

August 2004



The

JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

Now the righteousness of God apart from the law is revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, even the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe.

Romans 3:21,22

From The President's Desk

Q Before too much time elapses, I want to make sure we say something about President Ronald W. Reagan. However, I could not do better than allow Miss Ann Coulter to carry his water (anncoulter.com, June 16, 2004)—indeed, a lot better than I could do.

“I read The New York Times last week and apparently a fellow named ‘Iran-Contra’ died recently. But that’s all I’ll say about the people who have consistently been on the wrong side of history and whose publisher is a little weenie who can’t read because he has ‘dyslexia.’ The three key ingredients to Ronald Reagan’s sunny personality were: (1) his unalterable faith in God; (2) for nearly 30 years, he didn’t fly; and (3) he read Human Events religiously but never read The New York Times.

“Even in his death liberals are still trying to turn our champion into a moderate Republican—unlike the religious-right nut currently occupying the White House! The world’s living testament to the limits of genetics, Ron Jr., put it this way at Reagan’s funeral: ‘Dad was also a deeply, unabashedly religious man. But he never made the fatal mistake of so many politicians of wearing his faith on his sleeve to gain political advantage.’

“Wow. He’s probably up in heaven—something Ron Jr. doesn’t believe in—having a chuckle about that right now. To hear liberals tell it, you’d think Reagan talked about God the way Democrats do, in the stilted, uncomfortable manner of people pretending to believe

something they manifestly do not. (In a recent Time magazine poll, only 7 percent of respondents say they believe Kerry is a man of ‘strong’ religious faith, compared to 46 percent who believe Bush is.) Or, for that matter, the way Democrats talk about free-market capitalism.

“The chattering classes weren’t so copacetic about Reagan’s religious beliefs when he was in office. In 1984, Newsweek breathlessly reported that ‘Reagan is known to have read and discussed with fundamentalist friends like (Jerry) Falwell and singer Pat Boone such pulp versions of biblical prophecies as Hal Lindsey’s best-selling *The Late Great Planet Earth*, which strongly hints of a nuclear Armageddon.’ One hundred Christian and Jewish ‘leaders’ signed a letter warning that Reagan’s nuclear policy had been unduly influenced by a ‘theology of nuclear Armageddon.’ In the second presidential debate that year, President Reagan was actually asked to clarify his position on ‘nuclear Armageddon.’

“Most confusing to Democrats, at the time Reagan was doing all of this Bible-reading and consorting with preachers, he hadn’t even been accused of cheating on his wife. What kind of angle was he playing? liberals asked themselves.

“Meanwhile, President Bush says he appeals to ‘a higher father’ and liberals act like they’ve never heard such crazy talk from a president.

“Newsweek’s Eleanor Clift says Bush is unlike Reagan because Reagan “reached out, and he was always seeking converts.’ That’s true, actually. I think Reagan would have favored converting Third World people to Christianity. (Now why does that idea ring a bell?) Clift continued: “That is the big difference between Ronald Reagan and the president we have today. The president today would like to consign his political opponents to oblivion.’

“Here is how Reagan ‘reached out’ to Democrats:

“Reagan on abortion: ‘We cannot survive as a free nation when some men decide that others are not fit to live and should be abandoned to abortion or infanticide.’

“Reagan on gay rights: ‘Society has always regarded marital love as a sacred expression of the bond between a man and a woman. It is the means by which families are created and society itself is extended into the future. In the Judeo-Christian tradition it is the means by which husband and wife participate with God in the creation of a new human life. It is for these reasons, among others, that our society has always sought to protect this unique relationship. In part the erosion of these values has given way to a celebration of forms of expression most reject. We will resist the efforts of some to obtain government endorsement of homosexuality.’

“Reagan on government programs to feed the ‘hungry’: ‘We were told four years ago that 17

million people went to bed hungry each night. Well, that was probably true. They were all on a diet.’

“Would that more Republicans would ‘reach out’ to Democrats the way Reagan did!

