

A CANON PRESS ORIGINAL SERIES



A black and white photograph of a man with a beard, looking out over a city skyline. The man is in profile, facing left, and is wearing a dark jacket. The city skyline is visible in the background, with several buildings and a body of water. The image is framed by a thick orange border.

**MAN
RAMPANT**

**SMALL
GROUP
GUIDE**

MAN RAMPANT
OFFICIAL STUDY GUIDE

MAN RAMPANT

OFFICIAL STUDY GUIDE

Man Rampant: Official Study Guide
Copyright © 2019 by Canon Press.

Published by Canon Press
P.O. Box 8729, Moscow, Idaho 83843
800.488.2034 | www.canonpress.com

Interior design by Valerie Anne Bost
Printed in the United States of America.

19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

Episode 1: The Sin of Empathy	1
Episode 2: Education and Kingmaking . .	7
Episode 3: The Lie of Servant Leadership .	13
Episode 4: The State vs. Your Family . . .	19
Episode 5: The Sins of Christian Women .	25
Bonus Episode: Impotent Christianity. . .	31

EPISODE 1

THE SIN OF EMPATHY

THE POINT

“God commands us to be compassionate. He commands us to show sympathy, but people demand empathy and they regard it as a kind of betrayal if you refuse to join them in their pain and their grievance.... The fundamental thing for an individual man is are you taking responsibility for yourself and then having done so are you taking responsibility for those under your immediate care? Be a man there, and trust the rest to God.”

*Dr. Joe Rigney, pastor and professor
at Bethlehem College*

MARSHMALLOW SHTICK

Welcome to Man Rampant. Out there in the talking heads business opening monologues are given very important sounding names like The Memo or Talking Points or Shrieking Feminist Nonsense. Because we here at Man Rampant are very important talking head professionals, this opening monologue will henceforth be known as the Marshmallow Shtick. It's going to be sharp, but also flexible and bendy with flaming goop on the end. Nobody should be hurt too badly. So then welcome to the Marshmallow Shtick. On guard!

I want to talk about tribal empathies. We live in empathetic times, and no this is not a good thing. We also live in a time of increasing fragmentation and polarization resulting in virulent forms of tribalism. Back in the day when we were faced with old school tribalism, the tribe was an objective reality outside yourself and it set one's baseline. This was when tribes had names like Apache or McGregor. As a result, members of a tribe tended to grow up with a fixed loyalty to that tribe when considered against all others, and empathy was out of the question. For others, it was doled out accordingly. What was good for the tribe defined everything, and you empathized with the fellow member of the tribe simply because less to no empathy was accorded outsiders.

In other words, tribal membership determined the empathies.

In our fragmented times, we are seeing the opposite. Like a river reversing course, instead of tribes created by geography, ancestry, and language establishing our empathies, our empathies today are now establishing our tribes. Shared sentiments now harden groups into tribes, complete with tribal loyalties. I was once walking through a major city and passed the Center for the Empowerment of Deaf Alcoholics. That's an example of hyper specialized empathy which will result, in the long run, in a fairly small and exclusive tribe. Sort of like the White House press corps: often drunk, never listening.

But there are alternatives to tribalism whether we are talking about massive tribes of white liberals or micro tribes of city league bowlers and Topeka on the secular side of things. Those alternatives would include massive nationalist ideologies like Nazism, or internationalist ideologies like communism, which is the kind of thing that happens when tribalism tries to scale. And mass ideologies, like petty tribalism, demand loyalty and empathy, and to hell with outsiders.

The only real alternative to an insider-outsider tribal mentality is the Christian faith. Because the claims of Christ are ultimate, and because he is the head of the church, these claims originate from

outside the cosmos, which means that his claims trump every other claim. I have a tighter bond to someone who is baptized in the Triune name, but who lives in Tehran, than I do with my next door neighbor who's not baptized.

The Christian faith is genuinely international. Regardless of how much superficial commonality I might share, the universal point of integration, the Arche, is Christ seated at the right hand of the Father. He is the one who became incarnate. He was born of a particular woman named Mary. He had a hometown, Nazareth. He went to Nazareth High. He spoke a particular language. He was of the tribe of Judah. The blood of Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba flowed in his veins. He had ten toes, and I've been baptized into him.

