

PSYCHOLOGY, EDUCATION, THE CHURCH, AND THE MISUSE OF SCIENCE:

The Evolutionary Legacy of Six Men - Part 2

The Ideology and Legacy of Harold Rugg (1886-1960)

Harold Rugg defined the beliefs that would be conditioned into the minds of school children. Dewey provided the general goals; Rugg provided the specifics. Rugg was one of Dewey's "disciples."⁹⁶ He also owed an ideological debt to Thorndike, for **Rugg's goal was to replace traditional, biblically-oriented curricula with secularized versions.** Thorndike had led the way in aggressively discrediting the vestiges of classical education in the public schools, leaving an open field for Rugg's new curricula to occupy. Indeed, under Thorndike, "[f]or the first time in the history of American education, psychological sanction was given for including in the curriculum such courses as the newer social studies and various technical subjects. ..." Thus began vocational education and the slow demise of the liberal arts. "Those who adhered to the traditional theory of a classical schooling faced unrelenting, and increasingly hostile, attacks from Thorndike's followers."⁹⁷

Rugg answered two questions which Dewey had posed but not fully answered: (1) which beliefs would be employed in conditioning school children; and (2) who would decide the direction which the conditioning should take. Rugg responded (1) that conditioning would be employed to force a belief in collective, socialist government, and (2) that a plan would be managed by overseers to guarantee this outcome. Rugg did not reveal the identity of the overseers, but from the fact that he was working within the framework of the National Education Association (NEA) with hundreds of specialists, researchers, writers, and editors leaves little doubt that the "overseers" were the movers and shakers of the educational and psychological establishment.⁹⁸ In Rugg's prime years, therefore, the overseers would have included Dewey and Thorndike, both of whom were active then.

Rugg's vision of the future was that "through the schools of the world we shall disseminate a new conception of government - one that will embrace all of the collective activities of men; one that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interests of all people."⁹⁹ "Scientific control" is a euphemism for central planning, as will be discussed below.

Rugg advocated "*First and foremost*, the development of a new philosophy of life and education which will be fully appropriate to the new social order; *Second*, the building of an adequate plan for the production of a new race of educational workers [a master race concept]; *Third*, the making of new activities and materials for the curriculum."¹⁰⁰ In other words, **Rugg's goal was to devise new curricula for the purpose of building a centrally planned new world order manned by suitably conditioned laborers,** thus echoing Thorndike's vision of the vocationally-trained and compliant factory worker.¹⁰¹

Though the NEA was engaged in revising all curricula, Rugg's specialty was the gathering of civics, history,

and geography into a new discipline called "social studies." Most people have had social studies in school, so it might seem strange that any questions could be raised about such an apparently harmless subject. As the old saying goes, however, the devil is in the details.

Rugg himself asked, "Why one general course rather than the separate subjects of history, geography, and civics?" One could respond that, in fact there is nothing inherently evil about grouping these three traditional subjects under one heading. But Rugg's answer hinted at an agenda which he did not forthrightly disclose: "Because the chief aim is to understand modern life and how it came to be."¹⁰² Rather than accepting this answer at face value, one should be aware that traditional civics, history, and geography had *already* been explaining to generations of students how things "came to be." Rugg's dilemma was that he did not care for the old explanations.

Before Rugg's curriculum revisions, for example, history books typically began with the biblical story of creation. An old United States history text began: "All our readers know that the history of mankind begins with Adam and Eve, about 6,000 years ago . . ."¹⁰³ Indeed, **advocates of the new social studies had a special dislike for biblical creation, because it threatened the entire ideological edifice for which Wundt had laid the (evolutionary) foundations.**

In the context of condemning capital punishment, one such advocate railed against biblical creation, lumping it together with other concepts he disliked, some biblical (e.g., biblical authority, biblical inspiration) and some foolish (e.g., astrology, biological evolution): "... capital punishment is scientifically and historically on a par with astrological medicine, the belief in witchcraft, the Fundamentalist view of Biblical authorship, and the rejection of biological evolution. ... [Advocacy of] the death penalty [is] no more valid in a scientific sense than astrology, witchcraft, the thesis of the literal and direct inspiration of the Bible, or the doctrine of a special creation of the world and its inhabitants in ... 4004 B.C."¹⁰⁴ The new social studies was really an umbrella to cover revisions that might otherwise have been more obviously objectionable.

Rugg further explained that in using his social studies texts, "The readers ... will encounter a second novel characteristic: *the frequent use of dramatic episodes.*"¹⁰⁵ In other words, in the new social studies, stories, not facts, were to be the vehicle for guiding the student into the desired conclusions. Why was this device necessary? Because the facts of science and history show that evolution is false and that socialistic collectivism is unworkable. Thus "dramatic episodes" were required to give the new social studies an appearance of plausibility.

The opening pages of a Rugg social studies text were radically different from those of older texts. In true evolutionary fashion, Rugg began with stories of change, not creation.¹⁰⁶ Next, Rugg raised the question - thereby implicitly suggesting - whether people are "wealth," i.e., resources like cattle or minerals: "Mr. Hilbert has a wife and three children. Are they wealth?" Rugg cleverly does not answer this question, but a previously unthinkable concept is now up for

discussion: "Evidently we must decide what we mean by wealth ..."107 Biblically, people are not resources but are stewards of the earth's resources. However, a collectivist centrally-planned state requires that men and women be viewed as resources to be exploited for the good of the state.

Rugg's push toward collectivism was not lost on the parents of school children: "By the end of the [1930s] several social-science textbooks were being condemned by the American Legion, the Advertising Federation of America, and the New York State Economic Council. In particular, the books written by Harold Rugg, at Teachers College, Columbia University, were most frequently denounced. ...

"One of the first attacks occurred in August 1936 when a criticism of Rugg's textbooks appeared in the *National Republic*. Entitled 'Sovietizing Our Children,' the article attempted to show that Rugg's books tended toward 'collectivism'."108

Further displacing the Bible, Rugg also ignored biblical reasons for America's wealth. The influence of America's godly heritage was replaced with a racist explanation: "Americans are known over the world as energetic people. Why is this? Our pep, our energy, is one of the greatest causes of our wealth."109 This specious reasoning led to the conclusion that other peoples are inferior, and was a way of conditioning students to accept racist, eugenic views.

