Therefore we also, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which so easily ensnares us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us. Hebrews 12:1

From The President's Desk

Your editor has long recommended George Gilder’s book *Men and Marriage*. Indeed, I recommend it to every session at the Summit. It is a great defense of marriage—something that is politically incorrect to defend today.

The following report published by the Heritage Foundation and printed in part in The Washington Times (April 15, 2002, p. A3) is a fitting sequence to Gilder’s defense of marriage.

“Marriage is the only institution that protects mothers and children from domestic abuse and violent crime, a new report says.

“The report, compiled by the Heritage Foundation, concludes that domestic abuse is twice as high among women who have never married than among those who have. Children of divorced or never-married mothers are six to 30 times more likely to suffer from serious child abuse than children raised by both biological parents who are married, the report says.

“‘Social science data clearly show that mothers and children are safer in a married family,’ said Patrick Fagan, a William H.G. Fitzgerald research fellow in Family and Culture Issues. ‘It’s time for the government to adopt policies that reflect this knowledge and rebuild—rather than undermine—the institution of marriage.’
“The findings also support President Bush’s plan to spend $300 million per year on efforts to rebuild marriage among the poor.

“ ‘In establishing programs to help those who need assistance, the question before Congress shouldn’t simply be whether to fund the program, but how much its policies would improve the well-being of adults and children,’ said Kirk Johnson, a senior policy analyst at the foundation’s Center for Data Analysis.

“The report’s findings are based on an analysis of the 1999 results of the National Crime Victimization Survey, which the Justice Department has conducted since 1973:

“Highlights of the study:

“Never-married women experience more domestic abuse than those who are married. Among those who have been married, the annual rate of domestic abuse is 14.7 per 1,000 mothers. For mothers who have never been married, it’s 32.9 per 1,000.

“Never-married mothers with children are more likely to be victims of violent crime than married women who have children. The report shows that never-married women suffer 147.8 violent crimes per 1,000 mothers each year, compared with 52.9 crimes per 1,000 among married mothers.

“Children who live with their mother and a boyfriend who is not their father are 33 times more likely to be abused. The rate of abuse is six times, higher in step-families, 14 times higher in the single-mother family and 20 times higher in cohabitating-biological parent families.

“Groups such as the Family Research Council (FRC) and Smart-Marriages.com agree with the foundation’s findings.

“ ‘Marriage definitely protects women and children,’ said Diane Sollee, director of SmartMarriages.com, which is part of the Coalition for Marriage, Family and Couples Education LLC, an independent organization that deals with the strengthening of marriage.

“A long-term commitment like marriage offers more stability in the home than less-committed relationships, the groups say. Their idea is that commitment heads off violence, a product of instability.

“ ‘When people are married, they make an investment in each other’s lives,’ said Jennifer Marshall, director of FRC’s Family Studies department. ‘When you’re in a less-committed relationship, it can get volatile because these kinds of relationships don’t carry the same commitment.’”
And what more shall I say? For the time would fail me to tell of Gideon and Barak and Samson and Jephthah, also of David and Samuel and the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, worked righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, became valiant in battle, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again.

“Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. Still others had trial of mockings and scourgings, yes, and of chains and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn in two, were tempted, were slain with the sword. They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented—of whom the world was not worthy. They wandered in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth.

“And all these, having obtained a good testimony through faith, did not receive the promise, God having provided something better for us, that they should not be made perfect apart from us.”

—Hebrews 11:32-40

The Christian is in a different position from other people who are trying to be good. They hope, by being good, to please God if there is one; or—if they think there is not—at least they hope to deserve approval from good men. But the Christian thinks any good he does comes from the Christ-life inside him. He does not think God will love us because we are good, but that God will make us good because He loves us.

—C.S. Lewis, Mere Christianity

Let it be repeated, there are two views of one’s life. One is that a man’s life is his own, to do with as he [or she] pleases; the other is that it belongs to another and …that the other to whom it belongs is Christ Himself.”

—John R. Mott
“Imagination is more than knowledge. It is a preview of life’s coming attractions.”

