



Keene Fulton Tiedemann was born in Knoxville, Tennessee. The son of a NASA geologist, he moved extensively throughout the United States during his childhood. Academic credits include an Associate of Science in Aviation Instruments and Electronics Technology, Bachelor of Science (cum laude) in Electronics Technology with a minor in Aviation Science, Master of Science in Aerospace Studies, and a Doctor of Management in Organizational Leadership. He is a member of the Alpha Chi Honor Society, Alpha Eta Rho Aviation Fraternity, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Military Officers Association, and the

Knights of Columbus.

Joining the United States Air Force in 1985, 2nd Lt. Tiedemann earned his Navigator wings and was awarded Distinguished Graduate honors upon completion of Electronic Warfare Officer (EWO) training. He flew in the B-52H aircraft while participating in Strategic Air Command's (SAC) nuclear alert mission. Competitively selected for duty in SAC's premier B-52 Combat Crew Training School, he became one of the command's youngest-ever EWO instructors. Part of the initial staff that re-activated the 34th Bombardment Squadron, he participated in the development of the Air Force's first composite wing and quick reaction conventional strike force. With the retirement of the B-52G bomber, Capt. Tiedemann was reassigned to the 45th Reconnaissance Squadron at Offutt AFB, Nebraska where he fulfilled various flying and staff assignments until his retirement as a Major in 2005.

At the time of this book's publishing, Dr. Tiedemann was in training to become a faculty member of Axia College of Western International University where he will teach undergraduate courses in philosophy, management, and educational information technology (IT). He studied philosophy, business management, and organizational leadership at the University of Phoenix and is the author of a doctoral dissertation titled *Integrity in Military Service: A Leadership Impact Study* (UMI Number: 3151230).

ID: 134912
www.lulu.com



All Hail the Death of Truth! The Advent of the Postmodern Era

All Hail the Death of Truth! The Advent of the Postmodern Era



Dr. Keene F. Tiedemann, DM

ALL HAIL
THE DEATH OF TRUTH!

ALSO BY DR. KEENE F. TIEDEMANN

Integrity in Military Service: A Leadership Impact Study

(UMI Number: 3151230 at <http://www.lib.umi.com/dxweb/gateway>)

ALL HAIL
the
DEATH
of
TRUTH!



The Advent of the Postmodern Era

Dr. Keene F. Tiedemann, DM

ALL HAIL THE DEATH OF TRUTH!

Copyright © 2005 by Keene Tiedemann.

All rights reserved.

Courtesy: Keene Research Center

<http://www.keeneresearch.org>

*To Bobby and Suzanne
who courageously and selflessly
provided their unwavering support to their parents
and sister Terri
while they, too, suffered terribly at the foot of the Cross!*

Contents

INTRODUCTION vii

PART I LAMENTATIONS

A FAILED PARADIGM? 1

REJECTION OF TRUTH 23

END OF THE MODERN ERA 35

PART II PROCLAMATIONS

THE POSTMODERN MEANING OF LIFE 57

POSTMODERN “SOULFULNESS” 74

POSTMODERN VALUES 91

POSTMODERN ETHICS 101

POSTMODERN LEADERSHIP 125

PART III REVELATIONS

TRUTH, SELF, AND THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE 135

CHOOSE THIS DAY . . . 156

INDEX 167

ENDOTES 174

Truth advances and error recedes step by step only; and to do our fellow-men the most good in our power, we must lead where we can, follow where we cannot, and still go with them, watching always the favorable moment for helping them to another step.

Thomas Jefferson

INTRODUCTION

Are you worried about what is happening to American society? Do you watch the evening news or read a newspaper? If so, do you believe you are getting an accurate assessment of what is happening in your world? Increasing numbers of your fellow citizens do not.¹ Many Americans are turning off their television sets and canceling their subscriptions to news-related publications. Others are turning to the “new news media” that now brings the conservative perspective to mainstream America. With the rising popularity of conservative voices including Laura Ingraham, Michelle Malkin, and Ann Coulter, we hear pundits like Bill O’Reilly and Sean Hannity asking why things have gotten so bad in our country. The following research provides the answer to that question.

Prior to working on a Doctor of Management degree in Organizational Leadership, I did not understand why so many of the citizens I was defending, as an officer in the United States Air Force, were so diametrically opposed to the military’s mission. Nor did I understand why so many of my beloved brothers and sisters did not appreciate or accept the historically conservative nature of the Great American Experiment. While it was easy to see the deterioration of the very society I was defending occur right before my eyes, it was not so easy to understand why this was happening. Then, in the flash of an eye and the fall of great buildings, a great Phoenix rose from the ashes. The terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 galvanized America’s support for its Constitutionally mandated military mission and woke the silent conservative majority from its 50-year slumber.

Now another war has begun. It is not the type of war you think about when someone refers to “Nine-Eleven.” The war I

refer to is very different from the one currently being conducted on the battlefields of Afghanistan and Iraq. It is a war for the soul of American society. It is a war to determine the moral and philosophical direction in which we head. It is a war whose outcome will determine whether this nation will thrive or fail. Like all wars, it is a war that *will* be won. The question is: *By whom?*

America's enemy is a liar whose mastery of the art of deception is unrivalled. Common among the lies is the fallacy that conservatives want to return to the racism and sexism of the 1950s. No, the truth is that conservatives want to return to the spirit of selflessness, moral courage, personal integrity, and faith in God deemed honorable in the 1950s. Unlike their "progressive" counterparts who are blind to the lessons of the failed socialist experiments of the twentieth century, conservatives intend to learn from history's mistakes rather than repeat them.

It is hard to say whether America's conservative base was lulled to sleep by economic prosperity, chased into the closet by the Watergate scandal, paralyzed with depression after the Vietnam fiasco, or some combination of these and possibly other factors. Whatever the reasons, an increasingly socialist political agenda has permeated American thought and action since the 1960s with very little conservative resistance. Recalling only the most commonly enumerated sociological factors associated with our current generation of American leaders, we see their college years accentuated by the liberal use of mind-altering drugs and "free-love." We see a generation so spiritually weak and morally gutless they allowed personal fear to overcome any semblance of self-sacrifice for our national defense. We see their rejection of authority giving license to abandonment of the very traditions that made this country great.

