

EDITOR
Thomas Fleming

MANAGING EDITOR
Theodore Pappas

SENIOR EDITOR, BOOKS
Chilton Williamson, Jr.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Michael Washburn

ART DIRECTOR
Anna Mycek-Wodecki

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
Harold O.J. Brown, Katherine Dalton,
Samuel Francis, George Garrett,
Christine Haynes, E. Christian Kopff,
Clyde Wilson

CORRESPONDING EDITORS
Bill Kauffman, William Mills,
Jacob Neusner, John Shelton Reed,
Momcilo Selic

EDITORIAL SECRETARY
Leann Dobbs

PUBLISHER
Allan C. Carlson

PUBLICATION DIRECTOR
Guy C. Reffett

PRODUCTION SECRETARY
Anita Candy

CIRCULATION MANAGER
Rochelle Frank

A publication of The Rockford Institute.
Editorial and Advertising Offices:
934 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103.
Editorial Phone: (815) 964-5054.
Advertising Phone: (815) 964-5811.
Subscription Department: P.O. Box 800,
Mount Morris, IL 61054. Call 1-800-877-5459.
For information on advertising in *Chronicles*,
please call Rochelle Frank at (815) 964-5811.

U.S.A. Newsstand Distribution by Eastern News
Distributors, Inc., 1130 Cleveland Road,
Sandusky, OH 44870.

Copyright © 1995 by The Rockford Institute.
All rights reserved.

Chronicles (ISSN 0887-5731) is published
monthly for \$39.00 per year by The Rockford
Institute, 934 North Main Street, Rockford,
IL 61103-7061. Second-class postage paid
at Rockford, IL and additional mailing offices.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to
Chronicles, P.O. Box 800, Mount Morris,
IL 61054.

The views expressed in *Chronicles* are the
authors' alone and do not necessarily reflect
the views of The Rockford Institute or of its
directors. Unsolicited manuscripts cannot be
returned unless accompanied by a self-addressed
stamped envelope.

Chronicles
A MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN CULTURE

Vol. 20, No. 1 January 1996

Printed in the United States of America

On Scots Nationalism

Michael Hill, in "Scots Nationalism, Yesterday and Today" (November 1995), says that few men of the caliber of our forefathers are alive today and that "we lack the spirit of resistance that moved our forebears to defend their ancient liberties." If the "we" referred to consists of academics, corporate executives, and conservatives, then I heartily agree with the assessment. However, as a general, demoralizing indictment, it doesn't obtain.

Gordon Kahl battled federal marshals in the Dakotas, and Robert J. Matthews made his epic, last stand 11 years ago this December on Whidbey Island, Washington. The late Vicki Weaver is of the same mettle as the pioneer women who held the Plains Indians at bay. We do not lack for heroes. What is lacking is a willingness on the part of right-wing men of wealth and station to assist these heroes. The Weavers found a champion in attorney Gerry Spence. Due to Matthews' eccentric political affiliations, his bones have been left as carrion for tabloid caricature, though his memory is kindled by a small segment of lower-class, young white Americans.

—Michael A. Hoffman II
Coeur d'Alene, ID

Dr. Hill Replies:

Mr. Hoffman is correct in pointing out the sacrifices made by the likes of Vicki Weaver, Gordon Kahl, and Robert Matthews against a federal Leviathan bent upon depriving us of our liberties. He is also right when he says that, in general, "academics, corporate executives, and conservatives" lack "a willingness . . . to assist these heroes." It was not my intention to issue a "demoralizing indictment," but merely to point out that all too few Americans of every station take seriously the threats to their freedom.

I had hoped to challenge those of position and power who fancy themselves conservatives and traditionalists to call forth the courage of our Scottish ancestors in restoring the Old Republic. Undoubtedly, there are tens of thousands of hardworking, patriotic Americans who display this courage every day; however, they lack proper organization and leadership—without which they will not succeed in rolling back the power of the illicit state. To give direction to the emerging populist groundswell, it is time for men of influence to take a stand.

