

FRANCIS A. SCHAEFFER: THE FORCE BEHIND THE EVANGELICAL  
TAKEOVER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN AMERICA

A THESIS IN  
Political Science

Presented to the Faculty of the  
University of Missouri-Kansas City in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

By

CHARLES S. BROOMFIELD

B.A., William Jewell College, 1961

Kansas City, Missouri  
2013

© 2012

CHARLES S. BROOMFIELD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

FRANCIS A. SCHAEFFER: THE FORCE BEHIND THE EVANGELICAL  
TAKEOVER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN AMERICA

Charles S. Broomfield, Candidate for the Master of Arts Degree – Political Science

University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2012

ABSTRACT

Over the last 40 years or so, Americans have been involved in a religious/political struggle that has divided the nation. The struggle has impacted American government, culture, the economy, and international relations. It has divided the American people, almost evenly between so-called secularist, who favor government based on the Declaration of Independence, The United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and evangelical/fundamentalist Protestant, Catholic Christians, many of whom seem to prefer a government based on the principles and dictates of the Bible.

These particular Christians number in the tens of millions, with reputable polling organizations suggesting that there one hundred million of them. These conservative Christians attend tens of thousands of churches across America regularly and for the last forty years or so, have been listening to sermons offered by their ministers that regularly demonize the Supreme Court, Congressional liberals, Presidents, particularly if they are Democrats, and the United States government in general.

As a result of these circumstances, it has been suggested by knowledgeable observers that conditions in America today resemble in some ways, the conditions that existed in this nation prior to the Civil War in the 1860s.

While numerous individuals, organizations and philosophies deserve credit and/or blame for this current situation, a relatively unknown American missionary who spent most of his working life in Europe, is primarily responsible for "striking the match that lit the fire that started" the Religious Right of America on its current course to "take back America for God." That individual was Francis A. Schaeffer, who along with his son Frank, came back to America in the 1970s and 1980s to offer encouragement, guidance and a philosophical foundation upon which evangelical/fundamentalist/Catholic Christians would organize and develop one of the most powerful political organizations in the history of this country. A significant part of the success of these particular Christians has been the near "take-over" of the Republican Party.

This thesis examines the life and work of Francis Schaeffer, his religious beliefs, and his leadership in the development of the Religious Right in America. It also presents new insights on perhaps the single greatest issue used by evangelical/fundamentalist/Catholics to incite their followers--ABORTION.

Much of the personal information about Francis Schaeffer and his son Frank, comes not only from their numerous books, and news articles and books about them, but from several face to face interviews with Frank during his 2010 and 2011 trips to Kansas City to speak about his and his father's political/religious activities in the 70s and 80s.

Frank, who regrets what he and his father got started, now travels the country attempting, unsuccessfully, to enlighten Americans to the dangers America now faces as

a result of their earlier work. He also offers many personal and somewhat private observations about himself, his family and many of the current and previous leaders of the Religious Right.

A most disturbing aspect of the entire situation is the fact that a vast majority of Americans and the American media either are unaware of the facts presented here, or they are fearful to discuss them.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies have examined a thesis titled “Francis A. Schaeffer: The Force behind the Evangelical Takeover of the Republican Party in America” presented by Charles S. Broomfield, candidate for the Master of Arts degree, and certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committee

Max Skidmore, Ph.D., Committee Chair  
Department of Political Science

Dr. Robert Evanson, Ph.D.  
Department of Political Science

Dr. Greg Vonnahme, Ph.D.  
Department of Political Science

## CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| ABSTRACT .....  | iii  |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....  | viii |
| Chapter   |      |
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1    |
| Definitions.....  | 2    |
| American Politics and Religion Today,<br>According to Frank Schaeffer ..... | 8    |
| 2. WHO WAS FRANCIS A. SCHAEFFER IV? .....                                   | 11   |
| Schaeffer’s Beliefs.....  | 37   |
| 3. CHANGING TIMES CALL FOR CHANGING<br>ATTITUDES.....                       | 46   |
| Frank Schaeffer: His Father’s Son.....                                      | 51   |
| The Truths .....  | 58   |
| Teaming up to Share God’s Message .....                                     | 67   |
| 4. WHERE EVANGELICAL/FUNDAMENTALIST<br>CHRISTIANITY IS TODAY .....          | 95   |
| The Tea Party .....   | 114  |
| The Faith and Freedom Coalition.....  | 117  |
| The New Apostolic Reformation Movement.....                                 | 119  |
| The Greatest Political Machine in American History.....                     | 121  |
| 5. CONCLUSION.....  | 128  |
| REFERENCES.....   | 134  |
| VITA.....   | 143  |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Frank Schaeffer, who during my studies and research became my friend, and to his unbounding courage and quest to tell the truth to the American people about his and his father's errant ways in the last half of the 20th century.

Special thanks to my wife, Marsha Broomfield for affording me the time to study, research and write this thesis. And thank you to Dr. Max Skidmore and Dr. Robert Evanson for guiding me through my academic tour of politics and government after serving some 40 years on the street in the political/governmental arena--I should hasten to say that there are very few similarities between the two fields.



## Dedication

In honor of my former colleagues in the Missouri House of Representative and Senate, from both political parties, who served the people of Missouri with honor and distinction.

And to all the authors and intellectuals who have written many warnings about what this thesis attempts to describe.

CHAPTER 1  
INTRODUCTION

*“Is America to be guided by reason, or the revealed word of God?”<sup>1</sup>*

These are the words of Ann Norton, found in her book, *Leo Strauss and the American Empire*. As this paper explores the religious political developments in America over the last forty years, Norton’s question becomes increasingly important and obvious. What Francis Schaeffer started only enlightened Americans can stop.

Francis August Schaeffer IV, a twentieth-century Presbyterian missionary; his wife Edith, and his son Frank, who was his father’s helper, confidant, and alter ego, have had a profound impact on American religion, politics, and culture during the last fifty years. While their identities have been relatively unknown to a majority of Americans, the ripple effect of their actions and influences has been devastating—leading to divisions in politics, religion, and culture similar to those that existed in the decades immediately preceding the Civil War in the mid-1800s. This paper will argue and present evidence that today’s divisiveness in American politics and the major conflicts in the U.S. Congress result directly from the work and influences of Francis Schaeffer and his son, Frank. What is so strange about the current political/religious circumstance is the fact that few Americans realize that it was the Schaeffers who played a major role in laying the groundwork that has led to our current state of affairs. It can be argued that few private,

---

<sup>1</sup> Anne Norton, *Leo Strauss and the Politics of American Empire* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 2.

non-political, non-elected individuals have had such a profound impact on America.

Because Francis and Frank Schaeffer helped launch a full-scale political and theological campaign against the U. S. Supreme Court, the Congress, and frequently the President, significant numbers of Americans have turned against their country. These individuals, mostly evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics, are angry, motivated, and active, while many other Americans are ignorant of what is happening to the country, confused about its condition, and fearful for its future. Influenced by the leadership of Francis and Frank Schaeffer and others who will be identified, these evangelical/fundamentalist Christians have all but taken over the Republican Party. Statistical data and documented remarks serve as evidence that the Schaeffers' diatribe against America's government helped lead a specific group of evangelical/fundamentalist Christian leaders to form the Moral Majority, and later, the Christian Coalition, and to organize tens of thousands of conservative religious congregations across the nation to step into the political arena. The ultimate goal of these groups is to "take back America for God" and return America to what they erroneously believe has always been, and was meant to be, a Christian nation.

### **Definitions**

For a better understanding of the ideology and language in this religious/political struggle, it will be helpful to provide definitions of several terms.

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians:* As stated by George W. Marsden, noted religious scholar and professor of history at the University of Notre Dame, "neither fundamentalism nor evangelicalism is a clearly defined religious organization with a

membership list.”<sup>2</sup> However, it is generally agreed that evangelicals are those Christians who focus their primary beliefs on the teachings of Jesus Christ as described in the New Testament in the Bible. Evangelicals believe in “the proclamation of Christ’s saving work through his death on the cross and the necessity of personally trusting him for eternal salvation.”<sup>3</sup> Many Protestants adhere to evangelicalism.

During the latter quarter of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century a major split took place between liberal and conservative evangelicals, and the conservative faction took the name “fundamentalists” to describe themselves. Evangelical/fundamentalist preacher Jerry Falwell is famously quoted as having said, “A fundamentalist is just an evangelical who is mad about something,”<sup>4</sup> while Marsden describes a fundamentalist as “an evangelical who is militant in opposition to liberal theology in the churches or to changes in cultural values or mores, such as those associated with secular humanism.”<sup>5</sup>

Specifically, when the term “evangelical/fundamentalist Christians” is used here, we are referring to that large group of Christians who are referred to in various contexts as the Religious Right, right-wing conservatives, and/or the Christian Right. Many Catholics fit in this description, as do Southern Baptists, Charismatics, Pentecostals, Mormons, and Jews. With few exceptions, these evangelical/fundamentalist Christians oppose abortion and gay rights and vote for conservative Republican candidates. Since

---

<sup>2</sup> George W. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991), 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Mel White, *Religion Gone Bad: The Hidden Dangers of the Christian Right* (New York, NY: Penguin Group, 2006), 11.

<sup>5</sup> Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, 1.

the 1960s, there has been little difference between the two groups (evangelicals and fundamentalists) when it comes to politics, government, and conservative religious beliefs, although some Christian churches maintain a level of liberal thinking as it relates to biblical interpretations.

*Taking back America for God* (also referred to as *Christian Nation*, *the Battle for God*, and *The City on a Hill*): These terms refer to concepts and language frequently used inside the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian community to indicate the belief or desire that America was originally intended to be a “Christian nation” or that they plan to “take America back” to that condition. These terms have become rallying cries for evangelical/fundamentalist Christians who are angry and frustrated with liberal Christianity, modernity, and what they refer to as “secular humanism.” Many of these Christians prefer and hope that America will someday be governed by religious leaders and that the decisions of leadership will be based upon these leaders’ interpretations of the Bible as opposed to the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

*Secularization* (also called *Secular Humanist* and *Humanism*): Secularization is, defined by Marsden as “...a trend away from distinctly Christian influences.”<sup>6</sup> The term “secular humanist” was popularized by Francis Schaeffer, Tim LaHaye, and numerous other evangelical/fundamentalist preachers to refer to individuals and groups who they believe have led other Christians and Americans away from Christian teachings and principles. Schaeffer and the others see secular humanists as enemies of the true Christian Church. They also believe that secular humanists are enemies of the United States. Of

---

<sup>6</sup> George W. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006), 49.

course, they, too, oppose much of what has happened to American culture. Schaeffer states: “Humanism is the placing of Man at the center of all things and making him the measure of all things.”<sup>7</sup> Thus, in Schaeffer’s view, Man is attempting to place himself in the position of God and not giving God the credit that he deserves. LaHaye says “humanism is destroying our culture, families, country—and one day the entire world. Most of the evils in the world today can be traced to humanism, which has taken over our government, the UN, education, TV, and most of the other influential things in life....The church of Jesus Christ is the last obstacle for the humanist to conquer.”<sup>8</sup>

*Inerrancy:* This term is used by fundamentalist Christians to identify their belief that every word, concept, and statement in the Bible is true, literal, and the word of God. This belief may be the single most important influence that divided evangelical Christians into warring camps in the 1890s and continues to divide them and vast numbers of Americans today. Two fundamentalist leaders, Archibald Alexander Hodge and B. B. Warfield, are given credit for a precise definition of the term. According to Marsden, Hodge and Warfield defined the term “inerrancy” relating to Scripture by saying that “the Scriptures not only contain, but ARE THE WORD OF GOD, and hence that all their elements and all their affirmations are absolutely errorless, and binding the faith and obedience of men.”<sup>9</sup> The term will be expanded upon and explained more fully in the body of this paper.

---

<sup>7</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1981), 23.

<sup>8</sup> Tim LaHaye, *The Battle for the Mind: A Subtle Warfare* (Old Tappan, NJ: Power Books, 1980), 9.

<sup>9</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 113.

*Modernism* (also called *Modernity*): Modernism was the original term used to identify the goal of evangelicals who realized that there were conflicts and errors in various interpretations of the Bible and refused to accept inerrancy of the Bible. They sought compromise with the conservative evangelicals to no avail. They wanted to alleviate the problems by accepting a more liberal interpretation of the Bible. Numerous battles took place between the two groups over the issue, and eventually the conservatives broke away from evangelicalism and chose to call themselves fundamentalists. Today, fundamentalists identify social issues such as drug use, sexual permissiveness, pornography, and abortion as products of modernism<sup>10</sup> and blame liberal evangelicals and secular humanists for these issues.

*Dominionism*: The concept of dominionism comes from language in the Bible's Book of Genesis 1:26-31, where it states that God has given man "dominion" over all creation. This concept has been interpreted to mean that "American Christians have been mandated by God to make America a Christian state."<sup>11</sup> A specific statement by one prominent evangelical fundamentalist leader, George Grant, explains the term more completely and offers insight into what most evangelical/fundamentalist Christian leaders and many of their followers want. Grant says, "But it is dominion we are after. Not just a voice. It is dominion we are after. Not just influence. It is dominion we are after. Not just equal time. It is dominion we are after. World conquest. That's what Christ has

---

<sup>10</sup> Craig Unger, *American Armageddon: How the Delusions of the Neoconservatives and the Christian Right Triggered the Descent of America—And still Imperil our Future* (New York, NY: Scribner, 2007), 67.

<sup>11</sup> Chris Hedges, *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America* (New York, NY: Free Press, 2006), 11.

commissioned us to accomplish. We must never settle for anything less.”<sup>12</sup> Prominent fundamentalist preachers D. James Kennedy and Pat Robertson have quoted Grant in their remarks to others.

*Dispensational Premillennialism:* This term comes from an English preacher, John Nelson Darby, who came to the United States in the 1850s.<sup>13</sup> Based upon his study of the Bible, he concluded and preached that the history of man was divided into seven periods of time that he called “dispensations.” The final and most important dispensation would occur with Christ’s return to Earth as described in the Bible’s Book of Revelations. Darby maintained that just before the beginning of the Tribulation, there would be a “Rapture”—a snatching-up of born-again Christians, who would be taken up to heaven and escape the terrible sufferings of the Last Days.<sup>14</sup> Most evangelical/ fundamentalist Christians have always so believed and the belief, or major parts of it, is still dominant among these believers today.

*Saved or Born Again:* These two terms are used interchangeably and are used to identify evangelical/ fundamentalist Christians from other so-called liberal Christians. Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians believe that an individual must be “born again” or “saved” before he or she can be a true Christian and enter the kingdom of God.

---

<sup>12</sup> George Grant, *The Changing of the Guard: Biblical Principles for Political Action* (Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987), 50-51.

<sup>13</sup> Unger, 25-27.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.



## **American Politics and Religion Today, According, to Frank Schaeffer**

“They hate America!” exclaimed Frank Schaeffer as he spoke to listeners of the Steve Kraske Radio Talk Show in Kansas City, Missouri, in 2010.<sup>15</sup> Schaeffer was referring to the group of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians commonly known as the Religious Right. He went on to say, “The spirit of the Religious Right is fundamentally an anti-America movement.”<sup>16</sup> As he continued his dialogue with Kraske, Schaeffer named names; included in the list were such evangelical/fundamentalist luminaries as Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Franklin Graham, James Dobson and John Hagee. He was candid and forthright as he talked about the long-time relationship that he and his father, Francis Schaeffer, had with these and other leaders of the Religious Right, most of whom are evangelical/fundamentalist Protestants and Catholics.

Schaeffer admitted that he was a part of this hate-America group at one time and was one of its leaders. He had been invited to appear on Kraske’s show to talk about one of his recent books, *Crazy for God: How I Grew Up as One of the Elect, Helped Found the Religious Right, and Lived to Take All (or Almost All) of it Back*.<sup>17</sup> In this book and several others, Schaeffer goes into detail to explain how he and his father “had once contributed mightily to the creation of the right-wing/evangelical/Republican

---

<sup>15</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview, Steve Kraske Radio Talk Show, Kansas City, Mo., 6 May 2010.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

subculture....”<sup>18</sup> Schaeffer went on to say, “We were very anti-America... We became a truly anti-American revolutionary force.”<sup>19</sup>

At one point in the show, Kraske interrupted Schaeffer to say, “Frank, these are very serious charges.” Schaeffer responded by saying that he knew they were serious charges and went on to say that he had spent many years at his father’s side as they led American evangelical/fundamentalist Christians out of the pews and into politics. In telling the story of how he and his father helped spearhead the development of the Religious Right, Schaeffer stated that he was sorry for what he and his father had done and that he was now attempting to alert the American public to the truth about what they had helped create. “We were wrong... We made a mistake,”<sup>20</sup> he admitted.

Toward the end of the interview, Schaeffer told of times in the 1970s and 1980s in Washington D.C., where he and his father met with former Republican presidents Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and Gerald Ford. One comment was revealing. He said, “...nobody paid any attention to Jesus...” until “...Kemp, Koop, and Reagan realized that they could pry off Catholics’ and evangelicals’ votes from the Democratic Party.”<sup>21</sup> He then said, “Religion in America is politics... big-time politics.”<sup>22</sup>

As one studies and researches the story of Francis and Frank Schaeffer and their contributions to the leadership that created the Religious Right, one question keeps

---

<sup>18</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God: How I Grew Up as One of the Elect, Helped Found the Religious Right, and Lived to Take All (or Almost All) of it Back* (New York, NY: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2007), 4.

<sup>19</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

recurring: Which of the two, Francis or Frank, was the most prominent in leading evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics into politics? This thesis will help answer that question.

Based on the facts in their story and upon readily available resource material related thereto, the following can be ascertained:

1. It is true that Francis and Frank Schaeffer were responsible in the beginning for getting leading evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics into the political arena.
2. It is also true that evangelical/fundamentalist Christians have built a religious-political organization that numbers in the tens of millions and is today one of the most powerful political forces that the United States has ever seen.
3. Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians are actually using their church facilities to promote their political agendas.
4. They dominate the Republican Party.
5. Many of them really do hate America, as Frank Schaeffer claims.
6. It is a goal of many of these evangelical/fundamentalist Christians to take over the United States government and have the nation governed as a theocracy led by religionists.
7. And, yes, Frank Schaeffer was correct when he made inflammatory statements on the Steve Kraske show and in his several books, as well as in numerous radio and television appearances, and in newspaper and magazine articles.

Frank Schaeffer will be discussed at greater length, as will the aforementioned issues, in this paper. First, however, we should review the life of Francis A. Schaeffer IV and analyze several of his basic beliefs, which ultimately affected America for the worse.

## CHAPTER 2

### WHO WAS FRANCIS A. SCHAEFFER IV?

Religious intellectual Francis A. Schaeffer IV believed in, taught his students about, wrote and preached about, and advocated all of the elements of evangelical/fundamentalist Christian beliefs, including the concept of inerrancy of the Bible, opposition to secular humanism, anti-modernity, separatism, dominionism, born-againism, dispensational premillennialism, and eventually, the takeover of the United States government, by force if necessary, to return America to God. His teachings and preaching were filled with interpretations of these ideas and concepts during his fifty-year ministry during the mid-twentieth century. Most are articulated and discussed in his final book, *A Christian Manifesto*, published in 1981.<sup>1</sup>

As a result of his work, he became famous in the 1970s within the American conservative religious community. He is credited by numerous religious leaders with bringing Catholics and evangelical/fundamentalist Christians together and then out of the churches into the political arena. Also during the 1970s and '80s, Francis Schaeffer became a darling of several prominent Republican politicians, including Congressman Jack Kemp and his wife, Joann. He also developed close relationships with presidents Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and Gerald Ford.

During this time of religious leadership and involvement with the Religious Right in the United States, Schaeffer was hailed by numerous leading evangelical/fundamentalist preachers, televangelists, and in several conservative religious

---

<sup>1</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto* (Westchester, Illinois. Crossway Books, 1981)

publications as having “...done more to shape the culture of American Evangelicals at the end of the 20th Century than any one person outside C.S. Lewis or Billy Graham.”<sup>2</sup> A 1997 article in *Christianity Today* referred to Schaeffer as “evangelicalism’s most important public intellectual who prodded evangelicals out of their cultural ghetto.”<sup>3</sup> Dr. Richard Land, who for many years has been the chief lobbyist and spokesman for the 16-million-member<sup>4</sup> Southern Baptist Convention in Washington D. C., says this: “As an evangelical Princeton University undergraduate in the late 1960s, I, like so many in my generation, was electrified and galvanized by Schaeffer’s challenge to rejoin the contemporary cultural and philosophical debate armed with what he called ‘true truth’....”<sup>5</sup> Dr. Mel White—an ordained evangelical minister, ghostwriter for Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, and confidant of Francis Schaeffer—said in his book, *Religion Gone Bad: The Hidden Dangers of the Christian Right*, that “History may teach us that the rise to power of fundamentalist Christianity in our time began in L’Abri, the Schaeffer home in Switzerland, where a very loving Francis and Edith welcomed anyone ‘seeking the meaning of life.’”<sup>6</sup> White worked with Schaeffer on his well-known film series, *How Should We Then Live: The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture*. A former student of Schaeffer, Colin Duriez wrote one the few biographies of his professor. In his book, titled *Francis Schaeffer: An Authentic Life*, Duriez offers an insightful commentary on Schaeffer by Damon Johnson, who studied and wrote about

---

<sup>2</sup> Colin Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer: An Authentic Life* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008), 181.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>4</sup> Official Website of the Southern Baptist Convention. The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission. Web. 17 June 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Deal W. Hudson, *Onward Christian Soldiers* (New York, NY: Simon-Schuster, Inc., 2008), 55.

<sup>6</sup> Mel White, *Religion Gone Bad*, 26.

Schaeffer. Johnson says, “Schaeffer was an important, perhaps the most important, intellectual and spiritual [force] behind evangelical social and political activism during the 1970s and 1980s.”<sup>7</sup>

Indeed, Schaeffer was in a special class in twentieth-century evangelical/fundamentalist Christianity, as were his wife, Edith, and his son, Frank. To understand and appreciate this uniqueness, we must go back to the Schaeffers’ early years to discover what factors led to and laid the foundation for them to have the profound impact on America that they have had.

Francis Schaeffer was born on January 30, 1912, in Germantown, Pennsylvania, “to working-class ignorant pagan parents,” according to his son Frank, who quotes his mother Edith, in his book, *Crazy for God*.<sup>8</sup> His ancestry on his mother’s side was English; on his father’s side, German. Francis’s father was a carpenter, and as a boy Francis picked up some of his father’s talents. Francis Schaeffer was born with severe dyslexia, but it went relatively unnoticed. Even with this handicap, Schaeffer appears to have done well with his studies. Duriez reports in his biography of Schaeffer that “...in an intelligence test (at his high school) he had been found to have the second highest score recorded in twenty years.”<sup>9</sup> Schaeffer was always slight in stature and had what others described as a screechy voice, yet he appears to have been a good speaker. Duriez reports that as a Boy Scout, Schaeffer won a speech contest and was awarded “...a cup which he

---

<sup>7</sup> Duriez, 16.

<sup>8</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 12.

<sup>9</sup> Duriez, 18.

kept for the rest of his life.”<sup>10</sup>

A momentous event occurred in Schaeffer’s life on September 3, 1930. He was eighteen years old. On that date, after considerable reading and studying about the concept of conversion, Schaeffer “committed himself to Christ and the Christian faith.”<sup>11</sup> In the parlance of the day, and even in this day, Schaeffer would be said to have been saved or born again on that date. For the rest of his life he held to this conversion, although at times he questioned his faith and wondered if in fact there was enough evidence to warrant it. Even prior to the conversion, he struggled with the developing influence of liberal theology and the growing tendency toward a modernist interpretation of the Bible. As years passed, he became more and more hostile to the concept of modernity and Christian liberalism. So would vast numbers of other evangelical/fundamentalist Christians.

Schaeffer’s father and mother expected that he would become a carpenter like his father, but Schaeffer had other ideas. According to his son-in-law John Sandri, after Schaeffer read the Bible through for the first time, he “came to the conclusion that basically the Bible answered ‘all important questions in life’” and that “...all truth is from the Bible.”<sup>12</sup> After his conversion Schaeffer decided that he would become a Christian pastor. His parents opposed the idea. The morning before he was to leave for Hampden-Sydney College in southern Virginia to enter a pre-ministerial program, his father told him that he was opposed to his plan and wanted him to stay home. In what might be

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>11</sup> Duriez, 21.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

considered an act a bit contrary to Christian doctrine, Francis told his father that he needed a few minutes to think about it. He went to his room, prayed, and took a coin out of his pocket and flipped it. If the coin landed heads up, it would mean that God wanted him to go. Heads down meant he was not to go. The first flip landed heads up.<sup>13</sup> Schaeffer was still not sure. He flipped a second time with the same result. Again, not sure, he flipped a third time. Heads up again! He returned to tell his father he was going to college. At that point, his father wished him well and, while he was not satisfied with his son's decision, he and Mrs. Schaeffer supported their son's final decision during the years that followed.

The second major decision that Schaeffer made regarding his faith and his future life's work came on December 10, 1930. The decision was noted in his diary. He recorded the following words, "Prayed with Sam Chestnut today. Now my mind is fully made up. I shall give my life for God's service."<sup>14</sup> Then, and even today, that commitment meant that the individual making such a decision would follow the dictates of God, whatever and however those dictates were received and interpreted. Schaeffer would be true to his word for the rest of his life.

At Hampden-Sydney College,<sup>15</sup> Schaeffer followed the typical lifestyle of a young evangelical Christian attending a liberal arts college that was not totally Christian. His fellow students drank alcohol (even though Prohibition was in full force), and they caroused and partied on the weekends. Schaeffer did none of these things. However, he

---

<sup>13</sup> Duriez, 21.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 24.



did his best to help care for some of his fellow students when they came home drunk on Saturday nights. He would stay up late studying and wait for his colleagues to return to the dorm and then help those who needed support as a result of their inebriation. Again, as is typical of “born-again” young people in such a college, he was active in the Ministerial Association, as well as the League of Evangelical Students. He served a term as president of the Ministerial Association and helped out with young people in a black church nearby. Fran, as he would later become known, was an excellent student and excelled in literature and philosophy, although he always struggled with spelling. “At the time there was no chapter of Phi Beta Kappa”<sup>16</sup> at Hampden-Sydney College, but as proof of his intellectual capabilities, in 1980 Schaeffer was made an honorary member of that fraternity for his contributions to human knowledge.<sup>17</sup> He graduated magna cum laude from Hampden-Sydney College in 1935.