What this developmental pattern has given America is a generation of national leaders who prioritize social equality over social morality, freedom of speech over public decency, and redistribution of wealth over individual personal empowerment. Their laws are responsible for the attenuation of public educational standards as well as personal discipline

among students. They allow the propagation of child pornography, advance the homosexual agenda, and suppress religious expression. They defend the right to life for rapists, pedophiles, and murderers on death row while simultaneously endorsing fetal homicide, suicide, and state-sponsored euthanasia of innocent victims incapable of defending themselves.

This generation gave us a President who taught our children, by personal example, that any form of sexual stimulation short of intercourse is not really sex. Even worse, this generation gave us half a century of liberal national leadership that taught our children, by their example, the insignificance of personal morality and also that the politically powerful, particularly on the left, are seldom accountable for their actions. Finally, this generation has given us an intelligentsia that is teaching our children, by their deconstructive techniques and relativistic beliefs, that laws are made to be broken or disregarded and that neither our families, our religious institutions, nor the U.S. Constitution have the power to stop this from happening.

The differences between the America I was raised in and the America I have defended for the last twenty years are astounding, to say the least. When I was growing up, no one gave a thought to the fact that my brother, sister, and I were freely wandering the neighborhoods of Bowie, Maryland, or Clear Lake City, Texas, or even the now infamous city of Littleton, Colorado for that matter. We did so either alone or with a group of friends. In my children's world, however, they do not experience the freedoms and independence that my parents and I took for granted. They live in a world of Amber Alerts, neighborhood pedophiles, and school shootings that were unimaginable in their parents' childhood! In our youth, high standards of academic performance were the societal norm and, consequently, they were seriously enforced. Normal human sexuality was academically introduced at an appropriate age — in Junior High school — when those particular hormones were becoming active. It was taught from biological standards

without reference to the myriad aberrant forms of its expression and marital monogamy was simply a given.

It is difficult to say exactly *when* this book started. Undertaken in earnest shortly after the re-election of President George W. Bush, the thoughts contained herein may be considered a collection of observations, research, and conclusions derived from my three years of doctoral study. A rigorous academic endeavor, to say the least, those years of study were extremely satisfying and yet enormously frustrating. While post-graduate faculty members will tell you that any good doctoral program contains both of these qualities, the frustration stemmed not so much from the academic rigor — that was the part I found extremely satisfying. The frustration came from the faculties' adherence to an odd social paradigm that was being taught as gospel truth.

On the other hand, it is not difficult to say *why* this book was written. It answers the social riddle that confounded me during the years of my youth wherein I answered God's call to defend my country. At the dawn of the new millennium, it has become a popular notion among academicians that truth is in the mind of the believer. Many of the world's most renowned scholars now tell us that we create our own realities and live exclusively therein. Therefore, the way to peaceful coexistence is to learn, as best we can, what each other's realities are in order to understand why people think the way they do. Once we have achieved this understanding — once we have “placed ourselves in the other guys' shoes” — we learn to accept others for who they are and we can all get along. In a nutshell, this is the basic premise of postmodern philosophy.

On the surface, the posit may seem logical. Unfortunately, it fails a very basic psychological, sociological, in fact *any* kind of logical test. Even if I understand *why* Osama Bin Laden directed the attack against my country (and I believe that I do), it does not mean that I am going to allow him to continue this course of action. Furthermore, there are “shoes” of many people I will never care to place myself in. The pervert who rapes a child, stuffs her in a plastic bag with her teddy bear, and buries her alive is a person we can neither understand nor one with whom

we can simply get along! As hard as postmodernists try to deny the fact that evil exists in the world, the sad truth is abundant and self-evident.

The relativist line of reasoning fails to address adequately myriad basic problems facing humanity. Primary among them is our self-centered nature born from the animal instinct for survival. The first cognitive focus of every human being is self-awareness. This may enhance our chance for survival on an individual basis but it ultimately leads to our destruction on a collective one. In other words, this instinct for putting the needs of one's self before the needs of others runs counterproductively to the very premise of social development. Consequently, the primary message of Judeo-Christian philosophy (the foundation of traditional American values) is that the social human animal has to *die to self* in order to live.² Sacrificing our needs in order to serve the needs of those around us reflects the very essence of our Creator. Since we are created in His image, it stands to reason that selflessness is supposed to be the very essence of humanity as well. This is the reason we are taught that the "first shall be last and the last shall be first."³ Ironically, we cannot say that selflessness is what separates human beings from the rest of the animal kingdom because there are historical cases where humans have been saved by animals who have risked and lost their own lives in the process. Did they do so knowingly? Perhaps so or perhaps not; the point is that if animals do it, what rights have we as a higher species not to do the same?

During my doctoral studies, I often proposed that if everyone focused on the needs of those around them rather than on their own, there would be very few needs left, indeed. In contrast, the postmodern version of personal ethics primarily focuses on self-fulfillment. From this basic starting point, we begin to see another great line of ideological departure. Is the physical world we so easily perceive all there is to life? Alternatively, is there a spiritual world of which we are only dimly aware? Postmodernists run in both directions and when postmodern thinking adheres to a spiritual ideology, what inevitably follows is a line of reasoning purported to be full of

freedom and light when, in fact, there is hideous darkness secreted beneath the surface⁴.

Alternatively, postmodern protagonists are more often diametrically opposed to any concept of human spirituality. Progressive scholars proudly reassert Friedrich Nietzsche's claim that God is dead. Indeed many authors refer angrily to religious ideas and dismiss proven social concepts like Servant Leadership as mere *Paulist ideology*. The negative emotions contained in such writings often stem from the author's unconstructive personal encounter with some aspect of religion. For example, Robert H. Knight records that "Foucault, a committed hedonist, had died of AIDS, still shaking his fist at God."⁵

Whenever writers dare to publicly deliberate on the subject of truth, they open the door for their relativist critics to complain that they arrogantly claim to know *all* truth. This is simply one of many tactics progressive opponents use to redirect the debate away from their inability to logically support their fallacious line of anti-reasoning. In order to preclude this particular attack, let me make perfectly clear that I am no more privy to all truth than the next person. What makes me, "and those of [my] ilk,"⁶ able to discern some semblance of truth, as opposed to our increasingly clueless postmodern critics, is the fact that we recognize a lie when we hear one. So, let's just cut to the chase. . .

This book ultimately posits that the current departure from long-standing American religious, moral, and social norms has brought about such heinous realities as cult-led mass suicides, children slaughtering children in schools, state-sponsored murder of the most vulnerable and innocent among us, and even the stealing of live babies from the wombs of their murdered mothers. These examples are real and they are all by-products of an evil so pervasive it will, if left unchecked, ultimately devour American culture and destroy this civilization. As human beings deny their spiritual nature and desensitize themselves to violence, evil becomes acceptable — even titillating.