“Most peculiar, the passing of America’s most pro-life president is supposed to be a clarion call for conservatives to support the disemboweling of human embryos—in contrast to that heartless brute President Bush always prattling on about the value of human life. Someone persuaded poor, dear Nancy Reagan that research on human embryos might have saved her Ronnie from Alzheimer’s. Now the rest of us are supposed to shut up because the wife of America’s greatest president (oh, save your breath, girls!) supports stem-cell research.

“Ironically, the always market-oriented Ronald Reagan would probably have asked his wife, ‘Honey, if embryonic stem cell therapy is such a treasure trove of medical advances, why isn’t private research and development funding flocking to it?’

“President Bush has never said that fetal stem cells cannot be used for research. He said ‘federal money’ cannot be used to fund such research. If leading scientists believed fetal stem-cell research would prove to be so fruitful in curing Alzheimer’s, why is the private money not pouring in hand over fist? Do you realize how many billions a cure for Alzheimer’s would be worth, let alone all the other cures some are claiming fetal stem-cell research would lead to? Forget Alzheimer’s—do you know how much middle-aged men would pay for a GENUINE baldness cure? Then again, Porsche sales would probably fall off quite a bit if we ever cured baldness.

“But you can’t blame Nancy. As everyone saw once again last week, she’s still madly in love with the guy. She’d probably support harvesting full-grown, living humans if it would bring back Ronnie. Of course, I thought it was cute and not creepy that she consulted an astrologer about Reagan’s schedule after he was shot. That didn’t make astrology a hard science. But liberals who once lambasted Nancy for having too much influence on Reagan’s schedule now want to anoint her Seer of Technology.

The lesson to draw from what liberals said about Reagan then and what they are forced to say about him now is that the electable Republican is always the one liberals are calling an extremist, Armageddon-believing religious zealot. That certainly bodes well for President George W. Bush this November, thank—you should pardon the expression—God.”

Q For we have previously charged both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin. As it is written: ‘there is none righteous, no, not one; there is none who understands; there is none who seeks after God. They have all turned aside: they have together become unprofitable; there is none who does good, no, not one. Their throat is an open tomb; with their tongues they have practiced deceit, the poison of asps is under their lips, whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known. There is not fear of God before their eyes.’

“Now we know that whatsoever the law says, it says to those who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

“But now the righteousness of God apart from the law is revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, even the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe. For there is no difference; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth as a propitiation by His blood, through faith, to demonstrate His righteousness, because in His forbearance God had passed over the sins that were previously committed, to demonstrate at the present time His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus.

“Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from the deeds of the law. Or is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also the God of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also, since there is one God who will justify the circumcised by faith and the uncircumcised through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? Certainly not! On the contrary, we establish the law.”

—Romans 3:9-31

Q Langston Hughes, if he is to emerge as the poet of the Democratic party, will have to be bowdlerized. ‘Let America be America again’ is a line from one poem Hughes wrote, and its vagueness is useful. But Hughes was not vague. And as for [George Washington] Carver’s celebration of Christianity, Hughes was, well, skeptical, as in the poem ‘Goodbye Christ’ (1932):

Listen, Christ,

You did alright in your day,

I reckon—

But that day's gone now.

They ghosted you up a swell

story, too,

Called it Bible—

But it's dead now.

“That exegesis of Langston Hughes would puzzle Democratic delegates in Boston in July, vibrant with life and mission. And it wasn't just that Hughes had had a one-night stand with skepticism. No, Hughes had a very specific view about history and on the question of which historical road America should travel:

Goodbye,

Christ Jesus Lord God Jehovah,

Beat it on away from here now.

Make way for a new guy with no

religion at all—

A real guy named

Marx Communist Lenin Peasant

Stalin Worker ME.

“Langston Hughes was asking America to ‘be America again,’ meaning, not an America that history had known and chronicled, but an America realizable in a new and different vision. The land of Marx and Lenin and Stalin.”

