

A HOUSE OF CARDS

The Absurdity of Postmodernism

Common truth is common sense.

Review

In this series, we are learning to take every thought captive to the obedience of Christ, which means that we filter every idea, philosophy, or cultural movement through the Scriptures. We either take those ideas captive, as Paul said, or they will take us captive. Christians who are thinking biblically should not think like the world on most issues, because the world’s view is typically the opposite of a biblical view.

So far, we’ve learned that *everyone has a worldview*. What one believes about God (theology) affects his view of everything else. Orthodoxy leads to orthopraxy, meaning right doctrine leads to right practice. The opposite is also true, that *wrong doctrine leads to wrong practice*. True wisdom begins with a knowledge and fear of God, but foolishness begins when God is eliminated from the equation. We likened the rejection of God to opening Pandora’s Box, which leads to a worldview disaster.

Also, in the third session, we previewed five other worldviews – Secular Humanism, Cosmic Humanism, Postmodernism, Marxism/Communism, and Islam. Then, we focused on the evil side effects of Darwinism and Secular Humanism. We even read some of the tenets of the *Humanist Manifesto*, and we discovered that a nation that forgets God will produce a culture of death. Remember Solomon’s warning? “There is a way that seems right to men, but it only leads to death” (*Prov. 14:12*).

In this session, we will continue to investigate the attack of the “isms,” primarily looking at relativism -- the secular humanist view of truth and morality -- and our nation’s experiment with postmodernism. America’s biblical values have all but disappeared as we have embraced the belief that anything goes. What will become of a nation that holds to this philosophy? What is the biblical view of truth and morality, and why is our view the most sound for society?

Postmodernism

Before we consider the issue of morality, we must first nail down the views and values of Postmodernism. But trying to grasp this whacky worldview is like nailing Jell-O to the wall. It’s nearly impossible.

First, let’s start with truth. What is truth? Noah Webster defined truth as “conformity to fact or reality” (*1828 Dictionary*). In other words, a truth claim or belief aligns with what is real. If someone says, “It is snowing outside,” then we should be able to go outside and verify that it is snowing. If it is indeed snowing, then that would be a true statement, because the statement conformed to reality.

Postmodernism is simply another view of truth. The term “postmodernism” means “after modernism.” Modernists in the 17th to 19th Centuries held to the view that truth has a standard (God and His Word), and it can be known, what is called “objective truth.” Objective truth is eternal. It never changes. Truth is universal, the same for everyone. Sound familiar? Truth is what God says it is. Truth never changes because God never changes. That is objective truth.

Men have been searching for truth throughout history. Remember the conversation between Jesus and Pontius Pilate? Pilate said, “So You are a king?” Jesus responded by saying that Pilate’s statement was *true*, that He had been sent to earth to “testify of the truth” (*John 18:37, 38*). Pilate responded, “What is truth?” The Roman Governor asked the age-old question. Men had been searching for something true to build their lives on, something solid they could believe. Little did Pilate know that Jesus was God, the Truth in the flesh, for Jesus said earlier, “I am the Truth” (*14:6*).

However, postmodernists hold to the opposite philosophy, that there is no standard of truth, and truth can’t be known, what is called “subjective truth.” In other words, truth and morality are constantly changing, and they are unique to each individual or society. What is true for you is not necessarily true for me. Another term for subjective truth is relativism. Truth is relative to individuals or groups.

Without a standard of reality or truth, postmodernists believe that reality or truth can only be defined in

terms of an individual's experiences and feelings. Thus, over the past fifty years, we have watched the unraveling of our modern society. First, it was art. Modern art mirrors reality, but postmodern art has no resemblance to reality. It reflects the artist's mood or emotions. Then, it was architecture. No longer were there logical lines, angles, and designs. Now no design is outside the box. Next, it was language. Words no longer have a set definition or meaning, they began to change. Postmodernists have reinterpreted and derailed our language. Now, it is family, gender, and sexuality. The standards set by God in His Word have been erased and replaced with a plethora of choices.

But remember, all people instinctively know the truth of God and His laws, because of conscience and creation (*Rom. 1:10, 20; 2: 14, 15*). However, they suppress the truth they know, act like God does not exist and, therefore, ignore truth altogether (see Session 3, *Romans 1:18*). Instead, postmodernists replace objective truth with their individual or social preferences, opinions, experiences, and feelings.