A photograph of "energetic" (white) Canadian factory workers walking home is contrasted with a picture of (black) "workers in a hot tropical country like the Bahamas" who happen to be working sitting down. Note the contrast between the energetic look of the [Canadians] and the [supposedly inferior] look of people in the tropics ..."110 In World War II, the crushing defeat of Hitler's Germany blasted Rugg's concept of racial superiority.111

Though "social studies" became a reality through Rugg's efforts, he was not the first to call for social planning via the social sciences. "[A]s early as 1737, the Abbe de Saint-Pierre had definitely stated that the main hope for a better human future lay in the possibility of guiding social change by means of social science and an academy of experts to control developments.

This position was developed more fully by [others] ... Comte and Lester F. Ward held that sociology and the social sciences have as their main responsibility the guidance of social change, and, hence, that such studies must occupy an outstanding position in the curriculum. ...

"... By the last decades of the [nineteenth] century, various new events and trends slowly combined to awaken an interest in [history, civics, and economics] among educators in the secondary schools. These were [among others] the training of some leading American educators, such as G. Stanley Hall ... in foreign countries, especially Germany.

"In 1892, the National Education Association appointed a committee on Secondary Schools, and a subcommittee on history, civil government, and economics was set up ... It dealt mainly with the desirable history program for elementary and secondary schools ...

Much more important than all of the preceding ... was the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education

created by the National Education Association in 1913, which provided for a subcommittee on the social studies. ...

"A formal report was published in 1916 on 'The Social Studies in Secondary Education.' ... In the decade following the issuance of the report, about 27,000 copies were distributed [urging implementation of social studies curricula in public schools]."112 Thus Rugg found a ready reception for his social studies innovations among intellectuals.

Although Rugg's racist stance has been discredited by history, the elitist view has endured that experts in the social sciences should guide education and all public policy. For example, "There are many persons who are convinced that the sentencing power should be shorn from our judges and handed over to a board of scientists, known as a diagnostic clinic. ... The diagnostic clinic would be staffed by a group of persons skilled in the fields of human behavior. It should be composed of a psychiatrist, a social worker, a psychologist, and such other persons who are eminent for their knowledge of human behavior."113

In the 1970s, child protection agencies staffed with social workers began replacing judge and jury in meting out punishment to mothers and fathers deemed unworthy of parenting. This is a legacy of Rugg's central-planning vision. Rugg's collectivist vision also remains alive in the politically leftward stance of the education establishment.

IV. THE EVOLUTIONARY LEGACY IN THE MODERN CHURCH

The Bible presents several purposes for the local church. The local church exists for corporate worship, and well as for fellowship and for evangelism. However, another critical purpose of the church is often overlooked. 1 Tim. 3:15 identifies the local church as the "house of God," and equates the house of God with the "church of the living God." This verse ends with the description of each local church as the "pillar and ground of the truth." In other words, each local church is to provide a resting place or foundation ("ground") for biblical truth, and is to provide support (the "pillar") for biblical truth.114

The failure of most American local churches to fulfill this purpose is evident in the number of para-church organizations springing up to address issues that local churches have been negligent in teaching. Even worse, current "user-friendly" church growth strategies have abdicated the church's "ground and pillar" function altogether, opting for an atmosphere designed to help each attendee "feel good" by the end of the service. The American church's purpose of truth-preservation has been exchanged for the purpose of cultivating self-gratification. This did not happen by accident. A major influence pushing the church in this direction has been the work and ideology of psychologist Carl Rogers.

The Ideology and Legacy of Carl Rogers (1902-1987)

Carl Rogers was the originator of the self-acceptance movement. He achieved vast influence before his death: "Carl

Rogers is ... arguably the world's most influential living psychologist. ... Book shelves across the country are stocked with self-help and popular psychology manuals that are merely variations on themes that Rogers developed. ...

"Beyond that, the language of professional caring that Rogers pioneered has become embedded in every day conversation. Terms such as 'whole person,' 'awareness,' 'potentials,' 'growth,' 'self-concept,' 'realness,' 'spontaneity,' and 'process' have become staples of the vocabulary we use to describe personal states. More than any other individual, Rogers is responsible for the popularity of such concepts.

... [Rogers was] the first person to use the word 'client' to substitute for 'patient' ...¹¹⁵

Prior to Rogers' rise to influence, Freudian psychoanalysis and the "behaviorism" of B.F. Skinner, an ideological descendant of Hall and Thorndike, had ruled the psychological landscape. **In America, Rogerian psychotherapy largely displaced both psychoanalysis and behaviorism after World War II.** Thus, "Therapeutic psychology has evolved into three main forces: the Freudians, the behaviorists, and the humanists. And Rogers is certainly [most prominent] in that third force."¹¹⁶

Like G. Stanley Hall, after graduation from college Rogers spent a year at the Union Theological Seminary.¹¹⁷ Like Dewey, "Rogers [stressed] the importance of process over content. The self is a process, and one should not try to define it; learning is a process; communication is a process. ... The idea of an education from Roger's perspective is not to learn history or literature or physics - because these things are always changing - but to develop process skills."¹¹⁸

The Rogerian insistence on ignoring content echoes Dewey's claim that only process and method matter, and, as will be discussed below, this belief has had a crucial effect on Rogerian counseling. In other words, since "[a]daptations of Carl Rogers so-called 'client-centered' counseling dominate the field of pastoral counseling and form the basis of most liberal and conservative counseling,"¹¹⁹ the Rogerian insistence on the unimportance of content has affected virtually all pastoral counseling as well.

Rogers' vast influence on the church is not a Christian influence: "It is a strange irony that Rogers, who long ago disavowed Christianity, has had such a profound effect on it. He began his career of helping people by entering Union Theological Seminary in the hope of becoming a minister, and actually assumed the position of pastor in a rural Vermont parish one summer in 1925 as part of his training. But a year later he left Union for Columbia University across the street, and a career in psychology. Since then he has had no kind words for Christianity."¹²⁰

Rogers was the first psychologist successfully to import humanistic counseling into the church. Like Wundt and his other ideological predecessors, Rogers was spectacularly successful, so much so that "the practice of blending Christianity with [humanistic] psychology constitutes one of the major trends to have surfaced in American churches.