—William F. Buckley, *National Review*, June 28, 2004, p. 54, 55

Q Immortal, invisible, God only wise,

In light inaccessible his from our eyes,

Most blessed, most glorious, the Ancient of Days,
Almighty, victorious, Thy great name we praise.
Unresting, unhasting, and silent as light,
Nor wanting, nor wasting, Thou rulest in might;
Thy justice, like mountains, high soaring above
Thy clouds, which are fountains of goodness and love.
Great Father of glory, pure Father of light,
Thine angels adore Thee, all veiling their sight;
But of all Thy rich graces this grace, Lord, impart;
Take the veil from our faces, the vile from our heart.
All laud we would render: O help us to see
'Tis only the splendor of light hideth Thee,
And so let Thy glory, almighty, impart,
Through Christ in His story, thy Christ to the heart.”

q “Keep clear of psychiatrists unless you know that they are also Christians. Otherwise they start with the assumption that your religion is an illusion and try to ‘cure’ it: and this assumption they make not as professional psychologists but as amateur philosophers.”

—C.S. Lewis, Letters (1947)

Q The culture of rock music is coercive and brooks no competitors. It is as if it instinctively understood that subtler, more reflective traditions are a reproach to it—and in this it is quite right. The son of a friend of mine, who attends one of Britain’s most exclusive boarding schools and plays the cello, says that he is frightened to take his favorite CDs to school for fear of revealing himself to be a devotee of Bach. The pressure in less elevated social circles to conform to a taste for the supposedly rebellious genre of rock music can only be imagined.

“Lest I be accused of mere snobbery, I should add that my target is not popular music in all its manifestations, just because it is popular. One way and another I get to hear quite a lot of Indian popular music, which clearly does not have the brutalizing effect (or intent) of so much of its Anglo-American equivalent. The same is true of African and Latin American popular music, which is vastly superior to, and more civilized than, ours.

“Although I am in favor of people’s right to smoke, and feel that there should be places and establishments in which they are perfectly free to do so in public, I do not believe that they have a right to pollute the air with their smoke that I have no choice but to breathe, and this would be so even if 99 percent of people smoked. Similarly, I believe that I have a right to a rock-music-free environment, even if 99 percent of people—which heaven forbid—like it and wish never to be without it, the better to suppress their cerebration. It is time to free ourselves from the tyranny of rock music.”

—Theodore Dalrymple, *National Review*, June 28, 2004, p. 51

Q First, it is important to understand that on the whole Hitler’s view of ethics and morality was by no means conservative or reactionary, despite the fact that some of his specific positions were. For example, some scholar focusing on Hitler’s rejection of feminism and abortion have branded Hitler’s ideology as reactionary. However, as Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Wippermann have shown in *The Racial State: Germany, 1933-1945*, Nazi ideology cannot be pigeon-holed so easily, because Hitler opposed feminism and abortion on totally different grounds than did traditional conservatives. He believed that feminism and abortion were biologically deleterious and thus antiscientific (and he only opposed abortion for ‘Aryans’). Though some of his policies lined up with conservatism, Hitler saw himself as a revolutionary who would bring advancement and progress to Germany and the world. Burleigh is right to argue that Nazism was ‘a dystopian attempt to fabricate “new” men and women by erasing or transforming their “inherited” ethical values in favor of others derived from a modernized and scientized version of pre-Judeo-Christian conduct. In other words, it was a case of ancient or primitive civilizations put through the refracting mirrors of Darwin and Nietzsche.’

“Hitler’s view of ethics can probably be summed up in the following quotation: ‘The ethical ideal demands of us, that we place our entire life in its service; and the racial ideal is such that we really can live according to it. With every deed and with every inaction, we have to ask ourselves: does it benefit our race? And then make our decision accordingly.’ Neither Hitler nor any of his entourage penned this. Rather a leading Darwinian biologist, the geneticist Fritz Lenz, who in 1923 became professor of eugenics at the University of Munich, made this assertion in his 1917 article, ‘Race as a Principle of Value: Toward Renovating Ethics.’ In 1933, Lenz boasted that this article ‘contained all the basic characteristics of the National Socialist world view.’”

—Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 6, 7

Q I've notice all those in favor of abortion are already born."

—Ronald W. Reagan

Q All pro-abortionists would become pro-life immediately if they found themselves back in the womb."