Postmodernists claim that they are more open-minded. To be believe in objective truth is too narrow-minded, exclusive, and discriminatory. In fact, anyone who suggests that there is only one truth or one moral standard is arrogant, insensitive, and offensive. Thus, postmodernists are more loving, accepting, inclusive, and tolerant than everyone else. The Tolerance Movement is a postmodernist movement.

Tolerance Movement

While the Tolerance Movement may sound logical and inclusive, it is a fallacy, and it's very dangerous to society and to the Gospel. The original meaning of the word "tolerance" has been hijacked and redefined. What was the original meaning of tolerance? Webster defined tolerate as, "To suffer to be without prohibition or hinderance, to allow or permit by not preventing." To tolerate people is to put up with them (i.e., in-laws or church members). Webster defined tolerance as, "The power or capacity of enduring." While we may not agree with others' opinions, preferences, views, or values, we respect their right to hold them, and we will not prohibit or prevent them from having or sharing their thoughts (*Eph.4:2; 1 Cor. 13:4-7*).

But the new definition of tolerance is much different. To the postmodernist, tolerance means to accept all views as valid or true. Our society has moved from allowing all views and opinions to be expressed (freedom of speech) to accepting that all views and values are equal and true. Thus, we have moved away from the original meaning of tolerance to the redefined position of the new tolerance.

For example, pretend that the neighbor believes the earth is square. In the original meaning of tolerance, we would allow the neighbor to hold and even express his views, although we could agree to disagree. However, with the new meaning of tolerance, the neighbor's view that the earth is square is equal to our view that the earth is round, and to claim that the neighbor is wrong is to be intolerant, arrogant, insensitive, even offensive. Simply put, the new tolerance is itself intolerant of opposing views.

The same idea could be applied to religions. We believe that there is only one way to be made right with God, through the sacrificial death of Christ on our behalf (*John 14:6*). That is the Gospel. However, the neighbor believes that all people are reincarnated as rocks after death, and therefore they will live forever. While we know that the neighbor is wrong, to refute his belief is intolerant, exclusive, and offensive. Today, his beliefs are as valid as ours. Therefore, we are wrong, and the neighbor is right.

The Tolerance Movement is Satan's way to eliminate the Gospel. He hates the exclusivity of Christianity, that there is one way to God, one salvation. Therefore, Satan has clouded that one way with many ways. Today, there are many paths to God (pluralism). No one can claim one way to the exclusion of the others. That is intolerant, arrogant, and offensive.

We must be able to discern the lies and avoid being taken captive by this philosophy (*Col. 2:8; 2 Cor. 10:3-5*). The Tolerance Movement is a *house of cards* that can easily be toppled with truth. We simply must confront the lie by exposing it with questions. Asking questions is a harmless way to unravel one's truth claims. Rather than argue or preach or fight, ask simple questions to "put a rock in the shoe" of the postmodernist (*Tactics*, Greg Koukl).

For example, the postmodernist claims that there is no such thing as absolute truth. We simply ask if that statement is absolutely true? His claim cannot be absolutely true because he believes there is no absolute truth. The postmodernist claims that all views are valid and true. But what about the view that postmodernism is wrong? Is that equal and valid? The postmodernist claims that we are intolerant, but frankly he is the one who is intolerant. If he is claiming that his postmodern views are right and the Christian worldview is wrong, then he is being intolerant. He can't have it both ways.

Regarding religious pluralism, can all religions be equally valid and true? Can all paths lead to God? One view claims Jesus is God and the only way to be made right with God (Christianity). Other religions claim that Jesus was a prophet but not God, not the Messiah, therefore He is not the way to salvation (Judaism, Islam). Still other religions don't even acknowledge Jesus, or they believe that God does not exist, and all but one religion claims that works or living a good life are the way to eternal life. Can all these contradicting religions be right, valid, or true? They could all be wrong, but they cannot all be right.

Another lie of religious pluralism is that Christianity is wrong because it is exclusive, meaning that it holds to one way to be right with God, through Christ. The deception here is that all religions are exclusive. They claim one way to be "saved" or one way to attain eternal life. Therefore, to claim that Christianity alone is exclusive is a lie, a trick of the enemy to squelch the Gospel.

