



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 16, NO. 11, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JUNE, 1983

Double Standards in Academic Freedom

The Religion of Secular Humanism

It took parents more than a decade after the Supreme Court expelled prayer and Bible reading from the public schools to discover that the intellectual and moral vacuum left behind by those decisions was filled NOT by a neutrality toward religion but by an affirmative hostility toward religion. In the past several years, many writers and parents have identified that hostility as, in fact, a religion called Humanism.

But even after Humanism was identified and labelled, a severe semantic problem tended to conceal what was really happening. After all, the average person would say, what's wrong with Humanism? It sounds like something humanitarian; or evidencing a caring concern for humanity; or a love of the humanities; or at worst, just harmless.

Modern dictionaries offer little help. Humanism is a word with several definitions, and most of them are not threatening. The primary definitions are "any system or mode of thought in which human interests, values, and dignity predominate"; or "a devotion to or study of the humanities."

Humanism as a word with positive instead of negative connotations is further enhanced by the fact that, in the dictionary, the sequence of words is humanism, humanist, humanitarian, humanitarianism, humanity, humanities, humanize, and humankind.

So, religious parents found it very difficult to get anyone motivated to oppose the "danger" of Humanism. The typical reaction of the average citizen was that "Humanism" probably doesn't exist, and if it does it isn't a "religion," and in any event it certainly is not something that public school children or parents need worry about.

The claim that Humanism is a religion was alleged to be a hallucination of the imagination of fundamentalists. It was suggested that the only people who believe that Humanism is a "religion" taught in public schools must be the kind of "primitive" who would believe that the earth was created instead of that it evolved.

Referring back to earlier Webster's dictionaries, however, one finds this accurate definition of Humanism: "a contemporary cult or belief calling itself religious but substituting faith in man for faith in God." In later dictionaries, that precise definition was dropped. Meanwhile the cult expanded its influence.

The house organ of the religion of Humanism is a magazine called *The Humanist*. It conducted an essay contest and published the prize-winning essays in its January/February 1983 issue. One of them, called "A Religion for a New Age" by John J. Dunphy, is startling in its frankness. It lays all the Humanist cards on the table. Here are some direct quotations from this anti-Christian diatribe.

"I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being.

"These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the education level — preschool day care or large state university.

"The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new -- the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of Humanism, resplendent in its promise of a world in which the never-realized Christian idea of 'love thy neighbor' will finally be achieved."

So there you have it. To paraphrase a famous line, "Yes, Virginia, Humanist preachers are teaching their religion in the public schools." And it is more aptly called "Secular Humanism" because it has substituted faith in man for faith in God.

Every time a teacher rejects or refuses to recognize God's moral law as codified in the Ten Commandments, and tells the child that we cannot or should not be judgmental about stealing, lying, killing, maiming, blaspheming, fornicating, or coveting, that teacher is teaching the religion of Humanism. Every time a teacher rejects or ridicules the notion that God created man and the earth, that teacher is teaching the religion of Humanism.

It's time to expose the hypocrisy of those who have so dogmatically chased God and the Bible out of the public schools in the name of freedom of religion, and then forced their own Humanist religion on the children instead.

Is School Prayer Constitutional?

In a sensational decision in January 1983, a U.S. District Court held that prayers offered by teachers in Alabama public schools are NOT unconstitutional. Of course, this decision was overruled by a higher Federal Court. But while it was in effect, the scholarly 66-page decision in *Jaffree v. James* made waves in legal circles.

The *Jaffree* District Court decision gave us quite a lesson in U.S. history and constitutional law. It overturned popular myths about the First Amendment and explained what the First Amendment really means in terms of freedom of religion.

The Establishment Clause in the First Amendment had a dual purpose: (1) to guarantee to each individual that Congress would not impose a national religion, and (2) to guarantee to each state that it was free to define the relationship of the state and religion under its own state constitution and laws.

The "separation of church and state" myth has been carefully cultivated in recent years to make people believe that America was founded on the principle that religion should be totally separate from government. That is a falsification of history.

At the start of the American Revolution, nine of the colonies had established churches. Rhode Island and Virginia were the only states where all religious denominations were disestablished, but even those states acknowledged the Christian religion.

The establishment of specific Protestant religions by states was gradually abandoned, but the quasi-establishment of religion-in-general replaced it. Even at the start of the 20th century, no person who denied the existence of God could hold office in many states.