"... [A]ttempts to reconcile Christianity to [humanistic] psychology will actually have the effect of undermining the Christian point of view. The most obvious

example of this undercutting is provided by the [Rogerian] emphasis on self-acceptance.

"In contrast, Christianity starts off by saying that we're not OK the way we are. ... Christians are not supposed to facilitate the growth of the old self. They're supposed to give it up and put on a new self. ... OK people don't need a savior [but] Christ came to save sinners, not self-actualizers.

"The contradiction between Christian ideas and ideas currently fashionable in psychology has not escaped the notice of the psychologists. Erich Fromm once observed that if the doctrine of original sin were true, much of his own theory would be untenable. ... An obvious question to ask, then, is why so many Christians have been unable to see the contradictions. ...

"The answer is that [humanistic] psychology bears a surface resemblance to Christianity. It counterfeits important Christian beliefs. For example, Christianity says that we ought to love ourselves; so does [humanistic] psychology ... The fact that these propositions have vastly different meanings in the two traditions doesn't always register."¹²¹

How does Rogerian counseling emphasize the self? Rogers himself advocated "non-directive" counseling in which "[t]he counselor should listen, show no authority, give no advice, not argue, talk only to aid or relieve or praise or guide the client and to clarify his problem."¹²² That is, the non-directive counselor is to offer no directions or advice.

Rogers himself made the connection between the non-directive style and the presumed autonomy of the client: "The non-directive viewpoint places high value on the right of every individual to be psychologically independent."¹²³

In other words, the client in non-directive counseling is expected to be a fount of wisdom from which he can devise his own solutions to his problems, even without biblical input: "The more recent alumni of theological schools are very reluctant to be directive in the office of pastoral counselor. The good pastor in this office is not judgmental, he is not directive; and as we have ourselves insisted throughout, he is not moralistic. So when someone puts this kind of question to him, 'What ought I to do?' he knows that he must not answer it, whatever else he does or does not do. He is permitted to ask, 'Well, what do *you* think *you* ought to do?'"¹²⁴

The Bible does not take this view. Jesus stated that man must live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4, Lk. 4:4), because what issues from man's heart is sinful and destructive (Matt. 7:21-23). **This means that counselors should be directing their clients to the Word of God as the source of solutions.**

Proverbs is perhaps one of the most helpful books in counseling, but "Counseling in Proverbs is anything but non-directive. ... Throughout Proverbs anti-Rogerian thought appears. ... Proverbs exhorts the young man to listen to others rather than to depend upon his own ideas: 'Do not rely on your own insight' (Prov. 3:5). Words could hardly be more anti-Rogerian. ... Rather than encouraging clients to do all the talking, counselors frequently ought to urge clients to listen to words of advice."¹²⁵

Lest it be doubted that Rogerian non-directiveness assumes an unbiblical human autonomy, let us consider the words of Christian psychologist Rollo May:

‘This brings us to the matter of moral judgments in counseling. It is clear, first from a Christian point of view, that no one has a right to judge another human being; the command, judge not [Matthew 7:1], is an incontrovertible, particularly since it was given a dynamic by Jesus' own life. And psychotherapeutically in the second place, judging is unpermissible; ‘and above all,’ as Adler says, ‘let us never allow ourselves to make any *moral* judgments, judgments concerning the moral worth of a human being’.”¹²⁶

In this passage, (1) May tries to justify his non-directive methodology scripturally; and (2) quotes Adler, an occultist, as an authority supposedly buttressing his faulty analysis. As we will see, Christian counselors of the Rogerian sort frequently resort to citing pagan experts to buttress their position. The issue in Matthew 7:1 is that of not imputing to another the motives and spiritual state which only God and the person himself can know.

However, Matthew 7:1 does not rule out making evaluative judgments as May contends. Further, John 7:24 actually commands evaluative judgments. Evaluative judgments are required in counseling as surely as in parenting. The parent's cry, "Don't touch the hot stove!" is an appropriate evaluative judgment for a two-year-old. Evaluative judgments measuring all decisions by the Bible are appropriate for older people.

Despite biblical commands to evaluate, the typical Christian counselor follows the Rogerian road with its emphasis on "self." For example, Larry Crabb gives a contradictory message about the self. We must be losing "ourselves in Christ," he says, but "recover our self-esteem!" These two goals are opposites; the Bible states that we cannot serve two masters (Matt. 6:24). Contradicting himself again, Crabb later writes, "We must resist the influence of a ‘Christian’ culture that values self-discovery and self-fulfillment above abandoning ourselves to God.”¹²⁷ But recovering self-esteem (which Crabb applauds) is the same as self-discovery (which he condemns). To the average reader this is confusing.

Josh McDowell seeks to move his readers into a Rogerian stance: "Many Christians are uneasy about the notion of acknowledging *any* self-worth. They are adamantly against the idea of loving or accepting themselves, [quoting] Romans 12:3, ‘Do not think of yourself more highly more highly than you ought, but rather think of yourself ... with the measure of faith God has given you’.”¹²⁸ McDowell has twisted a biblical text to make it seem to agree with Rogerianism. Contrary to McDowell's view, this verse indicates that **with sufficient faith we will see ourselves as God sees us, not as we want to see ourselves; that is, we will see ourselves as having worth only in Christ, not in ourselves.**

McDowell then writes: "The distinction between self-worth and pride is hard for some Christians to perceive ... *Self-worth* is a conviction that you have fundamental value because you were created by God in His image and because Jesus died for your sins. Pride points to self.”¹²⁹ But so does *self-worth*. The biblical truth is the Christ died for us though we had no

value to Him, not because we were worthy. All my worth is imputed to me by Christ, and even this is overstating the case, since we are all unprofitable servants at best (Lk. 17:10).