This means that I do not have to repudiate my particularities, and you do not have to repudiate yours in order for loyalty to exist between us. I can belong to my tribe and I can do so with gratitude and affection. But I cannot bow down to my tribe, in my case Clan Gunn from Scotland, because Christ was not from that tribe. He was from His tribe. I can be from mine. And because he ascended into heaven and left all tribes behind, I can keep an appropriate emotional distance from my tribe. Something more sports fans and identity politicians need to learn.

What does this do to my empathies? That is what we are here to discuss today.

Douglas Wilson

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What is the difference between sympathy and empathy? Why do people feel it's virtuous to feel the same thing as someone who's hurting? How does this emotionally compromise us and prevent us from helping people?
2. How can emotional distance help us better evaluate situations? Why do people often think that trying to verify the facts is betrayal? How can people be emotionally manipulative without trying to be?
3. What is the problem with the modern paid counselling system? How are all our loyalties to our family and friends subordinate to our loyalty to Jesus and the truth?
4. Is there a place for being a shoulder to cry on? Why can it not end there? Why do we need to maintain our own identity while helping someone?
5. How do things work out when the most mature people in a group remain level-headed and

impartial? How does empathy make groups adapt to the least mature person in the group? Why is it easier to apologize than to tell the truth?

6. How has our culture weaponized victims? How does reacting to stories without investigating create tribalism? Why is it hard to apologize after we repeat inaccurate stories?
7. How can prayer help us avoid reacting and repeating lies? How can God be our stability in these times?

FURTHER SCRIPTURE READING

Read Deut. 19:15-21, Matt. 18:15-20, and 1 Timothy 5:17-21. Why is it important to have two or three witnesses for a charge to be accepted? Is this different in the New Testament? Why is it important not to be partial at the outset of an investigation?

LESSON 2

EDUCATION AND KINGMAKING

THE POINT

“I don’t want kids to be going out into the world, begging “please” for a job. I want my kids to be the ones giving jobs to others. I want to raise and graduate kings, not peons or servants. You give them the skills of leadership so they can go out and build and be Solomons.”

*Dr. Ben Merkle, president of
New Saint Andrews College*

MARSHMALLOW SHTICK

Welcome to Man Rampant. I’m Douglas Wilson. The world of education has been in steady decline for

decades. There are still plenty of smart kids who make their way in the world, but this is frequently despite the formal education they received. And even though the cream of the crop can do well, the vast majority of kids require a true education and are frequently crippled when they don't receive one, and this has happened to our educational system. I'm here speaking of the government school system, with millions of Evangelical Christians continuing to participate in it. As things have continued to deteriorate, I've often wondered what it would take exactly to get Christian parents to pull their kids out. The things that are controversial today, say a guy showering in the girl's locker room are the sorts of things that would have caused riots 50 years ago.

If Christians simply said, "Not with my kids you don't," and departed peacefully, the whole thing would be over. Actually, if just the Southern Baptists did that, the whole thing would be over. Far too many Christians fail to realize that the secular establishment of our culture, the one that distresses them night after night as they watch the evening news, is an establishment that rests upon the back of the government educational system, and that governmental educational system rests on the backs of the parents who continue to enroll their kids there. In other words, Christians are the ones who are keeping paganism alive in our country. The secularists are not having

their own children. They are not anywhere near the replacement rate of 2.1 children per family. This means that secularism has to continue to fill its ranks by means of recruitment, that is to say, by means of their unbelieving forms of evangelism, because many of their recruits come from Christian homes.

This means that Christians have resigned themselves to being breeders for the secularists. I think we really ought to aim our sights a bit higher than that. The Apostle Paul says that Christian fathers are required to bring their children up in the “nurture and admonition of the Lord” (Ephesians 6:4). This is a reference to the *Paideia* of the Lord, which is the process of enculturation. The *Paideia* of the ancient world involved far more than just math facts or the basics of grammar. No, it was the process through which a youngster was insinuated into the customs and beliefs of his people. And this means that when Paul required a Christian *Paideia*, he was requiring Christian parents to train their children to be citizens in the Kingdom of God, citizens in the Christian Commonwealth. But there was no Christian Commonwealth! But that’s how you build one. Which comes first, the chicken of Christian culture or the egg of Christian education? Fortunately, that one is possible to answer. We start with the egg. This approach that Paul urged was the basis of the establishment of the first Christendom. We have let much of

it fall into disrepair, but that's all right. If we heed Paul's instructions, we can always build another one.