—Albert Einstein

“If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don’t deal in lies,
Or, being hated, don’t give way to hating,
And yet don’t look too good, nor talk too wise;
If you can dream—and not make dreams your master;
If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet up with triumph and disaster
And treat those two imposters just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you’ve spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave up your life to broken,
And stoop and build ’em up with worn out tools;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the will which says to them, ‘Hold on’;
If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds’ worth of distance run—
Yours is the earth and everything that’s in it,
And—which is more—you’ll be a man, my son!”

—Rudyard Kipling

“In footnotes to two legal briefs, solicitor general Ted Olson declared that it was the
executive branch’s position that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to bear arms. This reading treats the amendment like the rest of the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment, for example, recognizes an individual right to speak freely. It does not prohibit all regulations of that speech: Someone who falsely cries Fire! in a crowded theater may be punished. But the Constitution does bar laws attempting to reduce the amount of speech. Similarly, the Constitution allows some regulations on gun ownership—and indeed, in the very cases about which Olson was writing, he urged the Court to let the particular regulations at issue stand. But a ban on handgun ownership would not be consistent with the Constitution. Nor, pursuing the analogy to the First Amendment, would a law designed to ‘reduce the number of guns on the street.’ Unless, that is, the Constitution were amended. That’s the route properly open to those people who believe the Second Amendment was a mistake, or is obsolete.

—National Review, June 3, 2002, p. 8

“When CNN opened a Havana office five years ago, bureau chief Lucia Newman said Cuban officials had promised the network ‘total freedom to do what we want and to work without any prior censorship.’ Perhaps that’s because they knew CNN would censor itself. According to a new study by the Media Research Center, CNN’s Havana-based journalists have produced 212 prime-time reports on the Cuban government or life on the island. A grand total of seven of them dealt with political dissidents or prisoners, which is fewer than the number of stories CNN ran in the first three months of this year about alleged human-rights abuses of Taliban prisoners held at Guantanamo Bay. The bureau also put out a mere four stories on the absence of democracy in Cuba, including one that had Newman remarking that Cuba’s one-candidate ‘elections’ contained none of the ‘dubious campaign spending’ found in the U.S. Overall, Communist spokesmen were given six times more airplay than non-Communist ones. Perhaps this is because the non-Communist ones would fear for their lives if they spoke against the regime—a great story in itself, if only CNN would report it.”

—National Review, June 3, 2002, p. 10

“The sovereign Maker of heaven and earth has established for His own glory an order in creation governing the position which each part holds. God has revealed His will concerning this order, both in creation itself and in the Scriptures. When mankind arrogantly or ignorantly defies the divine order and abrogates divine law, he brings God’s inevitable wrath upon society itself, for suppressing the truth by pretending autonomous freedom from God.

“With this conviction, we want to raise an alarm. This nation’s policy of enrolling women
instead of men in armed combatant roles and categories is contrary to the revealed will of
almighty God, from whom all human government derives its just authority. A nation has no
warrant to expect divine approval and to hope for providential blessing when its policy
expressly opposes the Sovereign God’s revealed will. Instead, there is Biblical warrant to fear
divine discipline. The enrollment of women as warriors, positioned to engage the men of
enemy forces, marks an abdication by men of a solemn duty as protectors of women and
children. It is a fundamental abuse of women to make them protectors of men.”

—Hope For America, Willow Grove, PA 19090

The issue of women in combat is even more deadly when one realizes that the former
president of the United States, Bill Clinton, avoided the draft himself and then advocated
women in his place. For those interested in the subject, consult ‘Woman As Warrior: Does It
Matter?’ published by Hope For America, PO Box 1007, Willow Grove, PA 19090. Email
hfa@aol.com

“Over a century ago Ernst Renan wrote, ‘Muslims are the first victims of Islam. I have
observed in my travels in the Orient, that fanaticism comes from a small number of
dangerous men who maintain the others in the practice of religion by terror.’ Today it is not
only by terror, as with the Taliban of Afghanistan, it is by personal conviction, indoctrination,
and promises of a Paradise guaranteed through murderous acts.