Echoing the Rogerian belief in human goodness, Bruce Narramore claims: "Underneath all our sin, temptation, and confusion, the image of God exists in man. Underneath our sinful surface, we have an awareness of our failures and a desire to do better. No matter how far we fall short, the image of God in us will triumph.”¹³⁰ In contrast, the Bible says, "There is none that doeth good" (Rom. 3:12). Narramore's sentiments are the same as the old humanist claim that all men have a spark of divinity within.

Minirth and Meier, also strong Rogerians, cite Adler the occultist as back-up for their position: "What Are the Primary Sources of Emotional Pain? ... One of these primary sources is a *lack of self-worth*."

"Alfred Adler coined the term *inferiority complex*. He and his followers have done a great deal to contribute to our understanding of its root causes. Lack of self-worth is definitely a major source of emotional pain in human beings.”¹³¹ In contrast, the Bible teaches that an unwillingness to bend to God's will is the source of emotional pain. Adler, like Wundt, presumed that man is not sinful, but that he is an animal with unlimited evolutionary capacity for development. Why would Minirth and Meier justify their claim about self-worth with Adler's conclusions? This is not true *Christian* psychology.

Cecil Osborne likewise resorts to another occultist, Erich Fromm, for support of his Rogerian position: "Erich Fromm suggests that learning to love requires giving it priority. ... Accept ... the idea that a proper self-love is all right, and that God expects it. Jesus commanded it when he taught that the supreme law is to love God with all of your heart, mind, soul, and strength and to love your fellow man *as you love yourself*" (Mark 12:30-31).¹³² The difficulty with Osborne's use of this verse is that the Bible recognizes that in our fallenness we already love ourselves too much; **Jesus is here directing that we should love others with the same fervency, not that we need to love ourselves more.**

Other Rogerians appear genuinely confused about Biblical teachings. John C. Maxwell focuses his counseling on "Attitude Axioms" which he claims will change a person's life. The Attitude Axioms are seemingly good statements that, being somewhat directive, give the appearance of moving away from Rogerianism. For example, Maxwell's Attitude Axiom #1 states, "Our attitude determines our approach to life.”¹³³

However, it is not attitude ultimately that determines our approach to life, but God working in us as we trust Him. "I can do all things through him which strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13), and attitudes can improve as we obey Him, allowing Him to give us strength. In other words, for the Christian, attitudes and other characteristics must be rooted in our ties to God, or, as Jonathan Edwards put it, in our "religious affections.”¹³⁴ Biblically based religious affections allow the Christian to learn to think biblically instead of like the world (Rom. 12:1-2).

An significant feature of nearly all books by Christian Rogerians is that they depend heavily on stories rather than on biblical principles. These stories are like the "dramatic episodes" which Rugg wrote for his social studies curricula. Stories are subjective and can be interpreted to mean almost anything. Even the parables of Scripture had to be explained by Jesus Himself and alone are not the basis for establishing principles or doctrine. As with Rugg's curriculum revisions, the Rogerian revision of biblical psychology requires "dramatic episodes" for additional plausibility.¹³⁵

The Rogerian insistence on human autonomy has harmed not only the church, but the schools: "During the sixties and early seventies many teachers, inspired by Rogers and writers such as John Holt, put pupil self-evaluation into practice by letting students grade themselves. Most abandoned the experiment, but the underlying hypothesis that a teacher doesn't have much of a right to judge his students lingered, and helped to boost the general grade inflation that still plagues education at all levels."¹³⁶

One of the most fascinating aspects of Rogerian non-directive counseling is its characteristic of *non-interest* in the client. Rogerian counselors, Christian or not, have the reputation of being very interested in their clients. This reputation is undeserved, because "listening, which is so often equated wrongly with Rogers' non-directive method, is not Rogerian methodology, for Rogerian counselors do not listen. That is precisely what they do not do. A good listener is interested in what another has to say. But [Rogerian counselors] consider content to be unimportant. ... Rogers wrote:

"`The counselor ... must be prepared to respond not to the intellectual content of what the person is saying, but to the feeling which underlies it'."¹³⁷

Thus, "despite all [Rogers'] claims, the Rogerian counselor's interest is not really in the client. The client has come with a problem to which he wants a solution. He recognizes that if his problem were solved, he'd feel better, but the Rogerian counselor will take interest in the client only as some vague, one-dimensional person; only as a carrier of feelings. What the client thinks is of no importance.

"... We all know the typical scene. The client begins the interview: 'I'm really upset.' The counselor focuses upon that word and reflects it back in different words: 'I see that you're torn two ways.' 'That's right,' says the client, 'I'm very distressed.' 'I see,' the counselor replies, 'that you're quite troubled.' 'My difficulty is that I don't know what to do about a certain problem,' says the client. 'You are trying to find a solution,' says the counselor. 'Yes, that's right. I've had problems with homosexuality. Do you think homosexuality is wrong?' asks the client. And his counselor replies, 'I see you are asking me whether homosexuality is ethically or religiously proper.'

"This is not listening. Listening means taking interest in what another says, and responding appropriately. ... The Rogerian stance, on the contrary, avoids help, avoids advice, avoids value judgments, avoids applying divine declarations to personal problems."¹³⁸

Rogers' legacy to the church is a movement away from biblical principles for problem solving. He legitimized

substituting human opinion for the Word of God. His educational legacy of content de-emphasis and grade inflation also echoes the content-dilution vision of his ideological predecessors Dewey and Thorndike.

Ecumenical Evangelism: The Legacy of Hall, Dewey, and Thorndike

Prior to the 1940s, local churches of various denominations had a long history of cooperating in evangelistic outreaches. Billy Sunday's revival campaigns were conducted on the basis of this type of cooperation. The liberal denominations did not participate, however, having capitulated to the view that every man has a spark of divinity within and therefore needs no Savior or salvation.¹³⁹ Thus the only cooperating churches were those professing the fundamentals of the Christian faith.¹⁴⁰

A major shift occurred among cooperating churches in the late 1940s toward a phenomenon known as "ecumenical evangelism." Liberal churches professing no belief in the power of Christ alone to save began working with conservative and fundamentalist churches in Billy Graham evangelistic crusades. One observer stated, "I began to learn that Mr. Graham was cooperating with liberals and including them in his meetings.

