

April 1997 Summit Journal

- [From the Presiden't Desk](#)
- [Month in Review](#)
- [Partial-Birth Abomination](#)
- [Politically Correct Academia](#)
- [Attack on the Family](#)
- [Humanism and Science](#)
- [Summit Successes](#)
- [Other](#)

From the President's Desk

Any time you have a lone county judge in one corner and the ACLU in the other, you have a 15 round heavyweight fight worth witnessing - especially if the fight is over the Ten Commandments.

Patrick Buchanan (*The Washington Times*, February 12, 1997) explains it best:

"There may be yet another rebellion brewing down in Alabama.

"Last week, Gov. Fob James Jr. told a prayer breakfast that no judge, state or federal, will be allowed to tear down a plaque of the Ten Commandments from an Alabama courtroom as long as he, his state troopers and Alabama's National Guard can prevent it.

"Today, Mr. James told me President Clinton will have to nationalize the Guard to take down the plaque before he lets it happen. If the governor holds his ground, he can make Etowah County Courthouse the Concord Bridge of a Middle American revolution against our reigning judicial dictatorship.

"Here is the situation: In Gadsden, county seat of Etowah, a local judge, Roy Moore, routinely opened court with a prayer and displayed a scroll of the Ten Commandments over his bench. An outraged American Civil Liberties Union found a friendly judge and won a partial victory. Montgomery County Circuit Judge Charles Price said the prayers had to go but the plaque could stay. Or at least the plaque could stay until Judge Price visited Judge Moore's court to decide whether the Commandments were displayed as a religious or historical document.

"Gov. James' stand is being equated by his critics with Gov. George Wallace's stand in a schoolhouse door. But, as Mr. James notes, Mr. Wallace never defied a law that was constitutionally enacted. When he took his stand, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had not been passed.

"The issue is power: Who decides?"

"Belief in majority rule is deeply ingrained in Americans. We will accept laws we dislike and leaders we abhor if the laws are enacted constitutionally and the leaders elected democratically.

"The rebellious rage at the courts arises out of a conviction that we have a rogue judiciary. Millions believe that to reshape society in its own image of what is true and beautiful, the Supreme Court acts dictatorially and arbitrarily, and neither presidents nor Congresses have the courage to put the court back into the narrow pen to which the Founding Fathers originally consigned it.

"The American people were never consulted on whether they wanted school prayer, Bible study or the Ten Commandments out of their schools and all expressions of religious belief expelled from public life. The edict was handed down, without precedent in law, by a court acting as arbitrarily as a communist commissar.

"Gov. James is taking his stand on ground that not only is strong constitutionally and historically but - because he is trying to keep God's law from being driven out of American public life - is also the high moral ground. In challenging judicial supremacy, he can cite presidents from Jefferson to Jackson to Lincoln to FDR.

"Are the Ten Commandments a religious document? Of course, they are. They were given to Moses on Mount Sinai. To believing Jews, Christians and others, they tell us what men must do, and not do, to live justly on this Earth. They were a foundation of American law. From Sunday blue laws to anti-blasphemy laws, to laws against adultery, false witness and murder, they served as the basis upon which we built much of our early civil code and public life.

"Who is to tell us they cannot so serve again?"

"And if they can be ordered consigned to one's home or church by unelected judges ignoring the Constitution as understood by the men who wrote it, then we have ceased to be the free republic we once were.

"In taking his stand, Gov. James has an ally in Thomas Jefferson. In the Kentucky Resolution of 1799, Jefferson upheld the right of a state to nullify a law that was patently unconstitutional, even if the Supreme Court had approved it. As president, Jefferson declared on his own authority that the Alien and Sedition Acts violated the First Amendment. He ordered released everyone under indictment or in prison under those acts.

"As Jefferson wrote in a letter to Abigail Adams, the acts were a `nullity, as absolute and as palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image ... it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage, as it would have been to have rescued from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image.'

"Gov. James intends to peacefully, but forcefully, resist any court order to take down the Commandments, even from the Supreme Court. If Mr. Clinton eventually nationalizes the Guard and orders it to remove the Commandments, at least then we will see, no longer as through a glass darkly, that true power has passed forever from the majority to what Jefferson called the `despotism of an oligarchy.' Keep an eye on that Etowah County Courthouse."

