. They believed that beauty, goodness, and truth made way for progress for mankind. They believed that there were objective standards for beauty, goodness, and truth and that those objective standards, when properly adhered to, could produce a better society, a greater hope, a brighter future. Their vision was a vision largely fixed not on the present. They believed it was necessary for their generation to defer gratification for a greater day yet come.

In the eighteenth century, this was rare.

- c) ***How do Daniel Webster's seven principles of leadership help provide answers to the difficulties of the election of 1824, as well as to the difficulties of our own day?*** One of the men standing on the outside of this whole escapade was Daniel Webster, the great orator of the North. Webster outlined some basic principles for Congress to reform itself. He called for a Congress that would return to principle over party and partisanship. His idea was simply this: politics never solves anything in the long run. It can only divide. But statesmanship can lead, is rooted in principle, and can have long-lasting effects. (Very much paraphrased, summarized and, quite frankly, cherry-picked, the principles of Webster are outlined here.)

He said, first of all, leaders can never play to the camera. Real leaders have to shut their eyes to public opinion polls while at the same time opening their ears to the voice of the people. That's a delicate balance. You have to hear what the people are saying, but you have to lead. You have to understand that when you lead you will always invite criticism. Do anything and you're going to be criticized. Do nothing and you can stay safe. But if you actually step forward and do something, you are going to be criticized.

Secondly, if you're going to stand for anything, that necessarily means that you are standing against some things. There are a lot of politicians out there who just want to affirm everything, they're *for* everything. You can't be for everything. If you are for anything, you've got to be necessarily, by the nature of things, against some things.

Third, it is hard, it is laborious. It takes cunning and skill, it takes courage. It's a battle to get anything done. The least little thing requires a tremendous amount of effort. As Helen Keller, the great life philosopher of the last generation said, out of her world of silence and darkness, "It is the little pushes of unrelenting labor that move civilization forward." "It is the *little* pushes of *unrelentingly* labor that push civilization forward."

At the same time, while it is a battle, while it's inevitable that we are going to have to fight, if we are principled, we must always fight fairly. We must always realize that pragmatism is, at its root, a lie at some level. To do whatever you need to do to accomplish your agenda is a very dangerous thing because inevitably you have to violate your own principles to get there.

Fifth, we live in a world that is mysterious. We're mysterious, our world is mysterious, the electorate is mysterious. The mood of the nation is mysterious. We just have to accept it. It's not a science. There's no such thing as political *science*. It is *not* a science.

Sixth, the battle is, wherever the clash of arms is, that's what you have to run toward. You don't run away from abortion because it's a contentious issue. If you are a statesman, you run toward it. You deal with the stuff. That's what leaders are for.

Leaders aren't supposed to tip toe around the dangerous things. Leave that to the dainties of King George. If we are actually going to do something, we've got to wade in, roll up our sleeves, and muck it out in the mess. We made a mess. You can't clean up a mess unless you get messy. Run toward the roar. That necessarily means that whatever you do, if you take a stand, if you wade in, if you talk about something that people don't want you to talk about, if you deal with issues that people don't want to deal with, you have to acknowledge, *Look, it's dangerous*. Every single time I sit in my office and I have a counseling appointment, I know it's dangerous if I tell the truth. I could be nice, I could be, oh, dear Pastor Grant, oh we just love Pastor Grant, as long as I don't tell the truth, as long as I just

dry the eyes and pat the back and do the little sideways Christian hug with the three pats for the Trinity. As long as I do that stuff, I'm great! But if I tell the truth and I say, *No, it is not a phobia, and no, it is not a psychosis — it's sin and you've just got to stop it. Got it? Stop it! Stop it, stop it, stop it!* That's dangerous. Now, the question is, at this point, with the map crimson, do we have the guts to do that?

9. Choose one of the following essay questions to respond to:

- a) ***What three traits would you most like to see in an elected official? How would these particular traits enable one to lead our nation through its current issues. Provide specific examples in your answer.*** Answers will vary.
- b) ***Choose one of the fourteen forgotten presidents and briefly describe his life. In your answer, explain how the forgotten presidents provide an example of true leadership.*** Answers will vary depending on which president was chosen. Please see Lesson 19.
- c) ***How did the story of Jonathan and his servant encourage those who fought for independence?*** The Americans told themselves that story over and over and over again because the facts of the promises of history didn't seem to match the facts of their circumstances. So which facts would they trust? That's a question that we all have to ask ourselves constantly, isn't it? What are we going to believe — what we know to be true because God has said it, or what we feel, think, or desire? Do feelings have dominion? Do our thoughts rule or is God sovereign? The big question that faced the patriots was, God is God, we are not, so who should we believe, us or Him? Amazingly, astonishingly, all out of character with most of the rest of history, and certainly all out of character with most of the rest of the people at that time, they chose to believe God. It was crazy. It seemed next to impossible. But that was the stand that they took.