

July 2004



The

# JOURNAL

---

A Summit Ministries Publication

---

Why do the nations rebel and the peoples plot in vain? The kings of the earth take their stand and the rulers conspire together against the LORD and His Anointed One.

Psalm 2:1, 2

## **From The President's Desk**

Pat Hastings was a Summit graduate, 6th session, 2003. Upon leaving Summit, he enrolled at Rice University where he quickly became the talk of campus...but let me allow him to tell his story.

“When I entered Rice University in Houston last fall, the warnings of religious persecution still rang fresh in my mind from Summit. It took barely three weeks for me to experience it personally in a big way.

“I wrote an op-ed in the Rice student newspaper opposing gay marriage. The previous week someone had written a very pro-homosexual column and there was virtually no discernable reaction. However, my column, ‘Gays undermine marriage’s meaning,’ took an unpopular position and thus created a small firestorm on campus. The reaction included:

—Personal emails condemning my writing. One was especially direct, ‘I don’t know what twist of fate allowed you into Rice University, but it was embarrassing for me that a fellow student held those beliefs...I think there is a time and a place for bigoted beliefs such as yours...unfortunately for you that time was about 60 years ago, and the place was Gestapo Germany.’

—Flyers distributed and posted in hallways at one of the residential colleges. They featured a

color picture of Ross Perot + a picture of Dumbo the elephant = a picture of Pat Hastings. Below my picture it asserted in bold letters, ‘How is that for un“natural,” [expletive]?’

—In a paper that typically has two or three letters to the editor each week, two and a half pages of letters in the following edition of the Rice newspaper, with a total of eleven letters and one column opposing what I said. Additional letters continued to appear for several more weeks.

—My writing was even labeled hate speech. A professor sent out emails that linked to a website designed to fight hate crime on campus. She said, ‘I think it is particularly appropriate in light of the [newspaper’s] unfortunate decision to publish last week’s editorial about same-sex marriage.’

“There were, of course, some within the conservative and Christian community that appreciated my efforts. But they were a too-small minority. Secular Humanism truly dominates Rice and, I suspect, many other universities. I have seen the ugly side of Secular Humanism and the religious fervor with which the preachers of tolerance refuse to tolerate the truth.

“The truth is not always easy to accept, nor is it always easy to share. Those who choose to do so must take the inevitable unfortunate consequences. But we need more people willing to speak the truth at whatever the cost. And that is why we need a place like Summit: to train and encourage young men and women to take a stand and be a light in a very dark world.”

Now that’s Pat’s summary of his experience at Rice, but I need to mention two other things. First, at the end of the school year Pat was chosen The Rice University Thresher newspaper’s opinion columnist of the year with the following comments as presented in the Rice newspaper for April 16, 2004: “There’s one every year: a freshman so willfully determined to publish his or her controversial thoughts in opinion column form. Year after year we warn them, ‘Are you sure you want to write this?’ But they persevere, unconvinced of the problem they might face at Rice University after everyone knows who they are. You have to admire Hastings’ confidence in the face of immense opposition and, at the same time, thank him for getting a conversation about gay rights started, even if it starts with vitriol and lighter fluid.”

And second, I want you to read his column that stirred all the controversy on campus:

“The notion of sanctioning marriage between two people of the same gender is absolutely outrageous. Yet America must face and deal with this idea. It cannot be ignored, and the outcome of the debate is very much in doubt.

“It is interesting that people in homosexual relationships want to be officially ‘married.’ Why aren’t they satisfied to have their relationships be like other unwed couples who live together?

“According to Representative Ron Paul (R-Tex.), ‘if homosexuals were only interested in having a monogamous relationship with each other, we wouldn’t hear this debate going on. What they really want is to not only have all Americans condone the practice, but force them to pay for it.’

“As a ‘married’ couple, gays would be entitled to employee benefits and family packages offered through Social Security, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (which provides food stamps), and other welfare programs. Gays want to be accepted as ordinary people doing an ordinary thing, and they want their ‘relationships’ put on the same level as those of traditional married couples.

“This must not happen for several reason. First, and seemingly most obvious, homosexual behavior is not natural. This is not a paper on biology, but it is safe to say the male and female bodies are designed to facilitate having sex with one another. And the function of the sexual relation is to produce offspring.

