



If you do not know this person, you should get to know him. He is your top Christian theologian and apologist in the world with over 50 books published.

Standing on the Cross: An Interview with Dr. Robert A. Morey. *Dr. Morey was interviewed by B.K. Campbell of The Christian Thinker*

Question: *Dr. Morey, we at The Christian Thinker do not believe that anti-intellectualism is exclusive to our time; we believe this obstacle must be overcome in every generation and in every culture. We believe this because man's nature is set against the "intellectual" truth of God. It is easier to distract the mind than it is to think with the mind. You have often referred to anti-intellectualism in your books. Perhaps, you can tell us why anti-intellectualism poses such a threat to the stability of the Church?*

Dr. Morey: Theologians and philosophers used common words and phrases, the meaning of which depends on how each individual author defines those words. The term "anti-intellectualism" is a good example of how a phrase can have different meanings.

To the rationalist, anyone who holds to the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura* is "anti-intellectual" in the sense that Scripture is placed above the human intellect, i.e. above human reason. Anyone who believes that the Bible is the final authority in all matters of faith and morals is "anti-intellectual" in this sense.

When a rationalist wants to dismiss Christian thinkers like Schaeffer or Van Til, he will hurl the term "anti-intellectual" as an *ad hominem* slur on their character. Thus the phrase "anti-intellectual" is often used in an emotive sense as a way to dismiss a theologian with the wave of the hand. While it is a cheap shot, it does avoid having to deal with the arguments of your opponents.

On the other hand, those who look to God as the Origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty, view rationalism as "anti-

intellectual” in that absolute truth and morals are not possible if you make man’s intellect (i.e. reason) the Origin and Measure of all things. If you begin with yourself, you will eventually fall into the abyss of the unrelated and quagmire of relativism.

One of the themes of Jonathan Edwards’ Great Awakening was the insufficiency of human reason and general revelation. [1] When Princeton Seminary was established, in his inaugural speech, Archibald Alexander argued against the exaltation of human reason above the authority of Scripture.

“We must unequivocally deny to reason the high office of deciding at her bar what doctrines of Scriptures are to be received and what not.”[2]

Instead of bowing before the idol of reason, Alexander stressed that we must,

“insist that all opinions, pretensions, experiences, and practices must be judged by the standard of the Word of God.”[3]

In his speech, Alexander stated that the two greatest threats he saw in his day to the church were rationalism and mysticism. The Bible was the final answer to both errors.

Today, once again, the errors of rationalism and mysticism dominate the Evangelical and liberal theological landscape. Be it the rationalism of William Lane Craig or the mysticism of James Taylor, either road does not lead to the one true God who has spoken in Scripture.

Rationalism cannot justify its own validity on the basis of human reason because one man’s reason is another man’s idiocy. What is or is not “intellectual” is more *psychological* than philosophical. You may “feel” a certain doctrine is “intellectual” in the morning, but, by

Noon, “feel” it is “anti-intellectual.”

Rationalism has generated the seeker-church movement, the emergent and emerging church heresies, the Open View of God, the New Exodus, the New Perspective, and a host of other plagues that have harmed the Body of Christ. The root problems are rebellion against the authority of Scripture and *reasonolatry*. Pro. 3:5-6 warns us “do not lean on your own understanding.” Instead, we should lean on divine revelation.

The consistent theist views the human “intellect” as the gift of God which He created to *receive* truth and morals from the Creator. Man was not created to be a truth-maker or a morals-maker because he is not the Origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning or beauty. God is the Origin and Measure of all things. Thus to be truly “intellectual” is to submit to divine revelation.

The other error that faces us today is mysticism. Instead of looking within themselves to their intellect, the mystic looks within himself to his feelings (i.e. “heart”) to tell him right from wrong and truth from error. Scripture tells us that the heart is continually evil (Gen. 6:5) and “out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, and slanders” (Mat.15:19). Pro. 28:26 warns us that only a fool would trust his heart to tell him truth and morals.

Mysticism has produced the madness seen on TBN, which we have nicked named “The Babylonian Network.” The “health and wealth” prosperity movement’s extravagant claims of healings, revivals, resurrections, gold fillings, limb replacements, holy laughter, vomiting, dancing, visions, dreams, 90 ft. Jesus, and tongue speaking have made “Christianity” a subject of derision on Saturday Night Live! Positive thinking, positive confession, blab it/grab it, contemplative prayer, imaging, inner godhood, and other New Age ideas have filled stadiums and hell.

