

SSR, P&CG, personal versus functional value, Dec. 2, 94

Mar. 2, 96

If we claim that the human person is the highest worth, must we not value sexuality primarily for its ability to bring into existence that which is of the highest worth. We value anything for what it can bring into existence. Sex can bring into existence pleasure and human beings, which result is of more worth? So if we do not value sex primarily for bringing human beings into existence, how can we say human persons possess the highest worth? And if we place a value of sex that excludes the bringing into existence of a human being, how can we say that the value of a person is an absolute value, the value of an end-in-itself, something worthy of committed love, not for its function, its ability to bring something else into existence, but for its own sake. We value things other than absolute values for what they can bring into existence. If sex is the only way to get X, but we explicitly decline to value sex for bringing X into existence for the sake of bringing something else into existence, can the existence of X be the value that measures all other values, a value that all other values must at least be consistent with?

So the value we place on sexuality will inevitably determine the value we place on human life.

Committed love implements the value of the person.

Jan. 24, 95

A PBS reporter asked his interviewee, after the Jonestown murder/suicides, where the loneliness comes from. The short answer is "The birth control pill." Before the birth control pill, sex was the glue of society. We exploited our most powerful, non-coercive, interpersonal force for the maximum happiness of all.

Now instead of being the glue of society, sex is what drives us to be isolated individuals. Sex is the isolated individual's most fiercely guarded private possession. Sex is what drives us into being isolated individuals.

Feb. 8, 95

Human life comes from an act of love between persons. The meaning, the value, of human life is that of the committed love of one person for another, from which life comes. That is why illegitimate children have always been (unfairly) scorned. The meaning of their coming into existence was not the value of a person as worthy of committed love.

P&CG

Since there are no rights without God, from the point of view of society's interest in protecting and preserving human rights, all religions are not equal, i.e., secular humanism is not of equal social value to theism.

Mar. 14, 95

Because sexuality is our person-making ability, the context in which we use it can either affirm the ethically absolute value of the person as such or deny it. Do we have the right to tell someone else: I consensually give you permission to use my person-making ability in a way that prevents the absolute value of the person from being affirmed?

Mar. 24, 95

Why is extra-marital sex "dirty" or degrading? What does it degrade? It degrades the value of human life.

The pinup model who did not want to pose nude because she did not want

her future children to see the pictures. Why worry if a child sees her mother nude? To be nude is to expose and give away her ability to be a mother. For her ability to be a mother is her ability to stimulate the male. And the male's ability to be a father requires his being stimulated by the female.

Human life is the product of an act of animal passion. What then is the value of human life?

Human life is the product of committed love between persons. What then is the value of human life?

May. 30, 95

There is an alternative to making sex an affirmation of the value of human life by making it a vehicle for committed love between persons. That alternative is death. If we do not tie sex to the value of human life, human life loses its value to the point where we justify killing. Why? You might think I am talking about abortion. But first consider euthanasia. Birth control prevents there being enough people in the younger generation to economically take care of the older generation. The solution? Encourage the older generation to commit suicide and even take their life from them without their consent, if we judge that their life is not worth continuing. This is actually happening.

Book mentioned on "The Abundant Life" on EWTN: [Saving Your Marriage Before It Starts.](#)

See "Journal Graphics" transcript of [Frontline's](#) "The Vanishing Father." McLanahan shows that the effect of the absent father is independent of economics and class. Whitehead has a good statement about the liberal's (false) dilemma of choosing between parental happiness and the child's

welfare.

Big

If we separate our life-giving faculty from committed love, we are separating the life we give, human life, from being deserving of committed love. We can choose the spousal-parental relation. We can't choose the child-parent relation. If the latter is not by essence, by nature, a relation of committed love, our existence of the offspring, is not that of a being worthy of committed love by being what she is, as opposed to receiving committed love by the gratuitous choice of someone else to love us, if they want to, as the spousal-parental relation is, i.e., the spousal relation is the a chosen relation of committed love for someone else. The child-parent relation is ontological, our being, what we are, is included in it. Is what we are worthy of committed love?

So in seeking freedom from the connection between sex and committed love for the sake of pleasure, we are devaluing our own existence. We are "choosing" to live like animals (who cannot choose it; they have to live that way). That is why extra-marital sex is "dirty", because of what it does to the value of human life.

Possible title: "Sexual Alienation," i.e., alienation from our meaning as persons.

In choosing a mate, is sex like other activities we would want to observe the potential mate perform beforehand? If so, we are treating sex like a task, a function to be performed -- not as the instantiation of a personal relationship. We are not viewing our partner as an object of committed love but as providing a service, and we are measuring their value as a provider of services, not as a person.

We say that we are teaching people to do anything they want with their

sexuality as long as they do it responsibly, i.e., without hurting or coercing someone else. (Notice the addition of "or coercing." What if someone said that it is all right to coerece as long as you don't hurt?) But does it really work out that way. Are we not really telling pedophiles and other deviants to pursue their own pleasure, as long as they can get away with it. Why? Because we are really telling the rest to pursue their own pleasure as long as they can get away with it. Most cannot pursue their own gratification without in fact behaving in a way others would call "responsible," because they need the others for their gratification.

In other words, the motivation for "Do anyting you want as long as it does not hurt others" can be selfishness: you need the help of others, but you won't get it if you hurt them, or, at least, you are much less likely to get it. But there is more to it than the possibility that the motivation will be selfishness. If there is no more to morality than "Do anything you want, as long as it does not hurt others," then there is no basis for having any motive other than selfishness. Equality is not enough; morality must be based on the dignity of persons.

And so, when we apply "Do anything you want . . ." to sexual behavior, we can expect that people, including pedophiles and abusers, will do what they perceive they can get away with. Because everyone else does. Do I have any proof for this other than "logical" argument? Not directly. But there is independent empirical evidence that "Do anything you want . . ." is applied selfishly in other matters. So the burden of proof must be on them who believe it will not be applied selfishly in sexual matters.

What does that independent empirical evidence consist in? In the absence of prior investigation of what the effects will be on children, as for example, in Sweden or, in America, the effects of divorce.

Permanent Commitments, Jun. 3, 95 BIG

While we are not under immediate pressure to break-up our own marriages, we

pass laws, binding on ourselves and others, making it very difficult to back away from our marriage commitment. Why? Because we are doing ourselves a favor by passing those laws. We know how easy it is to succumb to the temptation to sacrifice something that will more likely lead to the long-range happiness of most people for the sake of short-range happiness. Or, we know how difficult it is not to succumb to that temptation. So we pass laws making it very undesirable to succumb to that temptation.

Pew, Oct. 25, 94

Possible recommenders: Ashley, Veatch, Crosson, McInerney, Dougherty, G. Matthews. MUST have a social scientist. Ask Dan O'Connell. Have a social scientist, a philosopher, and a theologian: Ashley? Peter Berger? Ask Kevin Ranaghan for a theologian who can back up my interpretation of the prayer for unity. Finnis, Grisez.

Possenti. Burrell. Stanley Hauerwas. Nicholas Capaldi. Rescher. Ralph Nelson (as a "social scientist"?).

For the sake of the philosophical reviewers, refer to the influence of 19th-century thinkers on our century and their lack of attention to the place of personal relationships (but not in the sense of G. E. Moore!). What will the next century take from us? Hopefully, the need for and need to support committed personal relationships of the sexually-based kind.

Also explain why the proposal belongs in philosophy. The empirical evidence has existed for some time. What is needed is a philosophical framework, including conceptual clarification, etc.

In the proposal or the cover letter, call attention to the fact that unlike almost all University Press Books, this was awarded a grant in support of publication from the ACPA.

Why philosophy and not just social science? Phil insight needed to form a clear argument out of facts that have been there all along.

Why Christian? The value of the person and personal relations have been lost even to sacramental Church's, which tend to become providers of services.

Pew, Dec. 2, 94

Concept of personal versus functional value comes from a Christian philosopher, Gabriel Marcel.

May. 30, 95

Read and respond to The Way We Never Were.

Many other books on this topic, perhaps. But most present it in terms of the dichotomy between the parent's happiness and the child's. The way to overcome the dichotomy is to prevent or minimize beforehand the need for the parent to seek happiness elsewhere, i.e., to minimize beforehand the occurrence of unhappy marriages.

Not opposed to affirmative action as long as it doesn't benefit women at the expense of black males, as long as it does not seek diversity at the expense of correcting past and present discrimination, as long as it does not define diversity selectively, to the exclusion, for example, of orthodox Jews and Christians, as long as it does not include chosen behavior among the criteria for diversity.

For evidence that women's liberation has hurt affirmative action for black males, see the Globe, 5-21-95, p. 30, and the next 4 days. Also, see the article you clipped out of the Herald a month or 2 before.

What university presses have chosen similar books?

Endorsers: Veatch, ask MacIntyre for a protestant name, ask Deal Hudson for a Protestant name, ask Rasmussen and Peterson how Veatch is, ask Rasmussen for a protestant name.

Must answer the objection that the sexual revolution is not an attack on the family, because it does not prevent people from choosing the family. The response has several elements. First, there is sociological evidence that it prevents large numbers from choosing the family successfully. But Second, why should we be concerned if it prevents them from choosing the family successfully. For example, equality of opportunity does not require equality in results. Why are we justified in taking steps to ensure more successful results here. One reason is that we need the family for the sake of children. And there is sociological evidence here. But also we need the family as the locus for the recognition of an implementation of the value of the person.

Christian inspiration: 2 places. First, the value of the person depends on theism. And without the value of the person, cannot have anything other than an arbitrary ethic anyway. There will be a tendency to justify things like euthanasia in terms of the good of the whole human species. But there really won't be any reason to prefer the good of the species. So when it suits our purposes not to prefer the good of the species, we won't.

Second, change at the media level can only result from a deep change in convictions on the part of the large majority of people. Such a change can only be religious. But for such a change to occur, both the sacramental and evangelical churches have to stop making the same mistake, i.e., the effectiveness of both of their ministries requires Christian brotherhood at the local level. People interpret the prayer for unity in terms of ecumenicism. I do not deny that dimension. But an equally important, though ignored, dimension is the need for local Christian groups to be brother/sisterhoods. This fits in with the Pew fellowship's reference to analysing the mission of the Church as a valid topic.

For the text, but not for the proposal:

This position is not opposed to liberalism. I am not a liberal in the sense of believing that all values are relative. I am in favor of a government activism because I believe values are objective. But relativism is supposed to encourage openness to new ideas, non-dogmatism. Too often, liberals are not open to new ideas, the opposite of the effect advertised for relativism (and this is an argument against relativism).

What could be more rational than Mill (though he was not the first): do whatever you want as long as it does not hurt someone else. But again, the effect is often the opposite of always seeking the greater good instead of your own good (which is what Mill intended). The proof is that we ask about the consequences for children last.

But it is a false dichotomy to see a conflict between the parents' happiness and the children's needs.

Ethics, SSR, quality of life, birth control, Nov. 20, 94

What constitutes the "quality of life" should be measured by moral values, e.g., courage. Instead, moral decisions are now made in terms of a concept of the "quality of life" defined by non-moral features.

Feb. 8, 95

Human life comes from an act of love between persons. The meaning, the value, of human life is that of the committed love of one person for another, from which life comes. That is why illegitimate children have always been (unfairly) scorned. The meaning of their coming into existence was not the value of a person as worthy of committed love.

When I employ sex in a way that intends to avoid procreation, I am

placing a value on my partner, even my imagined partner if the sex is autoerotic. I am using her person-making features. But I am not only putting a value other than person-making on those features and hence on her, I am trying to suppress those features. E.g., what she is in my values is a source of pleasure for me, not a person-maker. If so, what is a person in my evaluations? A person is no longer an absolute value, by which all other values must be measured.

The opponent says I commit a fallacy by talking about a non-existent person, an abstract or merely potential person, i.e., the person who will not result from this sex. But no; there is an actual person involved here, my sex partner. If I value her person-making ability to be something less than that, to the point of trying to exclude the making of a person, can I consistently evaluate her to be an end-in-herself, an ethical absolute? NO. If a person, she, deserves to be valued as an end-in-herself just because she is a person, then our person-making features must have the status, in our evaluations, of person-making features.

In marriage, human life comes from one person's complete giving of him/herself to another person. The meaning of that coming into existence is one person's believe that another is worthy of his/her complete giving of him/herself. Anything less than that, and we are not evaluating another to be worthy of complete giving of ourselves. We are not evaluating the other to be that, but are we denying it? When I enter into an ordinary business or social exchange, am I denying that the other is worthy of committed love just because the act in question is not an act of complete giving of myself?