“Homosexual behavior does not appear to be a normal function of the body, and it definitely does not produce children. There is a myth, still purported by many pro-homosexuals, that a critical mass of 10 percent of the human population is ‘gay.’ However, during the Lawrence v. Texas Supreme Court case this spring, even the pro-homosexual side admitted these numbers were a steep exaggeration.

“According to the Lawrence briefings, ‘The most widely accepted study of sexual practices in the United States is the National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLs). The [1992] NHSLs found that 2.8 percent of the male and 1.4 percent of the female population identify themselves as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.’

“Second, gay marriage would destroy the very meaning of the union. The concept of marriage is not discriminatory. But by definition it is a union between two sexes, not just two people. The concept of marriage is so important to society that it has been uniquely protected by law and by culture.

“If marriage can be defined differently, why couldn’t it take place between a man and a monkey? Where can we draw the line? What about ‘marriage’ between a man and a 10-year-old boy? And who says marriage can only be between two people? How about three women getting married? Or 14? These examples may be extreme, but so was the idea of homosexual marriage in the not-so-distant past.

“Finally, gay marriage is not like traditional marriage. Marriage encourages a monogamous relationship; homosexual relationships are the complete opposite. In fact, according to a 1996 survey by *Genre*, an upscale gay men’s magazine, 42 percent of readers said they had had sex

with more than 100 different partners. Despite this promiscuity, legally ‘married’ homosexuals would have every legal right to pursue adoption on an equal basis with traditionally married couples.

“If gay marriage is sanctioned by the government, and it may be in the near future, some very important principles will be turned upside down. Gender will become irrelevant. Sexual differences will be more like personality types. Marriage will be meaningless.

“Gay marriage must not be permitted. To put it on the same level as the traditional American marriage would not elevate homosexuality to a new level. Rather it would destroy the principles of the family unit and signify the painful beginning of the death of marriage.”

### Month In Review

Q “O LORD, our Lord, how magnificent is Your name throughout the earth! You have covered the heavens with Your majesty. Because of Your adversaries, You have established a stronghold from the mouths of children and nursing infants, to silence the enemy and the avenger. When I observe Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, the moon and the stars, which You set in place, what is man that You remember him, the son of man that You look after him? You made him little less than God and crowned him with glory and honor. You made him lord over the works of Your hands; You put everything under his feet: all the sheep and oxen, as well as animals in the world, birds of the sky, and fish of the sea passing through the currents of the seas. O LORD, our Lord, how magnificent is Your name throughout the earth!

—Psalm 8:1-9

Q “Why do the nations rebel and the peoples plot in vain? The kings of the earth take their stand and the rulers conspire together against the LORD and His Anointed One. Let us tear off their chains and free ourselves from their restraints. The One enthroned in heaven laughs; the Lord ridicules them. Then He speaks to them in His anger and terrifies them in His wrath: ‘I have consecrated My King on Zion, My holy mountain.’ I will declare the LORD’s decree: He said to Me, ‘You are My Son, today I have become Your Father. Ask of Me, and I will make the nations Your inheritance and the ends of the earth your possession. You will break them with a rod of iron; You will shatter them like pottery.’ So now, kings, be wise; receive instruction, you judges of the earth. Serve the LORD with reverential awe, and rejoice with trembling. Pay homage to the Son, or He will be angry, and you will perish in your rebellion, for His anger may ignite at any moment. All those who take refuge in Him are happy.”

—Psalm 2:1-12

Q “St. Paul...approved of capital punishment—he says ‘the magistrate bears the sword and

should bear the sword.’ It is recorded that the soldiers who came to St. John Baptist asking, ‘What shall we do?’ were not told to leave the army. When Our Lord Himself praised the Centurion He never hinted that the military profession was in itself sinful. This has been the general view of Christendom. Pacifism is a v. recent and local variation. We must of course respect and tolerate Pacifists, but I think their view erroneous.