That same year, he fell in love with and married Edith Seville. She was a daughter of missionaries to China who had recently returned to Germantown, Pennsylvania. She shared and practiced Schaeffer’s religious beliefs, principles, and goals. Later, Edith would comment on what she called Schaeffer’s best and worst qualities related not only to his education but also to most aspects of his life: “All through life Fran’s best quality has been his worst feature: such severe concentration on what he is doing, come wind or weather, that nothing stops him.”<sup>18</sup>

Not only was Edith Schaeffer an insightful wife about her husband’s qualities and

---

<sup>16</sup> Duriez, 29.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

faults, she was fully an equal in the extraordinary success of what would become their L'Abri ministry in Champéry, Switzerland. According to Os Guinness, a close friend and confidant of Schaeffer who worked with him in his ministry and was an on-the-scenes observer, "Mrs. Schaeffer is the secret of Schaeffer."<sup>19</sup> An exceptional woman in her own right, unlike her husband she was cultured<sup>20</sup> and refined, having been educated as the daughter of missionary parents with significant wealth. According to her admiring son, in his memoir *Crazy for God*, Frank described her as "...my gorgeous mother,"<sup>21</sup> "a sexy saint..."<sup>22</sup> who believed "that God had called her to do Christian work that required her to sacrifice herself... to marry my father to work and put him through seminary."<sup>23</sup> She would be Schaeffer's life-long companion, his helpmate, and his co-equal in writing and building what would become their unique ministry.

After graduation from Hampden-Sydney College, Schaeffer immediately enrolled in Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This was the seminary that Dr. J. Gresham Machen and several of his colleagues founded in 1929 after they left Princeton Theological Seminary over several theological battles related to liberal and conservative interpretations of the Bible in the Presbyterian Church.<sup>24</sup> As reported by author George Marsden, an expert on evangelical and fundamentalist religion, "In almost every major American denomination, sometime between the late 1870s and World War I,

---

<sup>19</sup> Christopher Catherwood, *Five Evangelical Leaders* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1994), 137.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>21</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 32.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>24</sup> *About WTS/History*. Westminster Theological Seminary website. March 12, 2012.

serious disagreements broke out between conservatives and liberals.”<sup>25</sup> Even though Schaeffer was a young seminarian at Westminster, he was in the middle of several of these ongoing church battles. Westminster was a Presbyterian seminary, and the Presbyterian Church, of which Schaeffer and his wife were members, was at the heart of this particular controversy.

Machen was one of Schaeffer’s favorite professors. Machen had been “...a brilliant New Testament scholar at Princeton Seminary (from 1915 to 1929) ...who eventually assumed... the mantle as chief intellectual spokesman for conservative Presbyterians.”<sup>26</sup> Basically the battle centered on the question of the direction that American culture was taking and the inerrancy of the Bible. In his analysis of the conflict, Marsden states: “The fundamentalists’ most alarming experience was that of finding themselves living in a culture that by the 1920s was openly turning away from God.”<sup>27</sup> Contributing to the ills of that culture were two specific issues: “...Modernism and the theory of evolution, they were convinced, had caused the catastrophe by undermining the Biblical foundations of American civilization.”<sup>28</sup>

Modernism was partially defined early in the twentieth century by James M. Gray, who at the time was President of Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. He stated that, “Modernism is a revolt against the God of Christianity. It is the foe of good government.”<sup>29</sup> William Jennings Bryan, former three-time Democratic candidate for

---

<sup>25</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 101.

<sup>26</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 137.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-4.

President of the United States, and also a fundamentalist and opponent of modernism, stated: “The evolutionary hypothesis is the only thing that has seriously menaced religion since the birth of Christ... and it menaces civilization.”<sup>30</sup> When Charles Darwin published his book *On Origin of Species* in 1859, it created a furor in the Christian religious community. Darwin’s theory that man had descended over eons of time from a common ancestor, as opposed to being created in one day by God as stated in Genesis 1:27, was a direct challenge to what Christians had believed for nearly two thousand years; the really true believers would not accept this new science and the many derivatives coming from it. Tens of millions of American evangelical/fundamentalist Christians hold firmly to this opposition to Darwinism today, as well as many other aspects of scientific discovery. Marsden observes, “The antimodernism of the 1920s was a major factor in shaping much of subsequent twentieth-century American evangelicalism.”<sup>31</sup>

Machen’s philosophy and teachings would affect Schaeffer for the rest of his life; they served as a foundation for his lifelong ministry. Unlike most fundamentalists who fought Darwinism and modernism, Machen was an intellectual, and while he too opposed Darwinism, he took a far less hostile approach to the subject. “Machen struggled to preserve both his inherited Presbyterian faith and his intellectual integrity in a world in which the leading intellectuals, and even many theologians, ridiculed traditional Christianity,”<sup>32</sup> according to Marsden. Machen saw both sides of the argument and the

---

<sup>30</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 4.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

ensuing battle. The main goal of the liberals was to “...emphasize practical work such as evangelism, missions, and ‘relieving the misery of man,’”<sup>33</sup> but he also saw what he believed was the more dangerous problem, that being “the liberals who said, ‘Christianity may be subordinated to culture.’”<sup>34</sup>

In the end, Machen chose to stay with the fundamentalists. He “argued that since the new liberalism denied that human salvation was dependent on the historical fact that Christ died to atone for human sins, such liberalism was not Christianity at all but a new religion... essentially a faith in humanity even though it used Christian language and symbolism.”<sup>35</sup> “In honesty, he said, liberals should withdraw from churches that had been founded on a very different basis of biblical Christianity.”<sup>36</sup> All of this had a profound effect on Schaeffer and his wife.

He also obviously was affected by a somewhat different and unique aspect of his professor. Machen was a devotee of the arts, even though most fundamentalists associated arts with culture, and, according to Marsden, “Some Christian groups...equated culture with the ‘world’ which must be shunned...”<sup>37</sup> As we will see later, Schaeffer and his wife, and eventually their entire family, grew to love the arts and spent considerable time enjoying them.

In 1937, Machen became embroiled in another dispute with the Presbyterian leadership over issues involving the church’s foreign missions policy. Eventually the

---

<sup>33</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 137.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, 58.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>37</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, vi.

dispute led to his suspension from the Presbyterian ministry. Machen's removal and other issues at Westminster in which Schaeffer was involved led to a further split in the Presbyterian Church. A new denomination, the "Presbyterian Church of America (later renamed the Orthodox Presbyterian Church)" was created<sup>38</sup> and yet another seminary established. It was to this new seminary, Faith Seminary, in Wilmington, Delaware, that Schaeffer transferred in 1937 and from which he graduated that same year. Schaeffer was one of the first to graduate from the new institution and the first to be ordained in the new Bible Presbyterian Church, which had also been split off from the mainline Presbyterian Church.

Schaeffer was affected in major ways by these combative seminary experiences and by his relationship and dedication to Machen, who would over time become his friend. Years later, Schaeffer would write in one of his major works, "Division, separations—they rend the fabric of society. The history of man is the record of splits and schisms, every one of which has its origin in the primal separation of man from God."<sup>39</sup> One can only wonder if he was talking about his seminary experiences with Machen when he wrote these words, and rather than attributing the differences between Machen and his colleagues to their own perhaps selfish interest, Schaeffer attributed their origins to man's breaking away from a spiritual source.

The subject of separation goes even deeper in fundamentalist Christianity. The issue of separation was a factor in the split between liberal evangelical and conservative evangelical Christians between 1870 and 1920. Again, basing their beliefs on the

---

<sup>38</sup> Duriez, 38.

<sup>39</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *A Christian View of the Bible as Truth: Genesis in Space and Time* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1982), 73.

inerrancy of the Bible, many fundamentalist Christians determined that separating themselves from the sinful world was the correct thing to do. They based this idea on two pieces of scripture. The first, found in II Corinthians 6:17, says, "...come out from among them, and be ye separate ..." <sup>40</sup> The second is referred to by Schaeffer in Volume 5 of his *Complete Works*, titled *A Christian View of The West*. Here, Schaeffer says, "From the earliest days of the Christian Church, when Christianity was a small minority movement, believers had struggled with their personal and corporate response to Christ's prayer that they *be* in the world but not *of* the world." <sup>41</sup> Based on both of these ideas from scripture, many fundamentalist Christians—after the 1870 split—made a concerted effort to stay separate from most American cultural and societal affairs. Many took the position that they should not participate in politics and government. In fact, many did not even vote. This was their basic position for a hundred years, when Schaeffer apparently re-interpreted these sections of the "inerrant" Bible and, as we shall see later, contacted Jerry Falwell after the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision to tell him that he should now lead fundamentalist Christians back into politics.

The importance of these conflicting experiences, as with so many Christian religious organizations, would indicate that controversy and tribulation in the Christian church community is a perpetual contagion. One group or individual disagrees with another over scripture, church policy, or personality, a battle ensues and the church splits into two, only to be followed by a similar event at the next church the group or individual starts or joins. The personal experiences of Schaeffer in these controversial

---

<sup>40</sup> *Holy Bible* (New York, NY: Oxford Press, 1945) II Corinthians 6:17.

<sup>41</sup> Schaeffer, *A Christian View of the West, Vol. 5* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1982), 93.

entanglements seem to have affected him throughout his ministry and may have had significant influence on his leaving not only the Presbyterian Church but also the United States. However, it should be noted that, before Schaeffer entered into the European phase of his ministry, he spent seven years as a pastor at three different churches in the United States. The first pastorate he took was in Grove City, Pennsylvania, where he served for three years. Next he served a small church in Chester, Pennsylvania, for nearly two years. His final American pastorate came in 1943, when he accepted the minister's position at the First Bible Presbyterian Church in St. Louis, Missouri, where he served until 1947.<sup>42</sup>

With the exception of the theological impact and damage from the two bruising internal denominational battles, particularly within the Presbyterian religious community, and the involvement of his close friends and professors in those internal church struggles, Schaeffer's educational years and the years he spent as a church pastor were relatively uneventful. However, he did remain active in the organizational and administrative aspects of the new Bible Presbyterian denomination. He served on numerous committees and attended several national meetings representing his St. Louis church and several other Presbyterian churches in the area. As a result of these meetings and the contacts he made there, he became increasingly interested in the Presbyterian Church's administrative activities in Europe, which were a direct outgrowth of Machen's efforts in 1933 to establish an independent Presbyterian foreign missions board. Schaeffer eventually became a member of the board of directors of the organization.

It was during these years of administrative involvement that the Schaeffers began

---

<sup>42</sup> Catherwood, 115-116.



to cultivate a second interest. During their American pastorate years, they developed a great concern for children and young people. Perhaps this was not unique, for it had always been a belief and practice in religious communities that the best time “to save the unsaved” was when they were young, pure, and in their formative years. Also during these years, the Schaeffers became the parents of three daughters. The Schaeffers engaged actively in all aspects of the youth ministry in all three churches they served. They were so excited about leading young people to Christ that they organized a group they called Children for God. Over a period of time, the program became so successful that other churches copied it, and it became widely recognized across the country in various Presbyterian churches. The program also became known to Schaeffer’s fellow board members on the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Schaeffer’s youth ministry activities occurred during a time when the events of the Second World War were winding down. American Christian churches of all kinds had begun to consider what part they might play in the rebuilding of Europe, particularly from a Christian religious perspective. Because of the Schaeffers’ interest in young people and in foreign missions that they had developed, Francis was a natural candidate to take a trip to Europe to investigate opportunities for further mission work. His experience in inter-church relations would be an asset in beginning recommunication activities with foreign Presbyterian churches that had been lost during the war.

Thus, in the spring of 1947, Schaeffer accepted an appointment by the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions to take a fact-finding trip to thirteen countries in Europe to determine what opportunities might exist in those countries for the Bible Presbyterian churches to launch a mission program. The trip was

to last three months. According to Duriez, the pace was hectic:

Francis [Schaeffer] would visit countries in northern, central and southern Europe, involving around two interviews a day for three months, July to September, mainly with Christian leaders in the thirteen countries. He would sleep in fifty-three places in France, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Italy, Greece, Holland, Belgium, England, and Scotland.<sup>43</sup>

While the trip was quite successful, it was also quite grueling, to the degree that “Fran’s three months in Europe would lead to extensive mental and physical exhaustion.”<sup>44</sup>

In this regard, it should be noted that Schaeffer exhibited throughout his life bouts of depression. He frequently exhibited examples of extreme anger, “suffering in isolation,” and “introverted personality.”<sup>45</sup> His son Frank would later quote Edith as attributing such behavior to “...Fran’s weaknesses.”<sup>46</sup> It appears that Schaeffer never sought professional help in dealing with his emotional problems.

After Schaeffer’s return to the United States from his European mission trip, he provided an impressive report to the Presbyterian missions board, indicating that the climate was ideal to launch a full mission program. Soon after, the board offered the young pastor a challenging proposal. It read, “We find from what you have given us in your report that we feel strongly that we should send someone to Europe to help strengthen the things that remain, and the consensus is that the only two we would send would be you and Edith.”<sup>47</sup> The record indicates that neither Schaeffer nor his wife sought or expected the offer, but a poster that hung on their bedroom wall in their home

---

<sup>43</sup> Duriez, 62.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 63.

<sup>45</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 117.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>47</sup> Duriez, 73.

on Waterman Boulevard in St. Louis, Missouri, probably offered a hint as to their acceptance or rejection of the offer. It read, “Go ye into all the world.”<sup>48</sup> Soon thereafter, Francis and Edith and their three daughters would be on their way to their first assignment in Europe. In 1948 they arrived in Rotterdam, Holland. After a brief residence in Rotterdam, they moved to La Rosiaz, near Lausanne, Switzerland, high above Lake Geneva. The next year they would move to a chalet in Champéry, Switzerland, which would serve as a base for their missionary work.

Between 1948 and 1955, Schaeffer served as a missionary for the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions, during which time he traveled all over Europe and fell even more in love with the continent. He had made numerous church contacts on his three-month exploratory visit to Europe, and now it was his job to call upon and work with many of these churches, offering them guidance, encouragement, and conservative, or fundamentalist, theological training. At every opportunity, he and Edith, and often the children, took advantage of the opportunity to visit museums, art galleries, plays, and musical events. They visited Paris, Brussels, London, and Rome. As time passed, they took numerous trips throughout Scandinavia, England, Scotland, France, Germany, and Italy, vacationing every year on the Italian Riviera.

The family’s interest in nature, the arts, literature, architecture and history<sup>49</sup> would eventually have a significant effect not only in their life’s enjoyment but also in Schaeffer’s recognition in the American fundamentalist religious community as a respected intellectual theologian. This interest, like several others, may have been

---

<sup>48</sup> Duriez, 73.

<sup>49</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 137.

attributable to Francis and Edith's fondness for J. Gresham Machen. First daughter Priscilla states of her father that "on his day off he'd take us children... (and) parade us through the St. Louis Art Museum... He had a great respect, admiration, and insight so he'd tell us about the history of the paintings..."<sup>50</sup> Later, when in Europe, she said, "Daddy was parading us around European art museums. It was this great interest in art that differentiated him from the run-of-the-mill pastors and the church government... this love for the arts."<sup>51</sup>

That love extended to music. His son Frank takes great pride in speaking of his father's evangelical circles: "If you wanted to know what Bob Dylan's songs meant, Francis Schaeffer was the man to ask. In the early 60s, he was probably the only fundamentalist who had even heard of Bob Dylan."<sup>52</sup>

Edith shared her husband's love of art, music, and even dance, though dancing was frowned upon by most evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. Frank Schaeffer stated on a radio talk show in Kansas City, Missouri, in 2011 that his mother had been offered an audition for a dance part in a Broadway play prior to her marriage to Francis.<sup>53</sup> Some who knew Edith believed that she could have had a successful career as a professional dancer had she not married Schaeffer and joined him in his Christian ministerial career. One of the great joys that the Schaeffer family shared in Europe included their visits to historical sites, great art museums, historic architectural masterpieces and musical events. The knowledge gained from these experiences would also eventually be used by

---

<sup>50</sup> Duriez, 54.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 54.

<sup>52</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 118.

<sup>53</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview, Steve Kraske Radio Talk Show, Kansas City, Mo., 6 Oct 2011.

Schaeffer to develop many of his theological positions on fundamentalism, modernity, and the decline of America. Eventually, too, this love affair with the arts would become a Francis Schaeffer trademark and gain for him intellectual respectability in the American evangelical/fundamentalist Christian community that would allow him to be influential among the leadership.

In the United States, the populace, which had survived the strife and strain of World War II, was settling in and moving ahead. Conservatives and evangelical/fundamentalist Christians were focusing their attention on a new enemy—“Godless” communism. Hitler and Nazism had been defeated, but now the new sinister force of communism was rearing its ugly head and had to be defeated. The leading spokesman against communism within the Presbyterian Church community was a preacher by the name of Carl McIntire.

McIntire had been a close ally and colleague of Machen, Schaeffer’s mentor at Westminster and Faith seminaries, but he and Schaeffer did not have close ties. Still, after McIntire founded the American Council of Christian Churches in 1941, Schaeffer became a member of the board of that organization. McIntire becomes important here only because he was responsible for Schaeffer’s eventual resignation from his position in Europe as a Presbyterian missionary. According to Frank Schaeffer: “In the 1940s my parents had a big fight with a fundamentalist leader I never met, Carl McIntire.... McIntire accused Dad of being a communist...this was... ‘part of the McCarthy-era witch hunts.’ Anyway, the upshot was that Dad left the mission that sent him to Europe in 1947.”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 30-31.

Frank, or “Franky,” as he was known in his youth, offered another important insight into the psyche of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. Frank points out that “Fundamentalists never can just disagree. The person they fall out with is not only on the wrong side of an issue; they are on the wrong side of God.... We don’t just disagree; we demonize the ‘other.’ And we don’t compromise.”<sup>55</sup> This philosophy would eventually lead Francis Schaeffer to begin preaching against America after another ten-years of study, research and writing at L’Abri. As we will see, this philosophy has also been adopted by many in the Religious Right and appears to be the major posture of Tea Party Congressmen and Congresswomen.

According to Duriez, another split was developing within the newer Presbyterian denomination, and McIntire, with his communist witch-hunt paranoia, was a part of the problem. This split would eventually lead to Schaeffer’s resignation from his position with the Presbyterian missions board.

Between 1951 and 1954 Schaeffer continued to travel all over Europe; he also took a long furlough back in the United States. During this time he “spoke 346 times in 515 days.”<sup>56</sup> At one of these speaking engagements, a troubling conversation occurred. After Schaeffer finished his remarks, a lady approached Edith, who had joined her husband at the event, and said, “Edith, there’s going to be a split in our denomination.”<sup>57</sup> Because this furlough had lasted much longer than previous ones, the Schaeffers must have had some inkling that something was wrong. While they waited for instruction from

---

<sup>55</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 31.

<sup>56</sup> Catherwood, 121.

<sup>57</sup> Duriez, 122.

the board, they took steps on their own to raise funds for their next mission assignment, realizing that whatever happened, funding would be insufficient for what they wanted to do.

It is fortunate that they began their own fundraising efforts because, even though they finally did receive directions from the Missions Board to return to Europe near the end of the eighteen-month furlough, adequate funding for their mission work was never fully restored. The Schaeffers had already decided to go out on their own. They had made enough contacts with wealthy American fundamentalist Christian contributors who supported their work to continue their ministry, however different that fundamentalist Christian work might be. It should be noted, however, that their trials and tribulations were certainly not over. They struggled mightily with their finances, their faith, and their belief that God would provide for their ministry. That ministry was to become quite unique.

From this point on the Schaeffers were more or less on their own, or as they believed, totally dependent on God for guidance, sustenance, and direction. Schaeffer wrote a letter of resignation to the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions on June 5, 1955. A year later, he explained to a friend in another letter: "...at this time I no longer have connections with any of the large organizations which have been known as 'the separated movement.'"<sup>58</sup> No indication has been found that the Schaeffers held any animosity toward their former Presbyterian colleagues, but they appear to have been ready to launch their ministry into new evangelical and fundamentalist Christian venues.

---

<sup>58</sup> Duriez, 132.

In 1955 the Schaeffers moved their residence and mission operation from Champéry to a chalet in the village of Huémoz located in Canton de Faud, in the Swiss Alps. Francis chose to name the chalet L'Abri, which means "the shelter" in French. Perhaps they were seeking shelter after the turmoil back home with the Presbyterian missions board. Or perhaps the name was influenced by the details of a skirmish they had in Champéry with local Swiss authorities. A Catholic priest had complained to the authorities that the Schaeffers were "having... a religious influence in the village of Champéry."<sup>59</sup> Apparently, the local Roman Catholic canton of Vallias<sup>60</sup> did not like the influence the Schaeffers were having in their community.

Thus, the Schaeffers were not only ordered to leave "the chalet they loved... but also Switzerland itself, all within six weeks..."<sup>61</sup> Only after strong intercession in their behalf by a powerful area politician were they able to stay in Switzerland, but they did have to move from Champéry. That's how they settled on the chalet at Huémoz, which would become famous as L'Abie.

Regardless of the source of the inspiration for the name, they were beginning a new ministry and a new chapter of their lives that would eventually lead to fame and fortune. Little did they realize in the beginning how their new ministry would grow and what a monumental success it would become in Europe and in the United States.

Based on numerous reports from those who visited and benefited from the services at L'Abri, the place must have been unlike any other. A *Time* magazine article

---

<sup>59</sup> Duriez 129.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 128.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.



called it “one of the most unusual missions in the Western world.”<sup>62</sup> The Schaeffers and the children believed it was the place they had dreamed of and prayed for. Were it not named L’Abri, it might have been called Shangri-La. L’Abri overlooked the Rhone valley and offered a magnificent view of the Alps. It was located near Geneva, Switzerland, and was only a four-hour train ride from northern Italy. Pictures of it and the surrounding mountains prove that it must have been an inspiring, heavenly location. Reverend Mel White described L’Abri this way: “The always-expanding, never-quite-large-enough Schaeffer compound offered hospitality to literally thousands of young, dissatisfied Americans who visited L’Abri to study, pray, dialogue, and debate with Francis, who taught ‘with a Bible in one hand and *Time* magazine in the other.’<sup>63</sup> White spent a considerable amount of time at L’Abri, helping Francis and Frank put together their first film, *How Should We Then Live*. White goes on to say, “Anyone who visited L’Abri during the next three decades will remember Edith Schaeffer’s amazing gift of hospitality and the delicious orange rolls she served to the young people sitting at Francis’s feet.”<sup>64</sup>

By the time the Schaeffers settled in at L’Abri, their oldest daughter, Priscilla, had entered the nearby University of Lausanne. On weekends she would invite fellow students to come to L’Abri to meet her family and enjoy the Schaeffer hospitality. Priscilla told of these weekends in an interview with Colin Duriez in 2007, when he interviewed her and her husband John Sandri. Duriez, quoting Priscilla, offers insight to significant change in

---

<sup>62</sup> “Mission to Intellectuals,” *Time*, (11 Jan 1960), 62-63. Volume Unknown.

<sup>63</sup> White, *Religion Gone Bad*, 26.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

Schaeffer: "...all of a sudden I saw my Dad in front of nineteen- and twenty-year-olds, answering their questions and relating it to the culture. Daddy loved that."<sup>65</sup> She recalled the sense of pride she felt about the experiences taking place at L'Abri:

The whole thing snowballed...As it went on, it got more and more orderly and organized. What was so wonderful was that for the first time in those early days I saw my father not reading all his religious Presbyterian magazines, or whatever; he was interested in *Newsweek* and his *Time* magazine, and spending all the hours he had talking to students, my friends, which was my joy. There wasn't anybody that I couldn't bring home—no matter how eccentric, how rebellious, how blasphemous as long as they had an interest, liked talking. I didn't have to be ashamed.<sup>66</sup>

Frank, Priscilla's much younger brother, added further insight to his sister's observations. He says in his book *Crazy for God*:

My parents' compassion was sincere and consistent. And they never allowed belief to make them into bigots. I grew up in a community where homosexuals (the term 'gay' was not in use) were not only welcomed but where my parents didn't do anything to make them feel uncomfortable and regarded their 'problem' as no more serious (or sinful) than other problems, from spiritual pride—a 'much more serious matter,' according to Dad—to gluttony."<sup>67</sup>

As time passed, even more diverse people flocked to L'Abri. Not only students came. Religious and non-religious came: old and young, male and female, from all nationalities. Many had various addictions, mental issues, and even a few came with serious illnesses. As news spread about L'Abri, all sorts of people became interested in it and came to learn from this new kind of religious teacher. Some came to enjoy the Alps. Many of the young people were on their own and lacking funds.

---

<sup>65</sup> Duriez, 135-136.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>67</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 77.

On the other hand, plenty of sons and daughters of America's wealthy, as well as its religious royalty, came to L'Abri. Billy Graham's daughter spent time there, as did President Gerald Ford's son. Timothy Leary, the famous American psychologist, writer and former Harvard professor, known for his advocacy of psychedelic drugs, came to L'Abri to meet Schaeffer. After several private sessions, Frank quotes Leary as saying to him, "If I thought your father is typical of other Christians, I'd reconsider my position."<sup>68</sup> Even the English actress Glynis Johns often came for Sunday high tea.

Prominent people and not-so-prominent people came to L'Abri for rest, comfort, and solace. They came from all over Europe and America. Frank Schaeffer related that Al Metsker and his wife Vidie, who in the 1950s and 1960s founded and promoted the Kansas City Youth For Christ organization, visited the Schaeffers at L'Abri.<sup>69</sup> Metsker brought Billy Graham to Kansas City in 1956. They were close friends and colleagues "in Christ." Of Graham, Frank says, "...the Billy Graham family sometimes dropped by to worship" in the small living-room chapel at L'Abri.<sup>70</sup> Frank also states, "By the time I was seven or eight, on any given weekend there were about fifteen guests packed into our house... By the time I was eleven or twelve, L'Abri had 'grown so wonderfully' that there were twenty or more guests staying with us all week. In summer, there were even more, with the overflow sleeping on the balconies that ran around the second and third floors... By the time I was fifteen, there were eighty to a hundred guests with us year-

---

<sup>68</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 79.