Month in Review

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

Romans 1:28-32

"If the Divine call does not make us better, it will make us very much worse. Of all bad men religious bad men are the worst. Of all created beings the wickedest is one who originally stood in the immediate presence of God."

C.S. Lewis, *Reflections on the Psalms*

"Wickedness, when you examine it, turns out to be the pursuit of some good in the wrong way. You can be good for the mere sake of goodness: you cannot be bad for the mere sake of badness. You can do a kind action when you are not feeling kind and when it gives you no pleasure, simply because kindness is right; but no one ever did a cruel action simply because cruelty is wrong - only because cruelty was pleasant or useful to him. In other words badness cannot succeed even in being bad in the same way in which goodness is good. Goodness is, so to speak, itself: badness is only spoiled goodness. . . . Evil is a parasite, not an original thing."

C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

Partial-Birth Abomination

"A pro-choice leader sent shock waves through the movement yesterday by admitting he had lied about the true number of partial-birth abortions in the United States.

"In a candid interview with the American Medical Association News, Ron Fitzsimmons, executive

director of the Alexandria-based National Coalition of Abortion Providers, said he 'lied through his teeth' during a 1995 appearance on ABC's 'Nightline' about the controversial procedure.

"In a partial-birth abortion, the unborn child is delivered up to its neck, at which time a doctor kills it by piercing the skull with scissors and sucking out its brain through a tube. Congress passed a law banning such abortions last year, which President Clinton vetoed. After Congress failed to override the veto, Mr. Clinton defended the procedure as sometimes necessary to protect the health of the mother.

"Mr. Fitzsimmons, whose organization oversees 200 abortion clinics nationwide, says he mistakenly told a 'Nightline' reporter that women had partial-birth abortions only in the most extreme circumstances.

"The truth, he now says, is that such abortions are fairly common. The vast majority of these abortions are performed in the second trimester - at four to six months gestation - on healthy unborn children and healthy mothers.

"'The abortion-rights folks know about it, the anti-abortion folks know it, and so, probably, does everyone else,' he told the AMA News."

The Washington Times, Feb. 27, 1997, p. A1

"This year's session of the Arkansas legislature is still young, but it won't be easy for even legislators to produce a statement more striking than one state senator's explanation for his vote to keep partial-birth abortions legal. He said he'd reached the conclusion that 'we had no business putting any threat to obstetricians. . . of a felony hanging over your head when you are trying to perform a lifesaving procedure to save the baby.'

"Why, sure. In a world in which life is death, why can't abortion be a life-saving procedure to save the baby? George Orwell could explain it. What we have here is just one more entry in the annals of that newest and most advanced of the medical sciences, therapeutic killing.

"It is hard to recall any story in the news that has been so replete with partial truths as partial-birth abortion. Maybe because, when ideology runs headlong into fact, it's the fact that must be explained away. But facts, as crusty old John Adams once noted, are stubborn things. It may take a while, but they have a way of intruding on even the most devoutly held orthodoxies. And what could be a more central article of the liberal faith in the morally numb '90s than the unrestricted practice of abortion - any kind, any time, at home or abroad? Including the semi-abortion, semi-infanticide that's called partial birth.

"But how could anyone, even a politician, think a partial-birth abortion might be confused with a medical procedure to save the life of, yes, *the baby*? For that matter, how could anyone, despite our president's rote recitation of the abortionist's creed, believe that partial-birth abortions could save the life or health of the mother?"

Paul Greenberg, *The Washington Times*, Feb. 27, 1997, p. A15

"The latest baseless statement [in the abortion debate] was made by President Clinton himself when he said that if the mothers who opted for partial-birth abortions had delivered their children naturally, the women's bodies would have been `eviscerated' or `ripped to shreds' and they `could never have another baby.'

"That claim is totally and completely false. Contrary to what abortion activists would have us believe, partial-birth abortion is never medically indicated to protect a woman's health or fertility. In fact, the opposite is true: The procedure can pose a significant and immediate threat to both the pregnant woman's health and her fertility. It seems to have escaped everyone's attention that one of the five women who appeared at Mr. Clinton's veto ceremony had five miscarriages after her partial-birth abortion.