—C.S. Lewis, Letters of C.S. Lewis, 1952

Q “A speaker had difficulty with the loudspeaker system. Finally the audio man handed him a note: ‘We’ve found what the trouble is. There’s a screw loose in the speaker.’ ”

Q “Lyndon B. Johnson said in a speech, ‘Al Smith was addressing a crowd when a heckler yelled, “tell ’em what’s on your mind, Al. It won’t take long.” Smith grinned, pointed to the man, and shouted, “Stand up, pardner, and I’ll tell ’em what’s on both our minds. It won’t take any longer.” ’ ”

Q “The late Yale professor and lecturer William Lyon Phelps once said he got credit for only one-fourth of his after-dinner speeches. ‘Every time I accept an invitation to speak, I really make four addresses. First is the speech I prepare in advance. That is pretty good. Second is the speech I really make. Third is the speech I make on the way home, which is the best of all; and fourth is the speech the newspapers the next morning say I made, which bears no relation to any of the others.’ ”

Q “Sometimes a restaurant special will be marked, ‘No substitutions.’ Now it is becoming evident that as far as our civilization is concerned, there is no substitute for the religious traditions on which it was based. Marxism? Surely not! Democracy? Weak, and our idea of democracy keeps changing. Affluence? Better than want, but does not fulfill our need for meaning in life. As Prof. Delsol discussed in *Icarus Fallen*, Europe has largely abandoned religion, i.e. Christianity, as a source of hope. The concept of Progress, coming from the Enlightenment of the 18th century, the ‘Century of Lights’ functioned as a substitute for a while, offering the prospect of a Utopia on earth, supposedly attainable by unaided human reason. This vision hardly survived the carnage of the First World War, except in North America. In Europe the end of the ‘war to end all wars’ produced, instead of peace and plenty, the monstrous totalitarian tyrannies of the Nazis and the Communists. The failure of both systems has taught us that centrally planned, ideologically motivated total social control is to be categorically rejected as the way to human happiness. Unfortunately, even though we would not think of voting for a totalitarian regime, it is possible for central control to sneak in and to expand by small, unthreatening steps until it reaches something like gentle totalitarianism.

“The late Italian philosopher Augusto Del Noce asks: ‘If we have no substitute for religion, can we still speak of society without a shared vision of the good? If there is no common

vision of the good, then the only standard by which we can judge a state is the degree to which it facilitates the fulfillment of our desires. A state whose only claim to our loyalty is the way it helps us fulfill our desires will not be able to keep that loyalty in hard times.”

—Harold O.J. Brown, *The Religion and Society Report*, June 2004

Q “As far as the future of our Western civilization is concerned, there is no substitute for the biblically based faith of the past, for Christianity and Judaism believed and taken seriously. To put our faith in democracy is an illusion. As a form of government, democracy is far preferable to tyranny, but it is not a religion, and if it is treated as a religion, it becomes idolatrous. Just as some traditional churches have slipped so far theologically and morally that it is hard to call them Christian, some democracies, including ours, have deviated so far from the traditions of the founders that they are no longer democratic, but something else: in our case, a kind of cross between bureaucracy and judicial autocracy. The attempt to salvage high ethical standards without the faith from which those standards were derived is futile. Several of the great thinkers of 19th-century philosophy sought to salvage the morals and ethics of Christianity while abandoning Christian doctrines. It worked for a while, but only for a while, perhaps because Christianity’s influence functioned as a kind of fossil fuel. By the 20th century it became evident that the altruism of which Fichte spoke was no substitute for the Second Great Commandment, ‘Love thy neighbor as thyself.’ Why should we, in the age of the computer and space travel, love our neighbors? The reason is simple, but to be effective, it needs to be believed: those words are not a government regulation, but were spoken with the authority of the God who made the heavens.”

—Harold O.J. Brown, *The Religion and Society Report*, June 2004

Q “A classic, according to the critic’s rule of thumb, is a work that is still read and still relevant after 50 years. By that standard, William Golding’s novel *The Lord of the Flies*, published in 1954, is now officially a classic.

“Most books and other works of art come into vogue because they tap some cultural current or satisfy some passing fashionable taste. Most old books, like most new books, are unreadable after their expiration date. But a work that retains its power after half a century or more has tapped into something universal in the human condition.