To the theist, it is the rationalist and the mystic who are guilty of “anti-intellectualism” in that by beginning only from themselves, with themselves, and by themselves, they have destroyed any hope of ever finding truth, justice, morals, meaning or beauty. The Apostle Paul put it this way, “Let God be true even if it means that every man is a liar.”(Rom. 3:4)

Question: *I find your perspective on anti-intellectualism most compelling. Where most would be inclined to refer to anti-intellectualism as merely a mystical and emotional threat, you have touched on the reality of another kind of anti-intellectualism (one not as easily seen); the anti-intellectualism of the rationalist who hides behind the appearance of truth and logical consistency. And yet, he is so man-centered in his thinking that he refuses to think Biblically. If ideas do not conform to his self-ascribed theory of knowledge then [for him] they cannot be true; scripture is judged at the bar of human reason. So, if I have understood you correctly, then you are saying, that reason must always be subject to scripture?*

Dr. Morey: It is important to begin by noting that the biblical Hebrew and Greek languages do not have a noun that is equivalent to our English noun “reason” because there was a different anthropology (i.e. view of man) in the Bible that has nothing to do with the modern Western European Renaissance view of man.

Our modern English word “reason” is a noun that refers to an idealized and romanticized faculty within man that is infallibly capable of discovering truth and morals apart from and independent of God and His Law/Word. It is loaded with philosophical baggage that grew and developed with the twists and turns of Western European philosophy. The science of hermeneutics warns us not to take such modern ideas and insert them into the ancient Jewish Scriptures.

The Rationalists during the Renaissance looked within themselves and abstracted and absolutized the ability of man to string ideas together in such a way that one idea seemed to lead to another idea until we come to a conclusion. The rules/laws of what was or was not a valid string of ideas came from Aristotle via Aquinas. The validity of these rules/laws was not questioned until recent times, which is why there are now non-Aristotelian rules/laws.

These rules/laws sometimes contradict each other or are self-refuting. For example, one rule says that all appeals to authority as the basis of truth or morals are invalid. Yet, if you ask on what basis is that rule itself valid, it is based on the authority of Aristotle!

The Renaissance Rationalists capitalized the letter “r” in “reason” and changed it to “Reason.” The capital “R” emphasized that they viewed human “Reason” as the Origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty. Using the error of reductionism, they reduced all knowledge to what was obtainable through thinking as opposed to any knowledge coming from experience or feelings. They assumed that reality must conform to what they thought it to be because the real was the rational and the rational was the real.

When explorers returned from Australia for the first time, they described an animal that had a bill like a duck, fur like a beaver, claws like a bird, lived in water, laid eggs, and yet was a mammal. The Rationalist pronounced that such a creature could not exist. When later explorers brought back the skins of these animals, they were denounced as clumsy frauds created by sewing together body parts of several different animals. Only after a live duckbilled platypus was taken back to Europe did the Rationalists finally admit that such a strange creature existed.

Reasonolatry reached its climax during the French Revolution when

an actress was carried into the Notre Dame Cathedral and enshrined as the goddess of Reason. Everything must conform to the demands of the goddess of “Reason.” Everyone (including God) must stand before her judicial Bar and she alone decided right from wrong, good from evil, truth from error, the ugly from the beautiful, etc.

The authors of the Bible never heard of the Renaissance concept of “Reason.” Their view of man was different. Man’s thinking about things was not absolutized into some “thing” that existed within man. Faculty psychology, in which man is divided into reason, experience, and feelings, is a modern Western philosophic concept that was unknown to the biblical authors.

In the Bible, man “reasoned,” i.e. thought and argued about things, but he did not have a “Reason” *per se*. This is why the verb “reasoning” has parallels in both biblical Hebrew and Greek but there is no noun that refers to what the High Renaissance called human “Reason.” Thus the prophets and apostle never referred to the “demands of Reason,” the “bar of Reason,” etc. and never claimed that their ideas were “reasonable” or “rational,” i.e. in line with what Renaissance man thought was true and good.

When I am asked, “Is Scripture above Reason or Reason above Scripture,” I begin by saying that the question assumes there is such a thing as “Reason.” Now, I can pick up the Bible and hold it in my hand. Thus I know it exists. But I cannot hold “Reason” in my hand because it does *not* exist. It is a mere figure of speech or metaphor for man’s limited, fallible, and often mistaken attempt to string ideas together in order to arrive at a valid conclusion.

