between separatists and inclusivists better seen than in the examples of Bob Jones and Billy Graham.

Bob Jones, an influential revivalist preacher typical of the traveling evangelist of the time, founded Bob Jones College, later Bob Jones University, in 1926, the year after the Scopes Trial. His goal was to train young men and women in fundamentalist theology, and the isolationism and withdrawal from society that he imposed upon the university that bore his name was typical of separatist fundamentalism of the period.

Though Billy Graham started his preaching in the 1940s as simply a self-identified fundamentalist, he soon made his inclusivist tendencies known. In 1947, Carl F. Henry, a close associate of Graham's, published The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism, in which he argued that fundamentalists needed to leave their isolationism and bring their faith to bear on modern society. Graham soon supported Henry in these ideas and stopped using the label "fundamentalist," describing himself instead merely as "born-again" and "evangelical." As Graham began involving liberal Christians in his crusades, many separatist fundamentalists felt that he had betrayed them and abandoned the truth.

In essence, fundamentalists and other conservative evangelicals broke into two groups after 1930, and the inclusivist group giving rise to the modern evangelical movement while the separatist group giving rise to modern fundamentalists. This split took institutional form when the separatists founded the American Council of Christian Churches in 1941 and the inclusivists founded the National Association of

---
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Evangelicals in 1942. The answer is that fundamentalists are evangelicals, but they are evangelicals with additional defining characteristics (Biblical inerrancy, premillennialism, and separatism). Both evangelicals and fundamentalists emphasize personal conversion and the importance of the Bible, but fundamentalists also insist on strict Biblical inerrancy and premillennialism. Yet, some evangelicals also believe in Biblical inerrancy and premillennialism, so the difference here is more in degree, as fundamentalists dogmatically insist on strict adherence to Biblical inerrancy and premillennialism in a way that those who are simply evangelical do not. The final defining characteristic of fundamentalists is separatism; fundamentalists believe that the world around them is evil and they therefore need to withdraw from it, and this belief is not shared by other evangelicals. There is, though, a gray area of overlap between evangelicals and fundamentalists, and was in this area of overlap that I was raised.

The 1960s was a time of great social change and individuals searching for some form of truth; it was a good time for fundamentalists to find converts glad to have real, unchanging truth to hold onto and answers in a world that seemed to be full of chaos and change. In 1962, the Supreme Court outlawed school prayer, and what fundamentalists saw as systematic attacks on the home, school, and church followed in the next decade; fundamentalists soon came to the conclusion that these
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attacks must be coming from a unified ideological source, a
technique that fundamentalist leader Tim LaHaye identified in his
1980 book, *The Battle for the Mind*, as secular humanism.\textsuperscript{123}
Fundamentalists felt threatened by many things, including the
Equal Rights Amendment, the questions being raised about the
discipline of children, the movement for rights for homosexuals,
humanist ideas being taught in schools, and the Supreme Court's
legalization of abortion in 1973.\textsuperscript{124} Fundamentalists were being
shaken from their slumber as "there was a growing sense that if
"God's people" did not stand up for their principles, the nation
might forever be lost."\textsuperscript{125}

The 1970s saw a rapid acceleration in the growth of
Christian schools as fundamentalists sought to remove their
children from godless, atheistic schools and place them in
environments where they would be taught truth. Between 1965 and
1985, the number of children enrolled in Christian schools
sexptupled as the number of such schools rose to around ten
thousand.\textsuperscript{126} In addition to this growth in Christian schools, the
1970s saw the great success of televangelism, which had begun in
the 1950s.\textsuperscript{127} Televangelists made use of television to broadcast
their fundamentalist message across the nation in an effort to
reach people with the truth. Fundamentalists also made use of
the newfound funds of many fundamentalists who were now in the
middle class to use radio, tapes, and literature to reach out
with their message.\textsuperscript{128} In this way, fundamentalists were able to
be separatist and seek to reach out with their message at the
same time.
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In 1976, an evangelical Christian, Jimmy Carter, was elected to the presidency. Though Carter was a liberal evangelical, national attention was paid to evangelical and fundamentalist voters for the first time, and both groups gained "a new sense of efficacy." In 1979, Jerry Falwell founded the Moral Majority, a political lobbying force which sought to influence the government with Christian views. Falwell was an influential fundamentalist pastor and televangelist who had founded Liberty University, a college designed to train and equip fundamentalist students, in 1971. Falwell outlined the five main positions of the Moral Majority in his *The Fundamentalist Phenomenon*; these included being pro-life and pro-traditional family, opposing illegal drug traffic and pornography, and supporting the state of Israel.

The 1970s saw a materialization of fundamentalism that surprised the nation. Fundamentalists were finally looking up from their isolation and seeking to influence the world around them. Fundamentalists were finally looking up from their isolation and seeking to influence the world around them, and the formation of the Moral Majority marked the beginning of fundamentalist involvement in politics. Though the Moral Majority officially dissolved in 1989, prominent fundamentalist minister and televangelist Pat Robertson formed the Christian Coalition to take its place; Robertson put this new organization under the leadership of Ralph Reed, a newly-converted fundamentalist and strong Republican. Christian fundamentalism had reared its political head, and it was gaining force. I will further examine the involvement of evangelicals and
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fundamentalists in politics in the section of this book on the religious right.

Not all fundamentalists were willing to leave their isolation at all, though, and those who have become more active still strive to maintain their purity even as they seek to influence the society around them. Ammerman said that Christian fundamentalists today can be found either "waiting for the rapture...or actively lobbying the White House."\(^{133}\)

Just as fundamentalists made gains in the last few decades of the 20\(^{th}\) century, they also faced obstacles. Televangelism had become successful in the 1970s, and the late 1980s saw a series of scandals involving Oral Roberts, Jim Bakker, and Jimmy Swaggart, all prominent televangelists. These scandals damaged the fundamentalist image and helped cause the term "fundamentalist," which Billy Graham had said carried an "aura of bigotry and narrowness,"\(^{134}\) to continue its fall from fashion.

Defining the term "fundamentalist" is difficult today because of the number of fundamentalists who have stopped identifying themselves as such. Since fundamentalists are also evangelicals (conversion, Biblicalism, activism, crucicentrism), many fundamentalists today simply use that label. My father, for instance, would not call himself a fundamentalist even though his views and beliefs place him squarely within that category. Yet, in spite of the decline of the use of the label, fundamentalist beliefs are still widespread and strongly held today.

Fundamentalists today still embody Ammerman’s four features North American Protestant fundamentalism: evangelism, inerrancy, premillenialism, and separatism. Fundamentalists are
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evangelistic, believing in the need for personal conversion and personal salvation through Jesus Christ alone; they divide the world into two categories, "saved" and "unsaved." Fundamentalists also put an incredible importance on the inerrancy of the Bible. They believe that the Bible is without error or contradiction and is the literal Word of God; rather than being questioned and picked apart, they believe that what the Bible says should be accepted at face value. In addition, fundamentalists remain strong believers in premillennialism; they believe that Jesus will return and rapture all true believers any day now, and that this rapture will be followed by a tribulation and final judgment. Many fundamentalists are fascinated by the study of the end times. Finally, fundamentalists are separatists; they believe that they must withdraw from everything that will bring them into sin and that they must live their lives strictly according to the Bible and in rejection of modern society. Those who accept modern society and live within it without making waves often have their Christianity and even salvation questioned in fundamentalist circles.

My parents were evangelistic, believed ardently in the inerrancy of the Bible, eagerly awaited the rapture, and intentionally separated my siblings and I from mainstream society; though my father did not claim the term fundamentalist, my family clearly fit within the beliefs of fundamentalism. Understanding the history I have provided will be a great help as I spend the rest of this section on fundamentalism exploring how their fundamentalist beliefs affected my parents and my family. Looking back, I can see the tremendous affect these views had on my upbringing, an affect that completely shaped the way I thought and the way I saw the world.
Chapter 8: Our Liberal Enemy
Standing Against the World

"When people see the world through a Biblical worldview, they see truth," Dad often told us children. "When they look through a secular worldview, an atheistic worldview, they see something very different. That is why we see the origins of the earth differently. We look at the world through a Biblical worldview and know that God created the world in six days, but atheists look at the world assuming God does not exist and, looking at science instead of the Bible, they believe that the world simply came about without cause. Everyone has a different worldview. In this country, those with an atheistic worldview want to do away with true Christians. They see us as country yokels without brains and can't accept true wisdom; they are truly blinded by their worldview. We need to defend truth and protect ourselves from the threat of secular humanism and liberal theology, which is only a step away from atheism. We needn't fear, for we have the truth, and we need only stand firm on that."

"Why do they dislike us so much?" I wanted to know one day when I was thirteen and we were in Massachusetts visiting Dad's parents. Dad put a lot of importance on talking with us children about things, and I knew that he would be happy to answer any question I had, in order to help me understand further.

"You see, Rachel," Dad said. "The devil hates us, and he is alive and active in this world. Jesus said in the Bible that we would be persecuted, and that is being fulfilled today.

"Is that like the people who want to take the Ten Commandments out of courthouses?" I wanted to know. I had read in the various conservative magazines we subscribed to about a
number of cases in which the ACLU was trying to remove Ten Commandments displays from courthouses.

"Yes, that is part of it," Dad replied. "Secular humanists want to erase every vestige of Christianity from this country, and they will stop at nothing to get their way. They refuse to see that these things are merely a part of our Christian heritage. Another part of this persecution is the support for things like gay marriage that we see today among secular humanists and others who are anti-Christian. This is an attack on the traditional family just as abortion is an attack on life. Do you remember what Jesus said about our relationship to the world, Rachel?"

"Yes," I responded. "He said that we're to be in the world and not of it, right?"

"Exactly. We have to be Christ's light in the world without being contaminated by the world. We are persecuted and we face opposition, but we know that we will win in the end."

"But, Dad?" There was something else concerning me. "What about the rapture?" I asked.

"What about it?" Dad responded.

"Well, won't everything just get worse and worse until the rapture?" I wanted to know. "I mean, it's not like we will ever actually be able to fix things or make society completely Christian, right?"

"That is true," Dad said. "Still, though, we have to try. God wants us to influence others and do what we can to bring morality back to society. Remember the parable Jesus told about the rich man who went away and left different amounts of money with some of his servants?"

"Yes, I do," I replied. "When the rich man came back, some of the servants had used his money and made more money with it,
but one had just hidden the money away and kept it safe, and the
master ended up killing him but he rewarded the others. Right?"

"That's right," Dad said. "Clearly, Jesus wants us to try
to influence other people and the world as much as we can."

"Dad, when do you think the rapture will happen?" I asked.

"Any year now," Dad replied. "In fact, I would imagine that
the rapture will probably happen sometime in the next five to
ten years."

"Really?"

"Yes," Dad replied. This answer caused me no small amount
of worry. I wanted to get married and have children someday,
and, if the rapture happened before I grew up, some of my dreams
would never become reality. For the moment, though, I wanted to
make sure that I fully understood the rapture.

"When the rapture happens," I said with confidence, "all
the Christians will simply disappear. Right?"

"Yes, and then the seven year tribulation will begin," Dad
said. "Without Christians, the world will be a terrible place;
God will have removed his presence from the earth. Then, at the
end of the tribulation, Christ will judge the earth. Right now,
though, we have to try to do what we can to keep the earth from
complete chaos and sin."

Conversations like this were commonplace as I grew up. As
fundamentalists, we saw ourselves as the only true Christians,
and we believed that we were pitted against a hostile, secular,
atheistic world. Dad wanted to make sure that we children
understood truth; he therefore spent countless hours discussing
theology, worldview, the Bible, end times, liberalism, and
secular humanism with us. It didn't take us children long to
learn what Dad believed, and it didn't take much more time for
us to agree that he was right.
On our many trips to visit Dad's family in Massachusetts, I learned to understand Dad’s background and see how it affected his beliefs. One Sunday, as we were all walking to the nearby Baptist church my Massachusetts relatives attended, a conversation took place in which I learned something about Dad that I had not known before. Dad and I were leading the way to the church, walking a bit ahead of the others, and I was holding two-year-old Mercy's hand to make sure that she didn’t walk into the road. Curious about something, I turned to Dad, who was carrying baby Patience.

"You went to church here when you were a child, didn’t you, Dad?" I asked.

"No, I didn’t," he replied.

"Wait, then where did you go to church?" I asked, puzzled. I had thought that Dad grew up in the little Baptist church we were walking to.

"Do you know where your grandfather is right now?" Dad asked. I looked around, expecting to see him walking with us, and realized with surprise that he was absent.

"No," I replied in confusion. "Where is he?"

"He’s at the Congregationalist church downtown," Dad continued. "That’s where we all went to church when I was a child."

"What changed, then?" I wanted to know.

"Well Rachel," Dad said. "That church downtown is an old liberal denomination. They don’t teach the true Christianity of the Bible there."

"What do they teach?" I asked.

"Liberal theology." Dad replied. "One thing they believe is that all religions are valid. They also allow female ministers."

"What?!" I cried out in shock. "But the Bible says - "
"Yes, the Bible says that women aren't to be pastors," Dad assured me. "Like I said, the Congregational church downtown doesn't teach the Bible."