<sup>69</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Personal Interview, Kansas City, Mo., 8 Sept. 2011.

<sup>70</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 99.

round...”<sup>71</sup> Ronald W. Ruegsegger, one of Schaeffer’s many students who studied at L’Abri, described it this way: “L’Abri is a study center, rescue mission, extended family, clinic, spiritual convalescent home, monastery, and local church rolled into one; a milieu where visitors learn to be both Christian and human through being part of a community that trusts God the Creator and worships him through Christ the Redeemer.”<sup>72</sup>

No better view of L’Abri and the ministry at L’Abri of Francis Schaeffer can be found than the description offered by Edith Schaeffer in her book, simply titled *L’Abri*. In it she answers a question posed about her husband’s ministry: “Where did your husband get all this?” She begins by giving God credit for bringing a variety of people to the compound—people both young and old, seeking truth about their lives and the world they lived in. They were not interested in reading and studying about God, but they sought someone who would listen to them and give them logical and reasonable answers to their questions. Schaeffer, a common man yet insightful and intellectual, offered wisdom, knowledge, and simple truth based on his study and research of what God said in the Bible. Edith emphasized that Schaeffer accepted and spoke with all kinds of people from all nations and from all religious backgrounds and had been doing it for nearly fifteen years. She said he talked to “existentialists, logical positivists, Hindus, Buddhists, liberal Protestants, liberal Catholics, Reformed Jews and atheistic Jews, Muslims, members of occult cults, and people of a wide variety of religions and philosophies, as well as atheists of a variety of types.”<sup>73</sup> She emphasized further differences in the people who came to

---

<sup>71</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 67-68.

<sup>72</sup> Ronald W. Ruegsegger, *Reflections on Francis Schaeffer* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986), 14.

<sup>73</sup> Edith Schaeffer, *L’Abri* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1992), 227.

L'Abri. They included doctors, lawyers, scientists, and artists. They included engineers, philosophers, the educated and uneducated. Edith concluded her answer to the question by again giving God credit for what her husband had been able to gain from his experiences, research, and education and his ability to present to all kinds of people in a simple yet appealing and empathetic manner that endeared him to all who came.

By 1968, the year that Edith answered the question about her husband, the Schaeffers, and sometimes the children, had traveled over much of Europe on religious business, preaching opportunities, academic presentations, and vacations. On these trips, they never missed the opportunity to visit the great art displays, music festivals, and architectural masterpieces of Europe. Frank claims, and seems to regret, that his parents did not follow what he thought were really their first loves: music, dance, art, literature, history, and architecture. He says of his parents: "They were happiest when farthest away from their missionary work, wandering the back streets of Florence; or, rather, when they turned their missionary work into something very unmissionary-like, such as talking about art history instead of Christ."<sup>74</sup> But, they were missionaries and they were dedicated to their work in Christ. Thus, they kept going, albeit in a very different way than most evangelical/fundamentalist missionaries would have done.

In addition to their full-time missionary work at L'Abri and their travel, love, and study of the culture of Europe, the Schaeffers also studied, researched, lectured, and wrote many articles, speeches, and books. Edith, whose primary efforts focused on taking care of Francis and overseeing all aspects of life and living at L'Abri, also found time to become a competent and talented writer. The Schaeffers became well known not only

---

<sup>74</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 99.

throughout Europe but also in the United States, as evidenced by the sale of numerous books, speeches, and religious writings. Several major newspapers and magazines wrote articles about L'Abri and Francis Schaeffer. *Time* and *U.S. News and World Report* were paying attention to him, as were many Christian publications, including *Christian Nation*, *Christianity Today*, *Christian Century* and *Christian Scholar's Review*.

Between 1955 and 1980, which could be considered the most active years of his ministry, Schaeffer wrote twenty-two books containing over two thousand pages. According to Ruegsegger, more than three million copies of his twenty-two books had been sold by 1986; since 1982, when Schaeffer's *Complete Works* was first published in five volumes, the title has had five printings. The complete works were subtitled *A Christian Worldview*.<sup>75</sup> Based on these numbers, it is obvious that Schaeffer had become extremely popular in Europe and in the United States, particularly with American evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. Ruegsegger says of Schaeffer, "Among evangelicals he became an opinionmaker, a consciousness-raiser, and a conscience-stirrer, particularly regarding abortion on demand, for which the *Roe v. Wade* decision laid the foundation in 1973."<sup>76</sup>

### **Schaeffer's Beliefs**

While it would be impossible to offer a complete summary of all of Schaeffer's written work here, a brief summary will be helpful. Schaeffer's basic beliefs dominate his writings and can be found throughout his entire body of works. These beliefs can be

---

<sup>75</sup> Ruegsegger, 8-10.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

divided into several specific topics, most of which are based on the “fallen man” concept. This belief holds that man is “fallen” and is based on the story of Adam and Eve in the Book of Genesis, Chapter 3, in verses 7-24. In this story, Adam and Eve are instructed by God not to eat the apple from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. They eat the apple anyway. Having disobeyed God’s instructions, they are driven from the garden and are said to have fallen from the grace of God. It is the belief of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians that, because Adam and Eve represent the origin of all peoples, their “fall”—their sin—is passed on to every succeeding generation. The only way for any individual to return to the graces of God, they believe, is to be saved or born again. Otherwise, Hell—interpreted to represent a place of eternal suffering—awaits. From this belief, it is generally concluded that man is basically bad, always in sin, and untrustworthy.

It is interesting to note that this concept is one of the key principles held by most conservatives. According to Terence Ball and Richard Dagger, in their textbook, *Political Ideologies and The Democratic Ideal*, “In the case of conservatism, the fundamental conviction is that human beings are, and always will be, deeply flawed.”<sup>77</sup> Perhaps this is one of the reasons that so many evangelical/fundamentalist Christians flocked to Schaeffer’s teachings and books. This was a constant theme of Schaeffer’s work.

Schaeffer’s teachings and writings are also based on the literal truth of the Bible. The inerrancy of the Bible and all its teachings is a basic foundation of evangelical/fundamentalist Christian beliefs; Schaeffer never wavered from this basic foundation. He held, as do most evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, that the Bible is

---

<sup>77</sup> Terence Ball and Richard Dagger, *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal* (New York, NY: Pearson/Longman, 2004), 88.

the literal truth of God and every word in it is to be interpreted literally. After the story of God's creation of the heavens and the earth and his creation of man and woman in Genesis, the next truth for man comes from the story of Adam and Eve. From this story forward, most evangelical/fundamentalist Christians believe that man must live in this world according to the dictates and teachings in the Bible, with the goal of being found worthy by God to enter the Kingdom of Heaven when life ends or when God returns to Earth as described in the Book of Revelations. To avoid the wrath of God—to free oneself of sin and to be able to enter the Kingdom of Heaven—one must be saved or born again during one's lifetime. Furthermore, after one is born again, that individual is bound to both believe in all aspects of the Bible's teaching and to "spread the word of God to all nations," which means he or she must "evangelize" the world. This brings us to the "end times" concept, again coming from the Book of Revelations.

It is here that Schaeffer, in his later years, seems to have departed from his old belief of separatism and concluded that mankind was so bad and had fallen so far from God's grace that instead of "coming out from the world and being separate," true believers must now come back into the world, particularly to America and "take America back for God," as God had originally intended. This change occurred in a major way in the 1970s.

Interpreting this change in attitude and philosophy of Schaeffer, Barry Hankins, one of Schaeffer's biographers, chooses to describe it as "a call to cultural war."<sup>78</sup> Hankins also notes that "[son] Franky's influence was crucial," and that "Schaeffer's

---

<sup>78</sup> Barry Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008), 175.



career to this point had been thoroughly apolitical.”<sup>79</sup> Schaeffer’s new stance reflected some of the philosophy of Rousas John Rushdoony, a twentieth-century Christian philosopher and evangelical/fundamentalist Christian preacher who wrote *The Institutes of Biblical Law* in 1973. He is given credit for developing a much more radical form of Christianity known as dominionism. It is also referred to re-constructionism. Schaeffer is considered by some scholars and writers to have been a dominionist, as are Pat Robertson and even Sarah Palin.<sup>80</sup> Hedges says that some of the more radical aspects of dominionism, such as the idea that “the world is to be subdued and ruled by a Christian United States,” and that “the death penalty is to be imposed not only for offenses such as rape, kidnapping and murder, but also for adultery, blasphemy, homosexuality, astrology, incest, striking a parent,... delinquency, and, in the case of women, un-chastity before marriage,”<sup>81</sup> were a bit much for Schaeffer and Robertson. Hedges says, “This ideology (was) made more palatable for the mainstream by later disciples such as Francis Schaeffer and Pat Robertson.”<sup>82</sup>

Schaeffer wrote his final book in 1981 while dealing with early stage lymphatic cancer. The book was titled *A Christian Manifesto* and it called for “force...<sup>83</sup> the duty to, disobey the state...<sup>84</sup> the possibility of civil disobedience<sup>85</sup>...the right to resist unlawful

---

<sup>79</sup> Hankins, 175.

<sup>80</sup> Chip Berlet, *What is Dominionism? Palin, the Christian Right & Theocracy*, Theocracywatch.org. Sept. 5, 2008. Web. Accessed 15 July 2012.

<sup>81</sup> Hedges, *American Fascist*, 12.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>83</sup> Francis Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*, 117.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

authority,”<sup>86</sup> and “...we should attempt to correct and rebuild society before we advocate tearing it down or disrupting it.”<sup>87</sup> It should be noted that Schaeffer fully realized that he was playing around the edges of serious legal matters, but he persisted in going forward with these potentially seditious statements. He repeatedly made reference to the seriousness of his remarks and at one point wrote that “Anarchy is never appropriate,”<sup>88</sup> but his pronouncements along these lines continued until the time of his death in 1984.

One of Schaeffer’s favorite topics of conversation, discussion and teaching throughout his ministry was man’s World View, as contrasted with the Christian World View. Later the concepts were picked up and copied by other evangelical/fundamentalist Christian luminaries including Rev. D. James Kennedy, Charles Colson and Dr. James Dobson. Basically the “world view” concept had to do with how man looked at himself, where he came from, how he lived in this world and where he was going when he left this world. Of course for Schaeffer, the Bible, the teachings of Jesus, and the Christian faith offered the perfect world view that all men should live by. On the other side, was the world view of the non-believer which Schaeffer called “a humanistic one,” practiced by humanists who believed that “man is the measure of all things.”<sup>89</sup> In other words, humanists left God out and put their faith in man and man’s ability to figure out important matters on his own, without dependence on God. According to Schaeffer, the

---

<sup>86</sup> Francis Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*, 127.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>89</sup> Francis Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto* (sermon presented at the Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida), 1982.

Christian world view was based on “a Judeo-Christian consensus”<sup>90</sup> and the humanistic world view was based in large part on what Schaeffer called, in his sermon at D. James Kennedy’s Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church, “the material-energy final world view (shaped by pure chance)...”<sup>91</sup> or “...a world view based upon the idea that the final reality is impersonal matter or energy shaped into its present form by impersonal chance.”<sup>92</sup> Schaeffer was talking here about Darwin’s theory of evolution, which fundamentalists had hated since Darwin proposed it in 1859. Fundamentalists have always loved what they considered to be the certainty of creation by one God, in the beginning, as described in Genesis. It was Schaeffer’s belief that the humanistic world view, along with Darwinism, had begun with Thomas Aquinas, who “had an ‘incomplete view of the Fall,’ teaching that the human will was corrupted but not the intellect.”<sup>93</sup>

Schaeffer believed that Aquinas was wrong and that man’s intellect was also corrupted; thus man could not be trusted to use his own intellect, reason, and human wisdom to determine right from wrong. Therefore, if man continued forward in this world, without near total dependence on God and the teachings of the Bible, man’s society, culture, and government would become worse than it is today.

As mentioned earlier, evangelical/fundamentalist Christians became increasingly angry and frustrated about what was going on in the country. Schaeffer mentioned such things as “permissiveness, pornography, the public schools, the breakdown in the family,

---

<sup>90</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto* (sermon presented to congregation of Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, 1982.)

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Ruegsegger, 202.

and finally abortion,”<sup>94</sup> as the most obvious short-comings of humanistic society, which he believed had taken over the country, but there were still other major issues that these Christians were angry about. Schaeffer said in *A Christian Manifesto* and in his sermon in the Coral Ridge church that “We are now losing those freedoms...”<sup>95</sup> The freedoms that Schaeffer was mistakenly talking about were not freedoms at all. They were the issues and subjects that the courts, particularly the Supreme Court, had examined and found unconstitutional. They were issues like school prayer, the placing of religious symbols on public property, and abortion. It was Schaeffer who led the way for evangelical/fundamentalists Christians to begin thinking that American democracy had been established by Christians and that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution had been written by the Founding Fathers with the intent that the nation was to be a nation based on the Judeo-Christian ethic based upon a literal interpretation of the Bible. Schaeffer found new ways to re-interpret the nation’s founding documents and to make the claim that, during the last forty to fifty years, the courts and sometimes the Congress had gone far astray in leading the nation in the right direction. Hankins says that, “As Schaeffer issued a call for Christians to resist the slide toward authoritarianism (the courts), he changed his rhetoric about secular humanism”<sup>96</sup> and claimed that its practitioners were “an organized group of persons and even agents of anti-Christian activists”<sup>97</sup> who had developed “...a concerted effort, a plot, and a war carried out against

---

<sup>94</sup> Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*, Sermon.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

Christian values.”<sup>98</sup> Hankins goes on to say that Schaeffer was well aware that “a war against a visible army embodied by real people was much more energizing for populist foot soldiers than abstract arguments against dangerous yet disembodied ideas.”<sup>99</sup>

Following this same theme in 1982, Schaeffer preached the lengthy sermon at the Coral Ridge church mentioned above. In the sermon he repeatedly claimed that the United States was in a state of tyranny. His exact words were, “There is no other word we can use for our present situation that I have just been describing, except the word TYRANNY! TYRANNY! That’s what we face.”<sup>100</sup> He continued: “When the government negates the law of God, it abrogates its authority. God has given certain offices to restrain chaos in this fallen world, but it does not mean that these offices are autonomous, and when a government commands that which is contrary to the Law of God, it abrogates its authority.”<sup>101</sup> Schaeffer eventually asked the congregation, “Should we obey man... rather than God?” He then answered his own question by saying that “it is the duty of the Christian to disobey the government... Caesar is not to be put in the place of God...”<sup>102</sup> His references to “man” and “Caesar” were of course direct references to the United States government.

It should be remembered that early Christians interpreted this verse in the Bible’s Book of Matthew to mean that Christians should follow the laws made by Caesar (government) and to follow the principles established by God/Jesus in all other aspects of

---

<sup>98</sup> Hankins, 177.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> Francis Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*. Address. Fort Lauderdale, Fla. 1982. People for Life Website. June 3, 2010. Web. 6 June 2011.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

life. Matthew was quoting the words of Jesus, who said, “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things which are God’s.”<sup>103</sup> Once again, we find that when conflict arises having to do with the inerrancy of the Bible, modern-day Christians seem to have little trouble re-defining or re-interpreting it.

Was Schaeffer advocating sedition? Frank Schaeffer says his father was advocating such and he admits that he was also.<sup>104</sup> This new thinking on the part of Schaeffer might have come originally from his early encounters with the writings of Rushdoony, even though Frank Schaeffer claims that his dad regarded Rushdoony “as clinically insane.”<sup>105</sup> Regardless, the elder Schaeffer, began to preach and write that “when all avenues to flight and protest have closed, force in the defensive posture is appropriate.”<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> *Holy Bible* (New York, NY: Oxford Press, 1945), Matthew 22:21.

<sup>104</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Sex, Mom and God* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2011), 140.

<sup>105</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 333.

<sup>106</sup> Francis Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*, 117.

## CHAPTER 3

### CHANGING TIMES CALL FOR CHANGING ATTITUDES

During the L'Abri years a major transition began to develop in the thinking and philosophical attitudes of Francis Schaeffer. These changes did not take him far from his original thinking about God and his faith that "...all truth comes from the Bible,"<sup>1</sup> but they did give him a new perspective about young people, their interests, and their problems. This change in perspective would give him a great opportunity to begin to interpret the newer culture developing in America. Schaeffer's observations of what was happening in America in the 1960s not only alarmed him greatly but convinced him even more that the Great Fall or End Times predicted in the Book of Revelations was rapidly approaching. These observations and his conclusions would eventually lead to his return to America.

The 1960s were turbulent years in America. Some seventy million children from the post-war baby-boom were becoming teenagers and young adults, and the societal movement away from conservative religious principles and doctrines of the past was reaching its peak. There was a desire, particularly on the part of young people, to move America into the modern age, or space age, as it was called. These young people seemed to reject most everything from the past. They dressed differently, as evidenced by hot pants and miniskirts, which were quite alarming to religious conservatives because girls' legs and body curves were being revealed. Boys wore vivid, colored clothing and let their hair grow long, which many conservatives found shocking. Music, art, and literature changed as well. Conservative religious people had hated the gyrations of Elvis Presley

---

<sup>1</sup> Duriez, 21.

and his music in the 1950s, but the worst was yet to come. The Beatles arrived from England in 1964, followed by the introduction of many different kinds of pop and rock-and-roll music, and the use of various drugs for recreational purposes gained in popularity. The music of black musicians became increasingly popular, most of which was revolting to conservative Christians who were alarmed if not overwhelmed at what they saw as more modernity taking over America. Festivals and celebrations that combined these symbols of modernity occurred with frequency. In the late 1960s an estimated 400,000 young people gathered at the Woodstock Music Festival in upstate New York. Media coverage of the event shocked even moderate Americans, who wondered what was happening to the nation's youth.

Several other nation-changing events took place in the 1960s that shocked the mostly white Anglo-Saxon Protestant population. John F. Kennedy became the first Catholic in American history to be elected President of the United States. Shortly thereafter, in 1963 he appointed a Presidential Commission on the Status of Women to address women's rights. The Civil Rights movement that had begun in the mid-1950s continued to gain momentum, with picketing and demonstrations across the United States. The results culminated with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which banned discrimination in employment practices and public accommodations. Other Civil Rights acts followed. The Voting Rights Act in 1964 assured voting rights for blacks and other minorities. This was followed by the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which banned discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. While the American populace was shocked and alarmed by these events, evangelical/fundamentalist Christians became not only incensed by the events but increasingly determined to rise up and "take America back for



God.” Their rallying cry? “America is a Christian nation.”

The Vietnam War, which had begun somewhat secretly in the late 1950s, became a major issue in the 1960s as well. Many young Americans who opposed the war and draft laws protested and revolted against the war. Riots and demonstrations broke out in all parts of the country, and many young Americans fled to other countries to avoid becoming a part of the war. Citizens began to fear that democracy was breaking down. American patriotism, the foundation of America’s success in World War II, was now in question. Daily, national television and newspaper coverage of the war carried horrible pictures of the killings, bombings, and destruction taking place in Vietnam. Americans became more and more distraught over attitudes and conditions in the country. Most distraught of all were the conservative evangelical/fundamentalist Christians.

Amidst all these alarming circumstances in the 1960s and early 1970s, the U.S. Supreme Court was pushing and promoting what many considered to be liberal, anti-religious, anti-Christian and anti-American court rulings. And the Congress, in the opinion of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, was doing little about it. In the early 1960s a series of cases came before the Supreme Court that dealt with the question of prayer in public schools. Prayers had been a staple in schools almost from the beginning of the country, even though some religious denominations, such as Catholics and Mormons, were uncomfortable with the situation. In 1962 the Supreme Court ruled in the case *Engel v. Vitale* that prayer in public schools was unconstitutional.<sup>2</sup> A year later, in *Abington School District v. Schempp*, the Court overturned the practice of the school

---

<sup>2</sup> John W. Whitehead. *Key United States Supreme Court Religion Decisions*. The Rutherford Institute Website. 2002. <http://www.rutherford.org/PDF/SupremeCourtReligionFinal.pdf>. March 20, 2012.

district that had required the reading of at least ten Bible verses each day.<sup>3</sup> A few years later, in 1971, in the case *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, the Court ruled that any practice or event sponsored by public schools in any state had to meet a three-fold test: (1) Any event or activity had to have a secular purpose, (2) The event or activity should neither advance nor inhibit religion as its primary effect, and (3) It must not result in an excessive entanglement between government and religion.<sup>4</sup> All of these Court decisions, combined with the earlier 1954 *Brown v. the Board of Education* decision that overruled the long established principle of separate but equal schools for black and white students, continued to infuriate conservative evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. Some Americans believed that southerners were far more incensed by these actions than other Americans, but resentment over all these events and activities was widespread across the nation.

The proverbial straw that broke the camel's back came on January 22, 1973. On that day the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in the *Roe v. Wade* case, overturning a Texas abortion law and making abortion legal in the United States. That decision will probably go down in American history as one of the most divisive Court decisions ever made. As we shall see, from that day forward, the United States has been, and continues to be, a divided nation. Just as the issue of slavery divided Americans in the mid-1800s, *Roe v. Wade* divided Americans in the final quarter of the 1900s and that division has carried forward unabated through the first decade of the twenty-first century.

---

<sup>3</sup> John W. Whitehead. *Key United States Supreme Court Religion Decisions*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

The greatest clamor against the Roe v. Wade ruling came from millions of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics. These were the very same people who had been seething over other court decisions as well as the nation's general "turning away from God" that had been going on far too long, in their opinion. Jerry Falwell, a young Baptist preacher from Lynchburg, Virginia, best described his feelings, and those of millions of other evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, about the Roe v. Wade decision in his autobiography. Falwell writes:

On January 23, 1973, just four months before the S.E.C. began its attack on Thomas Road Baptist Church, a story in our *Lynchburg News* radically affected my life and the life of my family. The morning's banner headline read: 'Lyndon Johnson Dies.' At the same time I noticed another front-page announcement almost lost in the long presidential obituary.<sup>5</sup>

Falwell quotes the short article:

Supreme Court Legalizes Abortion: Yesterday, in the landmark Roe v. Wade decision, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional all state laws that prohibited voluntary abortions before the third month. Feminists hail the decision as an important breakthrough for their cause. Right to life opponents of the decision promise to fight for a constitutional amendment banning abortions.<sup>6</sup>

Falwell went on to say:

In growing horror and disbelief, I read and reread the short article describing the historical case titled Roe v. Wade. The Supreme Court had just made a decision by a seven-to-two margin that would legalize the killing of millions of unborn children. In one terrible act they struck down all the state laws against abortion and legalized infanticide across the land. I could not believe that seven justices on the nation's highest court have so little regard for the value of human lives.<sup>7</sup>

Falwell spoke that day for millions and millions of Americans, and from that day to this

---

<sup>5</sup> Jerry Falwell, *Strength for the Journey* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 334-335.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

day, the battle rages. The Roe v. Wade decision ignited a fire that continues to sweep the nation.

Across the Atlantic in the Swiss Alps, the Roe v. Wade decision was watched with great interest by the Schaeffer family. Frank Schaeffer was particularly interested in it because of a coincidental event that was being played out in Frank's life during this time. Frank's actions would eventually have a profound impact on the abortion issue in America.

### **Frank Schaeffer: His Father's Son**

However, before we discuss that event, we must focus additional attention on Frank Schaeffer. Earlier quotes from books and public appearances by Frank Schaeffer have provided insights and observations about Francis Schaeffer, Edith Schaeffer, L'Abri, and the Schaeffer ministry. It is now time to introduce Frank Schaeffer, the last child and only son of Francis and Edith. History may someday report that Frank became a more prominent player than his father in bringing America to its knees religiously, culturally, politically, and economically.

Frank Schaeffer, better known in his younger days as "Franky," was born in Champéry, Switzerland, on August 3, 1952. By his own admission Franky was a rascal. His parents, Edith and Francis, were already near forty years of age, his three sisters were nearly grown, and his father was deeply enthralled with his unique European ministry, so Franky was much the odd man (child) out. He acknowledges that early on his father had little time for him, but he was obviously the apple of his mother's eye. It would be incorrect to say that she doted over him, but at the same time she was bound and

determined to see that he was a loved, educated, and well-cared-for child.

He loved growing up in the Alps and at L'Abri, and he treasured the experiences he got to enjoy getting acquainted with all the students and visitors to L'Abri, particularly the girls. In *Crazy for God*, he says, "The view of the Alps always seemed like a special reward to our family for doing God's will. 'If we had stayed in America, we'd never have a view like this,' Mom would say."<sup>8</sup>

Frank says of himself, "I grew up with a gift for verbal communication. By the time I was nine or ten, I could mimic my parents and compose an articulate answer to almost any theological question. And I had a flair for vocabulary that maybe only a dyslexic raised with no TV and who had a mother who read out loud, could acquire."<sup>9</sup> Frank would later become and is today a successful and well-known author of fiction and nonfiction books. His work has received awards.

Frank took great delight in ridiculing his parents about many of their peculiar religious beliefs, their 24-hour-a-day Christian rituals, and their evangelical/fundamentalist beliefs. To say that Frank was irreverent would be an understatement. An example of this can be found in a story he tells in *Crazy for God*, where he describes a conversation relating to a bout he had with polio. He came down with the disease at age two while the family was returning to Europe after one of their furloughs to the United States. After several years of treatment, an operation, and therapy, he recovered well; the only evidence that he had the disease is a slight limp.<sup>10</sup> The narrative reveals Frank as a

---

<sup>8</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 9.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>10</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Personal interview. Charlie Broomfield. Kansas City, Mo. 8 Sept. 2011.

rascal and gives insight into some of the religious ideas of the family.