Douglas Wilson

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How is education a very real form of evangelism and ministry? How is the Great Commission about more than just people repenting and praying the sinner's prayer?
2. How is the gospel relevant to all of life? Why is education not neutral? Why do so many Christians think education is neutral and the gospel has nothing to do with cultural transformation?
3. What is the problem with arguing that Christian kids need to be salt and light in the public school system? Why are kids who have received a Christian education are often better equipped to argue and debate without getting emotionally wound up?
4. Why is it important for parents to discuss the world and how the Bible applies to it all the time? How does this prevent homeschooling or private schooling from becoming retreatist? How is the world retreating when it says we should not be "judgmental"?

5. How does Christian philosophy, theology, and education help Christian kids? What does a classical education address that a red-state American culture might not? How can a classical education that deals with pagan texts help prepare kids for interacting with non-Christians in the real world?
6. How is community important for new college students? How can college help someone become a mature, thinking adult? What is the problem with trying to aim for a secure job in a cubicle? How are changes in technology making such jobs insecure?

FURTHER SCRIPTURE READING

Read Deuteronomy 6, Matthew 28:16-20, and Ephesians 6:4. How does Moses tell Israelite parents to educate their children? What does Jesus tell the disciples to teach people? Paul uses the Greek word *Paideia*, which was a common pagan term for enculturating kids. Does this change how you see the verse? Is there a way we can separate “book learning” and “academics” from the Christian life?

EPISODE 3

THE LIE OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP

THE POINT

“If you’re just a doormat, people are going to run right over you. You have to be able to stand your ground.... In any human relationship there’s just going to be times you’re going to have to stand your ground. It’s up to us to decide with wisdom where those lines are and to be able to handle it, but sometimes you just gotta hold the line.”

*Aaron Renn, Senior Fellow at the Manhattan
Institute for Policy Research*

MARSHMALLOW SHTICK

Welcome to Man Rampant. I'm Douglas Wilson. C. S. Lewis says somewhere—I think it might be in *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*—that there has been a great shift in how we describe our cultural leaders. I am referring to our more contemporary usage. Lewis says that we used to speak of our rulers, while today we want to refer to them as leaders and we naturally think that we understand why our shift is much to be preferred. The word “ruler” sounds dictatorial, autocratic, like some kind of bossy-pants. A good leader, on the other hand, knows how to listen, how to shape consensus, how to go where we tell him. In other words, egalitarianism is in the water, and individualism is in the air. We are yet another example of how fish don't feel wet.

Now, some might object, saying that a shift in usage like this doesn't really signify anything. Really? Let's take a very popular phrase in Christian circles. Change a few words back and see what happens. Everybody likes the phrase “servant leadership,” and if anyone starts to exhibit any nervousness about it, we can just hammer them with the texts about the glory of servanthood. The New Testament is crammed with them. But what if the objection is not the service which the Lord Jesus modeled for us,

but rather to the concept of leaders, which we don't find in the Bible anywhere. Let me illustrate. Suppose some hapless chump of a conference speaker decided to advertise a seminar on how husbands could become quote-unquote servant rulers, and suppose we pack into the word "servant" everything that the New Testament has on it. That word "ruler" still sticks in our craw. Such a conference speaker, or at least his marketing director, would be run out of town on a rail. Or suppose we decided to imitate Sarah and the holy women of old and we started calling what evangelical husbands are supposed to model for their wives as something like Servant Lordship.

Now there's a sense in which servant leaders and servant rulers and servant lords could all be referring to the same thing, but when we put it that way, they plainly are not. So the word "leader" is actually being used as a diluting agent, and the thing being diluted is authority. Jesus washed his disciples' feet, that's true. But he also, in a way entirely consistent with his decision to wash their feet, commanded them and exercised complete authority over them. What about that part? Well, that part is actually the problem part, but because we are evangelical Christians we want it to look as though we are obeying the Bible. We want it to seem like we have no problem with the Pauline doctrine of headship

and submission. And so we quote those verses out loud in sermons and everything, but perhaps—and I think it is more than a perhaps here—perhaps we have actually redefined everything. Perhaps the patriarchal emphasis of the Scriptures is Laphroaig straight out of a charred oak barrel, and complementarianism is an O'Doul's, but with a scary label on the bottle. Discuss among yourselves.