"... I went to a breakfast for preachers who would sponsor Billy Graham in the Tidewater [Virginia] area. I sat at a huge table with pastors of every denomination, belief, and unbelief. Liberals in the area who did not believe the Bible was the Word of God sat there, as did men who were fundamental, Bible preaching and believing."¹⁴¹

One could ask what the reason was for liberal churches to participate in evangelistic efforts in which they could not truly believe.¹⁴² However, the focus here will be to examine how it is that Graham came to his policy of uniting unbelievers and genuinely Christian conservatives together in spiritual cooperation. There is in fact no doubt that this was Graham's policy early on: "Almost from the beginning, Graham would not accept any invitation to preach where ecumenical representation - including Roman Catholic clergy - was not present. That is still his policy today."¹⁴³

When Graham was fairly young, he was strongly influenced by Henrietta Mears. Mears was Director of Christian Education at the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, California, for about thirty years starting in 1928. "According to Graham, Mears was, next to his mother and his wife Ruth, the one woman who impacted his ministry the most." Graham wrote: "I doubt if any other woman outside of my wife and mother has had such a marked influence."¹⁴⁴ **To understand Billy Graham, we must understand Henrietta Mears.**

Mears was a gifted teacher with charisma sufficient to influence her proteges profoundly. Indeed, "At the time [that Mears began at First Presbyterian Church], enrollment in Sunday school classes was 450 people. In two and a half years, the enrollment grew to 4,200."¹⁴⁵ Further, Mears' Sunday school curricula became known the world over. "Among her

admirers she was dubbed 'Mother of Sunday School'.¹⁴⁶ She founded Gospel Light Press which became Gospel Light Publications. Because of Mears' immense influence over the lives of millions of Christian workers via her Sunday school curricula, Mears has been called "The Grandmother of us all."¹⁴⁷

Though Mears apparently did not know Hall, Dewey, or Thorndike personally, she brought their ideologies into her work of directing the Sunday school at First Presbyterian Church. She had been a public school teacher for many years before her Sunday school work. "So convinced was Mears that educational expertise was essential [that] one of her considerations for teaching positions was whether or not one was a teacher in the [public] school system. ... [S]he kept an eye out for the public school professionals in her church. ... [S]he determined to translate the knowledge she had gained herself through public school teaching into the life of her Sunday School ..."¹⁴⁸ Thus for Mears, **the ideology of public education was the guide for her work in the Sunday school.**

Echoing Hall's ideology of separating students into grades, Mears enforced the "revolutionary ... assignment of [Sunday school] students into grades."¹⁴⁹ **Like Hall, Dewey, and Thorndike, Mears placed a high priority on "method" or "process."** She "was a stickler for planning" whose "talent was in organization."¹⁵⁰ This resulted in a "no-nonsense, well-oiled program that assured success at least in terms of numbers."¹⁵¹ Thus the educational framework devised by Hall, Dewey, and Thorndike influenced the approach of Henrietta Mears toward Christian education, resulting in a pragmatic stance in which policies were justified because they "worked." Mears passed this pragmatic ideology to Graham who also executed a pragmatic course in his evangelistic efforts. For both Mears and Graham, pragmatism produced huge attendance and wide publicity.

Rather than following the biblical order, Mears adopted a attitude of expediency, "[taking] authority even over the elders of her church in directing their chores in Sunday school, as well as teaching men herself ... [S]he did not adhere to the Word of God in her own work [but did what was expedient]. The results of this unbiblical position ... ultimately [led] to spiritual error manifesting in the churches affected by her disciples. [While] Mears believed that the position of preacher is for men only, [h]er work was to teach men to be preachers."¹⁵² Mears assumed that because she had been in public education, she was fit to be one of those to "oversee" the activities of others, thus reflecting the elitist attitudes of her ideological predecessors in public education.

Besides Graham, Mears influenced four additional men who would lead the modern ecumenical movement: "Charles E. Fuller, founder of Fuller Seminary, where the new evangelical movement was announced, and Harold Ockenga, pastor of Park Street Church in Boston, first president of Fuller Seminary, and initial proclaimer of new evangelicalism, were both Mears' proteges. So was J. Edwin Orr, 'an expert in awakenings' and professor at Oxford, whose rule was that 'he would only speak where there was an ecumenical representation.' Finally there

was Armin Gesswein, who originated 'today's ecumenical prayer breakfasts.'

"These five - Mears, Fuller, Ockenga, Orr, and Gesswein - worked together to establish ecumenical campus movements. ... [W]hat they started has developed into something that portends a global religio-political agenda operating with the framework of a loose form of ecumenical unity."¹⁵³

The pragmatism of evangelistically cooperating with the largest possible base of support, including unbelievers, has ironically produced an America without any significant revival. **Though individuals have been saved in the ministries of Mears' proteges, there has been little movement toward Christ in American culture as a whole.** The liquor and gambling industries, which in many revivals of the past were shut down, are stronger than ever despite decades of Graham crusades and other evangelistic efforts of Mears' disciples.¹⁵⁴

As good as it is that people have been saved through these ministries, could it be that God had a future for America much better than the present reality? The answer appears to be Yes. **After World War II, America was ripe for national revival.** The country had just come out of the most destructive war in history.¹⁵⁵ The war had shown millions that the world holds no answers to the ultimate problems of life and death. There was a national tenderness toward the things of God.¹⁵⁶ To Christian observers, it seemed as if national revival were near. "[In the late 1940s] evangelists all over the country were having real revival. ... In fact there was a spirit of revival moving all over the country and [many conservative evangelists] were expecting a nation-wide revival to break out at any time. ...

"[Several years later at a meeting with other evangelists, evangelist William Ward Ayer] asked us if we felt that America had been on the verge of revival in the late forties and early fifties. We all agreed that it seemed so to us.

"Then he asked us if we had any idea why the revival fires had cooled down so rapidly before we had the revival we were expecting. ...

"I am convinced that it was during this period of time that the philosophy of evangelism began to change. Organization, cooperation, slick advertising, and the presence of men with well-known names [another legacy of Mears'] in high places of religion or government ... and the entertainment world became important. ...