"So how did you end up going to this church instead?" I asked as the little Baptist church came into view.

“Well, your grandparents stopped making me come to church when I was in middle school," Dad told me. "I had never heard the true gospel of Jesus' Christ's sacrifice bringing salvation, and I thought that I would go to heaven if I did more good than bad. Also, all of the Christians I saw were hypocrites, saying one thing and doing another. I didn't see any point to going to church, so I simply didn't. Then, when I was in high school, my older brother, your Uncle Steve, was invited to the Baptist church here by some friends. It was there that he understood the gospel for the first time and accepted Christ's gift of salvation. I spent a year making fun of him before I set foot through that door, but the positive changes in Steve's life soon became obvious. I was finally persuaded to go and I, too, was saved. Soon the rest of my brothers began attending the Baptist church as well, and then your grandmother joined us. Your grandfather, though, never left the Congregationalist church."

Several years after this conversation, I visited the Congregational church with my grandpa during another trip to Massachusetts, and I was even more shocked than I had expected to be. The female minister (whom I later learned was a lesbian) told us in her sermon that Satan is just the other side of God and that the two are truly one. She likened God and Satan to the chocolate and vanilla ice cream in a swirlly ice cream cone, and said that we need to embrace both sides of ourselves, the good and the bad, in order to achieve true peace and spirituality. At the time, I was astounded that this church could even be called Christian, and yet it was.
In this way, the separation between liberal and conservative Christians became clear to me as I went through high school. I felt then that Dad was right, that we had the truth and that these other Christians had sold out to the world and abandoned the simple certainty of the Bible. In addition to their opposition to liberal Christians and belief in the rapture, my parents joined forces with many other fundamentalists in supporting the nation of Israel.

One Sunday while we were in Massachusetts, a Christian missionary to the Jews in Israel spoke at the little Baptist church, shedding light on the pro-Israel sentiment that is another common facet of fundamentalist beliefs. The missionary spoke about the founding of the nation of Israel and all that God was doing for his chosen people, and then reminded us that Christ would not return until the Jewish temple was rebuilt on the temple mount in Jerusalem, a location which currently contains a Muslim mosque.

Mom had often told us children that the foundation of the modern nation of Israel was a critical step in God's plan for the world, as it had to be achieved before end times could begin. Mom echoed common fundamentalist beliefs as she assured us that the fact that the nation of Israel had been reestablished so recently clearly meant that we were living in the last days and would be raptured in the near future.

Dad often talked with us about the Israeli/Palestinian conflict; he told us that the Palestinians were truly only Arabs who wanted to take the land rightly possessed by the Israelis, and that the Arab nations had attacked Israel without provocation again and again and yet, Israel had, through the grace of God, managed to survive every assault. We read articles about the persecuted Israelis in World, a conservative Christian magazine we had subscribed to since before I can remember. The
Palestinian claims to Israeli land, we read, were false and invented while the Israelis, God's chosen people, were clearly in the right in the conflict.

My parents were fundamentalists, and they were doing their best to raise us to follow them in this. They were completely sure that what they believed was truth, and passing this on to their children was one of the most important things in the world do them. My parents were evangelistic, stressing the importance of conversion and missions, and they believed strongly in the inerrancy of the Bible and never doubted the coming rapture and tribulation. Finally, they did what they could to separate us from the world, to teach us truth and keep our minds from being polluted with liberal secular humanist ideas. They saw society as evil, and wanted to raise us God's way instead of man's way. These beliefs and practices had a huge affect on me as I grew up.
Chapter 9: Adam is our Ancestor

Defending Biblical Creation

When I was around ten, I became fascinated by some books I found at our church library; I read Henry Morris's *The Genesis Record* from cover to cover and poured over numerous other related books. I was immersing myself in creationist literature, and I loved it. I had never doubted that God created the world in six days as Genesis stated, and I loved having the tools and arguments to support my belief. I was soon an extremely ardent creationist. I showed the books to Mom and Dad, and found that they, as I had suspected, agreed with me. Mom and Dad had already read some books on creationism, but my interest in it spurred them to further research as well. We soon acquired the makings of a creationist library.

Then, the year I was thirteen, we went on a family trip out to the Grand Canyon. This was a trip of a lifetime, and I don’t think any of us children will ever forget it. Yet, the entire time we drove out west, there was something that seemed to continually bother Dad everywhere we went.

"Look," he said when we arrived at the Grand Canyon itself. "There it is again; that sign says that the Grand Canyon is hundreds of millions of years old. There were signs like that at the Petrified Forest and the Painted Desert yesterday. I wish they would stop stating this as fact when it isn’t fact."

As we traveled through the west, Dad continually pointed out to us that we couldn’t know the actual ages of the various geological landmarks because the dating mechanisms scientists used couldn’t be trusted. He told us that the worldwide flood of Noah could have created much of what we were seeing, and that this could have happened only thousands of years ago.
As I approached high school, my science textbooks, which were ordered from homeschool publishers, also taught that creation was true and sought to expose evolution as a falsehood. From time to time, Pastor David preached that Biblical creation was the and condemned those who gave in to evolution and the atheism he said it inevitably led to.

Then, the spring of my freshman year of high school, an event occurred that galvanized my parents' support for creation. Mom and Dad were in charge of Evansville's annual homeschool conference, and they were bringing in Ken Ham and Buddy Davis from Answers in Genesis as their big name speakers.

For fundamentalist Christians, reliance on the truth and inerrancy of every word of the Bible is incredibly important. Fundamentalists believe that all of the Bible can—and should—be taken literally and factually. This means that fundamentalists strive to accept what the Bible says at face value without questioning or changing its meaning. They see the Bible as, from its very first word, inspired and inerrant, and that includes Genesis. This is why my parents were creationists, and this is why they saw bringing creationist speakers to our homeschool conference as important.

The conservative evangelicals who came to be known as fundamentalists have been fighting against evolution since the late 19th century. It is important to remember that a great many Christians embraced evolution without qualm from its very inception. Asa Gray, a strong Christian and a good friend of Darwin's, did his best to pave the way for the acceptance of evolution in America, declaring that "since the Bible was not a science textbook, there was no need for 'reconciliation.'"135 Yet, while most Christians had accepted evolution as God's

mechanism of creation by the end of the nineteenth century, fundamentalists refused to do so. Fundamentalists felt that evolution made man no more than an animal and eliminated any need for God. Fundamentalists at the beginning of the 20th century blamed the problems they saw in society on these evolutionary ideas, believing that evolution would in effect give people the license to behave as animals.

Anti-evolutionism reached its climax in the 1920s as William Jennings Bryan launched his crusade against evolution and state after state banned the teaching of evolution in the public schools. Public sentiment changed, though, after the Scopes trial of 1925, in which a teacher was on trial for teaching evolution and fundamentalists came out looking backward and ignorant. After Scopes, there was a respite in anti-evolution activities that continued until the Great Depression centered people's attention elsewhere. Fundamentalists continued to reject evolution, but their views were not widely advertised.

Fundamentalists in the early 20th century, while they were united in their opposition to evolution, were fragmented on how they believed God went about creating the world. Bryan believed that the "days" in Genesis 1 were actually "ages," and he believed that animal life could have evolved. Bryan campaigned adamantly against evolution because he could not accept that man had evolved, and instead insisted that man had been a special creation of God. In addition to interpreting the days in Genesis 1 as ages, some fundamentalists inserted a "gap" between God's original creation in the first verse of Genesis 1 and his six days of creation in the rest of Genesis 1. They believed that
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this gap contained God's destruction of the world after Satan's fall, and that this was the origin of the fossil record. George McCready Price, another fundamentalist prominent in the fight against evolution in the beginning of the twentieth century, was practically on his own in asserting that the earth was only thousands of years old and that the fossil record had been created by Noah's flood. Most fundamentalists were termed "creationists" not because they believed in a young earth creation in six literal days but rather because they believed that God was intimately involved in creating the earth and that man had a supernatural origin. Fundamentalist opposition to evolution changed dramatically beginning with the 1960s.

The Soviet Union's launching of the Sputnik in 1957 caused the United States government to raise standards for science education, and, as a result of this, the government had a new biology curricula published in the 1960s, a curricula which taught biology from a pervasively evolutionary perspective. This curricula helped cause a fundamentalist backlash against evolution that still continues today.

The 1960s saw a "creationist renaissance" and the advent of "creation science" as more books were published on creationism between 1960 and 1970 than in the preceding three decades. In 1960, John C. Whitcomb and Henry Morris published The Genesis Flood, in which they sought to use scientific evidence to show that the world was less than 10,000 years old and that the fossils were laid down by Noah's flood. The Genesis Flood proved to be very popular among fundamentalists, and Morris became a nationwide speaker. In 1963, Morris founded
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the Creation Research Society, which, though Morris himself was dedicated to young earth creationism and flood geology, did not exclude other creationists so long as they were Christian.\textsuperscript{144} Because Morris wanted to mandate belief in young earth creationism and flood geology, the board of the Creation Research Society decreed that it would publish nothing that advocated and old earth position.\textsuperscript{145} The society published a journal called the \textit{Creation Research Society Quarterly} and created a creationist biology textbook for high school students. This was the age of creation science.

In 1970, Morris founded the Creation Science Research Center, which conducted research on flood geology and produced "radio programs, seminars, and literature."\textsuperscript{146} The Creation Science Research Center was renamed the Institute for Creation research within a decade, and was firmly dedicated to research and education rather than political action.\textsuperscript{147} According to Ronald Numbers, a historian of the creationist movement, "by the 1980s the flood geologists had virtually co-opted the name creationism to describe the once marginal views of Price."\textsuperscript{148} No longer did creationism stand for old earth day-age or gap theories of evolution as it had at the beginning of the twentieth century; instead, it stood for young-earth flood geology creationism.

Creationism has changed even further since the 1980s with the advent of the theory of intelligent design.\textsuperscript{149} Intelligent design advocates claim that the world has signs of design and could not have come about randomly, without the aid of intelligence. By merely stating the need for an intelligent

\textsuperscript{144} Gunn, 120.
\textsuperscript{145} Numbers, 231.
\textsuperscript{146} Numbers, 284.
\textsuperscript{147} Numbers, 286.
\textsuperscript{148} Numbers, xi.
\textsuperscript{149} Gunn, 121.
designer and not addressing who or what this might be, supporters of intelligent design assert that their theory is science, not creationism. Intelligent design advocates also claim that many biological systems are "irreducibly complex" and thus could not have come about through random chance.\textsuperscript{150} Michael Behe, a professor of biochemistry and a prominent advocate of intelligent design, wrote \textit{Darwin's Black Box}, in which he states that the vast complexity of the cell, rather than any sacred text or religious belief, led him to the conclusion that an intelligent designer must exist.\textsuperscript{151} Behe does not question that the earth is billions of years old or that it came about through evolution; he merely asserts that there must have been an intelligent designer involved in the process.\textsuperscript{152} Thus, though there are a number of scientists who say that they've been convinced by science to become believers in the theory of intelligent design, these scientists are not necessarily young earth, flood geology creationists.

As I grew up, I heard my parents talking about scientists who came to embrace intelligent design and failed to realize that this did not necessarily make them young earth creationists. When, in January of 2004, we learned that Anthony Flew, a prominent atheist philosopher, had been convinced by the theory of intelligent design and had subsequently become a deist, I erroneously thought that this meant that he had become a young earth creationist. My father told us children that someday scientists would all be convinced of the truth of young earth creationism, and I took Flew's conversion as proof of this. Nevertheless, intelligent design presents an argument that
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can portray itself as purely scientific rather than religious, and it is used by creationists of every kind.

Now, I may not have known the history of the fundamentalist campaign against evolution or the progression of creationist beliefs when I was in high school, but I knew that my family and I believed that God and created the world in six literal days six thousand years ago and I knew that I couldn’t wait to hear the speakers from Answers in Genesis. Much of the creationist literature I had been reading came from Answers in Genesis, and I was therefore sure that I would love this year’s homeschool conference and Ken Ham and Buddy Davis, the speakers Mom and Dad were bringing in.

Ken Ham, who was the founder of Answers in Genesis, became a part-time creationist speaker when he was a public school science teacher in Australia in 1976. Then, in 1979, he quit his job to go into full time ministry, founding what he eventually called the Christian Science Foundation (CSF). In 1986, Ken Ham decided to move to the United States and become a speaker for Morris’ Institute for Creation Research, while at the same time maintaining his post as director of the Christian Science Foundation.

In 1993, Ken Ham left the Institute for Creation Research and founded the Creation Science Ministries (CSM) together with some colleagues. Ken Ham vigorously espouses Morris’ young earth, flood geology strain of creationism, teaching that this is the only legitimate form of Biblical creationism. Though he uses evidence from intelligent design scientists, he rejects the old earth views they often hold. CSM was autonomous from CSF in Australia, though the two had a good relationship. CSM began a
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radio program in 1994 and continued to publish the already established *Creation Magazine*. Also in 1994, CSM changed its name to Answers in Genesis. CSF soon followed suit and came to be known as “Answers in Genesis Australia.”