Shortly after returning to Switzerland, Edith was referred to a local doctor who claimed that he had discovered a cure for polio. Frank tells the story:

This polio ‘specialist’ talked Mom into allowing him to replace some of my spinal fluid with a ‘special serum’ he made from tapping the spinal fluid of chimpanzees... Mom knew this doctor was crazy, and she prayed for guidance... Dad left all medical decisions up to Edith, as well as letting her decide anything to do with our education, prayer life and introduction to the facts of life... Apparently she got told by God to proceed, and I was wheeled off by the nuns who were nurses in this very Roman Catholic hospital... Mom said she waited on her knees, crying in the ward... They administered one treatment and brought me back to Mom... Throughout my childhood, Mom often repeated the story and said it was the hardest decision of her life, but ‘Who knows, perhaps that old doctor’s ideas really did save your other leg because you walked again and they all said you wouldn’t...’ I have monkey blood in me?’ I asked, feeling strangely delighted. ‘Not monkey blood, darling: chimpanzee spinal fluid.’ ... When I arrived at the state of life, around eleven years old, when teasing Mom became one of my favorite pastimes, I would bring up the ‘monkey story.’ A good time to wind Mom up was at bedtime when she came up to read to me and then we’d pray together, and moments later she would be about to close my bedroom door, having tucked me in. I didn’t want to go to sleep... ‘Mom?’ I asked just as my bedroom door was closing... ‘Yes dear?’ ... ‘Mom, if monkey serum cured me, then maybe it proves we really are evolved from monkeys.’ ... ‘Don’t be ridiculous, dear.’ ... ‘I’m not, Mom. I’ve been thinking about my polio, and I really do think that maybe this proves evolution.’ ... ‘you might be joking and you might think this is funny but you are coming awfully close to joking about things we never joke about.’ ... ‘Monkeys?’ You know perfectly well what I mean! ... Good night, dear.<sup>11</sup>

Another candid observation that Frank was apparently making as a young man about fundamentalist Christianity and about his parents’ missionary endeavors is found in other personal references he makes in *Crazy for God*. Frank says, “I think my father lived with a tremendous tension that pitted his growing interest in art, culture, music, and history against a stunted theology frozen in the modernist/fundamentalist battles of his

---

<sup>11</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 37-38.

youthful Christian experience.”<sup>12</sup> His next comment on the same subject is equally insightful. Talking about his mother and father, their marriage, their religion and religious work, and the rearing of their children, he says, “...what they never intended, but was also part of their legacy, was that they drove their children crazy.”<sup>13</sup> Obviously these are great exaggerations, but Frank offers them to show the extreme difficulty that human beings have in attempting to deal with life and life’s issues while at the same time attempting to live one’s life by the dictates and mandates found in the 2000-plus-year-old Christian Bible, which is considered by evangelical/fundamentalist Christians to be the word of God and/or the inspired word of God and positively inerrant.

Frank admits that he came of age, or to adulthood, before his time. He also admits that he was smitten, even before he was a teenager, with many of the young girls who came to L’Abri. Frank is a very candid and forthright gentleman today, and he apparently was then.<sup>14</sup> The following story about Frank’s life offers insight into the difficulties of living a totally committed Christian life. He says that his life took a major new direction at age 17, when he impregnated an 18-year-old girl named Genie who had visited L’Abri and stayed. Shortly after the discovery of her pregnancy, Frank and Genie married. Nine months later, a new daughter arrived. Frank says his mother and father had to have realized that the two youngsters were having sex but overlooked it. Eventually, Edith reminded Francis, who was extremely angry about the situation, that the same thing

---

<sup>12</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 37-38.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>14</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Personal interview. Charlie Broomfield. Kansas City, Mo. 8 Sept. 2011.

might have happened to him and her when they first met back in Philadelphia years before. That seemed to have quelled Francis' anger over the "un-Christian" situation.

The only reason for telling this very personal story is because it relates specifically to the Roe v. Wade decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and because it played a major role in the next ten or so years of Frank and Francis Schaeffer's life. It even haunts Frank today. Frank has written about his and his wife's early experience with pregnancy, childbirth, and the problems that many young people have when addressing the question of "What in the world are we going to do? I'm pregnant." But how does Schaeffer's personal situation tie in with the way that the abortion issue in America skyrocketed to national prominence?

When Steve Kraske interviewed Frank on his radio show in 2010, he asked him a similar question. Schaeffer responded that he was "a young fiery guy...I was trying to learn how to become a father"<sup>15</sup> when he became aware of the Supreme Court decision. "It [abortion] was not a political issue with me...it was partly theological and partly personal...very human...it was a very personal issue with me...I took this issue seriously on a gut level..."<sup>16</sup>

By this time also, Frank says, "I had become my Dad's sidekick in his ministry that by now had grown significantly given his wide recognition in the evangelical/fundamentalist religious community, his twenty-plus books that were selling in the millions, his speaking engagements, and recordings."<sup>17</sup> He had an office, administrative

---

<sup>15</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview. Steve Kraske, KCUR Public Radio Show. Kansas City, Mo. 6 Ma 2010.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.



assistants and secretaries, and a budget of a million-and-a-half dollars to make a documentary about history, art, culture, and theology.<sup>18</sup> He and his dad were in the early stages of producing a new thirteen-episode Christian documentary titled *How Should We Then Live*, which would eventually become another major success with the burgeoning Religious Right in America. That the subject of abortion would arise at this time was logical, given the nature of plans for the film. He explains:

When we started making *How Should We Then Live?* Dad had not wanted to even mention abortion in the series. We were already in production when the Supreme Court handed down the *Roe v. Wade* decision legalizing abortion. If it hadn't been for me, Dad's reputation as an evangelical scholar would have remained intact. As it was, my absolutist youthful commitment to the pro-life cause goaded my father into taking political positions far more extreme than came naturally to him.<sup>19</sup>

The rest of this important story is valuable and insightful. Unfortunately, had it been studied and considered more at the time by those who got so deeply involved in the issue, Americans may not have ended up in the religious, legal, political, and cultural turmoil that we find ourselves in today. Frank goes on: "...Dad and I had been arguing for several weeks before my trip...(over the abortion issue). I had just come home from yet another successful fundraising tour in the States. (He was raising money from wealthy evangelical donors to produce the documentary). We picked up (the argument) where we left off."<sup>20</sup> Frank's father's response to his son's insistence that the subject be a part of the documentary proves his position. "I don't want to be identified with some Catholic issue. I'm not putting my reputation on the line for them! ...What does abortion have to

---

<sup>18</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 260.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 265.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

do with art and culture? I'm known as an intellectual, not for this sort of *political thing*.”<sup>21</sup>

Frank continues the argument by challenging his father on some of his Christian teachings having to do with the uniqueness of every individual. His father concedes to some extent on this point, then objects that they had already written the script for the documentary. Frank shouts back at his father, “*We’re* writing the script! We can change the fucking script...” “Don’t you dare say ‘fuck’ to me again,”<sup>22</sup> his father responds. “I didn’t say ‘fuck’ to you, I said ‘fucking script.’”<sup>23</sup>

In the end, Francis Schaeffer acceded to his son’s wishes, and the script for the documentary was changed. Not only was it changed, a review of the documentary shows that the single major issue of the documentary now became *Roe v. Wade* and abortion, which the narrative claimed was additional proof of the decline and eventual fall of America. According to Frank,

Dad agreed with me about abortion in principle. He had already noted in several lectures that *Roe v. Wade* was a ‘horrible decision.’...Dad and Mom prayed over the matter...My father came to me a few days after our screaming match and said he had decided that, as ‘rude and abrasive’ as I had been, my call to him was nevertheless ‘prophetic.’ We would change the last two episodes of *How Should We Then Live*.<sup>24</sup>

The documentary was completed in 1977. This was 34 years after Francis Schaeffer began his ministry. The documentary soon became a classic for fundamentalists. Millions of copies were sold and it became a staple of evangelical/

---

<sup>21</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 267.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

fundamentalist Christian and Catholic teachings against abortion. It also was used by these groups in their ongoing campaign against not only abortion but also against the Supreme Court and the U.S. government. While no numbers have been found as to how many times the documentary was shown to what must have been tens of thousands of Catholic and evangelical/fundamentalist Christian church congregations, the numbers must have been overwhelming.

The documentary is still available and appears to be selling well as of late 2011. Gateway Films/Vision Video, which sells the documentary, advertises it on its website with this description: “This is Dr. Francis Schaeffer’s spectacular series on the rise and decline of Western culture from a Christian perspective... This program presents profound truths in simple language and concludes that man’s only hope is a return to God’s Biblical absolute—the Truth revealed in Christ through the Scriptures.”<sup>25</sup>

### **The Truths**

It is important to note now the eight words stated above and the “Truth” they argue for. The concept, or “Truth,” referred to in the statement is exactly that which Francis Schaeffer believed in and dedicated his life to in 1930 when he was eighteen years of age. It is also the basic belief of most evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, as well as members of many other Christian denominations in the United States.

We should now identify and examine several of these basic “Truths” or beliefs in more detail because it is these beliefs that provide the historically established foundation for the religious beliefs that have caused and are causing the turmoil between

---

<sup>25</sup> Gateway Films Vision Video Website.  
[http://www.visionvideo.com/taf?\\_function=detail&a\\_product\\_id=319938kywdlinkid=56&g](http://www.visionvideo.com/taf?_function=detail&a_product_id=319938kywdlinkid=56&g).

evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and most other Americans over the issue of modernism and whether America is or should be a Christian nation. The abortion issue is simply an extension of these beliefs, but it provided the spark that started the fire that rages today in America between these two mighty forces.

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians believe in the total and complete inerrancy of the Bible.* It is this Bible, and this Christian faith, that Francis Schaeffer committed himself to in 1930 when he stated that “all important questions in life”<sup>26</sup> are answered in the Bible and “all truth is from the Bible.”<sup>27</sup> Schaeffer and most Protestant Christians base their faith and beliefs on the Christian Bible, a book that actually consists of sixty-six different books written by numerous individuals over a many-year period. The first book in the New Testament, the Book of Matthew, begins what is described by Christians, at least in the King James version of the Bible, as being God’s “new Covenant” with his people. It was written some thirty-seven years after Jesus, God’s son, was supposedly crucified on the cross.<sup>28</sup> The remaining twenty-six books that make up the New Testament were written over the next thirty years or so. This vast amount of time would lead one to question at least some aspects of the Bible, not to mention the age and writers of the books in the Old Testament, but these numbers appear to have had no effect on Francis Schaeffer and his fellow evangelical/fundamentalist Christians.

Consider Francis

Schaeffer’s own words on this important subject:

---

<sup>26</sup> Duriez, 21.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Rev. C. I. Scofield, *The Scofield Reference Bible, King James Version* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1909), 993.

He (God) had spoken (in the Bible to his people) in ways that people could understand... in the old Testament, in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, and in the gradually growing New Testament. Thus the Christians not only had knowledge about the universe and mankind that people cannot find out by themselves, but they had absolute, universal values by which to live and by which to judge the society and the political state in which they lived.<sup>29</sup>

Schaeffer went on to say, "...the Bible tells men and women true things about God.

Therefore, they can know true things about God. One can know true things about God because God has revealed Himself."<sup>30</sup> Thus, it was Schaeffer's belief, and it is the belief of a vast number of American evangelical/fundamentalist Christians today that all of these words and the concepts they offer are true, correct, indisputable, and all that one needs to know. Anything other than these "Truths" is secondary or of no value. To be a true "saved" Christian, one must agree and believe "in one's heart" and in one's mind that the Bible is inerrant and the true word of God.

Obviously, great conflict arose and continues today within the Christian community, and throughout the nation and the world, over such an omnipotent belief system. To be sure, it has divided Christian against Christian, Americans against Americans, and evangelical/fundamentalist Christians against almost everybody else. Recently, Theo Anderson, who holds a Ph.D. in American history from Yale University and teaches seminars at Chicago's Newberry Library, said, in observing this phenomenon: "America's divisions involve fundamental questions of trust and truth: What authorities do you believe? Whose definition of truth do you accept?"<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live: The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer, A Christian World View, Volume 5.* (Wheaton, Illinois. Crossway Books, 1982), 86.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Theo Anderson, *New Confederacy Rising*, In These Times, October 5, 2011.

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians must believe in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ.* Believing in the inerrancy of the Bible, its correctness, and its literalism, one must then believe what is stated in Matthew 1:18, which reads, “Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: when his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>32</sup> These words, according to fundamentalist belief, mean what they seem to say, that Jesus was born of a virgin.

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians must believe in Christ’s substitutionary atonement for man’s “original” sins.* It is the belief of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians that “man is fallen.” In other words, man is sinful and has always been sinful, from his beginning in the Garden of Eden, when Adam and Eve failed to obey God’s directions. It is believed by these believers that the sin of Adam and Eve has been passed on down through the generations to every man and woman, even those living today. Thus, it is only through the shedding of Jesus’s blood as he hung on the cross that atones for man’s sins. By believing this, and by being born again, one can now enter the kingdom of heaven. Schaeffer and other Christian theologians refer to this as “Christ’s substitutionary atonement.”<sup>33</sup>

This concept relates back to an ancient practice of the early Jews, described in the Old Testament that has to do with the Jews’ early relationship with God. To protect themselves from God’s judgment and to prove their redemption, each year Jews were to slaughter an unblemished lamb and with its blood paint a mark on the posts outside one’s door. Thus, as the practice is explained in Exodus 12:13, when the Lord “passes over,” he

---

<sup>32</sup> Book of Matthew, *Holy Bible*, King James Version. N.p.: Thomas Nelson, 1990.

<sup>33</sup> Leroy Seat, *Fed Up with Fundamentalism: A Historical, Theological, and Personal Appraisal of Christian Fundamentalism*. (United States: 4-L Publications, 2007), 8.

will see the sign and not “suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you.”<sup>34</sup>

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians must believe in the bodily resurrection of Jesus.* As the Bible states in the Gospels, after Jesus was crucified on the cross, and died, his body was placed in a tomb. On the third day, the Bible records in the Book of Mark, Chapter 16, verse 6, that “...Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James, and Salome” came to the tomb, “and entering into the sepulcher, they saw a young man sitting on the right side,” ...who told them, “he is risen...”<sup>35</sup> Thus, evangelical/fundamentalist Christians believe that Jesus rose from the dead and they believe that he ascended into heaven, where he awaits true believers.

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians must believe “the factuality of Jesus’s miracles.”*<sup>36</sup> According to the Bible, Jesus is recorded to have performed many miracles. These included walking on water, restoring a blind man’s sight, and returning a dead man to life. Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians must believe these and other miracles, to be considered born again. It is amazing that millions upon millions of Americans profess to believe in these and other miracles of Jesus, as evidenced repeatedly over the years in annual polling done by Pew Research, Gallup and others.

*Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians must believe in what is called Apocalypticism (also called endism).* While a thorough examination and analysis of the evangelical/fundamentalists’ beliefs listed above may come as a surprise to many

---

<sup>34</sup> Rev. C. I. Scofield, *The Scofield Reference Bible, King James Version*, 84.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 1068.

<sup>36</sup> Leroy Seat, *Fed Up with Fundamentalism*, 8.

intellectual thinkers, this later one may be the most dubious. And, it should be the most disturbing, particularly today. This is so, because not only do evangelical/fundamentalist Christians believe in apocalypticism (endism), they are now coming to believe that they must do all in their power to bring the world to an end by aiding and assisting Jesus, or God, in his return to earth.

Apocalypticism (endism) is the belief, based upon the story in the Book of Revelations, that God will soon return to earth to set up his Kingdom. Following is a direct example and explanation of this belief as stated by Gary Frazier, a born-again Christian and a professional organizer, mostly for evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, of Holy Land tours in Israel. He is also a close colleague of the Reverend Tim LaHaye. He and LaHaye took a group of approximately 90 American evangelical Christians on a trip to the Holy Land in May of 2005. As reported by author Craig Unger, “On a scorching afternoon in late May 2005, Tim LaHaye, the seventy-nine-year-old coauthor of the *Left Behind* series of apocalyptic thrillers, leads several dozen of his acolytes up a long, winding path to a hilltop in the ancient fortress city of Megiddo, Israel.”<sup>37</sup> Megiddo, according to Unger, is, “the site of roughly twenty different civilizations over the last ten thousand years, ...it is also one of the most important”<sup>38</sup> for evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. It is at this site, better known as Armageddon, that a cataclysmic battle between the forces of Christ and the Antichrist will take place, according to Revelations. It is important to note that most Christians, particularly

---

<sup>37</sup> Unger, *American Armageddon*, 15.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.



evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, for hundreds of years have been expecting this cataclysmic battle to occur.

LaHaye turns to Gary Frazier to explain to the gathering how the apocalypse will begin. Frazier begins by asking the group, “How many of you have read the *Left Behind* prophecy novels?”<sup>39</sup> Almost everybody raises their hands. “The thing you must know,” Frazier tells them:

...is that the next event on God’s prophetic plan, we believe, is the catching away of the saints in the presence of the Lord. We call it the Rapture...the Lord will descend from heaven with a shout...The dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air... Christ is going to appear...He is going to call all of his saved, all of his children, home to be with him...in the twinkling of an eye...Jesus taught his disciples that he was going to go away to his father’s house, but that he was not going to abandon them...Jesus is going to come and get his bride, which comprises all of us who are born again...Now ladies and gentlemen, I want you to know...that Christ is coming...And we believe that that day is very, very near.<sup>40</sup>

Frazier now turns to Revelations 19 and begins to read: “And I saw heaven standing open...And there before me was a white horse, whose rider is called Faithful and True. With justice he judges and makes war. His eyes are like blazing fire...”<sup>41</sup> Frazier continues to build to the climax of his biblical lesson on the apocalypse by using phrases and statements such as these: “This doesn’t sound like compassionate Jesus... This doesn’t sound like the suffering servant of Isaiah 53. This is the Warrior King. He judges and makes war...out of his mouth comes a sharp sword...”<sup>42</sup> Finally, Frazier gets to the story of the actual beginning of the battle between Christ and the Antichrist. Unger, who

---

<sup>39</sup> Unger, *American Armageddon*, 16.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

was on the trip with Frazier and LaHaye, continues, “Once Christ joins the battle, both the Antichrist and the False Prophet are quickly captured and cast into a lake of fire and brimstone.”<sup>43</sup>

Craig Unger concludes this section of his book with this observation: “Such beliefs may seem astounding to secular Americans, but they are not unusual. According to a Time/CNN poll from 2002, 59% of Americans believe the events in the Book of Revelations will take place.” In addition he says, “...a January 2007 study by the Berna Group, a Christian research firm, found that there are 84 million adult evangelicals in the United States—38% of the population.”<sup>44</sup>

It should be pointed out that Francis Schaeffer and most other Christian theologians rarely ever admit that as history has advanced, many questions have arisen about the Bible and what various verses mean, and how conflicting issues are to be resolved. Such issues are most often interpreted by church leaders, philosophers, and theologians who frequently come up with different interpretations. It is also interesting to note that much of the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian belief system that endures today was not part of the belief system of the Christians that came to this country in the 1600s; rather, much of it was developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s at Princeton Theological Seminary—the same seminary where Dr. J. Gresham Machen taught prior to his dismissal as a result of disputes over modern and fundamentalist interpretations of the Bible. Machen was a good friend, mentor, and professor of Francis Schaeffer at

---

<sup>43</sup> Unger, *American Armageddon*, 18.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

Westminster Seminary, before they both left Westminster to go to and start Faith Seminary in 1937.

As mentioned previously, Francis Schaeffer wrote twenty-two books and hundreds of articles, and preached many sermons and made numerous recordings, most of which were based on the basic fundamentalist beliefs outlined above. He believed completely in the total content of the Christian Bible, preached it, wrote about it, and lived it. However, he did offer many different interpretations of different parts and different subjects in the Bible that were not exactly in line with basic evangelical/fundamentalist beliefs.

This is to say, Schaeffer was not content to establish an unchanging, inflexible belief system. He reinterpreted ideas as he became more knowledgeable, and his reinterpretations often appeared to move him toward a more radical perspective. An insightful comment made by Frank Schaeffer about his father will help readers better understand Francis Schaeffer and his changing attitude about man, man's future, and American politics and government. When Frank was in Kansas City, Missouri, in 2010, his response to a radio program caller revealed a great deal about the evolution of his father's beliefs. The question was "What did your dad think/believe about—?" Frank responded: "First, you need to tell me the time frame in which you want to know." The point that he was making was that, like most people, Francis Schaeffer's ideas, opinions, and philosophy changed over time. By the time he had gotten deeply involved in the abortion issue, he appears to have become angry. In the years immediately preceding his death, he expressed his anger outwardly to the degree that he believed that mankind had fallen so far that he appears to have been ready to revolt against the U.S. government.

What made Schaeffer's beliefs, teachings, and writing significant was his apologetic method, in which he combined scripture, theology, and culture to deliver a message that was a kind of rationalist approach to the mysteries of faith. This method became his trademark; it afforded him a reputation as an intellectual, a man who relied on reason to guide him. It was this strategy, plus his charisma, that endeared Schaeffer to the leadership of the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian movement and allowed him to attain respectability in the secular community of the mass media.

### **Teaming up to Share God's Message**

Evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, always seemingly against new ideas and progress, had last risen to do battle with modernity and Darwinism in the 1920s. That story is well known and well recorded by historians, scholars, religionists, and moviemakers. A popular 1960 Hollywood film, *Inherit the Wind*, provides a graphic and entertaining review of the Scopes "Monkey" Trial. In 1925, young Dayton, Tennessee, schoolteacher John Scopes was accused of violating a recently passed state statute that made it a crime to teach Darwin's theory of evolution. Local and national evangelical/fundamentalist church leaders, who had been seething over the continual encroachment of Darwinism and modernity in society, saw an opportunity to stop both by using the legal system to convict Scopes.

Liberals also saw opportunity in the trial. They saw not only a chance to defend the right of free speech but also to prove some of the inconsistencies of biblical inerrancy.

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) convinced the already famous defense lawyer, Clarence Darrow, to represent the young schoolteacher.

Two important aspects of the trial are not well known but each is having major repercussions today on American politics, culture and religion. First, the trial, which was covered extensively across the nation by radio broadcast and hordes of national newspaper reporters, turned out to be a fiasco for evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. As a result of the trial and the ensuing publicity, the fundamentalists ended up being ridiculed and embarrassed. Even their aging fundamentalist lawyer, William Jennings Bryan, who had been the Democratic Party's three-time Presidential nominee, showed himself to be "a bumbling, incompetent, obscurantist..."<sup>45</sup> It quickly became apparent that the fundamentalists' side of the argument was losing, and even though Scopes was eventually convicted, fundamentalists lost their battle. As a result, they became the laughingstock of the nation. They were embarrassed and angered by what they saw as ridicule and defeat in the trial. H. L. Mencken, a reporter for the *Baltimore Sun* newspaper, "denounced the fundamentalists as the scourge of the nation" and called them "gaping primates of the upland valleys."<sup>46</sup> Fundamentalists were incensed by what they considered unfair and disrespectful treatment from the news media and from their fellow Americans across the nation, particularly those in the big cities. It is conceivable that some of the animosity between rural and urban Americans today is traceable to these kinds of battles of the late 1920s.

---

<sup>45</sup> Karen Armstrong, *The Battle for God: A History of Fundamentalism* (New York, NY: Ballantine Books, 2001), 177.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

Secondly, the defeat, the embarrassment and the humiliation in the Scopes trial caused fundamentalists to withdraw almost completely from political and cultural involvement. Karen Armstrong, in her book, *The Battle For God: A History of Fundamentalism*, states, “After the Scopes trial, Protestant fundamentalists retreated from the public arena and withdrew to their churches and colleges.”<sup>47</sup> Many people thought that American fundamentalist Christianity would go the way of Europe and never again be a major political or cultural factor.

As history shows, nothing could have been further from the truth. Indeed, the fundamentalists did retreat. It might be said that they went underground, but they were not about to quit. In fact, they immediately began to lay the foundation for what was to become in the last quarter of the twentieth century and first decade of the twenty-first century the most powerful religious, political, and cultural force in the history of the United States.

Armstrong continues, “The more radical fundamentalists formed their own churches, especially the premillennarians, who believed it to be a sacred duty, while waiting for Rapture, to separate themselves from the ungodly liberals.”<sup>48</sup> While separating themselves from much of society and the secular community, they constantly recruited new members to their churches, using general anxieties about the fear of God and hellfire and brimstone to bring people to Jesus. Their membership numbers grew, as did the number of new churches. Armstrong reported that “by 1930, there were at least fifty fundamentalist Bible colleges in the United States. During the depression years,

---

<sup>47</sup> Armstrong, *The Battle for God*, 214.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

another twenty six were founded.”<sup>49</sup> They also continued to build an expanding publishing empire devoted exclusively to the spreading of conservative evangelical/fundamentalist Christian teachings based on inerrancy of the Bible, God’s creation of man in his own image (as opposed to Darwinism), and the end times, as described in the Book of Genesis. Unger, author of *American Armageddon*, says, “As early as 1934, Gerald Winrod’s *Defender Magazine* boasted 600,000 subscribers” and “(Carl) McIntyre’s

“”ΩΩΩΩΩ reached 120,000 homes.”<sup>50</sup> These were only two of many fundamentalist Christian magazines, newsletters, and periodicals on distribution lists, not to mention a plethora of Christian books and Bibles that were being sold.

New radio technology was rapidly expanding across the country as well, and early evangelical/fundamentalist preachers saw radio as a great opportunity to reach into the homes of thousands of potential American listeners. Eventually, such fundamentalist luminaries as the Reverend Billy James Hargis, Carl McIntyre, and Oral Roberts would preach and teach on the radio, soon to followed by Christian television, which began to reach tens of millions of Americans beginning in the 1950s. However, the force of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians built between 1925 and the mid-1960s was miniscule compared to the numbers that would be generated between the 1960s and today.

As early as the mid-1960s, “a group of Washington D.C.–based conservatives

---

<sup>49</sup> Armstrong, *The Battle for God*, 216.