Douglas Wilson

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How does complementarianism define masculinity only in terms of men's relationships to their wives? How did older societies see masculinity as something social and related to the entire community? How is masculinity about mission?
2. What are the things that make a man attractive to a woman? How is it not “worldly” for women to be attracted to men with high status, or for men to be attracted to beautiful women? Can you see any examples of this in the Bible?
3. What kind of “tough” criticism is helpful to men? What kind just tears men down?
4. How did purity culture adopt a “prosperity gospel” mindset regarding marriage? How did

it put too many undeliverable expectations on spouses? Why is wisdom far more powerful than following a set of rules or a method?

5. How do evangelicals that promote servant leadership present a false choice between serving yourself or serving your family? How is a man's mission broader than just serving his family? How can family help a man with his mission?
6. How do men often communicate that their wives have a higher status than them, and why is this a bad idea? How can charisma, mystery, and other alpha male characteristics make wives feel they got a deal when they married their husband?
7. Why is it important for Christians not to look to the Bible to find ten-step solutions for every problem they face in the world? Why is it important not to mindlessly follow the culture?

FURTHER SCRIPTURE READING

Read 2 Timothy 2:1-4:8. How does Paul motivate Timothy? How does Paul present his suffering as an example to Timothy? How does he tell Timothy to handle temptation? What does he say about the opposition to Timothy?

EPISODE 4

THE STATE VS. YOUR FAMILY

THE POINT

“What’s your story? If it’s just your story ... then basically it’s founded on your will, your ability to carry forward your plan.... But if you think of your household and marriage as reflecting the relationship of Christ and the Church, then there’s a whole different way of thinking about your marriage in your household, and what people ought to see when they look at a Christian household is the end of the world.”

C.R. Wiley, pastor and author

MARSHMALLOW SHTICK

Welcome to Man Rampant. I'm Douglas Wilson. As we look around the world, it only takes a few glances to see that it is a royal mess. I'm speaking particularly of the relationship between the sexes and the related relationships between parents and children. In short, I'm talking about that helicopter-crash known as the modern household, and of course the natural reaction that all sensible people have is that of trying to figure out a way to blame all of this on Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Early modern political thinkers began to work with something that has come to be known as Social Contract Theory. I'm thinking of men like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. They tried to go in different directions with social contract theory: Locke in the direction of individual liberty, Hobbes with a hard-nosed autocracy, and Rousseau taking the gold with his pioneering concept of totalitolerance. C.S. Lewis rightly called him the father of the totalitarians, but I think Brave New World fits him better than 1984, though it is also true that you can't really get the one without the other.

In social contract theory, a primeval and very hypothetical scenario is envisioned in which individuals surrender their individual rights to the state in exchange for security and protection. Some might

criticize this by pointing that such a parliament was never actually convened and nobody ever actually voted. It was a hypothetical thought experiment vote, and it was totally binding. This was just another way of saying that we are all mysteriously bound by the thought experiments of seventeenth century philosophers. But let's look for a moment at how they set their thought experiment up, because if they were butchers selling meat, we should suspect that somebody has their thumb on the scale. One of the reasons why modernity has taken a hard turn into individualism is that the individualism was baked in from the beginning. In other words, this primal social contract was a contract between hypothetical individuals, but who established the suffrage laws for the voting on this social contract? What is the voting age? Do women vote? Only land-owners? Do households vote and if households do not vote, why not?

Statism is not opposed to individualism anymore than omelets are opposed to eggs. Statism depends upon individualism. It thrives on it. Each individual is an atom and an individualistic society is an atomistic society. It is like a big leather bag filled to capacity with grease or oiled BBs. There's no structural rigidity, which means that all the atoms are easily manipulated and moved around. There's no resistance to any demands that the state might

make. A nation of fornicating potheads is a grave threat to a people, to a culture, but not to the state bureaucrats. In contrast, a Christian view of society is molecular, what Burke defined as his “little platoons.” Lesser loyalties are the greater loyalties that give a culture its molecular strength. The bonds that exist between husband and wife, parents and children, pastors and congregations, sister church and sister church, denominations, local townspeople are bonds that resist the universal solvent of the state. These molecules require atoms, but they are the atoms of individuation or what might be called individuality, not individualism. As the wise fellow once said, beware of all isms except for prisms.

Douglas Wilson

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What is social contract theory? How does thinking of people as separate individuals with no obligations to each other encourage the growth of the state?
2. What is the difference between modernity and modern technology? Why is individualism not actually how people make decisions as groups? Why do people with age, experience, and wisdom naturally have more authority than others?