Also, advocates of the New Tolerance movement claim that Christ is tolerant, therefore His followers should be tolerant. Didn't Jesus say, "Judge not, or else you will be judged"? (*Matt. 7:1*). Unfortunately, this passage from the Sermon on the Mount is one of the most misinterpreted and misunderstood among Christians and non-Christians. Jesus was not saying that we can never judge someone's actions or views or values. In the context of the rest of the passage (v. 1-3), He was warning His followers to judge themselves first before judging anyone else. If we are going to judge others, we must be ready to be judged by the same standard. First, we must look at our lives before we look at others, otherwise we are acting hypocritically.

There are times to judge. There is a right and a wrong, according to God's standards. It is right for us to "take every thought or idea captive according to Christ" and judge whether it aligns with biblical truth (*2 Cor. 10:5*). People make judgments every day. When the postmodernist says, "Judge not," he is attempting to use the Bible against Christians, to shut us down, to keep us from refuting his truth claims, and to prevent us from sharing our own. In other words, the "Judge Not" statement is a trick of Satan's to undermine the Gospel.

Finally, we must be aware of how postmodern relativism and tolerance have crept into the church. The Emerging and Emergent Church movements are one example. Rather than preach the exclusive truths of the Gospel, Emerging churches attempted to be more open-minded, more tolerant for seekers. However, in their attempt to be more inclusive, they compromised the truths of Scripture and embraced a pluralist attitude.

For those churches that are not Emerging, relativism and tolerance have infiltrated them in other ways. For example, rather than preaching the Bible exegetically, they have applied their own preferences, opinions, and biases. To teach the Bible exegetically is to discern the original meaning and context of the letter or message, what it meant to the people to whom it was written. Instead, postmodern preachers will forego exegetical preaching and simply filter passages through modern culture, reinterpret them to mean something that was not intended, and apply them in unbiblical ways.

Another dangerous practice is to ask in a Bible study, "What does this passage mean to you?" Rather than attempting to discern the original context, meaning, and truth, Bible students mix their own opinions, preferences, and experiences with Scripture and end up with a concoction that is unbiblical and erroneous. We should never filter the Bible through our opinions and preferences. Rather we must learn to filter our opinions and preferences through the truths of God's Word. Otherwise, we are in danger of teaching a false gospel.

The bottom line is that common truth is common sense. While the postmodern philosophy may sound good on paper, it is illogical and impossible. For

people to live together in peace, people must agree to one central unchanging truth. If each person decides what is true for him, that society will dissolve into chaos and confusion. The idea of one standard of truth brings unity and peace.

For common truth to exist, there must be a truth-standard common to all people, and there is. The Creator God is our common bond, for all people were made by Him and made for Him. Since all people are God's creatures, then they are accountable to Him. He is our common truth, our standard for reality.

Moral Relativism

When postmodernism is applied to morality, we get what's called *moral relativism*. There is no standard for right and wrong. There is no divine Lawgiver. Morality is simply what you make it to be. Because there is no standard of truth or right, everyone is right, and everything goes. Does this sound familiar, that everyone does what is right in his own eyes? We are watching the period of judges play out again before our eyes (*Jud. 21:25*). There is a word for this – *license*.

Remember what we read in the *Humanist Manifesto*? “We affirm that moral values derive their source from *human* experience. Ethics is *autonomous* and *situational*, needing no theological or ideological sanction. Reason and intelligence are the most effective instruments.” When humanists removed God from the worldview equation, they eliminated the common ground that unified all human beings – that of one standard for truth and morality. The natural conclusion is that truth and morality are whatever we say it is. Again, there is a word for that – *license*.

Before we study the issue of morality, let's first establish some definitions. Because the term “morality” means different things to different people, definitions allow us to work from the same starting place. Notice in these definitions that Webster not only provides the meaning of morality but also the source.

MORALITY: The doctrine or system of the duties of men in their social character; ethics. The system of morality to be gathered from the writings of ancient sages falls very short of that delivered in the *gospel*.

The practice of the moral duties; virtue.