No, but in such acts, I am not using, and placing a value on, the other's person-making ability.

Also, in certain contexts, the act that brings a human person into existence is an act of committed love and complete self-giving. If from a moral point of view, that act, sex, can legitimately take place in a context where it is not an act of committed self-giving, then is the value of the offsprings of such acts the value of something worthy of committed love? They

do not come from committed love, and morally need not come from committed love, so how can the meaning of their existence be the fact that persons are worthy of committed love for their own sake? So the unfortunate scorn of bastards is a recognition of the fact that if sex is not used in the context of committed love, persons are not worthy of committed love. For to use sex outside of the context of committed love is to use our person-making ability outside of the context of committed love. It is to actuate the source of persons, to implement the source of persons, to exercise the power that makes persons outside of the context of committed love for a person, where outside has a privative, not just negative, meaning: it is to exercise the power to make persons in a context where committed love is deliberately excluded. And so that which is made by this power is not something whose existence bespeaks the person as worthy of committed love, where, again, the "not" is privative, not just negative.

Jun. 12, 95

Society requires that sex be confined to relationships of committed love. That means that the meaning of sex is giving love to another being, sharing life with another being, who is worthy of committed love for their own sake, i.e., a person. And since sex is also the way we share existence itself with beings worthy of committed love for their own sake, we cannot frustrate the latter function of sex without contradicting its meaning of being a relation to a being worthy of love for her or his own sake.

Artificial insemination, in vitro insemination, surrogate motherhood, Jul. 4,
95

If we are responsible for the existence of a being worthy of committed love, we are responsible for giving it committed love. Who else would be responsible if we are not? To assign that responsibility to someone else is to

confuse personal value with functional value. For replacability is the ethic of functional value.

SSR, Ethics, Oct. 23, 94

In something I read recently, Gore Vidal was quoted as saying that making another person into a (sexual) object was joy, and as long as it was consensual on the part of the other person, it was all right. But one can hardly call marriage make another person into an object. In marriage, one gives one's body to the other permanently, completely. That is hardly making an object out of the other. Nor is it giving the other permission to make an object out of you.

Sex is too essentially and uniquely connected with human life for sex not to be part of a permanent sharing of life with another. If we use sex outside of such a permanent sharing, we are diminishing the value of human life, because human life is so essentially connected with sex.

Nature has chosen that human life would come into existence as a result of the physical desire of one person for the pleasure that another person's body can give. If so, how can the value of human life not be merely that of an accidental product of a purely physical desire? Human life can have the dignity it deserves and needs only if the use of sexual desire is made part of a relation of committed love and committed self-giving of each other's bodies between those who will create human life through their desire.

Jan. 24, 95

We cannot use our sexuality, even auto-erotically, without coming into an evaluative relation with other persons, even persons represented in or imagination.

SSR, Ethics, Equality not enough, Sweden, rights of children, more responsibility to children, G and L, Oct. 23, 94

How does such and such a development affect children? Why do we ask this question last. not first? E.g., in Sweden, where there appear to have been few "studies" on the questions I want answered. What does that tell us about our values? It says that "Do anything as long as it does not hurt another" really means "Get away with as much as you can and don't go out of your way looking for others you might actually be hurting. Our principle is not "Aim at the greater good" but "Aim at your own good until someone complains; that is, aim at your own good without looking for the good of others.

Jan. 18, 95

Masters and Johnson have a very small sample. Feldman and McCullouch have a very short follow up period.

Jun. 12, 95

Studies show that many homosexuals can adapt sufficiently to have a satisfying heterosexual life in marriage. But studies also show that premarital sex in youth is a predictor for considerably less chance for success in marriage. One might expect, therefore, that premarital sex would make success in marriage even more difficult for homosexuals. In fact, many clinicians, who practice those therapeutic techniques that almost everyone would find acceptable (unobjectionable on moral or aesthetic grounds -- see what terms the Sexual Brain guy uses), report that the difficulty of heterosexual adaptation increases with the amount of prior homosexual activity. (Note that "who practice those . . ." excludes both Masters and Johnson and Feldman and McCullouch.)

The above paragraph would be a good strategy for a short piece, e.g., an

op-ed piece. For a book, do the following. After presenting all those who testify to "the longer in, the harder out," make the statement that there are a variety of methods, not all of them acceptable to everyone. Then, describe Master's and Johnson's method and explain why it would not be acceptable. Only then say that they make the claim that their method works as well for the longer in as for the shorter in. Even if this were true, it would not help most homosexuals. But it is far from certain that it is true.

Then move on to Feldman and McCullough, first quoting the Sexual Brain guy. Quoting him first will set up F and M perfectly. The most that they could show would be that their method works as well for both, but their method is objectionable and does not work for exclusive homosexuals.

SSR, Abortion, Ethics, Value of human life, Sep. 16, 94

In one of these notes files, in the last few months, I refer to Julian Huxley's statement that they, scientist's, accepted Darwinism before it was proven because Darwinism was perceived to get rid of God, and God was a great bother to their sex lives. As similar thing happened in the case of the value of human life. In the late forties through early sixties, one can find any number of statements in scientific literature stating that human life begins at conception. And one can find no, or almost no, denials. Now some scientists are denying that human life begins at conception. Why the change? The sexual revolution intervended, and the belief that human life begins at conception, or at least that innocent human life should not be taken, became a great bother to our sex lives.

But notice the connection between these two changes. If there is no God, then is the belief that human life begins at conception really a great bother to our sex lives? On the other hand, if there is a God, then the belief that human life begins at conception really should be a bother to our sex lives. Because, if there is a God, a human life is the life of an image of God.

P&CG, Sweden, SSR, pluralism, social engineering, Sep. 11, 94

The recent history of Sweden (as told by Popenoe) shows that shows that social engineers allowed themselves to be led by contradictory goals within a generation (tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine). This is important because, while Burke is certainly wrong and some orders need to be overthrown because they are evil, the question remains how to measure when an order is so evil that overthrowing it is worth the very real risk of throwing out many goods along with the evil order. The answer depends on our value systems, and history shows that they can change with every new intellectual fad. We need permanent principles by which to judge things. But we do not need permanent principles that become identified, in our consciousness, with an existing order, so that it appears that overthrowing the order will overthrow the principles. The Catholic church has made that mistake many times. The principles must guide us in modifying existing orders.

G and L, Aug. 31, 94 AA

More recent developments: Goldwater not a "social" conservative, at least not on this issue. Genetic infidelity (Time article and book The Moral Animal by Wright) contra my paragraph about sexuality chosen for monogamy. Poll claiming to show that gays are economically underprivileged. The cable show arguing for a pre-natal rather than genetic cause of homoseuxality. The Channel 2 show about treatments for homosexuality. The Focus on the Family ad about encouraging the spread of disease among our youth, which makes it look as if I am borrowing from them.

SSR, Ethics, P&CG, Abortion, Aug. 31, 94

If our use of the life faculty is not based on committed love, then human life is not (cannot be) the object of committed love, be something worthy of committed love for its own sake.

An op-ed piece in the Globe has a title about the need to "restore values." Is it even conceivable that we can restore values when the value of human life itself is relative to our choices, depends on our choices. Then what value does not depend on our choices? If human life does not provide a standard our choices must conform to, what is there for our choices to conform to? Is the standard of "As long as you do not hurt someone else" enough? But our choices decide who is someone else, and what it is to hurt them. SSR, P&CG, G and L, Hentoff, Rights, Free Speech, Censorship, Aug. 21, 94

Contra Hentoff (in the Eagle Tribune this week): When expression is a socially harmful act and when the means of opposing it do not take away free will in the sense of voluntariness, or inflict violence, or are not immoral in themselves (because of the harm they would do even in other contexts), then we are obligated to oppose that use form of expression, obligated to, for example, used boycotts to end that form of expression.

The alternative would be that we are obligated to permit that socially harmful behavior.

Modernity, P&CG, Ethics, SSR, Aug. 21, 94

It is conventional wisdom that one of the main results of modernity was do dislodge man from being the center of the universe in his own perceptions. This happened in two ways: Astronomy showed that we are not the center of the universe and indeed are just a speck in the universe. Animal psychology allegedly shows that we cannot find anything, e.g., language, that definitively distinguishes us from lower animals.

While in an important sense, it is true that that man no longer views himself as the center of reality, in a much more important and profound sense

the result of modernity is the opposite. The result of modernity is that we think we are the center, where before we would not have thought that. Before we considered ourselves subordinate to a supreme being. We considered that our judgments had to be measured by his purposes for things, including ourselves, purposes expressed by the natures we found in things. We were not the measure of all things. Our judgments had to be measured by something greater than ourselves.

The result of modernity is well expressed by the title of a philosophy book, which title answered a question of Plato to the Sophists: Man Is the Measure. Judgments, e.g., of value, merely express our contingent and subjective interests. Even scientific judgments just express conceptual frames through which we interpret otherwise unintelligible and chaotic experience. Humans are in effect the supreme arbiter of right and wrong, good and evil. Humans are beholden to no one, answerable to no one.

And does modernity exalt reason? Perhaps earlier it did. But now it tells us reason is not an instrument for knowing what is. Only Catholicism defends reason. Modernity has fulfilled Maritain's prophecy, as quoted by Frankel, that without something above reason, reason itself would fall prey to forces below it.

P&CG, SSR, DEMocracy, Aug. 21, 94

Can we really keep our religious values (e.g., secular humanistic values) out of our public decisions. In that sense, can we really make religion something "private"? I doubt it. Secular humanists make decisions based on their secular humanism all the time.

SSR, P and CG, Ethics, G and L, Aug. 16, 94

At the Film Institute's tribute to James Stewart, Dustin Hoffman asked what

happend to the America portrayed in It's a Wonderful Life. That America was based on love. For a society to be based on love, we have to train people, especially the young, to love. We can't do that without telling the young that chastity will be expected of them. Without chastity, our most important and basic (fundamental, ie., others depend on them) love relationships won't work: the spousal and parental relationships.

Another point: the value we place on human life is the value we place on sex. Note that in this formula, the value of human life comes first. So if we put an absolute value on human life, it follows that we have the attitude that sex is a vehicle for committed love. And therefore, if we do not view sex as a vehicle for committed love, we cannot put an absolute value on human life.

SSR, P&CG, Feb. 3, 94

Why so much wife beating and child abuse? We need to teach children that they will be expected to love. But we can't teach them, successfully, to love and fail to teach them that their sexuality is supposed to be used as an instrument of committed love, a vehicle and support for committed love. If we let them think their sexuality is a means to private gratification, and that marriage is just one kind of "set up," "arrangement" in which their desires for self-gratification can be fulfilled, they will not successfully achieve a love relationship in marriage.

P&CG, Conformity, Individuality, SSR, Jan. 28, 94

James Bourke, on Connections, asks what's become of our individuality? We've heard that worry for at least a century. The result? We haven't paid a bit of attention to the breakdown of community and, in particular, of personal

relationships. Consequently, we now have a population of isolated, lonely, "sort-of-a-good-partner" individuals, and individuals who conform to what the media tells them to conform to, which is the least common denominator.

SSR, G and L, Jan. 28, 94

Promoting the avoidance of self-control (and calling the lack of self-control, the inability to control oneself, to control one's desires, "freedom," rather than "compulsion.")

Choosing not to make marriage the norm amounts to choosing against marriage, not being neutral. Marriage can perform its necessary functions only if it is taken seriously as the norm.

Sweden, SSR, P&CG, Jan. 28, 94

Questions to ask: how long to extra-marital relationships last, i.e., how much stability do they provide people, how often must people look for another "sort of a good" partner? How lonely are older women? What is the rate of venereal disease? How is it that are committing suicide and why? How often are infants killed outside the womb? (See that Eagle-Tribune op-ed piece, or rather the Register op-ed piece.

P&CG, Ethics, SSR, Jan. 25, 94

The connection between the functional approach to value and reducing the person to the individual: If each of us is just an individual, we are each tiny specks in the mass of humanity, and our claim to rights cannot stand up against the claims of the mass. Then, what becomes of our value? Our value is our contribution to the mass, other than the contribution we make just by

being what we are (persons); in other words, our value is our function, the function by which we contribute to the mass.

P&CG, Ethics, Harvard speech, SSR, Jan. 25, 94

How foreign it is to think about, e.g., whether human life means what sex means, etc., when nothing matters as long as you don't hurt someone else. Nothing intrinsically matters to you, as long as you don't hurt someone else; nothing has a claim on you, as long as ... If everything is pure personal preference, as long as you don't hurt someone else, life really doesn't mean anything, no end is worth living for, is worth seeking for its own sake.