—Norman L. Geisler, Frank Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, p. 186

Q We give evidence for Christianity because we ought to live our lives based on truth. Socrates once said that the unexamined life is not worth living. We believe that the unexamined faith is not worth believing. Furthermore, contrary to popular opinion, Christians are not supposed to 'just have faith.' Christians are commanded to know what they believe and why they believe it. They are commanded to give answers to those who ask (I Peter 3:15), and to demolish arguments against the Christian faith (II Cor. 10:4-5). Since God is reasonable (Isa. 1:18) and wants us to use our reason, Christians don't get brownie points for being stupid. In fact, using reason is part of the greatest commandment which, according to Jesus, is to 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind' (Matt. 22:37)."

—Norman L. Geisler, Frank Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, p. 29

Q The history of most fossil species includes two features particularly inconsistent with gradualism: 1). Stasis. Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they disappear. Morphological change is usually limited and directionless. 2). Sudden Appearance. In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and 'fully formed.' "

—Stephen Jay Gould

Q In other words, Gould is admitting that fossil types appear suddenly, fully formed, and remain the same until extinction without any directional change—exactly what one would expect to find if creation were true."

—Norman L. Geisler, Frank Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, p. 152

Q This Moral Law is our third argument for the existence of a theistic God (after the Cosmological and Teleological Arguments). It goes like this:

1. Every law has a law giver.
2. There is a Moral Law.
3. Therefore, there is a Moral Law Giver.

“If the first and second premises are true, then the conclusion necessarily follows. Of course, every law has a law giver. There can be no legislation unless there’s a legislature. Moreover, if there are moral obligations, there must be someone to be obligated to.

“But is it really true that there is a Moral Law? Our Founding Fathers thought so. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, ‘Nature’s Law’ is ‘self-evident.’ You don’t use reason to discover it, you just know it. Perhaps that’s why my friend Dave hit a roadblock in his thinking. He knew ‘helping people’ was the right thing to do, but he couldn’t explain why without appealing to a standard outside himself. Without an objective standard of meaning and morality, then life is meaningless and there’s nothing absolutely right or wrong. Everything is merely a matter of opinion.

“When we say the Moral Law exists, we mean that all people are impressed with a fundamental sense of right and wrong. Everyone knows, for example, that love is superior to hate and that courage is better than cowardice. University of Texas at Austin professor J. Budziszewski writes, ‘Everyone knows certain principles. There is no land where murder is virtue and gratitude vice,’ C.S. Lewis, who has written profoundly on this topic in his classic work *Mere Christianity*, put it this way: ‘Think of a country where people were admired for running away in battle, or where a man felt proud of double-crossing all the people who had been kindest to him. You might just as well try to imagine a country where two and two made five.’

“In other words, everyone knows there are absolute moral obligations. An absolute moral obligation is something that is binding on all people, at all times, in all places. And an absolute Moral Law implies an absolute Moral Law Giver.”

—Norman L. Geisler, Frank Turek, *I Don’t Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, p. 171

Q Atheists have no real basis for objective right and wrong. This does not mean that atheists are not moral or don’t understand right from wrong. On the contrary, atheists can and do understand right from wrong because the Moral Law is written on their hearts just as on every other heart. But while they may believe in an objective right and wrong, they have no way to justify such a belief (unless they admit a Moral Law Giver, at which point they cease being atheists).

“In the end, atheism cannot justify why anything is morally right or wrong. It cannot

guarantee human rights or ultimate justice in the universe. To be an atheist—a consistent atheist—you have to believe that there is nothing really wrong with murder, rape, genocide, torture, or any other heinous act. By faith, you have to believe there is no moral difference between a murderer and a missionary, a teacher and a terrorist, or Mother Teresa and Hitler. Or, by faith, you have to believe that real moral principles arose from nothing. Since such beliefs are clearly unreasonable, we don't have enough faith to be atheists.”

—Norman L. Geisler, Frank Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, p. 193

Q Even if the Saudi royal family's latest pledge to cut off direct terror financing is genuine—a huge if, to be sure—one of the major revelations of the 9/11 commission's recent interim report demonstrates (albeit indirectly) that it won't make much difference.

“Why? Because the 9/11 commission's best estimate of the plot's cost is \$500,000 to \$600,000, reaffirming something we've long known: Terrorist acts are cheap.