<sup>50</sup> Unger, *American Armageddon*, 32.

began to build an infrastructure for conservatism they called the New Right.”<sup>51</sup> The organization was led by Paul Weyrich, a Catholic who eventually established himself as one of the most prominent conservative leaders in America. It did not take long for the Washington-based conservatives to realize the great opportunities offered them by association with the burgeoning Religious Right that numbered in the tens of millions.<sup>52</sup> The new organization “focused on research and advocacy of conservative ideas, coordination of other organizations, and electoral politics.”<sup>53</sup> It was a perfect organization for the likes of Reverend Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Tim LaHaye, James Dobson and others to become a part of; the Schaeffers, with their intellectual appeal, would eventually add greatly to the union.

In fact, several groups began to coalesce around the idea that America was going in the wrong direction and had been going in the wrong direction for too many years. Previously, these groups had been hostile to each other and had fought, ridiculed, and in some cases, attempted to do in the other, but now, based on the efforts of certain key leaders, they were coming together. Perhaps the best example of this change in attitude by one group toward another is represented by the chasm that had existed for hundreds of years between Baptists and Catholics. Other Protestant denominations were very much anti-Catholic as well, but the disagreement between the Baptists and the Catholics was clear and well established. In fact, Armstrong states in *Battle For God* that “many

---

<sup>51</sup> Ruth Murray Brown, *For A Christian America; A History of the Religious Right*. (Amherst, New York, Prometheus Books, 2002), 131.

<sup>52</sup> Richard Viguerie, *The New Right: Ready to Lead* (Falls Church, Va. The Viguerie Company, 1981), 129.

<sup>53</sup> Ruth Murray Brown, *For a Christian America* (Amherst, New York, NY: Prometheus Books, 2002), 131.



(Catholics) could not forget the fundamentalists' traditional hatred of Roman Catholicism”<sup>54</sup> when it later became advantageous to both groups to join together in the Moral Majority, an organization that would be founded by Falwell. The issue would become so heated that Bob Jones II called Falwell “the most dangerous man in America”<sup>55</sup> over his leadership in associating with Catholics.

Another powerful coalition that would soon take advantage of a close relationship with Falwell's Moral Majority and later, the Christian Coalition, was a group known as the Neocons. Many of the leaders of this group were New York Jews, who, in the 1940s and 50s, had been liberal Democrats.

Falwell had begun his Baptist ministry in Lynchburg, Virginia, in 1956 by organizing the small Thomas Road Baptist Church. Over the next several years the church grew into what is called today a megachurch. Eventually Falwell began making radio broadcasts of his sermons and Sunday church meetings. This led to the launch of his evangelistic radio/television program, *The Old-Time Gospel Hour*. “By 1971, the television outreach that began just fifteen years before on a local radio station in Lynchburg was beginning to saturate the nation from more than 300 stations reaching every state in the union,”<sup>56</sup> says Falwell in his autobiography. By the early 1970s, Falwell was one of the leading and most popular evangelical/fundamentalist preachers in America.

In addition to his evangelical/fundamentalist preaching, Falwell had always been

---

<sup>54</sup> Armstrong, *Battle for God*, 310.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Falwell, 313.

committed to fighting Darwinism, modernism, liberalism, and what he called the “sins of the nation.”<sup>57</sup> Eventually, Falwell would exclaim, “In spite of everything we were doing to turn the nation back to God, to morality, and to constructive patriotism, the national crisis was growing quickly out of hand.”<sup>58</sup> The crisis Falwell was talking about pertained to the continuing trends toward modernism, individual liberty, and what fundamentalists continued to see as the lessening influence of fundamentalist Christianity. To counter these trends, Falwell and other fundamentalist preachers were preaching harder, verbalizing more publicly, and organizing more and more church congregations to do the same. Falwell states in his autobiography that he had been following the writings, teachings, and thinking of Francis Schaeffer for several years.<sup>59</sup>

He was also catching the attention of some other conservative/religious “fellow travelers,” including Schaeffer and Weyrich, who had been following Falwell’s rise to prominence and success. It was Francis Schaeffer who made the call to Falwell to urge him to get his followers out of the church pews and into politics over the abortion issue. He called Falwell to tell him that he was doing a great job preaching the word of Jesus and leading the un-saved to Christ, but he told Falwell that he “was avoiding fifty percent of my (his) ministry.”<sup>60</sup> Schaeffer told Falwell that he had a responsibility to confront the culture where it was failing morally and socially.<sup>61</sup>

Interestingly, at this time Falwell had been experiencing a conflict between his

---

<sup>57</sup> Falwell, 35.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 358.

<sup>59</sup> Jerry Falwell, *Strength for the Journey* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 361.

<sup>60</sup> Unger, 69.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 69.

religious convictions and philosophy. A true believer in the principle of biblical inerrancy, Falwell admits in his autobiography that he had been struggling with what he and a vast majority of fundamentalist Christians had always believed—that Christians should “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and give unto God that which is God’s.”<sup>62</sup> Yet another scripture verse compounded the problem for Falwell and other evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. This verse stated, “Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing...”<sup>63</sup>

Basically, these verses had been interpreted to mean that Christians should only have limited involvement, if any, in worldly or governmental affairs and give their full attention to God and his Commandments. In his autobiography, Falwell admitted that he had struggled mightily with these scriptures, realizing that he would be in violation of the inerrancy principle if he began religious involvement in politics and government. He stated that “...when I began considering how to put together a political organization that included all Americans, I was faced with a terrific problem...yet I was convinced that there was a ‘moral majority’ out there among these more than 200 million Americans sufficient in number to turn back the flood tide of moral permissiveness, family breakdown, and general capitulation to evil and to foreign philosophies such as Marxism-Leninism.”<sup>64</sup>

Francis Schaeffer’s call to Falwell may be one of the most important telephone calls ever made. “Dr. Schaeffer was a great help to me,” Falwell says. “He declared that

---

<sup>62</sup> *Holy Bible* (New York, NY: Oxford Press, 1945) Matthew 22:21.

<sup>63</sup> *Holy Bible* (New York, NY: Oxford Press, 1945) II Corinthians 6:17.

<sup>64</sup> Falwell, *Strength for the Journey*, 361.

there is no Biblical mandate against evangelical Christians joining hands for political and social causes as long as there was no compromise of theological integrity.”<sup>65</sup> While it will not be a subject for further consideration here, this decisional interpretation of scripture by Schaeffer and Falwell’s acquiescence of it must cause true believers great concern. How can scripture, having been interpreted as meaning one thing and accepted as inerrant for hundreds of years, be so readily re-interpreted and accepted in such a short amount of time? True Christians must have to struggle mightily with these kinds of events.

As a result of the communication between Schaeffer and Falwell, Schaeffer’s writings, teachings and sermons became widely popular inside the evangelical/fundamentalist Church community. Francis and Frank Schaeffer became constant invitees and speakers at hundreds of churches and Christian radio and television stations across the country. They became fixtures in the Christian Right community. As Frank told Kraske on his Kansas City talk radio show, he and his father had become “evangelical/fundamentalist royalty.”<sup>66</sup> Frank speaks at length in *Crazy for God* about their many personal experiences with Falwell, Robertson, Ralph Reed, LaHaye, Dobson and many others. Frank and his father appeared several times on Robertson’s popular Christian television show, *The 700 Club*, and spoke at Falwell’s Thomas Road Baptist Church and at Liberty University.<sup>67</sup>

Another fateful contact arose for the Schaeffers in the late 1970s. Joanne Kemp, a devout evangelical/fundamentalist Christian, had begun reading and studying the works

---

<sup>65</sup> Falwell, *Strength for the Journey*, 361.

<sup>66</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview, Steve Kraske Radio Talk Show, Kansas City, Mo., 6 May 2010.

<sup>67</sup> Frank Schaeffer. *Crazy for God*, 317.

of the senior Schaeffer and had organized a Bible study group in Washington D.C. in his honor. Kemp was the wife of the famous Buffalo Bills football team quarterback Jack Kemp, who was serving in the U.S. House of Representatives and would later become Senator Bob Dole's vice-presidential choice when Dole ran for the Presidency in 1996. Mrs. Kemp called her book club the "Schaeffer Group"<sup>68</sup> and hosted "about twenty born-again senators' and congressmen's wives who came together weekly to study my parents' books,"<sup>69</sup> according to Frank. The Schaeffers became regular guests at the Kemp home and "Jack hosted a meeting at the Republican Club in Washington, D.C.... There were more than fifty congressmen and about twenty senators there."<sup>70</sup> Schaeffer goes on to say that, "The evangelical antiabortion movement that Dad, Koop and I helped create seduced the Republican Party. I was there—and/or Dad was—participating in various meetings with Congressman Jack Kemp, Presidents Ford, Reagan, and Bush, Sr., when the unholy marriage between the Republican Party and the Evangelical Reconstructionist-infected "pro-life" community was gradually consummated."<sup>71</sup> The arrangement between Republican Party leaders and the evangelical/fundamentalist Christians was and is obvious to anyone who examines the intricate details of the arrangement that continues to this day. Frank says it best: "Republican leaders would affirm their antiabortion commitment to evangelicals, and in turn we'd vote for them—by the tens of millions."<sup>72</sup>

Falwell devised a new idea to involve more Christians and the public in what

---

<sup>68</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 284.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.

<sup>71</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Sex, Mom and God*, 136.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

might be called semi-Christian patriotism: in April 1979, using a large musical team made up of students from newly established Liberty University, Falwell began traveling the country performing what he called “I Love America” shows. They traveled to some 150 cities across the United States, spreading Christian fundamentalism and patriotism.<sup>73</sup>

The shows were popular and well attended. They gave significant attention to Falwell, his Liberty University, and to the various cultural and political problems that fundamentalists saw in America. One of the special multimedia presentations carried the title, “America, You’re Too Young To Die.” Falwell states in his autobiography: “This sobering indictment of the sins of the nation and the dramatic call to spiritual renewal filled auditoriums and coliseums all across America.”<sup>74</sup> Yet, as Falwell realized and stated, this was not enough. More had to be done.

Thus, in June of 1979, Falwell called together a group of his fellow evangelical/fundamentalist preachers and conservative church leaders to form the Moral Majority. They realized that open warfare in the political arena was the only avenue left if the evangelical/fundamentalist Christians were going to “take back America for God.” The group included numerous evangelical/fundamentalist luminaries who had already established their own successful religious empires. Among the group, the two most well known were probably Pat Robertson, who owned the Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN) and numerous other business ventures, including diamond mines in Africa; and preacher-turned-author Tim LaHaye. LaHaye would soon become famous as the co-author of the *Left Behind* series of apocalyptic fiction books that became international

---

<sup>73</sup> Falwell, 356.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 357.

bestsellers. Two other well-known preachers of the day were in attendance. They were Dr. D. James Kennedy, pastor of the 25,000-member Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and Charles Stanley, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Atlanta, Georgia. Stanley also had been president of the Southern Baptist Convention. Other mega-church preachers attended, but one of the most important non-preachers to attend was Paul Weyrich. It was Weyrich who prompted Falwell to name his new organization the Moral Majority.<sup>75</sup>

Weyrich had begun his conservative political involvement as an aide to Colorado Senator Gordon Allott, a Republican. One day, by accident, he was invited to a planning meeting of a group from the liberal Brookings Institute who were intent upon passing a piece of legislation in the Congress. Representatives from numerous interest groups and backgrounds attended and participated in the meeting. Lawyers, lobbyists, church groups, newspaper people, and writers were in attendance. Weyrich described the meeting this way: "...there before me were all the different liberal groups, inside and outside Congress, the journalistic heavies, and it was a magnificent show... They put together a battle plan, right then and there. I was absolutely mesmerized. From that day on, I became absolutely insufferable," Weyrich said.<sup>76</sup> He resolved that conservatives had to create the same system but to do it bigger, better, and meaner. He went on to say, "Think tanks, lobby, legal arm, means of communication, political action—you know, the whole nine yards."<sup>77</sup> Weyrich did exactly that. With his Colorado connections and close

---

<sup>75</sup> Falwell, 359.

<sup>76</sup> Unger, 71.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

relationship with the Coors Beer family, he obtained a \$250,000 gift to establish The Heritage Foundation in 1973. His close friend and political ally, Richard A. Viguerie, himself a key contributor of the vast right-wing political religious machine, had this to say about Weyrich:

I can think of no one who better symbolizes or is more important to the conservative movement than Paul Weyrich. He started or played the critical role in such key conservative groups as the Heritage Foundation, the American Legislative Exchange Council, The Republican Study Group, the Senate Steering Committee, Library Court, to name a few.<sup>78</sup>

These were only a few of the conservative think tanks that were to follow.

Weyrich was one of a new breed of right-wing religious fundamentalists. Not only was he deeply involved with the evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, he also played a key role with the conservative business community and with conservative Jewish and Catholic organizations. One of Weyrich's famous quotes was: "We are different from previous generations of conservatives. We are no longer working to preserve the status quo. We are radicals, working to overturn the present power structure of this country."<sup>79</sup> One of Weyrich's colleagues in the religious conservative movement, although it is not known how close they were, echoed a similar sentiment when "he described his methods as stealth and assassination."<sup>80</sup> He said, "I want to be invisible ... I do guerilla warfare. I paint my face and travel at night. You don't know it's over until

---

<sup>78</sup> Richard A. Viguerie, *The New Right: We're Ready to Lead* (Falls Church, VA: Viguerie Company, 1981), 53.

<sup>79</sup> Thomas J. McIntyre, *The Fear Brokers* (New York, NY: The Pilgram Press, 1979), 156.

<sup>80</sup> Max Blumenthal, *Republican Gomorrah: Inside the Movement that Shattered the Party* (New York, NY: Nation Books, 2009), 107.



you're in a body bag.”<sup>81</sup> Strange words for leaders of the Christian, Catholic, or Jewish communities, but such statements, sentiments, and actions have spread across the broad swath of the American religious-right political landscape over of the last forty years. While this meanness, anger, hostility, and deceit may not be readily apparent to most Americans, a close examination clearly indicates that these attributes permeate evangelical/fundamentalist Christianity today in America.

While Francis Schaeffer did not attend the 1979 meeting with Falwell and others in Lynchburg, he must have been there in spirit. Falwell and his Moral Majority wasted no time in going forth “to turn back the flood tide of moral permissiveness.”<sup>82</sup> Falwell says that he borrowed \$25,000 to get a mailing list started. In a few weeks he had received enough contributions to pay back the loan and begin to hire a small staff to carry on the work of the new organization. Within three years the Moral Majority had a \$10-million budget, nearly a hundred thousand trained pastors, priests, and rabbis, and several million volunteers. “In Washington D.C., for example, in just one day, 569 preachers who belonged to the Ministerial Alliance there joined hands with the Moral Majority and began to work with other volunteers across the nation on behalf of defeating an anti-moral ordinance in the nation’s capital.”<sup>83</sup>

By late 1979, Falwell and his Moral Majority were in full swing, having hooked up with several other right-wing conservative groups such as Phyllis Schlafly’s Eagle Forum, a group that, along with Beverly LaHaye’s Concerned Women for America, had

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> Falwell, 361.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 364.

recently defeated the Equal Rights Amendment, and with the neocons who would eventually help initiate the war with Iraq. The following year, “Falwell and his associates started going from state to state, meeting Catholics, old-line Protestants, and evangelicals, putting together 72,000 pastors in what it called ‘a pro-life, pro-traditional family’ coalition.”<sup>84</sup> Unger says that “they called upon Christians to do three things: get saved, get baptized, and get registered to vote.”<sup>85</sup>

Register and vote they did! They were already in the saddle with Ronald Reagan and the Republican Party, and Reagan was in the saddle with them. Even though the Moral Majority was just getting started, they registered 8.5 million voters in five years.<sup>86</sup> Many of these newly registered voters came into politics in late 1979 and in early 1980. Thus, as a result of Falwell’s and others’ evangelical/fundamentalist political activities both in and outside their churches, “Reagan garnered 56% of the White Baptist vote to Carter’s 34% and two-thirds of Reagan’s ten-point overall margin came from White evangelicals. In addition some two million new voters had been registered through a variety of religious and secular operations seeking votes for Republican candidates,”<sup>87</sup> according to Chip Berlet in his book, *Right-Wing Populism in America: Too Close For Comfort*.

After the election of Reagan, a famous picture appeared in the *New York Times*. The picture was taken at the Victory Party election night. The picture was of the

---

<sup>84</sup> Unger, 73.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 75.

<sup>87</sup> Chip Berlet and Matthew N. Lyons. *Right-Wing Populism in America: Too Close for Comfort*. (New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2000), 224.

celebratory Falwell, his wife, Macel and President-elect Reagan. Falwell was extremely proud of his leadership and the contributions that he and his fellow evangelical/fundamentalist Christians had made to Reagan's election. So much so that born-again Christian writer David Kuo, who served as a speechwriter for both Missouri Senator John Ashcroft and George W. Bush, says, "Falwell went on television and made it clear that Reagan owed his victory to the Moral Majority and that they were going to make sure he delivered."<sup>88</sup>

A more thorough review of the relationship between Reagan, the Republican Party, the evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and the Schaeffers at this point will serve greatly in understanding the connections between these parties during the last forty years. They are far greater today than they were during the Reagan, and subsequent, years.

Harvey J. Kaye, a professor at the University of Wisconsin and an award-winning author and editor, makes a profound and prophetic observation in his book, *Thomas Paine and The Promise Of America*. Kaye references Reagan's acceptance speech at the July 17, 1980, Republican convention. He says that, as: "Ronald Reagan stood before the Republican National Convention and the American people to accept his party's nomination for President of the United States,"<sup>89</sup> he spoke of the nation's past, his opponent Jimmy Carter, high taxes and other matters. "And, invoking God, he invited Americans to join him in a 'crusade to make America great again.'"<sup>90</sup> Kaye continues:

But Reagan had much more than restoration in mind. He intended to transform

---

<sup>88</sup> David Kuo. *Tempting Faith: An Inside Story of Political Seduction* (New York, NY: Free Press, 2006), 27.

<sup>89</sup> Harvey J. Kaye, *Thomas Paine and the Promise of America* (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2005), 3.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

American life and discourse. He had constructed a new Republican alliance...a New Right...corporate elites, Christian evangelicals, conservative and neoconservative intellectuals, and a host of right-wing interest groups in hopes of

undoing the liberal politics and programs of the past forty years, reversing the cultural changes and developments of the 1960s, and establishing a new national governing consensus.<sup>91</sup>

As always seems to be the case when religious leaders and political leaders hook up to “do good,” one side or the other, and most often both sides come away disappointed. Reagan gave the evangelical/fundamentalists what is often called in politics “some of the crumbs off the table” but nothing like they had expected. Soon Falwell and most of the others became disappointed and lost their enthusiasm. Other significant non-related events occurred, and the Moral Majority began to fall on hard times. It was in 1987 that a scandal broke into the nation’s newspaper headlines that greatly embarrassed Falwell and his colleagues. In North Carolina a new and exciting couple was becoming quite popular in the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian community. Their names were Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker. Their televangelist ministry was built around their weekly television show, *Praise the Lord*, or *PTL*, and their popular theme park was built with millions of dollars of charitable contributions.

Not only were the Bakkers eventually accused of extravagant living, they were found guilty of bilking tens of thousands of dollars from their contributors. Eventually they were both exposed for extra-marital affairs. Worse, Jimmy was found to have attempted to bribe his secretary with \$275,000 to keep her quiet about their affair.<sup>92</sup> In 1988, Jimmy was found guilty of mail fraud, wire fraud and conspiracy. He was fined and sentenced to prison, but later the charges were reduced and after serving time in

---

<sup>91</sup> Harvey J. Kaye, *Thomas Paine and the Promise of America* (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2005), 3.

<sup>92</sup> Armstrong, 359.

prison, he was released. Tammy Faye divorced Jimmy and soon married the builder of their Heritage Theme Park.<sup>93</sup>

Matters became even worse when the Bakkers asked Jerry Falwell to take over their operations. When he agreed to do so, they demanded hundreds of thousands of dollars “for going away quietly.”<sup>94</sup> Additionally, conflict arose with another popular televangelist, Jimmy Swaggart. He was the one who had brought the Bakker scandal to light, and shortly, it was discovered that Swaggart was cavorting with prostitutes in New Orleans. All of these sordid activities reflected badly on the entire evangelical/fundamentalist community. Supporters began to withdraw their support, and contributors stopped contributing. This, along with their political disappointments, eventually led to somewhat of a depression in the evangelical/fundamentalist community.

In 1989 Falwell announced that he was closing down the Moral Majority operation to “get back to the basics”<sup>95</sup> of his ministry, the Thomas Road Baptist Church and Liberty University. He also stated that the work and goals of the Moral Majority had been attained and many other religious leaders were ready to pick up and continue the battle with secular humanism and modernity. Little did Falwell realize that a far more determined and far more effective leader was waiting in the wings.

That leader was Pat Robertson. His ministries dwarfed Falwell’s. Robertson came from a wealthy Virginia family. His father served in the United States Senate for twenty years, following a ten-year career in the U.S. House of Representatives. After several

---

<sup>93</sup> Armstrong, 359.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Falwell, 397.

unsuccessful business ventures in the 1950s and his inability to pass the bar exam after graduating from Yale Law School, he entered New York Theological Seminary. He graduated in 1959 and was ordained a Southern Baptist minister two years later.<sup>96</sup> Soon he became enamored with the charismatic movement, “a religion that believes in speaking in tongues, faith healing and obtaining gifts from the Holy Spirit.”<sup>97</sup> Eventually he would leave the Baptist ministry and the Baptist Church, but he remained involved in the charismatic movement. However, Robertson was not satisfied with religion by itself. In 1960 “he purchased a small UHF television station in Portsmouth, Virginia, and chartered the Christian Broadcasting Network.”<sup>98</sup> After some difficult times economically, CBN began to flourish. By 1975, with the advent of cable television, CBN became a very successful Christian television station serving 110 million homes. Robertson soon launched his *700 Club* show, which became quite popular with evangelical/fundamentalist Christians across the country. A major part of the *700 Club* program was Robertson praying for God to heal callers who had serious illnesses and infirmities. Appeals for contributions to the ministry were also a regular part of the show, and soon contributions skyrocketed, making CBN, if not Robertson, very wealthy.

With CBN becoming quite successful in the mid-1970s, Robertson began to dabble more and more in politics. Writing in the *Sojourners* magazine in 1979, he made the following statement, “There is only one job in the United States and the world, I suppose, that would give me any more opportunity to do good for my fellow man. That

---

<sup>96</sup> Robert Boston. *The Most Dangerous Man in America? Pat Robertson and The Rise of The Christian Coalition* (New York, NY: Prometheus Books, 1996), 25.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 29.

would be the presidency.”<sup>99</sup> Apparently, Robertson had politics in his blood. He entered the 1988 presidential campaign and surprised many political observers when he came in second in the Iowa caucus. However, his campaign floundered thereafter and he dropped out of the race after speaking at the Republican National Convention.

Even though Robertson’s race for the Republican nomination for president was unsuccessful, in no way did it blunt his appetite for politics. In fact, the most important part of Robertson’s impact on American religion and politics actually began with what Ralph Reed claims was an accidental encounter at a Republican Victory Party dinner in Washington D.C. in January 1989. Reed says that he was “coincidentally seated next to Pat Robertson”<sup>100</sup> at the dinner. Afterwards, on the way out of the party, Robertson said to him, “I’m going to start this new organization, and I think it will change politics in America.” He went on to say, “The evangelicals and Roman Catholics have more grassroots supporters than anyone, but they need leadership and direction. I would like for you to come on staff and help make this vision a reality.”<sup>101</sup>

This was the beginning of the Christian Coalition. Reed was working on his doctorate in history at Emory University in Georgia. He had planned for a teaching career, but he soon changed his plans. As requested by Robertson, he wrote an outline and a proposal to get the organization started. The Christian Coalition would soon eclipse Falwell’s defunct Moral Majority. Even though Reed had an academic career in mind, he was an ideal candidate to be Robertson’s right-hand man. Reed was quite active in the

---

<sup>99</sup> Robert Boston. *The Most Dangerous Man in America? Pat Robertson and The Rise of The Christian Coalition* (New York, NY: Prometheus Books, 1996), 25.

<sup>100</sup> Ralph Reed. *Politically Incorrect: The Emerging Faith Factor in American Politics* (Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1994), 1.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*



College Young Republicans organization both locally and nationally and he was already well connected in Washington D.C. politics. He was closely associated with Karl Rove, Grover Norquist and Jack Abramoff. Rove would later become George W. Bush's chief of staff and often referred to as Bush's "architect."<sup>102</sup> Grover Norquist, after lengthy involvement in numerous political campaigns and lobbying efforts in Washington D.C., would become famous as the creator of *Americans for Tax Reform*, the organization that would, in 2012, obtain the written commitment of 95 percent of Republican congressmen to never vote for a tax increase. Abramoff would later serve prison time following a lengthy criminal investigation for corruption and bribing members of Congress. Both Reed and Norquist were involved in the criminal investigation, having received money from Abramoff, but neither was indicted.

Reed was also a born-again Christian. According to a *Time Magazine* article dated June 24, 2001, Reed had been a heavy smoker and drinker in college and in Washington D.C., but one day while "sipping soda in a Washington saloon as some pals drank harder stuff, he was seized by a thirst for 'deeper spiritual meaning' in his life. Reed chose a church at random from the Yellow Pages, went there the next morning and soon became a born-again charismatic."<sup>103</sup> It is interesting to note that when Reed "chose a church at random from the Yellow Pages," he chose a charismatic church. His religious affiliation, political connections, and organizational talents made him the perfect candidate to lead Robertson's new organization.

---

<sup>102</sup> James Moore and Wayne Slater, *The Architect* (New York, NY: Crown Publishers, 2006).

<sup>103</sup> Laurence I. Barrett. *Fighting for God and the Right Wing*. *Time Magazine*, June 24, 2001.