“This clash of worldviews must be won both by Muslims and by those of influence outside
Islam—politicians, intellectuals, and others. Indeed, Western supporters of Islamic radicals
need to rethink their loyalties: Are they for civilization and Western values, or for violence
and the terrorists? Professor Fred Siegel refers to a Muslim friend and former student who
emailed him to say he was ‘sickened’ to watch Middle Easterners celebrate the terror of
September 11. ‘He wants no truck with those who kill in the name of Islam.’ Siegel points
out that it’s also fair to ask this conviction of the Western ‘rationalizers of Palestinian and
Islamic terror.’ Indeed, ‘Why is it that everywhere in the world where Muslims are in the
majority, their minorities are persecuted?’

‘Professor Siegel wants to know where intellectuals and European leaders were during the
recent U.N. ‘hate’ conference in Durban, South Africa, ‘when Islamophobia was denounced,
while Muslim discrimination against non-Muslims was passed over in silence…’ And as for
America, ‘No doubt our multiculturalists will explain that, while even mild anger at Arabs by
Americans is a sign of deep seated racism, venomous hatred in the Arab world is merely a
part of a different culture that can’t be judged by our standards.’ (This, of course, was the
same argument the Nazis gave for their atrocities during the trials at Nuremburg.)

—John Ankerburg, John Weldon, Fast Facts on Islam, p. 95,96

The National Council on Bible Curriculum in Public Schools (NCBCPS) has had great success in returning the Bible to America’s public schools in a traditional, time-tested approach. Utilizing curriculum that has been in use for over 40 years, the NCBCPS elective course materials have been adopted by over 185 school districts in 33 states, and the numbers are steadily growing. The curriculum has never been legally challenged.

“Since 1995, over 70,000 students have taken the National Council On Bible Curriculum In Public Schools course on high school campuses. The curriculum is popular with both teachers and students, and it has been adopted to date nationwide in 92% of the school districts where it has been presented by local citizens.

“The NCBCPS uses the Bible as its textbook (the King James version is recommended) and through a study of the Old and New Testaments focuses on its comparisons with, and impact upon, history and literature.

“Following Constitutional guidelines, the course emphasizes that the Bible is the foundation document of our society and is the single most influential book in shaping western culture, our laws, our history, and even our speech. It is a lesson in America’s heritage.

“Some of the supporters of this curriculum are: Dr. Bill Bright, Dr. D. James Kennedy, David Barton, Joyce Meyer, Charles Stanley, Dean Jones (the actor), Jane Russell (the actress), and Captain Scott O’Grady (who was shot down over Bosnia and later rescued). For further information contact: Elizabeth Ridenour, PO Box 9743, Greensboro, NC 27429, 336-272-3799.

Former U.S. President Gerald Ford has accepted an invitation to join the advisory board of the Republican Unity Coalition, a gay-straight alliance that advocates support for gay issues within the Republican Party.

“Ford’s decision last month to join the RUC advisory panel marks the first time a past or current U.S. president has joined the ranks of an organization that advocates on behalf of gay equality.

“ ‘We’re honored and delighted to have him,’ said Charles Francis, the RUC’s founder and
Francis said former U.S. Senator Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.), who serves as the RUC’s honorary chair, contacted Ford about joining the RUC advisory panel last year after Ford expressed support for equal government benefits for same-sex couples in an October interview with Deb Price, an openly gay columnist for the Detroit News.

“When asked by Price if gay couples should receive the same economic benefits as married couples, such as Social Security and tax deductions, Ford said, ‘I don’t see why they shouldn’t. I think that’s a proper goal.’

‘I think they ought to be treated equally. Period.’ Ford, said in the interview.

“Ford told Price he applauds President Bush’s decision to appoint three openly gay officials to his administration.

‘I have always believed in an inclusive policy, in welcoming gays and others into the party,’ Ford said in the interview.

Francis said Ford’s comments in the Detroit News interview prompted RUC members to ask Simpson to approach Ford about joining the RUC advisory panel. Francis said Simpson, himself a prominent Republican Party leader, was ‘happy to do it.’”


Mary Cheney, Vice President Dick Cheney’s lesbian daughter, issued a statement this week saying she has joined the board of directors of the Republican Unity Coalition, a group that describes itself as a ‘gay-straight alliance’ seeking to build bridges between gays and the Republican Party.