Is there such a thing as seeking an end for its own sake, as opposed to seeking it because it satisfies a desire we have? But what if our desire is to have the kind of relation to something that appreciates it for what it is?

C and D, another mock speech, Jan. 4, 94

Write the speech about C and D in philosophy ironically from the opponent's perspective. E.g. "They accuse us of having just as much disagreement and confusion. But our confusion and disagreement is the right kind, the good kind, because it derives from the tools of Frege. Why are those tools good? Because they produce clarity, precision, and agreement."

"Simplicity is an unclear notion. Double effect is a quagmire. Of course, our concepts are concepts of quagmires, but they are good quagmires.

NEA, National Education Association, speech, Jan. 4, 94

The officers invited me to give you a quick update, since we have discovered that so much of what you were taught and have been teaching reflects only the intellectual fads of the time; not scientific truth.

Civics: the meaning of the right to free speech is not to discourage "self-censorship." If so, the spirit of the constitution would be that publishers and exhibitors were required to present things, rather than free not to present them.

Sex education: we now know that there is only one socially responsible use of sex, marriage. And there is no such thing as value-neutral sex education. Marriage can perform its necessary social function only if it is taken seriously as the norm for sexual behavior. So choosing not to make it the norm amounts to choosing against marriage, not being neutral to it.

Diversity: It does not mean all values are equal; if so, why value diversity.

Relativism: if all values are relative, Naziism is as good as any other system.

Non-conformity: It is usually conformity to the subtle "authority" of the media, or the intellectual establishment, etc.

Religion: In the absence of explicit religion (an absolute value with the credentials to be such) something else without the credentials will, inconsistently, become our absolute value (e.g., free speech in the case of Salmon Rushdie who was not rebuked for being guilty of blasphemy). We can avoid this only by concluding through ruthless logic that nothing, not even, e.g., free speech or individual rights, should be absolute for us.

Also, without God, the rights of the individual cannot be inalienable. The individual is only a speck in the cosmos, and her interests will not way, ultimately, against the perceived interest of the majority.

Abortion: the real issue isn't a woman's control over her own body. We all agree on that. But thousands of women die each day who will never have choice over their own bodies. So the prior question is whether they are human beings, and whether we can kill them when there is a good chance that they are.

Euthanasia: When respect for life is gone, the floodgates are open. We know, because it happened in two of our most advanced societies, Wiemar

germany and Demark.

Ethics, phenomenology, G and L, Jan. 4, 94

See Pam Hall's paper at the Nov., '93 Maritain meeting. She wants a phenomenology of natural inclinations to be a factor in moral decisions. But a decisive factor? Phenomenologically, homosexual desire may be the same as heterosexual. But the inclination to heterosexuality is, non-phenomenologically, an inclination to preserve the species, just as the desire to eat is phenomenologically a desire to satisfy a craving remove a discomfort, but biologically it is an inclination to self-preservation. Not all ways of satisfying a baby's, for instance, desire to eat are good. Poison can satisfy the desire to eat phenomenologically.

G and L, Jan. 4, 94

In heterosexual marriage, your spouse is the one who fulfills you by complementarity.

SSR, Ethics, Jan. 4, 94

Is taking a mate selecting a vehicle for satisfying your sexual desires? No, satisfying your sexual desires is a vehicle and support for a relation of self-giving to your mate, a relation of committed love, a relation of personal union.

The value of the human species is the value of sex, the source of the species. The value we place on sex will be the value we place on that mode of existence of which sex is the source and the essential source, that mode of existence which is nothing but a product of sex; that's all human life is. It

is not an accidental product of sex like, e.g., venereal disease. It is essential in the forward looking direction (from cause to effect) and in the backward looking direction. Concerning the latter, all human life is an result of sex. Maybe somewhere in the universe human life is produced in some other way, but here all is a result of sex. And artificial means would imitate sex, would have to imitate sex (a la Aristotelian art). Even test-tube babies show that our attitude toward sex is our attitude toward human life. If human life should not result from an act of giving between two persons, if sex is not the act of giving from which human life should result, human life is something that can be mechanically manipulated.

We can look on sex in two ways: it's a means to this mind-boggling pleasure; it's a means to the happiness that can only come from the family. But we can't successfully look at it in both ways at once.

Test-tube babies: the giving of existence is not an act of love in which two people give each other their life-sharing power.

Evolution selected sex as a means of getting you, the parent, into a lifetime personal relation with your child. Your action causes you to get into such a relation. But more, your action, your pleasure, causes another person, the other parent, to get into the same kind of relation. By mutually agreeing to practice birth control, you cannot change the fact that the pleasure you are experiencing was designed to do the above, has an essential relation to the above. I can choose to let the other party use my person-making power, but cannot choose that it cease to be a person-making power, or parent-making power.

Ethics, value of life, abortion, euthanasia, Jan. 4, 94

Equality is not enough. Respect, reverence, etc. for some value, e.g., human life, is necessary. This is shown by the experience of Weimar Germany and Denmark with euthanasia: give Drs. the power to take human life in some cases,

and the floodgates are open. As soon as reverence for life is gone, the floodgates are open.

Is respect for choice, rather than life, sufficient? No, choice needs guidelines provided by reality as it exists prior to choice, or choices, including the choice to respect the choices of others, are arbitrary.

Abortion, SSR, P&CG, family, premarital, sex, Oct. 23, 93

Unless we seek sexual gratification in a way that subordinates it to the goal of supporting committed love, we will conceive children in conditions unjust to them. (Remember that evolution selected human sexuality, in all its psychological dimensions, as a method of reproduction for offspring who would be dependent on the care of others for years; and abortion is the only sure means of birth control.)

So if we use sex selfishly, we will have to abort babies. So the opponent says, ok, I'll abort babies, if that is the price of not subordinating sex to committed love.

Remember that evolution selected human sexuality as a method of reproduction for offspring who would be dependent on the care of others for years. Reproductive acts outside of the context where that care was ensured would not be good from evolution's perspective, since they would produce offspring with less chance of survival. Further, the survival of adults for years after they had procreated would be reproductively significant, since reproductive success is not achieved until the young are raised. And the survival of adults would depend on cooperation with other adults consisting, not of instinctive behavior as in other species, but of moral behavior learned in their youth (and the cooperation would most often take place in small groups where unfaithfulness, if common, could be disastrous). Why, then, should evolution not have selected a reproductive method that would function, in all its

psychological dimensions, as a support and vehicle for a moral relation of self-giving between parents that would greatly increase the chance of reproductive success? Such a method would compensate for our losing the tremendous reproductive advantage of instinct. If so, from an evolutionary perspective, our proficiency at sex acts would not be like proficiency at hunting or cooking, qualities we might look for before taking a reproductive partner; our sexual ability would be the means for the relation of self-giving that human mating "should" consist in. For seeking sexual gratification in a way that does not subordinate it to the goal of supporting committed self-giving would be detrimental to reproductive success and to long range, individual happiness, both because it would produce offspring in unfavorable conditions and because it would sanction an attitude opposite to the needed attitude of self-giving.

We want to try out someone's cooking before selecting them as a mate. But trying out their sex changes the meaning of sex in marriage and weakens its contribution to the success of the marriage. In fact, it changes the meaning of marriage itself.

SSR, G and L, Oct. 7, 93

Another social cost of not supporting the family: health care. Those who live in a family have many fewer health problems, according to Don Feder in a Herald column in the last week or two.

SSR. G and L, Sep. 27, 93

It's almost as if evolution thought it had to provide for the survival of offspring that would be totally dependent on the care of others for years. Imagine that.

SSR, P&CG, 5-25-93

No one seems to have noticed that the triumph of [enlightenment, intellectualism, academicism, the academics, the intellectuals] has led to [a new form of . . ., to the breakdown of human relationships, to the loss of what is most important for human happiness, to an undermining of the foundations of social and personal happiness.

G and L, 5-19-93

The objection may be that only a small number of gays want to be parents. In fact, there may well already be many parents with homosexual orientations, but who were able to become parents because they did not become habituated to homosexual activity. And many of them would not have been able to become parents had homosexuality been socially acceptable during their adolescence, since had it been acceptable, they would have become habituated to homosexual activity.

Family, SSR, 5-18-93

Make a list of hidden social costs resulting from lack of support of the family: prisons, security, economically uncompetitive children, etc.

G and L, 2-1-93

Social conservatives tell us that relative values alone are not enough. But then they expect us to intuit that their version of absolute values, or at least of the political implications of absolute values, is the correct one, (Remember "In your heart you know he's right"?)

Gays have no more right to come out of the closet than those who drink have the right to drive or those who smoke have the right to make others inhale their secondary smoke.

G&L 12-1-92

Gs who fail in their attempt to change, or who do not try to change for fear of failure, are trying to get teenagers to have the same problem they have.

10-6-92

SSR

Why are these facts not better known through the media? Through a variety of historical accidents, those who oppose this point of view have managed to usurp the name "liberal" (meaning concerned with justice rather than order and viewing the state's role as the achievement of the common good, rather than merely the protection of individual wealth), they have managed to claim the name "liberal" for themselves, as if traditional liberals (whether economic or social), the admirers of men like Adlai Stevenson, Hubert Humphrey, and Walter Reuther, should not be concerned about our responsibilities to those least able to protect their own rights, our young -- as if their opponents were not concerned about justice for our young, and the state's responsibility to ensure that justice.

Unfortunately, my point of view is often associated, in the public mind, with those who appear to be against government, or to be more concerned that government ensure order than justice, or to value individual aggrandizement more than the common good. . . those who confuse a proactive government with socialism, who are more concerned with their freedom to pursue wealth than with

freedom of thought and expression,

10-6-92

4-17-88

Sexuality

"Social Relationships and Social Cognition in Nonhuman Primates", Science, Dec. 12, 1986, pp. 1361-66, by Dorothy Cheney et al.. They examine "the reproductive benefits of long-term social bonds," whether and how long-term social bonds contribute to reproductive success of the actor or its close relatives.

In man, the connection between the long-term bond between husband and wife and their offspring's chance of reproduction should be obvious. Human children are helpless at birth and unable to take proper care of themselves for years. They need the help of adults who are committed to them. In other words, human sexuality contributes to our reproductive success by supporting a long-term relationship between the parents. It supports this relationship in different though related ways. It provides an ongoing source of immediate reward for the sacrifices one makes in marriage. And it gets the marriage started by fostering an emotional relationship which will not last as long as the marriage but which is extremely helpful for the beginning to be the beginning a relation that will outlast the emotion. Also, it provides memories to help sustain the relation.

Human sexuality was selected because it performed these functions. For otherwise, it would not have fostered the reproductive success of the members of the species.

042488

PCG and Sex

We are taught not to expect any more of ourselves than to be controlled by our sexual desires, to have them be the organizing factor in our lives, to have them be in charge of our lives; not to expect any more of ourselves than to submit our lives to the service of our sexual desires.

That is the kind of self-image we have developed -- and that shows what an effect on our lives our self-image has.

042488

Sex, Society, and Rights

The PAQ criticism. State early: The literature, the discussion, of free expression has not adequately considered society's need for the family to function well nor the effect of pornography on the family.

State early: Democracy must recognize the parents' right to bring up their children. Therefore, a democracy has no choice but to try to make the family work. Because a society must also fulfill its obligation to provide children with loving environments.

The real issue is how much love we think our children deserve, how much risk we have the right to take that many children will not get that love. Do they only deserve the kind of love we can offer by setting up a cabinet office of children's affairs?

SSR - AA

6-14-91

Penelope Leach in the Boston Globe, 6-5-91, p.72: "Babies need a one-on-one

relationship and unconditional love, which is the root base of their self-esteem." Note that the love they need is unconditional, babies can't do anything to earn it. Babies are supposed to learn that persons deserve love just because they are persons. "Employers . . . have an obligation to help rear the next generation." In fact, we all have that obligation, and it obliges us to more than financial support (which she was talking about in the context of employers).

Leach's books: Your Baby & Child: From Birth to Age Five, Your Growing Child: From Babyhood through Adolescence, The First Six Months: Getting together with Your Baby. Now writing What about the Children?, a big book about children and society.