But stringing ideas together according to someone’s rules/laws does not mean that you will always end with truth. Something that is correct twice a day is to be preferred to something that is never correct. Does that sound “reasonable” to you? That proposition meets

Aristotle's rules/laws. But this means that a stopped watch is to be preferred to a watch that runs a minute slow or fast! The rules/laws that Aristotle set up would have you wearing a stopped watch!

Having taught both high school and college students, I do not have any romantic ideas that all men and women have an infallible thing inside of them called "Reason" that enables them to discover truth and morals. IQs differ and, be it math or logic; most students struggle to get it right. While I believe in reasoning, I do not believe in "Reason."

The Renaissance concept of Reason led to the rise of Rationalism. But it collapsed as a philosophy because it could not justify itself according to its own rules/laws. While Rationalism no longer exists as a viable philosophy in Western thought, its language, such as the "demands of reason" and the "bar of reason," etc. still haunt the halls of academia as the ghosts of a long dead European epistemology.

God, not man, is the Origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty. The biblical view of God, the world, and man is absolute and infallible. God is there and He has not been silent. He has spoken in the Written and Living Word. If we begin with God, we will end with truth and morals. But, as the book of Ecclesiastes demonstrates, if you begin only with yourself, by yourself, and from yourself, you will end in "meaningless, meaningless, utter meaningless."

Question: *Dr. Morey, your answer touches on an important point, the fact that we should not merely assume definitions outside the context of scripture. As Christians we have a set of presuppositions, which should ultimately determine the outcome of our definitions. It is not enough to simply speak of "reason" as an abstraction, but we must define what reason is. Indeed, we must always define what we mean when we use a word to explain a concept. This brings us to the idea of the non-believer's linguistic construction; can he or she really find objective meaning in words if those words are founded on a*

“blank” conception of reason? Is it possible for the non-Christian to defend the authority of his or her definitions? And after all, isn’t every theoretical position dependent upon the authority and sustainability of the words which make up that system?

Dr. Morey:

A. We must remember that “words” are only linguistic symbols used to express ideas. The symbols change from language to language because they are relative to time, culture, religion, and worldview. Thus “Dios” in Spanish or “God” in English are different symbols but each refers to the same idea. Thus systems are not built on “words” *per se* but on the ideas those symbols express. “Words” are not objective but relative to the speaker or writer. For example the word “is” can have fourteen different meanings.

B. All systems (theological, philosophical, scientific, mathematical, etc.) begin by assuming certain ideas are true. These ideas are called “foundational truths,” “axioms,” “first principles,” or “givens.” A “system” is a chain of ideas that is supposedly derived from or deduced from the foundational ideas when applied to various issues. But not all systems are created equal. Some are good, some bad, and far too many are ugly.

C. Some systems are inconsistent and include ideas in the chain that contradict the foundational ideas. For example, Joe assumes that evolution is a fact and that man is only an animal. But he also believes in human rights, equal rights, women’s rights, etc. But, if man is only a primate, he cannot have any rights beyond that of any other animal. This is why Skinner wrote *Beyond Freedom & Dignity*. Given his foundational ideas, a consistent humanist cannot believe in “man” any more than he can believe in God. Man died the day God died.

D. It does not matter if someone responds that he does not believe in presuppositions. He has just given you his presupposition!

E. The Christian should derive his foundational ideas from the Bible - not the world (Rom. 12:1-2). It is not hard to see what they are. Genesis chapters one through three give us the three ideas that the authors of Scripture use throughout the rest of the Bible to interpret all of life.

1. Creation *ex nihilo*,
2. The radical Fall of man into sin and guilt,
3. Redemption by grace.

F. These three foundational ideas form the basis of the biblical worldview. From Genesis to Revelation these three ideas are brought up over and over again as the basis of, or rationale of, this or that doctrine. For example,

a. In terms of Creation, because all people are created in the image of God, all people have dignity and worth. Man is not junk.

b. In terms of the Fall, the universality and inevitability of sin is the result of the imputation of the sin and guilt of Adam's sin to all his posterity. All have sinned and all are falling short of the glory of God.

c. In terms of Redemption, the Father designed and initiated a plan of salvation for sinful man through the vicarious blood atonement of His Son in which He could be just and the justifier of those who believe in Jesus. Salvation is by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone, according to Scripture alone.

G. The non-Christian has his own presuppositions or foundational ideas. In order for a Christian to challenge the unbeliever's belief system, the Christian must look beyond surface ideas to the

foundational ideas such as Monism, rationalism, evolution, etc. We need to lay the axe against the roots of unbelief instead of picking its leaves. As long as the roots survive, the leaves will grow back.