Mary Cheney’s decision to join the RUC board marks the first time she has taken a public stand on gay issues since news of her sexual orientation surfaced in July of 2000, when then-candidate George W. Bush named her father as his vice presidential running mate.

‘RUC is an organization that reflects my fundamental beliefs and principles,’ she said in her statement, which the RUC distributed by email to its members on April 21. ‘Working together we can expand the Republican Party’s outreach to non-traditional Republicans; we can make sexual orientation a non-issue for the Republican Party; and we can help achieve equality for all gay and lesbian Americans.’

“Charles Francis, the openly gay public relations executive who founded the RUC at the time
of Bush’s inauguration, said Cheney would help the RUC ‘reach out to gay and lesbian voters as well as build bridges to all within the Republican Party.

“In the same e-mail that included Cheney’s statement, Francis said Cheney would also ‘work with us to help build the RUC membership network across the country.’

“Francis told the Blade on April 25 that Mary Cheney would be attending several RUC fund-raising dinners this summer in Los Angeles, Phoenix, Dallas, New York, and other cities.

“We’re real excited to have her on board,” Francis said.

“Francis, a friend of President Bush and the Bush family from Texas, has said the RUC has formed a political action committee and planned to raise $1 million to give to gay-friendly Republican candidates in the 2002 congressional elections. A finance report the group submitted to the Federal Election Commission shows it had raised $33,000, as of Dec. 30, 2000, the latest period for which PACs are required to disclose to the FEC the amount of money they raised in the current election cycle.

“RUC official Eugene Lawson issued a statement on April 5 saying the RUC had joined the Human Rights Campaign, a non-partisan gay political group, in holding a joint fund-raiser for three Republican House candidates.

“Mary Cheney could not be reached by press time. When asked for Vice President Cheney’s reaction to his daughter’s decision to join the RUC, vice presidential spokesperson Jennifer Millerwise told Washington Post columnist Lloyd Grove, ‘The vice president loves and supports his daughter.’

“Earlier this year, former U.S. President Gerald Ford announced that he had joined the RUC’s board of advisors. Former U.S. Senator Alan Simpson (R-Wy.), who serves as the RUC’s honorary chair, is credited with persuading Ford to join the board of advisors.”

—Washington Bade, April 26, 2002, p. 26

The homosexualization of America appears to be right on schedule. While the Christian position has been banked to a great extent in light of September 11th the homosexual agenda plows on. California’s governor has turned the state into Sodom and Gomorrah.
“Cross-dressing and gender-bending activists with the ‘transgender’ pressure group GenderPAC (Gender Public Advocacy Coalition) lobbied members of Congress on Monday, urging them to sign the following ‘gender’ non-discrimination pledge for their individual offices: ‘We are seeking a written commitment that your office, in connection with the terms of employment, will not discriminate based on an individual’s gender expression or identity.’

“According to GenderPAC’s Website, less than 100 members of Congress had signed GenderPAC’s ‘Equal Employment Opportunity’ pledge as of last week. Several Republican lawmakers, including Rep. Nancy Johnson (Connecticut) and Mark Foley (Florida), have signed the pledge. GenderPAC calls its annual event ‘Gender Lobby Day.’

“Concerned Women for America sent the following email memo to all members of Congress on Monday:

‘Signing this pledge will commit you to hiring and retaining in your office transvestites (people who dress as if they were members of the opposite sex) and transsexuals (people who have undergone surgical mutilation in order to act out a role as a member of the opposite sex).

‘Ultimately, your signature on this pledge will be used to advance the legislative goal of requiring all employers to hire and retain transvestites and transsexuals or face lawsuits for employment discrimination.

‘This is not the way to healing and health for troubled individuals. Creating new ‘rights’ for those trapped in disordered behavior serves to discourage them from seeking the help they need.

‘Corporal Klinger, the cross-dressing character from M.A.S.H., might have been pleased to see congressional offices with men in dresses, but we don’t think your constituents would be so happy.

‘We strongly urge you not to sign this “Klinger Pledge.”’

—Culture & Family Institute, May 24, 2002

“Stephen Jay Gould, 60, an evolutionary biologist, prolific author and one of the most publicly visible scientists in the USA, died Monday of cancer.