Answers in Genesis has a threefold mission: “We proclaim the absolute truth and authority of the Bible with boldness; We relate the relevance of a literal Genesis to the church and the world today with creativity; We obey God’s call to deliver the message of the gospel, individually and collectively.”

Answers in Genesis spends a lot of time linking the acceptance of evolution and the questioning of the Bible with a perceived decline in morality in society.

I loved the books my parents had from Answers in Genesis’, books which were full of simple explanations and colorful illustrations, and I couldn’t wait to hear Ken Ham and Buddy Davis speak. I was not disappointed in the least; indeed, I found the speakers truly inspiring. Ken Ham explained to us that atheists and secular humanists had been trying to erode the Bible, the foundation of our worldview, for years. He told us that if the Bible cracked, our entire worldview and all of our beliefs would crack as well; we therefore had to support the authority of the Bible from its very first word - it was our duty as Christians. Ken Ham said that evolution was nothing more than a plot developed by atheists and secular humanists to undermine the Bible and bring an end to Christianity; in fact, evolution had resulted in the spiraling rates of divorce, suicides, and teen pregnancy. Ken Ham said that evolution was the number one issue we should be concerned about in the world today. Those Christians who claimed that they could be Christians and believe in evolution were deluding themselves, he

said; they were walking on a path toward destruction and the loss of their faith.

More than this, we learned that true science properly understood supported the Biblical creation story in which the world was created in six days six thousand years ago. In fact, if a scientist was truly objective about the evidence, Ken Ham said, he would naturally come to accept creation. We learned that fossils could form in thousands or even hundreds of years rather than taking millions of years, and that the fossil record was actually evidence of the worldwide flood of Noah's day. Everyone seemed thrilled to learn that trusting the authority of the Bible was the correct position scientifically as well as Biblically.

The entire sanctuary was full of energy and excitement. Buddy Davis, the other speaker from Answers in Genesis, shared creationist songs with us on his guitar as we all sang along with him:

I don't believe in Evolution,
I know Creation's true.
I believe that God above
Created me and you.
So praise his name for what He's done,
Give credit where it's due;
I don't believe in evolution,
I know creation's true.

The Bible speaks of a worldwide flood, of a worldwide flood, of a worldwide flood.
If there really was a worldwide flood, what would the evidence be?
Billions of dead things buried in rock layers all over the earth...

As far as I could tell, the information Ken Ham and Buddy Davis provided was received with delight by all present. Even the younger children understood a little bit of what was being said, and were thrilled with talk of dinosaurs and men walking side by side and dinosaurs on Noah's Ark. The speakers' presentations had plenty of colorful illustrations and easy-to-remember examples, and I found it all extremely appealing.

Evansville's annual homeschool conferences were always held at CFC, so Ken Ham and Buddy Davis stayed over to speak at church on Sunday. They sold their books, of which there were many, between services, and these books sold VERY well. One three-pack included Evolution Refuted, The Lie: Evolution, and The Answers Book all together for a reduced price; they sold out of this particular set, and I had to leave children's choir, where I served as a helper, in order to help put together new three-pack sets from the individual books. People loved hearing that they could believe every word of the Bible as true and they loved recieving the information they needed to support their beliefs.

I had an opportunity to put all of my new reading and learning to good use the summer following this conference when my Aunt Lydia came through Evansville on her way back home to Massachusetts after a vacation out west. Mom and Dad were planning to head out to Massachusetts for a visit a month later anyway, so they let Ben, Patience, and I go out east early with Aunt Lydia. The drive was nearly twenty hours long, and I spent literally the entire time arguing with Aunt Lydia about evolution. I loved my Aunt Lydia, but I felt that, as a liberal Christian, she was not on the straight and narrow path and
didn’t believe as a Christian should. I felt bad for her, brainwashed as I thought she was.

"Aunt Lydia, have you ever heard of Answers in Genesis?" I asked her as we left Evansville.

"No," she replied absentmindedly.

"There was a homeschool conference in Evansville in March, and speakers from Answers in Genesis came," I told her. "They showed us how science really proves creation, not evolution."

"Oh, really," said Aunt Lydia; she sounded incredibly skeptical.

"Yes," I said. "Every word of the Bible is true, including the first chapter of Genesis."

"Oh, I agree that every word is true," Aunt Lydia assured me. "It’s just that not every word should be interpreted literally; the beginning of Genesis is just a story God gave us to teach us things."

"But Aunt Lydia," I protested. "If you say it’s just a story, where do you draw the line? What is and is not just a story in the Bible? Are the gospels just stories without real truth?"

"No, the gospels really happened," she replied. "We can’t be sure, though, about everything in the Old Testament, especially Genesis."

"But you have to believe that the whole Bible is really true!" I insisted. "Otherwise, what do you trust?"

"Oh, I trust in God," Aunt Lydia replied. "But I use my head. Rachel, I can’t believe that every word in the Bible is true, because some of it is contradictory."

"No, there is nothing contradictory in the Bible," I informed her. "Nothing at all. It’s all true."

"I disagree," Aunt Lydia stated simply.

"Well, you should pray for more faith," I suggested.
"Right," replied Aunt Lydia, sounding unconvinced.

"But Aunt Lydia," I said, trying another tact. "Don’t you see that there are lots of problems with evolution? In fact, it takes faith to believe in evolution."

"Rachel, evolution is a scientific fact," she replied.

"That’s just what they tell you in public schools, and what the media says," I responded with confidence. "Real science, when it is truly objective, supports creation."

"Is that so?" Aunt Lydia asked.

"Yes."

"What about the dinosaurs?"

"Oh, God created them when he created all the animals on the sixth day," I informed her. "They lived alongside of men and then Noah took dinosaurs on the ark. You’re going to say they couldn’t fit, but they could; Noah took young dinosaurs."

"Then where are the dinosaurs today?" Aunt Lydia asked.

"They died in the ice age that started after the flood," I said. "The climate was all messed up after the flood. Some dinosaurs, but only a few, survived the ice age, and men have been killing them off for the last few thousand years. That’s what dragons were in the middle ages."

"Wait, there were dinosaurs in the middle ages?" Aunt Lydia was laughing.

"Yes," I replied, annoyed. I knew what I was talking about, couldn’t she see that?

"And where is your proof of that?" she asked.

"Well," I started, "where do you think all the stories about dragons came from? And there’s more, too. There are cave drawings of dinosaurs; that means that people and dinosaurs lived at the same time. Plus, there are some dinosaur footprints with human footprints right alongside them."
"Dragons were mythical creatures like harpies," Aunt Lydia assured me. "Also, those cave drawings aren't very clear; they could be any kind of animal. Finally, those footprints were proved to be a hoax."

"But -"

"Rachel, why do you say evolution has huge problems?" Aunt Lydia asked. "What proof do you have for that?"

Aunt Lydia and I went round and round the entire drive to Massachusetts. She seemed to have a counter for everything, but I felt that if I had the evidence Ken Ham had been using actually at my fingertips, I could prove this to her; I was sure that I was right and that I would never, ever change my mind about this.

Mom and Dad felt that Genesis was the foundation of everything they believed, and they told us that if it was allowed to crack and crumble everything else would fall. They taught us children that scientists were deluding themselves into thinking that evolution was true, that they just wanted to prove that God did not exist so that they would then not have to answer for their actions. On the other hand, they told us that real scientists, scientists who objectively followed the scientific method without bias, would find that creation was scientifically valid. Mom and Dad soon acquired a vast library of creationist resources and openly sought to bring others into line with their beliefs on this issue. We children naturally agreed with Mom and Dad that creation was true, and we felt sure that we understood the issues behind it; we knew we were not descended from monkeys and felt that there was no way anyone could make us believe that evolution was true. In this, my parents echoed the beliefs fundamentalists have held for over a hundred years. It is important to remember, though, that they not only supported creationism because of the Bible but also
because of the presumed scientific basis of creationism and falsity of evolution.

"What's amazing about our position today is that we don't have to be afraid of the truth," Dad often told us. "We should always search for the truth and we need never fear it. Asking questions is fine; you should never believe something just because someone says it. You should never be afraid of asking questions because your questions, kids, will always lead you to truth. That's what's amazing about being a Christian today; we know we have the *Truth*. Someday, someday in your lifetimes, scientific consensus will change in the light of the overwhelming evidence, and evolution will be rejected in favor of the truth of Biblical creation."
Chapter 10: We Were Different

Life in a Counterculture

“Rachel, you’re too old for children’s choir this year,” Mom mentioned to me at the supper table one day in late summer.

“I know,” I said sadly. I had been in CFC’s children’s choir since I was seven, and now, at twelve, I had become too old for it. I had positively adored being in children’s choir, and leaving it was going to be hard, especially because most of my siblings and many of my friends were still in it.

“The middle school church youth group is during second service at the same time as children’s choir,” I said. “I could just go there now; some of the girls I knew when I went to Sunday school when I was little are going there now, and it might be good to get to know them again.”

“Would you like that?” Dad asked.

“I think so,” I replied, but I was, in reality, a bit nervous about this. After all, the middle school youth group at CFC was very large, and I wasn’t used to being around that many children my own age in that sort of setting.

Nevertheless, I went to the middle school group the following Sunday. I saw some of the girls I had known back when I was five and six, but that was the only positive thing about it; other than seeing those girls and talking about old times, I hated the middle school group. At lunch after church, Mom and Dad asked how I’d liked my first day in the middle school group.

“Can I do something else during second service?” I asked.

“I don’t think I like the middle school group.”

“Really?” asked Mom. “Why not?”

“First, the music was so loud I could hardly hear, and it was some kind of rock music,” I replied. “And also the lighting
was strange and the kids acted wild. They were not well behaved. There seemed to be a lot of chaos." I was used to the well-structure atmosphere of children’s choir.

"Really?" Dad asked. I knew he would agree with me on the music issue; his taste ran more in hymns and classical music.

"Yeah," I said, and then went on. "The youth pastor had the kids do silly skits and dares, and I didn’t think it was very grownup or smart. Also, the message was about not giving in to peer pressure at school, and that didn’t really apply to me because I’m homeschooled. And then I tried to ask the youth pastor, Mr. Rodriguez, a question, but he wouldn’t answer me, and then one of the other kids told me I had to call him Andy, not Mr. Rodriguez, and that’s why he wasn’t answering me. I don’t want to go to the middle school group; I didn’t like it at all."

"Betsy, what do you think?" Dad asked Mom.

"I don’t know, Jon," she replied. "It’s important for her to spend time with other children her age."

"She does spend time with children her age," Dad responded. "She goes to AWANA, and there’s the homeschool music and art group she’s in, and then she gets to see other kids at our small group as well as any time we get together with other families."

"That’s true," Mom said, nodding her head.

I always found it strange when Mom and Dad talked about me like I didn’t exist, but I didn’t mind; it meant that I knew what was going on.

"Look, Betsy," Dad continued. "We’re trying our best to raise Rachel in a godly way, away from the influences of the world; there is a possibility that the other kids in this middle school group may be a bad influence on her."

"They’re church kids, Jon," Mom said.
"I know," Dad went on. "But you know that just because a person goes to church doesn’t mean he is a good person. Besides, remember what the modern view of the teenager is, even among many evangelical Christians."

"That’s true," Mom said, and then she turned to me. "You know Rachel, many people expect teenagers to wear trendy clothes, listen to loud music, be no help around the house, and rebel against their parents. That isn’t God’s way, though."

"I know," I responded. "I don’t ever intend to do any of those things, you know that."

"Yes. Rachel, your father and I believe that children don’t need to go through a time of rebellion, but that they should rather go straight from being children to being mature, respectful, helpful young adults."

"Yes, I know," I said. "And didn’t it used to work like that? I mean, back in the 1800s teenagers had to work hard, right?" I could tell that the younger children at the table were growing tired of Mom and Dad focusing on me and not on them, but Dad had more to say.

"That’s right," he agreed. "The idea of the teenage years being a time of immaturity is a modern construction."

"You know," Mom added. "It almost sounds like the middle school group at church may encourage this kind of immaturity."

"I bet you’re right," Dad said. "My question is, would being in this middle school group do Rachel any good? She gets all the correct teaching here at home anyway."

"That’s an interesting way to look at it, Jon," Mom said. "Going to this youth group would give her more exposure to what ordinary children are like, but I think that’s it."

"Is that kind of exposure a positive thing?" Dad wanted to know. "Children don’t need to experience the world until they’re ready for it. We should focus now on raising Rachel exactly as
God would want, on training her in the truth, and then, when she goes out into the world, she will be ready."

"I think you’re right, Jon," Mom assented. "There’s no reason for her to go to the middle school group, especially if she doesn’t want to."

"And I don’t!" I exclaimed. I truly didn’t want to go back to that group, and I was going to take advantage Mom and Dad’s mood while I could.

"I have an idea," Mom said. "Rachel, how would you like to help out in children’s choir with me?" I was thrilled with this plan, so I didn’t go back to the middle school youth group; instead, I helped Mom in children’s choir.