Unable to quell the human spirit via overt hostile methods vis-à-vis disease, pestilence, warfare, and terrorism, postmodern ideology has become the new weapon by which evil plans to prevail against humanity. The subtle denial of human spirituality combined with the seductive justification of self-gratification poised behind the façade of a progressive social movement is leading to the ultimate dehumanization of humanity. Fortunately for us, a conservative army is approaching the postmodern ideological battlefield. The ultimate aim of this text is to make sure that its foot soldiers know their enemy.

Telling the truth can be as difficult as hearing it. Many of the things I learned while working on my doctorate were disturbing, to say the least. In the process of doing the research for this book, I often found myself questioning my work. Are the quotes taken in their proper context? Did the author really say *that*? Am I misreading or misinterpreting the data? Halfway through this project two extremely significant events occurred. First, I came across a copy of *The Politics of Bad Faith* by David Horowitz. The wealth of information discovered therein was both amazing and frightening. Any lingering doubts as to what I am sharing with you now vanished upon reading his book. Raised a Marxist and a strong proponent of the progressive movement in his youth, he experienced the Churchill-Event as he matured. England's greatest Prime Minister once posited that if you are not a liberal in your youth, you have no heart and if you are not a conservative in old age, you have no brain. Mr. Horowitz' book provides an additional level of detail beyond what I am reporting in the pages that follow. It makes an excellent companion to this project and comes highly recommended.

The second significant event to occur while writing this book was the arrival of the new Bishop of Rome, Pope Benedict XVI. Just before the College of Cardinals cloistered in conclave to elect the next head of the Church, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger of Germany performed the Mass. In his homily he warned, "We are moving towards a dictatorship of relativism which does not recognize anything as for certain and which has as its highest

goal one's own ego and one's own desires.”⁷ Again, I found new inspiration to share this sociological research on the changes occurring in American culture during the last half of the twentieth century.

Part of the oath of office for government service is to defend America from all enemies, foreign and domestic. Having spent the last twenty years concentrating on foreign enemies, it is now time to refocus on the domestic ones. The following pages are penned with the hope that it is not too late for America to return to our traditional moral values. So, this is our war. It is a war of ideologies wherein the young Phoenix gathers the ashes of 9/11 into an egg of myrrh. Carrying its egg to the Son, our Phoenix flies past the forward edge of the postmodern battlefield where our story begins.

PART I LAMENTATIONS

CHAPTER ONE

America. . .they are trying to weaken you; they are trying to disarm your strong and magnificent country. . . . I call upon you: ordinary working men of America. . .do not let yourselves become weak.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn

A FAILED PARADIGM?

With the waning of the twentieth century, the modern era and its approach to reasoning have fallen to scorn among academicians. Referred to as “Platonism and Cartesian reductionism,”¹ postgraduate scholars correctly observe that, “[t]his paradigm continues to form the main foundation for most theoretical and practical approaches to how we cognize the world.”² However, many of this country’s most prominent intellectuals have long lamented modernism’s continuance — particularly in the way we deal with our social problems. Having recently earned a Doctor of Management degree in Organizational Leadership, I was amazed (and dismayed) to discover that a majority of university professors are both overtly and covertly promoting a Eurocentric ideology commonly referred to as *Postmodernism*. Consequently, this book is an emergency wake up call to the silent majority of Americans who hold the traditions of the American experiment close to their hearts. The following pages analyze this emerging paradigm by shedding light on its origins, revealing the motivations and alarmingly strange idiosyncrasies of its greatest proponents, and elucidating the fallacy of its supposed logic.

The centerpiece of earning a doctorate is developing the ability to conduct objective scientific, and defendable sociologic, research. This book entails the latter. Research in sociology is rarely, if ever, entirely free from subjective

reasoning and this work is, admittedly, no exception. It is the result of listening to three years of fallacious assaults on the modern concepts of objective reality, rational thought, and the singularity of external truth. Preparing to write this book, it behooved me to research the origins of the university from which I recently graduated. What I discovered brought focus to the faculties' efforts to undermine traditional American values. Founded by Dr. John Sperling in 1976, his preferences seem to parallel the university's ideology. Dr. Sperling has referred to the Red states as "'Retro America,' proclaiming, 'Its whiteness and maleness are mirrored in the Republican Party.'" ³ He is an advocate of the legalization of marijuana ⁴ and, not surprisingly, supported John Kerry for president. ⁵

To be sure, modern era pessimists abound in academia. "The idiom we have favored since the beginning of the modern era fails to inspire conviction or yield insight."⁶ According to scholarly proponents of postmodernism, we are transitioning into a new era. They state that modern ways of thinking have failed to solve the numerous problems that assailed modern society. They further assert that the modern era is, in fact, responsible for creating the social problems we are now facing in the postmodern era. The ubiquitous nature of an era makes the first statement utterly ridiculous. *Of course* modernism is responsible for the problems of the modern age. The second assertion is simply fallacious. Postmodern philosophy is responsible for the increasingly heinous social problems of the postmodern age. In the modern era, the biggest problems a teacher faced were students chewing gum in class or talking out of turn. In stark contrast, our teachers now face pregnant children and pubescent gunfire in the postmodern era!

Still, progressive scholars wax poetic about the promises of a postmodern future with nary a word toward its possible, indeed inevitable, shortcomings. The postmodern intellectual further claims that our inability to "predict and control things at will"⁷ indicates the failure of the modern project. In fact, quite the opposite may be true. Although we cannot predict and control *all* things at will, it is a remarkable achievement of the

modern paradigm that we have grown (and continue to grow) in our ability to predict and control the world around us.