CULTURAL REVOLUTIONS

SIR JAMES GOLDSMITH's *The Trap* (New York, 1994) is the clearest introduction to the arguments against global free trade and its consequences for the nation. The English translation adds helpful notes and bibliography to the French original, *Le Piège* (Paris, 1993). In some places, however, rearrangement and omission change Goldsmith's message.

The last chapter of *Le Piège* ends with a ringing endorsement of economic nationalism: "Our supreme responsibility will remain that of protecting the sovereignty, identity, territory and stability of the nation. Maastricht and GATT are trying to destroy these foundations of our society. Question: Is that why you

are running for the European Parliament? Answer: Yes." (He won a seat.) The English *Trap* suppresses this chapter and ends with what I call the Pocahontas chapter, a brief put-down of Christianity and praise of native folk cults and their purported vision of the goddess, Earth, translated from the penultimate chapter of the French. The last words in the English *Trap* come from a two-page letter supposedly written by Chief Seattle to President Franklin Pierce in 1854. (No one knows who wrote it, and there is no evidence that it was ever sent to Pierce.) We close the English *Trap* not with our duty to the nation, but with two pages of Transcendentalist mush, e.g., "Our dead never forget this beautiful earth, for it is

the mother of the red man. . . . The earth is not the white man's brother but his enemy. . . ." The French original gives us the gift Burns asked for, "to see ourselves as others see us." Near the beginning, Goldsmith notes that although the American Gross National Product has quadrupled in the last 50 years, "American society is in serious social crisis." In French, "*La société américaine [est] profondément malade*"; it is profoundly sick. Goldsmith notes in English that "The Founding Fathers originally conceived the United States as a true federation of free peoples." He goes on to say in the French, "The original conception was little by little suffocated [*étouffée*] by the central authority." Both versions tell us that Goldsmith heard Nobel Laureate James Buchanan say that Madison would be shocked if he were to return today. Only in the French does Goldsmith comment, "Our first task is to avoid degenerating into a centralized Leviathan" like the contemporary United States. Goldsmith is only one of many thoughtful Europeans who look forward to greater European unity, but always with the proviso, "we cannot allow what happened to the U.S. to happen to Europe."

Goldsmith's European patriotism is elided from the English *Trap*. "Europe has much to offer. Its civilization is far superior to the invading novelties emanating from North America." When united, Europe will have a greater influence on international affairs. "By that I do not mean intruding into everything the way America does. I mean influencing matters that really concern us, like international trade. America is trying to impose a globalist free market. A united Europe can and must protect itself from that." When asked what Europe can do, Goldsmith replies, "First of all, don't be impressed by American threats." Europe runs a large trade deficit with the United States. "Isn't it strange to see the seller threaten his client and even stranger to see the client take these threats seriously?" If Europe will not go along with global free trade, Mickey Kantor won't let them watch the next *Jurassic Park*.

The Trap is essential reading for all Americans. In French and English it explains why the European Union will be prosperous only if it is founded on the basis of prosperous and independent nations. The French original makes clear that a major obstacle to this goal is the

interventionist and globalist United States regime, founded by President Roosevelt in 1933 and still very much in control. The Department of Labor has estimated that NAFTA has destroyed over 42,000 jobs in this country. (*New York Times*, October 9, 1995). NAFTA's passage was a bipartisan effort, led by the President and the Minority Leader (now the Speaker) of the House. To restore freedom and prosperity to the United States, we need to restore the "suffocated" original conception of "a true federation of free peoples," isolationist in foreign policy and continentalist in economic policy. The true Contract with America is the Constitution of the United States.

—E. Christian Kopff

THE NEW SEXUAL WORLD Order is taking shape, thanks to the Peace Corps, the United Nations, and the U.S. Congress. In late September, Dr. J. Ricker Polsdorfer, the Peace Corps' director of medical services in Africa, was fired for promoting abstinence as a method of preventing AIDS. Dr. Polsdorfer's crimes, according to the Peace Corps director in Zimbabwe, were that he "pushed this stance to the point that you promote only abstention, disapprove of the use of condoms and have openly expressed the belief that sexual relations with host country nationals should be against Peace Corps policy."