“*The Lord of the Flies* is about some schoolboys who find themselves marooned on a desert island. Their plane has crashed and all the adults have been killed. Before long, the children lose the civilized ways taught to them by their parents, teachers, and other authorities. They form their own tribal culture. They revert to a new paganism, worshipping a beast. They run wild. They turn against each other. They brutalize and destroy and kill.

“Golding wrote the novel at a time when the Romantics still hailed ‘the state of nature’ as a

utopia, spoiled by the repressions of ‘society.’ The Romantics idealized and idolized childhood, lamenting how ‘civilization’ corrupts a child’s innate goodness and how ‘society’ stamps out a child’s creativity. Such Romanticism still survives, as it did in Golding’s day, in popular child-raising techniques and educational theories.

“Golding’s vision, though, rang truer. Parents recognized that children, left to themselves, can be shockingly selfish, destructive, and cruel. They do have to be civilized. And civilization—with its disciplines, laws, and limits on the untrammelled passions—is a good thing. Human nature is not innately virtuous. Rather, human nature, at its root, is something monstrous. If left to itself, like those schoolboys on the island, human nature is capable of committing unspeakable horrors.

“Golding said that he believed in original sin. His novels are full of theological speculation and biblical symbolism. For example, the novel’s title refers to a biblical name for the devil, Beelzebub, the lord of the flies, whom the children in all of their apparent freedom are actually serving. And yet, Golding, who died in 1993, apparently never fully embraced Christianity. He could diagnose the problems, but he never found the solution, the grace of God that forgives and redeems that human nature through the work of Christ. Still, although *The Lord of the Flies* is fiction, its truths keep manifesting themselves in the real world.

“Give a man like Saddam Hussein unlimited power and let him operate without any restraints of law or morality, and what will he do? He will make extensive use of rape rooms, plastic shredders, and mass graves.

“Take away the Iraqis’ legal system, as oppressive as it was, and what was the result? Not freedom but—among many—looting, anarchy, and terrorism. Freedom evidently requires not just getting rid of social controls, but the cultivation of self-control, bolstered by the rule of law.

“Put some poorly trained U.S. soldiers in charge of prisoners perceived as deserving punishment, in the absence of supervision and military discipline, and what happens? The lust for power over others, the pleasures of cruelty, sexual perversity, and other dark impulses that reside deep in human nature come out to play.

“Or take children and maroon them in a school where adults have given up on discipline and have adopted the Romantic fallacies about not wanting to stifle children’s natural impulses. Notice how cruel these allegedly innocent children can be to each other, with their bullying and gossip and humiliations. Notice how the children quickly form cliques and wolf-pack-style hierarchies that are no different from the primitive tribalism in *The Lord of the Flies*.

“So what awaits our civilization as we abandon what theologians call ‘the first use of the Law,’ the necessity of objective morality to restrain at least the outward manifestations of sin,

so as to make society possible? What will be the effect of reconstructing marriage so that instead of channeling sexual desire into the formation of families, it legitimatizes our perversions? What will be the effect of erasing moral considerations from the public square and turning them into nothing more than private ‘choices’? How will we like living on an island governed only by power? Read *The Lord of the Flies* for a preview of coming attractions. But read it now, since such a critique of human nature might not be allowed in another 50 years.”

—Gene Edward Veith, *World magazine*, June 5, 2004, p. 27

Q “Under court order, Massachusetts began to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples. The first couple to be married in Provincetown says theirs is an open marriage. One of the partners, Jonathan Yarbrough, a bisexual, told the *Boston Herald* that a lifetime commitment is ‘overrated’ and that it is ‘possible to love more than one person and have more than one partner—not in the polygamist sense.’ No doubt many of the same-sex couples getting married intend to stay together, and faithful, for life. But there is a certain kind of sense to Yarbrough’s view. At the root of the older conception of marriage, now rejected by the Massachusetts courts as outmoded, was the biological joining together of two people: a joining that could in principle be achieved only by the combination of one man and one woman. For the Massachusetts courts, marriage is primarily an emotional commitment. It is mere sentimentality and prejudice that insist that such bonds can involve only two people. There is no principled reason to reject ‘open’ marriage, an idea that is hardly even comprehensible on the older view of things, nor any principled reason to aspire toward forever. The law is a teaching instrument, and some people are already learning the new lessons. If the Constitution is not amended to stop them, courts will continue to unravel the institution.”