Women's Lib

6-14-91

Penelope Leach in the Boston Globe, 6-5-91, p.72: "Women are expected to do everything. They are expected to have careers and a satisfying family life, too. After giving birth to a child, they are told to get right back out there and get on with their careers, bring home the money. This suggests to them that it's not important for them to stay at home with the infant." Globe reporter: "Leach thinks a shift in attitude will come when industry and government give fundamental rights to babies, not parents. Babies are a minority and should have their needs met." Almost. Families, not just parents and children, have rights. The reason is that our obligation to civil law derives from the fact that civil law serves a common good, and a common good takes moral precedence over any corresponding individual goods. But the family has a common good of its own, and so civil law must respect the family as the locus of its own moral precedence over corresponding individual goods.

xxxSex, Pew, SSR, sexual ethics, 5-23-00

In marriage, Our sexual partner must be as close to us, as closely united to us, as our own sexuality is.

Why? Because what is the alternative? The alternative would be an arrangement, a contract, with a built-in distance between us, a built-in limit on how far we give ourselves to each other and how far we unite to each other.

We cannot be responsible for making the use of our person making ability into the kind of use in which it cannot be a person making ability. We cannot be responsible for making the way we use our person making ability be a way in which it cannot be a person making ability. This is what the homosexual does. Or this is what homosexual acts do. To choose a homosexual act is to choose to use our person making ability in a way that it could not be a person making ability.

The way we use our person making ability must be the same way that can produce offspring, by which we produce offspring, when and if we are fertile. For the use of our person making ability must always be such that any other goal we are seeking is subordinate to the goal of making persons. (Any other value it has for us must be subordinate to the value of making persons.)

If human beings were created to live forever, and if we all had person making ability, but if that ability was intended to produce only one new person, and if that was going to take 100 million years, our person making ability would still be the ability to make that for the sake of which everything else exists, and our person making ability would be that before for it was anything else. In other words, even under those assumptions, it would be immoral to use our person making ability as if it did not exist for the sake of producing that for the sake of which everything else exists. If we don't see that, we don't see the awesomeness of what it is to be a person.

When we see heterosexuals acting romantically toward each other, we know we're watching nature's design for making persons at work. We know this whether or not we know that the members of the couple are now

fertile. Because we know what the primary and essential purpose for our sexuality is, and not only is it essential it is absolute.

When we see heterosexuals acting romantically toward each other, we are watching nature's design for making person at work. We are watching nature's person making apparatus at work. We are watching nature's person making function at work. The way it works is for one person with a partial person making ability to be attracted to another person for the sake of the other person's partial person making ability. One person desires another person because of the other person's partial person making ability. One partial person making ability desires union with another person because of the other person's partial person making ability.

This is it.

The result, that is, the desired union, is the existence of a complete person making agency, a complete person making causal system. To say that my sexuality exists for the sake of the existence of persons is to say that, first of all, my sexuality exists for the sake of the existence of a complete person making causal system. So the fact that persons are that for the sake of which everything else exists means that my sexuality, as far as my values are concerned, must exist for the sake of the existence of a complete person making causal system. In my values, my sexuality must exist for that sake if persons are to have the status in my values all being that for the sake of which everything else exists.

3-5-01

In prostitution, visual pornography, etc., we let others enjoy our body for and like the drug(?) at the expense of our personhood, something we have no right to sell. For we are selling our person making ability not, for example, our food making ability.

1: Sex is fun, just fun, not to be evaluated more seriously than that. So don't get excited if, for example, the President fools around. 2: that kind of fun, that is, getting it whenever I can and as much as I can is my

highest priority, is what I think about the most, etc.. So it's OK if, for example, a President suborns perjury as long as the perjury is just about that trivial matter, sexual fun. (Or 2: it is so much fun in fact that. . . ; it is so much pleasure, in fact, that . . .).

Sexual freedom requires that it be morally justifiable to kill the product of conception.

In 1970 or so, we began killing fetuses, and the prophecy was made that infanticide and euthanasia were not far behind. In 2000, we are permitting voluntary euthanasia and our justifying infanticide. In 2030, we will be committing involuntary euthanasia and infanticide. In 2060? But remember, this is proof that we can have morality without religion. All we have to do is redefine morality.

There are two and only two relations where we are fully committed to another person precisely as something for the sake of which everything else exists, that is, as something deserving committed love for their own sake: the spousal relation and the parental relation.

I am a sexual being, I have sexuality, for the sake of being a person maker.

xxxLiberal Conservative, 3-7-01

Nonfundamentalist liberals, realist liberals rather than moderate liberals, have always been anti-Communist and antisocialist. Then nonideological wind of the ideal is not possible; they bend when the neo conservatives won't. I have always opposed to capital punishment, even before it was fashionable to do so. Been willing to admit that conservatives are sometimes right. Are willing to cooperate with those that fundamentalist liberals consider "enemies," for example, Pat Robertson. Think we should learn from past failings, such as our naivete regarding Soviet espionage; we do not avoid discussing those failings of the grounds that "it might give help to the conservatives." Do not consider conservatives and these as if this were some sort of game or war, even though that is what conservatives think of us. Believed that that moral

obligation binds us objectively and meta culturally; we hold our positions because we believe we are objectively obligated to do so; without objective obligation, there would be no reason to do so. Believed that the basis of a political position must be moral obligation that binds objectively, binds because it is based on our ability to know objective truth. Believed that we should judge, evaluate sexual behavior not just for what it can contribute to our individual pleasure, but to our long-term personal happiness and that of others, especially of children that have been and will be produced. Do not view abortion as . . . Believed in government intervention in the economy because of the necessity of private property and free markets and hence of the necessity to redress their failures.

SSR, Funcional/Personal value, P&CG, Women's Lib, 11/30/94

One way of describing the kind of value you have as someone who can perform a function, i.e., the kind of value you have in your employment: a piece of meat. For women to want to accomplish something by having careers is to want to become pieces of meat.

SSR, Ethics, 12-16-94

The reason why even consensual extramarital sex is exploitation is that you are reducing the value of human life and so reducing the value of even the consenting partner -- and of yourself. The reason why you re reducing the value is that the value we place of sex will be the value we place on human life, and vice versa.

SSR, Love-based Society, Rights of children, value of person, committed love,
11/17/94

If unless we confine sex to marriage, we cannot make it a successful vehicle for and support for a relation of committed love. We can try to make it such a vehicle. But the attempt cannot be successful, where success is measured by

the providing of an environment of committed love for those most in need of it, the products of sex, our children.

SSR, G and L, 10/14/94 BIG

We have taught people to worry about whether their sexual freedom is or is not, will or will not be, infringed on. We should have taught them to worry about whether their committed personal relationships will be successful. They worry about sexual freedom because they see that linked to their happiness. They should see their committed personal relationships as much more linked to their happiness. Once they see that their happiness depends mostly on personal relationships, they can then see their sexuality as a means to committed personal relationships and so see their sexuality as a means to happiness, not for its own sake, but as a means to successful personal relationships. We should teach people to worry about the conditions necessary for successful personal relationships.

To put sexual pleasure in perspective in relation to our happiness, consider parents who have had to experience the death of a child. That child is a product of their sexuality; another product of their sexuality is pleasure. Which product is more important? Any parent who has lost a child would trade a lifetime of sexual pleasure to have that child back. That child IS the meaning of their sexuality. What children contribute to our happiness is INCOMPARABLY more than what sexual pleasure contributes to our happiness.

Now consider spouses who do not have children but have the kind of loving relationship that is supposed to, and is able to, characterize marriage. Then assume that at some point, they are no longer able to have sex, for example, because of the health of one of the partners. The relationship they have is INCOMPARABLY more important than the sexual pleasure they have lost.

We cannot have a society based on committed love, if we do not teach people to subordinate their sexuality to committed love. If we do not subordinate our sexuality to committed love, a society cannot have committed love at the most basic level, the family, where committed love must exist, if the rest of society is to be based on committed love, if the rest of society is to benefit from being a society based on love.

Liberal/Conservative, Saving Liberalism from the Liberals, Freedom of Religion, Freedom of speech, 8-9-94

On the attempt to suppress religious expression in the workplace by government regulation. Originally, freedom of religion, like freedom of speech, meant freedom from the government. Specifically, it means freedom from government interference with, or even government influence on, one's religious activity. But like freedom of speech, that restriction on government interference with the activity of individuals meant that individuals would have to put up with activities of other individuals that the latter individuals did not like. Now freedom of religion supposedly means that government has the license to interfere with the religious activities of individuals, because freedom of religion does not mean restriction on government regulation of religious activity. It means restriction on individuals religious activities. That is the opposite of what it originally meant.

Maybe what was original was wrong. But people are not aware that we are doing the exact opposite of what we thought was right. They are not aware of it because the same language is now being used to describe the opposite of what it described before.

Why save liberalism? What's wrong with conservatism? Cs still to not see that Joe McCarthy gave anti-Communism a bad name. but we must save liberalism from those liberals who think Communism is just a logical extension of

American liberalism, as if too much of a good thing were not a bad thing, as if X's being good automatically makes more of X good.

Because government can be abused, the Cs want to prevent government from acting at all, except for the "defense of individuals" very narrowly understood. On the other hand, we need to save liberalism from the liberals, because the regulations they support can institutionalize what is merely the latest intellectual fashion, for example, so-called outcome-based education or certain versions of "civil" rights, e.g., gay rights.

C's say that liberals, e.g., environmentalists, don't trust in God to take care of the planet. But C's certainly do not trust in God alone when it comes to defense, even to the extent of justifying nuclear weapons. So they are implicitly, and shamefully, invoking God to justify their nuclear weapons, since they claim that what they do is based on trust in God.

Sweden, 7-11-94

Sweden has the highest rate of "parental" breakup. (Popenoe, last chapter.) So the Swedish system inflicts on youth the documented deleterious effects of "divorce", even if it is not called that.

Most Swedish youth still desire a lasting monogamous relationship, even if they do not use the word "marriage". (Popenoe, last chapter) So their search for happiness is still harmed by condoning extra-marital sex, since that condoning weakens their ability to *succeed* in a monogamous relationship.

Those who cohabit before marriage (or is it those who have extra-marital sex before marriage) have an 80% higher divorce rate in Sweden than those who do not. (Myers, The Pursuit of Happiness, Marriage and Family chapter.) So the degree to which extra-marital sex weakens marriage seems to go up as the

amount of extramarital sex goes up. One of those 1960's or 70's articles I read prior to writing the NOR piece refers to a positive but *low* correlation between premarital sex and marital failure. And it cited some books from the 50's and late 30's. Now, however the rate is 50% in America and 80% in Sweden.

SSR, G&L, 6-21-94

Judith Reisman, *Soft Porn Plays Hardball*, 1991, Huntington House, 0-910311-65-X. & Edward W. Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex, and Fraud*, 1990, Huntington House, 0-910311-20-X.

Liberal/Conservative, 1-20-97

I grew up admiring the unions for their concern for justice. Then during the civil rights days, it was clear that some unions wanted justice only for themselves. So they were exhibiting the same thing I reacted against in conservatism, SELFISHNESS.

Sadly, the same selfishness is exhibited by many ideological liberals today.

An example, is the reaction to "The People Versus Larry Flint." Despite all the harm Flynn has done, he is considered a hero. Why? To many people, there own freedom (of speech in this case) is more important than the harm that freedom has done to others.

Another example is assisted suicide. People favor it, not out of compassion, but out of their own desire to avail themselves of assisted suicide, should they choose to. But they ignore the known social consequences of assisted suicide in doing so. The social consequences of solitary suicide is one thing, but assisted suicide involves another human beings. So we must ask what

effects assisted suicide might have on that other human being and the further human beings that other human being will have an effect on.

We know what those consequences are. Ideological liberals say we can prevent the unwanted consequences through legislation. Isn't that the way the NRA argues: just enforce criminal laws?

Another example is abortion. People think, I would want the ability to kill my baby, if I were in that situation.

Another example is religion. The "no establishment clause" is meant to help people practice their religion without interference, not to prevent people from practicing their religion. But to prevent parents from home schooling, if the home schooling has a religious purpose, is to make second class citizens out of those who have religious motives. It is the same with the Georgetown U. homosexuality case.

Many ideological liberals obviously perceive religion as a threat. Maybe Jerry Falwell is a threat. But the reaction to Justice Scalia's use of his free speech and freedom of religion, shows that they want religious people to be second class citizens. The same with their reaction to football players praying on the sidelines, etc.

It is a myth that religious people and leaders are all conservative. Spreading of the myth, shows that they perceive the free exercise of religion as a threat. And well it may be, since religion stands for higher values than individual choice.

Am I a social conservative. No, I am arguing against selective compassion.

Social conservatives are not for health care reform, equal justice for women, affirmative action. Etc.

Another example, People for the American way, ie., they try to censor others.

Another characteristic of conservatism that ideological liberals emulate, inflexibility, rigidity.

