



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 45, Number 2

February 2005

## Our 51st Year!

### Inside



#### The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade please check out our website at [www.schwarzreport.org](http://www.schwarzreport.org). This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.



Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman with the assistance of Dr. Ronald H. Nash. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given.



And do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them. Ephesians 5:11

## Communism Is With Us, Party Is Not

by David A. Noebel and Chuck Edwards

“The [current campus culture] war is fundamentally over what kinds of knowledge universities should encourage their students to acquire...”<sup>1</sup>

—Phillip Johnson

“Gay marriage is not some sideline issue; it is the marriage debate. Losing it means losing marriage as a social institution, a shared public norm.”<sup>2</sup>

—Maggie Gallagher

“The Texas sodomy case makes it clear that conservatives are losing the culture war.”<sup>3</sup>

—Armstrong Williams

In the 1979 film version of *Les Miserables*, Police Inspector Javert says to Jean Valjean, “There is no God. There is only the law. Guilt and innocence do not exist outside the law.”

Javert’s comment agrees with postmodern beliefs: laws derive from the mind of man, not God. Similar to how the postmodernist understands the concept of “truth,” law is perceived as a social construct used by those in power to force others to do their will. Yet, Nietzsche and Foucault, pointed out that without God, there is no law. Given these two contemporary notions, if the screenplay of *Les Miserables* was rewritten for a postmodern audience, Inspector Javert would more likely say something such as this: “There is no law. There is only power. Guilt and innocence do not exist except in the power structure of society.”

It is interesting to note that today we find many postmodern “Javerts” in our midst. One example is Susan Estrich, Professor of Law and Political Science at the University of Southern California Law School and a syndicated columnist who has worked with many liberal politicians and appeared on numerous television talk shows. Estrich was asked once why she supported Anita Hill when Hill charged Clarence Thomas (during his confirmation hearings for the Supreme Court) with sexual harassment but opposed Paula Jones’ sexual harassment allegations against President Clinton. Ms. Estrich replied simply, “You believe in principle; I believe in politics.”

Ms. Estrich takes her cue from the playbook of Marx, Nietzsche and Foucault, implying that law is simply a tool of political power. Marx said, “Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another.”<sup>4</sup> Estrich intimates that she will use the law in any way necessary to get what she wants. Thus, the law is no longer a God-ordained, objective standard by which to judge men’s actions

“Dwell on the past and you’ll lose an eye; forget the past and you’ll lose both eyes.” Old Russian Proverb

and maintain an ordered society, but a weapon to beat political opponents into submission to your way of thinking.

The politics of power makes sense from the perspective of a Postmodern Marxist worldview. Starting with theological atheism and philosophical naturalism, the Postmodernist must rely on Darwinian evolution—“survival of the fittest.” With blind evolutionary forces at work, man becomes simply a product of his environment, and ethics become a matter of social preferences that have benefited our survivability as a species. In light of this postmodern “creation” story, law is what men decide, and politics becomes the vehicle that the powerful use to get their way. In a postmodern world, the survival of the fittest equals the survival of those in power. As Marx put it, “The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.”<sup>5</sup>

### Unbridled Political Power

Where does the politics of power take us? We only have to look back over the past century for the answer. R. J. Rummel studied extensively the archives of the former Soviet Union, as well as documents from other pertinent sources, to uncover the death and destruction brought about when governments institute a Marxist brand of power politics as the basis for law and no longer appeal to God as the Supreme Judge. In his landmark 20<sup>th</sup> Century book, *Death By Government*, Rummel reveals the following:

In total, during the first eighty-eight years of this century, almost 170 million men, women, and children have been shot, beaten, tortured, knifed, burned, starved, frozen, crushed, or worked to death; buried alive, drowned, hung, bombed, or killed in any other of the myriad ways governments have inflicted death on unarmed, helpless citizens and foreigners. The dead could conceivably be nearly 360 million people. It is as though our species has been devastated by a modern Black Plague. And indeed it has, but a plague of Power, not germs.<sup>6</sup>