“What the House of Saud will never stop funding, though, is the environment that produces fertile fields for terrorist recruiters: the religious schools, mosques and radical Islamic organizations that collectively constitute the infrastructure of terror. Quite simply, it can't. So it won't, not now, not ever.

“Given that Saudi Arabia is home to the two holiest cities in Islam, Mecca and Medina, any government must have religious sanction to justify its existence. Twenty-five years ago, that almost came crumbling down. After the government lost control of Mecca's Grand Mosque in 1979, it struck a Faustian deal to win the support of radical Wahhabi clerics within its borders by becoming their sugar daddies in exchange for them legitimizing the regime.

“Which bring us to today. Many Saudi apologists have recently offered the following rationalization: The Saudis have to be taken at their word because how could they continue to fund those who seek to destroy them? Easily: They have no choice.

“It is entirely possible that the Saudis have been spurred to some degree of substantive action in fighting al-Qaida and even in blocking direct terror financing.

“But what they cannot and will not do is reduce funding to madrasses (religious schools), mosques and radical Islamic organizations such as World Assembly of Muslim Youth and the International Islamic Relief Organization that glorify jihad and 'martyrdom.'

“The indoctrination factory starts with small children, poisoning their minds even before they can read, radicalizes them further at Wahhabi mosques that foment both anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism, and give their rage purpose with calls from groups such as those just mentioned to take up arms in the name of Islam.

“For proof, consider the recent survey of 15,000 Saudis that showed nearly half support bin Laden’s ‘sermons and rhetoric.’ Various Arab and Muslim commentators have attempted to spin this finding as almost inconsequential; after all, they reason, ‘it’s not as if they support his actions.’ When it comes to bin Laden, however, supporting his ‘sermons’ is to support his actions. Actions are all he advocates: death to Jews, death to Israel, death to the West and death to the United States.

“Bin Laden finds such a receptive audience among Saudis because they have been primed for it from their earliest educational experience. And because of the pervasive influence of Saudi petrodollars, this is happening not just in the kingdom but around the world. Look at Palestinian children who are readied for death almost as soon as they are born. Suicide bombs that the terror masters strap on these kids cost maybe \$150.

“Throw in lump cash sums Saudis give to families of suicide bombers, and Saudi support for Palestinian terrorism, not even counting direct aid to terror groups, is literally cradle-to-grave.

“Understanding that direct support is but a small piece of the terror financing puzzle. Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, recently spearheaded a request, also signed by five of her colleagues, to the General Accounting Office to investigate the U.S. government’s progress in tracking, and halting, the funding of the infrastructure of terror.

“What the GAO must do, though, is look inside the United States. Saudi cash has flooded northern Virginia, Los Angeles and everywhere in between. Who knows what the GAO might find. Most frightening could be discovering just how many American Muslims feel as the Saudis do about bin Laden’s ‘sermons and rhetoric.’”

—Joel Mowbray, joel@nationalreview.com, 2004

Q With college commencement season in full swing, leftist propagandists are making the rounds of our nation’s universities—as they do all year ’round. ...

“ ‘Care to hear Noam Chomsky skewer America’s soulless, capitalist wealth and privilege? It will set you back \$12,000...And Chomsky’s leftist academics-in-arms have similarly immodest asking prices. Take Princeton’s resident race baiter, Cornel West. With an official per-lecture fee of \$15,000 plus first-class traveling expenses, West ranks among the priciest academics. Recently, he spoke at Denver University for \$35,000. For one hour....

“ ‘Few may be shocked to learn that Michael Moore’s speaking fee, like Moore himself is, well, hefty. The left-wing filmmaker asks \$15,000 to \$20,000 per speech. Similarly, the fact that “comedian” Al Franken doesn’t joke around about his \$25,000 fee is unlikely to raise many eyebrows. ...

“ ‘Radio lefty Nina Totenberg’s NPR salary doesn’t prevent her from charging \$15,000 a pop to lecture the kiddies.’

—Jacob Laksin, “Gucci Radicals”, FrontPage Magazine.com

Q People of both political parties and many persuasions have been talking for decades about education reform.