The *Jaffree* District Court carefully reviewed the historical record, including the Congressional chaplain system, the Federal moneys appropriated for the education of the Indians, and the Thanksgiving Day proclamations. The court concluded that it is "abundantly clear" that the Founding Fathers and the authors of the First Amendment "never intended the Establishment Clause to erect an absolute wall of separation between the Federal Government and religion."

Massive historical and constitutional research proves that Jefferson's phrase "wall of separation" referred only to a "wall" that should prohibit action such as Federal laws establishing a national religion or prohibiting the free exercise of worship. All evidence indicates that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, even though they led the fight in Virginia for the separation of church and state, both believed that the First Amendment only forbade the establishment of a religion by the national government, and also believed that the states were free to establish religions as they saw fit.

The famous "wall of separation" was actually put into Jefferson's mouth by Justice Hugo Black in *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947). It took on a life of its own and this nonconstitutional "wall" grew higher and higher in subsequent Supreme Court opinions.

The *Jaffree* District Court then tackled the oft-repeated argument that the First Amendment was made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment. This notion began with an assertion by Justice Black in *Adamson v. California* (1947).

The *Jaffree* District Court examined and summarized the extensive research by distinguished professors

who had studied the Congressional debates on which Black based his notion. They all concluded that Black had misread the debate on the Fourteenth Amendment, that it simply did not do what Black pretended it did.

The court reviewed scholarly papers, the Fourteenth Amendment ratification debates, and U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the years following the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment. All the evidence shows that no legislature and no court believed that the Fourteenth Amendment incorporated the First Amendment against the states until Black invented this theory in 1947. Another conclusive argument is the debate over the Blaine Amendment proposed in 1875. It would have specifically applied the First Amendment language to the states; but it was defeated.

The *Jaffree v. James* District Court concluded that the U.S. Supreme Court "erred in its reading of history," and that it really "amended the Constitution to the consternation of the republic." A careful review of the legislative history of both the First and the Fourteenth Amendments, together with their plain language, "leaves no doubt that those Amendments were not intended to forbid religious prayers in the schools which the states and their political subdivisions mandate."

It is unfortunate that the anti-religious secularism of the higher Federal Courts has falsified the facts of American history for two decades. Our school children have been the big losers.

Peer Pressures and the First Amendment

The crux of the argument in the lawsuits of those who have kept prayer out of the public schools, and who went into hysterics at the pro-prayer District Court decision in the Alabama case of *Jaffree v. James*, is the alleged harm that is inflicted on the atheist when the other students in the classroom stand in prayer. The atheist claims that this harm is an infringement of his First Amendment rights.

This point was stated in the *Jaffree* brief filed in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals by Ishmael Jaffree as follows: "Even though appellants have requested that they be excused from class during all prayer activity, they are being made to suffer by exposing the fact that they are 'different' than peers each time they leave the classroom to protect their First Amendment freedoms."

Jaffree's lawyers thus played on the emotions of the court in order to evoke sympathy for the child's predicament. He either loses "face" in front of his peers by appearing "different," or he succumbs to peer pressure and prays (in alleged violation of his First Amendment rights) even though his parents don't want him to pray.

But that argument is precisely the argument of parents who oppose classroom training about sex. They complain about the harm that is inflicted on their children by being forced to sit through a classroom discussion with students who believe that teenage pre-marital sexual activity is morally acceptable; and, if they are excused from class, they are made to suffer because that exposes the fact that they are "different" from their peers each time they leave the classroom to protect their First Amendment freedoms.

A similar conditions exists when a child, whose parents have brought him up to believe that God created man, is required to sit in a classroom where the teacher, the textbooks, and his peers exert pressure to make him

believe that man evolved from apes. The religious child is clearly made to feel "different" regarding matter that infringes on First Amendment rights.

Teenage pre-marital sexual activity is contrary to the principles of most, if not all, religious denominations. The use of contraceptives is additionally objectionable to the religious principles of some denominations.

Yet, a major feature of the coed classroom sex training provided in many schools is a detailed description of the various methods of contraception. The use of contraceptives is affirmatively presented to teenagers as a means of "responsible" sexual behavior.

The same liberals who say that the atheistic child must be protected from the peer pressure of classmates who want to use a classroom to say a prayer will deny the religious child any protection at all against the peer pressure of classmates who use the schoolroom to discuss sexual activity as though it had no relation to marriage or morals.

The liberals rationalize this inconsistency by alleging that saying a prayer is obviously classroom "religion," but that teaching anti-religious attitudes about sex or evolution is "fact" or "science." But is that really so?