“To the general public, Gould did for evolutionary biology and paleontology what Carl Sagan did for astronomy. Throughout his distinguished career as a professor of zoology and geology at Harvard University, he was a champion for making difficult concepts accessible to the
Gould published more than a dozen books, including Hen’s Teeth and Horse’s Toes and Bully for Brontosaurus, and wrote 300 uninterrupted monthly columns for Natural History magazine. Gould’s latest book, I Have Landed: The End of a Beginning in Natural History, is scheduled for publication today.

“To scientists, Gould was an unabashed critical thinker who challenged many basic assumptions about evolution and the origin of species. One of his most significant contributions was the notion of punctuated equilibria,’ which he developed in 1972 with his close friend and colleague Niles Eldredge, now curator of paleontology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

“The theory contradicted a century of belief that species evolve slowly over time. Gould asserted instead that species remain relatively constant until they are affected by something outside their normal system, such as a catastrophic climate change or an asteroid impact like the one that killed off the dinosaurs. Then, species tend to change very rapidly. After the asteroid impact 65 million years ago, mammals flourished soon after.

‘In addition to the concrete science that Stephen contributed to so deeply, he showed the world that science can be and ought to be a truly intellectual exercise,’ Eldredge says.

“Gould also fought to change the way scientists and the public have viewed evolution overall since it was first popularized by Charles Darwin in the 19th century. Gould argued tirelessly that evolution is not some guided process toward perfection. Gould argued that natural selection, which is the driving force of evolution, occurs more by chance. Most scientists no longer believe that evolution is directed.

“Gould was first diagnosed with cancer in 1982. He successfully fought that battle until just a few months ago.

‘This is truly a terrible loss of a phenomenal thinker and leader in science,’ says Alan Leshner, head of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). ‘He always pushed the frontiers. He challenged the thinking of the time to push to the next level, and that’s what you look for in a leader.’

“Gould was elected president of the prestigious AAAS in 1998.

“His desire to push the frontier and challenge big notions began as a student.

‘When we were in school together he said, ‘We can’t wait until we’re 60 years old to challenge the big ideas. We have to start now,’’ Eldredge says.”
The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has ordered the National Education Association and its affiliates to stop violating the religious rights of members who disagree with the union’s political causes.

“In a ruling made public yesterday, the federal agency said it would sue the nation’s largest teachers union if it did not stop forcing teachers who categorized themselves as ‘religious objectors’ to undergo annual written procedures so their dues would not fund the union’s political agenda.

“Some objectors say the NEA’s agenda promotes pro-abortion, pro-homosexuality positions and policies that interfere with parental rights.

“‘The evidence obtained during the investigation establishes a violation of a federal statute has occurred,’ Michael Fetzer, EEOC’s district director, wrote in a May 13 letter to the NEA.

“Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, union officials may not force any employee to financially support a union if doing so violates the employee’s sincerely held religious beliefs. The law allows union members to donate their fees to charities of their choice if supporting the unions violates their religious beliefs.

“The union’s policy was designed to harass teachers of all faiths, attorneys representing the objectors said.

“‘The NEA union’s illegal scheme is intended to force teachers of faith to shut up and pay up,’ said Stefan Gleason, vice president of the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, a Virginia-based nonprofit group that represented the objectors.

“‘The EEOC’s action further underscores that the nation’s largest teacher union is systematically persecuting people of faith,’ Mr. Gleason said.

“NEA officials said yesterday they could not comment on the ruling because they had not seen a copy of it. ‘We are awaiting the letter,’ said Kathleen Lyons, a spokeswoman for the NEA. ‘We will be able to comment on it after we receive it and review it.’

“In their complaint to the EEOC, the attorneys for the objecting teachers argued that the union’s nationwide policy unlawfully placed an undue burden on teachers and that teachers should be able to file one-time objections to forced union dues.
“The charges stemmed from a case in Ohio, where a high school teacher filed a complaint with the EEOC against the Ohio Education Association in 2000, after union officials there rebuffed the teacher’s long-standing objection over his dues during the 1999-2000 school year.

“Dennis Robey, a member of the Church of God, made his religious objections public to union officials in 1995 and said he wanted his dues to go to Habitat for Humanity. Dues in Ohio are about $400.