Modernist Domination

Postmodernists aggressively attack all manner of modern motive. Liberal professors claim the reason modernists try to predict and control the world in which they live is because they seek to dominate. “We predict the weather and try to control inflation because. . . . [t]hey are . . . objects we want to subject to ourselves.”⁸ Again, it is only fair to question this assertion. Herein every reader must answer the question by examining his or her own motives. It is academically disingenuous for a scholar to claim with absolute certainty that they understand the motives of another without examining all possible reasons for those motivations. Is it your desire to control inflation simply for the sake of controlling inflation or to protect your wealth, investments, and purchasing power? Do you want to control the weather because you want to proclaim to all your ability to do such an extraordinary thing or because you want to protect and enhance your lives and the lives of those around you? Progressive scholars believe they can adequately defend the assertion that we cannot dominate our world by illustrating our inability to predict or control even ourselves:

Strictly speaking, I do not predict or control myself or my behavior. I promise or decide to do a certain thing; I pledge myself to do it. I do not manipulate or arrange my behavior so that it proceeds to the desired outcome. I either do or fail to do what I set out to do.⁹

Indeed, coherently arguing the opposite position is not difficult. Manipulating and arranging personal behavior is *exactly* how people “proceed to the desired outcome” — especially when the outcome requires behavioral patterns the person may be unaccustomed to. Common among the unaccustomed behaviors in this supposedly emerging postmodern age are controlling one’s temper or refraining from derogatory idioms of speech. Failing to do what one sets out to do is often caused by failing to control (manipulate and arrange) one’s behavior. Further offsetting this postmodern illustration is

the fact that most parents begin to teach their children to control their behavior as toddlers. As children mature, the various institutions in society — namely family, school, and church — teach them (or at least *try* to teach them) to understand their personalities in order to successfully “manipulate and arrange” their own behaviors. While, again, our prediction and control cannot be called perfect, just ask the CEO of any major corporation how she or he got to such a position and you will hear mention of their ability to successfully predict and control key elements in their environment — including their own behavior. In other words, you will learn of ways they were able to predict their internal reactions to those external environmental elements in order to successfully manipulate situations and, ultimately, ascend to a position of power.¹⁰

Predicting and Controlling Others

Mainstream postmodern philosophy further posits that another particularly evil motive of the modern era is that people want to learn how to dominate each other. “Nor would I think of predicting and controlling others to whom I am bound by ties of respect and affection.”¹¹ Again using the parental illustration, parents who love their children learn to predict their behavior in order to control them. The police officer loves the community in which she serves therefore she learns to predict the behaviors of her fellow citizens in order to control them as required. Ministers and priests support the spiritual welfare of their congregations and, once again, we see the need for these servant leaders to learn how to predict and control the actions and behaviors of their parishioners.

Intentionally ending these examples with the premise of *controlling* others requires detailed examination of the question of motive. Do the parent, police officer, priest, and minister control the actions of others for the sole purpose of domination? Sadly admitting that this is sometimes true, it is extremely pessimistic to proclaim that domination is the *prevailing* motive of modern society. Parents control their children in order to protect them and successfully guide them through life’s myriad challenges. Police officers place their lives in jeopardy on a

daily basis in order to protect the population and maintain public order. Priests and ministers commit their lives to helping people successfully handle some of life's most difficult emotional and spiritual issues. Congregations similarly entrust them with responsibility for ensuring that all members remain true to the dogmas of their faith.

In a world where pain and suffering abound we would, indeed, be remiss in our social duties if we did not learn to predict and control "others to whom [we] are bound by ties of respect and affection." In the same way, we certainly hope that others will come to our aid with their power and control when we face our own crises that overwhelm our ability to properly reason for ourselves. Prediction and control are to be *positive* social forces. Unfortunately, their occasional misuse gives rise to permanent pessimism in the postmodern soul.

Victimization

Employing the assumption that the current objective of leadership in American culture is simply to dominate other human beings as well as the environment, victimization becomes a key element of the argument. Friedrich Nietzsche is widely considered the founder of postmodern philosophy. Reportedly suffering from a lifetime of migraines and ultimately succumbing to a permanent mental breakdown, Nietzsche believed that, in mass, people were weak and suffered under a "slave morality"¹² which drove them to seek religious traditions like Christianity in order to advance their powerless personal agendas by convincing others to be kind and considerate to them.

In the liberal versus conservative debate, advantage goes to the former in the postmodern argument:

Liberals have been most determined collectively to plan and engineer society for the better. They, accordingly, have been associated most closely with the obstreperous problems of social policy and the vacancy of public discourse. To conservative minds, the sensible alternative to misguided liberal ambitions is a healthy respect for the natural order of things. We can affect the large design of society only in a negative manner. All we can do

positively and collectively is step aside and allow native ambitions of individuals and the spontaneous dynamics of small groups to take their beneficial course.¹³

However, the quote above is a flagrant misrepresentation of the conservative agenda taken from a point of view that apparently fails to understand the inherent goodness of humanity. “Healthy respect for the natural order of things” implies optimism rather than pessimism. It is the belief in human ingenuity and the compassion found within local communities that embolden conservatives to proclaim that individuals have the power to make or break themselves and determine their own destiny. The idea that only conservatives rely “on the spontaneous dynamics of small groups to take their beneficial course” proves invalid when one considers the fact that both conservative and liberal minds were responsible for inventing, developing, and nurturing the United States through its first two centuries. During the federalist era, they did so raucously, yet collaboratively, because open-frontier optimism ruled the day. From this history of governmental development, conservatives understand the efficacies of government control in limited sectors including raising and supporting a standing Army. Unlike their postmodern liberal counterparts, however, they retain the optimistic belief in the capacity of the *individual* and, therefore, promote the minimization, rather than the maximization, of government intervention in mainstream society.

Planning and engineering society for the better sounds like and, indeed, *is* a noble cause. Unfortunately, President Johnson’s dream of a Great Society fell sway to the seduction of unfettered political power. History proves that the Democratic Party that established the Great Society quickly discovered that the key to remaining in power was to keep the lower class dependent upon the very programs designed to lift them out of poverty. This is why they “have been associated most closely with the obstreperous problems of social policy.”