I have friends who should otherwise be liberals but who have been driven to conservatism by the moral liberals. They see that most moral liberals are political liberals. Why can't they see that the reverse need not hold?

Because liberalism has become dominated, in the popular mind, by moral liberals.

Pew, SSR, Sex, 1-10-97

A child is worthy of committed love. Therefore, she should be brought into existence through committed love, and it is an injustice to her if she is not.

And it is an injustice if we use our person-making power for less than committed love, thereby weakening the institution that can create and nurture the child with committed love.

SSR, Woman's lib, Pew, 3-19-96

"I don't want my body to be respected for its ability to carry children." Then you inevitably making your body into a sex object. "No, I want my body to be respected as belonging to a person, an end-in-herself." But you cancelled the value of a person when you refused to let your body be respected as the place where *persons* come into existence and are nurtured. Once that value is rejected, reduction to being a sex object is inevitable.

Liberal/conservative, saving liberalism from the liberals, Dec. 2, 94

Liberalism is the center, the mean between conservatism and socialism. But L must not let ideology get in the way of caring for those in most need of our support, our children.

By condoning abortion, liberals are supporting a form of selfishness as great or greater than that of the robber barons or arbitragers.

I am not for moderate liberalism, but more liberalism -- more true to its principles and consistent in their application. E.g., capital punishment and freedom of expression. The alternative is pushing good ideas to illogical extremes. In some cases, the effect will be moderation, but that is not the point. In other cases, the effect will be far from moderation.

Many liberals do not realize that they were taught a religion in college. For example, the belief that communism is benign, just another political system, and that Russia was well intentioned.

Dec. 6, 94

The most radical forms of feminism are the latest form of male manipulation of women. The proof is that more men than women have consistently favored the radical feminist agenda, e.g., on abortion. This is not a case of calling for less liberalism but calling for more. Abortion violates the liberal principle of defending the defenseless, and it does so in the name of a selfishness more universal than capitalist selfishness. Not everyone can relate to the selfishness of the entrepreneur, but everyone can understand sexual selfishness.

Jan. 18, 95

The only way to save opposition to the death penalty is to save it from those who go beyond that opposition all the way to giving killers furloughs and paroles.

That we don't study the effects on children first show that it's not really justice that we want. It's really: I'll give you freedom because I don't want my freedom interfered with. So we look for ways our freedom is potentially interfered with. And being adults, we overlook the ways the interests of children are interfered with. It's not justice; it's "enlightened" self-interest. Our goal is not to help others but to achieve self-gratification, not as an effect of the object aimed at, but as the object aimed at. I help others to the extent that I see it help me.

This started to become clear in the labor movement's refusal to give blacks jobs. They wanted justice - so long as they benefitted from it.

May. 30, 95

Do not ask: what is the primary function of government. Ask: what has government actually accomplished for good or for bad. Then ask, on the basis of past

experience, what can we expect government to accomplish in the future.

Saving Liberalism from the Liberals, Nov. 15, 94

Because Clinton went too far, we do not have health reform. See Sunday Boston Globe, Focus section, p. 3, September or early October, 1994.

I am not counselling "moderation". Often, we need to be more liberal, more consistent with liberal principles. One of those principles is the obligation for government to help those who cannot defend their own rights. That principle should make us opposed to abortion and gay rights. In those examples, ideologies extraneous to justice, to the common good, to defending the defenseless, have overruled those liberal principles. One of those ideologies, for example, is sexual freedom, which really means selfishness of a kind equal to that of any free marketeer who does not want to pay income taxes. For we do not even ask what effect that sexual freedom will have on the rights of the young (the dog did nothing in the night time).

Another example of not being consistent with liberal principles, letting killers off with less than life sentences. This is a violation of the principle of justice.

Other evidence that we need to save liberalism from the liberals, to save the country from conservatism: compare the lenient sentences liberal judges give to those that conservative judges give.

Another example: taxing businesses is regressive, is a hidden sales tax.

Intellectual fads, course idea, Nov. 20, 94

Example: values clarification, I' Ok-You're OK, Games people play, Co-dependency, Freudian analysis, cognitive therapy, Marxism, biofeedback.

Can make opposition to an intellectual fad appealing to students by making the opposition appear avante-garde, which it is.

Eugenics, Marxism, Freudianism, Progressive Education, over-population, relativism enhances tolerance, deconstruction, existentialism, structuralism, no differences between men and women.

Chesterton says someplace that England wanted the morals without the faith, or better, thought they could have the morals without the faith. But next it was: maybe we don't need those morals. But after that came a loss of any standards, much less moral standards. We don't even have educational, intellectual, or artistic standards. Paintings by four-year olds still win awards. Silly articles in silly scholarly journals still are considered valuable contributions that count toward tenure, promotion, and salary increases. Etc., etc.

We no longer defrock clergyman for sodomy.

SSR, Nov. 20, 94

In criticizing the condoning of extramarital sex for making successful marriage more difficult, am I illegitimately going beyond the right to opportunity to the right to certain results? False dichotomy. The opportunity we need is an opportunity for a successful marriage, not just the opportunity to try to have a successful marriage. It is an injustice to diminish the opportunity for a successful marriage. Likewise, it would be wrong to say "You have the opportunity to try to succeed economically," when we are depriving someone of the conditions necessary for the attempt to succeed. So not guaranteeing success, but guaranteeing conditions needed (normally) for the attempt to succeed (*ceteris paribus*). Not guaranteeing sufficient conditions, but necessary conditions.

Jan. 18, 95

It's easy to be a parent, so easy that one person can do it as well as two.

Liberal/Conservative, Saving Liberalism from the Liberals, P&CG, SSR, Empiricism, Predicament, C&D, Sep. 16, 94

Neither side is addressing the underlying issues. The number on welfare grew under both (or is it the number under the poverty line?) The rich/poor wage gap grew under both. The necessity of both parents to work to maintain the

"same" standard of living. Now stress on the job is epidemic and reaching crisis proportions.

Neither side is serving us; they are serving their ideologies. Cs make it a government or else issue. They define it as "The purpose of government is not to solve such issues; so we have to let things take their course." Contrary to the way Cs perceive Ls, Ls don't wake up thinking "How can I expand the power of government today?" Any expansion of government (and a smaller percentage works for government than in the 1950s according to Kuttner in the Globe this week) is an unitended, not directly intended, side-effect. Instead of thinking as the Cs say they do, Ls ask, "Will this plan help this problem?" Cs should, but can't, argue that this specific plan is bad, not that government cannot help. Ls, on the other hand, should appreciate the need for subordinate entities, the family and business, to contribute and that government cannot replace them, cannot compensate for their loss. Ls should also appreciate the importance of supporting and promoting such subordinate and independent entities in indirect ways (indirect to preserve their independence from government). For example, it is incumbent on government officials not to undermine the family by coming out of the closet when they habitually practice extramarital sex.

In the absence of a religion meeting minimal rational standards (one God; a transcendent God, rather than a mother-God) L itself becomes a religion to fill the vacuum. The Humanists and the People for the American Way demonstrate this. Once it becomes a religion, a good idea, L, gets pushed to illogical extremes, in the absence of any higher principles to restrain it. For example, the judge who refused to let the library kick out the noisy, stinking, homeless person. The judge said get rid of the condition of homelessness, not the person. But contrary to his "religion," we cannot end all such conditions, only ameliorate them. Utopian Sweden shows that there are limits to what we can do. That judge and Ls like him are bad for L, because they are sitting ducks for C's criticism. Because they give L a bad name. And both they and Cs make some straight-jacket, false-dichotomy, either-or assumptions. They say to blame it on society's failure to do something it could do. They say that government cannot do such

things (completely eliminate such problems), so don't let government do anything to such people but punish them. The truth is, that after our best efforts to eliminate homelessness and other such conditions, there are always going to be some people who need to be kicked out of libraries, in the name of the common good, for noisiness, stinking, etc.

The problem is bad metaphysics. Some are in love with the idea that society causes the problem, as if the idea that we are not responsible did not demean us. (Yet they unconsciously pride themselves on having and acting on such enlightened ideas, as if they could take credit for being responsible for acting in this enlightened way.) C's are in love with deducing "order" from eternal principles. We are victims of bad metaphysics because we can no longer draw on the interest from Judeo-Christian values, since we have spent the capital.

Saving Liberalism from the liberals, Sep. 11, 94

Example: Anti-nuclear groups expelling pro-lifers. And health care by committee is not good, but where were the conservatives before the liberals proposed health reform legislation? Clinton's "weed out" statement (quoted by Hentoff) is a liberal outrage, but where were the conservatives before?

When they were liberals, the founders of neo-Conservatism were pro-Communist (see the letter about the Yom Kippur war in Crisis). Then they flip-flopped completely. Where is liberal flexibility versus conservative rigidity? The neo-conservatives showed that they had always been as rigid as the conservatives have always been. Thus, the neo-conservative phenomenon shows why we need to save liberalism from the liberals. Many so-called liberals are just as rigid as any conservative, so much so that they can switch and become conservative at any time, as the neo-conservatives did. The next time, the cause of the switch will be something else. E.g., when enough liberals realize that defending the defenseless means promoting the family for the sake of children and stopping abortion, many current "liberals" will jump on the old conservative "free choice" bandwagon.

Compassion presupposes justice. This does not necessarily mean that justice

is more important than compassion, only that it is a necessary condition for compassion, a condition that prevents a good idea (compassion) from being carried to illogical extremes. You can't give the shirt off your back, if it is someone else's shirt. Today's liberalism seeks compassion without looking for guidance from justice. A good example of this is paroling murderers, or letting them have furloughs. The only just thing to do to a murderer is to lock him up and throw away the key. And second-degree murderers get out of jail ridiculously soon. We do this in the name of compassion. But it is not being compassionate to the rest of society not to affirm the value of human life by giving murder a just punishment.

Saving Liberalism from the Liberals, Liberal/Conservative, Aug. 31, 94

Check out that letter to Crisis on the origins of neo-Conservatism in the Yom Kippur war. Liberalism for many meant sympathy for Communism. Another reason to save Liberalism from the Liberals. For that view forced them to adopt Conservatism, when they lost their sympathy for communism. No sympathy for Communism, no Liberalism. And Conservatives gave anti-Communism a bad name by defending Senator McCarthy.

Why oppose Conservatism? Conservatives make you think that to defend the family you have to oppose welfare, hate-crime laws, that you have to use censorship stupidly, have to use law to impose religion, e.g., prayer in the schools, etc.

Liberal/Conservative, Saving Liberalism from the Liberals, Aug. 16, 94

We need to save liberalism from the liberals in order to save America from the conservatives.

What is liberalism, this thing I want to save? It used to be defined by a concern for justice over order. Now it is defined by compassion, which is really just a different kind of order. Liberals need to know that compassion presupposes justice. The concern for compassion more than justice is much like opting for relativism for the motive of encouraging tolerance. But if there are no

absolute values, why be for tolerance? Well tolerance minimizes conflicts and violence. But why be against conflicts and violence.

This may seem self-evident. But in fact, without principles to guide us, today's tolerance becomes tomorrow's intolerance. That is not just rhetoric. A good example is those whose interpretation of religion being a "private" matter no longer defines privacy against government interference, but would use government to prevent what until now all "reasonable" people would have considered freedom of speech, as well as freedom of religion.

Without principles, even apparently "liberal" laws become what Marx said, instruments for the ruling ideology of the day.

But then why save L? One reason is that it is the only alternative to conservatism. But why be against conservatism? For many reasons. They do prefer order to justice. And they prefer tradition to justice. They are laissez-faire. They cannot see the great amount of good that, for example, the ACLU does. They are not concerned with defendants rights. They do not want to use the military for humanitarian purposes. They cannot see the many good things about, for example, Swedish society.

Another example of why save liberalism: We may be about to get a very bad health plan. But where were the conservatives on this issues until the liberals actually proposed legislation to deal with it. Now the conservatives present a plan, as if they had always been concerned with health care, but they weren't.

Another reason: they do not want to use government to help people.

Liberal/Conservative, Jan. 4, 94

Liberal betrayal: labor unions who turned against civil rights for African-Americans; sixties radicals who turned against freedom of speech for their opponents in the eighties.

Liberal, Conservative, Oct. 1, 93

The liberal social agenda: civil rights, women's rights, gun control, the rights of victims and the accused, health care, protection of the environment,

etc.

P&CG, 6-14-91

Conservative and Liberal - both want freedom for the individual, not the person. And both are naive about evil, e.g., the unseen hand. And both want big government.