H. Someone can be a “Christian” in his “heart,” but humanistic in his “head,” i.e. his worldview is humanistic. This happens when a professing Christian has foundational pagan ideas. For example, many “Christians” assume the humanistic dichotomies of mind/matter, form/essence, nature/grace, nature/freedom, etc, when they believe in the secular/sacred dichotomy. For example, art is divided into sacred art and secular art. But all of life is sacred according to Scripture (1 Cor. 10:30). The Lordship of Christ is over all of life. There is no “secular” realm of life where God is absent.

I. Christians must become epistemologically self-conscious of their foundational ideas and bring them into conformity with Creation, Fall, and Redemption.

Question: *Dr. Morey, the role of scripture is, no doubt, central to your method. What does it mean to believe and apply the authority of scripture? And, if you would be so kind as to explain, why is this authority superior to all other authorities?*

Dr. Morey: The definition of the word “authority” is the first task before us. For something or someone to function as an “authority” over you means that the thing or person is “greater” than you in some sense. The “lesser” must always bow before the “greater.” Second, we must make the distinction between “power” and “authority.” Someone may have power over you but no authority to exercise such power. For example, a rapist may have the power to violate you sexually because he has a gun to your head. But, he has no authority to have sex with you. The state has God-given authority to levy just taxes but no God-given authority to steal from you by unjust

taxation. You have to have God-given authority to exercise power.

Third, there are different spheres of authority. God ordained the state, the family, and the church as three sovereign spheres, each with its own set of delegated duties and the divine authority to fulfill those duties.

The spheres overlap in a few places. For example, my son is a citizen, my child, and a member of my church. The state has the duty and authority to protect his life and health. Thus I cannot, as his father or as his pastor, put him to death. But the state cannot interfere with my duties as a father or as a pastor. Thus I have the God-given right to educate my son in the ways of the Lord, and I have the God-given right to discipline him as a church member if he falls into heresy or immorality.

But one sphere must not usurp the authority of the other spheres. The state cannot usurp the spheres of the family or the church. Thus the state has no God-given authority to tell fathers or pastors to contradict their duties as given in Scripture. When the state told Peter what to preach, he refused to submit to the state (Acts 4:19-20). The church has no authority from God to control the government or the family. The family has no divine authority to take over the state or the church.

1. The State: The state has God-given “authority” (i.e. legal power) to tell you what to do and not to do in all matters pertaining to the common good. It does not require you to respect, love or even like government authorities. While we respect the office, we may despise the man or woman who holds it.

a. The state has the authority (i.e. legal power) to make laws and levy taxes on you. The state can set the speed limit and require all kinds of permits.

b. The military officer whose rank is above your rank has authority (i.e. legal power) over you. This means that he can order you to do things that he feels are necessary. He has the power and the authority to send you into harm's way. It is not necessary for you to even like your superior officer. You simply have to obey his orders.

c. The police have the power and the authority to order you to do things. When the police tell you to stop, you acknowledge their authority by stopping.

d. Judges and the courts have “authority,” i.e. power over you. They can send you to jail and even put you to death.

e. In the area of state education, someone is an “authority” if he is your teacher and you are his student; if he has higher degrees in the area than you; if his peers acknowledge him as the expert on the issue. The student should acknowledge the authority of his teacher by doing what he says in terms of papers, projects, tests, etc.

f. Your employer or supervisor at work has “authority” over you. They can hire or fire you. They tell you the work you are to do.

2. The Family: In marriage, the husband is the head of his home. Thus he has God-given authority over his wife and children. The parents have God-given authority over their children. We reject the heresy that the state owns our children. They are given to us as a stewardship to raise in the fear and admonition of the Lord and we will be held responsible for this task on the Day of judgment.

3. The Church:

a. First, councils, creeds, confessions, theologians, constitutions and bylaws, ecclesiastical courts, denominational leaders, church

discipline, pastoral decisions, official resource works, etc. have God-given authority to rule over the doctrines and morals of the members of said church. The pastor/elders are “over” the members and the members are to obey and to submit to their doctrine and discipline (Heb. 13:17). Members are to highly respect them in love for their work’s sake (1 Thess. 5:12-13).

b. Second, the Reformation doctrine of *sola scriptura* says the Bible is the *final* authority in all matters of faith and practice in the sense that it is the *last* court of appeal and the *final* judge of truth and morals. We do not believe in *solo scriptura* but *sola scripture*.