The quality of an action which renders it good, the conformity of an act to *the divine law*... This is the strict theological and scriptural sense of morality.

ETHICS: A system of moral principles, or a system of rules for regulating the actions and manners of men in society

MORAL: Relating to the practice, manners, or conduct of men as social beings in relation to each other and with reference to right and wrong. The word “moral” is applicable to actions that are good or evil, virtuous or vicious, and has reference to the *law of God* as the standard by which their character is to be determined.

The moral law is the *law of God* which prescribes the moral or social duties and prohibits the transgression of them.

VIRTUOUS: Morally good or acting in conformity to the *moral or divine law*; practicing the moral duties and abstaining from vice

VICE: In ethics, any voluntary action or course of conduct which deviates from the rules of moral rectitude or plain rules of propriety (what is proper); any moral unfitness of conduct, depravity, or corruption of manners

What can we deduce from these definitions? Webster not only provides the meaning of morality but also the source of morality. First, the meaning of morality is “the quality of an action that renders it good.” Something that is moral is good, and something that is immoral is bad or evil. But who gets to decide what is good and evil? Webster provided the answer. Something that is good or moral, he said, “conforms to the moral or divine law.” The moral law, he wrote, is the *law of God*. He also added that the best system of morality is the *gospel* or the New Testament, what we generally call the teachings of Jesus.

As we study the subject of morality, we are talking about what is viewed as right and wrong, or good and evil, in a society. Every society has a standard of

morality, and people act on that standard when they make laws, pass judgments, and give penalties or punishments. But where does that sense of right and wrong originate? What is the standard of right and wrong? Right and wrong – morality -- for a society will either begin with God or man.

Remember, every person has a conscience, that inner sense of right and wrong, and that sense was given by God (*Rom. 2:14, 15*). Therefore, every person instinctively knows right and wrong, according to God's standards. However, men do not want to be held to a standard they did not establish, nor do they want to be held accountable to God, therefore they suppress the truth of God and derive their own sense of morality, ethics, and justice (*Rom. 1*). Can you predict what will happen if sinners devise a system of morality? It will produce a culture of death (*Prov. 14:12*, see Session 3).

Biblical View of Morality

Before we consider the world's view of morality, let's first establish a biblical view of morality.

Morality, that which is good, begins with God, who is the all-wise Creator and the only good or moral being in the universe. He determines what is moral. Jesus said, "No one is good but God alone" (*Luke 18:19; Mark 10:18*). He is righteous and holy (*Ps. 92:15; Isa. 6:3; 1 Pet. 1:16*). John wrote, "God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all" (*1 John 1:5*). God's goodness sets Him apart from humanity (*Isa. 55:8, 9*).

Because God is good, holy, and moral, His laws are the standard for goodness or morality (*Ps. 119:1, 9*). Actions that violate God's standards for goodness or morality are deemed evil or immoral. Furthermore, God's created beings (believers and non-believers) are subject to His laws. Remember, God's laws are eternal (fixed, unchanging) and universal (apply to everyone). People must obey them or face the consequences. They will be held accountable to God's laws and eventually judged by them (*Acts 17:24; Heb. 9:27; 1 Pet. 4:4, 5*).

What are God's laws? Where do we find them? Webster said the laws of God are summarized in the Old and New Testaments. In the Old Testament, all of God's laws are based on the Ten Commandments, and in the New Testament, the Ten Commandments are

summarized in Jesus' two Great Commandments and applied in His teachings. Thus, God's Moral Law is a combination of the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Christ.

Let's first consider the Ten Commandments, what is often called "the Moral Law," because they are God's standards for morality. To assist His people in the building of the nation of Israel, God revealed His laws to them, so that they could be written down or codified. His revealed laws were given to Moses (*Ex. 20:1-17*).

The Ten Commandments are so simple yet so significant. They are rules or restrictions, but they establish a structure for a safe, just, free, and happy society. Any nation built on these laws would be a desirable place to live. Why? Let's examine the laws.