Card of the Card-Carrying Intellectuals of the World

4-19-91

First page:

Card-Carrying Intellectuals of the World

Legal name, nom d'plume, IQ, percentile, # of lines in my Who's Who entry, dissertation director, latest accomplishment, # of times mentioned in the New York Review of Books, Amount contributed to PBS, # of NEH grants, Fulbright year, Next sabbatical, # of years since attending church, synagogue, or mosque,

Second page

This card is proof of the bearer's unawareness that intellectuals have chronically:

- o Attacked unfashionable forms of religious bigotry while promoting others.

- o Been tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine (Marxism, Freudianism, social Darwinism, Malthusianism, trial marriages. I.e., that outside of the hard sciences where disputes can be settled by intersubjectively available data, we have promoted appealing intellectual fads as if they were undeniably true.

- o Defended the rights of intellectuals and artists under dictatorships while ignoring the daily abuse of the rights of the vast majority.

- o Conformed to the latest intellectually popular theory while criticizing

others for mindless conformity.

- o Taught both that there are no objective values and that their values are superior to those of other eras, groups, and cultures.

CCIW's Mottos:

Oops!

Well, back to the old drawing board.

Although a theory is held by most intellectuals at a given time, it still might be true.

Liberal/Conservative 12-4-92

The Liberal says: don't say we can't find the money to do justice; it's the Lord's money; He will supply if we try to do the just thing. The conservative says: the environmentalist does not trust God to take care of things.

Saving Liberalism from the Liberals, P&CG, 9-21-94

Use quotes around "Liberals" in the title: Saving Liberalism from the "Liberals". It is important to point out that these liberals are very well intentioned. They think of themselves as being virtuous by taking the positions they do. They think of themselves as advancing good causes, as achieving good intentions.

With reference to the neo-Conservatives who switched 180 degrees from extreme liberalism, their lack of liberal flexibility shows that they were Conservatives in sheep's clothing all along. I.e., they were trapped by a metaphysics all along; they just switched from one bad metaphysics to another.

12-1-89, Society, Definition of a Person

A person is an entity that not only has being but can share being with others. But any cause shares being. A person has a world, a universe that is the whole of being. A person can share the world, the universe, the whole of being with others. Other whats? Other entities? Not just any other entity, but entities that can also share the world. So the definition so far is redundant.

Because a person has a universe, a world, it follows that a person can also share that universe if there are other persons capable of receiving what the first shares.

The conclusion I want to get to is that the individual is defined in opposition to the community, but the person is not. Community follows from the definition of a person. So if a society upholds the value of persons, it must uphold the value of the communities, especially the family, that the person is related to be being a person.

Society, P&CG, liberal/conservative, 3-8-91

Who has a higher view of human nature, liberals or conservatives? Allegedly, liberals have a naively optimistic view of human nature. For example, they assume that welfare cheats will be few enough to justify welfare for those who are not cheating, while, so the conservative believes, welfare is just another temptation for human nature which will jump at any chance to get something the easy, if dishonest, way.

But conservatives also believe that human nature is such that if people are forced to rely on themselves, forced to fend for themselves, they will learn how to do it successfully, i.e., successful at least to the extent of maintaining subsistence for themselves and their children. Recall when that conservative couldn't believe the report (of another conservative) that people were starving in Latin America. Isn't that a naively high view of human nature?

Also, that view justifies the belief that if people don't succeed in maintaining subsistence, it's their own fault; for it isn't human nature's fault, since nature gives us the ability to learn to fend for ourselves. And does human nature do that? Especially in today's world where we don't need strong backs anymore, we need strong minds, i.e., technically trained people.

PCG - BIG 5-6-91

Personal fulfillment and happiness comes from loving something greater than yourself, serving something greater than yourself, for its sake, not your sake. So, enlightened selfishness means searching for something that, when you find it, deserves your commitment for what it is, not for your desire for fulfillment, i.e., enlightened selfishness means being willing not to put your desire for happiness first. The selfishness that cannot be enlightened, on the other hand, is a desire for happiness that refuses to acknowledge any greater reason for acting.

If we do not serve anything greater than ourselves, we have chaos, as we have now. But since we are persons, whatever is greater must have something to do with persons. E.g., we can commit ourselves to the social common good, because it is a common good for persons. Thus, we can sacrifice our lives for the social common good.

But achieving the common good requires restraints, because we are not just persons, we are also material individuals. That is, we need SOCIAL SUPPORT to make our decisions for the common good, e.g., the decision to marry, work. Because we are material individuals, we need that support, e.g., censorship of pornography.

PCG 5-29-91

Both liberals and conservatives want their idea of freedom, but freedom for selfishness. Reagan wanted a country where anyone could get rich. Feminists want natural differences between men and women to be ignored except when it comes to their ability to bear children. Then they want the fact that children

are in their bodies to permit them to kill the children. So both left and right want freedom for the selfish individual, not for the sake of justice or the common good.

I feel more betrayed by the left than by the right in this. I always knew the right was for selfishness and was unconcerned for the common good. But I grew up thinking the left's call for freedom/big government was for the sake of justice and the common good. I should have known better when so many union members who wanted justice for themselves during the forties and fifties showed they did not want it for blacks during the fifties, sixties, and seventies.

Ethics - AA

11-5-91

Can we tell people to be committed to their own pleasure, to fulfilling their own desires for pleasure AND tell them to be equally committed to the rights of others. Can that really work?

SSR - AA - BIG 11-14-91

Most social philosophies view society like a highway in which each person is going to her own destination, and the problem is: what are the minimal number of rules we need to keep us from interfering with each other's pursuit of our destinations?

No, the problem is: how do we achieve the common good, more specifically, how do we achieve communion with one another, union with one another? For that is what human happiness consists of this side of the grave, and that is what the most helpless among us, children, need.

Libertarians forget that we are individuals who, as such, are subordinate to the common good. They do not recognize the existence of, or they misunderstand the nature of, the common good.

It is not sufficient for someone to say, "I chose not to pursue communion with another person." We have the obligation not to interfere with and weaken other people's pursuit of communion by behavior that experience shows to weaken

the family. We know from experience that true communion is very difficult; so we have the obligation not to make it more difficult than it already is.

SSR - Permanent Commitments 1-26-92

What is the function of permanent commitments? What purpose do they serve in our lives? In fact, our long-term happiness depends on making sacrifices we might not want to make if we were not "forced" to make them in order to keep a permanent commitment. Marriages only succeed if the partners put aside other preferences for the sake of making the marriage work. In fact, human nature, or at least the human condition, is such that we would tend not to make the required sacrifice of our preference, if a commitment did not require us to do so. All other things being equal, it would not *appear* to us to be worth it to make the sacrifice. It truly is worth it but does not appear to us to be worth it, all other things being equal. But all other things are not equal, because we have made a permanent commitment that is very hard to get out of. Getting out of the commitment appears worse than making the sacrifice necessary to make the commitment work. So we make the sacrifice, and in the long run, we and the rest of society are *MUCH* better off for it.

SSR, P&CG, Family, Saving Liberalism from the liberals, Anti-Catholicism,
9/19/94

The U.N. convention on the rights of children (see Family Policy) has a paragraph that seems to say that parents cannot interfere with whom their children seek the companionship of, as if parents did not have the obligation to do that -- one of their most important obligations.

Another question is how should parents decide on who are good companions and who are not. The U.N. convention, and Anthony Flew (God and Philosophy), etc. seem to say that parents cannot use their religious beliefs in making such decisions. And Flew and others certainly say that parents cannot teach religious beliefs to children.

To say that is to say that parents cannot base their judgments on how to bring up children on their most fundamental beliefs, on their beliefs about what is most important, their most basic beliefs about what is most important. But at the same time, those holding this view can impose their most basic beliefs on the way the children of others will be brought up. For their position is a deduction from their de facto religious beliefs. They would say their position is not based on religious beliefs but on ethics. But to imply that there is nothing more important to consult in this matter than supposedly "rational" ethics is to adopt a non-rational but religious stance toward reason. To claim that this is not a religious stance toward reason is special pleading; it is to claim exemption for yourself from the criteria you apply to others. For there is no rationally justifiable proposition to the effect that reason is the highest arbiter in these matters, i.e., that there is no standard more basic and important than one which appeals to reason in this restrictive sense.

SSR, Liberal/conservative, population, 8/ 7/94

Population fear mongers are exactly like fundamentalist Christians predicting the end of the world. The fundamentalists know the end has been predicted many times before. But they say that this time the signs of the end are really there. Likewise, Malthus was predicting disaster in Sweden, but then the industrial Revolution came along. Malthusians know that false prophecies have been made in the past, but they say that this time the bases for the prophecies are really there.

Of course, they will also say that no harm is done in acting on the prophecies, since it's better to be safe than sorry. But harm can be done. Abortion is one form of harm, especially if "justified" on the basis of false predictions. Economic harm is another. Personal relationship harm is another, since NFP families are happier, including sexually happier. And there is the harm done by devaluing human life as an absolute end, when we use the means to human life while frustrating that end.

SSR, P&CG, Mock Harvard Speech 7/24/94

Peter Kreeft in Crisis July-August, 1994, p. 42 quotes Julian Huxley as saying that all his scientific colleagues immediately and eagerly embraced Darwin's Origin of Species, as soon as it appeared even before they had checked the evidence, because "Natural Selection got rid of God, and God was a great bother to our sex lives." Why should God be a bother to our sex lives? Maybe bring in at end of Harvard speech, after explaining why confining sex to marriage is necessary for our happiness. Ask how the change is going to come about. Then quote Huxley and point out that God is really on the side of our happiness.

Another topic, the sliding scale of the relation between condoning extramarital sex and failure in marriage. Earlier there was a positive but low relation. Now that extramarital sex is more common and there is less disapprobation of marital failure, there is a 50% relation. But in Sweden, according to Myers' The Pursuit of Happiness, there is an 80% relation. So the harm that condoning extramarital sex does to marriage is directly proportional to the degree of condoning extramarital sex.

Ordinati, P&CG, SSR, 7/24/94

Personal relations and personal value: your personal relations define who you are. I am the son of A and B; the brother of C and D; a citizen of this hamlet, etc.

Bishop George, GL, 7/3/94

Letter to Bishop George: Separate the following: 1) Comments on the statements of the bishops and the WCC from the point of view of clarity, misleading doctrine, etc. I.e., everything someone could say who did not know my arguments concerning GL rights. 2) The argument that the WCC statement was not strong enough, because we now have enough evidence to know that Gs coming out hurts our

young. We have an obligation to give our young an upbringing that gives them what they need to succeed in marriage.

Quote the Vatican on the duty of bishops to "promote" the family. That statement falls outside of the Vatican's vague statements about not being able to judge specific laws. But we cannot promote marriage if we condone those who engage in sex outside of marriage coming out of the closet. And one of the best ways to do this, short of making impossible laws against it, is for private individuals not to rent or sell housing to them. This is not the same as job discrimination, because housing is the scene of the "crime."

SSR, PCG, Happiness, Proposal to Prevent, 7/ 3/94

A proposal to prevent woman and child abuse. 1 woman is beaten every 16 seconds (in the USA) ; that comes out to 2 million per year.

We know that if we do not train children to look upon sex as a vehicle and support for committed love, their attempts at committed love will not succeed around 50% of the time. And we know that the more promiscuous someone is before marriage, the more likely they are to be unfaithful in marriage. Is it unreasonable to extrapolate that training them to view sex as an instrument for committed love will minimize the sexual and physical abuse of women and children?

People need love and nurturing. But we know that if we do not train people to view sex as essentially connected with marriage, they are much less likely to successfully get love in marriage. And where else are they going to get it, if marriage does not work?

According to Popenoe, Disturbing the Nest, last, summarizing chapter, even the large majority of Swedish youth still desire a lasting monogamous relationship (even if they do not use the word "marriage"). So it is still the case that the happiness of the large majority depends on marriage.

According to David Myers, The Pursuit of Happiness, a Swedish study shows that couples who cohabit before marriage (or is it those who have premarital sex?) are 80% more likely to divorce than those who do not. Relate this to the quotation, from one of those 1970s or 1960s articles that the correlation between pre-marital sex and divorce is positive but low. Now, in the USA, it is around 50%. The rising scale is evidence that the earlier statistics reflect a time when those who had premarital sex had fewer encounters with fewer partners and that they had more social support for faithfulness, after they got marriage. Thus, in Sweden, they have more pre-marital experience and more partners, and they have much less social support for faithfulness, after marriage.

Happiness, SSR, Mock Harvard speech, May 15, 1994

Every twelve seconds a woman is battered.