“Now comes what could be the most radical and most successful education reform proposal ever made. The Southern Baptist Convention—the nation’s largest Protestant denomination with about 17 million members—is meeting this week in Indianapolis, and among the resolutions it is considering is one calling upon parents to withdraw their children from public schools and either educate them at home, or enroll them in private Christian academies.

“The rationale is contained in the text of the resolution authored by Houston attorney Bruce Shortt and retired Brig. Gen. T.C. Pinckney: ‘Whereas, the Bible commands that fathers are to bring up their children in the training and admonition of the Lord (Ephesians 6:4)...(and) Whereas, the government schools are by their own confession humanistic and secular in their instruction, the education offered by the government schools is officially Godless, and Whereas, the government schools are adopting curricula and policies teaching that the homosexual lifestyle is acceptable—and homosexual organizations are present as student “clubs” in thousands of government schools and are spreading rapidly...’ well, you get the idea.

“In an essay published last week at ethicsdaily.com, Shortt wrote, ‘Government schools are converting our children to alien creeds and infusing them with false and destructive values.’ And it has been the decision by too many parents to allow government to shape their children’s worldview and values that is responsible for spiritual and intellectual disorder that now inhabits the souls and minds of too many offspring of Christian parents.

“The private and home school movements remain relatively small compared to the number of students in government schools. According to the latest U.S. Census Bureau figures (2003), there are 73.2 million children in school with 10 percent of them in private elementary or high schools. The number of children educated at home is estimated by home-school advocates and the Census Bureau at approximately 2 million.

“Most school choice advocates believe the poor would be the first to head for the exit should vouchers be approved for the parents of government school children. Numerous surveys have shown that lack of money is the only reason most poor children remain trapped in government schools and that if money were no longer a concern, poor parents would place their children in private schools. Liberal Democrats, who claim to be advocates for the poor, have failed them on this issue because they like getting contributions from the National

Education Association. While such contributions help keep them in office, poor children continue to starve intellectually and morally.

“By passing the resolution, the SBC could inject new energy into this slowly growing trend toward nongovernment education and convert it into a powerful example with momentum. If large numbers of Southern Baptist and other Christian parents begin exiting government schools, the education monopoly will be forced to consider returning to real education standards. Like a business that is required to compete, government schools will either reclaim a once proud heritage, or go out of business; either way, the children will benefit.

“Conservatives have worried more about changing decadent culture than in changing themselves and their own children. Millions of school children reared with morals, values, ethics and faith that are endangered in the government schools would do more to enrich and advance culture than all of the political movements combined.

“So, Southern Baptists, show the way and perhaps many will follow. Stop waiting for the world’s permission to fully exercise your faith and beliefs (which will never come) and start training up your children in the ways your God wants them to go. That can’t be done in government schools, but it can in yours or in your homes.

“It’s time to give the word ‘exodus’ a new meaning.”

—Cal Thomas, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, June 16, 2004, p. M6

Q With all the noise being made you might never suspect that there was a National Day of Silence. What you might also not suspect is that this day is observed in schools and colleges across the country, where students agree to remain silent for a day in order to show support for homosexuals.

“The idea is that people who are sexually different have been silenced by society and that the students who observe the National Day of Silence are showing that they are on the side of the gays, lesbians, etc. The schools themselves promote and cooperate with this exercise, allowing students to hand cards to their teachers when they do not respond to questions asked in class.

“Theoretically, this is a protest against the silencing of people because of their sexual orientation. But only theoretically is this about free speech.

“A sophomore at a San Diego high school discovered the hard way just how theoretical the concern about free speech is. He did not agree with the view of homosexuality being promoted by his school and wore a T-shirt that said so—silently. Yet he was suspended.

“The front of his T-shirt said: ‘I will not accept what God has condemned’ and the back said: ‘Homosexuality is shameful.’

“On what grounds was he suspended? The school’s speech code bans statements that promote ‘hate’ or ‘violence.’

“Such speech codes are nothing more and nothing less than thought control by those who want no competition against the indoctrination that they are promoting under the guise of education.