This situation illustrates something important about the way I grew up. I have mentioned that one characteristic of fundamentalists is a withdrawal from the world, which they see as evil. Even as fundamentalists in recent years have turned outward in an attempt to influence the culture around them, they still withdraw from the world in a variety of ways. In my case, my parents formed a counterculture.

Mom and Dad believed that most Americans today were worldly and self-centered rather than Christ-centered like people should be. They told us that mainstream American culture was evil and anti-God, and that it was a poisonous environment to grow up in. The public school systems, they said, brainwashed children into believing secular humanist beliefs, beliefs that held that the universe had come about through evolution and that there was no absolute right and wrong in the world; at the same time, they told us that the media today led people into sin through its indecent ads and movies and its portrayal of happiness as coming through worldly goods. Instead, Mom and Dad wanted to give us children a solid grounding in Truth, the truth of Christ and the Bible.
In order to keep us from being influenced by the atheistic environment in public schools, Mom and Dad homeschooled us from kindergarten all the way through high school. This allowed them to control every single thing we children learned in school, and Mom and Dad chose our textbooks carefully, making sure that everything we were taught lined up with their beliefs. We learned science from textbooks that taught a Biblical six-day creation that took place six thousand years ago, and studied from history books that followed the hand of God moving through history. The books Mom and Dad had us read for history and English were carefully chosen to support their values, and what we read for fun was also screened. We didn’t watch TV, so my parents didn’t have to worry about what we were learning from that source. We had an old TV/VCR set and watched about a movie a week, but Mom and Dad carefully screened all movies. In short, nearly everything we saw and heard was carefully monitored; occasionally, something questionable would slip through, but when that happened Mom and Dad were careful to discuss any questionable beliefs or information with us to show us what was true and what was not.

Homeschooling also allowed Mom and Dad to control who our friends were; because they wanted to ensure that we were raised in truth, my parents were careful about just who we spent time with. In general, the children we spent our time with were children whose parents were just like my parents in belief and practice. In order for a counterculture to work, there generally have to be a good number of families involved in it, and that was something we definitely had. There was a large homeschool community in Evansville, and most of these families were also dedicated to raising their children in a godly environment rather than in the world. These other homeschool parents, many of whom either went to CFC or were involved in homeschool groups
with us, were my parents closest friends; we children saw other homeschooled children at church, at homeschool groups, and when our parents got together, and these children were our closest comrades. This meant that I grew up in a world where all of my friends were homeschooled, none of my friends' had parents who were divorced, and none of my friends were at all wayward or rebellious; rather, all of my friends were just like me in belief in action. As I grew up, I didn't have much contact, if any, with people who didn't share my parent's exact beliefs and values. I never (knowingly) saw someone who was homosexual or met someone who had had an abortion, for instance.

I remember times when people would come up to Mom and Dad and ask: "Aren't you worried you're sheltering them too much?" Mom and Dad didn't think they were; they felt that if they concentrated on teaching us truth, we would be able to stand up against falsehood in the world when we saw it. Some families at our church sent their children to public school, saying that the children would be missionaries to their friends there, but Mom and Dad disagreed. They felt that children were too young to be missionaries to their peers and would instead be led astray through peer pressure and the influence of secular humanist teachers. Therefore, Mom and Dad put their energy into raising us to know the truth so that we would someday be ready to go out into the world and remain true to our beliefs, influencing those around us.

Dad was very committed to what he called "raising up the next generation," doing his best to teach, train, and shape us and many of our homeschool friends. Dad had a passion for training high school students to be future conservative leaders, and he therefore did everything he could to get us all involved in politics. As we children grew, Dad made extensive use of the homeschool networking system we had in Evansville to involve as
many young people in politics as he could, and he was good at it. Dad took the time to carefully teach us his political beliefs, values, and views.

"We are intentionally raising you children differently," Dad often told us. "We are not alone in this; there are many others in the homeschool community who are raising their children like this as well. We are going against the world and teaching you God’s truth. There are many Christians, unfortunately, who live within the world, looking like the world even as they profess Christ. We, however, are raising you differently, raising you as Christ intended, raising you as the world should be; we are training you up to be godly men and women who will make a difference in the world, and you are incredibly blessed to be raised with this truth from your very birth."

Looking back, though, I can see that we children made creating this counterculture very easy in many ways; we accepted the way they were raising us without question and truly gloried in it. I loved to read the newest literature about how young ladies should act; I wished I had been born a hundred years ago, and I did what I could to make up for being born in what I considered an inferior era. I orchestrated tea parties and taffy pulls, carol sings and skating parties; I had friends over to can beans and sew doll clothes, to build forts outside and watch Jane Austen movies. I only wore skirts, glorying in being slightly old-fashioned, and my friends played right along as well.

When my friends and I got together, we didn’t listen to new music or go to the movie theater or the mall. Instead, we baked, sewed, talked about politics, took walks, and spent time watching our younger siblings; when we had parties, we watched Jane Austen movies, made taffy, played board games, or went
fishing or swimming in the pond. In a way, we children were intentionally rebelling against the culture at large, finding great joy in having only what we considered good, clean, wholesome, old fashioned fun. To my knowledge, none of us minded being raised like this; in fact, we and our friends were proud to be taught and sheltered the way we were. We gloried in being different from everyone else, gloried in being raised as Christ would have us, gloried in being slightly old-fashioned and strange. We had no desire to know or see anything else and felt that it was a privilege to be raised they way we were; in fact, we pitied those children who weren't.
“No, see, that’s my question, Rachel,” Grace Kauk said emphatically. “Why should girls go to college at all?”

“To learn,” I said. “To get an education.” My friend Grace Kauk and I often had conversations like this; we enjoyed discussing various controversial topics, especially when they helped show us God’s way, which we found was usually directly opposed to that of the world. I was sixteen at the time of this particular conversation, and we were discussing whether or not Christian girls should go to college.

“But why should a woman get an education?” Grace Kauk pushed. “For what purpose?”

“In case something happens to her husband and she has to work,” I replied.

“So the only reason a girl should go off to college,” Grace Kauk asked, frowning, “is so that she has something to do if her husband dies or something?”

“Well, no,” I said. “It’s also important to learn.”

“To learn what?” Grace Kauk wanted to know. “What do women really need to learn?”

“To cook and clean and keep house and care for children,” I replied. “We agree there. But Grace, we’re assuming that these girls already know how to do these things — I mean, you and I do. So what I’m saying is that girls raised as we were should go to college to learn more academically and so that they can have a career if they have to.”

“And what I’m saying, Rachel,” Grace Kauk said adamantly, “is that women can get ordinary jobs without college degrees if they really have to work. Why, then, should they go to college?
Women aren't supposed to have careers, after all. And besides, we can continue our academic learning at home; we can read and teach ourselves."

"But Grace," I repeated, trying another tact. "Going to college is what people do these days. It's a formative part of growing up."

"Have you any idea how many girls just like us go off to college at eighteen and then never come home?" Grace Kauk wanted to know. She was starting to get really fired up about this. "They become liberal and buy into the world's lies. What I'm saying is that a truly godly woman should have no reason to go off to college. If she stays home she can serve others and learn more homemaking skills and actually be using her time in a manner worthy of God rather than using her time only on herself. If a girl stays home she is spending her time seeking God and serving others whereas if she goes to college - and remember, that women in the past never went to college, that's only something recent - she's spending her time on herself and her own vain desires." Grace Kauk spit this whole phrase out like it was rehearsed; she truly meant every word she said, and she felt passionately about this issue.

"I understand what you're saying," I said. "I guess I'm just not sure about living like I really believe that."

"Ruth and I aren't going to college," Grace Kauk informed me. "There's no need. We're going to stay home and seek God and then marry. I think that's the better path. Now of course, I'm going to continue learning about therapy like I have been; I might even take part in some sort of apprenticeship. It's just that it'll all be under my father's roof and authority."

"I do see what you mean Grace, I truly do," I assured her. "And I don't know what I'm going to do when I graduate. But let's let that topic rest for now, shall we?"
I agreed with Grace Kauk a lot on this issue, but I still intended to go to college someday both because I loved learning and because I wanted to be a good influence on those around me there. My parents agreed with my desire because they also valued education, and because they believed that once I reached college age I would be ready to stand up for my beliefs against the world. Though this was the path I chose, I still seriously considered staying home under my father's roof like Grace Kauk and her sister Ruth.

In order to understand my parents' view of women and of family roles, it is important to understand just a little bit about the women's rights movement. The history of feminism is way too large and complex for me to address in any depth here. What is important to understand is that the 1960s saw an expansion of the women's rights movement, an expansion that frightened many conservative Christians. Just as fundamentalists were afraid that the rapid modernization and change they saw around them was threatening Christianity itself, even so many conservative Christians felt that the feminism that emerged in the 1960s was a threat to the natural order of the family. Again, the history of the backlash against the feminist movement is far from simple. Those reacting against feminism did so for a variety of reasons, and what they were often reacting to was a very caricatured and often downright fictitious view of feminism. For the purpose of this book, I am going to call anyone who opposed the feminist movement of this time an "antifeminist," yet is important to remember that antifeminists held a wide range of beliefs and views, some being more extreme than others. Because of this, when I speak of the beliefs of the antifeminist movement, I am often generalizing to some extent. Finally, though the antifeminist movement arose in the 1970s, it still exists today, and I was raised squarely within it.
Antifeminists see feminists as man-hating, power-hungry, and anti-family.\textsuperscript{155} Feminists, they say, are upsetting the God-ordained nature of humanity. In fact, antifeminists link what the perceived destruction of morality in this country with the feminist movement. They believe that everything is connected - divorce, drugs, promiscuity, professional childcare, sexual material on television, teenage pregnancy, crime, a disregard for human life - and that it is all linked to the challenge on the family and the disregard of male authority found in the feminist movement.\textsuperscript{156}

What, then, is the God-ordained order of society? Jerry Falwell quoted the Bible and echoed the beliefs of many antifeminists when he said that "the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church."\textsuperscript{157} Man was to lead, woman was to submit; man was to be the leader, protector, and provider, and woman was to be the wife and mother. This did not mean that women were to be inferior, but rather that women had a different role to fulfill than men. Antifeminists actually generally place a lot of value on women, seeing the roles of keeper of the home and mother as extremely significant. Antifeminists place an incredible importance on the family, which is seen as the way God intended to order society. Because of all this, many conservative Christians, fundamentalists and evangelicals alike, saw feminism as something they needed to fight in order to protect the family. Again, though, I am in part generalizing because this reaction was, in reality, not at all straightforward or universal.

\textsuperscript{156} Diamond, 127.
In 1972, the U.S. Senate passed the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), which stated that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." The ERA, which would grant women equal rights with men, needed to be ratified by thirty-eight states in order to become an official amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Within a year, thirty states had ratified the amendment, but the amendment then began to face problems.

The antifeminists soon opposed the ERA, which they said would subject women to the draft, make women responsible for providing for their families, and end laws protecting women from sexual predators. Phyllis Schlafly, an activist in the conservative right and a devout Catholic, led the campaign against the ERA. She asserted that the "ERA will take away the right of the wife to be supported and to have her minor children supported. Obviously, this is an attack on the rights of the wife and on the family. The principal thing that ERA does is to take away the right of the wife in an ongoing marriage, the wife in the home." Schlafly founded STOP ERA in 1972. In state after state, Schlafly led a force that successfully blocked the ratification of the ERA, and, once the time allotted for the amendment to be ratified finally passed, the ERA was completely defeated. The antifeminists hailed this as a huge victory for their cause.

The antifeminists continued to wield political influence through two important organizations formed around this time. The first, the Eagle Forum, founded by Schlafly in 1975, played a significant part in the pro-family movement, but it also had
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its own political right agenda.\textsuperscript{163} The second organization was Concerned Women for America (CWA), founded in 1979 by Beverly LaHaye, a well-known speaker for evangelical women; by 1994, CWA had between 600,000 and 700,000 members.\textsuperscript{164} CWA's mission is "to protect and promote Biblical values among all citizens...thereby reversing the decline in moral values in our nation" and its vision is "for women and like-minded men, from all walks of life, to come together and restore the family to its traditional purpose and thereby allow each member of the family to realize their God-given potential and be more responsible citizens."\textsuperscript{165} CWA, which has accused feminists of "seeking to abolish marriage and destroy the role of women as homemakers, and promoting sexual promiscuity, especially of the lesbian kind,"\textsuperscript{166} has been extremely influential in the religious right.

The diverse beliefs and ideas that were behind this backlash against feminism continue to this day. Fundamentalists and evangelicals work hard to support the Biblical family by upholding men as leaders of their families and women as homemakers and mothers, but they vary as to how far they take this. Focus on the Family, which I mentioned earlier, is one of the many organizations seeking to support the Biblical family today. In 1995, the United Nations held a World Conference on Women, at which delegates discussed "a range of problems plaguing women and children, including poverty, disease, warfare, and political repression."\textsuperscript{167} Dobson, the founder of Focus on the Family, echoed common antifeminist rhetoric when he called the conference "the most radical, atheistic and anti-
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family crusade in the history of the world."\textsuperscript{168} I was raised on this rhetoric, hearing my parents tell us children of the evils of feminism and its atheistic, anti-family crusade.