The Christian Coalition had its official beginning in September 1989, in Atlanta, Georgia.<sup>104</sup> Many of the leaders from Falwell’s Moral Majority joined the Christian Coalition and continued their deep commitment and dedication to making America a Christian nation again. They included Charles Stanley, D. James Kennedy and Beverly LaHaye. Kuo states that they “shared Robertson’s growing conviction that evangelicals needed new approaches, new strategies, and a new commitment to political activism.”<sup>105</sup> This conviction of Robertson and the others fit perfectly into the plan for the Christian Coalition that Reed was proposing. In that plan, Reed wrote, “There exists in American politics today a tremendous vacuum that must be filled. Estimates of the number of evangelicals range from a low of 10 million to a high of 40 million. Whatever the actual number, there is no constituency in the American electorate with greater explosive potential as a political force.”<sup>106</sup> Robertson explained his part of the plan and its purpose with this statement:

The mission of the Christian Coalition is simple—to mobilize Christians one precinct at a time, one state at a time, until we are at the head and not the tail, at the top and not the bottom of our political system. We will develop the ability to elect majorities in the U.S. Congress and the legislatures in at least 30 states as well as the city councils, the city school boards, and other local bodies. As the Bible says, if God be for us, who can be against us?<sup>107</sup>

Reed must have been standing nearby when Robertson made this statement.

Reed’s comment was, “If we execute this, in the coming ten years we will be the most

---

<sup>104</sup> Kuo, 28.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> Unger, 97.

powerful force in American politics.”<sup>108</sup> Reed also shared some of his other unorthodox tactics. He said, “I want to be invisible, I do guerrilla warfare. I paint my face and travel at night. You don’t know it’s over until you’re in a body bag. You don’t know until election night.”<sup>109</sup> Once again, these are strange words and tactics for born-again Christians. Note that they are similar to those used earlier by Weyrich and reflect similar ideas and comments often used today by evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. They convey the new negative approach to politics and government that now permeates the new Republican Party.

Perhaps it is because of this kind of attitude and these kind of tactics that Frank Schaeffer says, “Dad could not hardly have imagined how they would help facilitate the instantly corrupted power-crazy new generation of evangelical public figures like Ralph Reed.”<sup>110</sup> It should be remembered that all during these days, Frank and Francis Schaeffer were traveling with, speaking with, and sharing television and radio stages and/or church pulpits with all the evangelical/fundamentalists mentioned above and others. They were, in effect, a vital part of the ongoing organizations. By now Frank had begun to write his own books, and they, like his dad’s, were selling at a rapid pace. In *Crazy for God*, he says of their books, “Dad’s and my books were doing the advance work for people like Ronald Reagan and helping to craft Republican victories”<sup>111</sup>; and

---

<sup>108</sup> Unger, 97.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>110</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 299.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 295.

“Dad and I were also beginning to advise friendly political leaders specifically how best to woo the evangelical vote.”<sup>112</sup>

Frank also shares with the readers of *Crazy for God* these personal observations of his father relating to Falwell, Robertson and Dobson. “Dad got sick of ‘these idiots,’ as he often called people like Dobson in private. They were ‘plastic,’ Dad said, and power-hungry. They were ‘Way too right-wing, really nuts! and ‘They’re using our issue to build empires.’”<sup>113</sup> Frank also made another confession of his own, related to the above quotes. He says, “To our lasting discredit, Dad and I didn’t go public with our real opinions of the religious-right leaders we were in bed with. We believed there was too much at stake both personally, as we caught the power-trip disease, and politically, as we got carried away by the needs of the pro-life movement. And however conflicted Dad and I were, like the other religious-right leaders, we were on an ego-stroking roll. We kept our mouths shut.”<sup>114</sup>

During the 1980s and 1990s the Christian Coalition continued to grow and soon joined up with the forces of James Dobson and his Focus on the Family organization. Dobson’s organization eventually grew to become one of the most important—perhaps the most important—pressure groups in American politics, according to Dan Gilgoff, author of *The Jesus Machine: How James Dobson, Focus on the Family, and Evangelical America Are Winning The Cultural War*. Kuo, a close friend and confidant of Reed and many other players both inside the White House and on “K” Street, says, “Within five

---

<sup>112</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 299.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 300.

years they (Robertson, Reed and Dobson) would help Republicans take control of Congress for the first time in more than a generation and sweep Republicans into a majority of the statehouses.”<sup>115</sup> According to Boston, they (Reed and the others) traveled across the country mobilizing and training not only those preachers that Falwell had rallied but many others for grassroots political action. Boston reports that by 1990 the Christian Coalition claimed to have 1.7 million members and was growing rapidly. At that time they were able to control the Republican party in eighteen states and enjoyed great power with most Republican Presidential candidates.<sup>116</sup>

Dobson is probably one of the top five evangelical/fundamentalist Christian leaders in America today. He launched his popular Focus on the Family program in 1977, but he was also a leader, along with Falwell, Robertson, Weyrich and the others in the early 1970s. He deserves special mention here because of his current status. Gilgoff, senior editor of *U.S. News and World Report*, claims that “Dobson had become the movement’s (the Christian Right’s) standard-bearer” and “that he was more powerful than either (Falwell or Robertson) ...ever were.”<sup>117</sup> Gilgoff also said that Dobson had “unmatched” political influence in the evangelical world and “was uniquely able to transcend evangelicalism’s denominational lines.”<sup>118</sup>

Unlike most of the others, Dobson was not a preacher or televangelist but a psychologist. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Southern California in 1967

---

<sup>115</sup> Kuo, 29-30.

<sup>116</sup> Boston, 60.

<sup>117</sup> Dan Gilgoff, *The Jesus Machine: How James Dobson, Focus on the Family, and Evangelical America are Winning the Culture War* (New York, NY : St. Martin’s Press, 2007), xii.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, xiii.

and joined Children’s Hospital Los Angeles before launching a writing and public speaking career and before he started Focus on the Family. Soon, Dobson’s writings would appear in “roughly five hundred newspapers” across the country and “his Focus on the Family was heard by 25.6 million listeners in the United States every week or five million people a day.”<sup>119</sup> In 2006, White reported that the Focus on the Family budget was “approaching \$150 million” and that when Dobson visits Washington D.C. “...all three branches of government stand at attention.”<sup>120</sup> Today, Focus on the Family, headquartered in Colorado Springs, Colorado, has an eighty-eight acre campus and employs approximately thirteen hundred people.<sup>121</sup>

In 1983 Dobson founded the Family Research Council, an adjunct to Focus on the Family. Its primary purpose was to be an on-the-scenes lobbying force in Washington D.C. After a slow start, by gaining strong support from congressional leaders such as Tom DeLay, the organization began to have significant influence. By 1999, “the Family Research Council had a fourteen-million-dollar budget, 120 staffers, and a mailing list of nearly half a million people.”<sup>122</sup> Along with numerous other evangelical/fundamentalist lobbying organizations, it has developed into one of the strongest lobbying presences in the nation’s capital. In fact, Pew Research produced a report last year that indicated that over the last forty years the number of “religion-related advocacy” groups had grown

---

<sup>119</sup> White, 78.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 80.

<sup>121</sup> Gilgoff, xiii.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 118.

from fewer than 40 in 1970 to over 200 today.<sup>123</sup> The Family Research Council ranked number two in total lobbying expenditures, having spent \$14,259,622 in 2008.<sup>124</sup>

Francis and Frank Schaeffer appeared on Dobson's Focus on the Family program several times during the 1970s and 1980s, although early on they both appear to have determined that he was "an empire builder"<sup>125</sup> just like Falwell and Robertson. This was a term used by Francis Schaeffer to describe Falwell, Robertson, and Dobson. Frank himself says that "Dr. Dobson was the most power-hungry and ambitious person I have ever met."<sup>126</sup>

It must also be mentioned that during the heydays of the Moral Majority and Christian Coalition in the late 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, many other similar organizations were established to do similar work. One was even organized for the express purpose of bringing all the groups together and was charged with making ongoing plans to move the country in the conservative religious directions already discussed. And they were all interconnected. Together with the leaders of many thousands of local evangelical/fundamentalist Churches across the nation, as well as the support of dozens of other conservative think tanks, conservative foundations, business associations, Christian television and radio stations, and publishing companies, they form a massive network of local, state, and national political power.

---

<sup>123</sup> *Executive Summary: Lobbying for the Faithful, Religious Advocacy Groups in Washington D.C.* Pew Research. Nov. 21, 2011/Updated May 15, 2012. Web. 20 June 2012.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God*, 297.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 315.

A short, but excellent list of some of these organizations and the financial resources they command are: the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian church organizations such as James Dobson's Focus On The Family and his Family Research Council, with a budget of nearly \$15 million;<sup>127</sup> Concerned Women for America, with a budget of nearly \$12 million;<sup>128</sup> Christian Advocates Serving Evangelism, with a budget of nearly \$44 million;<sup>129</sup> and the American Family Association, with a budget of \$21 million,<sup>130</sup> combined with the Falwell and Robertson empires with annual budgets of \$396 million and \$295 million respectively.<sup>131</sup> With these kinds of organizations and this kind of money, is it any wonder that many knowledgeable observers fear that they are well on their way to "taking back of America for God," if this is not already the case. One recent scholar alludes to this concern in his book, *The Reactionary Mind, Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin*. That author/scholar is Dr. Corey Robin who is a professor of Political Science, both at Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. In the conclusion of his book he simply states, "The end (in both senses of the word) of the right's long march against the twentieth century may be in sight."<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Rob Boston, *The 12 Worst and Most Powerful Christian Rights Groups*, Americans United for Separation of Church and State (May 2, 2011), 1. [http://www.alternet.org/teaparty/150809/the\\_12\\_worst\\_\(and\\_most\\_powerful\)\\_christian\\_right\\_groups?page=entire](http://www.alternet.org/teaparty/150809/the_12_worst_(and_most_powerful)_christian_right_groups?page=entire).

<sup>128</sup> Ibid.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid.

<sup>132</sup> Cory Robin, *The Reactionary Mind, Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin* (New York, NY: Oxford Press, 2011), 246.



## CHAPTER 4

### WHERE EVANGELICAL/FUNDAMENTALIST CHRISTIANITY IS TODAY

Frank Schaeffer likes to use phrases such as, “We lit the match that started the fire that created the Religious Right. More light was shed on the subject by Schaeffer when he made the following statement on the Kraske radio talk show in Kansas City, Missouri, in 2010: “We knew we had a fringe group... My dad, Koop, Falwell and Robertson realized it... We were saying that Christians would have the right and even maybe the duty to overthrow the government... It was an extreme sort of rhetoric... When you keep ramping up the rhetoric, somebody is going to take it serious.”<sup>1</sup> Indeed, somebody did take it serious! In fact several different people and groups took it seriously and still do. Unfortunately they number in the tens of millions, if not one hundred million, as described by the Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals.<sup>2</sup>

Few Americans would believe that, in addition to Francis Schaeffer, there are others among us who seek the kind of radical change that Frank Schaeffer was referring to that day; however, research on the subject proves that Schaeffer knew what he was talking about. There are those who have come to the conclusion that many of the basic principles upon which our country is based are unsound, take away our “freedoms,” and/or are against God’s teaching. Fewer would believe that some of these radicals come very close to committing the crime of treason and/or sedition, if not in fact doing exactly that, by calling for the overthrow of the U.S. government. Consider, for example, some of

---

<sup>1</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview, May 10, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> *How many evangelicals are there?* Retrieved from: [www.isae@wheaton.edu](http://www.isae@wheaton.edu). Wheaton, IL: Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals, 1.

the recent quotes, preaching, and teaching from several prominent leaders of the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian/Catholic movement.

A conference of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians was held in Worcester, Massachusetts, in February 1989. It was hosted by John A. Stormer, author of the book made famous by Barry Goldwater, who used the title of the book, *None Dare Call It Treason* in his speech to the Republican National Convention in 1964. Stormer had a background in journalism, having been the editor of a military publication during the Korean War. After the war he graduated from San Jose State University in California with a journalism degree. He became a born-again Christian in 1965 and soon became involved in Republican politics. He served on the Missouri Republican State Committee and became Chairman of the Missouri Young Republicans during the years 1962 to 1964. Shortly thereafter he became a preacher and served as a pastor at several fundamentalist churches in the St. Louis area. During these years, he appears to have become more radical.<sup>3</sup>

According to Berlet, “Treason and conspiracy were the main themes of the conference.”<sup>4</sup> Stormer’s anger and hostility toward American secularists came through loud and clear when “he argued that secularists, liberals, humanists, and socialists believe that... man is basically good, when true Christian conservatives know that man is basically evil and finds goodness only through submission to God.”<sup>5</sup>

This same kind of thinking, conversation and writing took place in a symposium

---

<sup>3</sup> Bio on Stormer from Liberty Bell Press. libertybellpress.com. Web. Accessed 15 June, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Berlet, 241.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

several years later, in November of 1996, but it was not organized by evangelical/fundamentalist Christians. It was organized by a neoconservative Catholic, Father Richard John Neuhaus. Neuhaus had a checkered career, always seeming to have problems with authority—first apparently with his father and later with the Lutheran Church, in which he became an ordained minister in 1960. Damon Linker, author of *The Theocons: Secular America Under Siege*, worked with Neuhaus. He says that Neuhaus “quickly showed himself to be a theological and political radical who planned to treat his preaching as an occasion for political protest... feeding off his own irrepressible rebelliousness.”<sup>6</sup> After giving up his Lutheran ministry, Neuhaus became a Catholic priest and eventually founded the religious news magazine, *First Things*, where Linker worked with Neuhaus. It was through this publication that he organized the 1996 symposium, ostensibly to discuss *The End of Democracy*, which was the title he chose for a book that soon appeared reporting on the results of the symposium. The subtitle of the book and the symposium was “The Celebrated First Things Debate with Arguments Pro and Con and The Anatomy of a Controversy.”

The book contains essays by twenty-six writers—scholars, intellectuals, religious leaders, and conservative political activists described by Linker as neocons and theocons, most of whom are quite critical of America as we know it today. In several of their expressed opinions, they suggest that “...popular support for our present system of government...” has ceased to exist, that “the government of the United States of America no longer governs by the consent of the people” and that “law, as it is presently made by

---

<sup>6</sup> Damon Linker, *The Theocons: Secular America Under Siege* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2006), 18.

the judiciary, has declared its independence from morality.”<sup>7</sup> After numerous similar statements, Neuhaus and the other writers suggest “possible responses to laws that cannot be obeyed by conscientious citizens—ranging from noncompliance to resistance to civil disobedience to morally justified revolution.”<sup>8</sup>

Neuhaus goes on to say, “What is happening now is more than disturbing enough. What is happening now is a growing alienation of millions of Americans from a government they do not recognize as theirs; what is happening now is an erosion of moral adherence to this political system.”<sup>9</sup> Toward the end of the book’s introduction, Neuhaus asks the question, “What are the consequences when millions of children are told and come to believe that the government that rules them is morally illegitimate?” He answers his question with these words: “A Christian should not support a government that suppresses the faith or one that sanctions the taking of human life.”<sup>10</sup>

Neuhaus apparently had as his goal with the symposium to rally major opposition to several additional recent Supreme Court decisions that infuriated Catholics and evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, just as the *Roe v. Wade* decision had done twenty-three years earlier. This symposium eventually led to the breakup of the neocon and theocon coalition, but here we want to focus specific attention on some of the inflammatory statements made by several of the writers of articles in the book.

Here is part of Charles Colson’s statement. Colson will be remembered as a Watergate felon in the Nixon administration who, after serving time in prison, became a

---

<sup>7</sup> Richard John Neuhaus, *The End of Democracy* (Dallas, TX: Spence Publishing Co., 1997), 6.

<sup>8</sup> Neuhaus, 6-7.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

born-again Christian and founded the Prison Fellowship in 1976. He wrote: "...a showdown between church and state may be inevitable. This is not something for which Christians should hope. But it is something for which they need to prepare."<sup>11</sup>

James Dobson added these words to his article in the Neuhaus symposium. "I doubt very much that our culture, having established tolerance as the new absolute, has the moral rectitude to insist that government move in the direction of traditional morality...Our culture is operating on the same philosophical premise... that we all have a fundamental right to create and live by our own sense of reality... Will clergy and laity alike be willing to face cultural ostracism, imprisonment, or worse in order to defend the faith they now profess?"<sup>12</sup>

From the Catholic perspective, consider this statement: "The Catholic Church in America must forthrightly acknowledge that a state of war exists between herself and the American political order."<sup>13</sup> These were the words of William F. Buckley's brother-in-law, L. Brent Bozell, who "broke with *National Review* to co-found with Frederick Wilhelmsen, a Spanish Carlist movement called 'Sons of Thunder' and a magazine called *Triumph*."<sup>14</sup>

Perhaps the best article to come from the Neuhaus symposium was written by Jacob Heilbrunn. He describes quite succinctly the key question that must soon be answered by American citizens. Heilbrunn correctly identifies the root problem of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics with American society, culture, and

---

<sup>11</sup> Neuhaus, 7.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 83.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 151.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 150.

government today. He calls the problem “a war” and he says, “This war is fundamental. It is rooted in a battle over the identity of the American nation. The theocons”—he was speaking of evangelical/fundamental Christians and Catholics—“argue that America is rooted in an idea, but they believe that idea is Christianity.”<sup>15</sup> He goes on to say that the theocons believe that the nation should ultimately be governed by “natural law.” By this they mean biblical law, when it conflicts with laws made by man, as are the laws made by the U.S. Congress and interpreted by the Courts. In such instances “God’s law transcends the arbitrary and tyrannical decrees of what the theocons increasingly refer to as an American judicial ‘regime.’”<sup>16</sup> Conversely, Heilbrunn explains that the neocon position was and is “founded on an idea—a commitment to the rights of man embodied in the Declaration of Independence—not in religious affiliations.”<sup>17</sup> Thus, Heilbraunn precisely identifies and simply articulates the basic problem America deals with today and has been dealing with since Francis Schaeffer convinced Jerry Falwell and the other evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics to turn away from democracy and the concept of separation of church and state and choose instead what they describe as a Christian nation.

In *The Battle for God: A History of Fundamentalism*, Armstrong writes about radical fundamentalists throughout the world. She makes the following observation about the American breed: “Fundamentalists have no time for democracy, pluralism, religious

---

<sup>15</sup> Neuhaus, 144.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 144.

toleration, peacekeeping, free speech, or the separation of church and state.”<sup>18</sup> In the fields of medical science, earth science, and numerous other branches of science, Armstrong says, “Christian fundamentalists reject the discoveries of biology and physics about the origins of life and insist that the Book of Genesis is scientifically sound in every detail.”<sup>19</sup>

In this regard, over one hundred members of the National Academy of Sciences, along with thirteen Nobel laureates and two thousand scientists, issued a national alert in 2005 titled “Defend Science.” In what they called “An Urgent Call By Scientists,” they stated that “the attacks on science are coming at an accelerated pace... to deny scientific truths, disrupt scientific investigations, block scientific progress, undermine scientific education, and sacrifice the very integrity of the scientific process.”<sup>20</sup> The paper went on to say, “Today this dominant political agenda is profoundly allied and intertwined with an extremist (and extremely anti-science) ideological agenda put forward by powerful fundamentalist religious forces commonly known as the Religious Right.”<sup>21</sup> The scientists conclude their urgent call with an appeal to the public stating that the issue is of vital importance not only for scientists but for people throughout society and for humanity.<sup>22</sup>

Reverend Mel White offered this warning: “Fundamentalism, like a mutating virus, infects and sickens Christianity, especially evangelical Christianity—on a regular

---

<sup>18</sup> Armstrong, xi.

<sup>19</sup> Armstrong, xi.

<sup>20</sup> *An Urgent Call by Scientists*. Defend Science Website. 2005. January 20, 2009. <http://www.defendscience.org/statement.html>.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

basis.”<sup>23</sup> The list of prominent observers, commentators, and writers on the dangers and overwhelming influence of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians in American politics today is legion. Consider this statement by writer Kevin Phillips, a prominent Republican from the Nixon era. Phillips says that the takeover of the Republican party has “become a gathering threat to America’s future...”<sup>24</sup> Phillips goes on to quote Bill Moyers, former press secretary to President Lyndon Johnson and a former Baptist minister: “...one of the biggest changes in politics in my lifetime is that the delusional is no longer marginal. It has come in from the fringe to sit in the seat of power in the Oval office and in Congress. For the first time in our history, ideology, and theology hold a monopoly of power in Washington.”<sup>25</sup>

An equally alarming warning came from Chris Hedges, a graduate of Harvard Divinity School and well-known author and journalist. Hedges has observed: “A group of religious utopians, with the sympathy and support of tens of millions of Americans, are slowly dismantling democratic institutions to establish a religious tyranny, the springboard to an American fascism.”<sup>26</sup>

It is interesting to note that the term “fringe” mentioned by Moyers is the exact term used by Frank Schaeffer on the Steve Kraske Talk Show on May 16, 2011, when he described the realization by him and his father that they had a “fringe” group participating in their organizational activities in the late 1970s and 1980s, while

---

<sup>23</sup> Mel White, *Religion Gone Bad*, xv.

<sup>24</sup> Kevin Phillips, *American Theocracy: The Perils and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*. (New York, NY: Penguin Group, 2006), xiv.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Hedges, 10.



promoting rebellion against the United States government. “We didn’t realize at the time that the ‘fringe’ would eventually take over the effort.”<sup>27</sup>

Over the years, Francis Schaeffer seemed to grow more hostile toward modernity in America. Following his early Presbyterian upbringing and seminary education, he preached and practiced separatism, often referred to by fundamentalist Christians as “coming out from among them and being separate.”<sup>28</sup> However, by 1981, Schaeffer had changed this part of his belief system. It was that year that he wrote *A Christian Manifesto*, one of his last and most popular and most important books. The book called for evangelical fundamentalist Christians to use “...force, even physical force... is appropriate”<sup>29</sup> to address the issues that evangelical/fundamentalist Christians have with the government. It is important to note that Schaeffer prefaces his remarks by saying, “The Christian is not to take the law into his own hands and become the law unto himself. But when all avenues to flight and protest have closed, force in the defensive posture is appropriate.”<sup>30</sup>

Recall Schaeffer’s 1982 address in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, to the very conservative congregation at the Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church; the pastor of that church was D. James Kennedy, one of the original founders of the Moral Majority.<sup>31</sup> Schaeffer’s remarks advocate, in extreme circumstances, the use of force: “...at a certain point, it is not only the privilege but it is the duty of the Christian to disobey the

---

<sup>27</sup> Frank Schaeffer, Interview, 6 May 2011.

<sup>28</sup> *Holy Bible* (New York, NY: Oxford Press, 1945) II Corinthians 6:17.

<sup>29</sup> Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*, 117.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> Falwell, 363.

government... Should we obey man? ... Rather than God.”<sup>32</sup> Frank Schaeffer verifies his father’s preaching against the U.S. government and admits that he did so as well. He makes several references to their activities in his book, *Sex, Mom and God: How The Bible’s Strange Take on Sex Led to Crazy Politics—and How I Learned to Love Women (and Jesus) Anyway*, with such phrases as “the instigation of revolution,”<sup>33</sup> “our books and articles about the evils of the U.S. government,”<sup>34</sup> and what he and his father had done to “contribute to a climate in which the very legitimacy of our government was questioned.”<sup>35</sup>

Similar preaching and writing within the evangelical/fundamentalist Christian community had been happening for several years. Fueled by the community’s collective opposition to abortion, it began to spread across the country in evangelical/fundamentalist Christian and Catholic churches with astounding speed. As it spread, it picked up additional targets, including animosity toward the Supreme Court and other courts, as well as criticism of the actions and inactions of the Congress and the sitting President, particularly if he was a Democrat.

Tim LaHaye was so enthralled with Schaeffer and his seditious preaching that he wrote his own book on the subject and dedicated the book to Schaeffer. In the book, titled *The Battle for the Mind*, LaHaye went so far as to question and condemn democracy. He states that “Democracy is a fantasy!” and says that “As we have seen, total liberty, or as

---

<sup>32</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto*. Address.

<sup>33</sup> Frank Schaeffer, *Sex, Mom and God: How the Bible’s Strange Take on Sex Led to Crazy Politics—and How I learned to Love Women (and Jesus) Anyway* (Philadelphia, PA: DeCapo Press, 2011), 175.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

they call it, ‘democracy,’ leads to anarchy.”<sup>36</sup> Picking up on another popular theme of Schaeffer’s, LaHaye believes that America has been taken over by secular humanists out to take away religious rights, destroy religion, and ultimately destroy America. He offers this warning to true believers:

Most people today do not realize what humanism really is and how it is destroying our culture, families, country—and one day, the entire world. Most of the evils in the world today can be traced to humanism, which has taken over our government, the UN, education, TV, and most of the other influential things in life.<sup>37</sup>

Based on these and many other utterances, it is obvious that there is a developing desire on the part of many evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics for a cataclysmic battle between Americans who are satisfied to live in a secular nation based upon freedom, democracy, and separation of church and state, and those like Francis Schaeffer, Neuhaus and the many other evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics who appear to want a theocratic country ruled by religion.

Schaeffer preached against America; so did Falwell, Robertson, and many others continue to do it. Is it any wonder that tens of millions of Americans have turned against their country and turned against democracy when, year after year for most of the last forty years, preachers and priests from tens of thousands of evangelical, fundamentalist, and Catholic churches have been preaching against the government? At some point the U.S. government and its leadership are going to have to recognize what these particular Christians are advocating. Is it sedition, or is it not sedition? If it is not, it comes very close to this students understanding of the term. According to Black’s Law Dictionary,

---

<sup>36</sup> LaHaye, 89.

<sup>37</sup> LaHaye, 1.

sedition is “an insurrectionary movement tending towards treason, but wanting an overt act; attempts made by meetings or speech, or by publications to disturb the tranquility of the state.”<sup>38</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary makes the distinction between treason and sedition in that sedition “does not aim at direct and open violence against the laws or the subversion of the constitution.”<sup>39</sup> At the same time it implies some sort of threat to the “public peace.”<sup>40</sup> Webster’s New World College Dictionary is not as generous with its interpretation, describing sedition as a form of agitation against the government and that sedition “applies to anything regarded by a government as stirring up resistance or rebellion against it and implies that the evidence is not overt or absolute...”<sup>41</sup> Combined with an understanding of “overt” as obvious or conspicuous and “absolute” as being without specific terms or conditions, let us reconsider the statements by Neuhaus in *The End of Democracy*. What is he advocating? Is it overt or absolute?