"None of this risk is ever necessary for any reason. We and many other doctors across the U.S. regularly treat women whose unborn children suffer the same conditions as those cited by the women who appeared at Mr. Clinton's veto ceremony. Never is the partial-birth procedure necessary. . . . Sometimes, as in the case of hydrocephaly, it is first necessary to drain some of the fluid from the baby's head. And in some cases, when vaginal delivery is not possible, a doctor performs a Caesarean section. But in no case is it necessary to partially deliver an infant through the vagina and then kill the infant."

Paul Greenberg, *The Washington Times*, Feb. 27, 1997, p. A15

Politically Correct Academia

"A recent essay in `The Chronicle of Higher Education' - the trade paper of the academic world - noted that graduate students who have had job interviews at meetings of the Modern Language Association have found that its English professors `subject candidates to tests of ideological acceptability.'

"That apparently is also true of the Modern Language Association's journal, according to a professor who has followed it: `No Marxist, feminist, or multi-culturalist premise,' he says, no matter how outrageous, is allowed to be questioned in this journal.

"In all the studies that have repeatedly shown the left-wing bias of professors, few have inquired whether this is just a natural or accidental development - or whether it is in many cases a deliberate result achieved by leftists determined to keep out competing viewpoints.

"What `diversity' almost invariably means in practice are ethnic and sex quotas, usually among people limited to those on the political left. When there are black leftist professors, white leftist professors, female leftist professors and Hispanic leftist professors, then you have `diversity,' as that term is used in academia."

Thomas Sowell, *The Washington Times*, Feb. 26, 1996, p. A14

"When the Senate voted 99-1 two years ago to condemn the national history standards drawn up at the behest of the federal government, people concerned about the brainwashing of school children with politically correct history figured the battle had been won. Wrong. Sure, the standards-writers pieced together a revised version that seemed to mollify most critics, highlighting a previously snubbed George Washington and other neglected heroes and stories. But that all now seems a ruse. When children turn to page one of their new history textbooks, they will read a history entirely in keeping with the seemingly rejected first set of standards.

"Those interested may think that Lynne Cheney, who launched the attack on the standards in October 1994, nailed them when she exposed the bogus 'three worlds meet' theory according to which Native Americans, Africans, and Europeans shared equally in the American founding. Cheney raised the nation's consciousness by laying bare the standards' misplaced emphasis on the 'grandeur' of Mansa Musa's court, their suggestion that students hold a mock trial of John D. Rockefeller, their near deification of American Indians, their disproportionate coverage of the Ku Klux Klan and McCarthyism, and their omission of Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Jonas Salk, and the Wright brothers.

"But Cheney's expose, though absolutely correct, turns out to have had little impact on educators and publishers. Also ignored were scholarly critiques of the standards by Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Herman Belz, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, and John Patrick Diggins, among others, as well as scathing accounts by media commentators. Even President Clinton and presidential candidate Bob Dole complained about the standards in the 1996 campaign. Nevertheless, certain of support from the American Historical Association and a host of like-minded groups, which overwhelmingly approved of the original standards, educators and publishers simply forged ahead. . . .

"Against this dismal backdrop, there is, happily, one excellent new history series from a major publisher, Oxford University Press's *A History of the US*. And, of course, careful teachers can mitigate the ill effects of the other new texts with supplements and debates crafted to expose errors and make up for omissions. But diligent parents should always review their children's lessons and homework for curricular abuse. As the new textbooks come into use, one fact is clear: The national history standards once thought to be discredited have made their way into the nation's classrooms, and we are all the losers."

The Weekly Standard, March 10, 1997

Attack on the Family

"One of the claims made for divorce was that with greater freedom to dissolve marriage, women would gain greater equality and independence in their family lives. Yet the evidence suggests that widespread

divorce has generated new forms of inequality for women and children. It has contributed to greater economic insecurity and poverty among women and children, and it has been a principal generator of unequal opportunities and outcomes for children. Indeed, it is hard to think of any recent economic force that has been as brutally efficient as divorce in transforming middle-class haves into have-nots. In a high-divorce society - even if the wage gap continues to narrow, jobs continue to be plentiful, and child-support enforcement continues to be more efficiently and aggressively pursued - women are still likely to lose ground in their efforts to achieve economic equality.