A nation that adheres to the Ten Commandments will be a free society. Listen to what the Lord said to His people. "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery" (v.2). Slaves work non-stop, all day every day, but God expects people to do what He did at creation — take a day off. "Six days you shall labor..." He instructed, "but the seventh day is a Sabbath of the Lord. In it you shall not do any work" (v.8-11). This is the only commandment that is not restated or supported by the New Testament. In other words, followers of Christ are no longer bound to this law, as the Jews were. However, the premise still holds true. Someone who is free does not work seven days a week.

A nation that honors the Ten Commandments will view life as precious, a gift from the Creator. "You shall not murder," the Lord said (v.13). That nation will likewise set in place protections for the lives of those both inside and outside the womb. That nation will also protect private property. "You shall not steal, and you shall not covet... anything that belongs to your neighbor" (v.15, 17). Such a society will value and protect people's property because it values people.

A nation that abides by the Ten Commandments will preserve the family unit. "You shall not commit adultery..." God said, "or covet your neighbor's wife. Children, honor your father and mother" (v.12-14, 17). This nation will understand that the family is the

backbone of society, and it will do whatever is necessary to keep it strong, by promoting natural, heterosexual, monogamous marriage and by respecting parental authority in the home.

A nation that follows the Ten Commandments will be just. The Lord said, “You shall not lie or bear false witness against your neighbor” (v. 16). For a nation to be just, it must be based on honesty. Its citizens must honor the truth above all else, and they must view lying and cheating as evil.

A nation that keeps to the Moral Law will honor the Lawgiver, the Creator God (v. 3-7), who is also the giver of life and liberty. To honor His laws, citizens must honor Him above all else, even themselves. Their laws must complement His laws, rather than contradict them. Citizens will eradicate any aspect of their society that does not glorify God, and they will align all their institutions and administrations to His values.

Now, what about the Gospel? Jesus summarized the Moral Law by calling all men to love God and to love people (*Mark 12:30, 31*). Then, He demonstrated this love in His exemplary life, death, and ministry. Webster wrote, “As God is the only perfect Being, His character must be the model of human excellence, and His laws must be the only rules of conduct by which His creatures can reach any portion of like excellence.” The Golden Rule, for example, is an excellent law for all societies. “Treat others the way you want to be treated” (*Matt. 7:12*). The nation that institutionalizes this law will be one of peace, liberty, and justice.

Legislating Morality

This topic provokes several questions. For example, is it right to legislate morality? The simple answer is yes. The purpose of a law is to regulate morality. Laws are meant to determine what is right and what is wrong in society. For example, the speed limit draws a line and states that only speeds below the limit are safe (right) and any speeds above the limit are not safe (wrong).

Every law legislates morality. The better question is whose morality will be legislated – God’s or man’s? Who decides the answer to that question? In the United States, the people do. In our republic, “We the People” are the authority, and our lawmakers fulfill the will of

the people. Therefore, the people determine the system of morality that will be institutionalized in the laws.

In the beginning, the United States was a nation that honored God and His Moral Law. It was, as the motto says, “One nation under God.” His Commandments were enshrined on the walls of every institution and in the hearts of its citizens. As a result, America became the envy of the world. Millions of immigrants flocked to embrace the opportunities here. What was it that those millions wanted to experience? Liberty, the Land of Liberty, a place like no other! Can anyone blame them? Imagine a nation where God’s laws were revered and institutionalized. What kind of nation would that be? A place of liberty, peace, prosperity, safety, and justice for all.

However, this system of morality – God’s Laws – is no longer an option in our society. Remember, America has been secularized or de-Christianized. God is no longer revered, and His laws are looked upon with contempt. God’s standards of morality have been replaced with man’s standards.

I once had a conversation with a college student named Andy. He was a friendly young man, trying to find his way in the world. He told me that he was an atheist. The topic of our conversation was abortion, which led us to discuss a variety of issues, including God, government, and morality.

At some point, Andy commented that Pro-Lifers (like me) are just trying to force their morality on everyone else, which is not right or fair. “Of course, we are,” I said, “but aren’t Pro-Choice people trying to do the same thing, force their morality on everyone else?” He nodded his head.

I followed my question by trying to establish common ground so that rather than argue we could work together to find a solution. I said, “Andy, can we agree that every law we pass draws a line of morality, meaning that something is right, and something is wrong.” He agreed. “So then,” I continued, “every society has a system of morality on which it bases its laws. That’s not debatable. What is debatable is whose morality will we choose — yours or mine?”