“After 1999, union officials began demanding that Mr. Robey fill out lengthy forms each year in which he must describe in detail his religious views.

“On the form, union officials asked what Mr. Roby called ‘probing personal questions’ about his relationship with God and his religious affiliation. They also required him to obtain a signature from a religious official attesting to the validity of his beliefs.

“The EEOC said its investigation found an ‘unnecessary delay’ in the Ohio Education Association’s response to teachers who had asked that they be categorized as religious objectors early last year. The commission said that even though the Ohio Education Association complied with teachers’ requests, it took the local union up to nine months to process. ‘The amount of time it took the union to accommodate teachers was unreasonable,’ Mr. Fetzer wrote.

“The agency also concluded that the union’s requirement that objectors submit annual written statements was burdensome.

“ ‘Once an individual is on the record that he/she objects to paying fair share fee and has designated an agreed upon charity to which his/her portion of the fair share will be donated, he/she should not be required to reiterate the objection on an annual basis,’ Mr. Getzer wrote.

“The EEOC has given the NEA and its affiliates time to eliminate the annual procedure. If the NEA does not, the EEOC will seek to resolve the issue in court.

“Daniel Cronin, director of the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation’s legal information department, said the foundation receives about 100 reports each year from teachers who have complaints about the NEA’s policies regarding religious objectors.

“He said the ruling should change that.

“ ‘This hopefully will make life easier for these teachers,’ Mr. Cronin said.”
“In the days of pre-modern medicine, the adage was: Whatever else hospitals do, they should not spread disease. In these days of postmodern higher education, the adage is: Whatever else schools do, they should not subtract from understanding. Which brings us to the subject of ‘women’s studies.’

“Christine Stolba, a history Ph.D and senior fellow at the indispensable Independent Women’s Forum, recently steeled herself for the ordeal of reading a lot of meretricious rubbish. The result is her report, ‘Lying in a Room of One’s Own: How Women’s Studies Textbooks Miseducate Students.’ It is published by the IWF, a voice for women unlike those who have hijacked feminism.

“The hijackers include the authors of five widely used women’s studies textbooks. Because these represent the mainstream of women’s studies, they illustrate the extent to which political screeds, the cultivation of grievances and anti-intellectualism have gained academic respectability.

“The textbooks’ factual errors serve the ‘transformative’ mission of women’s studies—the political mission of agitation and mobilization, aka ‘consciousness raising.’ However, the postmodern premise (explicitly endorsed in one of the texts) is that ‘no purely factual studies exist.’ That is, ‘truth’ is ‘socially constructed,’ and in ‘patriarchal,’ ‘phallocentric’ societies ‘factual’—scare quotes are obligatory among postmodernists—assertions merely reflect power relations of male domination.

“So textbooks’ assertions about the ‘wage gap’ between men and women do not mention the fact that many women chose to sacrifice compensation in exchange for flexible work arrangements. Certain feminists, radiating contempt to all women—the vast majority—who differ with them disparage this choice as a ‘mommy track.’ They say it is not a real choice, it is mindless adherence to imposed sexual stereotypes.

“The textbooks’ assertion that women have been shortchanged in medical research is unsupported by evidence and refuted by facts, such as: Women are 60 percent of all subjects in National Institutes of Health-funded clinical trials, and since spending on various forms of cancer research began to be tracked in 1985, more money has been spent on breast cancer than on any other cancer research. And women are more likely than men to have medical insurance.

“The textbooks’ attempts to cling to the myth of education bias against women founders on facts such as: Today women receive most bachelor’s and master’s degrees, and soon will earn
most Ph.D.s. So stuck are these books in a time warp, one text, while rejecting the traditional literary canon (too many dead white males), recommends I, Rigoberta Menchu: An Indian Woman in Guatemala, a book which helped the author win the 1992 Nobel Peace Prize—before it was demonstrated to be fraudulent.

“What Stolba calls the ‘women-under-siege’ theme—what one of the textbooks calls the ‘matrix of domination’—is impervious to evidence. As one book insists: ‘The overall effect of the twentieth century on women was neither liberation nor gender equality as much as it was change in the nature and meaning of their fragmentation.’

