



July 2012

The Culture War

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“Is not the fanaticism of your irreligion more absurd and more dangerous than the fanaticism of superstition? ... You talk of nothing but tolerance, and never was a sect more intolerant.” – Louis Freron, 18th Century French parliamentarian and journalist, in a letter rebuking one of the anti-Christian *philosophies*.

“Given certain conditions, Christianity, Islam, and other faiths can and do contribute to violence. But what is implied in the conventional wisdom that religion is prone to violence is that Christianity, Islam, and other faiths are more inclined toward violence than ideologies and institutions that are identified as ‘secular.’...We like to believe that the liberal state arose to make peace between warring religious factions. Today, the Western liberal state is charged with the burden of creating peace in the face of the cruel religious fanaticism of the Muslim world. The myth of religious violence promotes a dichotomy between *us* in the secular West who are rational and peacemaking, and *them*, the hordes of violent religious fanatics in the Muslim world. *Their* violence is religious, and therefore irrational and divisive. *Our* violence, on the other hand, is rational, peacemaking, and necessary. Regrettably, we find ourselves forced to bomb them into the higher rationality.” –

William T. Cavanaugh, Associate Professor of Theology, University of St. Thomas (1)

During the 18th-century French Culture War, which ended in the French Revolution and the Napoleonic dictatorship, Christian writer Guillaume Francois Berthier described the fashion in which cultural debates had been framed: "The custom has been to call 'philosophers' those who attack revealed religion, and 'persecutors' those who battle for its defense."

In contemporary America a similar custom presently prevails, in which collectivists - however violent - are said to represent the forces of "tolerance," and traditionalists - however peaceful - are portrayed as agents of "hate" and "violence." Although hardly limited to the issue, this double standard is most visible in the campaign to normalize homosexuality and promote the bizarre artifact of social engineering our rulers insist that we call "same-sex marriage."

Marriage and the family are institutions that antedate political government. They are neither the creation of the state nor properly subject to its jurisdiction. (2) It wasn't until the Jacobin revolution in 18th Century France that government arrogated to itself the supposed authority to regulate and solemnize marriage. Once this occurred – and this system was exported throughout the western world, including the United States – it was inevitable that the state, invoking the conveniently amorphous concept of “tolerance,” would re-engineer the institution.

Every human government has targeted the traditional family for extinction. This isn't simply because governments tend to attract the depraved (although this is certainly true); it also reflects the fact that the family is an impediment to the state's growth, a shield against the government's invasion of individual liberties, and a natural institution that can regulate and sustain itself outside of political control.

Some totalitarian societies – such as ancient Sparta and Mao's China – used the blunt and unrefined instrument of state terror in an effort to destroy the family outright. More sophisticated tyrannies, such as the one operating in the United States today, approach the matter from exactly the opposite direction: Rather than persecuting the family into oblivion, they seek to destroy its uniqueness by making it more “inclusive.” Yes, the conventional family will be permitted to exist, but we will not be allowed to “discriminate” against those who prefer a more “progressive” arrangement, such as “same-sex marriage.”

To the unobservant, or easily manipulated, this seems like a commendably tolerant arrangement – until it becomes clear that those in charge of it exhibit no tolerance for those designated “intolerant.”

All human beings who exercise a measure of personal liberty practice discrimination. Each of us makes choices in social, economic, political, and religious associations that involve including some and excluding others. Inasmuch as we do so without violating the property rights of others through force or fraud, no government has any role in scrutinizing them, much less micro-managing them and punishing those who make choices that some people find objectionable.

In the name of officially mandated “tolerance,” however, the government ruling us has created a system in which all of our commercial enterprises and private associations are quietly monitored for evidence of politically unacceptable opinions regarding race, sex, and what is called “sexual orientation.”

After the president of the Chick-fil-A restaurant chain expressed opposition to the peculiar social artifact called “same-sex marriage,” homosexual pressure groups announced their intention to boycott the business. Withholding business is a form of political activism compatible with property rights and the non-aggression principle. Attacking the property rights of someone with whom you disagree is not.

Chicago Alderman Proco Moreno, who was born in the wrong time zone to be a Communist Chinese functionary, has announced that he would use zoning ordinances to block Chick-fil-A's plans to establish a second store in the city. That action has the approval of Mayor Rahm

Emanuel, who has displayed greater tolerance for urban street gangs than he has for Christian business owners. (3)

Boston Mayor Thomas Menino made a similar announcement. He reversed his decision, however, after it dawned on him that in the current economy gestures of this kind might be the equivalent of political suicide. (4)

Left-leaning pundit Adam Serwer of *Mother Jones* magazine notes that “The government blocking a business from opening based on the owner’s political views is a clear threat to everyone’s freedom of speech....” Serwer neglected to mention that it is also lethal to the very concept of property rights. (5)

As the leftist jihad against the Chick fil-A restaurant chain illustrates, those who offer evidence of such proscribed views can find themselves subject to punitive sanctions of various kinds. In this case, the supposed offense committed by the chain’s president consisted of expressing opposition to so-called same-sex marriage in exactly the same terms used by then-candidate Barack Obama in 2008.

