



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness. Romans 1:18

From The President's Desk

"His name was Fleming, and he was a poor Scottish farmer. One day, while trying to make a living for his family, he heard a cry for help coming from a nearby bog. He dropped his tools and ran to the bog. There, mired to his waist in black muck, was a terrified boy, screaming and struggling to free himself. Farmer Fleming saved the lad from what could have been a slow and terrifying death.

"The next day, a fancy carriage pulled up to the Scotsman's sparse surroundings. An elegantly dressed nobleman stepped out and introduced himself as the father of the boy Farmer Fleming had saved. 'I want to repay you,' said the nobleman. 'You saved my son's life.'

" 'No, I can't accept payment for what I did,' the Scottish farmer replied, waving off the offer. At that moment, the farmer's own son came to the door of the family hovel.

" 'Is that your son?' the nobleman asked.

" 'Yes,' the farmer replied proudly.

"I'll make you a deal. Let me provide him with the level of education my son will enjoy. If the lad is anything like his father, he'll no doubt grow to be a man we both will be proud of.'

And that he did. Farmer Fleming's son attended the very best schools and in time, he graduated from St. Mary's Hospital Medical School in London, and went on to become known throughout the world as the noted Sir Alexander Fleming, the discover of Penicillin.

"Years afterward, the same nobleman's son who was saved from the bog was stricken with pneumonia. What saved his life this time? Penicillin! The name of the nobleman? Lord Randolph Churchill. His son's name? Sir Winston Churchill."

Month In Review

Q "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man—and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things.

"Therefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, in the lusts of their hearts, to dishonor their bodies among themselves, who exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

"For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their women exchanged the natural use for what is against nature. Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful, and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error which was due.

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a debased mind, to do those things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, sexual immorality, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, evil-mindedness; they are whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, violent, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, undiscerning, untrustworthy, unloving, unforgiving, unmerciful; who, knowing the righteous judgment of God, that those who practice such things are deserving of death, not only do the same but also approve of those who practice them."

—Romans 1:18-32

Q "As Christians we are tempted to make unnecessary concessions to those outside the Faith.

We give in too much. Now, I don't mean that we should run the risk of making a nuisance of ourselves by witnessing at improper times, but there comes a time when we must show that we disagree. We must show our Christian colours, if we are to be true to Jesus Christ. We cannot remain silent or concede everything away.

–C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q "We live in the most absurd age. I met a girl the other day who had been teaching in an infant school (boys and girls up to the age of six) where these infants are taught the theory of evolution. Or rather the Headmistress's version of it. Simple people like ourselves had an idea that Darwin said that life developed from simple organisms up to the higher plants and animals, finally to the monkey group, and from the monkey group to man. The infants seem to be taught however that 'in the beginning was the Ape,' from whom all other life developed, including such dainties as the Brontosaurus and the Iguanodon. Whether the plants were supposed to be descendants of the apes I didn't gather. And then people talk about the credulity of the Middle Ages! Apropos of this, can you tell me who said, 'Before you begin these studies, I should warn you that you need much more faith in science than in theology.' It was Huxley or Clifford or one of the nineteenth century scientists I think. Another good remark I read long ago in one of E. Nesbitt's fairy tales—'Grown ups know that children can believe almost anything; that's why they tell you that the earth is round and smooth like an orange when you can see perfectly well for yourself that it's flat and lumpy.'"

–C.S. Lewis, *Letters of C.S. Lewis*, March 30, 1922

Q "The Bergsonian critique of orthodox Darwinism is not easy to answer. More disquieting still is Professor D.M.S. Watson's defence. 'Evolution itself,' he wrote, 'is accepted by zoologists not because it has been observed to occur or...can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.' Has it come to that? Does the whole vast structure of modern naturalism depend not on positive evidence but simply on *a priori* metaphysical prejudice? Was it devised not to get in facts but to keep out God?"

–C.S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory*

Q "An egg which came from no bird is no more 'natural' than a bird which had existed from all eternity. And since the egg-bird-egg sequence leads us to no plausible beginning, is it not

reasonable to look for the real origin somewhere outside sequence altogether? You have to go outside sequence of engines, into the world of men, to find the real originator of the rocket. It is not equally reasonable to look outside Nature for the real Originator of the natural order?

–C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q "It [evolution] appeals to every part of me except my reason. ...I believe it no longer."