“The fact that women think they are better off is, the texts say, proof of how subtle and sinister their oppressors have become. The ‘internalization of society’s views’—internalized oppression’—causes women to have such ‘low self-esteem’ that they are ‘absorbed into the male worldview.’ That view, says one text, is apparent in the degrading stereotype of the kneeling Native American woman on the label of Land O’ Lakes butter.

“On sexuality, the theme of many textbooks is, Stolba says, ‘How do I love thee, let me count the heterosexist, patriarchal ways.’ The textbooks are morose about the idea that ‘women need men for sexual arousal and satisfaction,’ which produces ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ resulting from the dichotomous thinking’ that men and women are different and represent the full range of human types. The ‘culture of romance’? Not good. It ‘entails male privilege.’

“The ‘marriage myth’? Don’t ask.

“Fatherhood? Well, the textbooks say it is not all incest and child abuse. One textbook even finds a bright side:

“ ‘At present, it appears that domineering fathers may provoke reactions in their daughters that release our feminist impulses and creative potential.’

“The title of Stolba’s report echoes that of Virginia Woolf’s splendid 1929 essay ‘A Room of One’s Own,’ in which Woolf deftly suggested how many deprivations—including having no ‘room of her own’—could explain why a sister of Shakespeare would have been handicapped compared to her brother. Today a widely used women’s studies textbook fulminates against supposedly phallic words and phrases such as—no kidding—‘input,’ ‘plugs into,’ ‘thrust’ and ‘penetrate.’ How feminism has fallen.”


G “As far as most of us are concerned, the university is the most morally confused
mainstream institution in America. It is also among the most unfree, with its authoritarian speech codes and political correctness. Most Americans agree with William F. Buckley’s famous comment that he would rather be governed by the first hundred names in the Cambridge phone book than by a hundred Harvard professors.

“The question is, why? Why are the moral compasses of so many professors in the liberal arts and humanities—i.e., departments other than in the natural sciences and math—broken?

“Having thought about this ever since the 1970s, when I attended graduate school in international affairs at Columbia University, I would like to offer six reasons:

“First, college professors are regarded no matter how incompetent they are. Once a professor is granted tenure, he or she can announce that all sex between a man and a woman is rape, that parents should have a period of time after their ill child is born to determine whether or not they should kill it, or that children do just as well when raised by two women or two men as when raised by a man and woman married to each other—and still be well-paid and respected by colleagues.

“Second, professors live and work in an almost hermetically sealed ideological universe. As a radio talk-show host, I probably have to defend my ideas more often in a day than the average left-wing professor does in a semester. No wonder professors who write anti-American articles or letters to the editor often refuse my producer’s invitations to come on my show and defend their views—they almost never have to do so.

“Third, they believe in moral relativism—one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter, no culture is morally superior to any other—and increasingly even believe in the relativism of truth. For anyone who believes that nothing is objectively right or wrong or even true or false, moral clarity is impossible.

“Fourth, they lack wisdom. Many professors have an immense amount of knowledge in their field, but few possess wisdom. For example, I am convinced that my grandmothers, who never went to high school, understood men better than the average woman who earns a doctorate in psychology—let alone in women’s studies, sociology or political science.

“Fifth, they are alienated from the two main identities of other Americans: patriotism and religion. They regard patriotism and expressions of it such as flag waving as largely contemptible expressions of jingoism. And they regard religion—especially America’s foundational religions, Christianity and Judaism—as, at best, a crutch for the psychologically weak and, at worst, the greatest source of evil.

“Sixth, most professors believe that they are smarter than other Americans, and so they deeply resent the society that gives more power, money and fame to businessmen, politicians, athletes, movie stars and talk-show hosts. This further alienates them from the larger society.
“In sum, if the universities are morally right, Americans are, by and large, morally wrong, and America is indeed the malevolent force in the world that so many colleges depict it as. On the other hand, if Americans are by and large right about the greatest moral issues of the day, and America, with all its flaws, really is the greatest force for good in the world, our universities are, with a few exceptions, moral wastelands.”

—Dennis Prager, WorldNetDaily, May 21, 2002