From teaching English, distributing food, and digging irrigation ditches to installing "confidence in condoms" and encouraging sexual liaisons with the overseas hosts—how the Peace Corps has changed in 35 years. When started by President Kennedy in 1961, the Peace Corps focused exclusively on fighting poverty, hunger, and illiteracy in the Third World; its volunteers waged the Cold War on the humanitarian front, battling Soviet influence in these countries with shovels, schoolbooks, and by the sweat of their brow. But with the Cold War over and Western consumerism and egalitarianism the official future of mankind, Americans can now move on from feeding the hungry to satisfying equally basic needs. The recent U.N. Convention on Women's Rights, where the sterilization of the Third World was planned as a humanitarian gesture, was a preview of coming attractions, and the condemnation last summer of Zimbabwe President Robert

Mugabe by the U.S. Congress showed how dissidents in the new order will be pressured to conform.

At the opening of the Zimbabwe International Book Fair in August, President Mugabe called homosexuals "perverts" who didn't deserve civil rights and then denied a gay rights group representation at the fair. In support of their president, some 500 members of Mugabe's Zanu Party celebrated in the streets of downtown Harare; even the Zimbabwe Council of Churches, comprising Lutheran, Methodist, Anglican, and Catholic leaders, supported Mugabe's actions.

Seventy outraged members of the U.S. Congress immediately sent a letter of protest to Mugabe, denouncing his "anti-homosexual campaign." Concerned for the well-being of its gay delegates, the World Council of Churches chimed in and threatened to cancel its Eighth Assembly, scheduled to meet in Harare in 1998. None of this fazed Mugabe in the least. "Let the Americans keep their sodomy, bestiality, stupid and foolish ways to themselves," he said. "Let the gays be gays in the United States and Europe, but they shall be sad people here." Homosexuality should be treated "as a criminal offense, like theft," he concluded. Since many Third World countries punish thieves by cutting off the offending member, Mugabe's analogy makes homosexuals uncomfortable.

"I have no idea what he thinks he is doing," said an unnamed American diplomat to the Deutsche Presse Agentur. That Mugabe might be governing his country the way his people want it to be governed, this was irrelevant. "Zimbabwe has very severe economic and political problems that need desperate attention," said the diplomat, so "why is he [Mugabe] going on about gays?" The more obvious question is why American leaders are "going on about gays" in an inconsequential country some 7,000 miles away.

—Theodore Pappas

THE CALIFORNIA Civil Rights Initiative was headed for trouble from the start. Conceived by two California professors, Glynn Custred and Tom Wood, the CCRI is a proposed amendment to the state constitution that would bar public agencies and schools from discriminating in favor of women or minorities. In other words, it would kill affir-

mative action in California. Predictably, the CCRI and its authors have become the target of vicious attacks by blacks and liberals, in the grip of a collective hysteria not seen since the publication of *The Bell Curve*.

According to the *Contra Costa Times* on October 7, Fred Jordan, the head of the California Business Council of Organizations for Equal Opportunity, warns that the state will suffer economically if voters dare to endorse the measure. Blacks who work for big corporations, Jordan says, "might use their influence to dissuade them from coming to the Golden State" to hold conventions. The same issue reports that an activist named Arnolando Torres is sponsoring three initiatives of his own aimed at protecting affirmative action.

As reports in the *Sacramento Bee* make clear, the California Democratic Party has been at the forefront of the attacks on professors Custred and Wood. The attacks are invariably personal. Bill Press, chairman of the state party, says that "They are tools of the Republican Party and they're probably too dumb to know they are being used." A May 17 editorial in the *Bee* blasted Bob Mulholland, an advisor to the state party, for saying "he intends to 'research' Wood and Custred . . . to determine 'if they ever paid their taxes, inappropriately touched students or [have] ever been involved in lawsuits.' . . . Mulholland says that such research is a standard part of the political process."

But the most interesting remarks come from Willie Brown, speaker emeritus of the California State Assembly. Speaking before a mob of mostly black and Latino students on the Hayward campus of Cal State University, where Professor Custred teaches, Brown urged his audience to take Custred's class. "You ought to do what you do best, to terrorize professors you don't like," he said. If the students follow his advice, Brown assured them, "I guarantee [Custred] will be a basket case by the end of the term."