The regulation of attitudes and associations in the name of “tolerance” is a form of soft totalitarianism – albeit one that can harden into undisguised tyranny very quickly.

Social commentator Nikolas Strakon offers this incisive description of how the corporatist economic system works to the advantage of America’s cultural commissars:

“When we have talked about rights, we have said that property rights are the basis for all rights, and that the Left did not understand that. They thought that other rights could somehow exist without property rights. But now we see that leftists understand the connection perfectly well. And they understand that the way you keep a person from speaking his mind is to deprive him of his livelihood and to destroy his business — in other words, to violate his property rights. If you can keep him from expanding his business, you can punish him for speaking. *Maybe it’s illegal to put him in jail for what he says, but you can still repress him for it.*” (Emphasis added.) (6)

This isn’t to say, of course, that the proponents of totalitarian “tolerance” will be content merely to execrate, isolate, and expropriate those who are considered thought criminals.

In the late 1980s, psychologist Marshall K. Kirk and ad executive Hunter Madsen published a book entitled *After the Ball* that outlined a media campaign designed to win public support for the "gay rights" revolution. (7) Noted the authors, **"The first order of business is the desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference rather than keen emotion.... You can forget about trying to persuade the masses that homosexuality is a good thing. But if only you can get them to think that it is just another thing ... then your battle for legal and social rights is virtually won."**

According to Kirk and Madsen, once the public has been persuaded that moral indifference is a virtue, homosexuals would be able to use the mass media to "portray gays as victims, not as aggressive challengers. In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector." Once the public has been beguiled into believing that "decency" requires support for "gay rights," public hostility must be focused upon those who remain committed to traditional morality:

“At a later stage of the media campaign for gay rights ... it will be time to get tough. To be blunt, [traditionalists] must be vilified The public should be shown images of ranting homophobes whose secondary traits and beliefs disgust middle America. These images might include: the Ku Klux Klan demanding that gays be burned alive or [tortured]; bigoted southern ministers drooling with hysterical hatred to a degree that looks both comical and deranged....”

With a calculated dishonesty that would have won the admiration of Joseph Goebbels, the homosexual movement and its media allies followed this strategy. In contemporary popular culture, any expression of opposition to homosexuality, no matter how temperate and intellectually sound, is immediately free-associated with violent bigotry. Having defined the rules of engagement in America's Culture War, the homosexual "rights" movement is proceeding with its assault upon what remains of America's conventional institutions and traditional morality.

The campaign described by Kirk and Madsen included agents of influence – even “sleeper agents” – in practically every consequential social institution. Consider the case of Mel White, who presides over the Cathedral of Hope Metropolitan Community Church in Dallas. White made a reputation for himself as a ghostwriter for such Evangelical leaders as Billy Graham and Jerry Falwell. In the late 1980s, White “came out” and left his wife of 25 years.

White went public with his lifestyle shortly after a series of high-profile scandals involving televangelists such as Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart. The same media opinion cartel that luxuriated in its outrage over such admittedly disgusting hypocrisy warmly embraced White: A typically hagiographic profile in the August 10, 1993 *Washington Post* bore the mock-ironic headline, "**Mel White Gave Voice to the Christian Right. Then He Committed the Sin of Admission.**" The headline of a July 29, 1993, *Los Angeles Times* puff-piece proclaimed that White lives "**In a State of Grace.**"

This is in keeping with the Kirk/Madsen media strategy, which dictates: "In order to make a Gay victim sympathetic to straights you have to portray him as Everyman The campaign should paint gays as superior pillars of society." Thus, the *Washington Post* told its readers, "At first glance, Mel White looks like an ordinary guy from the suburbs; you could picture him as the weatherman in Pasadena."

The story proceeds to describe White as an articulate, soft-spoken man of preternatural tolerance toward his "oppressors" – that is, people who disapprove of his behavior, *not those who commit*

or would condone acts of aggressive violence against him (the latter being, at all times and in all circumstances, morally impermissible).

In the moral calculus of collectivists, the use of aggressive violence is the prerogative of the “oppressed.” This applies in all of the social conflicts orchestrated by proponents of social revolution and political consolidation – whether they involve people of different races, different religions, different sexes, or different “orientations.” And the supposedly winsome and unassuming Mel White embodied this dichotomy.