"This trend has increased and we have a whole generation of people who have never seen real revival."¹⁵⁷

Significantly, Graham at the close of his life saw no possibility for revival. In an interview with Robert Schuller, Graham was asked: "Tell me, what do you think is the future of Christianity?" Graham answered, "... I don't think we're going to see a great sweeping revival that will turn the whole world to Christ at any time."¹⁵⁸ This may be true, but unfortunately no hope was expressed for national revival either.

For decades, Graham's stance has been pragmatic and non-offensive. In the same interview quoted above, the following exchange took place:

Graham: "I think everybody that loves Christ, or knows Christ - whether they're conscious of it or not - they're members of the Body of Christ. ... They may not even know the name of Jesus ... And I think that they are saved, and that they are going to be with us in heaven."

Schuller: "What I hear you saying, that it's possible for Jesus Christ to come into a human heart and soul and life, even if they've been born in darkness and have never had exposure to [the message of] the Bible. Is that a correct interpretation of what you're saying?"

Graham: "Yes, it is. Because I believe that. I've met people in various parts of the world in travel situations, that they have never ... heard about Jesus, but they believe in their heart that there was a God, and they have tried to live a life that was quite apart from the surrounding community in which they lived."¹⁵⁹

Graham has for years asserted that there is no eternal punishment for the lost: "I used to believe that pagans in far-off countries were lost and were going to hell - if they did not have the Gospel of Jesus Christ preached to them. I no longer believe that ... I believe there are other ways of recognizing the existence of God - through nature, for instance - and plenty of other opportunities, therefore, of saying yes to God."¹⁶⁰

Some might suggest that such comments express the view that God is able to reach people in different ways - "The wind bloweth where it listeth ... so is everyone that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). Indeed, Graham elsewhere says that, "I'm told to preach Christ as the only way to salvation. But it is God who does the judging, not Billy Graham."¹⁶¹ The difficulty is that he seems to allow interviewers and listeners to conclude that one does not need to come specifically to Christ *alone* for salvation - if that is what they want to hear.¹⁶² Thus he sends contradictory messages: one needs to come to Christ, but then, one doesn't need even to have heard of Christ, much less come to Him, for salvation.

Why would Graham deny the existence of hell, and suggest that one need not come to Christ alone for salvation? These are the positions of unbelieving liberals. Indeed, the Roman Catholic Church has for centuries taught that though hell exists, one can escape it by getting out of purgatory. The Roman Church also teaches that faith in Christ alone is not sufficient for salvation: one must also keep the sacraments of the Roman Church.

Perhaps the reason for Graham's denials of biblical doctrine can be traced back to the influence of Henrietta Mears, who also seems to have been drawn into a tolerance of erroneous Roman Catholic doctrines. It is a matter of record that, "Before Henrietta's [first year of public school teaching] was to end, a Catholic priest called on her to thank her for the amazing changes she was bringing about in the lives of the town's young people ... They subsequently had many long, interesting talks together on spiritual matters."¹⁶³

In short, Mears adopted a pragmatism due at least partly to the influence of the public education ideology of Hall, Dewey, and Thorndike. Her pragmatism apparently extended to a tolerance of Roman Catholic error. Her policy of expediency was then passed on to Graham and her other

proteges, resulting in a tolerance of false doctrine for the purpose of attracting a large audience in evangelistic work.¹⁶⁴ The legacy of Wundt and his ideological descendants therefore lives on in the church as well as in the educational establishment.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Modern psychological, educational, and church activities are predominantly designed to condition man the animal and to provide him with self-gratification. Such an approach neither heals the soul, educates the mind, nor provides the spiritual rebirth necessary for eternal life.

In recent decades, there has been a movement back to biblical psychology. This movement is led by scholars who stress with the practitioners of yesteryear that sin is the root of psychological problems, and that only God's inerrant Word is the final authority for faith and practice. The counseling which these scholars advocate is called "nouthetic" counseling.¹⁶⁵

These scholars reject therapies which (1) ignore man's sinful nature, or (2) promote self and claim that problems are the result solely of unmet needs, rather than sin. They recognize that medical science is a useful adjunct when practiced subject to biblical truth. They also reject humanist concepts such as, but not limited to, Rogers' concept of client autonomy, realizing that man's chief psychological need is to glorify God by enjoying Him forever.

These positions, of course, belong to the pre-humanist psychology which Wundt and Hall forced into oblivion for a time. **From the long view of history, however, it is Wundtian psychology which is the interloper - along with all of its offshoots including Rogerian "self-esteem" counseling.** In fact, secular schools are beginning to recognize that nouthetic counseling is a valid methodology. A course in Nouthetic Christian Counseling defines it as beginning "with two presuppositions: a) abnormal behavior is caused by sin, organic illness, or Satanic influence, and b) the Bible is God's authority for how we are to live."¹⁶⁶

There are also churches which continue to practice biblical counseling and evangelism, lovingly warning hearers that sin may rightly cause one not to "feel good," and that this sin problem can be resolved only by faith in Christ alone for salvation and by surrendering to His Lordship in daily life. Many of these churches are of the "independent" variety, but the Christian should carefully examine the evangelistic practices and doctrine of any church before committing to membership.

Notes (continued from Part 1)

⁹⁶ Lionni, p. 84. ⁹⁷ Rippa, pp. 240-241.

⁹⁸ H. Rugg, *An Introduction to American Civilization*, Ginn, 1929, p. x. This page lists some of the prominent staff whom Rugg supervised. Given the ideological connections of the educational establishment with the world of psychology, it should be no surprise that both establishments were now unified in curriculum revision. Incidentally, Ginn Publishing Company, now

Silver Burdett & Ginn, was founded by a Wundt protege in the late 1800s with the goal of implementing the new humanist psychology in its textbooks.

Though Rugg did not identify the overseers, he explicitly stated his view that they exist. In the context of discussing who would oversee the social studies curriculum, Rugg asked, "Who knows best what these great institutions, problems, and trends are? Specialists on the frontier of thought who see society from a height [i.e., those who literally oversee]." (Rugg, p. iv).