It is important to remember that antifeminists are not anti-woman. They are not trying to hold anyone down, but rather to help women achieve happiness by fulfilling their God-given roles. Again, Christians hold widely differing views on feminism, some embracing it completely, and even antifeminists are divided in how far they take their opposition to feminists. In addition, women in the antifeminist movement are often extremely active and influential. For instance, while fundamentalist and evangelical women are not as likely to run for office, they are nevertheless extremely politically involved at the grassroots level, running crisis pregnancy centers and leading the movement against sex education in schools.\textsuperscript{169} Thus these women are politically involved, they are simply do so while remaining in their God-ordained roles as women. In this way, antifeminism is not anti-woman, but rather pro traditional family roles.

Growing up, I was unaware of the history of the debate over women's rights; I knew only that my parents said that feminism had somehow gone wildly astray. Feminism, Mom and Dad told us children, was leading to the devaluation of the family and resulting in millions of women who would forever be unhappy because they were seeking to be the same as men, seeking to do something they were not made for, rather than fulfilling their God-ordained roles in society. In many ways, my parents went even further than most conservative Christians in their beliefs about women and about family roles in general, and all of this
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had a dramatic affect on how I saw people's roles, especially my role as a woman and a daughter.

Mom and Dad had strong views about people's roles in the world. They told us children that men were to be the heads of their families, the leaders; they were to hold authority over their wives and their children. They said that women, on the other hand, were to be under the authority of their husbands and submit to them. Mom and Dad taught us that a woman's place was at home raising her children and keeping the house; the only time it was permissible for a woman to work was before she had children and after her children were grown. It was best if women homeschooled their children themselves and were always intimately involved in their lives, Mom and Dad taught us.

Sons were to be obedient to their fathers as they were trained to be men; when they turned eighteen they were then their own authority, ready to go out into the world and make a place for themselves and, someday, start their own families. Daughters were under their fathers' authority until they married men their fathers approved of; this meant that an unmarried adult daughter remained under her father's authority and had to submit to him in obedience in everything until she married, and even then, that marriage had to be approved. My parents believed that the father was accountable before God for the lives of his children, including the lives of his unmarried daughters. The best thing for an unmarried daughter to do, we were taught, was to stay at home and serve in her father's house as a helpmate to her father as she continued to learn homemaking skills.

The authority of the father was quite extensive. My parents believed that a daughter should have to have her father's blessing to go to college, take a job, or even go out with friends at night. In fact, this authority also extended to matters of spirituality; if a daughter had a theological
question, my mother told me, she should go to her father, who was her theological authority, and then accept what he said.

My parents also advocated an end to dating; in fact, my entire community did. Believing that a young couple’s relationship should be guided and controlled by their parents at all times, they wanted to go back to courtship. An ideal courtship - and we had a great supply of literature on this - began with a young man (who was at a point in his life where he could financially support a wife) asking a young woman’s parents for permission to court her. The parents would then take the young woman aside and speak with her and pray over the whole matter. When a decision was reached, the young woman’s parents would notify the young man. Ideally, both the young man and the young woman would still be living at home with their families. The young man would then come to the young woman’s house to call on her, making visits in which he spent time with her entire family. Rarely would the two ever be alone together. After things progressed, the young man would ask the young woman’s father for his daughter’s hand in marriage. With more prayer and careful thinking, a decision would be reached. The young man would then ask the young woman for her hand and the two would become engaged. An engagement would be short - a maximum of six months - and then the couple would be married and begin a life together. The daughter would no longer be under the authority of her father, but rather under the authority of her husband.

My mother believed that we children should each save our first kisses for our wedding day. Mom and Dad saw this last century of changing views and attitudes toward sex and sexual activity as one of the downfalls of our society, and therefore advocated a return to a time when young men and young women followed their parents lead in finding spouses and remained
perfectly chaste, barely so much as holding hands, until their weddings.

These views about men, women, sons, daughters, sexuality, and the role of the family were held alike by the other parents in our community. In fact, all of my friends growing up were raised with these views and beliefs. My friends and I knew that if our fathers died we would then be under the authority of our (often younger) brothers, and we knew that we were not allowed to date. Indeed, neither I nor any of the friends that I grew up with even wanted to date while in high school, and we all intended to court someday, remaining under the watchful authority of our parents. My friends and I had no problem with any of these beliefs and views; we had been raised to expect these roles, and we felt cherished and loved even as we longed to fill the places laid out for us by God.

One way my parents shared their views on family roles and sexuality was through the literature they gave us. We read *I Kissed Dating Goodbye*, by Joshua Harris, who was, coincidentally, homeschooled just like us. He supported the return to courtship my parents advocated, and we children and our friends found his book to be full of wisdom and insight. We also read other books, stories of young men and women in our day and age who carried out successful courtships. An example of these are the books *The Courtship of Sarah McLean and Jeff McLean: His Courtship*, both written and published by Stephen B. Castleberry, a homeschool father of eight. These books inspired my siblings, friends, and I and gave us hope for our own futures.

In addition to books about courtship, we also read books that expounded upon the Biblical role of the daughter. We

---

learned that the daughter’s role was to help her mother, learn homemaking skills, and be a helpmate for her father. Some of the books we read while growing up were written over a hundred years ago; one example of this was *Beautiful Girlhood*, by Mabel Hale, a book of Christian advice for girls. When I was younger, Mom often sentenced me to reading chapters out of this book as a punishment when I transgressed a principle of Biblical girlhood. As I grew older, though, I learned to love this book.

Other books that we read were not so old. Vision Forum is a ministry directed toward supporting Biblical fathers and Biblical sons, and they publish and republish numerous books which they sell on their website and through their magazine. Vision Forum is run by homeschoolers, and everyone I knew in my homeschool community growing up knew of it and loved it. Vision Forum takes its mission very seriously, stating that “if we have not taught our wives and daughters to love children and be ‘keepers at home’ then we are ‘blasphemer’; if we have not trained our men to be providers, then we are ‘worse than infidels.’”

Vision Forum sells books for building the family, but they also sell books specifically for boys and specifically for girls. The section of their magazine that they called “The Beautiful Girlhood Collection” sells books with titles like *How to be a Lady*, *Verses of Virtue*, and *The Princess and the Kiss*. These books stressed the importance of purity for young ladies and the critical necessity for young women to trust and obey the guidance and leadership of their fathers. One book Vision Forum sells, *So Much More*, by Anna Sofia and Elizabeth Botkin, two homeschooled sisters, advises girls to focus on helping their mothers and fathers at home, urging them to serve God in their homes and avoid going to college altogether. My mother gave me
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this book for Christmas one year, and I read it from cover to cover.

Most of these books railed against feminists, secular humanists, and modern culture, calling on girls to return instead to the roles held by daughters over a hundred years ago. Girls were not to be bold and adventurous, but rather to be young homemakers, submissive and virtuous, thus fulfilling their Biblical roles.

We, both parents and children, also gained a lot of our information and beliefs from two magazines we received the entire time I was growing up. These were *No Greater Joy* and *Above Rubies*. *No Greater Joy* is put out by Michael and Debi Pearl. Michael Pearl has been a pastor and missionary for forty years, and he and his wife homeschooled their five children. The Pearls have written numerous books and Bible studies in addition to publishing their own magazine. They advocate homeschooling, herbal remedies (rather than medical doctors), and a complete trust in the Bible alone. The Pearls encourage people to stop watching television, which they seem to see as the world’s way of polluting true Christians, and they are even opposed to couples getting marriage licenses from the government because they believe that that would link them with homosexuals when they “inevitably” obtain the right to government marriages. Michael Pearl preaches adamantly against pornography, which he sees as completely evil, degrading and of the Devil. The Pearls also discourage parents from sending their children to college, which they say brainwashes Christian young people away from true Christian beliefs and practices. The Pearls have a lot of beliefs and views, but the two they seem to focus on most are child rearing and the Biblical family.

The Pearls teach that it is critically important for Christian parents to raise up their children to follow God, and they wrote *To Train up a Child* in 1994. Mom and Dad read this book when I was young, and they completely loved it. Mom ordered extras and kept a stash of them, giving them away to anyone and everyone. Based on the teachings of this book, Mom and Dad expected strict obedience from us children. We were expected to eat every bite of our food every meal and do numerous chores without complaining. After reading this book, Mom trained her smallest children out of crying and whining, and we children were all expected to be incredibly helpful in every way. In many ways, this book laid the foundation of how Mom and Dad raised and trained us children.

Debi Pearl also wrote a book called *Created to be his Help Meet* in which she set forth her view of Biblical womanhood. I don’t know for sure if Mom ever read this book, but I do know that she and Dad both seemed to put a lot of importance on the Pearls’ views of the roles of husband and wife. The Pearls held that the husbands were to be the leaders and the wives were to serve and support their husbands joyfully, knowing that it was their God-given duty. Women were created to be helpers to their husbands, and it was only through true, heartfelt, godly submission and obedience that women could achieve true contentment in life. Only when women chose to submit to their husbands and let them lead would marriages truly function well, the Pearls taught.

Mom once told me that she sometimes felt that the Pearls were a bit too isolationist and extreme in a few things; nevertheless she and Dad always accepted what the Pearls said as true, and we children did too. My parents weren’t the only ones who read *No Greater Joy* magazine regularly, either; we children loved to pour through it as well, and there was hardly an issue
that made it through our house without my reading it cover to cover.

The other influential magazine, Above Rubies, has been published by Nancy Campbell for over thirty years. Above Rubies now circulates over 130,000 worldwide, and its goal is "to encourage women in their high calling as wives, mothers, and homemakers." Above Rubies contains articles from a Christian perspective to encourage and uplift wives, mothers, and homemakers. Mom loved Above Rubies, and I did too; as a future wife, mother, and homemaker, I sought to glean information that I knew would help me in the future.

"I'm really glad you like that magazine," Mom said one afternoon when she found me reading Above Rubies when I was around sixteen. "It really has a lot of truth in it."

"I know," I answered. "I love it."

"You know, Rachel," Mom said, "There are a lot of women today who think that they will find happiness and fulfillment through a career."

"I know."

"And Rachel," Mom continued. "You know that while your father and I do want you to go to college it is only to get a continued education, not so that you can have a career."

"I know," I replied. "I don't want a career. I want to be a stay-at-home mother, just like you."

"I'm very glad of that," Mom said. "Women's happiness lies in fulfilling their Biblical roles, in being good wives and mothers, rather than in chasing after the empty promises of the world. And, when you go off to college in a few years, you will come face to face with that conflict."

“Yes, I know,” I said, nodding. “But you and Dad have taught me well; I’ll be fine.”

“What article are you reading right now?” Mom asked, looking over my shoulder.

“It’s really interesting,” I said. “It’s about a woman who went to college and had a career. She started being a stay at home mother when she started having kids, but she always felt like that she was missing something. When she found this magazine, though, she found true happiness and contentment as a homemaker. She has ten children now.”

“I always enjoy the testimonials too,” Mom said. “You know, there was a time in college when I bought into those lies about careers. I still remember once when I was probably about ten or so and my teacher asked us what we wanted to be when we grew up. I said I wanted to be a mommy, and she said: ‘What else? You want to be a mommy and what else?’ It was like all of girls in the class had to have an actual career and being a mother wasn’t enough. I actually started to buy into that.”

“What changed your mind?” I asked.

“Well, when you guys came along I took time off of my job as a nurse – and I did love being a nurse. But then, when I started homeschooling you, I found books that helped me understand the true place of women, and what brought true happiness. That’s when I started receiving Above Rubies. As I read about the Biblical role of women I realized that my place is right here at your side, guiding you all as you grow.”

“So, you’re kind of like the woman in this article, aren’t you?” I asked, fascinated.

“I suppose so,” Mom replied. “And you know, when it comes to the woman’s role, God has taught me a lot through a specific book I bought from Above Rubies. It’s called Me? Obey Him?!, and it has probably had the most influence on my contentment.”
"Why?" I wanted to know.

"Well, submission is something that most women don't like," Mom told me.

"Yeah," I answered, nodding. I understood what she was saying, and knew that submitting to a future husband wouldn't always be easy; I felt then that I would do it, though, because it was my Biblical role.

"This book shows how, for a woman, submission to her man is obedience to God," Mom continued. "Women need to let men lead while they themselves strive to be the best helpmates they can be. Men need our support, not our competition, and furthermore, submission is in no way degrading, nor does it make us inferior. Indeed, the career woman is the most unhappy of women, and that is because she is striving to be something she was not meant to be."

"Feminism really messed things up for us, didn't it?" I asked.

"Yes, indeed, it did," Mom replied. "Feminists are so misled and so unhappy."

"Mom, what about all the things I love to do?" I asked, curious about something. "You know how much I love history, and writing, and sewing, and things like that. What about those things? Can't I do the things I love?"