–C.S. Lewis, *Christian Reflection*

Q "The news that a prestigious private school in Manhattan has banned the celebration of Mother's Day (and Father's Day) so as to protect the feelings of children of gay couples and single parents is more than another isolated bit of P.C. silliness. It's a portent of things to come.

"Not fifteen years ago, the loony ideas of Catherine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin about the effective equivalence of consensual heterosexual intercourse and rape were dismissed as extremist nonsense, even in the *New York Times*. Today, while the intercourse-rape equation would still be dismissed by most everyone (except the *New York Times*) MacKinnon is the leader of a prestigious school of legal theory, and has effectively written her ideas about sex into our nation's laws on sexual harrassment. Mother's Day may or may not be around fifteen years from now, but there's every chance that by then, the attack on motherhood will have grown and, in some form or another, institutionalized itself.

"An attempt to abolish Mother's Day may seem absurd, but in a sense, the effort's been around for some time now. Feminist academics have long cherished the utopian fantasy of an androgynous society—a world in which the differences between men and women will have been effectively eliminated. Many feminists draw on Nancy Chodorow's book *The Reproduction of Mothering*, which argues that, if men and women spend equal amounts of time nurturing children, the differences between the sexes will disappear. And Chodorow's ideas have been popularized by author's like Carol Gilligan and William Pollack, who cooked up a phony 'girl crisis' and 'boy crisis' to save adolescents from the supposed oppressiveness of their own sexual identities (as fearless feminist critic Christina Hoff Sommers has shown). Even so-called mainstream feminists, when they lament the continuing numerical dominance of men in legislatures and executive suits, are really asking for an end to motherhood as a distinctive social role. For it's only women's disproportionate desire to be the primary caretakers of their children that makes them shun the career fast track preferred by men.

"And now, of course, there's the movement for gay marriage, which claims that it will only strengthen the family, but which is destined to undermine it. As the *New York Post* reports, the celebration of Mother's Day at Rodeph Sholem school was banned shortly after a man who had adopted his son with a male partner boasted that he had persuaded administrators to remove Mother's Day from the school's holiday list. This is not an anomaly, but reflects the hope and expectation of many gay thinkers that same-sex marriage will 'subvert' society's respect for the complementarity of the sexes.

"The other day I argued in a piece on gays in Hollywood that the best interests of cultural majorities and minorities sometimes conflict. It certainly is important that the government not enshrine one particular religious belief over others, so that all of us can continue to feel like equal citizens. But complete neutrality about everything of cultural interest by all institutions, public and private, would mean the death of culture itself. No majority could affirm or celebrate anything, for fear of offending some smaller group.

"I once attended a conference of historians of religion where it was announced that speakers were no longer allowed to use the word 'feminist' in their presentations. Instead they had to substitute for 'feminist' the phrase 'feminist/womanist/mujerista' (i.e. white feminist/black feminists/Hispanic feminists). And each of those groups had a tendency to splinter as well. Now our country as a whole risks being dragged into this same Leftist splintering and paralysis. For fear of 'leaving out' the few, we're leaving out the many.

"But intellectuals aren't always as stupid as they seem. When academic feminists and 'queer theorists' rant and rave against motherhood, they look like silly extremists unlikely to threaten or convince anyone beyond a few susceptible undergraduates. But when the policy reforms supported by seemingly more moderate feminists and gay-rights activists come to pass, sure enough, it's motherhood that's under attack. What happened to Mother's Day in New York this week is no fluke. Once gay marriage becomes a reality—once the reality of sexual complementarity is deprived of any legal standing whatsoever—more and more of the taken-for-granted underpinnings of our world will come under attack: monogamy, the very existence of marriage as a state, and of course, the differences between mothers and fathers. It is simply not going to be possible to create complete equivalence between homosexuality and heterosexuality without undermining the family, an institution necessarily built around the overwhelming predominance of heterosexuality. But the battle is sure to expand. Proponents of apple pie beware."

—Stanley Kurtz, *National Review Online*, May 9, 2001

Q "In San Francisco, the government officially pronounced the Truth in Love campaign,

which shared the gospel of Jesus Christ with homosexuals, hateful rhetoric. Truth in Love, was co-sponsored by Focus on the Family, the American Family Association, Coral Ridge Ministries, Family Research Council, and others. The City said that calling homosexuality a sin leads to violence against homosexuals, and the ministries were partly to blame for the murder of Matthew Shepard, the homosexual beaten to death in Wyoming. The City prevailed upon local television stations not to run ads for the campaign.