Community Lost

Postmodernists lament a misguided notion of modern philosophy wherein:

The crucial debility of the rule of prediction and control . . . [is] the expatriate quality of public life. We live in self-imposed exile from communal conversation and action. The public square is naked. American politics has lost its soul. The republic has become procedural, and we have become unencumbered selves. Individualism has become cancerous. We live in an age of narcissism and pursue loneliness. . . . these expressions of distress should disquiet us because they indicate that we have no common life, that what holds us all together is a cold and impersonal design.¹⁴

Progressive scholars believe the loss of the sense of community in our society has created a sense of sullenness and indolence.¹⁵ The problems of low voter turnout, racial minorities condemned to capital punishment, high unemployment rates of African Americans, failure to consider social conditions that favor drug abuse, and inordinate compensation for pain and suffering are brought forward as proof that Americans no longer care about each other. “Indolence comes to the fore in the expression, so often delivered with finality, ‘it’s *my* choice.’ What sounds like the ultimate assumption of personal responsibility is usually the flourish of moral retreat . . . and the retirement to self-indulgence.”¹⁶

Pessimistic postmodern arguments expounding a lost sense of community continue in ways that actually require a look in the mirror:

Take the doctrine of strict liability, which absolves one from having to use a jeep or a lawnmower with care and caution. This doctrine shifts the burden of any accident to the manufacturer, who is held strictly, that is, almost unconditionally, liable. The doctrine acknowledges common indolence, people’s inability to accept reasonable responsibility for their acquisitions and actions; it sanctions their resentment of pain and loss that follow from irresponsibility.¹⁷

The modernist will counter charge that the example above stems directly from the shift into the postmodern paradigm. They cite the writings of other postmodern proponents who make claims like, “The 1960s were the true beginning of the postmodern era.”¹⁸ The fact is, many pernicious dilemmas including licentious litigation, the drug culture (see Chapter 5), and murderous children were not the seriously pervasive problems during the modern era that they have become in the postmodern era. These new social problems are derivatives of a relativistic culture inculcated and incubated by the very protagonists of the postmodern paradigm who now complain so vociferously about them as by-products of the modern era.

The Heart of Postmodernism

For the purposes of this narrative, an appropriate definition of relativism is “a theory . . . that holds that absolutely true knowledge is impossible because of the limitations and variability of sense perceptions.”¹⁹ Many postmodern proponents are finding themselves on the defensive as an increasingly conservative backlash develops against the social chaos created by the relativistic nature of their philosophy. In their deceitful attempts to defend this philosophy, progressive scholars are even beginning to claim that postmodernism is *not* relativistic.²⁰ This is only one of the many forms of misleading advertising employed by postmodernists and the following evidence is offered as proof that the paradigm is, indeed, being taught at the postgraduate level as an overtly relativistic line of reasoning. During the fourth week of our second doctoral course, candidates received the following assignment:

The focus of this week's discussion is on the shift from the main western tradition of Platonism and Cartesian reductionism as the basis for thinking about questions of cognition, truth and meaning to a *postmodern approach in which no set of truths such as are embodied in traditional western culture are regarded as inherently trustworthy. Rather, each of us constructs the world we live in and attributes meaning to it.* [italics added] The traditional questions of epistemology--Is this true? Can this be known accurately? What evidence is there for this?--are set aside for others. These include: Does this interpretation of the world serve me and those I wish to

have dealings with well? Does this allow me to live authentically, effectively, and in harmony with others? Do others attribute meaning in the same way I do here?²¹

Note the declarative nature of the statement. Without asking doctoral learners if they observe a paradigm shift, formal declarations claim that said shift is occurring. The design of such proclamations insidiously inculcates learners at even the highest academic levels into this new “reality.” Critical examination of all ideas is a normal prerequisite at the doctoral level, however, this one was put forward as an absolute from the beginning of academic study. Alarming, some fellow recipients of this message passively accepted it. One can imagine, then, how readily students at lower levels of education will accept the premise — especially those who think of their professors as all-knowing fountains of knowledge. Interestingly, however, the indoctrination is much more subtle. Overt declaration of postmodernism as a philosophical paradigm is not required. Instead, constructivism allows the social indoctrination of schoolchildren in public and private settings and in the academic rigors of those and higher institutions of learning.

Romantically phrased with ideas like *living authentically* and *in harmony with others*, we observe the essence of an angel of light calling us to be more than we presently are. Looking deeper, however, this same “angel” is implying that we, and the social world we have created, are solely (and soul-y) inadequate. While it is important to acknowledge that there is always room for improvement in the human condition, the postmodern summons focuses primarily, indeed almost exclusively, on the negative aspects of modernity (and all previous ages). According to Dr. J.P. Moreland, Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at Biola University:

Postmodernism leads to the institutionalization of anger. Postmodernists are preoccupied with power struggles that surround language use and social practice, and they see themselves as part of a missionary movement to liberate powerless, oppressed victims from dominance. They often practice a “hermeneutics of suspicion” in which they interpret body language, speech, and written

communication, not in terms of the communicator's own intentions, but in terms of his or her attempt to victimize and dominate the other as understood according to the postmodernist's interpretive agenda (e. g., feminism, gay rights, etc.). To be sure, power issues are a legitimate aspect of language, though one hardly needs postmodernism to see this. But by making power struggles and victimization a central focus of the postmodern crusade, the movement dignifies anger by institutionalizing it and placing it on ideological high ground, and it creates anger by fostering relational suspicion according to which there is a Victimizer under every linguistic tree. America is a country of very angry people, and postmodernism is to be blamed for its share in creating this situation.²²

Postmodernists believe that we must shake off the past and delve into the future unfettered by any, and all, preconceptions.

The [postmodern] critique draws upon the philosophy of language and science to assert that communication and perception must be flawed and unreliable. This implies that empirical inquiry is meaningful only to the investigator. If so, it would make no sense to share results because no one could be sure how others would take them. Research would be a selfish, ego-centered pursuit."²³

Ironically, such a view of reality makes the very endeavors of the scholars who support them non sequitur. This begs the question how a scholar supporting the postmodern paradigm can claim to be a doctor of *anything*. If the research they perform is irrelevant in this postmodern world, then how can these "doctors" espouse the very meaning of the postmodern ideology they so vociferously pontificate?

Antithesis of American Culture

Reviewing the main posits of postmodernism, truth simply does not exist and our proper focus is on self-awareness. In an attempt to mollify the modern/religious mind tempered by an externally focused morality, the postmodern proponent usually includes a phrase such as "as well as others" when referring to self-aggrandizement. Contrast this to Judeo-Christian values ascribed to American culture since its inception including central premises such as "improvement for the public good."²⁴

What we discover is a shift away from community towards individuality that dwarfs even that which occurred during the transition from medieval to modern era.