99 Lionni, p. 84, citing H. Rugg, *The Great Technology*, p. 271.

100 Lionni, p. 85, citing Rugg, *The Great Technology*, p. 258.

101 Rugg's vision should not be regarded as strange or extreme. The Bible predicts that eventually, the "god of this world" will attempt to cobble together a one world state; those not attuned to God's purposes have tended to fall in with this goal throughout history. No "new world order" plan has succeeded, and, as the Bible makes clear, none will, excepting the final kingdom established by the Lord Himself.

102 Rugg, *An Introduction to American Civilization*, p. iv.

103 S.G. Goodrich, *A Pictorial History of the United States*, J.H. Butler, Philadelphia, 1875, pp. 11-12. This was the history book my great grandfather used in the 1870s teaching in a one-room schoolhouse. In those pre-Rugg days, this was considered a "secular" text, and the one-room schoolhouse was a *public* school.

104 Jeremiah P. Shaloo, "Harry Elmer Barnes: Criminologist and Penal Historian *Malgri Lui*," in Arthur Goddard (editor), *Harry Elmer Barnes: Learned Crusader*, Ralph Myles, 1968, p. 468, citing H.E. Barnes, *The Story of Punishment*, Stratford, 1930, pp. 248-249.

Significantly, Barnes was a protege of G. Stanley Hall: "[Barnes] was most fortunate in finding a friend and counsellor in Granville Stanley Hall [at Clark University]" (Richard Dewey, "Harry Elmer Barnes' Contribution to the History of Social Thought," in Goddard, p. 399). Richard Dewey was son of John Dewey.

105 Rugg, *An Introduction to American Civilization*, pp. iv, v.

106 *ibid.*, pp. 4-10. **107** *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

108 Rippa, pp. 292-293. **109** Rippa, pp. 33. **110** Rippa, 38-39.

111 Long before Rugg, the Bible had taught that "God hath of one blood made all the nations of men" (Acts 17:26), showing that racism is wrong. Of course, this biblical teaching was omitted from Rugg's curricula.

112 Louis Gasper, "The Impact of Harry Elmer Barnes on American Educational Theory and Practice," in Goddard, pp. 623, 624.

113 Shaloo, in Goddard, p. 457, citing H.E. Barnes, *New Horizons in Criminology*, 1951, p. 294.

114 1 Tim. 3:15 does not say that the local church is the *origin* of truth. The origin of truth is the Word of God (John 17:17). 1 Tim. 3:15 focuses on the local church as the place where biblical truth finds a secure resting place and is supported or defended.

The Roman Church misinterprets 1 Tim. 3:15 to try to show that the Roman Church, not the Bible, is the originator of truth (Joel Peters, *Scripture Alone?: 21 Reasons to Reject Sola Scriptura*, TAN Books, 1999, pp. 15-16).

115 William Kilpatrick, *The Emperor's New Clothes: Psychological Fashions and Religious Faith*, Roger A. McCaffrey Publishing, 1998, pp. 107, 108, 110.

116 Kilpatrick, p. 112. Incidentally, though some insist that Freudianism is dead, the basic principles of Freudianism remain despite the dominance of Rogerianism. For example, the Freudian assumption continues that unsatisfied "animal" needs are the root of psychological problems. This false idea reinforces the conclusions of Rogerianism discussed later in the text.

117 Sutton, p. 81. Union Seminary was founded as a Presbyterian institution but by the time Hall and Rogers attended, it had been taken over by Unitarians. Union Seminary is across the street from Columbia University and Teachers College in New York City.

118 Kilpatrick, p. 139. Rogerianism has had other harmful effects in the educational system. For example, "Still very much alive in the schools is another derivative of Rogerian nonjudgmentalism: values clarification" (Kilpatrick, p. 134).

119 Jay E. Adams, *Competent to Counsel*, Zondervan, 1970, pp. 80-81.

120 Kilpatrick, p. 129. **121** Kilpatrick, pp. 17-20.

122 J. Adams, p. 78, citing "fundamentalist" Stanley E. Anderson, *Every Pastor a Counselor*, Van Kampen Press, 1949, p. 55.

123 J. Adams, p. 81, citing C. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, Houghton Mifflin, 1942, p. 127.

124 J. Adams, p. 78, citing Julian Hartt, *A Christian Critique of American Culture*, Harper and Row, 1967, p. 338.

125 J. Adams, pp. 99, 100.

126 J. Adams, pp. 84-85, citing Rollo May, *The Art of Counseling*, Abingdon, 1939, p. 176.

127 L. Crabb, *The Silence of Adam: Becoming Men of Courage in a World of Chaos*, Zondervan, 1995, pp. 32-33. It should be noted that Zondervan is no longer a conservative Christian publisher, but was bought out long ago by Harper & Row. It is now part of HarperCollins and publishes both liberal and conservative books as long as they are profitable.

128 J. McDowell, *His Image, My Image*, Here's Life Publishers, 1984, pp. 131-132.

129 McDowell, p. 134.

130 B. Narramore, *You're Someone Special*, Zondervan, 1981, p. 39.

131 Frank B. Minirth and Paul D. Meier, *Happiness Is a Choice*, Baker, 1986, pp. 51, 53.

132 C.G. Osborne, *The Art of Learning to Love Yourself*, Zondervan, 1980, p. 101. Erich Fromm was quoted above as saying that if human depravity exists, much of his own work would be baseless. Fromm viewed man as without sin, following Wundt and Hall.

133 J.C. Maxwell, *The Winning Attitude*, Thomas Nelson, 1993, p. 16.

134 Jonathan Edwards, *The Religious Affections*, Banner of Truth Trust, 1991, reprint of 1746 edition.

135 Pre-Wundt psychology texts began with biblical principles, not stories, e.g., Rivers, *op. cit.* The contrast with virtually any modern Rogerian Christian book (e.g., Crabb, *op. cit.*) is obvious.

136 Kilpatrick, p. 134.

137 J. Adams, p. 87, citing C. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, Houghton Mifflin, 1942, p. 37. Rogers himself cultivated the appearance of listening, but the image of patient neutrality disappeared when he was moved to disagree. Kilpatrick (p. 114) observed, "He is the picture of a kind and patient grandfather. He also has a habit of nodding his head up and down, up and down ever so slightly when someone else is talking, as if to say 'uh huh, uh huh, I'm listening intently to you. ...'" But "When talking or writing about those who let the past or traditional authority guide them, he will often step out of his nonjudgmental shoes" (Kilpatrick, p. 135).