“The particular issue at any given time might be race, sex, or any number of other subjects on which there is a politically correct line—from which dissent will not be tolerated. Disagreements about policies like affirmative action or gay marriage can be redefined as showing hatred for minorities, gays, or women.

“Here and there the courts have shot down some of these vaguely worded speech codes but that may just force some rewriting of the language. The real power remains with campus kangaroo courts that loosely define racism, homophobia or whatever other buzzwords can be used to justify the punishment of students who step out of line ideologically.

“Meanwhile, members of any minority group can shout any insult or obscenity they want against whites and these speech codes will do nothing. Radical feminists can accuse any given man, or men in general, of anything under the sun and nothing will be done, even if the charges are proved false. Homosexuals can shout louder than ever that they are being silenced and nothing will be done.

“The ostensible basis for these speech codes is as phony as the loose and biased standards applied. What problems were these speech codes supposed to be solving? Who was suffering what?

“Since I was a black student at predominantly white high schools and predominantly white universities before these speech codes came in, you might think that I would have encountered the perils from which speech codes are supposed to protect minorities. But I neither saw nor experienced those terrible dangers. Nor have I seen minorities or women so fragile that a disagreement over policy issues would crush their spirits and impair their learning.

“Speech codes are meant to silence any criticism of the brainwashing and double standards that schools and colleges have increasingly practiced. That is what it is all about.

“The student suspended in San Diego was criticizing the brainwashing. That was what he was suspended for.

“Most parents have no idea how widespread and dogmatic are the programs to change their children’s values from those taught in the home to those considered chic in politically correct circles. That is what must be stopped, even more than the speech codes.

“Conservatives are sadly mistaken when they try to get schools to teach abstinence when many students can’t even spell abstinence. Schools must teach academic skills, not indoctrinate.”

—Thomas Sowell, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, June 19, 2004, p. M6

Q Only a few years ago, two prominent demographers hailed the Dutch family as a model for Europe. Somehow the Dutch had managed to combine liberal family law and a robust welfare state with a surprisingly traditional attitude toward marriage. Even as a new pattern of highly unstable parental cohabitation was sweeping out of Scandinavia and across northern Europe, the Dutch were unswayed. To be sure, premarital cohabitation was widespread, but when Dutch couples decided to have children, they got married. At least they used to.

“Today, marriage is in trouble in the Netherlands. In the mid-1990s, out-of-wedlock births, already rising, began a steeper increase, nearly doubling to 31 percent of births in 2003. These were the very years when the debate over the legal recognition of gay relationships came to the fore in the Netherlands, culminating in the legalization of full same-sex marriage in 2000. The conjunction is no coincidence.

“A careful look at the decade-long campaign for same-sex marriage in the Netherlands shows that one of its principal themes was the effort to dislodge the conviction that parenthood and marriage are intrinsically linked. Even as proponents of gay marriage argued vigorously—and ultimately successfully—that marriage should be just one of many relationship options, few Dutch parents were choosing marriage over cohabitation. No longer a marked exception on the European scene, the Dutch are now traveling down the Scandinavian path.

“Call it the end of the Dutch paradox, the distinctive combination of liberal social policies and traditional behavior. On euthanasia, prostitution, drug use, and now gay marriage, Dutch law is the cutting edge of Western liberalism. Yet among Dutch people, drug use and sexual license are far from rampant. Many have asked whether this balance of tolerance and tradition with its deep roots in Dutch culture and history, is sustainable over the long term. At least for marriage, the answer appears to be no.”

—Stanley Kurtz, *The Weekly Standard*, May 31, 2004, p. 26

Q No Western society has secularized more radically or rapidly than Holland. The cultural revolution of the 1960s weakened the churches. Once faith became too fragile to sustain the

social order, the pillars collapsed. The Netherlands changed from one of the most religious countries in Europe to one of the most secular. Today, nearly three-quarters of the Dutch under 35 claim no religious affiliation. The very speed of the collapse virtually guaranteed that some traditional patterns of behavior would linger at first. Sooner or later, though, would Dutch society fray, as one social experiment after another drew down the cultural capital of the past?"

—Stanley Kurtz, *The Weekly Standard*, May 31, 2004, p. 26