Originally framed around the concepts of religion, morality, hard work, and self-sacrifice (chided by postmodernists as a *federalist* mindset) the center of public thinking and discourse has changed drastically in the last hundred years. Initially established as a God-focused culture, John Winthrop well phrased a summary of the evolving American social contract, “The covenant between you and us is the oath you have taken of us, which is to this purpose: that we shall govern you and judge your causes by the rules of God’s laws and our own, according to our best skill.”²⁵

The postmodern scholar, however, will be quick to the attack. “Late in the 19th and into the 20th century, they [Puritans] began to be portrayed as incubators of the strain of prudery and bigotry that supposedly is close to the surface of our national character, ‘the stereotype of sour, steeple-hatted persecutors.’”²⁶ This is one of the most common postmodern tactics. The idea is to angrily point out, and promote rage against, imperfections in previous ideologies. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for a postmodernist to outright lie about historical ideologies and the motives of their proponents. Having done so, they go on to use baseless arguments to discount an entire historical foundation of thought on an erroneous premise.

One postmodern proponent writes of “bitter disputes about whether children should be taught skills of ‘moral reasoning’ — a very postmodern concept — or should instead be taught to accept unquestioningly some rock-solid American values and beliefs.”²⁷ Moral reasoning is an attractive way of teaching young schoolchildren to challenge their parent’s concepts of personal morality (and, inevitably, authority). In the same sentence, the insinuation continues that the only alternative is that children will become mindless robots espousing (God forbid) “rock-solid American values and beliefs.” Contemplating the notion of teaching children the relativist constructs of moral reasoning, the question naturally arises as to

what kind of mindset ascribes to children the intellectual propensity of adults. To this end Dr. Kiku Adatto, a faculty member in Harvard's Department of Sociology, comments on the recent public skirmish between parents and the sexually explicit advertising of Calvin Klein and warns, "[t]he innocence of childhood has given way to the portrayal of children as erotic objects."²⁸ Recalling an episode of the sitcom *Friends* wherein Ross and Rachel have sex in the museum where Ross works, George Will writes, "More depressing than what *Friends* considers wit . . . is the fact that the program transmits to teenagers the message that such shallow sexuality is not only acceptable, it is expected of them."²⁹ So promises the future of postmodernity . . .

Relativist philosophy purports that what is true or appropriate for one person may not be so for another. Upon hearing an absolutist's voice, the relativist's primary weapon of choice is to label the dissenter as *intolerant of diversity*. Apparently, the postmodern academic agenda is successfully indoctrinating our children and young adults. Research indicates that by the mid 1990s over 70% of young people between the ages of 13 to 27 had become relativists³⁰. This fact is readily observable in every day life as illustrated by the fear of even the most vociferous conservative voices to take a public moral stand against the obvious sexual perversion of homosexuality.

Anita Bryant was, metaphorically speaking, publicly crucified for taking such a stand in the late 1970s. Labeled among the likes of Adolf Hitler³¹, this former Miss America lost her sponsorship for Florida orange juice marketers after gay rights advocates inundated the public forum with charges that she "perpetuates anti-Semitic and racist ideologies."³² Liberally biased western media outlets claimed that her "campaign against homosexual men and women is an attack on the human rights of one of the most vulnerable groups in our society. It is frightening to realize that homosexuals were amongst the first victims of fascism in Hitler's Germany."³³

Notice how the issue immediately turns away from the question of sexual morality and obliquely diverts to the sidebar of personal bigotry. The chance to debate homosexuality as

either a sexual perversion or a societal norm never occurs because *progressive forces know they would quickly lose the argument*. Furthermore, that small minority of “gays” in the population would lose their public voice for a long time to come.

Honest science and godly love are at one with each other. The aim of homosexual rights advocates has nothing to do with honest love; it is the public justification and total acceptance of homosexual behavior. If possible, they will coerce this acceptance by so-called hate-crime laws.³⁴

By obfuscating the issue, homosexuality gains increasing acceptance in American society *and this minority begins to grow*. Unfortunately, so do the negative physical and psychological consequences to the health of both individuals and society as a whole. With tactics like this employed by those knowingly and unknowingly allied with the Father of Lies,³⁵ it is little wonder that amoral and anti-moral agendas are able to spread like wildfire in postmodern American society.

Roots of the Postmodern Weed

It is important to analyze postmodern origins in the process of examining the heart of the beast. Relativism is as old as Western philosophy and our current endeavor traces these roots to the Sophists of the 5th century BC.

The most popular career of a Greek of ability at the time was politics; hence the sophists largely concentrated on teaching rhetoric. The aims of the young politicians whom they trained were to persuade the multitude of whatever they wished them to believe. The search for truth was not top priority. Consequently the sophists undertook to provide a stock of arguments on any subject, or to prove any position. They boasted of their ability to make the worse appear the better reason, to prove that black is white.³⁶

Does this sound familiar? Some things in politics never change! “Progressives” make the worse appear better by fallaciously equating homosexual immorality with ethnic and racial minority status. The worse appears better when they refer to abortion as a

woman's choice without including the fact that they are choosing infanticide. The worse appears better as they claim to be advocating children's rights when the truth is that children need guidance and not license.

Some, like Gorgias, asserted that it was not necessary to have any knowledge of a subject to give satisfactory replies as regards it. Thus, Gorgias ostentatiously answered any question on any subject instantly and without consideration.³⁷

Do we not hear this happening regularly on the floor of the House of Representatives and the well of the Senate? We even observe similar ranting in the auditorium lectures of our most renowned universities. Two and a half millennia later, we are still electing clueless politicians and hiring clueless college professors.

To attain these ends mere quibbling and the scoring of verbal points were employed. In this way, the sophists tried to entangle, entrap, and confuse their opponents, and even, if this were not possible, to beat them down by mere violence and noise. They sought also to dazzle by means of strange or flowery metaphors, by unusual figures of speech, by epigrams and paradoxes, and in general by being clever and smart, rather than earnest and truthful. *Hence our word "sophistry": the use of fallacious arguments knowing them to be such.* [italics added]³⁸

The strategic similarities between Sophism and Postmodernism are striking. The disingenuous tactics used to support this relativist philosophy know no boundaries — not even adherence to the civil decency of telling the truth. Indeed, the most egregious of lies (that postmodernism is not relativistic) easily slips off the tongues of postmodernism's most ardent supporters. Other scholars, however, report on current sources of postmodern philosophy that openly adhere to the concept of relativism.