"In New York City, Pastor Kristopher Okwedy rented a billboard to display four translations of Leviticus 18:22 ('Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind: it is abomination.') The bottom of the sign said simply, 'I AM YOUR CREATOR.' Staten Island Borough President Guy Molinari wrote the billboard company a strongly worded letter, reminding the company that it did significant business with the City. Molinari also condemned the message—the unadulterated Word of God—as 'unnecessarily confrontational and offensive' and as conveying 'an atmosphere of intolerance which is not welcome.' In response, the billboard company immediately breached its contract and removed the sign.

"In Newton, Massachusetts, the Mayor recently declared that certain conservative groups opposed to the promotion of the homosexual agenda in the public schools threaten human rights, and the City will therefore 'stand up to them until their voices are heard no more.'

"At Temple University in Philadelphia, the 'City of Brotherly Love,' a Christian student was physically assaulted by university officials who then attempted to have him involuntarily committed to a mental hospital merely because he opposed a blasphemous pro-homosexual play.

"Other examples of government actions against religion abound. While government officials claim to support tolerance, the growing intolerance of religion generally and Christianity in particular is alarming.

"Over 50 years ago, the United States Supreme Court ruled that 'no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in...religion.' The current test for Establishment Clause violations states that government may neither endorse nor disapprove of a particular religion or religious belief, but must remain neutral. For our nation's first 150 years, the courts found no prohibition on government action regarding religion. Thereafter, Establishment Clause violations were found when government provided aid to religion. Cases concerning government hostility toward religion were nonexistent.

"Today, cases striking religious practices in public places abound (e.g., school prayer, creche displays in public parks, public display of the Ten Commandments, etc.). Indeed, so careful are federal courts to guard against any vestige of religion in the public square that they have even stricken a display of portions of the Declaration of Independence, the preamble to a state constitution, and the national motto ('In God We Trust') from the walls of a public school

because it ‘endorses religion’ and ‘attacks...the religious diversity that is our national heritage.’ This trend, while becoming more extreme in its particulars, is at least consistent with the general tenor of past Establishment Clause cases.

"Of far greater concern, however, is the growing movement toward overt hostility to religion. As universal experience and the above examples prove, the government frequently manifests overt hostility towards religion today, especially the Christian religion.

"The AFA Center for Law and Policy has filed suit in federal court in both the San Francisco case and the New York case raising this very issue of hostility. In New York, no ruling has yet been issued. In San Francisco, though, the trial court ruled that far from violating the principle of neutrality, the City ‘merely exercised its duty as a public body to address a matter allegedly relating to public safety.’ The court also decreed that simply ‘draping opinions’ in religious terms does not insulate them from government condemnation—in other words, the court found we were hypocrites.

"Such a ruling by a federal court itself displays a remarkable hostility toward religion. It both extends broad protection of government officials exhibiting animosity toward religion, and it denigrates those who would dare challenge those officials. Sadly, there appears to be a double standard on matters of religion: lawsuits claiming endorsement of religion are greatly favored and easily won; lawsuits claiming hostility toward religion are frowned upon and are virtually impossible to win. Both results point to a future in which religious individuals are excised from public life. One need look no further than the invective spewed upon John Ashcroft as the Attorney General nominee simply because he is a believing Christian for proof of this fact.

"As Christians, we should not be surprised at this development. After all, Genesis 3:15 states plainly that there will always be enmity between the godly seed and the seed of Satan. The country is straying farther and farther away from its Christian roots, wallowing in sex, violence and perversion. Can the lions be far behind?"

—Steve Crampton, *AFA Journal*, March 2001, p. 15

□ Q "In case your son or daughter has a habit of turning off the popular teen soap opera ‘Dawson’s Creek,’ when you walk in, here’s what you’ve been missing.

"In the latest episode, after months of obsessing about whether to ‘go all the way’ with boyfriend Pacey, the 17-year-old character Joey finally decided it was time. Accompanied by romantic music (not to mention the shrieking of adolescents all across America), the couple broke out the condom and started undressing each other as the screen faded to black.

"If the thought of your child watching this scene bothers you, you're out of touch. After all, these two high school seniors had waited nine months already, and waiting for marriage was never part of their plan anyway. The show's executive producer Paul Stupin said: 'It was time to address this issue. If we are going to depict an honest relationship, and show in a truthful way how a relationship between these two people progresses, sex has to be dealt with.'