Though its influence may be waning almost everywhere, the left can still muster its forces to harass, threaten, and intimidate. Unfortunately for the left, most Californians are implacably hostile to affirmative action and the ideology behind it. According to a field poll conducted in September, almost 60 percent of Golden State voters who have heard of the initiative are in favor of it. If this figure is broken down along party lines,

the results are surprising: about three-fourths of Republicans support the CCRI, and no fewer than 41 percent of Democrats side with them.

The racial breakdown is interesting, too. About two-thirds of white males are behind the initiative, and it enjoys the backing of some 44 percent of Latinos. While most blacks decry the measure as racist, about one in four of them endorses it. (This isn't the first sign that the left can no longer depend on black support on any racial issue. According to the December 6, 1994, issue of the *Village Voice*, about half of California's blacks voted for Proposition 187.)

Despite the acrimony of the left-wing activists, the CCRI may yet have a fighting chance. "To our knowledge," says Custred in the August 8 *Sacramento Bee*, "no significant portion of the American electorate has yet been given a chance to vote its conscience" on affirmative action. Until now. Although Custred and Wood have managed to raise \$450,000, they still need to cough up another million dollars to get their initiative on the November 1996 ballot. Those who would like to help their campaign may write to CCRI, P.O. Box 67278, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

—Michael Washburn

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, perhaps the most prestigious English-language Bible publisher (although far from the largest), brought out *The New Testament and Psalms: An Inclusive Version* on September 11. After "more than five years of steady work," the editors, according to Oxford University Press Senior Editor for Bibles Donald Kraus, sought "to expand the richness and deepen the expressiveness of a text that is already very familiar to many readers." The text is a revision, or perhaps better, a distortion, of the already politically correct *New Revised Standard Version*.

It must be rather humiliating to the editors who worked steadily for five years to have produced the same product that a college newspaper editor armed with a manual of politically correct "inclusive" language could have generated in a few weeks. The NRSV sought to make all references to human beings unisex and was even reluctant to admit that Jesus Christ was a man. Thus it edits one of the classic confessional statements of Scripture, which speaks of "One mediator between God and men, the man

Christ Jesus," to read "One mediator between God and humanity, Christ Jesus, himself human" (1 Timothy 2:5). Although this is not, strictly speaking, a gross mistranslation, it does change the nuances and suggests unorthodox views: "Between God and men" reflects the familiar idea that individuals must come to God in repentance, becoming disciples and being baptized, whereas "humanity" might suggest universalism, the redemption of all humans *qua* humans. Perhaps the more dangerous error insinuated by dropping the noun "man" and substituting the generic "human" in adjective form is not a loss of the reality that Jesus was a man (male of the human species), but a loss of the fact that he was a real, historic, individual human (man), not a generic human. "Christ Jesus, himself human" instead of "the man Christ Jesus" adulterates the biblical and creedal confession that the Son (the second Person of the Godhead, according to Christian doctrine) not only "became flesh," but also was "made man," a complete human being, and as it happens, for whatever reason it may have pleased God, one of the male sex.

Nevertheless, the NRSV retained traditional language for the deity Himself and did not venture to edit the words used by Jesus in addressing God in the most familiar of all Christian prayers, known as "the Lord's Prayer" and "the Our Father." "Our Father" becomes "our Father-Mother," a grotesque distortion of the words of Jesus and one that can hardly be considered anything else but blasphemous. The expression "Lord" is used in the Hebrew Scriptures as the normal way to refer to the sacred Name, the Tetragrammaton YHWH, in order to avoid the danger of taking that Name in vain. It is also used in the great confession of the first Christians, "Jesus is Lord." "Lord," however, must be dropped from the newest (per)version of the Bible because, according to the editors, it suggests a ruling class of lords, which of course our modern democratic world cannot accept. To be consistent, of course, one would also have to reject God Himself, in order not to have to acknowledge Him as "Ruler of All." Oxford's substitute, "All-Highest," is also inferior, suggesting an attribute or a quality rather than the personal God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Affirmation of "diversity" of all kinds requires such idiocies as the elimination of "the right hand of the Majesty on