Liberal/Conservative, May 15, 1994

The president of Hillsdale college says that colleges and universities are in a crisis. What if congress held hearings on the crisis? Congress holds hearings precisely to identify problems solvable by spending money. If there isn't such a problem, there is not a problem relevant to congress. But the Hillsdale guy says government money is the problem.

Likewise, Reagan refused to admit the existence of problems, e.g., acid rain, if its existence would require government action to solve. If it would require government action, there is no such problem.

So different metaphysics refuse to admit the existence of different kinds of problems. How can we avoid these ideological blinders preventing us from seeing practical problems? (1) Recognize the necessity, the unavoidability, of metaphysics and religion, contra the liberals; (2) once recognized, separate that from our politics, contra the conservatives. (when their necessity is unrecognized, we are necessarily their slaves.)

SSR, G&L, Ethics, May 15, 1994

By letting gays come out, we are saying to the young gay, "You have the ability to have a satisfying heterosexual relationship, but we are going to make it as difficult as possible for you to succeed in one, we are going to do everything we can to prevent you from succeeding in one."

If you separate sexual morality from the creating of human life in one generation, you have to devalue human life, at least in the next generation, if not before. There won't be enough people to support the previous generation. (Referring to 3 generations: previous generation, this generation, the generation subsequent to this one) So the solution is the death of the previous, through "voluntary" suicide.

SSR, Mock Harvard speech, 10-17-91

Harvard's new president, quoted on the channel 5 news at 11 p.m. "Harvard should help solve social problems." Give me your list of social problems. Does it include the breakdown of personal relations, include the failure of marriages, the effects of divorce and single-parent families on children? What are our criteria for social "problems"?

SSR, G & L, March 20, 1994

The article that Athanasiou and Sarkin refer to with reference to chastity, the 1960's article, speaks of a positive relation between chastity and marital success but a low positive relation. The reason why it was low in those days and strong now may be the following. In those days, when you asked someone if they have premarital sex, an affirmative answer would have represented many fewer experiences with many fewer partners than an affirmative answer represents today. Another important reason would be that when those who had premarital sex did marry, there was much more social support for fidelity and much more disapprobation of infidelity and divorce in those days.

Mock Speech, Now, January 21, 1994

They want to give ghetto kids back their fathers and prevent us from demonstrating our thesis about single parents (the thesis that the problem is all economic).

NEA speech, January 21, 1994

Values clarification: The important thing is not whether or not the child has internalized certain values and made them her own. That is secondary to whether her behavior is morally just. Being morally just behavior is more important than whether it is behavior that expresses one's personality.

Ethics, equality not enough, P&CG, January 14, 1994

Can we evaluate others properly, if we do not believe in God? If not, society and the state cannot be indifferent to theism.

Liberal/Conservative, January 14, 1994

Chris Hart says educational reform is held captive between the NEA, on one side, and right-wingers who don't want their tax dollars helping minorities, on the other.

Ethics, P&CG, SSR, G and L, Personal versus functional, January 10, 1994

The de-personalizing of the parental relation, ie., the parent is not obligated to give personal love, as long as someone does, turns personal relations into functional ones, gives personal relations the attributes of functional ones. The characteristic of functional relations in contrast to personal is their interchangeability. Someone else can do the job you are valued for. So your value is not unique. Likewise, who ever is responsible for giving you love can be replaced; the job is interchangeable; the parent does not have unique, irreplaceable relation with you. But it is such relations that give the person its unique value.

Also, our society says, in effect, "Let's get rid of these personal

relations. They are entangling, restricting of my freedom; they place too many restrictions on me." But getting rid of those relations diminishes your value. You are no longer something worthy of committed love for your own sake.

P&CG, individualism, personal relations, community, January 9, 1994

All my life I've heard about "The Endangered Individual." Think of the television show "The Prisoner", and there are so many other examples. Over and over we've heard: "Be concerned about the individual and her individuality," "Be concerned about the individual and her individuality," ... And all that time, personal relations were going down the tube. Our philosophies did not give personal relations a second thought; personal relations were, de facto, not in the ontologies of our philosophies.

P&CG, SSR, October 18, 1993

Why did Plato, Sparta, etc. think that the state had the right to take the education of children out of the hands of parents? The implicit assumption is that the education of children is totally subordinate to the common good of society and, therefore, that the person does not transcend the common good of society. And so if the person does transcend the common good of society, then the family has the primary right of education. For if the family's right to educate does not supercede the state's, the value of the person being educated does not supercede the state's value. In other words, if the value of the person transcends the state, the value of the parents transcends the state. But if parents cannot make decisions concerning their own children's education, the parents do not transcend the state. And education in the family means education where the child is valued as a unique person, as opposed to being subordinated to the common good of the state. If we suppress the rights of the family, we can give lip service to the person transcending the state, but if the person has no relationships that transcend those with the state, the person does not transcend the state, in actuality.

In the family, the child is valued as being of equal value to the parents, as being the same as the parents with respect to what gives them their value, i.e., being persons. That is what a child is, something of the same nature as the parents. Hence, if a parent is not obligated to give committed love as a unique individual, the parent is not worthy of receiving love as a unique individual. For if the child is not worthy of receiving love as a unique individual, the parent is not worthy of receiving love as a unique individual. But the child apparently is not so worthy, because its maker, the parent, is not obligated to give that love along with giving existence. So the being to which it gives existence is not a being worthy of being given committed love along with the existence.

The liberal economic, social, and environmental agendas can succeed, if government does not have to carry the extra burden of trying to compensate for the failure of the family to perform its social function. Government can perform its functions, if it can assume that other components of society are performing theirs. If it has to compensate for the failure of others to perform theirs (as the failure of absolute socialism showed), the benefits government could otherwise bestow, the functions it could perform, will suffer.

G and L, SSR, September 15, 1993

Those in favor of gay rights sincerely think they are just offering people a choice. In fact, they are denying people a choice, and denying it to the most defenseless people, people most in need of our help to protect their choice.

Do we or do we not have sexual control? Sometimes they tell us that everybody does it, especially every teenager. This implies we do not really have a choice. At other times they tell us they are just trying to offer people a choice. In fact, the choice is between having control over our sexual appetites or being controlled by them.

It is one thing to choose to live with a disability. It is another thing to

choose to behave in such a way that others will not be able to overcome their (genetic) disability.

1) We have our value as persons, as opposed to as performers of tasks, affirmed mainly in relationships. 2) The relationships most essential to our value as persons are sexually-based relationships. 3) For sexually-based relationships to adequately perform that function, sex must be accompanied by committed love. 4) Sex cannot be associated with committed love to the necessary social extent if extra-marital sex is common. 5) Why not? OK, nature associated the means of reproduction with a mechanism that would support the long-term relations children need. But why must it be the case that that mechanism will not adequately support committed relations if used outside of marriage? Why did nature make sex function best if confined to marriage? Because if the means of reproduction would function just as well outside of marriage, there would be all sorts of children born outside of the committed relation they need. If birth control had been around 4 million years ago, maybe nature could have done it differently. But even birth control isn't enough; abortion is the only sure means of birth control.

Marx viewed human beings as functionaries in his definition of alienation. And he is praised as a "humanist" for having done so. In fact, he was accepting one of the most de-humanizing aspects of capitalism. The only thing more de-humanizing is secularism.

G and L, SSR, July 25, 1993

Socialism follows capitalism in measuring value by function and counting value as achieved in the performance of a function rather than a relationship. In doing so, socialism concedes the most fundamental error of capitalism.

Other than providing for material needs, basic material needs (food, clothing, shelter, health care, public safety) the most important job in a society is the moral education of the children. That is why every past society has organized itself around social roles defined in relation to the bringing up of the children. And if we make someone gay, we are excluding him or her from

participating in that social structure around which every society has been organized (whether or not a particular form of that organization was just).

G and L, July 11, 1993

We cannot look at protecting the rights of children in terms of after-the-fact remedies. That is the way we try to protect the rights of adults who have the ability to defend their own rights. Our protection of the rights of children must be before-the-fact by supporting the family. Otherwise, we are shirking our responsibility to children.

P&CG, SSR, letter to first post modern philosopher, July 10, 1993

Our society thinks that its highest value is maximum freedom for every individual. But without any basis for valuing the individual (.e.g, the individual is a child of God), a perceived majority feels justified in trampling on the rights of other minorities, e.g., PC language, don't say anything that offends gays, etc. We don't really value the individual. Love of the individual is not our highest value. Instead, politically fashionable values, the fashion of the day, dominate. We are at the mercy of the fashion of the day, because we have no basis for assigning dignity to the individual.

Really, the popularity of the claim that we value maximizing the freedom of the individual, the false claim, is that it is surreptitiously appealing to the supposed "enlightened" selfishness of each individual. Our highest value is selfishness, not love of other individuals. This is exemplified by the statement, during the Maplethorpe controversy, that I don't mind my tax dollars being used for this. But that isn't even the question, if the rights of individuals, as opposed to selfishness, is our highest value. The question should be whether you mind other people's tax dollars being spent in this way.

Another example in a discussion of the socially harmful effects of pornography, I don't want anybody telling me what to read. OK, maybe nobody should. But the answer to that question depends on the answer to whether or not there are socially harmful effects, and how great they are. That question has

to be settled first, not cut off by an appeal to what you don't want as an individual.

So really, the appeal to the rights of the individual is based on everyone's feeling that my wants will be better served if we agree to maximize everyone's freedom. But the PC controversy shows that we can't really enlighten selfishness (as a "practical" truth, yes, e.g., AA; as a metaphysical fact, no). Today, those who want to protect gays may be in a majority, but what happens when the majority shifts and they are silenced with as much right as they now silence others?

The lack of a basis for respecting the individual also shows up in the prevalence of rape and sexual abuse. Allegedly we do what we want as long as it does not interfere with the desires of the other. Really, we do what we want as long as we think we can get away with it, as long as it conforms to our "enlightened selfishness." Don't forget, men have much less to fear in rape than women do, especially before AIDS. They don't have to worry about getting pregnant. And there is little likelihood that women will start raping them. Homosexual men might rape them occasionally, but there are relatively few of them. And the enlightened selfishness of gays will prevent gay rape from becoming a common threat.

Ethics, post-modern, June 29, 1993

In letter to the first post-modern philosopher, practical knowledge section. No one seems to have noticed that rational knowledge determines obligation. If we are ignorant of something through no prior fault of our own, we are not obligated by that knowledge. And if we had a prior obligation to obtain certain knowledge, that obligation was based on further prior knowledge. It follows that obligation is a relation between decisions and the content of our knowledge. What kind of relation?

SSR, G and L, July 6, 1993

There are two and only two ways to use sexuality for the good of society. Each

way is a way of giving one's sexuality completely to the good of others, for the good of others.

Human reason is incapable of dealing with evil. For example, the constitution has two "religion" clauses to protect us against abuses like, for example, the inquisition. It has a free speech clause for the same purpose. But now those very clauses are used, not just for evil purposes, but for the very evils they were meant to prevent. For example, teaching gay rights in schools attacks religious beliefs and so violates the no establishment clause, but the no establishment clause is used to prevent those whose religion is being attacked from defending their religion on an equal footing. For example, Camille Paglia calls "Stalinists" those feminists who want to use their right of free speech to influence sports magazines not to have swimsuit issues (ESPN, Sport Center, 2-16 or 17; 7 p.m.). In other words, the free speech clause protects against the right of free speech.

xxx Liberal, Conservative, G and L, 5-30-93

Some conservatives think that the only ones who do not have medical insurance because they are young enough are "health insurance deadbeats."

What is a "social conservative"? If its someone who places what is traditional over individual rights, I am not a social conservative. If it is someone who places order over individual rights, I am not a social conservative. (Someone unconcerned about the environment, endangered species, gun control, capital punishment, defendants' rights, first amendment rights -- wholistically understood to include freedom of religion and no establishment, inclusively understood -- women's rights, discrimination by race, civil rights, etc.)

Conservative/Liberal, 3-24-93

Ideological liberals never believe that the governmental cure is worse than the disease; ideological conservatives never believe that the governmental cure is better than the disease. Ideological liberals always judge by the good

intentions, abstracting from the facts; ideological conservatives always mistrust good intentions and ignore the good facts, i.e., the facts that support the liberal action.

Conservative/liberal, 2-14-93

C's create a false dichotomy when they argue that because social welfare agencies, or government in general, can't do X, Y, Z, e.g., can't do what the family can do or can't do things efficiently, that therefore social welfare agencies or government are bad. There is nothing wrong with social welfare agencies, just because we can't expect them to do what families can do. On the other hand, liberals are too optimistic about what social welfare agencies can do.