"Nor can it be said that widespread divorce has moved us closer to the social goal of greater gender equality. In a society marked by high and sustained levels of divorce, women not only bear double responsibilities for breadwinning and child-rearing but bear them alone. Thus, the achievement of a fair and equitable distribution of these tasks between men and women becomes ever more elusive. Moreover, in a high-divorce society the goal of involved, hand-on, nurturant fatherhood becomes more difficult to attain. Even for the most committed and determined divorced fathers, nonresidential fatherhood is a struggle. For those less heroic and resolute, solo fatherhood becomes close to impossible. Sadly, when extraordinary heroism is required, more men fail at fatherhood."

Barbara D. Whitehead, *The Divorce Culture*, p. 183

Humanism and Science

"It is not strange that our culture has become homo-centric, humanitarian and humanistic *par excellence*. Man is its glorious centre. It makes him 'the measure of all things'. It exalts him as the hero and the greatest value, not by virtue of his creation by God in God's own image, but in his own right, by virtue of man's own marvellous achievements. It substitutes the religion of humanity for the religions of superhuman deities. It professes a firm belief in the possibility of limitless progress based on man's ability to control his own destiny, to eradicate all social and cultural evils, and to create an even better and finer world, free from war and bloody strife, from crime, poverty, insanity, stupidity and vulgarity. In all these respects we live, indeed, in an era of a truly great glorification of man and his culture.

"Unfortunately, this dazzling facade is not the only aspect of our cultural and social edifice. Like the mythical double-faced Janus, it has another - and more sinister - face: the face of a great degradation and de-humanization of man; of debasement, distortion and desecration of all social and cultural values. If the dazzling facade glorifies man as a divine hero, the second face strips him of anything divine and heroic. If one face of our culture shows it as a creative flame of human genius rising higher and higher - reaching for the stars - to the eternal world of absolute values, its second face sneers at such a self-delusion and drags it down to the level of a mere reflexological ant hill, to the mere 'adjustment mechanism' of human ants and bees.

"We do not like to parade this sinister face of our culture; it is not exhibited at any World's Fair; and yet it is as certain as any solid fact can be. Even more, in the course of time, as we have seen, it is appearing more and more frequently, and progressively tends to overshadow the sunny aspect of our cultural

world. A mere glance at the main compartments of our culture will be sufficient to show this fact."

Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of our Age* (1941), p. 198

"To begin with, take contemporary science and ask how it defines man. The current answers are, as we have seen, that man is a variety of electron-proton complex; or an animal closely related to the ape or monkey; or a reflex mechanism; or a variety of stimulus-response relationships; or a psychoanalytical bag filled either by libido or basic physiological drives; or a mechanism controlled mainly by digestive and economic needs. Such are the current physico-chemical, biological and psycho-social conceptions of man. No doubt man is all these things. But do any or all of these conceptions completely explain the essential nature of man? Do they touch his most fundamental properties which make him a creature unique in the world? Most of the definitions which pretend to be especially scientific rarely, if ever, raise such questions. They pass them by.

"We are so accustomed to such views that we often fail to see the utter depreciation of man and his culture implied in them. Instead of depicting man as a child of God, and a bearer of the highest values in this empirical world, and for this reason sacred, they strip him of anything divine and great and reduce him to a mere inorganic or organic complex. Thus is contemporary science permeated by the tragic dualism discussed earlier. With one hand it creates all the real values that increase man's *summum bonum*; with the other it invents cannon and bombers, poisonous gas and tanks, that kill man and destroy his culture.