3. How has the idea that we choose who we are change how we view the family? Why don't we like the language of bonds and obligations when it comes to the family?
4. What kind of view of freedom does our country believe in? Why do people think of freedom as others "affirming" their choices? Why don't people want to have kids or own property anymore?
5. How is the family a picture of the cosmos? Does our culture think of the cosmos as being something ordered which we are meant to conform to, or as something random and chaotic that we shape? How has this affected modern American culture?
6. Why are we not in much danger of idolizing marriage as a culture? Why are the state and communism often anti-family?

FURTHER SCRIPTURE READING

Read Romans 13. What does Paul say we owe to governing authorities? Do we just owe taxes? In what context does Paul start talking about love? Do we usually think of love as something that is manifested in honor and respect and fulfilling our obligations to one another?

EPISODE 5

THE SINS OF CHRISTIAN WOMEN

THE POINT

“The Church needs to get in the game on this and start equipping men with more tools and less beating up. That accounts for why men don’t want to sign up for this. ‘We’re going to pour all this responsibility and blame upon you, and yet we’re not going to really equip you or have your back when things go south.’”

*Aaron Renn, Senior Fellow at the Manhattan
Institute for Policy Research*

MARSHMALLOW SHTICK

Welcome to Man Rampant. I'm Douglas Wilson. One of the more troubling aspects of life in the modern church is the marked tendency to assume that women don't need pastoral care. Not only so, but men can often receive excessive, not to mention abusive pastoral care. You may not be able to detect it, but my last use of care there should have scare quotes around it. The concept of male headship which is taught throughout scripture is not to be confused with the false doctrine that men are to be blamed for everything.

There's a difference between responsibility, which men do have, and fault, which they may or may not have. In the military, if a ship runs aground in the middle of the night because some enlisted man with three weeks left in the navy, say, was being careless and he didn't follow the assigned protocols, who's at fault? Well, since this is not a trick question, that particular sailor is. But who's responsible? Whose head is on the admiral's desk in the morning? Whose career as a naval officer is essentially over? Well that would be the captain. This is the difference between responsibility and fault. The sailor is at fault. The captain is responsible. Not only is this the way it is, we should note that this is the way it is for a reason. God has determined to run the world this way. The

fact that responsibility flows upward is not grossly unfair to those in positions of responsibility. Blame settles on the culprit, at least for all fair-minded people. Blame is a matter of justice; responsibility is a function of covenant. Now it has to be said that confusion of these two categories is one of our generation's besetting sins. We have a real problem with this. We're in a frightful muddle over it.

Suppose you're attending a bachelor party, the kind of tame affair that reformed Christians might host. The guys are sitting around, they have a few beers, and they sing a few Psalms. Then comes the time for all the veteran husbands to give counsel and advice to the young husband to be. Suppose one of the men says something like this: "You must never apologize to your wife." He then pauses for dramatic effect. "Unless you have actually done something wrong. Then you should apologize instantly and without guile, but never apologize simply as a way of making peace." Apart from filling the room with consternation, what is happening here? The reason for this is that men who apologize just to make "a situation" go away, are trying to build a healthy marriage on the ostensibly firm foundation of lying to their wives. That is not a good strategy. That has historically had very bad consequences, the kind that theologians of another era used to call bad juju.

It is an easy trap to fall into. In fact, our entire culture appears to have done so. There appears to be a vast conspiracy afoot, one that revolves around the idea that we should all band together and lie to the women. The reality is that the Christian faith teaches us that all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God. Men are sinners and women are sinners, and they each have temptations that accord with their respective natures. It ought to be possible for pastors to address those temptations the way the writers of the New Testament did. Men, watch out for this. Fathers, be careful about that. Wives, make sure you don't fall into this trap. It ought to be possible, but in the current climate, it isn't really. At least when it happens, it requires an act of courage.

Douglas Wilson

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Why did men and women work together in the home before industrialism? How did industrialism make women “homemakers”? What are some of the good and bad things about such a radical change in society? Does it make you read Proverbs 31 differently?
2. How do Evangelical Christians often see marriage as something that “civilizes” men? How do

marriage and children “incentivize” men with something they can work towards?

3. What is “white knighting”? Is it a good way for men to think of themselves? How does it make them think about women?
4. Why is it easier to beat up on men than on women in the pulpit? How does making marriage all about sacrifice discourage men from marriage? Why do men who have a lot of drive often despise the Church?
5. Why are inter-personal skills more important in the modern world? Why are pastors not giving men resources to make their way in the world? How does this explain the success of Jordan Peterson, pick-up artists, and other self-help gurus?
6. What is the problem with saying men are currently being mistreated by society? What is the problem with blaming external circumstances? Why is it important for the church to back men up?