"Of course you can," Mom responded with a smile. "I still do things I love. The solution is to find good ways to use these skills and passions. For instance, you could teach history to homeschooled children while homeschooling your own, or write books on the side. And of course, you can use your crafts to provide for your family. It's not a matter of giving up your dreams, but of channeling them to fit the position God has given you in life."
"That makes sense," I responded. "I guess my passions are really well suited to being a homemaker, aren't they?"

"Mommy, what are you talking about?" asked Mercy, who was only six. She had just woken up from a nap and was rubbing her eyes.

"We're talking about being mommies, Mercy," Mom responded.

"I want to be a mommy when I grow up," Mercy said matter-of-factly as she looked up with a smile on her face. "And I want to have a lot of children."

"So do I, Mercy," I said. "I want to have twelve, like Mom will if she has another baby after the twins. How many do you want?"

"Well, I don't know," Mercy said, her brow furrowed in concentration. "A lot. I guess twenty would be my maximum."

Mom and I exchanged glances and laughed. Mercy had, at her early age, already learned to love motherhood. For each of us, boys and girls, Mom and Dad believed that understanding our God-given places in life and living them out was of the utmost importance. The boys, as well as the girls, understood this importance.

"You know what Rachel?" thirteen year old Ben asked one day a few weeks after my conversation with Mom. "I'm glad I'll never have to give birth to a baby."

"Why, Ben?" I wanted to know.

"Well, it hurts a lot and all that," he said. "I kind of feel sorry for you."

"But I want to have babies," I responded. "I want to be a mother. You know what, I'm glad I'm a girl. I would never want to have all the authority or to be the one in charge. That must be scary, to have that responsibility. No, I'm glad I'm a girl and will someday have a husband to take care of me."
"Really?" asked Ben incredulously. "I’m glad I’m going to have that kind of responsibility. I’m looking forward to caring for a family and making those kinds of decisions."

"Hm," I mused. "I guess God truly made boys and girls different, didn’t he?"

"Yes, and I’m glad," Ben replied. "Also, I’ll be able to run for political office someday if I’m supposed to, if God wants me to."

"Well, I may never run for political office," I said with confidence, "but I can support my husband in doing so someday."

All of my friends were raised the same way, and none of us had a problem with it. We all saw mainstream society and the role that it placed women in as unbiblical, anti-family, and antithetical to true fulfillment. My friends and I were instead ready to buck the worldly norm and live our lives filling the roles God set out for us. None of us then had any thought of questioning or feelings of repression; instead, we gloried in our godly womanhood.
PART 3:

HOMESCHOOL
"Where do you go to school?" the woman behind us in the grocery store checkout line asked me; I was only six at the time, but I was ready for that question.

"Fulton Field School," I responded confidently.

"Oh really? How nice," the woman responded.

Mom had carefully instructed us children not to tell strangers that we were homeschooled. Homeschooling was legal in Indiana in the early 1990s when Mom and Dad began to homeschool us, but it wasn’t yet completely accepted in public opinion and many people still thought it was illegal. Twelve years later, though, as a homeschooled senior in high school, I overheard someone at the library asking my seven-year-old sister Mercy the same question.

"Oh, aren’t you a sweet little girl!" the woman said, patting her head. "Where do you go to school?"

"I’m homeschooled," Mercy responded.

"Really?" the woman said, smiling at Mercy. "That’s wonderful. Lots of kids are homeschooled these days, aren’t they?"

It was when I overheard that conversation and remembered what I had been taught to say when I was Mercy’s age that I realized just how much things had changed in the past dozen years. I wondered then about the history of homeschooling, which I understood only vaguely, but it was not until I began writing this book that I truly sought to understand the origins of the movement in which I was raised.
Homeschooling has its roots in the school reform movements of the 1960s and 1970s. In an era of change and the challenging of authority, reformers began to question the public education system, asking if it was truly best to restrain children to desks for so many hours every day. This was an era of school reform. Many of the reformers saw schools as factories or machines, failing to "allow children intellectual or emotional breathing room."  

John Holt, a school reformer influential in the 1960s and 1970s, was one of the earliest and most significant promoters of homeschooling. Holt believed that "conferenceally structured classrooms and curricula squelched children's natural inquisitiveness." Holt said that "true learning...has to do with our ability to think up important questions and find ways to get useful answers. [It] is not a trick that can be taught, nor does it need to be." Hold called his pedagogy "unschooling," advocating that children should be allowed to direct their own learning in natural freedom rather than being restrained to desks and structured curricula. Holt wrote numerous books and spoke across the nation, making his voice heard and becoming extremely influential.

Raymond and Dorothy Moore, with their incredible influence on homeschoolers, are often called the "grandparents" of homeschooling. They were educational researchers who became influential in the 1970s. The Moores taught that early education was not only unnecessary but also harmful, and they "challenged the wisdom of sending children to school before they reached
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eight, nine, or even ten years of age." 178 Yet, the Moores were not anti-authority. They believed that young children needed guidance, but they believed that this should come from parents, not factory-like schools. Their first books, Better Late Than Early and School Can Wait, gained nationwide attention, and their following books, Home Grown Kids and Home-Spun Schools, specifically advocated homeschooling. 179 "Mothers and fathers can provide deeper security, sheerer closeness, sharper instincts, longer continuity, warmer responses, more logical control and more natural example than the staff in the best care center or kindergarten," the Moores said. 180 The Moores believed that parents were their children's best teachers, and they made their voices heard. I grew up hearing many positive things about the Moores, and their book Home Grown Kids was extremely influential in my parents decision to homeschool me and my siblings.

The Moores were also strong Christians, and they saw problems with the influence of school authorities and peer pressure over children's moral development. "Step by step parents lose control, their authority usurped by the school authorities to whom they delegated responsibility for their children," the Moores cautioned. 181 Greg Harris, who started his career as a homeschool leader by being a conference coordinator for the Moores, warned against peer pressure when he said that "the more that our children have the opportunity to be the companions of foolish children, the more impervious they are to our counsel." 182 Homeschooling, then, provided a way for religious parents to keep their children away from the contaminants found in public schools and carefully raise them to

---

178 Stevens, 38.
179 Stevens, 89.
180 Stevens, 40.
181 Stevens, 52.
182 Stevens, 53.
follow in their religious beliefs. Incidentally, my parents heard Harris speak at the first homeschool conference they attended after they began homeschooling.

Though there were a few homeschoolers during the 1970s, it was during the 1980s that the movement truly took off and grew, and during the 1990s that it spread like wildfire. Parents listening to Holt's vision of unschooling and the Moore's warnings against early structured education removed their children from the public school system for the sake of their academic wellbeing while parents listening to the Moores and Harris warn against the bad influences of public schools removed their children from the public school system in order to give them the religious upbringing they believed was necessary. Homeschooling began to expand and grow, but parents homeschooled for different reasons and used different methods. Thus, the most important thing to realize about the homeschool movement is its diversity.

No two homeschool families are the same. Period. There are what my mother used to call the "hippie homeschoolers" and there are cults that homeschool their children in order to indoctrinate them. There are parents who are homeschooling because their children are gifted and they want to help them get ahead, and parents who are homeschooling because they believe that the public schools would be an evil influence on their children. Even as the reasons for homeschooling are various and different, so are the methods used. There are homeschool children who are involved in activities every moment of the day, and homeschool children that rarely leave their homes, homeschool children who have textbooks and workbooks laid out for every subject, and homeschool children who don't use textbooks at all. How do we make sense of all of this?
I like to see the reasons why parents homeschool as points on a line. At one end of the line are parents who homeschool only for academic reasons and at the other end of the line are parents who homeschool only for religious reasons. There are, of course, a lot of families that fall somewhere in the middle of this line, homeschooling for both reasons. The problem with this understanding of homeschoolers, though, is that it is too simplistic. For one thing, it completely ignores the differing methods homeschoolers use. Some homeschoolers are extremely regimented and detailed, with strict curricula and school textbooks, and others are very different from that, instead letting the children focus on whatever they want to study and using innovative ways to do this. Therefore, this could be seen as another line, with parents who use strict academic methods on one end and parents who allow their children complete free rein on the other, with most parents falling somewhere in between. If these two lines are placed at right angles to each other, we have a grid on which to place homeschoolers, a grid that allows us to see homeschool parents' reasons and methods.

The vertical axel represents homeschoolers' methods (structured or unschooling) and the horizontal axel represents homeschoolers' reasons (religious or academic).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unschooling</td>
<td>Unschooling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let us see what we can make of this graph. It is important to remember that there are not necessarily an equal number of homeschoolers in each of the four quadrants by any means, along with the fact that a homeschooler falling in one part of a quadrant would still be slightly different from a homeschooler falling in another part of the same quadrant.

Based on my experience homeschooling and what I have read, I think this framework goes a long way to show the differences and commonalities within the homeschool movement. It has its flaws, though. For instance, there are many families who homeschool for BOTH religious and academic reasons, and my graph does not really show this very well. Also, religious homeschoolers are less likely to use unschooling methods than nonreligious homeschoolers are. Finally, a study in 1995 found that 91% of homeschoolers reported that religious commitment was "very important" and only 1% of homeschoolers reported that it was "not important at all," and 97% reported believe in a real, living God.\footnote{Stevens, 12.} Clearly, then, religious homeschoolers are a much larger group than nonreligious homeschoolers. It is important to remember, in reading this book, that I was raised squarely in the religious homeschooler camp.

There is often a fundamental difference in how parents homeschooling for mainly religious reasons and parents homeschooling for mainly academic reasons view children. Religious parents tend to see children as sinful beings who need direction and can easily be led astray by their peers if they (the parents) don't carefully train and guide them (the children). Academic parents, on the other hand, usually see children as inherently good. They believe that children, if given freedom and opportunity, will grow and blossom in
themselves. Academic Unschooling parents allow the children complete freedom to explore their own desires and release the inner self, and Academic Structured parents, though they still usually see children as inherently good, believe that they need more structure and academic guidance as the develop and grow to reach their full potential.

A study conducted in 1995 found that homeschoolers were 98% white and 97% of homeschool parents were married. One third were college graduates and another 43% had some postsecondary education. Of the mothers, 78% were stay-at-home moms and, of those who worked, nearly all worked out of the home. As I mentioned above, a vast majority of homeschoolers report that religious commitment is extremely important to them. Thus, homeschool parents are predominantly white, religious, and married.

Since its inception, homeschooling has grown by leaps and bounds. There were fifteen thousand homeschooled children in the United States in the early 1970s, three hundred thousand in 1988, and nearly one and a quarter million in 1996. As homeschooling grew, homeschoolers sought to prove their legitimacy through their academic performance. Samples taken in 1986, 1987, and 1988 showed that homeschoolers' median scores were around the 66th percentile. A study done in 1992 found that the majority of homeschoolers' scores fell between the 70th and 79th percentiles, and a study in 1999 found that homeschoolers' median scores in every subject in every grade were above the national average. Though these studies were limited by who choose to respond and by the potential agenda of
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the group performing the study, it seems clear that homeschooling is generally academically successful.

There was always, though, the issue of the legality of homeschooling. Each state has its own education laws, but school attendance from around seven to around sixteen is universally compulsory. When homeschooling first came about, there was some legal ambiguity because there were no laws regarding it specifically. What constitutes a school varies from state to state, and in some states home schools technically counted as private schools legally, while in other states the compulsory school attendance laws automatically banned homeschooling. In some states, teacher certification was required, and this naturally created problems for homeschooling. I grew up hearing stories of the early years of homeschooling, when homeschoolers kept their children indoors during school hours and drew the blinds. Many of these early homeschoolers, who were already being countercultural, had no problem with homeschooling illegally.

Over the years, though, homeschoolers made themselves heard as they lobbied to change the laws in restrictive states. As homeschoolers began to be seen as more legitimate, state governments made moves to accommodate them. Between 1985 and 1992, a full twenty-five states exempted homeschoolers from compulsory school attendance laws.188 Today, homeschooling in some form is legal across the United States, though the restrictions on it vary from state to state.189 In some states like Indiana, where I grew up, there are virtually no restrictions on homeschooling and the government has no record of homeschoolers at all, while in other states restrictions vary
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from mandating the use of correspondence schools to requiring standardized testing.

In 1983, Michael Farris and Mike Smith, both homeschool fathers and lawyers, founded the Homeschool Legal Defense Association (HSLDA). HSLDA's mission is "to preserve and advance the fundamental, God-given, constitutional right of parents and others legally responsible for their children to direct their education." HSLDA, then, is a team of lawyers who defend homeschoolers across the country from legal problems and work to decrease restrictions on homeschoolers. From its very beginning, HSLDA has run a cooperative system where families pay an annual fee to become members, and then all members receive completely free legal protection in the case of legal challenge. In this way, no family has to pay for its own legal costs and every family has a safety net in case legal problems arise. HSLDA had 38,000 member families in 1993, and today it has over 80,000 member families. HSLDA has been very successful in lobbying for homeschool rights, in part because of its ability to activate its member families when potential threats to the legality of homeschooling arise.