—National Review, June 14, 2004, p. 6

Q “Marriage has been treated, in our society, as a sacrament, whereby two people consecrate their lives not just to each other but to the family that will spring from them. In no sense is marriage, so conceived, merely the rubberstamping of a sexual contract. It marks an existential transition, a move away from the concerns of one generation toward a concern for the next. It is not an act of gratification but an act of renunciation, the beneficiaries of which are not the spouses themselves, but their future children. Without marriage, as we are beginning to see, societies do not reproduce themselves. Hence to treat marriage as a human toy, that can be redesigned at will and for the pleasure of the merely living, is to jeopardize the rightful hopes of those unborn. Even if gay marriage does not involved perversion, therefore, to defend it is surely perverse.”

—Roger Scuton, *National Review*, June 14, 2004, p. 37



Q “Ben Shapiro attended the University of California at Los Angeles and came out dismayed by much of what he heard and saw. Professors there, he laments, routinely spouted liberal propaganda and rarely had their biases challenged. Conservative thinkers, on the contrary, Mr. Shapiro says, were generally shrugged off as not too bright.

“As a columnist for UCLA’s student paper The Daily Bruin, he was able to voice his outrage until, he claims, he was fired for his views.

“Now—having already graduated from UCLA at 20 - Shapiro has written *Brainwashed: How Universities Indoctrinate America’s Youth*, alerting the world to what Shapiro sees as the sorry state of U.S. higher education.

“Some early readers have already disparaged Shapiro’s book—published by a conservative watchdog group—as an angry rant. But the young author is clearly not alone in his views, and some suggest that the stir he is creating is indeed a sign that something is amiss in US academe.

“Freshly published—and without the support of a national advertising campaign—*Brainwashed* has already jumped to No. 28 on Amazon.com’s bestseller list.

“Of the about 50 reviews that quickly sprang up on the Amazon site, few were neutral in tone. Several were derogatory, complaining that the book contains ‘not a shred of fact’ and directing a cry of “shame on you” at its author. A few fellow UCLA students wrote that Shapiro’s comments did not tally with their experiences, and one commented that ‘The Lord of the Rings comes across as more realistic.’

“But more embraced Shapiro’s views, several saying their own college experiences were very similar—that their conservative views were discouraged rather than embraced by their unabashedly liberal college professors.

“Unfortunately, such claims are more than just rhetoric, says Greg Lukianoff, director of legal and public advocacy for the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education in Philadelphia. In his view, censorship of conservative views on college campuses is a growing problem that’s hard to ignore.

“ ‘I’m a liberal myself, but since taking this job I’ve been shocked,’ he says.

“Many U.S. colleges tend to be built on liberal values and are uncomfortable with students who don’t reflect those, he says. This has led many to adopt ‘speech codes’ that are intended to prevent discrimination but sometimes end up repressing legitimate forms of free speech.

“Mr. Lukianoff says he hears regular reports of campus newspapers airing conservative

viewpoints being destroyed before they can be read. Conservative speakers are sometimes silenced. At Ithaca College in New York, he says, when conservative students invited Bay Buchanan (sister of arch-conservative Pat) to speak, fellow students tried to have them arrested for harassment.

“Similar complaints led to the Academic Bill of Rights, which was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives and some state legislatures earlier this year. Conservative activist David Horowitz, who wrote the bill, said it was intended to protect conservative academics from discrimination on overwhelmingly liberal campuses.

“While widely considered unlikely to pass, the bill has garnered support from concerned conservatives such as Luann Wright, a San Diego educator who worried that her son’s college professors were promoting an overly liberal agenda. She established a website—[www.Noindoctrination.org](http://www.Noindoctrination.org)—asking college students to share accounts of liberal indoctrination. More than 100 have responded.

“Shapiro complains of similar discrimination at UCLA. He says his professors were moral relativists who shunned notions of good and evil and taught students to regard religious and patriotic values with suspicion.

“Of U.S. professors in general, Shapiro makes sweeping—and many would say absurd—charges that they promote atheism, absolute sexual freedom (including pedophilia and statutory rape, which are crimes), and rampant environmentalism to the point of urging the annihilation of the human species.