"Like science, contemporary philosophy has also contributed its share to the degradation of man and his culture: first, in the form of the growth of mechanistic materialism for the last few centuries; second, in the debasement of the truth itself either to a mere matter of convenience (Mach, Poincare, Petzold, Richard Avenarius, K. Pearson, William James, John Dewey and other representatives of positivism, neo-positivism, pragmatism, operationalism, instrumentalism, logical positivism and other similar philosophical movements), or to a mere fictional and arbitrary 'convention' (the philosophies of *als ob* or 'as if'); or to a mere 'ideology', 'derivation', or 'rationalization' as a by-product of economic, sensual or other drives and residues (Marxism, Paretianism, Freudianism); and third, in making the organs of the senses the main, and often the only, criterion of truth. Materialism identifies man and cultural values with matter; for this reason it cannot help stripping man and his values of any exceptional and unique position in the world. Truth reduced to a mere convenience or convention destroys itself."

Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of our Age* (1941), p. 198, 199

"The Cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be."

Carl Sagan, *Cosmos*

"We are the product of 4.5 billion years of fortuitous, slow biological evolution."

Carl Sagan, *The Cosmic Connection*

"I am a collection of water, calcium and organic molecules called Carl Sagan."

Carl Sagan, *Cosmos*

"We live on a hunk of rock and metal that circles a humdrum star that is one of 400 billion other stars that make up the Milky Way galaxy, which is one of billions of other galaxies which make up a universe which may be one of a very large number, perhaps an infinite number, of other universes. That is a perspective on human life and our culture that's well worth pondering."

Carl Sagan on ABC-TV, December 4, 1996

"When first year students voluntarily indicate their religious affiliations during registration each year [at Harvard University], fewer than 200 check off humanism."

Thomas Ferrick, Humanist Chaplain, *Harvard University Gazette*, July 9, 1993, p.10

Summit Successes

"My name is Douglas and I am in my first year at Grove City College. I attended the third week session at Summit Ministries in 1995. I want to express my sincere gratitude for the work you are doing. God is definitely moving in your ministry.

"Prior to coming to the Summit, I did not really have a clear focus on life (in general), I had not thought a great deal about my own worldview nor what is going on in the world, and as far as reading, I read about a chapter or two of the books I had to do book reports on in high school. Since then, I have left Summit Ministries with my, and I quote, `...feet on the ground and head in the air,' and have had a continued desire and motivation to start truly learning and making an impact on the world for Jesus Christ.

"I believe I am light years ahead of where I was two years ago. I have given up watching *I Love Lucy* and have read *Understanding the Times* as well as over a dozen other great books. I now read the Bible every day and God is teaching me many things. I see others around me struggling to figure out the Big questions. Many people have been swept away by the things of this world. I look forward to working where God wants me and making a difference in this spiritually and intellectually deprived generation.

"I am sure you have heard about Grove City College, especially since it has been in the news lately for severing its last ties with the government. I thought I should share a little bit about it since you probably run into many who are looking into colleges. The first class I went to here for the humanities core brought back some memories of the Summit. They taught about worldviews, the Laws of Non-

Contradiction, and the rest of the course would be best summed up by the fact that we used *The Theme is Freedom* by M. Stanton Evans. Many of the professors here have their Ph. D. and (that I have had) are Christian. My calculus teacher read from the Bible and prayed at the beginning of the course, and in Biblical Revelation (2nd semester humanities), which goes through the entire Bible, we pray to start each class. Not everything here is that good, but that should give you a general idea of the main focus and emphasis Grove City College has (in contrast to most American Institutions of Higher Education).

"Again, thank you so much for training, preparing, and motivating so many people at the Summit. I reap the benefits of what was sown in my own life at Summit Ministries on a daily basis. I will keep you in my prayers."

Other

"A few years ago Christian real estate agents were informed that they could no longer let people know that they were Christians. They could no longer have a cross or fish symbol in their advertising or on their business cards. If they had Christian clients they couldn't mention it in their ads. In fact, big government gave the real estate people long lists of words that they could no longer use, long lists of words to avoid and long list of words that were recommended for use. Failure to conform your ads to these words meant big government could remove your paid ad and fine you plus hit you with few other measures of `discipline.'