FURTHER SCRIPTURE READING

Read 2 Corinthians 2:1-11. Why did Paul decide not to visit Corinth? What kind of burden did he not want to put on them? What does he tell them to do with a person who had sinned and repented?

BONUS EPISODE

IMPOTENT CHRISTIANITY

THE POINT

“Jesus was vindicated and paid for the penalties of our sins on the cross. He takes it, is enthroned in heaven, heaven is His throne, earth is His footstool, and I’m thinking, why would He do all that? Just to let it all turn to dust? We’re still here after 2000 years. It started with just twelve apostles ... in the midst of the Roman Empire, opposition from their fellow Jews, [and it] transformed the world.”

Gary DeMar, president of American Vision

MARSHMALLOW SHTICK

Welcome to Man Rampant. I'm Douglas Wilson. Many Evangelical Christians have a defined system of eschatology, that system being the standard-issue dispensational and premillennial system. This is not necessarily because everybody feels all adamant about this topic, but rather just because they grew up in an ecosystem that simply assumes it. And if the only thing at stake in this was the bragging rights about who was correct about the end of the world, who predicted the end of the world stuff most accurately, and who best guessed what the seven thunders said, it would seem the part of wisdom to just let the whole topic go. Why should we fight over stuff like that? Doesn't the Christian Church have enough troubles without controversies over what might happen 10 or 10,000 years from now? And the answer of course is that nothing should drag us into useless controversies of the kind that edify no one.

If that were it, then that would be it. However, that is not it. There's a way in which our assumptions about eschatology tend to creep into what we think we should be doing right now. As in right this minute. In other words, if we frame the question as what did the seven thunders say at the end of the world, then an appropriate response would be or

might be, who cares? So turn this around. Suppose the question is something like this: Does God expect the Christian Church to be an effective and potent witness for the Gospel in a world governed by unbelief? The way we answer that question is going to affect how we plant churches, start businesses, establish institutions, send missionaries, have children, and so on. Not only will it affect whether we do such things: it will affect how we do them. My parents knew a married couple who during the Second World War decided not to have children. Their reason was that the end of the world was at hand and in this unfortunate circumstance, their theology was as barren as they were.

“Therefore, My beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord. For as much as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord” (1 Corinthians 15:58). Your labour in the Lord is not in vain. Reflect on that phrase, “not in vain.” Too many Christians have a theology that treats this world and its history as God’s Etch-A-Sketch. After he’s done with drawing his amazing and intricate and somewhat inscrutable design, he will turn the whole thing over, shake it good, and there we will all be, starting over.

We need to return to a theology that allows for the possibility that certain things we do or make or compose or build or establish in this life will not

be destroyed by fire. Like all things inherited from this fallen age, they will be tested by fire, but that is quite a different thing. Like our own resurrected bodies, they will be transformed and glorified, and they will welcome the glory. But also like our bodies, they will be glory in seed form. It is admittedly a thought experiment, but will we be allowed to sing Handel's *Messiah* in the resurrection with 10,000 bases, with God's idea of a celestial wall of sound? Now, if that's a possibility, as I believe it most certainly is, then what kind of theology, what kind of eschatology might help us to learn how to think that way?

Douglas Wilson

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Why is it important not just to think of Christianity as a small set of truths to believe, but as something that changes how we view the world? How does that connect to American history, politics, and law? How do secularists react when Christians try to bring "religion" into politics?
2. Why do people like to get excited by endtimes predictions? Why are charlatans and false prophets never discredited? Where do we see this among liberals today?

3. How has a pessimistic eschatology hurt the Evangelical church? What are ways we could think more generationally than we now do? How does this help explain why the Church is exploding in other countries but is falling behind in America?
4. Why was America so attractive to people from other nations? How did America become wealthy? What institutions and blessings in our culture are the result of our Christian past?

FURTHER DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Read Luke 10:17-20; John 12:27-33; 1 Cor. 15:25; Ephesians 1:3-10, 15-23; 3:8-10; Col. 1:15-23; and 2:13-15. What did Christ's death do for the world? What does it do for future ages? What did it do to his enemies? What did it do to Satan?