The “Plague of Power” Rummel refers to is Marxism, specifically the Communist stranglehold on the former Soviet Union, China, North Korea, Cambodia, and other Communist nations around the world. Here in America, we are moving in the direction of Marx’s vision for society, except, unlike the sudden political upheaval that engulfed Russia and China and the wholesale slaughter it brought, socialism is coming to us on the installment plan, or as Lenin called it, according to the “salami tactic”—one slice at a time.<sup>7</sup> Conservative columnist and author Ann Coulter also describes the situation: “While undermining victory in the Cold War, [American] liberals dedicated themselves to mainstreaming communist ideals at home.”<sup>8</sup>

Many Americans do not realize the shift in worldview that has taken place over the past half-century. Because this

change has been gradual, the Marxist worldview is mostly hidden, and much of this is by design. “Practically no one is a ‘communist’ today,” writes Balint Vazsonyi, “What happened?”<sup>9</sup> Vazsonyi is a Hungarian-born concert pianist and historian who lived under the iron hand of communism as a child, immigrated to America and was granted American citizenship in 1964. Vazsonyi answers his own question:

Fundamental attitudes don’t disappear into thin air. People might die, but ideas rarely do, especially when the idea is one of only two major strains of political thought that excite the people, dominate the minds, and determine the affairs of man for centuries. . . . It must count among the most amazing spectacles of history to be inundated with the rhetoric, theory, and practice of communism, and see not one communist around. We read and hear daily about class warfare, redistribution of wealth, the ‘dispossessed’ masses, the disadvantaged, universal health care, speech codes, sensitivity training, restrictions on parents’ rights, school-to-work—the list goes on and on. The agenda is with us; the Party is not.<sup>10</sup>

Vazsonyi points out that, despite denials, the “salami tactic” has introduced the *practice* of communism in the form of multiculturalism and feminism as well as even more potent changes in our political landscape such as the adoption of political correctness and identity politics. We will examine these topics more closely here.

### Political Correctness: Revising What Children Learn

Political correctness circumscribes the moral code for the politics of power. The PC crowd recognizes right and wrong, but instead of basing ethics on moral absolutes established by God, their standard for what is right revolves around their political objectives, hence the term *political* correctness. “The PC promoters may seem to have numerous goals,” writes Alvin J. Schmidt in *The Menace of Multiculturalism*, “but in reality they amount to only two: (1) to impose multiculturalist values that relativize all knowledge and standards of truth, except their own; and (2) to dismantle the Euro-American culture.”<sup>11</sup> How does one go about dismantling a culture? In George Orwell’s telling novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, a totalitarian government reshapes society by exercising complete power over the lives of its citizens. In the 1984 society of Oceania, it is a “thoughtcrime” to think for oneself. One of the tactics used by “Big Brother” to manage people’s thoughts is to rewrite history and control education, making sure all knowledge is filtered through government handlers.

An ominously similar trend is happening here in America—textbook writers and publishers are rewriting what students learn to suit politically correct sensibilities. This is

called “revisionism.” History is only one of a number of areas under revision. Diane Ravitch is a historian of education, a research professor at New York University, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, where she holds the Brown Chair in Education Policy, and author of *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn*. In an article titled “Education after the Culture Wars,” she presents her evaluation of national language arts tests for fourth grade students. She comments, “what I learned in this setting suggests that the problems within American education run deep, and that these problems have grave implications, not just for America’s primary schools, but also for its colleges and universities—and, indeed, for the future of our common culture.”<sup>12</sup> She discovered how reading samples used in these tests had been revised, leaving out ideas and images that might be “offensive” to certain groups of people. Ravitch notes, “In an essay on a giant sequoia tree, for example, the editors deleted a phrase that compared the sequoia’s shape to that of a Christmas tree because the analogy was considered religious and might be offensive to non-Christians. Another phrase in the same essay was dropped as sexist because it described a branch of the sequoia tree as so wide that a seven-foot man could stretch across it without being able to extend either his fingers or his toes over the edge.”<sup>13</sup>

Ms. Ravitch then spoke with the publisher of these tests. “When I asked why so few reading passages were drawn from classic children’s literature, the publisher explained that it was a well-accepted principle in educational publishing that everything written before 1970 was rife with racism and sexism. Only stories written after that date, he said, were likely to have acceptable language and appropriate multicultural sensitivity.”<sup>14</sup> She also discovered that every publisher of school textbooks has a list of guidelines to insure their texts and tests are screened for representational fairness, language usage, stereotyping, and controversial subject matter. “The language used in the tests was also carefully scrutinized for signs of bias,” says Ravitch. “Almost any use of the word ‘man,’ whether by itself, in a suffix (as in ‘salesman’ or ‘workman’), or in a colloquial phrase (‘the man in the street’ or ‘mankind’), is treated as an unacceptable form of gender bias.”<sup>15</sup> Here we see the feminist objective of equalizing the sexes rooted tangibly in educational practices. The classrooms of America have become politicized through the game of “power politics.”