138 J. Adams, pp. 90, 91-92. Kilpatrick (p. 117) records a Rogerian interchange with a questioner in a seminar that sounds the same:

Questioner: "I'm wondering about this question of humanistic approaches on the one hand and bureaucratic realities on the other. What's the gap, and how do you bridge the gap?"

Rogers: "How do you see that?"

Questioner: "That's why I asked you."

Rogers: "But you seem to have given a great deal of thought to this."

139 Carl Rogers held the same view of man. Rogers was not responsible for this view in the liberal churches, but by the 1930s his influence was immense, and served to strengthen this erroneous view which the liberal churches already held.

140 The "fundamentals" of the Christian faith include biblical doctrines such as (1) the divinity of Christ; (2) His virgin birth; (3) the shedding of His blood and His death on the cross; (4) His bodily resurrection from the dead; (5) the inspiration of the Bible; and (6) the infallibility of Scripture. Each of these doctrines affirms the power of Christ to save the soul eternally. Faith in Christ alone for personal salvation cannot be exercised if one consciously rejects these fundamental doctrines.

141 J.B. Collins, *When God Is In It*, Sermon and Song Publications, 2002, p. 110. It is appropriate to focus on Graham and his policies because he is universally recognized as having had influence exceeding that of any other modern evangelist. He has been affectionately called "the most famous preacher in the world" (Vernon McLellan, *Billy Graham: A Tribute from Friends*, Warner, 2003, p. 157), and "the most influential and beloved Protestant leader of our time" (McLellan, dust jacket).

142 Liberal churches have observed the positive influence of the Gospel on societal factors such as crime rates, delinquency, and family life. Though not believing in the Gospel itself, there can be little doubt that the social benefit explains the involvement of at least some liberal churches in the Graham crusades. This type of social concern is consistent with belief in the "social gospel" common to liberals.

143 Al Dager, "The World Christian Movement: Evangelism vs. Evangelization," *Media Spotlight*, Vol. 22 no. 2, April, 1999, p. 10.

144 Dager, p. 10, citing Ethel May Baldwin and David V. Benson, *Dream Big: The Henrietta Mears Story*, Regal Books, 1990, p. 304. Regal Books is a division of Gospel Light Publications which Mears founded.

145 Dager, p. 7. **146** Dager, p. 6.

147 Wendy Murray Zoba, "The Grandmother of Us All," *Christianity Today*, Vol. 40 no. 10, September 16, 1996, p. 44. From its beginnings, *Christianity Today* has been the voice of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association.

"Legion are the individuals who found Christ under Henrietta Mears' ministry, who entered into the charged atmosphere of dedication and service that she created at Hollywood's First Presbyterian Church and who went on to serve in positions of Christian leadership all around the world. They preach from hundreds of pulpits, serve in schools, speak over radio and television, lead choirs, direct Sunday Schools ... Most important, they are reproducing their kind wherever they go. ... The combined ministries of her spiritual children [continue] to the present" (Dager, p. 7, citing Baldwin and Benson, p. 224).

148 Dager, citing Baldwin and Benson, p. 121.

149 Dager, p. 6. **150** Dager, pp. 6, 7. **151** Dager, p. 6.

152 Dager, p. 7. **153** Dager, pp. 8-9.

154 History records many revivals resulting in a total stoppage of the worldly entertainment industries. Three examples are the Great Awakenings of the 1700s and 1800s in America, and the Welsh revival in England in 1905. After the Great Awakening of the 1700s, the average person lived a devout Christian

life; it has been estimated that 60% of the population of the thirteen colonies was genuinely saved at the onset of the Revolutionary War.

155 World War I, the "war to end all wars," had been one of the most destructive wars in history with 1 million dead. But sixty million perished in World War II!

156 Commentators have remarked that the 1950s were the most "Christian" decade in the twentieth century. The typical Hollywood movie gave at least a passing *mention of respect* to the Bible and Christianity.

157 Collins, pp. 109, p. 113. Collins adds: "... Yet all agreed that [Graham] preached the gospel of Christ and that many seemed to be saved in his meetings. ..."

"I have no doubt that Billy Graham was doing what he thought best. It surely increased the crowds and professions. However, from those days forward the popularity and name of the evangelist seemed to be more important to the people than the hand of God and giving God the glory. The blame cannot be laid at one man's feet. The people of our nation turned from being God-conscious to being man-conscious" (Collins pp. 109-110, 112).

158 Robert Schuller interview with Billy Graham, on Schuller's *Hour of Power*, June 8, 1997, in Al Dager, "The World Christian Movement - Part 2," *Media Spotlight*, Vol. 22 no. 2, August 1999, p. 11.

159 *ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

160 J.M. Beam, "I Can't Play God Any More," *McCall's*, January 1978, pp. 157-158.

161 Beam, p. 158.

162 Graham has led many to Christ, and also, arguably, many astray. Is Graham not a magnified version of every one of us - sometimes serving, but at other times opposing God's plan? So at the last day we all will have to say, "The Church is God's creation" - not man's! Christ builds His church despite human sin and folly (Matt. 16:18).

163 Dager, April 1999, p. 7, citing Baldwin and Benson, p. 77.

164 Scripture reveals that God works usually through men or women acting (humanly) alone, not through mass movements. The counter-example of Moses convening a board of counsellors (Ex. 18:13-26) is often cited positively as illustrating how Christian work must be done. Closer analysis reveals that the Bible does not condone Moses' action, but merely records it.

165 The National Association of Nouthetic Counsellors (NANC) is the primary organization representing this view.

166 Akamai University, 193 Kinoole St., Hilo, Hawaii 96720. This school describes its "sole mission" as "the advancement of the human condition and the sustainability of the planet." Thus Akamai University is not a Christian school. Its course in Nouthetic Christian Counseling labels the nouthetic approach one of four "major" counseling methodologies, along with the Freudian, Skinnerian, and Rogerian approaches.