How has it come to this? How did so many “fringe” individuals and groups coalesce into such a vocal and powerful organization bent on change based on the messages of a single book, the Bible, albeit a powerful book? The influence of the evangelical/ fundamentalist Christian community built over the last half-century has significantly affected all aspects of American life. It has impacted politics, religion,

---

<sup>38</sup> Henry Campbell and Joseph R. Nolan, *Black’s Law Dictionary: Definitions of the Terms and Phrases of American and English Jurisprudence, Ancient and Modern*. ST. Paul, MN: West Pub., 1990.

<sup>39</sup> *Black’s Law Dictionary. : Definitions of the Terms and Phrases of American and English Jurisprudence, Ancient and Modern* ST. Paul, MN: West Pub., 1990.

<sup>40</sup> Henry Campbell and Joseph R. Nolan, *Black’s Law Dictionary: Definitions of the Terms and Phrases of American and English Jurisprudence, Ancient and Modern*. ST. Paul, MN: West Pub., 1990.

<sup>41</sup> Webster’s New World College Dictionary. *Webster’s New College Dictionary*. N.P. n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2012. <<http://www.yourdictionary.com/about/websters-new-college-dictionary.html>.

culture, education, business, and even the American economy. It has influenced international relations and has had a profound effect on the operations of government at all levels and in all branches. One of the main reasons it has done so is simply sheer numbers. Successful politics, and successful politicians, depend on obtaining the majority vote at election time. And while evangelical/fundamentalist Christians do not comprise a majority of Americans, with the large numbers they do represent and with the power and organizational ability they possess and practice, plus what appears to be unlimited amounts of nontaxable revenue, they have become perhaps the most powerful political force in American politics. They have been inordinately successful in winning elections for the people they support and for candidates who pass their litmus test on their key issues.

Many scholars, writers, and researchers have alluded to this power. They and others have been warning Americans for years about the dangers this kind of thinking can lead to. Two popular writers—Kevin Phillips and Craig Unger—state the matter succinctly. Phillips worked in the Richard Nixon administration. He wrote a highly respected and influential book titled *The Emerging Republican Majority*. He has also written a scathing criticism of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians in his 2006 book titled *American Theocracy: The Perils and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Barrowed Money in the 21st Century*. Phillips says that the United States is faced with “a milieu of radicalized (and much too influential) religion...”<sup>42</sup> He calls them “Armageddon hucksters”<sup>43</sup> and points out that the GOP has been transformed “into the

---

<sup>42</sup> Phillips, Preface.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

first religious party in U.S. history.”<sup>44</sup> He warns that “these developments [represent] a gathering threat to America’s future”<sup>45</sup> and that “No leading world power in modern memory has become a captive, even a partial captive, of the sort of biblical inerrancy—backwater, not mainstream—that dismisses modern knowledge and science.”<sup>46</sup> The book was written in 2006.

Power and influence in politics comes from several sources. Among these are five very important ones. These include money, organization, issues, candidates and above all, numbers of people, or followers, who hopefully will become voters. Thus, two important questions now need to be addressed. First: Do evangelical/fundamentalist Christians and Catholics have enough votes to accomplish their goals, including “taking back America for God? And second: How many evangelical/fundamentalists Christians and Catholics are there in America?

Numerous sources are available to help answer these important questions. We will focus on three of these. They include statements from three of the most influential evangelical/fundamentalist leaders in America, plus a couple of observations from two important writers/ scholars on religion and politics, followed by three respected polling firms that, over the years have sought to find answers to these questions. We will conclude with a direct quote from an authoritative source within the evangelical/fundamentalist community that has been established for the primary purpose of studying evangelical/fundamentalist Christianity.

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Phillips, xv.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

In his autobiography, Falwell makes reference to the number of evangelical/fundamentalist Christians in America. He used similar numbers in other public statements he made during his fifty-year ministry. In discussing his shock over the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision, and while contemplating the idea of leading the evangelical/fundamentalists in their launch into politics, Falwell made reference to a Gallup poll he had seen: "In 1976 the Gallop poll organization had announced that sixty to seventy million Americans had experienced a new-birth relationship with Christ."<sup>47</sup> He went on to say, "I know that if even a small percentage of my Christian brothers and sisters could be mobilized to action, we could reverse the nation's downward spiral and set America back on the straight and narrow path once again."<sup>48</sup>

At about the same time, Richard A. Viguerie, the devout Catholic conservative who would become a most valuable member the right-wing effort to "take back America for God," was contemplating the potential voting power of a coalition of evangelical/fundamentalists, Catholics, Jews, and Mormons. Viguerie had become a master of direct-mail fundraising for conservative religious causes and his influence was already widely recognized. He attended Falwell's 1979 organizational meeting and was a close confidant of Paul Weyrich. He states in his book that "The potential of such a coalition (the Moral Majority) is tremendous.... There are an estimated 85 million Americans—50 million born-again Protestants, 30 million morally conservative Catholics, 3 million Mormons, and 2 million Orthodox and conservative Jews—with

---

<sup>47</sup> Falwell, 359.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

whom to build a pro-family, Bible-believing coalition.”<sup>49</sup> Several years later, Pat Robertson, while not specifically talking about numbers of evangelical/fundamental Christians, made a remark about the potential for a conservative evangelical/fundamentalist coalition (soon to become known as the Christian Coalition) and its ability to win elections. Robertson stated: “We have enough votes to run this country.”<sup>50</sup>

Two of the best known and most popular sources for obtaining statistical data and information about the American people and their attitudes, ideas, opinions, and beliefs are the Gallup polling organization and Pew Research. Both companies have been asking Christians about their religious beliefs and opinions for years. Repeatedly, both companies report that approximately one-third of Americans polled identify themselves as fundamentalist and/or evangelical Christians. For example, a December 2, 2005, Gallup report authored by Frank Newport and Joseph Carroll states, “About three in 10 white, non-Catholic Christians describe themselves as ‘evangelical.’” The report also references polling on the question, “Would you describe yourself as ‘born-again’ or evangelical?”<sup>51</sup> The report states, “The average agreement in four surveys conducted since December 2004 has been 43%.”<sup>52</sup> Note that the above referenced report indicates that Catholics were not included in the poll.

We know from numerous reports already mentioned that Falwell, Robertson, and

---

<sup>49</sup> Viguerie, 129.

<sup>50</sup> Unger, 74.

<sup>51</sup> Frank Newport and Joseph Carroll, *Another Look at Evangelicals in America Today*. 1-2/Dec. 2005. Web. 5 July 2012.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.



the Schaeffers had been recruiting Catholics to their cause. A poll that will be referenced later found that 18% of Catholics consider themselves to be “born-again” or evangelical.<sup>53</sup> Thus, some percentage of Catholics should be counted in this category. Could it be that approximately 100 to 150 million Americans, or between 30% and 45% of Americans consider themselves to be evangelical and/or fundamentalist “born-again” Christians?

A 2004 Pew Research report entitled *Religion in American Life* contained the following statement: “Growing religious intensity also is seen in how Americans, especially self-described Protestants, characterize their religious faith. In the late 1980s, 41% of Protestants and 24% of the population overall, identified themselves as ‘born-again or evangelical’ Christians. Today, 54% of Protestants describe themselves this way, and evangelical Protestants make up the largest single religious category (30% of the population).”<sup>54</sup> It is interesting to note that, again, the number 30% keeps coming up from polling organizations.

Another interesting poll was conducted in 2009 by Trinity College of Hartford, Connecticut. This poll is significant because of the large number of individuals polled, which is rare, even among those polling organizations that are the most highly respected. Fifty-four thousand, four hundred and sixty one individuals were polled between February and November 2009. As a result of its polling the Trinity College team stated: “Evangelical or born-again Americans make up 34% of all American adults and 45% of

---

<sup>53</sup> Rachel Zoll, Faith in America: Slight Drop in Christians. *Kansas City Star Nation Watch*. March 9, 2009.

<sup>54</sup> The Pew Research Center, *Religion in American Life*. [www.people-press.org/reports/display.php3?PageID+757](http://www.people-press.org/reports/display.php3?PageID+757).

all Christians and Catholics. Of particular interest, the poll found that “18% of Catholics consider themselves to be born-again or evangelical.”<sup>55</sup>

After all is said and done, perhaps the best number that can be found to authenticate the most accurate estimate of the number of evangelical/fundamentalists comes from an organization that is directly connected with the highly respected Wheaton University in Wheaton, Illinois. In a 2008 copyrighted study titled *How Many Evangelicals Are There?* The Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals concludes its study with this statement: “When all is said and done, a general estimate of the nation’s evangelical population could safely be said to average somewhere between 30-35% of the population, or about 100 MILLION AMERICANS.” (emphasis added).

One hundred million (100,000,000) Americans consider themselves to be evangelical/fundamentalist and/or “born-again” Christians! Within a nation that presently numbers approximately 330 million citizens, nearly a third of this population considers itself to be “born-again” and presumably follow the guidelines and teachings of the leaders of their churches. Once again, is it any wonder that American society, culture, politics, and government have gravitated rightward toward the interest of these Christians when they have been listening to and following the teachings and preaching of Falwell, Robertson, Reed, Francis Schaeffer, and their colleagues, successors, and fellow preachers for some forty years?

Granted, several of the most prominent earlier leaders of the Religious Right and evangelical-fundamentalists have passed in recent years. These include Francis Schaeffer, Falwell, Kennedy and Weyrich, but it must be remembered that others—often their

---

<sup>55</sup> Rachel Zoll, 1.

progeny—have risen to take their places. And it is important to remember that the message remains the same, “take back America for God.”

In the past few years three new groups of evangelical/fundamentalist leaders with multiple followers have arisen that, while they continue to follow the teachings of Francis Schaeffer, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson and the others, have added several new dimensions to their radical behavior and their desire to “take America back for God.” Several of these individuals have already held high public office and in 2012, actually ran for the presidency of the United States. And they continue to have strong evangelical/fundamentalist and Catholic support. They have also taken the very anti-democratic posture of refusing to work with other elected officials to solve major problems facing the country, and being extremely “scornful of compromise.”<sup>56</sup> Nor do they cooperate or even communicate in many cases with representatives from the other party. In fact, they seem to favor the country’s collapse, in lieu of compromising with the other party to solve serious economic problems.

Chief among these former and/or currently elected officials are Sarah Palin, ex-governor of Alaska, who was the Republican candidate for Vice-President in 2008; Congresswoman Michelle Bachmann, from Minnesota; Governor Rick Perry of Texas; and former United States Senator Rick Santorum, from Pennsylvania. All were candidates for President in 2012, although Palin decided not to run early on. Rounding out the list is Ralph Reed, that charismatic evangelical/fundamentalist Christian who goes back more than twenty years to the formation of the Christian Coalition in 1989.

---

<sup>56</sup> Thomas E. Mann and Norman J. Ornstein, *It’s Even Worse Than It Looks, How The American Constitutional System Collided With The New Politics of Extremism* (New York, NY: Perseus Book Group, 2012), xiv.

Remnants of the old Moral Majority and the Christian Coalition remain, as do Pat Robertson, his *700 Club* and his other ministries along with James Dobson's two groups, Focus on the Family and the Family Research Council, and they are as powerful as ever, but many of the younger evangelical/fundamentalists have found new groups and organizations to become active in. And, of course, many of the other similar organizations and religious groups continue on, in the same vain as they have been in for some forty years and they too are strong, vibrant and powerful.

The three new groups are: The Tea Party coalition, the Faith and Freedom Coalition, and the New Apostolic Reformation Movement. With new enthusiasm and a generally younger leadership, plus strong media coverage and public popularity with evangelical/fundamentalist Christians, it is quite likely that these three groups will play major roles in determining the future of the Religious Right, and perhaps America in the next decade. Thus, a brief review of each of these groups, as well as their particular slants on faith, politics, society, and culture is in order.

### **The Tea Party**

This organization had its beginning sometime after the 2008 election of Barack Obama. In fact, it is a large conglomeration of smaller disconnected political units in various communities across the country that have arisen, spontaneously, with the main goal of stopping future tax increases and/or lowering taxes on Americans. The name comes from the acronym TEA, which stands for "Taxed Enough Already." It is interesting to note that a vast majority of people who claim to be Tea Party members share a couple of other specific characteristics. They are mostly white and mostly

evangelical Christians. Knowledgeable observers have recognized this fact since the beginning of the movement. Their numerous public demonstrations in Boston and Washington D.C. and other cities were favorite media venues. During many of their early demonstrations, individuals carrying crosses, showing Bibles and showing placards quoting various scripture verses were always in the forefront. Few moderate Christians respond to economic and political issues in this manner; however, such methods appear to be commonplace to evangelical/fundamentalists.

It did not take Pew Research and other polling organizations long to begin studying Tea Party membership. Their polls soon discovered that, “Tea Party supporters tend to have conservative opinions not just on economic matters, but also about social issues such as abortion and same-sex marriage.” In addition, the Pew Research article stated, “...they are much more likely than registered voters as a whole to say that their religion is the most important factor in determining their positions on these social issues.”<sup>57</sup>

The Tea Party was recently called “...a part of a tidal wave that began in 2010...” by former Texas Solicitor General Ted Cruz, the recently elected Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate from Texas, who was strongly supported by the Texas Tea Party. Cruz went on to say that, “...the tidal wave is even stronger in 2012.”<sup>58</sup> Cruz may be correct. Few days pass that the news media do not carry story after story about Tea Party

---

<sup>57</sup> Scott Clement and John C. Green, *The Tea Party, Religion and Social Issues* (Pew Research Center Publications. February 23, 2011. <http://pewresearchj.org/pubs/1903/tea-party-movement-religion-social-issues-conservative-christian>.

<sup>58</sup> Cameron Joseph, Ted Cruz: Tea Party movement stronger now than in 2010. *The Hill*, August 12, 2012. Retrieved from: <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/senate-races/242257-cruz-tea-party-stronger-now-than-in-2010>.

activities. Recently the Huffington Post carried a story about the Tea Party with the headline, *When the Tea Party Rules America*.<sup>59</sup> The organization is apparently desirous of such a goal. In his recent book, *The Teavangelicals: The Inside Story of how The Evangelicals and The Tea party are Taking Back America*, David Brody, himself a born-again Christian and Chief Political Correspondent for the Christian Broadcasting Network, says that Tea Party members and evangelicals “are partners in this effort to take America back to its founding constitutional principles.”<sup>60</sup>

From its beginning, some observers have concluded that the Tea Party was really a smokescreen for the Religious Right movement, although recent public activities by many evangelical/fundamentalist Christian groups indicate that they have no hesitation or concern about their movement being identified and labeled as a religious/political movement. Dr. Jill Lepore, professor of history at Harvard, makes an interesting analogy between the Tea Party and the Religious Right, if in fact they are two separate groups. She says that the Tea Party people believe that America has “forsaken the Founding Fathers”<sup>61</sup> particularly as it relates to taxes and big government spending. On the other hand, the Religious Right believes that America has forsaken the Founding Fathers by not following what they believe was the intent of the Founding Fathers that America was and should always be a Christian nation. A close examination of early American history proves that both are mistaken in their understanding of the intentions of the Founding

---

<sup>59</sup> Glenn W. Smith, *When the Tea Party Rules America*, *Huff Post Politics*, (08/06/2012), 1.

<sup>60</sup> David Brody, *The Teavangelicals: The Inside Story of how the Evangelicals and the Tea party are Taking Back America*. (Zandervan, Grand Rapids, MI., 2012), 16.

<sup>61</sup> Jill Lepore, *The White's of Their Eyes: The Tea party's Revolution and the Battle over American History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 15.

Fathers. Lepore describes it appropriately. She refers to it as “antihistory.”<sup>62</sup>

Nevertheless, Tea Party members hold to this position and so does the Religious Right.

### **The Faith and Freedom Coalition**

This organization is the newest creation of Ralph Reed, co-founder of the Christian Coalition, who, in 1995 was featured on the front cover of *Time Magazine* under the headline “The Right Hand of God.”<sup>63</sup> More recently, many inside the beltway believed that Reed had been exiled “from the power structure in Washington...” having been “damaged badly in the Abramoff lobbying scandal in 2005” where he “...had taken millions from the disgraced lobbyist and used the money to mobilize Christian voters in Alabama against Indian casinos and state lotteries that were competing with Abramoff’s other Indian clients.”<sup>64</sup> However, Reed is back.

In early June, 2011 Reed “flexed his rehabilitated muscle” at a Washington D.C. rally where “attendees paid \$110 to see a stunning lineup of conservative political elites,” that “included George Romney, Tim Pawlenty, Jon Huntsman, Michelle Bachmann, Rick Santorum and even Donald Trump.”<sup>65</sup> This was the kick-off party for the Faith and Freedom Coalition and, according to *Nation Magazine* writer, George Zornick, “...almost every appendage of the Republican political establishment was present.”<sup>66</sup> Zornick goes

---

<sup>62</sup> Lepore, 8.

<sup>63</sup> George Zornick, The Return of Ralph Reed at Faith and Freedom 2011. *The Nation Magazine*, June 5, 2011.

<sup>64</sup> [www.thenation.com/blog/161156/return-ralph-faith-and-freedom-2011](http://www.thenation.com/blog/161156/return-ralph-faith-and-freedom-2011).

<sup>65</sup> George Zornick.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

on to say, “For two days, speakers gamely tried to paint Republican policy priorities and Biblical principles as inextricably linked.”<sup>67</sup> Congressman Paul Ryan, who failed in his bid to become the next Vice-President of the United States offered these words to the mostly Religious Right crowd. He told them that “our rights are not given to us from government—our rights are ours naturally, given by God.”<sup>68</sup>

Reed organized this new group with the stated intention of creating the most powerful political/religious organization ever. He named it The Faith and Freedom Coalition. “His goal is 5 million members, an annual budget of \$100 million, and full-time lobbyists in all 50 state capitols,” according to Zeke Miller, writing in an online blog titled “*Politics*.” The article is dated June 16, 2012 and reports on the recent meeting in Washington D.C. of the Faith and Freedom Coalition. The article quotes Reed as saying, “Number one, we’re going to build a database of 18.3 million social and fiscal conservative households in which reside 27.1 million voters... We’re gonna contact each and every one of those voters 7-12 times by mail, by phone, by email, by text message.”<sup>69</sup>

It should be noted that Reed is closely connected with the Tea Party. Brody points out in his book that “Ralph Reed’s group would definitely be considered a Teavangelical organization...” and says, “What we are talking about here are evangelical organizations who engage heavily in Tea Party issues as well as interact with Tea Party groups to see their mission accomplished.”<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> George Zornick, 1.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>69</sup> Zack Miller, *Ralph Reed’s New Plan for World Domination*. Politics blog. June 16, 2012. <http://www.buzzfeed.com/zekemiller/ralph-reeds-new-plan-for-world-domination>.

<sup>70</sup> Brody, 63.



## The New Apostolic Reformation Movement

This organization, unlike the Tea Party and the Faith and Freedom coalition, has gone relatively unnoticed by most of the media, but it has been followed closely by the *Texas Observer* newspaper and by Forrest Wilder, the paper's publisher.

According to Wilder the organization is “a little known but increasingly influential movement at the periphery of American Christianity.” He goes on to say, “they fashion themselves modern-day prophets and apostles,” and “they ... believe they have a direct line to God.”<sup>71</sup> Wilder reports that “...what makes the New Apostolic Reformation movement so potent is its growing fascination with infiltrating politics and government.”<sup>72</sup>

In this regard, Wilder tells the story of two Texas preachers, Tom Schlueter of Arlington, and Bob Long of San Marcos, who visited Governor Rick Perry in the Governor's office at the Texas State Capitol on September 28, 2009. Simply stated, says Wilder, the purpose of their visit was to tell Governor Perry “of God's plan for Texas. A chain of powerful prophecies had proclaimed that Texas was ‘The Prophet State,’ anointed by God to lead the United States into revival and Godly government. And the governor would have a special role.”<sup>73</sup> (the author of this thesis hastens to emphasize that these words come specifically from <http://texasobserver.org/cover-story/rick-perrys-army-of-god>.) Wilder goes on to say, “So you have to wonder: “Is Rick Perry God's

---

<sup>71</sup> Forrest Wilder, Rick Perry's Army of God, *The Texas Observer*, August 3, 2011. <http://texasobserver.org/cover-story/rick-perrys-army-of-god>.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 2.

man for President?”<sup>74</sup> The rest of the story is history of course. Perry entered the Republican Primary and after rising to the top in the polls, his popularity soon faded and he dropped out of the race.

What is most important about the Rick Perry story is the light it sheds on this most unusual evangelical/fundamentalist Christian organization, on some of its “key” leaders and it’s similarity to the teachings of Rousas Rushdoony and Francis Schaeffer, commonly known as “Dominionism.” Rachel Tabachnick, a researcher and writer on the New Apostolic Reformation says that, “the basic beliefs of the movement began with the idea of dominionism, and dominionism is simply that Christians of this belief system must take control over all the various institutions of society and government.”<sup>75</sup> Concepts such as these fit quite nicely into the cry of other evangelical/fundamentalist Christians who want to “take back America for God,” or to the words of Ralph Reed, who says, “We’re not just playing around. We’re not shadow boxing... We are playing for the most valuable prize in the history of the human race and that’s the United States of America and we are not going to lose.”<sup>76</sup>

Two well known prominent leaders of this group are Governor Perry and Kansas Governor Sam Brownback. Head counts aside, the end result of all this anti-democracy rhetoric and activity is deadlock in the U.S. Congress. Here is a perfect example. The *Wichita Eagle* newspaper, on May 14, 2012, carried the following headline, “Political

---

<sup>74</sup> Wilder, 3.

<sup>75</sup> Rachel Tabachnick, *The Evangelicals Engaged in Spiritual Warfare*. She appeared on National Public Radio on August 28, 2011 on the program Fresh Air with host, Terry Gross as interviewer <http://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcrit.php?storyId=139681021>.

<sup>76</sup> Zeke Miller, *Ralph Reed’s New Plan for World Dominion*. Retrieved from: <http://www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/ralph-reeds-new-plan-for-word-dominion>.

‘poison pills’ keep Congress all tied up.” The article reports that “Congress is producing little this election year that will become law”<sup>77</sup> because both Democrats and Republicans are playing to their party loyalists. A closer examination of the facts shows that Republican members of the Tea Party and those Congressmen and Congresswomen supported by the Tea Party, dominate Congress and are opposed to nearly everything being considered by that body because they oppose the very government they are serving. Frank Schaeffer says that they want the U.S. government to fail. While the Tea Party and its allies are not in the majority in the Congress, they obviously have enough votes to stop anything they oppose, and it appears that they oppose most everything. Thus, our government is deadlocked and our nation suffers greatly as a result of their unwillingness to co-operate, compromise and work with the Democrats and President Obama.

### **The Greatest Political Machine in American History**

In 1994 Hillary Rodham Clinton suggested that there was a “vast right-wing conspiracy” taking place in America. Most political pundits believed that Mrs. Clinton—the wife of President Bill Clinton, who was under impeachment proceedings at the time—was simply trying to divert attention away from her husband’s unfortunate predicament. Today, based on the evidence offered here, it appears that Mrs. Clinton was right on target with her observations.

Whether it is called a vast right-wing conspiracy, the Religious Right, the Tea Party, the Faith and Freedom Coalition, the New Apostolic Reformation, the Christian Coalition or some other name, it is evident to any citizen who cares to take time to

---

<sup>77</sup> Alan Frame, Political ‘poison pills’ keep Congress all tied up. *Wichita Eagle*, 14 May 2012.

examine the facts, that such an entity, or combination of entities exists and that they appear to dominate the Republican Party today, if not all American politics. And while the foundations may have been laid many years ago, the true beginning came on that fateful day that Francis Schaeffer called Jerry Falwell and told him to get his people out of their church pews and into politics.

Lest we forget the influence and impact of Francis Schaeffer, even though he left this world nearly three decades ago, we only have to look briefly at three of his acolytes, all of whom currently hold powerful positions in the United States government and all of whom aspire to even higher more powerful positions. All three, Michelle Bachmann, Todd Akin and Paul Ryan are members of Congress. Michelle Bachmann, for a brief period of time, held the lead in the 2012 Republican Presidential primary race. Todd Akin, until his recent downfall was the favored candidate to be the next United States Senator from Missouri. He had the support of the Religious Right, Ralph Reed and the Family Research Council, but with his radical fundamentalist belief system exposed, he went down to defeat. The greatest prize of all, next to being elected President of the United States is the Vice-Presidency and we find that another Congressman, Paul Ryan who is most popular with the Religious Right, was chosen by Mitt Romney to be his Vice-Presidential nominee. He too, went down to defeat, however, it is important to note that all these candidates and holders of powerful offices appear to be devotees of Francis Schaeffer's teaching and philosophy, and all have had direct, or indirect connections with him.

Congresswoman Bachmann is called "...an ideologue of the Christian-conservative movement," by Ryan Lizza in his *New Yorker* magazine article on the

August 15, 2011. The article is titled: “Leap of Faith, The making of a Republican Front-runner.”<sup>78</sup> The article gained wide attention at the time. It presented new insights into the thinking and beliefs of Bachmann and emphasized that “Michele Bachmann’s world view has been shaped by institutions and people unfamiliar to most Americans.”<sup>79</sup> The “key” institution Lizza was talking about was Oral Roberts University, in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and one of the “individuals” Lizza was talking about as having major impact on Bachmann’s thinking and beliefs was Francis Schaeffer. The University’s founder was Oral Roberts, a Methodist-Pentecostal televangelist and a Christian charismatic. He founded the school in 1963, as a Christian College. The school had difficulty in the beginning gaining accreditation, but eventually succeeded. Sixteen years after its opening in 1979, at the height of Schaeffer’s evangelical/fundamentalist influence, Bachmann enrolled in the new C.O. Coburn School of Law at Oral Roberts University.<sup>80</sup> According to Lizza, it took several more years for the Law School to receive accreditation, “because students were required to sign a ‘code of honor’ attesting to their Christian belief and commitment.”<sup>81</sup> Once the school was accredited, “The first issue of the law review, *Journal of Christian Jurisprudence*, explains the two goals of the school: ‘to equip our students with the ability to bring God’s healing power to reconcile individuals and to restore community wholeness’ and ‘to restore law to its historic roots in the Bible.’”<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Ryan Lizza, Leap of Faith, The Making of a Republican Front-runner. *New Yorker Magazine*, August 15, 2011.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 10. C.O. Coburn was the father of the current Oklahoma Senator, Tom Coburn, who is regarded as one the most conservative members of the Senate.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>82</sup> Ryan Lizza, Leap of Faith, the making of a Republican front-runner. *New Yorker Magazine*, 10.