c. Third, this means that, while we acknowledge *lesser* “authorities” in the church (i.e. its councils, *creeds*, *confessions*, *constitution* and bylaws, past and present noted theologians, church history, standard reference works, elders, pastors, etc.), the Bible is the *greatest* authority and it *alone* is the *final* test of truth and morals. When a church contradicts the clear teaching of Scripture it is apostate and becomes a false church.

d. Lastly, while we acknowledge the God-given authority of the state, the family, and the church to function according to their respective spheres, the authority of Scripture is absolute above all three spheres because it is the verbal, plenary, inspired, infallible, inerrant, written word of God. *What Scripture says is what God says* (Rom. 9:17, 25; 10:11; 11:2; 15:10). Scripture does not change and is unaffected by contemporary cultural or philosophical trends. It is the rock on which we stand and the beginning and end of what we believe and how we live.

Question: *Dr. Morey, what do you think about compromise? More specifically, when should we as Christian’s compromise? I mean, haven’t many believers been wounded by the “politically correct” Christian who is afraid to offend or stand against the grain and*

atmosphere of the world? Haven't many Christians been wounded, by those who profess faith in Christ, but refuse to stand for Christ?

Dr. Morey: What do I think about compromising truth or morals? To compromise truth or morals is a betrayal of the Lordship of Christ. It is sheer wickedness and high treason against the King of glory.

Today, personal peace and affluence has tempted many theologians and pastors to compromise truth and morals. The applause of the world, the riches of Egypt, and the pleasures of sin for a season have corrupted many. The lust for popularity, friendship with the world, and the fear of rejection has stumbled many. The way of the cross is hard and few there be that take that road today.

A well-known seminary professor came to my home and offered me the position of Head of their practical theology department. They particularly wanted me to set up an Islamic Studies Department to handle the cults and the occult. The only fly in the ointment was that I had to sign a statement that I believed in a certain prophetic doctrine that was in their statement of faith. Faculty members had to sign it each year. When I pointed out that I could not sign the statement in good faith, they were surprised. The professor explained that he did not believe the doctrine either but signed anyway. I objected that this is the game played by liberals. He looked at me and said, “Morey, if you don’t compromise, you will never succeed.” I replied, “I would rather be a failure in the eyes of man, and pastor a small church, than compromise my faith by signing something I did not believe.”

The true child of God is a soldier of Christ who announces to one and all, “I will not retreat; I will not sell out; I will not back down; I will not compromise; but I will fight on in the service of my King until He calls me home. To this end, I will run the race set me before me looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of my faith.”

Question: *Dr. Morey, you mentioned Islam, and this brings me to another point. Many readers will be familiar with your book [Islamic Invasion](#)- I find it interesting that you wrote about the threat of Islam long before it had been recognized. I wonder if you might tell us what you see as the historical threat of Islam- the threat that Islam always presents to a civilization?*

Dr. Morey: We are witnessing what is historically called a “people movement.” It happened to Europe once before when millions of Muslims moved into Europe and turned churches into Mosques. If you remember your history, Islam took over Eastern Europe and Southern Spain. If you do not know what I am talking about, you must read [Jihad in the West: Muslim Conquests from the 7th to the 21st Centuries](#) by Paul Fregosi.

How did Europe solve the problem of the massive immigration of Muslims into their lands? They went to war and forced them out by the sword. The kings and queens of England, France, Spain, Austria, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Transylvania, Hungary, Greece, etc. did not stop the forceful ejection of Muslims until all of Europe was free of Islam. The Muslims were forced back to Africa and Turkey.

Gleason Archer and I teamed up and wrote a book on the issue and we agreed that unless the politicians do not stop *all* legal and illegal immigration of Muslims, it is only a matter of time before Islam becomes the majority religion and Sharia law displaces Western law. Freedom of religion and all other freedoms will be gone. By the year 2050, Europe will become at least 50% Muslim and, some say, 60%.

I do not believe that the present politicians of Europe, Canada, America, South America, Australia, and Sub-Sahara Africa have the will or the courage to forcibly expel millions of Muslims from their countries. The election of Obama has emboldened terrorists around

the world. The insanity of political correctness is destroying the last vestiges of our Christian heritage. The legalization of gay marriage will lead to the legalization of Muslim polygamy. We are witnessing the death of the West with our own eyes.

This issue is intensely personal to me. My speaking against Islam and warning about Jihad has led to a terrorist attempt on my life, being put on a death list by Hamas, and the Pakistani secret police infiltrating my ministry in the attempt to get me to visit Pakistan - where I was to be killed. Thankfully, the FBI warned me in time to prevent my murder.