"Joey, in fact, is supposed to be a heroine because she waited for exactly 'the right moment.' The moral of her story goes something like this: Wait for sex until you're sure it's true love. Or until it's TV's big 'sweeps week,' when your bosses at the network count on you for some really good ratings.

"But seriously, what does it matter if two kids have sex on television? Teen-agers know it's all fantasy right? Actually, it would be surprising if they did, considering the amount of sexual imagery they see every day. As the Kaiser Family Foundation recently reported, about two-thirds of TV shows contain some sexual content; those shows feature 'an average of 4:1 scenes per hour involving sex.'

"On teen shows in particular, the same scenario repeats endlessly: Boy meets girl. Boy and girl date a while. Girl visits clinic and gets a stern but kindly lecture and a handful of birth-control paraphernalia. Boy and girl 'go all the way.' And usually, in the next few episodes, boy and girl part ways and start looking for other partners. (Rumor has it that such a breakup already is planned for 'Dawson's Creek's' passionate pair.) Examples of sexual morality are almost nonexistent. When a character on the college drama 'Felicity' declared his intention to save sex for marriage, it took his girlfriend all of three episodes to break down his resolve.

"Few and far between are characters like Nicole, a teen-ager in the new film 'Going the Distance.' After almost going too far with her boyfriend, Phil, Nicole looks at him and says simply, 'I wanted you to, but I'm really glad we didn't.' Acknowledging that it is going to be difficult, the two nevertheless decide to stick it out and remain chaste. But for every Nicole and Phil encouraging kids to abstain from premarital sex, there are at least six or seven Joeys and Pacey's suggesting they go for it.

"Sad to say, pop culture is only reinforcing the lessons taught by teachers and other authority figures. Author and educator Evelyn Lerman titles her recent book 'Safer Sex: The New Morality,' summing up the way many sex educators and health organizations view teen sex. Miss Lerman suggests a 'new morality' based on these ideas: 'Abstain from early sex if possible. Abstain from giving or getting sexually transmitted infections. Abstain from having unplanned babies. Abstain from the need for an abortion.'

"In short, morality now means waiting until you're sure you're in love and then using a condom. And the only 'sin' is getting sick or pregnant. If this is the test for morality, 'Dawson's Creek' passes easily. It has even won an award from the Media Project, an

organization that honors ‘accurate portrayal of family planning, sexuality, and reproductive health.’ But in real life, the ‘Dawson’s Creek’ scenario flunks out. For one thing, it makes ‘safe sex’ look safer than it is. In the picture-perfect world of teen television, there’s no such thing as a defective or torn condom, or a disease like human papillomavirus that can get past a condom.

"Even worse, such shows ignore the very real feelings of self-doubt and unhappiness that premarital sex brings with it. Abstinence educator Emily Chase recalls seeing girls come into her local crisis pregnancy center for pregnancy tests: ‘Often the test results were negative; the girl was not pregnant. But the hurts of the broken relationships, the guilt they felt about having breached their boundaries remained.’

"But with ‘the new morality,’ no one is supposed to feel guilt. One of Joey’s friends advises her, ‘Has it ever occurred to you that you might be so caught up trying to find the right choice that you never really stop to think about the possibility that there may not be the right choice or the wrong choice? Just a bunch of choices? There’s nothing to figure out here. It’s only what you feel.’

"Aside from terrible writing, the problem with that advice is that it’s unrealistic. It leaves teen-agers with no moral foundation, no reason to listen [to] the voice of conscience—and in the end, no basis for self-respect. Parents who truly want to be honest with their teen-agers about relationships would be well advised to turn off the teen soap operas and sit down for a talk about moral guidelines. Kids need to know that even though ‘the new morality’ may seem exciting and glamorous, it only works on television.

—Gina Dalfonzo, *The Washington Times*, February 25, 2001, p. B3

Q "Johnny Cochran and a group of successful trial lawyers plan to bring class-action suits against the federal government and some private companies they say profited from slavery. Rep. John Conyers (D.-Mich.) has already introduced HR 40, titled ‘Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act.’ HR 40 has 48 cosponsors and a number of them, such as Jim Traficant (D.-Mich.) and Jerry Nadler (D.-N.Y.) are white.

"Slavery was a gross violation of human rights. Justice would demand that slave owners make compensatory reparation payments to slaves. Since both slaves and slave owners are no longer with us, compensation is beyond our reach.