More than 99 percent of school sex-ed courses fail to warn students that Herpes is incurable, and that it is far more dangerous to females than to males, while falsely implying that antibiotics can cure all venereal disease. Most sex-ed courses are just as culpable in failing to warn the girls of the danger of cervical cancer from teenage promiscuity and of the physical dangers from contraceptives. The IUD (intrauterine device) has resulted in some 8,000 lawsuits or claims by women who believe they were harmed by its use. They claim that the IUD caused infertility, miscarriages, pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), and 17 deaths from pregnancy-related complications. The women, some of whom got their IUDs from Planned Parenthood, said nobody warned them of the dangers.

A Federal judge ruled that clinics distributing federally-funded contraceptives to teenage girls cannot be required to notify the girls' parents so they can help to rescue the girls from the religious, moral, psychological, and physical dangers of pre-marital sex. Yet nothing requires the agency to tell the teenagers of the dangers from incurable Herpes or from infection-producing IUDs.

The child has become a victim of the commercial contraceptive corporations and abortion clinics, plus the leftwing liberal litigating lawyers. Who will speak for the child's right to grow up clean and chaste, with a conscience that knows right from wrong?

Academic Freedom and Anthropology

"Academic freedom" is a favorite slogan of the liberal intellectuals. We've been told for several decades that professors and lecturers in universities must have the freedom to express themselves no matter how non-conformist, radical, or un-American.

Objecting to tax funds being used to pay the salaries of leftwing, anti-religious, or Marxist professors is usually treated as something akin to spitting on the First Amendment. But the liberals' claim that they want freedom of thought and speech to flower on college campuses is as phony as the Maoist slogan "let a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought

contend."

The only flowers allowed to bloom are those that support leftwing/liberal ideologies. The recent treatment accorded to Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick is witness to the fact that conservative flowers are ruthlessly weeded out on prestigious campuses.

Stanford University this year proved that academic freedom does not cover the freedom to tell the truth about Red China. Stanford arbitrarily expelled one of its brilliant researchers, Steven Mosher, a candidate for a Ph.D. in anthropology.

Mosher was expelled because he dared to tell the truth about Red China's inhumane policy of forcing abortions on women who are seven, eight, and even nine months pregnant. He knew what he was talking about because he had lived in a Red Chinese village since 1979, courtesy of a research grant, and speaks Chinese fluently.

Mosher published an article in Taiwan which was illustrated with photographs of the women who were receiving mandatory late-term abortions. As the old Chinese saying goes, a picture is worth a thousand words, and Mosher's pictures provided conclusive evidence of the hideous nature of Red China's tyranny. It's no wonder that Peking issued a statement warning Stanford to "deal with this matter sternly" or else there would be "negative consequences" for future scholarly exchanges.

Stanford says that Mosher was expelled for "behavior inappropriate for an anthropologist." But the spring of 1983 was a singularly inappropriate time to bring up the ethical question of what kind of behavior is appropriate for an anthropologist.

Are only those who toe the liberal line in morals and politics allowed to build a reputation in anthropology? That's the question being asked since the ruination of the reputation of the most fawned-over anthropologist of the twentieth century.

It is now generally admitted that the most famous anthropologist of half a century ago, Franz Boas of Columbia University, would tailor his research to promote his leftwing ideological predilections. He was a leader of the cultural determinists who taught that humans are totally shaped by their environment rather than by their heredity.

In 1923, Boas sent his young 23-year-old protegee, Margaret Mead, to Samoa in the South Seas to prove some of his liberal theories. She had no experience with life in general or with the Samoan culture or language but, as she later said of her mentor Boas, "He told us what to look for and we went and found it."

After a nine-month stay in Samoa, Mead came home with a book on adolescent girls called *Coming of Age in Samoa*. Because her thesis said what the liberals wanted to hear, they made her famous and made her book the first anthropological best-seller.

Mead's attack on conventional sexual mores had a profound effect on American culture. The point of Mead's book was that Samoa was free from the problem of teenage turmoil because the Samoans condoned free love among adolescents, and that attitude produced a utopian society without guilt or conflict.

Mead's book became the so-called "scientific" basis for the liberals who promoted permissive treatment of children and sexual liberation. Lord Bertrand Russell, author of the book *Why I Am Not a Christian* and the

slogan "rather Red than dead," was one of the many famous people who promoted Mead's notions on sex, marriage and child-rearing.

An authentic scholar and authority on Samoa from New Zealand named Derek Freeman has just published a book which completely destroys Margaret Mead's professional reputation and so-called research. He proves that her book simply falsified the facts about Samoa life in order to promote her ideology.