Andy thought for a minute. “That’s a good point,” he said. “But which system of morality is the right one to choose?” The one that is best for everyone, I suggested. He agreed, but then he demanded, “But, it just can’t be the Christian system.”

I was intrigued by this statement and asked him why not the Christian system. “Jesus was an immoral man,” he said. When I asked him to explain why he believed that about Jesus, he quoted some Scripture out of context that he did not understand. I gently explained the meaning of the passage. He said, “That makes sense.”

Then, I asked, “Andy, if you were in charge, what system of morality would you choose for our society?” He said, “That’s easy — treat others the way you want to be treated.” I chuckled. “What? Did I say something wrong?” he asked.

“Not at all,” I said. “I completely agree with you.”

“So then, what’s so funny,” he asked.

“Do you know who said those words?” He didn’t. “Jesus,” I said. He smiled and shook his head. Andy knew the best moral system for society, but he wouldn’t admit it because it was Christian.

I enjoyed my conversation with Andy. We talked for over an hour, but my time with him confirmed something that I already knew. Everyone knows there should be common morality but people like Andy are unwilling to admit it. To admit that there is a common moral code is to admit that there is one sovereign Code Giver — the Creator God — a proposition secularists cannot stomach.

Here is the hidden truth. People like Andy are suppressing what they know to be right because that would be admitting there is a God to whom they are accountable (*Rom. 1*). So then, they are left with no other option. There is either God’s way or man’s way.

The moral code that has produced the freest, most peaceful, prosperous, and protected society is that of Judeo-Christianity. The Ten Commandments and the teachings of Jesus are the most just and righteous

moral system in history. “Treat others the way you want to be treated” changed the world (*Matt. 7:12*). But anti-Christian forces will not allow such a proposition. They would rather impose “the way that seems right to men, the way,” the Bible says, “that only leads to death” (*Prov. 14:12*).

Noah Webster addressed this issue in his booklet entitled *Advice to the Young*. Here is an excerpt. “The moral principles and precepts contained in the Scriptures ought to form the basis of all our civil constitutions and laws. All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery, and war proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts in the Bible.”

Most of the problems that Americans are facing are a result of their abandoning God and His standards of virtue. If Americans honor God and set His moral system in place, they can expect His blessings. But, if we abandon God’s law, we can only expect oppression.

Liberty or License?

Postmodernists desire freedom, but most of us are unaware that the definition has changed. Freedom is not what we think it is. Let’s go back to Webster’s definitions.

LIBERTY: Freedom from restraint; the body is at liberty when not confined and the mind or will is at liberty, when one is not checked or controlled, and when no physical force restrains one’s actions or volition. Liberty is the power to act as one thinks fit, without restraint or control, *except for the law of nature*.

Notice that liberty is both *internal* (mind or will) and *external* (body). Adam and Eve were created to be free, with no physical force restraining their actions or volition. In other words, they possessed both internal and external liberty. They made their choices and acted as they saw fit apart from any physical authority.

Another observation to note is that liberty exists when no *physical* force restrains an individual. While Adam and Eve were created to be free from physical or human restraint, they were not created to be free from spiritual or *divine* restraint. Though they were made in

God's image (*Gen. 1:27*), distinct from everything else that He made, Adam and Eve were still part of God's creation and, therefore, subject to His authority.

In Webster's definition of liberty, he added, liberty is "the power to act as one thinks fit, without restraint or control, *except for the law of nature*." What is the law of nature? The law of nature is God's law, written and enforced by nature's Creator God. In other words, to enjoy liberty is not to be without all restraints but to be free within the boundaries set forth by the One who created all things and who has authority over all things.

Considering that truth, the difference between liberty and freedom comes to light. The two words are often used interchangeably but there is a slight distinction. Webster defined freedom as "a state of exemption from the power or control of another" (human or divine), which he subtly connected to the word "license." He then defined license as "leave, permission, or liberty to do *any act*, an *excess* of liberty, *exorbitant* freedom, or freedom *abused* or used in contempt of law or decorum" (that which is proper). In other words, liberty has boundaries while license does not.