"Absent from the reparations debate is who pays? Don’t say the government because the government doesn’t have any money that it doesn’t first take from some American. So which Americans owe black people what? Reparations advocates don’t want that question asked,

but let's you and I ask it.

"Are the million of Europeans, Asian and Latin Americans who immigrated to the United States in the 20th Century responsible for slavery, and should they be forced to cough up reparations money? What about descendants of Northern whites who fought and died in the name of freeing slaves? Should they cough up reparations money for black Americans? What about non-slave-owning Southern whites, who are a majority of Southern whites—should they be made to pay reparations?

"On black people's side of the ledger, thorny issues also arise. Some blacks purchased other blacks as a means to free family members. But other blacks owned slaves for the same reason whites owned slaves—to work farms or plantations. Are descendants of these blacks eligible and deserving of reparations?

"There is no way that Europeans could have captured millions of Africans. They had African and Arab help. Should Conyers haul representatives of Ghana, Ivory Coast, Nigeria and Muslim states before Congress and demand they pay reparations? By the way, is there anyone prepared to make the argument that blacks in America today would be better off if they were in Africa? If blacks wouldn't be better off, then why the reparations?

"Reparations advocates make the foolish unchallenged pronouncement that [the] United States became rich on the backs of free black labor. That's utter nonsense. Slavery doesn't have a very good record of producing wealth. Think about it.

"Slavery was all over the South and outlawed in most of the North. Buying into the reparations nonsense, the antebellum South was rich and the slave-starved North was poor. The truth is just the opposite. In fact, the poorest states and regions of our country were places where slavery flourished—Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia—while the richest states and regions were those where slavery was absent: Pennsylvania, New York and Massachusetts.

"The reparations movement would be little more than an amusing side-show were it not for the damage it can do to blacks. It misallocates time and resources that could be more fruitfully spent elsewhere.

"There's a growing black-owned and operated private school movement that addresses the fraudulent education of the public school system. Resources of the reparation movement could be used to add more private schools.

"High-powered reparations lawyers could use their legal skills to make court challenges of numerous state and local monopolistic regulations that stop people from getting into business, such as taxi licensing laws, cosmetology regulations, and restrictions on jitney and limousine

operations.

"I'd like to see lawyers bring class action suits against public school systems in cities like Philadelphia, Washington, Detroit and New York for producing fraudulent education—certifying youngster as high school graduates when those youngsters can't perform at seventh- and eighth-grade levels.

"There's a reparations issue completely ignored: Blacks as well as whites live on land taken, sometimes brutally, from Indians. Do we blacks owe Indians anything?"

—Walter E. Williams, *Human Events*, February 19, 2001, p. 13

Q I There is no single group responsible for the crime of slavery.

"Black Africans and Arabs were responsible for enslaving the ancestors of African-Americans. There were 3,000 black slave-owners in the ante-bellum United States. Are reparations to be paid by *their* descendants too? There were white slaves in colonial America. Are their descendants going to receive payments?"

II There is no single group that benefitted exclusively from slavery.

"The claim for reparations is premised on the false assumption that only whites have benefitted from slavery. If slave labor has created wealth for Americans, then obviously it has created wealth for black Americans as well, including the descendants of slaves. The GNP of black America makes the African-American community the 10th most prosperous 'nation' in the world. American blacks *on average* enjoy per capita incomes in the range of twenty to fifty *times* that of blacks living in any of the African nations from which they were kidnaped.

III Only a minority of white Americans owned slaves, while others gave their lives to free them.

"Only a tiny minority of Americans ever owned slaves. This is true even for those who lived in the ante-bellum South where only one white in five was a slaveholder. Why should *their* descendants owe a debt? What about the descendants of the 350,000 Union soldiers who died to free the slaves? They gave their lives. What morality would ask their descendants to pay again? If paying reparations on the basis of skin color is not racism, *what is?*

IV Most living Americans have no connection (direct or indirect) to slavery.

"The two great waves of American immigration occurred after 1880 and then after 1960.

What logic would require Vietnamese boat people, Russian refuseniks, Iranian refugees, Armenian victims of the Turkish persecution, Jews, Mexicans, Greeks, or Polish, Hungarian, Cambodian and Korean victims of Communism, to pay reparations to American blacks?

V The historical precedents used to justify the reparations claim do not apply, and the claim itself is based on race not injury.