Writing on the same topic, columnist John Leo exposes other samples of how today’s textbooks seek to eliminate any sense of bias:

Which of the following stories would be too biased for schools to allow on tests?

(1) Overcoming daunting obstacles, a blind man

climbs Mount McKinley;

(2) Dinosaurs roam the Earth in prehistoric times;

(3) An Asian-American girl, whose mother is a professor, plays checkers with her grandfather and brings him pizza.

As you probably guessed, all three stories are deeply biased. (1) Emphasis on a “daunting” climb implies that blindness is some sort of disability, when it should be viewed as just another personal attribute, like hair color. Besides, mountain-climbing stories are examples of “regional bias,” unfair to readers who live in deserts, cities and rural areas. (2) Dinosaurs are a no-no—they imply acceptance of evolutionary theory. (3) Making the girl’s mother a professor perpetuates the “model minority” myth that stereotypes Asian-Americans. Older people must not be shown playing checkers. They should be up on the roof fixing shingles or doing something vigorous. And pizza is a junk food. Kids may eat it—but not in a school story.<sup>16</sup>

### Speech Codes

Revising textbooks is only half the story. In order to establish a learning environment free from harassment and intimidation (as defined by PC supporters), universities have installed “speech codes” to punish any student or faculty member who does not abide by the new ethics of equality for “disadvantaged” groups based on their sex, race, sexual orientation, or disability. Speech codes prohibit anything that intentionally produces “psychological... discomfort, embarrassment, or ridicule,”<sup>17</sup> and includes such actions as telling jokes or even laughing at the wrong kinds of expressions. These campus policies are written in very broad, vague terms, relegating circumstances to a subjective exercise to determine whether or not the code has been violated.

While we agree students should be courteous in their remarks to one another, the significant point is that speech codes are not administered evenly. For example, it is *not* a breach of policy to call a white person a “honky” or “white fascist pig.” On the other hand, for saying anything that might be offensive to women, people of color, or homosexuals, a student can be brought before the administrative tribunal, required to attend sensitivity classes and write public apologies, or face being suspended from college. In several cases, conservative campus newspapers that have published satirical editorials or cartoons directed at protected groups have been censored by college officials, copies of the offending newspapers confiscated, and the aberrant editor banished from the paper’s staff.

The reason given for the differing standards is that cer-

tain groups, according to Marxist orthodoxy, historically have been oppressed. To level the playing field for these repressed people, the rights of those who have traditionally held the power (white males) must be subverted. Speech codes accomplish this goal of “liberating tolerance,” to use the term coined by Herbert Marcuse, by taking a stand of “intolerance against movements from the Right, and toleration of movements from the Left.”<sup>18</sup>

One such stunning example of PC thought management occurred in October 2001 at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, in which the school ordered the opening and examination of private messages in a UNC-W professor’s email account. The incident erupted when a student wrote an email with a scathing denouncement of President Bush’s response and actions after the 9-11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The student sent the email to a number of university faculty and concluded with an invitation to forward the email in the interest of “open, unbiased, democratic discussion.”<sup>19</sup> One professor, Mike Adams, sent the student a brief reply and forwarded the student’s message to others, several of whom responded directly to her. “Stung by sharp criticism, the student, in communications to the UNC-W general counsel, accused Professor Adams of intimidation, defamation, and false representation,”<sup>20</sup> and demanded that the university allow her to see the professor’s emails in order to sue him. The administration capitulated.

Thankfully, some of these attempts by universities to censor student or faculty free speech have lost when taken to court. Nevertheless, college administrators have set the stage for accentuating differences among people which leads only to a further sense of cultural distance between them. But, again, this fits the Marxist view of social relations and class warfare, so the politics of power is brought to our centers of education.