Liberty cannot exist apart from law. While that claim may sound absurd, it is true. But wait, isn't the definition of liberty "freedom from restraint"? If so, then how can law, which is the essence of restraint, be necessary for liberty to exist?

This concept appears contradictory at first until one remembers the nature of men. People are fallen, selfish, and sinful (*Rom. 3:10-12, 23*). Their hearts are deceitful and wicked (*Jer. 17:9*). Without restraint, sinful people are a danger to others. Sin jeopardizes life, liberty, and property. Thus, sinful people must be kept in check.

The freedom to do anything to anyone at any time, what Webster called "excessive liberty" or "liberty abused" is called *license*, and where license exists, liberty cannot. When one person practices license, he will inevitably abuse another person's liberty. Therefore, for people to enjoy their liberty, license cannot exist. Sinners must be restrained. Thus, liberty is dependent upon law. Only with law is license restrained and liberty preserved.

So then, back to Americans' misunderstanding of freedom. What Christians typically mean by "freedom" is to be free to act within God's boundaries (which is liberty). But remember, the secularist or postmodernist has eliminated God from the equation. What he means by "freedom" is to be free from all restraints to do what he wants, which is license.

Common Morality

But what is often misunderstood is the importance of common truth or morality, a standard to which all people are accountable. Consider the alternative. Does not having a common moral code produce a desirable outcome? Was the Period of Judges an ideal time? Each person was "free" to pursue his sinful pleasures, which fostered an environment in which no person's life, liberty, or property was safe. Forsaking God's moral standard led to national ruin.

Why did God give His people the Ten Commandments in the first place? Why did He expect them to follow His laws? To have order, security, and liberty in Israel, there had to be a moral law, one code that everyone followed — a *common morality*. God gave Israel His laws for their good. It was only when the Israelites rejected His laws that their society spiraled out of control.

In the postmodernist's worldview, there are no certainties. Therefore, anything goes. Life is a free-for-all. Imagine a big city with no traffic laws. The result would be chaos, confusion, and death. The worldview of postmodernism is irrational and foolish. Postmodernists want to be free to create right and wrong for themselves, but in that view, nothing is wrong, deviant, or evil. *The new common morality is that there is no morality*. Is that the paradise we want for ourselves?

Postmodernists want to be free from all restraints (license), but what they fail to understand is that to be truly free, restraints must exist. Remember, license jeopardizes life, liberty, and property. There is liberty, true liberty, only in law and order. Imagine trying to play a sport without any rules. Try teaching a classroom of students without any rules. What makes people think that they can live in a society without any rules? The idea is absurd.

Having common morality is common sense. There must be rules that everyone follows, rules to which all people are accountable, and rules that do not change. In that society, every individual would submit to common law. In a world like that, every nation would submit to common law. There must be rules for every person in society, common rules. Only then will there be liberty and justice for all.

A free society full of sinners who are free to sin is not a picture of liberty but tyranny. Only if a sinful society holds to a system of morality can free people survive.

Jesus told a parable of two men who built houses on different foundations (*Matt. 7:24-27*). “Everyone who hears these words of Mine,” He said, “and acts on them may be compared to a wise man who built his house on rock. When the rain fell and the floods came, the winds blew and slammed against the house, yet it did not fall. Everyone who hears these words of Mine and does not act on them will be like a foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain fell, the floods came, the winds blew, and it fell, and great was its fall.”

Any view of the world, other than that of the God of the Bible, is sand and cannot stand the test of logic, science, or reality. It is destined to be washed away. A solid worldview will have His truth and morality at the foundation. The postmodern worldview removes that foundation and, therefore, removes all that grounds truth, reality, and morality. No society will stand for long if that is the worldview it embraces.

Postmodernism is a *house of cards*. Its philosophies are appealing but illogical and unstable. With a little examination and comparison to truth, the whole structure topples. Building a life or society on its tenets would be foolish and destructive.

Once again, Christianity proves to be common sense, the true worldview, the one that most aligns with reality. We must understand that the enemy is doing everything in his power to undermine God’s truth and lead men and nations down the path of ruin. We must not be taken captive by these lies, but rather we must stand strong in the truth (*1 Tim. 3:15*). We must build our lives on the bedrock of God’s Word and take every idea captive “according to Christ.”