“However, the debate is not new, says Jonathan Knight, director of the program in academic freedom and tenure at the American Association of University Professors.

“‘Faculty are seen as more liberal than the general population,’ says Mr. Knight. ‘They have described themselves that way at least since the 1960s.’

“He points to William F. Buckley Jr.’s *God and Man at Yale*, first published in 1951, which covers similar ground.

“And, asks Knight, if overly liberal college professors and administrators have long indoctrinated students, ‘how do we explain then that (the U.S.) is the way that it is’ - fairly balanced between liberal and conservative views?

“One of the criticisms leveled against Shapiro is that despite disparaging elite and Ivy League schools in his book, he will attend one this fall — Harvard University Law School.

“That fact makes it hard, says Knight, to accept either Shapiro’s scorn for elite universities —

or for the UCLA education that helped him gain admission to America's most prestigious law school.”

—Majorie Kehe, Christian Science Monitor, May 25, 2004

Q “As graduation and the freedom of college advance rapidly, I have an additional accomplishment, in which to rejoice: I have successfully resisted the agenda of the liberal left. It is no coincidence that the overwhelming majority of educators are Democrats; Democrats so far to the left of left that it is difficult to determine their exact planet of origin.

“The academic elite is overtly attempting to subvert American democracy by brainwashing students and academic hopefuls alike. Except for the salvation of the occasional Milton Friedman, educators drown their pupils in oceans of deliberately manipulated, misrepresented, or otherwise blatantly concocted fairy-tales. They teach these myths as fact and demand their students ingest them as dogma. Independent schools are certainly not guiltless in this seditious conspiracy. I, however, developed a filter early in my education to separate fact from fiction, the real from the pretend, and the truths from the lies.

“From the Science department, I ‘learned’ that AIDS is spread by a lack of federal funding, although it is the most funded disease in the country. I ‘learned’ it is morally wrong to execute criminals convicted of a few specific and heinous crimes, but morally just to murder innocent infants. And I was taught it is ethically acceptable to grow members of our own species for the sole purposes of stealing their organs.

“From the History department, I ‘learned’ that the ACLU is wonderful because it upholds certain parts of the constitution, but the NRA is wicked and evil because it upholds certain parts of the constitution; that there was no clear victor in the Cold War, even though the United States emerged as the world's sole super power and the Soviet Union fell apart into independent democracies. I ‘learned’ that Herbert Hoover was indifferent and insensitive to the Depression, although his supply side economic programs were the only part of FDR's recovery agenda that were not struck down by the Supreme Court; and that even though Ronald Reagan was reelected by the second largest majority of any president in recorded American history, he was an unpopular and horrible public servant.

“From the Modern Language department, I ‘learned’ that Salvador Allende and Juan Peron perpetrated no human rights violations and the Catholic Church is the sole party responsible for the underdevelopment of Latin America.

“From the English department, I ‘learned’ that diversity is reading the same stories about minority oppression over and over.

“From the Classics department, I ‘learned’ that homosexuality is natural and should be

acceptable in modern culture because it was supposedly tolerable in Classical society, while classical political candidates were constantly attacked and scandalized for their wild, sexual lives.

“From the Religion Department, I ‘learned’ that the holocaust is the defining moment of Western civilization and that using the dating terms BC and AD in a Christian school is discriminatory.

“Because I grasped the true meaning behind these liberal fallacies and resisted the propaganda of the academic elite, I am moderately conservative. Yet, now I am dubbed ‘close-minded’ by certain members of the faculty because I have not gobbled up their fabrications, distortions, and obvious misrepresentations like some pin-headed nitwit or hungry teacher’s pet.”

—Aindriu Colgen, FrontPageMagazine.com, May 26, 2004

Q “Earlier this month, new reports revealed that the Labor Department has been engaged in an investigation into the political expenditures by the National Education Association (NEA), the nation’s largest union. The investigation began in April 2002, shortly after Landmark Legal Foundation filed its complaint, which documented that the NEA had spent tens of millions of dollars on political activity since 1994. The union, however, has failed to disclose any of those political expenditures in its annual LM-2 filing with the Labor Department.