Mom and Dad were members of HSLDA from the time I was little, and I heard nothing but the highest praise of it as I grew up. Having the protection of HSLDA was very comforting, especially because every homeschooled child I ever met had a secret fear of being taken away from his or her parents by social workers. For us, the social worker became a sort of dreaded boogey man, and we were told horror stories of social
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workers searching homeschoolers' houses or questioning and examining homeschooled children alone, without their parents. Mom and Dad pasted HSLDA's phone number on the inside of a kitchen cupboard door so that we children could find it if a social worker ever came to the door in their absence. Of course, we didn't ever face any legal problems whatsoever, but that didn't stop our active imaginations. It was therefore comforting to be members of an organization that would protect us if we ever faced such a threat.

Homeschoolers connect with each other through numerous homeschool networks. Growing up, I often heard of the Indiana Association of Home Educators (IAHE) and the South Western Indiana Association of Home Educators (SWIHE). Every state has organizations like these, some Christian, some nonsectarian, and some more specialized like the Latter Day Saint Home Educators Association, the National Association of Catholic Home Educators, and the Pagan Home Educators Network. These homeschool networks provide homeschoolers with information, resources, conferences, and support groups. IAHE, for instance, put out a magazine that my family received and also sponsored art and writing competitions for homeschoolers. These networks link homeschoolers together and give them a sense of community.

The variety of resources homeschoolers today have available is staggering. Homeschool support groups and co-ops are found in nearly every city and large town, and many tutors and music teachers today intentionally seek to advertise to homeschoolers. There are dozens of catalogues selling books and supplies specifically to homeschoolers, and there are publishing companies dedicated specifically to publishing textbooks and curricula for homeschoolers. By 1988, there were over forty correspondence schools and curriculum suppliers marketing
specifically to homeschool families. Homeschool parents can purchase textbooks on individual subjects and mix and match to create an individualized program of education for their children (my parents did this), or they can buy an entire set of curricula from one source. In fact, if parents want to be really structured with their children’s education, they can make use of the numerous homeschool correspondence schools available. For instance, A Beka Correspondence School, which is associated with Pensacola Christian College, “provides parents with day-to-day instruction programs, texts, ‘class and homework assignments, and tests’ and establishes a permanent academic record for each of its enrollees.” A great deal of the textbooks and supplies which are marketed to homeschoolers provide students with information and knowledge from an overtly Christian perspective. There are so many resources available to homeschoolers, though, that I often heard my mother complain that the problem is not finding good textbooks but rather choosing the best ones out of a large supply of wonderful materials.

Homeschooling has grown and changed over the years. There were very few homeschoolers in the 1970s, but in the 1980s homeschooling took root and grew. The homeschoolers of the 1980s were the pioneers of the homeschool movement, often facing the opposition of both education laws and public opinion. These homeschoolers had to prove that there was a reason for what they were doing, prove that homeschooling was legitimate. These homeschoolers were the pioneers as they created homeschool networks and resources, laying the groundwork for what was to come.

In the 1990s, homeschooling grew by leaps and bounds. Homeschoolers then increasingly didn’t face either legal
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challenges or public disapproval, and they made use of their ever increasing networks to thrive. There were increasingly numerous resources available to homeschoolers, and homeschool parents were innovative, forming co-ops (homeschool groups) and working to create specialized experiences for their children. The homeschoolers of the 1990s were the creators.

The homeschoolers of the first decade of the 21st century, though, are slightly different. Rather than creating programs themselves, they are more likely to ask what the homeschool community has to offer. They see homeschooling as an established network that has things to offer their children; rather than creating experiences for their children, they are consumers, ready to capitalize on the homeschool community that is already in place.

The homeschoolers of the 1980s, then, were the pioneers, the homeschoolers of the 1990s were the creators, and the homeschoolers of the first decade of the 21st century are the consumers. I am of course generalizing a bit here, but, nevertheless, this is the trend that I have personally seen take place.

This, in all its diversity of individuals and opportunities, is homeschooling. Ever growing and changing, ever different and diverse, it is a movement that is not easily pinned down. For someone growing up inside of the homeschool community, though, it is home. Homeschooling is engrained in me even today, and I cannot imagine what my life would have been like without it. Even now, in college, when I meet someone else who was homeschooled I find that there is an instant connection. There is a whole lingo, a whole way of thinking, a whole set of experiences that homeschoolers share, and this gives them a sense of collective commonality. I have often likened this bond to that shared by racial minorities. When I am around others who
were homeschooled, I know that they almost definitely share my experiences, understand my way of life, and share something with me that can never be taken away. Somewhere deep inside of me, a part of my heart will always cling to my homeschool upbringing.
Chapter 13: Our Plan of Action

How Homeschooling Worked for Us

Mom and Dad started homeschooling me when I was five. They weren’t sure if homeschooling was a good idea or if it would work, but Mom felt confident trying it because she knew she couldn’t mess up kindergarten. That year, Mom taught four-year-old Hannah and I both how to read. After this success, Mom and Dad decided to homeschool us for another year. During that time, Mom and Dad read *Home Grown Kids*, by Raymond and Dorothy Moore. Based on its recommendations, they decided to homeschool us until 3rd to 5th grade, and so, we were homeschooled for a few years longer. Each summer, Mom and Dad reevaluated and talked about putting us into public school, but they never actually saw a reason to. During these years, Mom and Dad read more literature on homeschooling and met numerous other homeschoolers in our church and the Evansville area; by the time I reached middle school, they were completely sold on the merits of homeschooling.

There were several factors in Mom and Dad’s decision to continue homeschooling us. For one thing, they wanted us to have the very best education they possibly could, and they believed that they best way they could do this was by teaching us themselves. They said that there was a lot of time wasted in public schools, and that teachers were often too busy to give students the individualized attention they needed. Mom and Dad, though, said that they could give us this individualized attention themselves, letting us take our school work at our own pace and advance as soon as we were ready.

Though Mom and Dad had academic reasons for homeschooling us, their most important reasons were religious. Mom and Dad
wanted to give us a godly education rather the secular, anti-God education they said we would receive in the public school system. They wanted us to learn to love God and seek him first, and they felt that they could do this best through teaching us themselves using curricula that put God at the center. They said that the curricula that was taught in public schools was atheistic and anti-God, especially because it taught evolution. My parents also had a problem with sex education in public schools, which they felt was teaching children to fall into sexual sin and promiscuity. By homeschooling us, Mom and Dad said that they could help us avoid these negative aspects of the curricula and atmosphere in public schools, giving us a godly education instead. Though my parents had both academic and religious reasons for homeschooling us, the religious reasons always seemed to be most prominent.

Today's homeschoolers have nearly limitless resources available to them, and Mom and Dad were quick to make use of this. In order to learn how to best teach us themselves, Mom and Dad visited numerous homeschool conferences where they attended workshops and picked out the best materials to help us learn. They gathered information from other homeschoolers in the Evansville area and began receiving some of the numerous catalogues of homeschool curricula now available. My parents made use of both structure and unschooling as they taught us, landing my family somewhere in the middle of that continuum.

Mom and Dad gave each of us an individualized education. We each learned the basics: math, science, history, English, music and art. Because we were given individual attention and allowed to go at our own paces, we were ahead of average in nearly every subject. Mom bought textbooks for each of these subjects, and we spent school mornings studying each subject. Unfinished work carried over into the afternoons, which were also used for
history reading. Mom checked up on us older children to make sure that we were completing our textbooks and worked one-on-one with the middle children. This was the structured side of our education, but it was not all that there was.

Being homeschooled gave us children the opportunity to study what we enjoyed. I loved ancient languages, and so studied not only Latin but also Greek and Hebrew. Jeremiah wanted to learn to play the bagpipes and Hannah wanted voice lessons; they both found their desires met. Mom and Dad used people outside of our family to tutor us in subjects when the need arose. It was Mom who actually taught us, but, at the same time, we children learned just as much from Dad as we grew up.

Dad incorporated education into everything, and he was eager to answer any question we might have; it sometimes seemed to us children that Dad knew everything. Dad was an engineer, and this meant he had knowledge about math and science; he was also a big history nut and he loved reading about government, politics, and economics. I remember a time when we were traveling in the car on vacation and Jeremiah (who was always asking questions about everything) asked Dad to explain the minimum wage; half an hour later, everyone in the van understood the economics of the minimum wage inside and out. Impromptu lectures like this were fairly common, and they were always interesting because Dad made sure to explain things in a way that we could each understand, regardless of age. We soon learned that if we had questions about current events or history, science or government, we should ask Dad at the supper table. Dad always seemed to know the answer to our questions and, on the rare occasion when he didn’t, he’d leave the table for a moment and return with an encyclopedia. During my years of homeschooling, I probably learned more at our dinner table than almost anywhere else.
This, then, was the unschooling side of our education. The reality was that the majority of our learning didn't take place during actual school time. There were various homeschool groups and also debate club, but, perhaps even more importantly, there were things we did completely independently of parental oversight which contributed to our learning in unique ways. For instance, the boys taught themselves, with the help of their friends, how to do computer programming, and I devoted countless hours to researching and understanding numerous historical periods simply because they interested me. Probably our most innovative way of learning was the CESW, an alternate reality world created by my brother Ben and some of his friends in which around forty of us homeschooled students ruled countries, waged wars, and wrote treaties. Because this alternate reality world was factually identical to our own world, we had to do a lot of research to learn how to properly rule and understand our nations and foreign treaties. We all learned an incredible amount through the CESW, which was not in any way monitored or controlled by any of our parents.

Being homeschooled gave us the opportunity to learn at our own paces, study what we loved, and incorporate true, hands-on learning into everything we did. I think that the best thing about being homeschooled was the passion we gained for life-long learning, learning that didn't end with graduation. Finally, homeschooling allowed us to learn in unusual ways. I offered Latin classes for other homeschooled students and Hannah offered art lessons, Ben was a member of the Civil Air Patrol and Jeremiah marched in a bagpipe band. Being homeschooled gave us children the freedom to explore our interests, allowed us to form our own educational experiences, and made us love learning.

Mom and Dad soon became leaders in our homeschool community. There were literally thousands of homeschoolers in
the Evansville area while I was growing up, and other homeschool parents often asked Mom and Dad for advice. When I was in high school, Mom and Dad were the presidents of the SWIHE (Southwestern Indiana Home Educators) steering committee. SWIHE offered homeschool information packets to new homeschool parents, sponsored a homeschool information day each summer, and put on Evansville's homeschool conference each spring. SWIHE is unashamedly Christian, and Mom and Dad had to sign a statement of faith when they joined the steering committee. When I was in middle school, there was a Catholic couple who wanted to join the SWIHE steering committee, but they refused to sign the statement of faith, which was explicitly Protestant. I don't remember what ended up happening, but the couple either didn't join the steering committee or the statement was revised to be more generically Christian. Statements of faith like this are common features of homeschool associations.

The year I was a freshman in high school, Mom and Dad, as the presidents of the SWIHE steering committee, were in charge of putting on Evansville's homeschool conference. Mom and Dad had the help of the five other couples on the SWIHE steering committee in planning the conference, which was attended by thousands of homeschool parents and children from around the Evansville area each year. I have already touched briefly on the year my parents were in charge of putting on this conference, bringing in speakers from Answers in Genesis, but I am here more concerned with homeschool conferences in general than with the beliefs of the particular speakers my parents brought to this specific conference.

There are three aspects to homeschool conferences: the keynote speaker, the workshops, and the vendors. Every year, SWIHE paid a big-name speaker to come speak at our conference; it might be someone who had founded a homeschool publishing
company, someone who was a nationally renowned speaker on family matters, or anyone else who could give talks somehow relevant to homeschoolers.

In addition to a main speaker, homeschool conferences also have workshops taught by homeschool parents or people from the community; there were various topics from teaching your child to read to financial planning for college, from encouraging mothers to teaching special needs kids, and everything in between. Mom taught a workshop on high school record keeping and transcript writing. In this way, more experienced homeschool parents taught others how to homeschool better, each sharing what they know best. This, both at conferences, in print, and at a day to day level is perhaps the most important way homeschool parents learn how to homeschool.

The third aspect of homeschool conferences is the vendors. There were college recruiters and people advertising local homeschool groups, but most vendors sold homeschool supplies. These vendors enabled homeschool parents to compare and contrast curricula and purchase textbooks without having to pay shipping and handling; there is so much curricula available for homeschool parents today that their problem is not finding it but rather deciding which textbooks are the best fit for their children. We children always loved the vendors as much, if not more, than the parents did; after all, there were vendors selling science equipment and outdoor materials along with lots and lots of textbooks, old novels, and reprinted classics.

There was another reason we children loved homeschool conferences: the socialization. Anyone who says homeschoolers aren't socialized needs to come to a homeschool conference; all of our friends were at the conference each year, and we also made friends with the various vendors' numerous children.
Parents also had the opportunity to see their friends and talk about the latest homeschool strategies and textbooks.

The homeschool community in Evansville was quite large, and we children had plenty of friends and educational opportunities. I loved being homeschooled, and all of my friends, to my knowledge, enjoyed being homeschooled just as much as I did. When you were homeschooled, you had a sense of belonging; you knew that there were others like you and that they understood your way of life and probably supported your values. My parents were leaders in the homeschool community, and they gave us children an education that contained both structure and unschooling. Homeschooling allowed them to teach us each in our own way and at our own pace, and also gave them the ability to control and direct what we learned in accordance to their beliefs. For us kids, though, it was simply our way of life.
"Rise and shine!" Mom called from the bottom of the stairs. "It’s seven o’clock on a Thursday morning! Everybody get dressed and start your chores; breakfast is at eight!" I could hear then hear her walking through the hall to call the same thing down the basement stairs to the boys’ room.