In the 1970s, the group of French philosophers . . . mainly on the Left, had become disillusioned with the heady days of the late 1960s when Western Europe and the United States were in political turmoil. For a short period in 1968, there seemed a strong possibility that major political changes could take place throughout

the Western world as a result of action by students, trade unionists, anti-Vietnam war protesters, liberal Communists and militant Socialists. This was not to be and in France where the struggle was arguably the most intense, this led to a waning of the huge influence previously wielded by the large Communist Party (to which most of these intellectuals owed allegiance). This disillusionment led to their disengagement with politics and their distrust of grand theories, such as Marxism, which they felt attempted but failed to explain the reality of social life and began to form ideas that slotted in to the themes explored by contemporary artists. Despite their many disagreements, they stressed the fragmentary and plural character of reality. They denied human thought the ability to arrive at any objective account of that reality. Any ideology or social theory that justified human action as a means to progress or order was condemned as meaningless. The grand social theory or narrative that justified human activity, whether it was Marxism, liberalism or Fascism is no longer credible, they argued. *There are no universal truths.* [italics added] All they have done in the past is legitimate the power of those who know and deny power to those who do not know.³⁹

Wisdom reminds the learned that “nothing is new under the sun”⁴⁰ and postmodern proponents would do well to examine history carefully. Relativist philosophy is indolent and, ultimately, Western civilization rejects it in every age. Unfortunately, the insidious nature of its rise into culture allows room for many destructive forces to wreak havoc before this rejection finally occurs. It is my fervent hope that our current generations will turn from this relativistic error in philosophy before irreparable damage to American society occurs.

Class Warfare

Whether advocating or defending the paradigm, pessimism is a prerequisite for the postmodern mindset. Few voices illustrate this better than Professor Albert Borgmann who writes, “a nation’s rank in the world is determined by its economic power.”⁴¹ Incorporating the socialist position that the powerful live to dominate the powerless, Borgmann proclaims this premise on a cultural scale. He goes on to say that, in order to retain America’s place of power in the world, her corporations take economic measures that drive society into a

“hyperactive” state that exhibits three features: “the suspension of civility, the rule of the vanguard, and the subordination of civilians.”⁴² Indications of the suspension of civility include cutbacks in: “legal aid, public aid for housing construction, enforcement of civil rights, and health and safety regulations. . . . [s]upport for basic research, for the arts and humanities.”⁴³ Referring to corporate executives as the *vanguard*, Borgmann purports that CEOs are seduced into “hyperactive work habits” he describes as:

Religious fervor. . . [which] provides direction in the face of idleness and doubt and serves as the warrant of individual accomplishment and collective salvation. Parents commend it to their children. It is what we know each of us should be dedicated to if only we were strong enough.⁴⁴

The postmodern scholar then asserts that, “[m]ost of us are not strong enough, however. Hyperactivity is the burden and the privilege of the vanguard.”⁴⁵ Singularly disturbing is the intimation that leaders are born and not made. This finds little credence in the American mindset let alone current business academic circles. While some people display a natural disposition toward superior leadership skills, scholars commonly accept the position that most people have the ability to be leaders given the proper training, environment, and motivation. Given equal opportunity, willpower may, indeed, be the distinguishing factor between what Borgmann terms the civilian and the vanguard.

Quite often, the militaristic metaphor heavily permeates the postmodern adjective. Professor Borgmann continues an angry soliloquy to proclaim class warfare:

The weakness of civilians is apparent in the disposability of the noncombatant workforce. The vanguard disposes of workers in a number of ways. It is free to determine the size of the workforce according to the requirements of economic productivity and stability. If relatively few or fewer can be conscripted profitably, so many more will remain unemployed. The vanguard can adjust wages downward if international competition requires it, and, above

all, the fighting elite is entitled to employ and dismiss the supporting troops as opportunity or difficulty dictate it.⁴⁶

Compare the militaristic tone of Professor Borgmann to what Marx & Engels wrote in 1847:

[N]ot only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons -- the modern working class -- the proletarians.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed -- a class of laborers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital. These laborers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.⁴⁷

The parallel is nothing short of amazing. Indeed, borrowing from Laura Ingraham's lexicon, "That's *disturbing!*" What Western society failed to succumb to via overt revolution and all manner of warfare now covertly overtakes American culture in the arena of academic social ideology. Clearly, postmodern philosophy is, among other things, an extension of Marxist philosophy. A former member of the progressive movement, himself, David Horowitz agrees. In the first chapter of his book, *The Politics of Bad Faith*, he discusses the failure of the Soviet Communist experiment and the horrific toll it took in human life. Instead of admitting their error, *progressive intellectuals* chose two forms of denial to escape from having to admit defeat.

The second, more prevalent, strategy of denial is dependent on a "postmodernist" attitude that accepts the fact of the Communist failure while avoiding its implications. This strategy acknowledges the failure of existing socialism, while denying its connection to the radical project. In the words of one Marxist academic, "The nightmare is over, the dream lives on." As though the nightmare was not also the dream. This form of denial is the path taken by most of the intellectuals who have remained faithful to the progressive idea.⁴⁸

Rejection of Religion

In postmodern circles, no single topic on the human condition comes under more vicious, and yet shallow, attack than that of Christianity. Evidence of this stems from the fact that the subject comes up in almost every book on the topic of postmodernism. Marginalizing or summarily dismissing God, religion, spirituality, and even humanity itself (as we shall see in later chapters) are common themes among postmodern proponents. Throughout postmodern writings, the central tactic in the assault is a disingenuous oversimplification of the very complicated problems the Church has faced, and overcome, all throughout her two thousand year history.

Even that mighty bastion stood on shaky ground. It was nervously on guard against heresies, murderously antagonistic toward them when they arose. Some of its solidity may well have been illusory. Max Weber has argued that there were actually quite different versions of Christianity operating in medieval Europe – an intellectualized one for the priests and scholars, and a much different one, full of folk beliefs and superstitions, for the ordinary people.⁴⁹

Aside from their shallowness, postmodern attacks against Christianity are pointedly angry. The vitriolic nature of the dialogue denotes the nature and source of its reasoning. Arbitrarily assigning the attribute of human fallibility to God and blaming Him for the errors of evil are consistent fallacies in the postmodern argument. Indeed, this has been the primary tactic of the Father of Lies since the Enlightenment.