high" (Hebrews 1:3), for the suggestion that the right hand is a place of honor might upset left-handed people (this left-handed editor, until his consciousness was raised, was not upset; in fact, he is not upset even now, no doubt an indication that he is so insensitive that he cannot even recognize derogatory insinuations that apply directly to him). "Darkness" must also be eliminated, for it might be offensive to dark-skinned people. (Will this rehabilitate the term "darkies," which up until now has been considered a bit condescending, to designate African-Americans?) What is lost, of course, is the love of the personal God, especially as it is expressed in the mystery of divine election: "Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated" (Malachi 1:2f, cited by Paul in Romans 9:13).

According to Kraus, the editors sought to produce "a version of the biblical text that will enlarge the reader's vision of the great human community." Perhaps it does so, but the purpose and power of the Bible as actually written is "to make thee wise unto salvation" (II Timothy 3:15). The Gospel, according to Paul, "is the power of God unto salvation, to every one who believes, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Romans 1:16). Paul was referring to the Gospel as proclaimed and taught by Jesus and His disciples, not to the twisted texts produced by Oxford. It is interesting to observe that although earlier heretics such as the Gnostics of the second century could have derived considerable benefit by changing only a few words in John's Gospel, they did not do so: they gave their own interpretation to the words as they stood, but did not change them to suit themselves. Perhaps they had too much reverence for the actual texts, or perhaps they knew that too many people knew the texts too well to permit distorting alternations to get by.

Oxford University Press and its editors cannot escape the charge of intellectual dishonesty. To "translate" a text so that it says what you want it to say, not what the authors wrote and meant, is dishonest and intellectually irresponsible. The late Paul Tillich, certainly no fundamentalist, warned about making verbal or conceptual idols to suit individual tastes. To change the words of Jesus and call God by names of one's own choosing, names evocative of things specifically prohibited in Scripture such as goddess worship, is blasphemous. It is dangerous to forget that—at least in the words of

the Bible as hitherto known—"God will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain" (Exodus 20:7).

—Harold O.J. Brown

OBITER DICTA: Look for *Chronicles* at the following stores in Georgia: Borders Bookstore, 3637 Peachtree Rd., Atlanta; Oxford Book Store, 2343 Peachtree Rd., N.E., Atlanta; Media

Play, Barrett Pl., Suite 100, Kennesaw; Media Play, 1317 Johnson Ferry Rd., Marietta; Media Play, North Pointe Market, Alpharetta; Media Play, Venture Point, Duluth; Media Play, Perimeter Sq., Dunwoody; Media Play, Largo Plaza, Savannah; Media Play, Heritage Pavilion, Smyrna; Barnette News Stand, 145 College Ave., Athens.

Among the Home Folks

(Matthew 13:53-58)

by *Harold McCurdy*

Power surged through him, unexampled power:
The halt began to dance, the blind to see;
The madmen in their chains, the storms that tower
Over black waves, grew calm in Galilee;
Legions of demons fled and left men free.

The hungry were fed, the thirsty drank from fountains
Never opened before. Out of the press
He slipped away at times into the mountains
To pray alone and in the wilderness
Draw fresh reserves to cope with human distress.

They were astonished at him. Jairus's daughter
Rose at his touch from death. His disciples saw,
And trembled to see, their Master walking on water
To rescue them. The synagogues in awe
Heard him expound the knottier points of the Law.

They were astonished, yes, but not all shaken
To the hard footings of their cautious lives.
Most looked askance at him, would not be taken
In by his wonders. Peering out of their hives
Like hornets at bay, they whetted their little knives.

"Who is this miracle-worker, this more than Moses?
Isn't he Mary's son who made ox-yokes?
Brother to Simon and James and Judas and Josés?
His sisters, aren't they our neighbors, just plain folks?"
They elbowed out of the synagogue cracking jokes.

He sighed, and observed that power can be resisted,
That unfaith too has power, and waits in place
(Skeptical, cramped, hypocritical, twisted)
To stop up any conduit of God's grace.
—And from his kinsmen, sadly, he turned his face.