### **Building a Utopian World**

Sadly, the goal of political correctness is not to educate students to become independent, morally upright, and involved citizens but rather to produce compliant comrades for the world community—and to produce the *socialist* dream of a better society. This radical political agenda is a utopian vision, a longing for a time when all of society’s ills and abuses will be eliminated. Religion, especially the Christian religion, is understood by Marxists to be the greatest hindrance to this utopian state. “[Leftist writer Walt] Whitman and [humanist educator John] Dewey tried to substitute hope for knowledge,” writes Richard Rorty, Stanford’s Professor of Comparative Literature and well-known proponent of postmodern thought. “They wanted to put shared utopian dreams—dreams of an ideally decent and civilized society—in the place of knowledge of God’s Will, Moral Law, the Laws of History, or the Facts of Science... As long as we have a functioning political left, we still have a chance to achieve our country, to make it the country of Whitman’s and Dewey’s dreams.”<sup>21</sup>

Notice Rorty’s language of idealism. The goal of the radical left is nothing less than remaking society to match the dream world they have conjured. Thomas Sowell refers to this desire for the perfect society as “The Quest for Cosmic Justice.” To achieve their utopia, Marxists understand they must dismantle the current social system in America by undermining the moral law of God. The fast track to achieving this goal is not only to control what students learn in school but also to subvert the home and the family by introducing young people to sexual licentiousness, including both heterosexual promiscuity and homosexuality.

### **The Homosexual Agenda**

Homosexuality is not new. It has been practiced since ancient times, most notably in the nation-state of Sparta which mandated homosexual “education” as part of the military training required of every male. Yet in every other nation throughout history, homosexual sex has been considered deviant behavior. In western civilization, which grew from a biblical foundation, homosexuality was condemned from the standpoint of God’s divine moral law as well as the natural law written on the conscience of every person (see Leviticus 18:22 and Romans 1:26-27).

Yet, in the early 1900s, prominent Marxists began to challenge traditional sexual mores. In the 1920s, George Lukacs headed the department of education for both the Soviet Union and, later, Hungary, where he launched an “aggressive sex education program which consisted, in part, of special lectures and literature in schools ‘instructing’ children in free love, presenting graphic portrayals of intercourse, undermining ‘archaic’ family structures, including the concept of monogamy, and emphasizing the irrelevance of religion, which, he said, deprived people of pleasure.”<sup>22</sup>

Taking their cue from Lukacs, other Marxist radicals sought to establish a beachhead in American education by replacing a biblically based ethic, which confines sexual intimacy to marriage, with a no-holds-barred “pursuit of pleasure.” Then, via the writings of Marx (who promoted sexual “liberation”) and Freud (who equated sexual repression with a host of neuroses), many college students of the 1960s embraced the whole package, preferring to “make love, not war.” “Free love” became their rallying cry, and the sexual revolution swept the nation, spreading from the campus to popular culture through rock musicians, film directors, and television producers. Yet this glorification of sexual license, like the legendary genie, does not stay in its bottle, and predictably has led to the legitimization of other kinds of sexual expression, namely homosexual practices.

As the latest “marginalized” minority group in the line-up of victims looking for liberation from their oppressors, homosexuals now assert their “rights” for acceptance into the American mainstream, and the educational establishment is once again the primary cheerleader for reorienting traditional atti-

tudes toward homosexual practices. Their spokesmen are in every discipline, but seem to be especially attracted to humanities departments. According to an article in *Campus*, “Looking for deviant sexual practices in classic literature is a favorite pastime for many Humanities professors. A professor at Duke University, Michael Moon, presented a paper to the Modern Language Association entitled ‘Desublimating the Male Sublime: Autoerotics, Anal Erotics, and Corporal Violence in Melville and William Burroughs.’ At the same conference, English professor Eve Kosofsky Sedgwich presented the topics ‘Jane Austen and the Masturbating Girl’ and ‘How to Bring Your Kids Up Gay.’”<sup>23</sup>

B. K. Eakman cites Lukacs’ model as the inspiration to introduce sex education into American elementary and secondary schools, largely through organizations such as the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States.<sup>24</sup> SIECUS, along with the National Education Association, the largest teachers union in the nation, promotes a homosexual agenda that includes funding to alleviate discrimination against deviant sexual practices, support for gay and lesbian history month (celebrating the contributions of homosexuals—and supposed homosexuals—in history, much of it fabricated!), and the inclusion of “sexual orientation” in sex education programs.<sup>25</sup> In the process, rhetoric has changed subtly but profoundly, referring to sodomy, for example, as “sexual orientation”—a more morally neutral designation. This change in terminology rings of the politically motivated “newspeak” coined by George Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. However, in the current situation, misleading language is not generated by government but by advocates of social change, and it is disseminated through the willing compliance of popular media. Unfortunately, as we reveal below, our lawmakers are not far behind in adopting the agenda.