The seminary in Pakistan, which honored me with a D.D. in Islamic Studies, was taken over at gunpoint and the Board and faculty thrown out. The government put in Muslim sympathizers who first denied that the degree had been given. But pictures of the ceremonies with Carl Macintyre being present refuted that lie. The Pakistani Christian community still stands with me against the terrorists who stole the seminary.

The Christian world has yet to understand the threat we face. Seminaries are not training pastors to deal with Islam. Bible colleges do not have courses on Islam and how to convert Muslims. The church is asleep while Islam is growing.

I had the opportunity to discuss this issue with Patrick J. Buchanan after his book [*The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization*](#), was published. I gave him [*Islamic Invasion and Winning the War Against Radical Islam*](#). He was surprised that I had written on Islam's threat to Western Civilization in the 1980's. He appreciated my documentation that Allah was originally the pagan Arabian Moon god, al-ilah. We both agreed that Europe is doomed. I also interviewed Bat Ye'Or who wrote [*Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis*](#). She also felt that Europe is

doomed.

I attended a high security “invitation only” meeting on Islamic Terrorism with government and private experts on terrorism. I was honored by several attendees as one of the few scholars who warned about this in the 1980’s. An FBI agent congratulated me on exposing several important terrorists who were either arrested or deported. I told them, “I am thankful that you guys are now getting the death threats that I use to get all the time. Since I am no longer alone in sounding the warning of terrorism, the Muslims no longer concentrate just on me. Thanks.”

The only thing that can save us now is a New Reformation. To this end I have been laboring night and day for almost forty years. I will continue to fight Islam and promote a New Reformation until my last breath. The first Reformation took place when Islam invaded the West. May God grant us another Reformation as we face another Muslim invasion.

Question: *Dr. Morey I was somewhat aware of your Islamic persecution for taking a stand, and have always had a deep respect for your work and courage. I don’t think people quite understand just how easy it is to be targeted by Islamic extremists. My prayers are with you, in that I hope the Christian community catches onto this great threat. What can you tell those Christians who are afraid to confront Islam? What can you tell future generation who may face the greater force of this threat?*

Dr. Morey: Many years ago, Dr. John Frame encouraged me to write a book on the fear of God. It took me ten years to do so as there were more pressing issues to address. But the book [*Fearing God*](#) was finally published. It analyzes all the Hebrew and Greek words for “fear” and exegetes all the pertinent passages where “fear” is found in Scripture.

Several key passages come to mind in answer to your question:

1. God commands us not to panic when the wicked threaten to assault us.

Do not be afraid of sudden fear, nor of the onslaught of the wicked when it comes (Pro. 3:25)

2. If you let the fear of man control you, it will bring you into spiritual bondage just as surely as the cords of a snare entangle a bird.

The fear of man brings a snare (Pro. 29:25)

3. The first antidote to the poison of the fear of man is to trust in God. The word “trust” means to place your ultimate confidence and hope in the Lord and to rest in that confidence that He knows what is best for you and your family. The sovereignty of God is the rock on which the child of God stands. Solomon goes on in Pro. 29:25 (via Hebrew parallelism) to say, *but he who trusts in YHWH will be exalted.*

4. The second antidote to the poison of the fear of man is the fear of God. To the degree you fear God is to the degree you will not fear man. The smile of God must be more important to you than the frown of man. Jesus warned us, And I say to you,

“My friends, do not be afraid of those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom to fear: fear the One who after He has killed has authority to cast into hell; yes, I tell you, fear Him!” (Lk. 12:4-5)

5. As I document in Fearing God, the triumph of the Transcendental Movement in New England during the 19th

century led to the feminization of American Christianity.

-- God was feminized by denying the doctrine of hell. Thus there was nothing about God that we should fear him. The love of God excluded the fear of God.

-- Jesus was feminized by depicting him as an effeminate white male with a pale complexion and womanly hair. He was so “sweet” that he would never harm a fly. He would never throw anyone into hell and there was nothing to fear from him.

-- Hymns were feminized by sentimental unmarried women hymn writers who used erotic imagery and language to describe their relationship to Jesus. They sang of “falling in love” with Jesus, resting in his arms or bosom, Jesus was their “lover,” etc. Sticky sweet love songs to Jesus could just as easily be sung to your sexual lover. “You light up my life” is a modern example of “hymns” that are erotic in nature.