"Then came the November 1996 issue of Today's REALTOR. Beginning on page 44 is an article called `Top Performer Niche Man.' The subheading: `One broker may change the way you think about marketing. His clients - gays and minorities - are responding in droves to his brand of targeted advertising.' His what?! `Targeted advertising'!!! The article commends this man for having `guts.' `At least that's what some competitors have told him about his specialized, unconventional niche - gays, lesbians and minorities. Even his workforce reflects his diverse clientele: About 65 % of his 65 salespeople are gay or lesbian' `Although one might shy away from such an alternative market, Grossman has welcomed it and prospered.' Says Mr. Grossman, `I've always been involved in the gay community both locally and nationally for several years.' `I started the company with my life partner' `People started calling saying, "We're moving here from Little Rock or Los Angeles for whatever. We're a same sex couple, and we've been told you're the one to call."'

"Now, please note that six years ago I called a real estate company in the town where my daughter and her family were to be relocated. I asked for a Christian real estate agent for her. They not only refused to give her a Christian sales agent and ridiculed me but lined her up with a man that gave her the creeps. She dropped him immediately and finally came upon a Christian woman sales agent whom she felt comfortable being with. Thank God the clients and customers aren't regulated like the agents and she was left alone about her decision to have a Christian agent serve her.

"But, let's look at these regulations coming down from big government: no discrimination allowed based on race (and related categories), sex (originally intended to mean male or female but being gradually

changed to reflect `sexual orientation'), familial status (this refers to having children under 18 or being pregnant and has been the agony of once comfortable retirement communities), handicap (here's where they put AIDS), religion (we have to act like it doesn't exist).

"Surely, there is going to be an outcry from big government of `discrimination' and `targeting' by this `niche' man. Surely this man is going to lose his license and pay heavy fines.

"Looking at the December 1996 issue of Today's REALTOR I see a letter to the editor complaining the `Gay Niche Market Article (Is) Offensive'. The letter is written by a manager and co-owner of a realty investment corporation. She says, `It offends me that the gay lifestyle is classified with "Minorities" The law is very specific about REALTORS not being prejudicial in any way. I also believe that it is our moral and ethical obligation to serve all segments of our population. One's particular sexual orientation should not put one in a category for special treatment. What I see this article promoting is exclusiveness, not just of a minority, but also of a particular lifestyle' The editor's response?

"Sexual orientation is identified as a protected class in many state and local laws that govern the conduct of real estate professionals, says the NAR Legal Affairs group. While REALTORS may choose to focus their efforts to obtain customers and clients on a particular group, both the law and the Code of Ethics prohibit the REALTOR from using the membership of a customer or client in that group to discriminate against the customer or client.

"Oh really?! Does this mean I can choose to focus my efforts to obtain Christian customers and clients? Forget it! Not by the hair of my chinny, chin, chin or they will huff and they will puff and they will blow my house down.

"Are you beginning to get the picture as to where our politicians and bureaucrats are leading us - or rather, forcing us? Honestly, the way the government is protecting the sodomites today instead of prosecuting them you'd think they were an endangered species. Meanwhile, these same sodomites are proselytizing the children - and doing it in the public schools across the land. They are actually using our tax money to convert our children! These are the same schools where you can't even mention Jesus!"

Marilyn Titus, *The Forecast*, December 1996

"The master plan for the federal takeover of public schools is contained in a remarkable 18-page `Dear Hillary' letter written on Nov. 11, 1992, by Marc Tucker, president of the National Center on Education and the Economy, an organization that has been able to milk the public treasuries of many states for millions of dollars to pay for copies of his plan to `restructure' and set `standards' for public schools.

"Mr. Tucker's letter confirms that his plan is the result of meetings with other left-wing gurus, including Ira Magaziner, David Hornbeck, and Lauren Resnick. It lays out a plan, modeled on the German system, `to remold the entire American [public school] system' into `a seamless web that literally extends from cradle to grave and is the same system for everyone,' coordinated by `a system of labor market boards at

the local, state and federal levels' where curriculum and 'job matching' will be handled by counselors 'accessing the integrated computer-based program.'

"The Tucker-Clinton plan would change the mission of the public schools from teaching children knowledge and skills to training them to serve the global economy in jobs selected by work-force boards.