In their book, *The Homosexual Agenda*, Sears and Osten chronicle a number of instances in which our publicly funded schools actively promote homosexuality. For instance, Ithaca, New York school officials require first and second graders to be evaluated on their tolerance levels, including how they respect others of varying “genders” (implying other than the two “traditional” genders, so as to include the “transgendered”). In Provincetown, Massachusetts, the school board voted to teach pre-schoolers about homosexual behavior. In Hayward, California, school policy allows teachers and staff to talk openly with students during classroom instructional time about their homosexual behavior and to do so without parental permission. And as with university speech codes, diversity and tolerance goes only one direction. In Ann Arbor, Michigan, a local high school held a “Diversity Week” that allowed students to give speeches on race, religion, and homosexuality at an all-school assembly. School officials, however, turned down one student’s request to present the biblical position regarding homosexual behavior, claiming that,

according to Sears and Osten, “her religious view toward homosexual behavior was ‘negative’ and would ‘water down’ the ‘positive’ religious message they wanted to convey.”<sup>26</sup> Not allowing dissenting views is another classic example of the totalitarian thought control portrayed in Orwell’s fictional world, but is now becoming a part of our real world experience.

In yet another peculiar case, kindergartener Daniel Walz was not allowed to give to his classmates as a personal gift pencils imprinted with the message, “Jesus loves the little children.” The 3<sup>rd</sup> U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the school has a “legitimate area of control” regarding speech, and therefore could restrict Daniel’s freedom in his choice of gifts to his friends at school.<sup>27</sup> For more examples of intolerance toward a biblical worldview, see David Limbaugh’s *Persecution: How Liberals Are Waging War Against Christianity*.

Activist court judges also play a role in promoting homosexual inclusion. An extremely significant issue regarding homosexuality was decided by the U. S. Supreme Court during the summer of 2003. In what is almost certainly destined to become a landmark case, *Lawrence vs. Texas*, the nation’s highest court took the radical approach that “deviant sexual intercourse with another individual of the same sex” is a constitutionally protected act. According to family activist Tom Jipping, the court also “rejected the whole idea that legislatures can enforce community standards.”<sup>28</sup> While the 6-justice majority wrote reassuringly that this ruling does not weaken marriage law, Justice Antonin Scalia said in his scathing dissent, “The court today pretends that... we need not fear judicial imposition of homosexual marriage, as has recently occurred in Canada.... Do not believe it.”<sup>29</sup>

Justice Scalia understood the implications and logic of the ruling, as did those who are pushing the homosexual agenda. According to a CNS news article:

Hours after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Texas sodomy statute, homosexual activists proclaimed their next target would be to overturn a host of laws they view as discriminatory, including those that limit marriage to opposite-sex couples. Now that the court has ruled that these sodomy laws are unconstitutional, homosexuals are prepared to eliminate other forms of discrimination, said Ruth Harlow, lead attorney for [litigates in the Texas case] Lawrence and Garner and legal director at the homosexual advocacy group Lambda Legal... Harlow said discrimination in marriage laws and by the U.S. military would be two of their targets. “By knocking out both sodomy laws and the justification of morality, this decision makes it much harder to defend those discriminatory schemes.”<sup>30</sup>

Attorney Harlow also said “people with strong Christian

views are outnumbered by a majority of Americans who opposed these sodomy laws. They are more and more being pushed to the sidelines. We don't have any problems with individuals making their own choices and having their own religious views. But in our country, a minority of individuals cannot dictate those views for the whole country."<sup>31</sup>

While Harlow's statement may come as a surprise to many Americans, the goal of changing society's view of the family has been a part of the homosexual agenda for a number of years. Enrique Rueda explains:

There is no question that one of the top priorities of the homosexual movement is to force a "re-definition" of the American family away from the traditional husband-wife-children model to a more "functional" definition based on the notion of economic unit or any other basis that does not require heterosexuality as its foundation. The notion that a family must involve persons of both sexes is profoundly inimical to the homosexual movement... As early as 1970, elements within the homosexual movement had identified the family as inimical to its interests. At a convention in Philadelphia, the "Male Homosexual" workshop included the following as one of its demands: "The abolition of the nuclear family because it perpetuates the false categories of homosexuality and heterosexuality."<sup>32</sup>

It is interesting to note that this demand by homosexuals mimics Karl Marx's statement in his 1848 *Communist Manifesto* when he called for the "abolition of the family"!<sup>33</sup> Marx gave a different reason for why the family must be eliminated, claiming that the "bourgeois family" is based on capital, private gain and the exploitation of women—a view championed by current day radical feminists in the battle of the sexes. Now, however, homosexuals have joined the fight, calling for destruction of the family because, for them, it promotes a false distinction between various "acceptable" sexual orientations.

### Countering the Homosexual Agenda

At this point, some may object that we are being homophobic. The objection is rooted in the notion that homosexuals are "born that way," and it is therefore unfair to consider their behavior deviant. While the "born that way" defense is often heard, it has no foundation in scientific fact. Media hype over discovering "gay genes" and studies linking heredity and homosexuality, on later inspection, is found to be based on an insignificantly small number of subjects in the study, partial reporting of results, or unwarranted conclusions in light of actual findings. To find out more about the misinformation surrounding the "gay gene" theory or how to help those struggling with homosexuality, we have listed a number of resources at the end of the chapter.

Most people are not aware of the flaws in the gay gene

theory, nor are they informed about the often severe emotional and physical repercussions of a homosexual lifestyle. According to one study, the median age of death for homosexual men is 44 to 46—a full 30 years less than the life expectancy of heterosexual married men!<sup>34</sup>

Today's young people are subjected to a skewed view from all cultural fronts: Hollywood, academia, and now the politicized courts—none of which offer the complete story on the homosexual lifestyle. How many college freshmen know, for instance, that over half of the AIDS cases in the U.S. are attributable to homosexual sodomy? Or that only two percent of people—men having sex with men—account for 60 percent of the AIDS cases in the state of Texas? Despite all the so-called reality television, no programs portray the struggle of the homosexual lifestyle for what it is. Where are the gay and lesbian couples suffering from HIV or gender identity confusion in *Will and Grace* or *It's All Relative*? In the name of equality, diversity, and inclusiveness, the country has shielded its youth from the truth about the devastating consequences of homosexuality. We do not say this to be harsh, but to be honest with all the facts, great portions of which are being hidden from the discussion regarding homosexuality.

Economist and author Jennifer Roback Morse explains that the assault on marriage "uses the rhetoric and language" of *choice* in the marketplace because it's "very seductive."<sup>35</sup> And a growing number of Americans are being taken in by the seduction. In 1988, 74.9 percent of Americans believed sex between two people of the same gender is always wrong. By 1998, that number had *fallen* to 54.6 percent.<sup>36</sup> And according to a 2003 Gallop poll, 39 percent of Americans believe homosexual marriage should be recognized with the same rights and benefits as traditional marriage between a man and a woman. Yet just seven years ago, only 27 percent believed the same thing. Even more revealing of the success of the homosexual agenda is the level of approval for homosexual marriage among members of "Generation Y." On the heels of the *Lawrence v. Texas* sodomy case, 61 percent of Americans aged 18-29 believe homosexual marriages should be valid.<sup>37</sup>

### Being Salty Christians

Those of us who seek what is truly best for individuals and society need to help our friends, neighbors, and public officials understand the seriousness of devaluing marriage. Maggie Gallagher warns of what will happen if we do not: "If the law embraces this message [of undermining traditional marriage], government will become its carrier and promoter. School textbooks, teen-pregnancy programs, and abstinence education (to mention just a few venues) will all be forced to carry this new unisex marriage vision. Religious people and social conservatives (not to mention marriage advocates in general) unwilling to champion this message, will retreat from the public square."<sup>38</sup>

Anyone who refuses to adhere to the government's mandated worldview will face the strong arm of the state. In some situations, this is already happening. For example, one college freshman asked the dorm housing authority if he could change roommates since his assigned roommate was an avowed homosexual who planned to have his lovers stay overnight in the dorm room. The university, labeling the *straight* student bigoted and forced *him* to attend sensitivity training in order to correct his politically *incorrect* views!