-- The clergy was feminized. Preaching hell fire and damnation sermons was frowned upon. People were not rebuked for sin or warned of hell. Pastors were reduced to reading poetry at the Ladies afternoon tea. Laws were passed forbidding pastors from holding public office or fighting in the military. Manly pastors who dared to discipline sinners in the congregation were slandered as “mean” and “unloving.” “Meekness” was interpreted to mean weakness.

-- Christian men were feminized by the heresy of passivism. They were told that they could not be a policeman or a soldier because Christians were forbidden to use physical violence. Evangelicals resigned from the police force and handed it over to the Irish whose Catholicism did not condemn the use of force. Hunting, boxing, and other manly arts were frowned upon as unchristian. Men were told that Christians could not defend themselves even when assaulted!

The reason I give this historical survey of the feminization of Christianity is that it gives us the context that explains why modern pastors and laymen refuse to confront Muslims. One pastor told me, “Morey, you’re crazy for getting the Muslims upset. They will kill you and your family. I would shut up if I were you.”

For years only Anise Shorrosh and I did public debates with Muslim apologists. Attempts were made on our lives. Acid was thrown at our cars. We had to travel under false names. We were threatened with death. One Muslim even wrote a book in which he said, “Dr. Morey, are you ready to die for your faith in Jesus Christ?” The FBI and the police had to be called upon at times to protect us. But we feared God more than we feared the Muslims. They could only kill the body but could not harm our souls.

Modern feminized Evanjellyfish are afraid of death because they do not believe in the absolute sovereignty of God, the doctrines of sovereign grace that flow from that grand truth, and thus they fear man more than they fear God. This is why the Evangelical world has fallen to pieces. No one is bold enough to stand up for King Jesus and go toe to toe in battle over the truth as it is in Jesus. Compromise and cowardliness are the rule of the day.

This is why the book I just finished writing, [Natural Law and Natural Theology](#), will be condemned as politically incorrect because I dare to call heresy *heresy* and name the heretics who are denying *sola scriptura* and promoting *sola ratiōne*. The dunghill idol of *Reasonalotry* is rebuked and God’s Word is exalted. It is bold, blunt, and confrontational.

I know ahead of time that many will ignore my arguments against naturalism, and *ad hominem* attacks will be made against me personally. But this is how Job, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jesus, the

apostles, the Reformers, Spurgeon, etc. were attacked. But I trust in the Living God, whom I serve day and night, that He will give me the grace to endure whatever the world or the apostate church throws against me. The smile of God is more important to me than their frown.

Question: *Dr. Morey it would be a shame to conclude our interview without finding out about your study habits. In your book "[Practical Christianity](#)" you tackle just about every major and controversial issue of the Christian life- this includes thought as well as practice. Your answers are intelligent and well researched. How do you proceed when you set out to write a book?*

Dr. Morey: The gifts and calling of God often go hand in hand. Because my family moved every year of my early life and I went to six different elementary schools, three different junior highs, and two different high schools, I excelled in academics instead of sports. I was an “egg head” with pens and a slide rule in his shirt pocket and not “cool” at all. Teachers made me their “pet” because they could always count upon me to answer their questions if no other student would or could.

In the 10th grade three things happened. I rated 3rd year college level in reading and comprehension; I was chosen by **Yale University** to be part of their S.M.S.G. advanced mathematics program; and I “found grace in the eyes of the Lord.”

My father was an agnostic when sober and an atheist when drunk. He was horrified that I had become a Christian and told me that if I did not renounce religion, he would throw me out of the house. Thus at the age of 16, I packed my bags and left home. I had to choose between my family or Jesus. I chose Jesus.

Being raised a skeptic made me question the evangelical world. I was thrown out of Columbia Bible College for the sin of intellectualism and for asking too many questions. When Professor Sanders claimed in class that he had lived without sin for two years, I raised my hand and asked, “May I talk with your wife?” When he asked why I wanted to talk with his wife, I said, “If you have sinned in the last two years, she will know.” He became furious, turned bright red, and yelled, “You are not allowed to talk with my wife.” He was the one who pushed for me to be thrown out.

I found that my questions were not answered at CBC and I was castigated for merely asking them. I began to doubt Christianity, as no one could or would answer my questions. There were four men who literally saved me from going liberal: Walter Martin, Gordon Clark, Francis Schaeffer, and Cornelius Van Til. These men took the time to answer my questions and did not put me down for asking them. They became my heroes and role models.