During an August 13, 1993, interview on the old CNN *Larry King Live* program, White disclosed: "I'm a member of ACT-UP. I know what we do and what we don't do." ACT-UP, the Aids Coalition to Unleash Power, was a national “direct action” group. Their cadres would disrupt religious services and carry out campaigns of harassment, violence, and intimidation. The organization’s Washington, D.C., chapter was organized by activists who used Hitler's *Mein Kampf* as their tactical bible.

White announced to King that he intended to conduct a "personal war" against the Religious Right, which he described as "**the enemy ... a threat to the warp and woof of American society.**" He accused Christian conservatives of "**us[ing] gays to make money, and the suffering from their rhetoric trickles down and causes death - literally.**"

The "trickle-down" metaphor was given fuller development by White in a statement he made to the *Washington Post*:

“We [homosexual activists] have gone underground and we have people in every one of the Religious Right's organizations. We're on their mailing lists. We're reading everything they're putting out. We think the words from their mouths trickle down into violence. And when our evidence reaches a critical mass, we're going to use the best attorneys in this country to bring a class action suit in 50 states to have it stopped.”

What exactly would White and his allies seek to "stop," and how would they "have it stopped"? Would they ask the federal government to suppress "homophobic" speech, or - in the fashion of White's ACT-UP comrades - disrupt "homophobic" worship services?

Just a few weeks after White made those comments, homosexual activists organized by ACT-UP conducted a pogrom against a theologically orthodox Christian congregation in San Francisco – but White piously disavowed the idea that his own words had somehow precipitated the violence. (8)

Although it occurred nearly twenty years ago, it’s worth reviewing the notorious assault on Hamilton Square Baptist Church in some detail – if only to put into context this summer’s media-generated controversy about the Chick-fil-A restaurant chain.

On September 19, 1993, a mob of homosexuals surrounded San Francisco’s Hamilton Square Baptist Church. They had been aroused to action by two newspaper articles announcing that the

service on the Sunday night in question would feature an address by Reverend Lou Sheldon, an activist with the Traditional Values Coalition.

Dr. David Innes, pastor of the Hamilton Square Church, noted in a press release that before the local press publicized Sheldon's visit, "Only the church's membership and regular attenders were notified of this service, through the church's own Sunday bulletin." During the week before the September 19 meeting, Innes received two phone calls demanding that Sheldon be disinvited. The church was also visited by two homosexual activists who told the building's caretaker that Sheldon would not be allowed to speak on the following Sunday.

Fearing for the safety of his congregation, Dr. Innes formally requested protection from the Northern Station police division. "**You must understand,**" Dr. Innes was told, "**this is San Francisco.**" Innes persisted until he received assurances that police would "monitor" the Sunday evening gathering.

The mob began to assemble around the church at 5:00 p.m. Sunday evening; an hour later the protest had evolved into a full-scale riot. The protesters essentially seized control of the church grounds and attempted to prevent worshippers from entering the chapel. Church property was damaged; obscene handbills were plastered on the building's walls and windows; worshippers were assaulted with obscenities and pelted with stones. A group of the protesters tore down the Christian flag that had been on display in front of the church and replaced it with the rainbow flag of the "Queer Nation." At one point, protesters caught sight of children in the church's lobby; they began to chant, "**We want your children. Give us your children.**" (9)

The September 23, 1993, issue of the *Bay Area Reporter*, a homosexual newspaper that helped publicize the protest, described the mob's reaction to Reverend Sheldon's arrival: "**Suddenly the doors to the sanctuary bulged inward as demonstrators pounded on the doors. Children began to cry as the doors appeared as if they were coming down and the booming sound of the pounding reverberated through the gothic ceilinged room.**"

Immediately after the riot, Dr. Innes offered a videotape of the atrocity to the *San Francisco Chronicle* and local television stations. "They were not only indifferent, they were frankly hostile," Innes later recalled. "They told me that they weren't going to run a story about the riot." Like Christians living under Soviet rule, Dr. Innes and his associates had to rely on *Samizdat* - underground circulation of their information - to make others aware of their plight.

Shortly after the protest, Dr. Innes received an anonymous phone message containing a bomb threat. Pastor Charles McIlhenny, who was in attendance at Hamilton Square Church on September 19, can testify that such threats are not to be lightly dismissed.

In 1983, McIlhenny and his family narrowly escaped death when his church, the First Orthodox Presbyterian Church (in San Francisco), was fire-bombed. Although the assailant was never captured, the McIlhenny family suspects that the murder attempt was made in reprisal for McIlhenny's public opposition to the collectivist element of the homosexual movement. Since 1977, the McIlhenny family has received numerous death threats from radical "gay" activists.