"The historical precedents generally invoked to justify the reparations claim are payments to Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, Japanese-Americans and African-American victims of racial experiments in Tuskegee, or racial outrages in Rosewood and Oklahoma City. But in each case, the recipients of reparations were the direct victims of the injustice or their immediate families. This would be the only case of reparations to people who were not immediately affected and whose sole qualification to receive reparations would be racial. During the slavery era, many blacks were free men or slave-owners themselves, yet the reparations claimants make no attempt to take this fact into account. If this is not racism, what is?

VI The reparations argument is based on the unsubstantiated claim that all African Americans suffer from the economic consequences of slavery and discrimination.

"No scientific attempt has been made to prove that living individuals have been adversely affected by a slave system that was ended nearly 150 years ago. But there is plenty of evidence that the hardships of slavery were hardships that individuals could and did overcome. The black middle-class in America is a prosperous community that is now larger in absolute terms than the black underclass. Its existence suggests that present economic adversity is the result of failures of individual character rather than the lingering after-effects of racial discrimination or a slave system that ceased to exist well over a century ago. West Indian blacks in America are also descended from slaves but their average incomes are equivalent to the average incomes of whites (and nearly 25% higher than the average incomes of American-born blacks). How is it that slavery adversely affected one large group of descendants but not the other? How can government be expected to decide an issue that is so subjective?

VII The reparations claim is one more attempt to turn African Americans into victims. It sends a damaging message to the African-American community and to others.

"The renewed sense of grievance—which is what the claim for reparations will inevitably create—is not a constructive or helpful message for black leaders to send to their communities and to others. To focus the social passions of African Americans on what some other Americans may have done to their ancestors fifty or a hundred-and-fifty years ago is to burden them with a crippling sense of victim-hood. How are millions of non-black refugees from tyranny and genocide who are not living in America going to receive these claims,

moreover, except as demands for special treatment—an extravagant new handout that is only necessary because some blacks can't seem to locate the ladder of opportunity within reach of others, many of whom are less privileged than themselves?

VIII Reparations to African Americans have already been paid.

"Since the passage of the Civil Rights Acts and the advent of the Great Society in 1965, trillions of dollars in transfer payments have been made to African-Americans in the form of welfare benefits and racial preferences (in contracts, job placement and educational admissions)—all under the rationales of redressing historic racial grievances. It is said that reparations are necessary to achieve a healing between African Americans and other Americans. If trillion-dollar restitutions and a wholesale rewriting of American law (in order to accommodate racial preferences) is not enough to achieve a 'healing,' *what is?*

IX What about the debt blacks owe to America?

"Slavery existed for thousands of years before the Atlantic slave trade, and in all societies. But in the thousand years of slavery's existence, there never was an anti-slavery movement until white Anglo-Saxon Christians created one. If not for the anti-slavery beliefs and military power of white Englishmen and Americans, the slave trade would not have been brought to an end. If not for the sacrifices of white soldiers and a white American president who gave his life to sign the Emancipation Proclamation, blacks in America would *still* be slaves. If not for the dedication of Americans of all ethnicities and colors to a society based on the principle that all men are created equal, blacks in America would not enjoy the highest standard of living of blacks anywhere in the world, and indeed one of the highest standards of living of any people in the world. They would not enjoy the greatest freedoms and the most thoroughly protected individual rights anywhere. Where is the acknowledgment of black America and its leaders for *those* gifts?

X The reparations claim is a separatist idea that sets African-Americans against the nation that gave them freedom.

"Blacks were here before the Mayflower. Who is more American than the descendants of African slaves? For the African-American community to isolate itself from America is to embark on a course whose implications are troubling. Yet the African-American community has had a long-running flirtation with separatists, nationalists and the political left, who want African-Americans to be no part of America's social contract. African Americans should reject this temptation.

"For all America's faults, African Americans have an enormous stake in this country and its heritage. It is this heritage that is really under attack by the reparations movement. The reparations claim is one more assault on America, conducted by racial separatists and the

political left. It is an attack not only on white Americans, but on all Americans—especially African Americans.

"America's African-American citizens are the richest and most privileged black people alive, a bounty that is a direct result of the heritage that is under assault. The American idea needs the support of its African-American citizens. But African Americans also need the support of the American idea. For it is the American idea that led to the principles and created the institutions that have set African Americans—and all of us—free."

—David Horowitz, *Human Events*, February 19, 2001, p. 11