"Nothing in these comprehensive plans has anything to do with teaching schoolchildren how to read. Although most Americans think that is the No. 1 task of schools, and it is obvious the schools' failure to do this is our biggest education problem, teaching children how to read is not on the radar screen of these plans and is not even one of the eight national education goals in Goals 2000.

"The implementation of Mr. Tucker's ambitious plan was contained in three laws passed in 1994: the Goals 2000 Act, the School-to-Work Act, and the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The final piece in the Tucker plan to convert the school system into job training to serve a managed work-force, which was called 'Careers' in the House version and 'Work-force Development' in the Senate version, didn't pass in 1996 but will certainly be revised this year.

"The Tucker-Clinton-Magaziner plan to restructure the public schools is based on specific mechanisms of control. (1) Bypass all elected officials on school boards and in state legislatures, either by making federal funds flow to a new entity called a 'consortium' of several district superintendents (the device revealed in Mr. Clinton's Jan. 22 speech in Northbrook, Ill.), or to the governor and his appointees on work-force development boards (as projected in the Careers/Work-Force Development bill).

"(2) Use a computer database, aka 'a labor market information system,' into which school personnel would scan all information about every schoolchild and his family, identified by the child's social security number: academic, medical, mental, psychological, behavioral and interrogations by counselors. The computerized data would be available to the school, the government and future employers.

"(3) Use the new slogan 'high standards' to cement national control of tests, assessments, school honors and rewards, financial aid, and the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM), which is designed to function much like the green card used by resident aliens, i.e., you can't get a job without it. Marc Tucker's outfit has been paid hundreds of thousands of dollars by individual states to write their 'reform' plans, which, funny thing, turn out to be substantially similar.

"(4) Control the vocabulary of education, so that many words have double meanings. Thus, when parents hear the words 'outcome-based' or 'performance-based,' they think the outcomes must be skills such as reading and the multiplication tables, but the educators mean 'accepting diversity' or 'being environmentally sensitive.'

"(5) Coopt the governors and the CEOs of large corporations to front for these 'reforms' by promising the former some control over the flow of federal funds and the latter some free teen-age labor. Once a

governor or CEO signs on, all decisions are actually made by the same education bureaucrats who gave us the problems in the first place.

"An all-day briefing put together by Rep. Henry Hyde, Illinois Republican, today will examine federal funding mischief from the viewpoint of state legislators all over the country."

Phyllis Schlafly, *The Washington Times*, Feb. 12, 1997

"Perhaps the most alluring and most powerfully sponsored claim for divorce has been its promise of greater personal freedom. One popular book promises women 'the joy of handling your own money, learning to cope as a single mother, and the freedom to manage your time as you see fit.' Another proclaims that 'there is joy in emancipating oneself.' Yet in ways not fully anticipated, divorced women's freedoms and opportunities are often quite limited. Single mothers in particular may find it difficult to achieve a satisfying blend of work and family life, and to 'be all that they can be.' Society's principal cheerleaders for expressive divorce have been its most economically advantaged and well-educated women, but only their message, and not their privilege, has been transmitted to their working-class 'sisters.'

"Divorce frees many men from the daily tasks of home and family life, and many men free themselves from the responsibilities of providing for their children. However, divorced fathers are not truly liberated. Their opportunities to share in the daily lives of their children and to enjoy the free and easy exchanges that come with daily life are lost. As they lose their franchise as fathers, many men also lose a central reason for working hard and participating in the life of the community. Divorced men also lose access to women's emotional and social intelligence in building and sustaining relationships. Men's social as well as family ties attenuate after divorce. They are less embedded in a network of relationships with kin and community, and less connected or committed to others. Although it is too soon to tell, fathers who abandon their children may be abandoned by their adult children when they become old, needy, and dependent, leaving elderly men to the care and custody of strangers.

"In a culture of divorce, children are the most 'unfree.' Divorce abrogates children's right to be reasonably free from adult cares and woes, to enjoy the association of both parents on a daily basis, to remain innocent of social services and therapy, and to spend family time in ways that are not dictated by the courts."

Barbara D. Whitehead, *The Divorce Culture*, p. 184

[Return me to the Summit Ministries Homepage](#)

[Return me to ChristianAnswers.net](#)