I took a few minutes to finish the math lesson I was working on and then turned to make sure that the little girls were getting out of bed. I was sixteen and shared a room with Mercy and Patience, who were five and three. I was already dressed and ready for the day; I had gotten up at five-thirty, as usual, and had already exercised with Hannah, showered, and then gotten a head start on my homework.

"Mercy, Patience," I sat on the edge of their bed and shook them gently. "It’s time to get up and get dressed. Come one, let’s go find some clothes." As I supervised Mercy and Patience getting dressed I could already hear the commotion of children doing chores all around the house. Grace, age seven, was vacuuming somewhere and Hannah cooking in the kitchen; I must have taken longer than I thought with my last few math problems, because those two were usually the last two awake.

"Alright, girls," I said to Grace and Mercy, who were now dressed. "You two need to go clean the bathrooms."

"Can I get one of the twins dressed first?" Patience asked.

"Maybe you can each dress one if you finish cleaning the bathrooms quickly enough," I replied. The twins, who brought the number of children in our family to eleven, were only a few months old, and we often fought over who got to dress and care for them.
I walked down the stairs on my way to the laundry room; I was in charge of all of the laundry in the house, and I tried to get a load started first thing each day.

"Hey Mom!" Jeremiah called across the house as I reached the bottom of the stairs. "I'm taking Charity out with me to help feed the rabbit, okay?"

"Just make sure she's dressed for the weather," Mom called back, her voice coming from the learning room. "It's not summer anymore, you know. And go out the side door, not the sliding door, okay?"

"Sure, Mom," Jeremiah replied.

I walked through the hall and into the dining room (the dining room opens into the kitchen and the learning room); I could then see why Mom had asked Jeremiah not to use the sliding door, which opened out of the dining room.

"Mom?" I asked, turning toward the learning room. "Why are the twins sunbathing?" Micah and Gideon, their two tiny, scrawny, naked, sleeping little bodies outstretched, were laying on pillows and blankets and basking in the sunlight shining in the sliding door. This looked very strange.

"I'm trying to get their bilirubin levels up," Mom replied without looking up from the school books she was sorting through in preparation for the day. "The doctor said they were low."

"Well, the twins look really strange like that," I replied as I walked into the laundry room and began my chores. In addition to starting a load of laundry, I also worked on folding some clean clothes. As I worked, Grace and Mercy finished cleaning the bathrooms and then brought me the dirty laundry, which was part of their chores as well. After receiving permission from Mom, they gleefully headed off to dress the twins. About the time I finished my folding, I heard Hannah calling everyone to the table.
"It's eight o'clock!" she called out to anyone who could hear her. "Breakfast is ready, everyone come to the table!" It was actually eight-twenty, but we were usually slightly behind schedule like that. I could hear the patter of running feet, and I soon joined the other children at the quickly-filling table.

"Not oatmeal again!" Josiah said with disgust as he noticed what was in the pot on the table.

"Oatmeal's good for you," Hannah relied. "You'll thank me when you're eighty and don't have cancer." Hannah was our resident health nut, and she made use of her position of cook to make sure that we ate healthily, at least as much as she could help it.

"Lima?" I asked Ben as Hannah served the oatmeal.

"Peru," he replied without missing a beat.

"Ljubljana?" I asked again.

"Slovenia," came the answer.

Ben and I played this game nearly every meal for years. Dad had mounted maps on our table under a fiberglass sheet, and we used them to memorize capitols and geographic features; he did the same thing with charts of body parts and U.S. Presidents.

"Luanda?" Ben asked.

"Angola," I responded immediately.

Some friends had given us a geography computer game, and Ben and I spent weeks competing with each other as we voluntarily used it to memorize the capitols of all of the countries in the world. Racing to beat each other’s times, we soon had nearly every capitol in the world memorized.

"Bangui?" I asked Ben.

"Um, um...I don't remember!" he said with chagrin.

I always knew I could catch Ben on that one; for some reason, he could never remember which country Bangui was the capitol of.
"It’s the Central African Republic," I told him, and then went on. "Manila?"

"All right kids, that’s enough," said Mom. "I’m going to read the Bible."

"Mom, do I have to eat my oatmeal?" asked Josiah.

"Yes, Josiah, you must finish it," said Mom as she opened her well-worn Bible and began to read to us as we finished eating and cleaned up. It was an unchanging rule in our family that we children always had to finish our food; if we didn’t eat it at one meal, it would be put in the fridge and saved for the next meal, with no snacks allowed in between. Needless to say, we always finished the unwanted food before actually starving ourselves. After Mom finished a few chapters in the Bible, she read to us from The Red Keep; we were studying the middle ages at the time, and this was historical fiction set in that time period. Cries of "another chapter, another chapter!" rose as she finished reading and closed the book.

"No, kids," Mom replied. "It’s time to hit the books now. Rachel, what do you need to get done this morning?" Mom began to make a list on the white board on the dining room wall, a strategy that allowed her to see just what we had - and hadn’t - finished.

"Latin, Greek, science, and writing," I replied. "I’m already done with Hebrew and math. Plus I need to do debate research, but that isn’t pressing."

"Hannah, how about you?" Mom asked.

"Who, me?" Hannah asked, looking up from the fingernails she was painting. "I have French, math, science, art and piano. Oh, and I need to work on my writing assignment."

"Ben?" Mom asked next.

"Math, science, Latin, and geography," he replied. "And I should practice flute at some point."
"All right," Mom said, continuing to write on the whiteboard. "Jer and Jo, we need to work on science here at the table. You two also need to write reports on *The Red Keep* when we finish it, so keep that in mind; oh, and you also have a math lesson to do with Rachel. Grace, you need to read to me at some point this morning, and you have a little bit of math you should do. You can also listen in on the boys' science lesson if you like. Mercy, Patience, and Charity, I'll get out some play dough for the three of you, and then you can play with dress up clothes downstairs. Maybe we'll make cookies together later. And Charity will take a morning nap. Now listen kids, I have an incentive for you all to get your homework done; the Weinzapfels are coming over at noon and Mrs. Weinzapfel and I are going out for lunch while the Weinzapfel kids stay here."

"Hurray!" we all chorused in unison. The Weinzapfels were our closest friends, and we all loved getting together with them.

"Quiet down, kids," Mom said as she continued. "You can only play with the Weinzapfels if your seatwork is done; if you're not finished, you're going to have to spend the time the Weinzapfels are here working on your schoolwork." The way we used the terms, seatwork, homework, and schoolwork were all synonymous, though seatwork usually referred more to work we absolutely had to do while sitting at desks or the table.

"All right," Mom said, pushing back her chair. "I'm going to go feed the twins and then put them down for a nap. Grace I want you to come with me and we'll do your reading while the twins nurse. Jeremiah and Josiah, how about the two of you get started on your math lesson for today with Rachel while you wait for me. Everyone else get busy."

As everyone stood up and went about finding what they needed to work on and getting started, the house was momentarily
a hub of activity; then things quieted down as, or the next few hours, everyone worked on their schoolwork. Hannah and Ben worked in their rooms, but I brought my Latin homework to the table because I needed to get Jeremiah and Josiah started on their math lesson.

“All right boys, let’s see,” I said, opening to the lesson that Jeremiah, aged ten and eleven, were working on. “Today we’re going to learn a new way to multiply fractions.” I spent the next half hour showing Jeremiah and Josiah how to multiply fractions by canceling, and I then supervised them as they did the problems that accompanied the lesson. We finally finished just as Mom came into the dining room after settling the twins, now ready to work with the boys on their science. I had managed to finish my Latin while the boys were doing their math problems, so I now went up to my room to work on my own science homework. I was studying advanced biology, which was essentially human anatomy.

Given the extra motivation, all of my siblings and I finished our seatwork before the Weinzapfels arrived at noon. Mom nursed the twins again before she departed, and then left them in my care as she and Mrs. Weinzapfel headed off for a few hours of alone time.

Since the weather was still fairly nice, Ben, Jeremiah, Josiah, Grace, Mercy, and Patience all went outside to play with Stephen, Drew, Christopher, and Daniel Weinzapfel.

“Hey Hannah,” I called upstairs to my sister, who was still in her room. “Rachel W. and I will make lunch today, okay?” Rachel Weinzapfel was my age, and she was one of my closest friends. I had offered to make lunch in Hannah’s place because I enjoyed cooking and I knew that Rachel W. and I would have to be somewhere where we could keep an eye on the kids playing in the backyard anyway.
“Okay, thanks!” Hannah called back. “Let me know if you need help with anything.”

“Will do,” I replied. I then turned to Rachel W. “Mom said she left the twins in their crib after she nursed them. Let’s go change their diapers and get them up.”

“Oh, wonderful!” Rachel W. said. “I was just wondering where the twins were.” More than anything, Rachel W. loved babies and cats.

“Hey, Rachel W.,” I said as we each lifted a twin from the crib. “Let’s have a race to see who can change a diaper the fastest.”

“That’s really not fair,” she replied. “But fine, let’s do it. Which twin do I have?”

“You have Micah,” I said. “He’s wearing blue and Gid is wearing green, that’s how you can tell them apart.” I quickly stripped off Gideon’s pants and changed his diaper, slipping his pants back up and straitening his clothes before looking next to me to see how Rachel W. was doing – she had just gotten Micah’s pants down, and hadn’t touched his diaper at all yet.

“My, you’re slow,” I said.

“Look,” Rachel W. responded with a wry smile. “Daniel is six, so it’s not like I’ve changed a diaper in a long time.” I helped Rachel out, and then the two of us took the babies into the kitchen and started working on lunch as we chatted; we also kept an eye on the backyard out of the window, making sure that everyone was playing nicely.

“Hannah,” I called upstairs a bit later. “It’s time for lunch and we’re about to call everyone inside; could you wake Charity from her nap and change her diaper and bring her down?”

“Sure,” Hannah replied as I turned to call the others in from outside.
Soon, everyone was seated at our large table and Rachel W. and I served monkey sandwiches and fresh popcorn. After lunch, Hannah, Rachel W., and I put the little ones down for a rest while the boys cleaned up the kitchen and then headed to the basement to play together there. Hannah, Rachel W., and I then went upstairs and rearranged our dollhouses. Rachel W. had introduced Hannah and I to the love of dollhouses, and we often made dollhouse furniture and food out of clay and other materials when we were together.

Mom and Mrs. Weinzapfel returned just before two in the afternoon, and they then spend some time sharing stamping and scrapbooking ideas; Mom was wonderful at sewing, cross-stitching, and quilting as well as stamping and scrapbooking, and she loved discussing these crafts with her friends. When the Weinzapfels finally left at about two-thirty, Mom called the boys and Grace, who was seven, into the living room for history; Hannah and I were old enough that we now studied history on our own. We children always loved history time, though, because it meant that Mom read aloud to us while we played with legos on the floor. This particular day, I joined the boys, Grace, and Mom in the living room; I was sitting at the computer doing research for debate club, but I was also half listening to Mom read. And then, as Mom read about medieval feasts and festivals, I had an idea.

"Hey Mom," I said when she finished a chapter. "We should have a medieval feast. We could do it right before Christmas, and we could turn out all the lights and only use candles. Oh, and we could dress up and use bread trenchers and drink wassail."

"And we could have sword fights!" Ben added, suddenly catching onto the excitement.
We all fell to planning; Mom loved making our study of history hands on, so this was just the sort of thing she liked to do. When we studied Egypt, for instance, we built a model of a mummy, when we studied Greece Mom made us all Greek costumes, and when we studied Rome we made wax tablets for writing on.

As history reading came to a close, the rest of the little girls started waking up from their naps and coming downstairs, and Mom took them into the kitchen to make cookies.

"Hannah!" Mom called through the house a little bit later. "Rachel, where is Hannah?"

"I think she's in her room," I replied.

"Could you go tell her she should be getting supper started soon?" Cooking for the family was part of Hannah's chores at the moment.

"Sure Mom," I said, and walked to the bottom of the stairs. "Hannah! Mom says you should get supper started soon!"

"Okay," she called back. "Tell Mom that I'm going to make spaghetti and I'll come down in a minute."

I went back to the living room and kept working on debate research; I could hear Ben practicing flute and Jeremiah and Josiah heading back outside to play in the backyard as it was beginning to get dark. Hannah was part way through her supper preparations when I went to the laundry room to work on getting another load of laundry through before supper. After I'd worked there for only a few minutes, I could see headlights out the window as Dad pulled into the driveway; the boys outside abandoned their swings and ran to welcome Dad home. Dad soon came into the house followed by a crowd of children.

"Come to the table!" called Hannah. She had just put the food on the table Grace had set and the smell of spaghetti and garlic bread was wafting through the house. We children began trooping in from here and there and taking our seats around our