McIlhenny recalls receiving phone calls "**describing our children - by name, appearance, where they attended school, when they got out of school, and what sexually deviant behavior was to be practiced on the children before killing them.**"

Needless to say, when McIlhenny heard the mob assailing the Hamilton Square Church chant, "**We want your children - give us your children,**" he understood the full, malignant import of that demand.

Eruptions of vulgar collectivist violence of that kind are relatively rare. Kirk and Madsen's disciples prefer a Fabian strategy – patient gradualism, punctuated by the occasional dramatic social "reform" (such as the political imposition of "same-sex marriage") and garnished by the occasional hate campaign against "reactionaries" (such as the demonization of Chick-fil-A). The state's administrative apparatus also quietly expands its power, relentlessly constricting the remaining private space for those who practice conventional morality and profess traditional values.

The state-aligned media provides support by immersing the culture in Kirk/Madsen-approved narratives; one spectacular example is this fall's much-hyped NBC program (brought to us by the people who concocted "Glee," a TV show that portrayed a sexually active adolescent homosexual couple) entitled "The New Normal." The premise is that a lovely, suitably "progressive" young woman volunteers to be the surrogate mother for a flawlessly telegenic "gay" couple, despite the untutored disapproval of her stereotypically bigoted, middle-aged, conservative mother. This is a singularly faithful adaptation of the *After the Ball* media template.

Last May, Barack Obama – who "triangulates" as habitually, if not as gracefully, as Bill Clinton – offered a highly qualified endorsement of "same-sex marriage." Within a few weeks, celebrity journalist Andrew Sullivan, who "married" his boyfriend a few years ago, wrote a *Newsweek* cover story designating Obama – crowned with a rainbow halo - as "The First Gay President." (10)

Speaking on the Chris Matthews Show after writing the piece, Sullivan wept openly over receiving what he considered a benediction from the sanctified hand of the Dear Leader:

"I sat down and watched our president tell me that I am his equal, that I'm no longer outside, I'm fully part of this family and to hear the president who is in some ways a father figure speak to that, the tears came down like with many people in our families, to be included." (11)

The architects of the Cultural Revolution we're discussing don't care a particle about the rights of homosexuals, or anybody else. Since they care nothing about their souls, they certainly wouldn't flinch about destroying their bodies in any number of ways they considered suitable to their purposes. Granted, they consider homosexuality – or any other nulliparous lifestyle – to be useful for the purposes of population control; this was made very clear in, among other things, the notorious "Jaffe Memorandum" compiled by Planned Parenthood. (12) But the people who seek to remold the world closer to their heart's desire would see nothing amiss in liquidating

“gays” – or anybody else cattle-penned in one of their collectivist pressure groups – once they’ve made use of them.

Witness what happened to Ernst Roehm and his fellow Brownshirts, who were embraced by Adolf Hitler in spite of the public scandal provoked by their unabashed homosexuality – only to be summarily slaughtered in the “Night of Long Knives” purge once they had done their part to consolidate power.

REFERENCES

- 1) “Does Religion Cause Violence?” William T. Cavanaugh, *Harvard Divinity Bulletin*, Spring/Summer 2007; archived at -- <http://www.hds.harvard.edu/news-events/harvard-divinity-bulletin/articles/does-religion-cause-violence>
- 2) See generally I Samuel: Chapter 8.
- 3) “Alderman to Chick-fil-A: No Deal,” *Chicago Tribune*, July 25, 2012
- 4) “Mayor Menino on Chick-fil-A: Stuff it,” *Boston Herald*, July 20, 2012
- 5) “In Defense of Chick-fil-A,” Adam Serwer, *Mother Jones* (online), July 26, 2012
- 6) “Stop and Think,” *The Last Ditch*, August 7, 2012; archived at <http://www.thornwalker.com/ditch/>
- 7) See generally *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90s* (Plume, 1990).
- 8) Detailed accounts of the incidents at the Hamilton Square Baptist Church have been archived here -- <http://hamiltonsquare.net/articlesRiotsNov1993.htm>
- 9) A video report about the assault on the church, and its aftermath can be found here – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WObJ1EkWGsA>
- 10) See *Newsweek*’s May 13 cover story.
- 11) For a video clip and transcript of Sullivan on the Chris Matthews Show, go here – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BxE8FLhFNUU>
- 12) *Family Planning Perspectives*, October 1970; cited in Robert Whelan, *Choices in Childbearing: When Does Family Planning Become Population Control?* (London: The Committee on Population and the Economy, 1992), pg. 4

Written by William Grigg

Barbara and I appreciate your faithful prayers, and your loyal support.

Stanley Monteith