Ms. Gallagher gives the practical rationale for championing marriage. She writes, "When men and women fail to form stable marriages, the first result is a vast expansion of government attempts to cope with the terrible social needs that result. There is scarcely a dollar that state and federal government spends on social programs that is not driven in large part by family fragmentation: crime, poverty, drug abuse, teen pregnancy, school failure, mental and physical health problems."<sup>39</sup> Of course, these kinds of problems would be anticipated from a biblical worldview, since God designed marriage to be the place where children learn to be moral, mature, contributors to society (see God's instructions to parents for raising godly children in Deuteronomy 6:1-25).

The cost of inaction on our part is measured in peoples' lives. We must argue for the truth of God's design for sex and marriage. C. S. Lewis admonishes the faithful in Christ to stand up and be heard. He writes, "As Christians we are tempted to make unnecessary concessions to those outside the Faith. We give in too much... we must show our Christian colors, if we are to be true to Jesus Christ. We cannot remain silent and concede everything away."<sup>40</sup> As former U. S. Ambassador Alan Keyes remarked:

More important than refutations of the particular sophistries that oppose us, however, is recognizing that the attack on marriage is an attack on the primal pattern of human life and is, accordingly, a breathtakingly cavalier and thoughtless project. It is the kind of irresponsible thing that we rightly associate with the worst attitudes of unreflective and inexperienced youth. The supporters of 'domestic partnership' know very well, in one sense, what they are doing. They know that they are attacking the privileged position of the marriage-based, two-parent family, and this apparently seems to them to be an eminently rational thing to do. So might the teen-ager who has taken the family car on a joy ride that ended in wreck and tragedy.... Sometimes refutation is not the best response. We need to recover our ability to look at such people and tell them, in charity, that they propose madness.<sup>41</sup>

When it comes to significant ethical issues such as the sanctity of life, we already have lost the battle and now must

seek to regain the high ground politically. In the case of marriage law, our backs are against the wall, and we must not give another inch, or it, too, will be lost.

We approach these issues, not to be unkind to homosexuals, but to show how a shift in worldview brings about a change in social mores and what is considered appropriate public policy. Christ died for sinners, which includes every one of us. And while, according to the Bible, any sex outside of marriage is wrong, Paul points out that homosexual sex is only *one* of the results of suppressing God's moral law. He describes homosexuality as "degrading" to those involved in it, an "unnatural" act in light of our male/female physical design, an "indecent" expression of God's moral law, and a "perversion" of His plan for expressing our sexuality in marriage. Yet, in the next breath, Paul delineates other outcomes of not acknowledging God: greed, gossip, and envy (Romans 1:18-32). We certainly do not suggest that homosexuals be treated with contempt or ridicule. We do suggest this: in the same way those who teach our children and preside over our courts of law should *not* be promoting greed or envy or adultery, they also should *not* be promoting homosexual sex.

As Christians seeking to be salt and light in our communities, we need to realize people will have a range of responses to our message. Some will steadfastly refuse to hear what we say. Others will hear but not understand. Yet, some will hear and be changed. We must insure that they hear God's truth shared with gentleness and compassion. The Apostle Peter instructs Christ's followers:

Therefore, get your minds ready for action being self-disciplined, and set your hope completely on the grace to be brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ. As obedient children, do not be conformed to the desires of your former ignorance but, as the One who called you is holy, you also are to be holy in all your conduct... but set apart the Messiah as Lord in your hearts, and always be ready to give a defense to anyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you. However, do this with gentleness and respect... (1 Peter 1:13-15; 3:15)

This means taking a two-stage approach. First, we need a "pastoral" sensitivity with individuals who are caught up in a homosexual lifestyle. We do this not by singling them out as particularly sinful but by explaining that we all are sinful in God's sight and therefore are in need of a Savior. Further, because of the addictive nature of homosexuality, we need to help individuals process the emotional pain they have endured in past relationships—relationships that have contributed to their emotional attachment to people of the same sex."

The second approach we need is to work in the political arena to halt the advancement of behavior detrimental to individuals and society. This means becoming involved with our

time and money in the election campaigns of pro-moral candidates. Our first study, *Thinking Like A Christian*, made it clear that God has ordained the state (Genesis 9:6; Romans 13:1-7; 1 Peter 2:13-14), and His followers need to be involved in government to insure that it functions as closely as possible to His moral will. This does not mean we should outlaw every vice imaginable, but on certain issues, such as homosexual marriage, we must draw the line for the sake of moral rectitude and social stability.