That recent Boston Herald op ed piece shows that conservatives really don't believe there is such a thing as racial prejudice. Rick Owens last night confirmed this ("The Irish were discriminated against, but we made it!"). On the other hand, liberals don't believe there is such a thing as anti-religious, especially anti-Christian and anti-Catholic bigotry, when it goes on blatantly in the media and in public dialogue, e.g., by gays, everyday.

Teaching tolerance toward gays in the schools violates the intent of the no establishment clause. But, contrary to the conservatives, the mere intent of the founders is not the important thing. The important thing is the right not to have ones government establish a religion. This is a liberal dilemma, because the same liberals who want to use the schools attack Judaeo-Christian values concerning sex do not want school prayer, and argue against it on the basis of the no establishment clause.

Conservatives don't worry about the no establishment clause when it comes to prayer in schools; liberals don't worry about the no establsihment clause when it comes to using the schools to attack Judaeo-Christian sexual morality.

Liberal, Conservative, G and L, 5-30-93

Some conservatives think that the only ones who do not have medical insurance because they are young enough are "health insurance deadbeats."

What is a "social conservative"? If its someone who places what is traditional over individual rights, I am not a social conservative. If it is someone who places order over individual rights, I am not a social conservative. (Someone unconcerned about the environment, endangered species, gun control, capital punishment, defendants' rights, first amendment rights -- wholistically understood to include freedom of religion and no establishment, inclusively understood -- women's rights, discrimination by race, civil rights, etc.)

C's create a false dichotomy when they argue that because social welfare agencies, or government in general, can't do X, Y, Z, e.g., can't do what the family can do or can't do things efficiently, that therefore social welfare agencies or government are bad. There is nothing wrong with social welfare agencies, just because we can't expect them to do what families can do. On the other hand, liberals are too optimistic about what social welfare agencies can do.

That recent Boston Herald op ed piece shows that conservatives really don't believe there is such a thing as racial prejudice. Rick Owens last night confirmed this ("The Irish were discriminated against, but we made it!"). On the other hand, liberals don't believe there is such a thing as anti-religious, especially anti-Christian and anti-Catholic bigotry, when it goes on blatantly in the media and in public dialogue, e.g., by gays, everyday.

Teaching tolerance toward gays in the schools violates the intent of the no establishment clause. But, contrary to the conservatives, the mere intent of the founders is not the important thing. The important thing is the right not to have ones government establish a religion. This is a liberal dilemma, because the same liberals who want to use the schools attack Judaeo-Christian values concerning sex do not want school prayer, and argue against it on the basis of the no establishment clause.

Conservatives don't worry about the no establishment clause when it comes to

prayer in schools; liberals don't worry about the no establishment clause when it comes to using the schools to attack Judaeo-Christian sexual morality.

Conservative/Liberal, 3-24-93

Ideological liberals never believe that the governmental cure is worse than the disease; ideological conservatives never believe that the governmental cure is better than the disease. Ideological liberals always judge by the good intentions, abstracting from the facts; ideological conservatives always mistrust good intentions and ignore the good facts, i.e., the facts that support the liberal action. Liberal/Conservative, January 14, 1994

Chris Hart says educational reform is held captive between the NEA, on one side, and right-wingers who don't want their tax dollars helping minorities, on the other. Liberal/Conservative, May 15, 1994

The president of Hillsdale college says that colleges and universities are in a crisis. What if congress held hearings on the crisis? Congress holds hearings precisely to identify problems solvable by spending money. If there isn't such a problem, there is not a problem relevant to congress. But the Hillsdale guy says government money is the problem.

Likewise, Reagan refused to admit the existence of problems, e.g., acid rain, if its existence would require government action to solve. If it would require government action, there is no such problem.

So different metaphysics refuse to admit the existence of different kinds of problems. How can we avoid these ideological blinders preventing us from seeing practical problems? (1) Recognize the necessity, the unavoidability, of metaphysics and religion, contra the liberals; (2) once recognized, separate that from our politics, contra the conservatives. (when their necessity is unrecognized, we are necessarily their slaves.)

xxxIntellectual fads, values, etc., October 18, 1993

Chesterton says someplace that England wanted the morals without the faith, or better, thought they could have the morals without the faith. But next it was: maybe we don't need those morals. But after that came a loss of any standards, much less moral standards. We don't even have educational, intellectual, or artistic standards. Paintings by four-year olds still win awards. Silly articles in silly scholarly journals still are considered valuable contributions that count toward tenure, promotion, and salary increases. Etc., etc.

XxxWomen's lib, ordination of women, March 20, 1994

Approach it this way: write an article entitled "How to Achieve the Ordination of Women". State that you are open to women's ordination if they can come up with good theological arguments, which they have so far failed to do. Political arguments, arguments about hidden intentions, etc., will not do. One can always do the right thing for the wrong intention.

xxxSSR, 6-27-89

Why the child has a *right* to the family. The parent has the obligation to see that the child's needs are fulfilled. What are those needs? Just some supportive environment? No the child needs friendship, not just justice. Justice governs the exchange of things external to the person. Friendship concerns the person.

BRING THE PRODUCTION-LINE-VERSUS-THE-FAMILY EXAMPLE INTO SSR!

The child needs an environment that values him or her as a person. The parent who brings the child into existence has the obligation to see that this need is fulfilled.

Authority, government, Simon, Feb 26, 1999

"The morality of the sovereign" What are his DUTIES, what things exceed his duties? What constitutes the tyrannical exercise of power beyond what is moral?

P and CG, Haldane on Liberalism, Rawls, Jun 17, 1998

Does society need common beliefs. Yes. But that is a different question from "Should the state enforce common beliefs" or more generally from "What should the state do, if anything, about this need." If Rawls is right on the second question, it does not follow that he is right on the first.

Example of why we need common beliefs: Laws are written to rely on the judgment of the "reasonable man."

Liberal/conservative, December 11, 1996

Liberals made fools of themselves defending Alger Hiss. C's made fools of themselves defending Joe McCarthy. Some C's make fools of themselves by their acts of censorship. L's make fools of themselves by talking about "self-censorship" and by attacking the free speech of others in the name of opposing censorship.

C's: no root cause; L's only economic root cause.

Abortion: L's, no choice for unborn women; C's, welfare reforms that encourage abortions.

Jan 22, 1998

Why we need to be saved from conservatism, i.e., why we need to reform liberalism so that we can be saved from conservatism. If we propose a stupid medical plan like Clinton's, we will either wind up with no medical plan or a bad one. So to defeat the conservative opposition to any medical plan, we need a good one.

We have learned or could have learned the limitations of bureaucratic solutions, the point where the cure for problem X can have side effects bad

enough that this cure is unjustified or needs tinkering. Instead of learning this, the criticisms of bureaucratic methods that we hear come from, or appear to come from, people who are against any governmental solution. So that what could be constructive criticism becomes, in effect, anti-government propaganda. So we shun it.

Search for "utopian" at the Vatican website. Clinton's medical plan tended toward the utopian, trying to cover all social problems at once. California's bi-lingual education tended toward the utopian, requiring the scores of languages be taught at taxpayer's expense.

What is the cause of this extremism among liberals? How do we cure it. At least one cause is the association of political liberalism with philosophical liberalism. Philosophical liberalism is so intellectually mushy that it, de facto, trains or encourages sloppy thinking, prejudice, intolerance, and naive judgments. Yes, philosophical liberalism the belief that there are not absolutes, encourages prejudice. For without any intellectual, objective way of distinguishing what is objectively too much or too little, what goes too far or does not go far enough, human nature puts us at the mercy of emotional reactions to appearances. We cannot overcome emotional reactions to appearances through rational awareness of realities, either because reason does not give us sufficient access to reality or because value judgments are not based on objective reality but on subjective dispositions.

Trained not to look for objective standards, for things that are objectively excessive or insufficient, we naturally do not find them. This leads us into really stupid positions. That gives political liberalism a bad name. Without objective standards, we are at the mercy of cultural conditioning.

An example which illustrates both how philosophical liberalism is sloppy and how it leads to stupid results. We tend to judge actions by their good intentions rather than their results, .e.g, the judge who wants us to be concerned about the cause of homelessness rather than to make people who use the

public library observe minimal standards of hygiene. First, even though we find the intention good, this obnoxious way of pursuing the intention tends to put the intention itself in a bad light, just as the methods of terrorists tend to make people unsympathetic to their cause, no matter who just the cause is.

But more deeply, what does it mean to consider an intention "good" if there are no objective standards?

It is important to be clear about what the objectivity of moral good or evil consists in. I am talking about the moral quality of concrete, individual actions, as opposed to the successful formulation of universal principles about individual actions. I do not need to be a moral philosopher to know that the holocaust was wrong, that it would be wrong for me to rape someone tonight. But formulating general statements expressing exactly why, when, and where a generic type of action is wrong is not always easy. We almost always consider what we call "stealing" to be wrong. But we can also think of situations in which actions that resemble stealing would be justified, actions for which many people have no better term than "stealing."

And even when we succeed in expressing the idea that it is not wrong for a genuinely needy to take what she needs from someone who has more than he needs, as long as there is no other way to satisfy her need, it would be very difficult to express in general statements guidelines that would tell us, in every case, when one person is so in need and another has so much more than they need that the first would be justified in taking something by "stealth" from the second.

But do I need general statements of that kind to know that, now, given the circumstances I am in at this very moment, it would be wrong for me to take food from a starving baby for the sake of enjoying a pleasurable snack for which I have no nutritional need. We know that such an act would be evil and that knowledge consist of awareness of an objective fact. For we can give factual reasons why the act would be evil. At some point in our attempt to give factual reasons, we would run into problems of a philosophical nature. But that statement is true about every area of human endeavor; when we get down to the

fundamental underpinnings of everything, we run into philosophical problems, because that is the nature of philosophical problems.

This is not to diminish the importance of those problems. But we know that such problems are important because the matters those problems concern are objective matters and objectively important. We know its worth pursuing our interminable philosophical debates about, for example, ethics, despite the fact that induction would lead us to believe that philosophers will never come to long-lasting (more than a generation) agreement on them, because we know that the things about which philosophers disagree are objectively important.

We can even know the truth of some general statements about ethics, which could not be the case if those statements did not concern objective matters. For example, peace is better than war and love between people is better than hate, all other things being equal. Of course, there could be something better than peace, something that would necessitate war, not as better than peace in itself, but as a means to something that is better than peace in itself, for example, the defense of those who are unjustly attacked and who cannot defend themselves. The fact that the "all other things being equal" clause often makes decisions about what is or is not the right action difficult does not diminish the fact that those decisions are important precisely because they concern things that are in themselves objectively better or worse than the other.

And when we think that some political intentions are better than others, we are really thinking that it is true that they are better than others, that their being better than others is because of what they and other things are, not because of our subjective dispositions. We know that our dispositions will cease when we die; we do not think our political beliefs will cease being true when we die.

There is nothing more dangerous than ignorance in action, but ignorance is measured by objective standards. Because there are objective facts, there is something more dangerous than ignorance in action: well intentioned ignorance in action. For the tendency is to think that the goodness of the intention absolves us from looking at facts to determine whether the way we are pursuing

that intention is good or bad.

Feb 2, 1998

When someone like Nat Hentoff leaves the ACLU, no matter how much good it still does, that should tell us something. We are at the mercy of currently fashionable causes, ideas of right and wrong, with no way to distinguish fashion from justice, distinguish what is good and bad in fashion, what is lacking from fashion.

The effect of these arguments may be "moderation" but that is not their intended goal. The goal is to be able to recognize when we are defeating our own purposes.

Sep 16, 1998

The embarrassed liberal. I find in contemporary liberalism vices, failings of the same kind that I find in conservatism. E.g., dogmatism, absolutism, inflexibility, selfishness. Where did those vices come from, how did they creep into liberalism? Of course, they were always there in the extreme left wing of the party, but I was innocent of the fact that they were called liberals. An example of conservative absolutism and dogmatism was calling every government action "socialism," that is, they were unable to distinguish between what was socialism, in the justifiably bad sense, and what was not.

That dogmatism came into liberalism as a result of the sixties. In particular, it precisely came from currents that promised tolerance of other views, currents that thought of themselves as existing for the sake of tolerance, of nonabsolutism, etc. Those currents were unknowingly sawing off the limb they were sitting on. For unless the person is an absolute, an end-in-itself, there is no foundation for maintaining tolerance against all the pressures not to maintain tolerance.

Start: there are tremendous pressures against being tolerant of others.