The cases of Margaret Mead and Steven Mosher are stunning examples of how academic freedom, fame and fortune in anthropology are available only to those who conform their research to the biases of the leftwing liberals.

In the Name of "Women Courses"

When Ronald Reagan announces even minimal cuts in federal funds for education, a chorus of anguished, orchestrated yelps go up on cue from the media and academia. We are given tear-jerking rhetoric about worthy students who will be forced to abandon college and look for a job in the cruel world.

A good antidote for the bleeding hearts about education cuts would be to read the Registration Book for the 14th National Conference on Women and the Law held in Washington, D.C., April 7-10. The second page of this booklet explains that it cost "hundreds of thousands of dollars to prepare and plan this Conference," which was sponsored by seven area law schools: American, Antioch, Catholic, George Mason, George Washington, Georgetown, and Howard.

The financial impetus came originally from Antioch Law School, which was founded with Federal funding about a decade ago. Since a new law school is about the last thing in the world for which Federal funds can be justified, Antioch was apparently started specifically to train leftwing legal activists at the taxpayers' expense.

The Conference had 214 workshops. No words of mine can describe them nearly so well as the following direct quotations from the Registration Book itself.

"Lesbian as Mother: Custody Issues. Overview and tactical approach to child custody issues, as they pertain to lesbian mothers. Litigation strategy for practitioners representing lesbian mothers in custody battles will also be presented."

"Career Options for Lesbians: Traditional and Non-Traditional Legal Spheres. Roundtable discussion led by panelists representative of employment options available to lesbians pursuing careers in law. Options appraised will include law firms, teaching positions, and starting law collectives, among others."

"Legal Challenges to Discrimination Against Lesbians. General overview of the law regarding discrimination against lesbians in civil, criminal, and employment contexts, including: right to privacy; universities and other public forums; civil service and private employment."

"Surviving Law School as a Lesbian. Brief presentations followed by open discussion. Topics to be addressed include: the pros and cons of being *out* to one's school community; coming out as a lesbian after starting law school; the process of finding supportive environments. Workshop open to women only."

"Lesbians and Motherhood -- In That Order! Arti-

ficial Insemination and Adoption. Examination of considerations to be made by lesbians who choose to become mothers; legal ramifications of the choice. Topics include: artificial insemination -- anonymous vs. known donor; adoption; enforceable (?) documents concerning partners' legal relationship."

"The Politics of Women's Sexuality. Facilitated discussion of the personal/political ramifications of women's choices of sexual relationships (lesbian, heterosexual, bi-sexual, celibate): exploration of myths about different sexual orientations; homophobia. Workshop open to women only."

"Lesbians and Elected Office: Can You Do Both? Presentation by lesbians who have held or are holding elected offices. Topics to include: factors surrounding a decision to run for local, state, or national office; campaign strategies; lesbianism, polling and the media; and can an *out* lesbian REALLY be elected?"

"Legal Aspects of New Reproductive Technology. Legal issues resulting from new technologies such as test tube babies, children's rights, parental rights, and special issues for lesbians and disabled women."

"Winning In Electoral Politics. Discussion of the campaign tactics and tools needed to win an election, with special attention paid to combating New Right tactics, the role of Political Action Committee (PACS), and overcoming barriers facing women candidates."

"Stay the Curse: A Feminist Critique of Reaganomics. Appraisal of the 'New Federalism', budget cuts, regulatory destruction, and supply-side economics, as they affect women, particularly TWW/WC and disabled women. Consideration of the use of international law to attack the policies of the Reagan Administration."

"Prostitution Issues. Workshop will address the relationships between prostitutes' rights, abortion/reproductive rights and lesbian rights. Panelists will also discuss the current state of the law, and the social and economic consequences of decriminalization versus legalization of prostitution."

"Genitalia and the Constitution. Panel discussion of the importance placed on anatomical differences between women and men in constitutional doctrine."

It is an offense against women, decency, and common sense to teach such "courses" with taxpayer or university funds. State legislators, university trustees, taxpayers, and parents should look carefully at what is being taught in the name of "women's studies" courses and what is being done with the funding given to "women's centers."

Phyllis Schlafly has her B.A. from Washington University, her M.A. from Harvard University, and her J.D. from Washington University Law School. Before her marriage, she was a librarian. She taught all her six children to read before they entered school. Two are lawyers, one is an orthopedic surgeon, one has his Ph.D. in mathematics and is the author of a book on Rubik's Cube, one is an electrical engineer, and the youngest is in college.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: \$10 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.