### Worldviews Matter

We have analyzed the devastating results of a socialist approach to politics, from totalitarianism's devastation of individuals and the breakdown of the stabilizing institutions of society such as the family and education to the wholesale slaughter of innocent citizens. As our review of the function of a worldview shows, these results are predictable. Because socialism begins with the wrong theology (atheism), it leads to a wrong philosophy (materialism), which in turn results in a wrong understanding of the nature of man (man is a product of social forces). So, the push is on for social change through a wrong-headed approach to politics—trying to force an outward change upon society under the guise of doing “good.”

Those who invest in learning history and observing the nature of man are aware of problems inherent in the quest for cosmic justice. J. R. R. Tolkien was one who did. In an early scene of *Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, Tolkien presents a dialogue between Frodo, the Hobbit, and Gandalf, the wizard. Frodo, upon learning of the power of the “one ring” in his possession, frantically attempts to give it to Gandalf. The wise wizard refuses to take it, saying, “Understand me, Frodo. I would use this ring from a desire to do good, but through me, it would wield a power too great and terrible to imagine.” Tolkien understood what those on the left side of the political spectrum do not: because of our sinful nature, no man or group can be trusted, unchecked, with power over the lives and fortunes of others.

The founders of the United States rejected the socialist's utopian vision and sought to create a nation based on different, more realistic ideals—individual liberty and opportunity. And because they also understood man's sinful nature, they sought to put “chains” (their term) around government to put at bay its tendency to abuse power. They knew the ultimate check on the politics of power is found in the opening phrase of the Constitution: “We, the people...” Their wisdom placed political power ultimately in the hands of the citizens. If we do not take our responsibility seriously, then we only have ourselves to blame when we lose our liberty to those who would seek to “do good.”

In another scene from *The Two Towers*, the second *Lord of the Rings* book, Pippin and Merry have entreated the peace-loving Ents (ancient trees that walk and talk) to join the battle against the forces of the evil Sauron. When the trees refuse, Pippin tries to solace Merry by saying, “Maybe

Treebeard is right. We don't belong here, Merry. This is too big for us. What can we do in the end? We've got the Shire. Maybe we should go home.” To which Merry replies desperately, “The fires of Isengard will spread, and the woods of Tribu and Buckland will burn. And all that was once great and good in this world will be gone. There won't be a Shire, Pippin.”

What Merry understood is a lesson for contemporary Christians. If we fail to act while we still have the freedom to speak our minds, there will come a day when the power-plays of political correctness will eliminate more and more of our liberties, and all that was once “great and good” about America will be gone. There will cease to be a land of the free.

A few years ago, the legendary, Oscar-winning screen actor Charlton Heston spoke at Harvard Law School, a modern bastion of political correctness. He forthrightly confronted the embracing of “newspeak” at that college. In his speech, he outlined the gravity of the problem with political correctness and took a bold stand for restoring sanity to our public conversation. We offer his words as a fitting conclusion to our discussion:

It scares me to death, and should scare you, too, that the superstition of political correctness rules the halls of reason. You are the best and the brightest. You, here in the fertile cradle of American academia, here in the castle of learning on the Charles River; you are the cream. But I submit that you, and your counterparts across the land, are the most socially conformed and politically silenced generation since Concord Bridge. And as long as you validate that...and abide it... you are—by your grandfathers' standards—cowards.... If you talk about race, it does not make you a racist. If you see distinctions between genders, it does not make you a sexist. If you think critically about a denomination, it does not make you anti-religion. If you accept but don't celebrate homosexuality, it does not make you a homophobe.<sup>42</sup>

**NOTE:** The endnotes are on our webpage ([www.schwarzreport.org](http://www.schwarzreport.org)), or may be requested in writing at PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829.

### Recommended Reading

—This article by your editor and Chuck Edwards is a chapter in *Countering Culture: Arming Yourself to Confront Non-Biblical Worldviews*. *Countering Culture* is a 13-week curriculum study available through Broadman and Holman Publishers or Summit Ministries, PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, CO 80829, 719-685-9103, or [www.summit.org](http://www.summit.org).