“It has been impossible for the Labor Department and any of the NEA’s 2.7 million members to ‘determine from the NEA’s LM-2s for any years since at least 1994 that the union has allocated any resources for political purposes,’ Landmark has said.

“What makes such a situation unacceptable is the explicit acknowledgement by NEA General Counsel Robert Chanin that the NEA pursues a robust political agenda. Indeed, in a speech before the National Council of State Education Associations, Mr. Chanin bragged about the NEA’s ‘political power and effectiveness at all levels.’ He also asserted that the national union and its affiliates ‘have the ability to help implement the type of liberal social and economic agenda that [our opponents] find unacceptable.’

“Mr. Chanin’s chief adversary has been Landmark President Mark R. Levin, who has spent the last several years working to require greater accountability for the NEA. Yet, as Mr. Levin has declared on numerous occasions, Landmark isn’t at all concerned about the NEA exercising its political power—as long as it does so within the rules that govern tax-exempt organizations. While the NEA is entitled to spend members’ dues on political activity, it is required by federal law to pay taxes on those political expenditures. That might explain why the NEA has been so reluctant to reveal the cost of its extensive political activities, which are spearheaded by its 1,800 UniServ directors.

“Operating in virtually every congressional district, UniServ directors are required, according to union documents unearthed by Landmark, to engage in ‘developing and/or executing local association political action.’ The NEA spends more than \$75 million annually to fund UniServ activities. But it has refused since at least 1994 to acknowledge on its annual Form 990 tax returns that even a dollar of those expenditures have been politically related. After receiving extensively documented complaints from Landmark, the IRS last year launched an audit of the NEA’s finances.

“If the investigations bring about the transparency and accountability that have been lacking for decades throughout the union movement, they will have performed a great service, not only to the millions of dues-paying union members but to all taxpayers, who, it is hoped, will no longer be required to subsidize the political activities of Big Labor bosses.

—The Washington Times, March 31, 2004, p. A 22

Q “There is no evidence of religious tolerance anywhere in the world where Islamic Sharia law predominates. Sharia law is the most fundamental of the fundamentalist Islamic doctrines.

“The Institutes for Religion and Democracy (IRD) in Washington says Sharia law discriminates against women and Iraq’s small (estimated at 2 percent) Christian population. In a statement, IRD says if a Christian man converts to Islam, he could divorce his Christian wife and she might lose custody of her children, who would be officially decreed Muslim. Anyone converting to another faith from Islam is considered an apostate and, under some circumstances and interpretations of the Koran, could be executed.

“That a single ayatollah—Sayyid Ali Hussaini Sistani—could delay the signing of the document (and many of his followers still express reservations about the size and role of the Kurdish population in a future government) signals the interim constitution may have less cohesive power than American officials think.

“In his book, *Islam, Muhammad and the Koran*, Labib Mikhail, an Egyptian who moved to the United States in 1973, notes: ‘The Koran commands Muslims to fight non-Muslims until they exterminate all religions so that Islam will be the world’s only religion.’ In the Koran, Surat Al-Baqara 2:193 says: ‘And fight them until there is no more Firnah (disbelief and worshipping of others along with Allah) and (all and every kind of) worship is for Allah (alone). But if they cease, let there be no transgression except against As-Zatimun (the polytheists and wrongdoers).’ To a devout Muslim, a polytheist is a Christian who believes God is three persons in one.

“As with Vietnam, there is tremendous political pressure to put something in place in Iraq for which victory, or ‘peace with honor,’ can be claimed. America’s enemies know this, and so

they might agree to sign something they plan to renounce later for the purpose of getting the United States to withdraw its forces and make a takeover that much easier.

“Secular leaders who fail to understand and appreciate the religious component of those who would rule Iraq miss something of crucial importance. As Mr. Mikhail writes in his book: ‘freedom of religion was granted [throughout Arabia] to all religions before Islam. When Islam subdued all Arabia, freedom of religion was eliminated, and Islam became the only religion until this day.’

“No wonder the IRD is concerned. There should be similar concern and watchfulness by the Bush administration, lest the political doctrine of ‘peace with honor’—which was neither peace nor honor—be repeated.”

—Cal Thomas, *The Washington Times*, March 14, 2004, p. B1