Of my four mentors, Francis Schaeffer was the best. Edith made my wife and me feel at home at L’Abri in Switzerland. She sent me out to pick snails off the trees and out of her garden so she could cook them. There was a wonderful retired opera star that was staying there. I will never forget Schaeffer assuring me with tears in his eyes that it was not wrong to ask questions. True humility is to acknowledge that all good in you and all the good done by you, you owe to God and to others.

The study habits of my heroes were such that they did not stop researching an issue until they had the answer. They were all prolific writers and worked day and night to defend the faith. My *modus operandi* is as follows.

Step 1

I fly to Washington, D.C. and read everything in the Library of Congress on a given subject. This is why it takes around two to three years to produce a major works such [*Death and the After Life*](#), [*Islamic Invasion*](#), [*Battle of the Gods*](#), [*The Trinity*](#), etc. I do not stop until there is nothing more to read on the subject.

Step 2

I organize the research material into files. For example, all the photocopies on Arianism would be placed in its own file folder.

Step 3

Once all the research has been filed, I work on an outline that is pedagogically arranged in such a way that each chapter naturally leads to the next chapter. You cannot understand chapter three unless you first understand chapters one and two. Thus the chapters interrelate and work in unison driving the reader to the conclusion.

Step 4

Once the chapters are “mind- mapped,” I get up around 4:00 AM each morning and begin writing. I use the files to plug in the citations I gleaned from the Library of Congress. It takes around one or two years to write the manuscript, depending on the size of the book. My new book, refuting [*Natural Law and Natural Theology*](#), took me two years of research and two years of writing. It is around 500 pages in length. One chapter is over 65 pages and has 148 footnotes with multiple references cited in each note.

Step 5

I rewrite and edit the manuscript three times and then give it to several scholars to proof read. Once I have all their suggestions and

corrections, I rewrite it one last time.

Step 6

The finished manuscript is handed to the publisher for them to format, add indexes, and prepare for publishing.

Several men have accompanied me to the Library of Congress to learn how to research a topic. I am sad to say that they got tired by the third day and quit. They could not take the unceasing grind of research. But I love it.

Question: *Dr. Morey, what advice do you have to give to those of us who believe in asking questions; to those of us who believe that the life of the mind is important, who believe that we must defend the faith and witness for Christ at all costs. What can you share with future generations of the Church? How can we fight for truths survival?*

Dr. Morey: After Walter Martin died, I was asked to speak in his place at a major apologetic conference in Rockford, IL. The title of my lecture was, “[*The Cost of Discernment*](#).” It has proven to be very popular for those who have been attacked for asking questions and defending the Faith.

1. There is a personal cost. Truth becomes all consuming, and the most important thing in your life. You cannot simply accept what people say without checking it out.
2. There is a family cost. Your wife, husband, parents or children will attack you. They will tell you that you need to be more “positive” and “accepting.”
3. There is a financial cost. You will spend countless thousands of

dollars on books, references works, DVDs, CDs, etc. in your pursuit of the truth.

4. There is a friendship cost. Friends will desert you because you are too “negative.”

5. There is a church cost. You will find it hard if not impossible to find a church that shares your love of apologetics. Many pastors will not like you and may view you as a troublemaker. They will pray and hope that you will move on to another church. They value money, buildings, and numbers while you value truth, justice, and righteousness.

6. There is a reputation cost. You will be maligned, slandered, and put down as mean, nasty, unloving, unkind, etc. You get tired of fighting the good fight.

7. There is a professional cost. Since you will not compromise; call good evil and evil good; are bold to condemn heresy; name names; and warn people against false popular false teachers, you will not be hired at most seminaries or called to pastor big churches.

8. There is a spiritual cost. Your spirit will be grieved over all the heresy being taught today. You are tempted to become depressed and discouraged. You live in an age where truth is not valued. No one seems to understand why you care about truth and holiness.

Thankfully, the godly have always faced this same situation: We are,

“Afflicted in every way, but not crushed; perplexed, but not despairing; persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed.” (2 Cor. 4:8-9)

We must keep in mind 1 Cor. 15:58,

“Therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your toil is not in vain in the Lord.”

The smile of God is all you need to endure the frown of man.

Footnotes-----

[1] Thabiti M. Anayabwile, *The Decline of African American Theology*, (Downers Grove: IVP, 2007),
ibid, p. 24.

[2] Archibald Alexander, *A Sermon Delivered at the Opening of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States May 1808*.

[3] Ibid.

Soli Deo Glori

Dr. Robert A. Morey

www.faithdefenders.com