One of the professors at Oral Roberts University was John Whitehead, a colleague and confidante of both Frank and Francis Schaeffer and also a close adviser to Rousas John Rushdoony, mentioned earlier as a leading advocate of Dominionism. It should be remembered Rushdoony called “for a pure Christian theocracy in which Old Testament law—execution for adulterers and homosexuals, for example—would be instituted.”<sup>83</sup> According to Lizza’s article, Rushdoony also “condemned the secularization of public schools and declared, ‘With the coming collapse of humanistic statism, the Christian must prepare to take over, he must prepare for victory.’”<sup>84</sup>

While it is not known that Congresswoman Bachmann was ever so bold as to utter such verbiage, it is a fact that she has made numerous suggestions that would lead a knowing observer to conclude that she learned her lessons well at Oral Roberts University and from her additional readings of the work of Francis Schaeffer. For example, Lizza quotes her as saying that being gay is, “personal enslavement,” and that if same-sex marriage were legalized, “little children will be forced to learn that homosexuality is normal and natural and that perhaps they should try it.”<sup>85</sup> Of Schaeffer, Bachmann says, he “was a tremendous philosopher, . . . (he) took Christianity beyond the Bible . . . (showed) how the application of living according to Christian principles has helped the culture for the better.”<sup>86</sup> Could it be that Congresswoman Bachmann, had she won the Republican nomination for President of the United States and gone on to win the Presidential election, would have followed these teachings of Schaeffer and Rushdoony

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 9.

and put them into play in guiding the nation forward?

The recent record and saga of Congressman Todd Akin of Missouri, dominated the national news and the 2012 Presidential campaign and convention, at this writing, for nearly three weeks. It is likely to go down in American political history as one of the most devastating events to happen to a presidential campaign in modern history, particularly if the apparent nominee Mitt Romney and his Vice-Presidential nominee lose the election. Akin, in a campaign interview on television concerning his position on abortion revealed, not only his lack of understanding of female physiology, but also his lack of appreciation for the dire circumstances forced upon women when they are raped and pregnancy ensues. Akin, like most evangelical/fundamentalist and Catholic Christians not only opposes abortion in normal circumstances, but even in cases of rape and incest. In fact this position has been a stated plank in the Republican party platform for several years.

As mentioned earlier, the abortion issue was one of the major issues that led to the rise of Frank and Francis Schaeffer in American evangelical/fundamentalist and Catholic circles in the 1970s and 1980s. It is interesting to note that Todd Akin holds a divinity degree from Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri which he received in 1984. Francis Schaeffer actually taught courses at Covenant Seminary beginning in 1965. As a result of his popularity there and with evangelical/fundamentalist Christians in America, as well as his service at Covenant, the Seminary honored Schaeffer by naming a branch of the Seminary after him. It is known as the Francis A. Schaeffer Institute.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> From the Covenant Theological Seminary website found on 27/8/12 at <http://www.covenantseminary.edu/academics/institutesinitiatives.francisschaefferinstitute/>.

It is interesting to note that one of the professors, Professor Jerram Barrs, was a longtime associate of Francis Schaeffer and worked with Schaeffer at the L'Abri Fellowship in England for several years before coming to the United States.<sup>88</sup>

Finally, it is interesting to note that Congressman Akin was apparently a devotee of D. James Kennedy, of the Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. According to Stephanie McCrummen and David A. Fahrenthold, writers for the Washington Post, “pastor D. James Kennedy was a strong influence on Akin...He (Akin) felt like different people had different callings, and he felt a calling in his life: to go into politics.”<sup>89</sup> As mentioned earlier, it was at D. James Kennedy’s church in Ft. Lauderdale that Francis Schaeffer gave his famous sermon on his *Christian Manifesto* in 1982.

Congressman Paul Ryan, now the defeated Vice-President of the United States has “a long history of social extremism” according to a recent New York Times editorial.<sup>90</sup> He also has an interesting, possibly direct connection with Frank and Francis Schaeffer. It was mentioned earlier that the Schaeffer family developed a close personal and professional relationship with Joanne Kemp and her husband, Congressman Jack Kemp, later to become a Vice-Presidential candidate himself in 1996.

Frank Schaeffer tells the story of his relationship with Jack Kemp in his book *Sex, Mom and God*, by saying that “Dad, Koop and I helped seduce the Republican Party...I

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Stephanie McCrummen & David A. Fahrenthold, Washington Post, wp Politics, *Akin’s agenda wins loyalty of Christian groups*. August 22, 2012. Retrieved from: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/akins-congressionallegacy-s-big/2012/08/22/b2c2d98e-ec75-11e1-aca7-272630dfd152\\_story\\_1.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/akins-congressionallegacy-s-big/2012/08/22/b2c2d98e-ec75-11e1-aca7-272630dfd152_story_1.html).

<sup>90</sup> Editorial, Paul Ryan’s Social Extremism. *The New York Times*, August 27, 2012, A18.



was there—and/or Dad was—participating in various meetings with Congressman Jack Kemp, Presidents Ford, Reagan, and Bush, Sr., when the unholy marriage between the Republican party and the Evangelical Reconstructionist-infected “pro-life” community was gradually consummated.”<sup>91</sup>

Those meetings took place in the 1970s and 1980s. Young Paul Ryan eventually became a legislative aide to Congressman Jack Kemp and helped write speeches for him. Ryan “counts Kemp as his personal mentor.”<sup>92</sup> It has not been ascertained at this writing whether or not Paul Ryan might have been involved in the meetings with Schaeffer, but it is probable that Kemp’s political and religious attitudes affected the young legislative assistant. Certainly the attitudes and philosophy that Ryan demonstrates today are in keeping with those of Francis Schaeffer and the Religious Right.

---

<sup>91</sup> Frank Schaeffer, 135.

<sup>92</sup> Dianna Marrero and Craig Gilbert, *Ryan, Kasten pay tribute to Kemp*. *JS Journal Interactive*. May 9, 2009. <http://www.jsonline.com/news/statepolitics/44616232.html>.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

After several years on the political/religious trail, fighting abortion, humanism and the perceived decline of America, Frank Schaeffer began to reflect on what he and his father had helped create. They had, in fact, helped lay the foundation for the Religious Right to eventually takeover the Republican Party. Frank apparently began to think about his earlier impressions of Falwell, Robertson, Reed, Rushdoony, Dobson and many others who had been a part of creating the Religious Right. He also began to contemplate the future. By this time, his Dad had been diagnosed with lymphatic cancer and early signs of the disease may have played a role in Frank's reflections. He says, "Dad seemed lost in a depressed daze. He had been saying privately that the evangelical world was more or less being led by lunatics, psychopaths, and extremists, and agreeing with me that if 'our side' ever won, America would be in deep trouble."<sup>1</sup>

Frank wondered about his Dad's thinking, but apparently never asked his Dad's opinion. However, he thought about it and commented on it. He says "It must have come as a shock to Dad to be plunged into the heart of the American evangelical scene in the 1970s and 1980s and to see just *who* he was urging to take power in the name of returning America to our 'Christian roots.'<sup>2</sup> Frank asked himself, which of those characters mentioned above, would end up being "...in charge."

Frank's final question and thought on the subject, is even more insightful and disturbing in light of our religious/political/cultural condition in America today. Frank

---

<sup>1</sup> Frank Schaeffer. *Crazy for God*, 335.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

pondered, “And what sort of fools would ‘*our people*’ elect as president or for Congress, given that they had so easily been duped by the flakes, madmen, and charlatans they were hailing (and lavishly funding) as their spiritual leaders?”<sup>3</sup>

Given Frank’s prophetic questions and seeing politics and religion as we see it today surely must lead us to the important question asked by Ann Norton at the beginning of this thesis: “Is America to be guided by Reason, or the revealed word of God.”<sup>4</sup>

Frank Schaeffer and his wife Genie now live in a small village near Boston, Massachusetts. Jessica, the baby girl conceived out wedlock, is grown now and married, and Frank reports that Jessica brought home a new granddaughter to him and Genie in 2007.

Frank continues to write, both fiction and non-fiction. He travels the country speaking and telling his and his father’s story, and attempts to alert the American people about the impact that the Religious Right has had and is having on America. Occasionally he appears on television and writes columns for the Huffington Post. Otherwise, he waits. As the Bible says, “...a prophet hath no honour in his own country.” John 4:44.

---

<sup>3</sup> Frank Schaeffer. *Crazy for God*, 335.

<sup>4</sup> Anne Norton, *Leo Strauss and the Politics of American Empire* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 2.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, Philip. *Exceptional America: Newness and National Identity*. New York, NY: P. Lang, 1999.
- Abbott, Philip. *Political Thought in America: Conversations & Debates*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock, 1991.
- Allen, James. *As a Man Thinketh*. White Plains, NY: Peter Pauper, 1900.
- Armstrong, Karen. *A History of God: The 4000-year Quest of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. New York, NY: A.A. Knopf, 1993.
- Armstrong, Karen. *The Battle for God*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000.
- Augustinus, Aurelius, and Thomas Williams. *On Free Choice of the Will*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1993.
- Ball, Terence, and Richard Dagger. *Ideals and Ideologies a Reader*. New York, NY: Pearson/Longman, 2004.
- Bawer, Bruce. *Stealing Jesus: How Fundamentalism Betrays Christianity*. New York, NY: Crown, 1997.
- Bell, Daniel. *The Radical Right. The New American Right Expanded and Updated*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1963.
- Berlet, Chip, and Matthew Nemirow. Lyons. *Right-wing Populism in America: Too Close for Comfort*. New York, NY: Guilford, 2000.
- Berman, Morris. *Dark Ages America: The Final Phase of Empire*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton &, 2006.
- Black, Henry Campbell, and Joseph R. Nolan. *Black's Law Dictionary: Definitions of the Terms and Phrases of American and English Jurisprudence, Ancient and Modern*. St. Paul, MN: West Pub., 1990.
- Blumenthal, Max. *Republican Gomorrah: Inside the Movement That Shattered the Party*. New York, NY: Nation, 2009.
- Boston, Rob. *The Most Dangerous Man in America?: Pat Robertson and the Rise of the Christian Coalition*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 1996.
- Bragdon, Henry Wilkinson., and Samuel P. McCutchen. *Frame of Government*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1962.

- Brock, David. *Blinded by the Right: The Conscience of an Ex-conservative*. New York, NY: Crown, 2002.
- Brock, David. *The Republican Noise Machine: Right-wing Media and How It Corrupts Democracy*. New York, NY: Crown, 2004.
- Brody, David. *The Teavangelicals: The inside Story of How the Evangelicals and the Tea Party Are Taking Back America*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012.
- Brown, Ruth Murray. *For a "Christian America": A History of the Religious Right*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2002.
- Carter, Jimmy. *Our Endangered Values: America's Moral Crisis*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2005.
- Carter, Jimmy. *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2006.
- Catherwood, Christopher. *Five Evangelical Leaders*. Wheaton, IL: H. Shaw, 1985.
- Chandrasekaran, Rajiv. *Imperial Life in the Emerald City: Inside Iraq's Green Zone*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.
- Clarke, Richard A. *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror*. New York, NY: Free, 2004.
- Clermont, Betty. *The Neo-Catholics: Implementing Christian Nationalism in America*. Atlanta, GA: Clarity, 2009.
- Coll, Steve. *The Bin Ladens: An Arabian Family in the American Century*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2008.
- Conason, Joe. *Big Lies: The Right-wing Propaganda Machine and How It Distorts the Truth*. New York, NY: Thomas Dunne, 2003.
- Coulter, Ann H. *Slander: Liberal Lies about the American Right*. New York, NY: Crown, 2002.
- Darrow, Clarence. *The Story of My Life*. New York, NY: C. Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- Dean, John W. *Conservatives without Conscience*. New York, NY: Viking, 2006.
- Dean, John W. *Worse than Watergate: The Secret Presidency of George W. Bush*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and, 2004.
- DeFrank, Thomas M., and Gerald R. Ford. *Write It When I'm Gone: Remarkable Off-the-record Conversations with Gerald R. Ford*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 2007.

- Drury, Shadia B. *Leo Strauss and the American Right*. New York, NY: St. Martin's, 1997.
- Duriez, Colin. *Francis Schaeffer: An Authentic Life*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008.
- Ebenstein, William. *Great Political Thinkers: Plato to the Present*. [New York]: Rinehart, 1956.
- Feldman, Noah. *Divided by God: America's Church-state Problem-- and What We Should Do about It*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.
- Friedman, Thomas L., and Michael Mandelbaum. *That Used to Be Us: How America Fell behind in the World It Invented and How We Can Come Back*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
- Friedman, Thomas L. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.
- Fromm, Erich. *Escape from Freedom*,. New York [etc.: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941.
- Gellman, Barton. *Angler: The Cheney Vice Presidency*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2008.
- Gilgoff, Dan. *The Jesus Machine: How James Dobson, Focus on the Family, and Evangelical America Are Winning the Culture War*. New York, NY: St. Martin's, 2007.
- Goldberg, Michelle. *Kingdom Coming: The Rise of Christian Nationalism*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton &, 2006.
- Gore, Albert. *The Assault on Reason*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2007.
- Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York, NY: Free, 2000.
- Grant, George Parkin. *The Changing of the Guard: Biblical Blueprints for Political Action*. Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion, 1987.
- Halsell, Grace. *Forcing God's Hand: Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture-- and Destruction of Planet Earth*. Washington, D.C.: Crossroads International Pub., 1999.
- Halsell, Grace. *Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War*. Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill &, 1986.
- Hamburger, Tom, and Peter Wallsten. *One Party Country: The Republican Plan for Dominance in the 21st Century*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2006.

- Hamilton, Alexander, and Clinton Rossiter. *The Federalist Papers; Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay*. [New York]: New American Library, 1961.
- Hankins, Barry. *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2008.
- Hartmann, Thom. *Cracking the Code: How to Win Hearts, Change Minds, and Restore America's Original Vision*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2007.
- Hedges, Chris. *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America*. New York, NY: Free, 2006.
- Hedges, Chris. *Death of the Liberal Class*. New York, NY: Nation, 2010.
- Hedges, Chris. *Empire of Illusion: The End of Literacy and the Triumph of Spectacle*. New York, NY: Nation, 2009.
- Hinkle, Nathan W. *A Critique of Progressivism*. Thesis. Liberty University, 2011. N.p.: n.p., n.d.
- Hitchens, Christopher. *God Is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*. New York, NY: Twelve, 2007.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in American Thought*. Boston: Beacon, 1955.
- Hudson, Deal Wyatt. *Onward Christian Soldiers: The Growing Political Power of Catholics and Evangelicals in the United States*. New York, NY: Threshold Editions, 2008.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Jacoby, Susan. *The Age of American Unreason*. New York, NY: Pantheon, 2008.
- Jeffers, Thomas L. *Norman Podhoretz: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010.
- Jefferson, Thomas, Maureen Harrison, and Steve Gilbert. *Thomas Jefferson: In His Own Words*. New York, NY: Barnes & Noble, 1996.
- Johnson, Chalmers. *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic*. New York, NY: Metropolitan, 2004.
- Kabaservice, Geoffrey M. *Rule and Ruin: The Downfall of Moderation and the Destruction of the Republican Party, from Eisenhower to the Tea Party*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2012.
- Kaplan, Esther. *With God on Their Side*. New York, NY: New, 2004.

- Kaye, Harvey J. *Thomas Paine and the Promise of America*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2005.
- Kazin, Michael. *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan*. New York, NY: Knopf, 2006.
- Krugman, Paul R. *The Conscience of a Liberal*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton &, 2007.
- Kuo, J. David. *Tempting Faith: An inside Story of Political Seduction*. New York, NY: Free, 2006.
- LaHaye, Tim F. *The Battle for the Mind*. Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1980.
- LaHaye, Tim F. *The Beginning of the End*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1972.
- Lambert, Frank. *Inventing the "Great Awakening"*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999.
- Leigh, David R. *Two Apologists: Cornelius Van Til and Francis Schaeffer*. Thesis. Wheaton College, 1990. N.p.: n.p., n.d.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Whites of Their Eyes: The Tea Party's Revolution and the Battle over American History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2010.
- Lerner, Michael. *The Left Hand of God: Taking Back Our Country from the Religious Right*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006.
- Lindsay, D. Michael. *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Love, Nancy Sue. *Understanding Dogmas and Dreams: A Text*. Washington, D.C.: CQ, 2006.
- Maney, Kevin. *Megamedia Shakeout: The inside Story of the Leaders and the Losers in the Exploding Communications Industry*. New York, NY: J. Wiley, 1995.
- Mann, Jim. *Rise of the Vulcans: The History of Bush's War Cabinet*. New York, NY: Viking, 2004.
- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Marsden, George M. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Marty, Martin E. *A Short History of Christianity*. New York, NY: Meridian, 1959.
- Matthew. *King James Version*. N.p.: Thomas Nelson, 1990.



- McIntyre, Thomas J., and John C. Obert. *The Fear Brokers*. New York, NY: Pilgrim, 1979.
- Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.
- Meyers, Robin R. *Saving Jesus from the Church: How to Stop Worshiping Christ and Start following Jesus*. New York, NY: HarperOne, 2009.
- Mill, John Stuart, and Jack Stillinger. *John Stuart Mill: Autobiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Miller, Aaron David. *The Much Too Promised Land: America's Elusive Search for Arab-Israeli Peace*. New York, NY: Bantam, 2008.
- Miller, Mark Crispin. *Cruel and Unusual: Bush/Cheney's New World Order*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2004.
- Minor, Robert Neil. *When Religion Is an Addiction*. St. Louis, MO: Humanity Works!, 2007.
- Moore, James, and Wayne Slater. *The Architect: Karl Rove and the Master Plan for Absolute Power*. New York, NY: Crown, 2006.
- Moyers, Bill D., and Julie Leininger. Pycior. *Moyers on America: A Journalist and His times*. New York, NY: New, 2004.
- Muncy, Mitchell S., and Richard John. Neuhaus. *The End of Democracy?: The Celebrated First Things Debate, with Arguments Pro and Con : And, the Anatomy of a Controversy, by Richard John Neuhaus*. Dallas, TX: Spence Pub., 1997.
- Neuhaus, Richard John., and Michael Cromartie. *Piety and Politics: Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World*. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1987.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994.
- Norton, Anne. *Leo Strauss and the Politics of American Empire*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2004.
- Orwell, George, and Bruce Rogers. *Politics and the English Language: An Essay*. New York, NY: Typophiles, 1947.
- Paine, Thomas, and Philip Sheldon Foner. *The Age of Reason*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, 1974.

- Parsley, Rod. *Silent No More*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2005.
- Phillips, Kevin. *American Dynasty: Aristocracy, Fortune, and the Politics of Deceit in the House of Bush*. New York, NY: Viking, 2004.
- Phillips, Kevin. *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Viking, 2006.
- Podhoretz, Norman. *My Love Affair with America: The Cautionary Tale of a Cheerful Conservative*. New York, NY: Free, 2000.
- Powers, Thomas. *Intelligence Wars*. New York, NY: New York Review, 2004.
- Prothero, Stephen R. *Religious Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know--and Doesn't*. [San Francisco]: HarperSanFrancisco, 2007.
- Reed, Ralph. *Politically Incorrect: The Emerging Faith Factor in American Politics*. Dallas: Word Pub., 1994.
- Ricks, Thomas E. *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2006.
- Robin, Corey. *The Reactionary Mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Rossing, Barbara R. *The Rapture Exposed: The Message of Hope in the Book of Revelation*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 2005.
- Roston, Aram. *The Man Who Pushed America to War: The Extraordinary Life, Adventures, and Obsessions of Ahmed Chalabi*. New York, NY: Nation, 2008.
- Rove, Karl. *Courage and Consequence: My Life as a Conservative in the Fight*. New York, NY: Threshold Editions, 2010.
- Rueggsegger, Ronald W. *Reflections on Francis Schaeffer*. Grand Rapids, MI: Academie, 1986.
- Saar, Erik, and Viveca Novak. *Inside the Wire: A Military Intelligence Soldier's Eyewitness Account of Life at Guantanamo*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2005.
- Savage, Charlie. *Takeover: The Return of the Imperial Presidency*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 2008.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. *A Christian Manifesto*. Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1981.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. *How Should We Then Live?: The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture*. Old Tappan, NJ: F.H. Revell, 1976.

- Schaeffer, Francis A. *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian Worldview*. Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1985.
- Schaeffer, Frank. *Crazy for God: How I Grew up as One of the Elect, Helped Found the Religious Right, and Lived to Take All (or Almost All) of It Back*. New York, NY: Carroll & Graf, 2007.
- Schaeffer, Frank. *Patience with God: Faith for People Who Don't like Religion (or Atheism)*. Philadelphia, PA: Da Capo, 2009.
- Schaeffer, Frank. *Sex, Mom, and God: How the Bible's Strange Take on Sex Led to Crazy Politics, and How I Learned to Love Women (and Jesus) Anyway*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo, 2011.
- Schaller, Thomas F. *Whistling past Dixie: How Democrats Can Win without the South*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2006.
- Scheer, Robert. *The Pornography of Power: How Defense Hawks Hijacked 9/11 and Weakened America*. New York, NY: Twelve, 2008.
- Schlesinger, Andrea Batista. *The Death of "why?": The Decline of Questioning and the Future of Democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2009.
- Seat, Leroy. *Fed up with Fundamentalism: A Historical, Theological and Personal Appraisal of Christian Fundamentalism*. Liberty, MO: 4-L Publications, 2007.
- Sharlet, Jeff. *The Family: The Secret Fundamentalism at the Heart of American Power*. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2008.
- Sheler, Jeffery L. *Believers: A Journey into Evangelical America*. New York, NY: Viking, 2006.
- Skidmore, Max J. *Legacy to the World: A Study of America's Political Ideas*. New York, NY: P. Lang, 1998.
- Smith, Michael Adger. *Christian Fundamentalism Militancy and the Scopes Trial*. Thesis. Clemson University, 2010. N.p.: n.p., n.d.
- Stefancic, Jean, and Richard Delgado. *No Mercy: How Conservative Think Tanks and Foundations Changed America's Social Agenda*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple UP, 1996.
- Stockman, David A. *The Triumph of Politics: How the Reagan Revolution Failed*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1986.
- Strozier, Charles B. *Apocalypse: On the Psychology of Fundamentalism in America*. Boston: Beacon, 1994.

- Sullivan, Andrew. *The Conservative Soul: How We Lost It, How to Get It Back*. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2006.
- Suskind, Ron. *The One Percent Doctrine: Deep inside America's Pursuit of Its Enemies since 9/11*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2006.
- Suskind, Ron. *The Price of Loyalty: George W. Bush, the White House, and the Education of Paul O'Neill*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2004.
- Tenet, George, and Bill Harlow. *At the Center of the Storm: My Years at the CIA*. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2007.
- Thurber, James A. *Rivals for Power: Presidential-congressional Relations*. Washington, DC: CQ, 1996.
- Unger, Craig. *The fall of the House of Bush: The Untold Story of how a Band of True Believers Seized the Executive Branch, Started the Iraq War, and still Imperils America's Future*. New York, NY: Scribner, 2007.
- Unger, Craig. *American Armageddon: How the Delusions of the Neoconservatives and the Christian Right Triggered the Descent of America--and still Imperil Our Future*. New York, NY: Scribner, 2008.
- Viguerie, Richard A. *The New Right: We're Ready to Lead*. Falls Church, VA: Viguerie, 1981.
- Webster's New World College Dictionary. *Webster's New World College Dictionary*. N.p., n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2012. <http://www.yourdictionary.com/about/websters-new-world-college-dictionary.html>.
- White, Mel. *Religion Gone Bad: The Hidden Dangers of the Christian Right*. New York, NY: J.P. Tarcher/Penguin, 2006.
- Williams, Peter W. *America's Religions: Traditions and Cultures*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1990.
- Wilson, Joseph C. *The Politics of Truth: Inside the Lies That Led to War and Betrayed My Wife's CIA Identity: A Diplomat's Memoir*. New York, NY: Carroll & Graf, 2004.
- Woodward, Bob. *The War Within: A Secret White House History 2006-2008*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2008.
- Zornick, George, The return of Ralph Reed at faith and freedom 2011. *The Nation Magazine*, June 5, 2011.

## VITA

Charles S. Broomfield was born on June 11, 1937, in the small community of Harlem, immediately north across the Missouri River from downtown Kansas City, Missouri. He graduated, with honors, from North Kansas City High School in 1956. After working his way through both high school and college, he graduated in 1961 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and a lifetime Missouri teaching certificate from William Jewell College, in Liberty, Missouri. In January of that year he returned to his high school alma mater and taught American Government and American History for four years.

In 1964 he was elected to the Missouri House of Representatives and was re-elected in 1966, 1968 and 1970. During this time he was elected Asst. Majority Floor Leader for two terms and served two terms as Vice-Chairman of the House Education Committee. He also chaired a Special Interim Committee on Intangible Taxes, which led to the elimination of this tax. For his work on this committee, he received the St. Louis Globe Democrat newspaper Meritorious Service Award. He was also honored in 1972 by the Missouri Jaycees as Outstanding Young Man of the Year.

After narrowly losing a race for a seat in the United States Congress in 1972, he joined Hallmark Cards in Kansas City, Missouri and opened that company's first Government Affairs Department representing the company in Topeka, Kansas, Jefferson City, Missouri and in Washington D.C.

During this time, Broomfield was elected as Western District Judge/Commissioner on the Clay County Administrative Court. He served in that capacity for 14 years.

In 1976, he opened his own government consulting and association management business. During this time, he managed the affairs of the Missouri Cable Television Association, the Trial Lawyers Association, the Midwest Organ Bank, the Rehabilitation Hospital Association, the Self Storage Owners Association and several others. He retired from that business in 2002.

Because of his love of education, politics and his community, Broomfield has returned to the education community and serves on several Boards in a volunteer capacity.