[T]he Church itself, the keeper of the faith, was a *cesspool* [italics added] of power and greed that failed spectacularly to operate according to Christian principles. It is hard to maintain the façade when you have political incidents such as the schism of the fourteenth century that produced two popes, each of whom excommunicated the followers of the other. The Western world began a long slide away from its faith in the cool, ultimate truths that the Greeks believed could be found and the medieval clerics believed had been revealed by Christian theology.⁵⁰

To be clear, there is a segment of truth in the preceding paragraph! One of the greatest mistakes the College of Cardinals ever made was electing a Bishop of Rome outside their immediate circle. That mistake has never been repeated. The Church is fully aware that she has suffered under the reign of bad Popes as well as prospered with the help of good ones. Many progressives will deny it is true, but the postmodern culture's vehement hatred of Christianity is irrefutable. Scoffing at religions in general and Christianity in particular as relics of a superstitious nature that dates back to when we were mere Neanderthals, postmodern scholars fallaciously dismiss the most productive social force in human history as non sequitur. In fact, they blame religion for holding humanity in chains of academic ignorance until secular forces finally broke the shackles during the Enlightenment. Duped into believing this nonsense, young students find themselves incapable of answering the crafty queries of their relativist instructors.

[T]here can be no doubt that some of the greatest intellects ever to appear on earth were active two thousand years ago and earlier. Among the ancient Hebrews and the ancient Greeks alone, there were thinkers who have never been surpassed in profundity, originality, vision, and wisdom. . . . What, then, can explain why most, if not all, of what these great minds thought they knew about the nature of the material world was wrong? Conversely, how did it happen that Copernicus, and then Kepler and Galileo (the two giants who came right after him), and those who followed in their footsteps all the way to the present day, got most, if not all, of it right?⁵¹

Explaining to naive young minds that the Church sentenced Galileo to life in prison for his teachings, postmodern scholars blame Christianity for more than a millennium of scientific ignorance. It is easy for these "progressive" teachers to glance over the fact that the Church was sensitive to Galileo's failing health and the sentence amounted to "house-arrest in the home of the archbishop of Siena"⁵² who was actually sympathetic to his position and allowed him to continue his work. Inclusion of such a sidebar has nothing to do with the point they are trying to make. This leaves our children believing that the Church is

nothing more than a source of cruel oppression — exactly what the Father of Lies is after. In the words of one of the world’s most celebrated relativists, “Religion is the opiate of the masses.”⁵³ What this intentionally disingenuous style of progressive indoctrination fails to consider, however, is the very nature of epistemology during that vast expanse of time.

One might imagine that so huge and consequential a question would be hard to answer. But no. Galileo himself answered it. The Scholastics, he clearly recognized, were interested only in explaining *why* things were as they were, and their explanations (with more than a little help from Aristotle) took the form of logical deduction from the truths they already possessed through revelation. Galileo’s revolutionary aim, by contrast, was to discover *how* things were by observing and measuring them.

Galileo never claimed that these new experimental procedures could uncover anything about the cause or the origin of the forces being measured and observed.

In restricting itself to what it was capable of discovering, instead of presuming to answer the ultimate questions that were beyond its ken, the human mind had rapidly acquired a vaster store of knowledge about the physical universe than it had managed to gather in all the years gone by.⁵⁴

In higher levels of academia, misrepresentation of the nature of Christianity is also common. Postmodern scholar Terry Eagleton of Manchester University used the deconstructive tactics (described in the following chapter) he teaches his students to trivialize the New Testament message claiming that it “adopts a fairly relaxed attitude to sex.”⁵⁵ Such a charge is blatantly false and, indeed, evidence indicates quite the opposite. In the Old Testament, polygamy was often an acceptable practice. In stark contrast, Jesus advocated monogamy and pointed out that even a lusting heart is a form of adultery.⁵⁶

Taking scripture out of context is also commonplace and Professor Eagleton continues by disingenuously equating Christ’s declaration that God comes first⁵⁷ as proof that Christianity takes a “dim view of the family.”⁵⁸ The progressive

academic elite tend to believe that they have outgrown the superstitious nature of the lower self. They believe they are transcending into a higher plane of postmodern superiority of intellect unfettered by the chains of a primitive belief in God. Apparently, attaining the top 2% status of academia leaves many a postmodern scholar with the false idea that they are above *all* things.

Attacks against Christianity — the very foundation of American philosophy — move into the social mainstream with logarithmic frequency. The fallacious argument of separation of church and state has been the premise for taking God out of the public dialogue. What started with the removal of prayer from school continues unabated. In 2004, the *Faith in Action* coalition announced on its website, “Michael Newdow, the man who fought to remove the Pledge of Allegiance is at it again. He is now threatening our very right to pray on Inauguration Day by filing suit in federal court to block the Inaugural Day Prayer!”⁵⁹

Deletion of Christianity from the social dialogue results in moral bankruptcy. Elimination of current standards of personal morality is essential to promoting social equality for homosexuals. Unfortunately, it is also leading our children into a spiritual vacuum. Anger fills this vacuum in a manner that erupts with increasing heinousness in the public square. The effects of relativistic postmodernism are evident in our current social trends. It is evident in an increasing number of young women who tattoo themselves like drunken sailors. It is evident in junior high school students who mutilate their bodies with myriad piercings while their high school siblings boast to friends of performing the same in unspeakable places. It is evident in Gothic trends that leave the spiritually inclined soul shivering with an instinctive recognition of their diabolic source.

When we renounce our moral authority in favor of moral relativism, behavior that once was clearly evil gets redefined as a “social problem” with a “sociological solution.” The individual’s right to judge, in other words, is subordinated to the secular “wisdom” of the group or the collective. . . . It convinced a

shocking number of Germans to torture and murder their fellow human beings-as a service to the state.⁶⁰

Alexander Solzhenitsyn recognized the advancing rejection of God in America. Indeed, he proved prophetic in his proclamation that our nation was in a state of decline. Dr. William J. Bennett notes that other foreign observers agree: “When the rest of the world looks at America they see no longer a ‘shining city on a hill.’ Instead, they see a society in decline, with exploding rates of crime and social pathologies.”⁶¹ Left unabated, postmodern rhetoric and the resulting moral relativism will corrupt and destroy the very fabric of American society just as it did the nation of Germany in the last century.

CHAPTER TWO

The deterioration of every government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded.

Charles-Louis De Secondat

REJECTION OF TRUTH

“Without a strong claim to truth, all political discourse devolves into mere manipulation.”¹ Despite claims to the contrary, relativism is the focus and impetus of postmodern philosophy. The reason for this epistemological treachery is that postmodern theories dissolve when exposed to truth. Therefore, dismantling this most deadly weapon called truth is an essential element in protecting the postmodern fallacy. Postmodernists use myriad tactics to dispel the notion of objective truth in order to obscure our understanding of the singular nature of reality; a reality born from the hard-won battles of the modern era. Ironically, the greatest yet most devious weapon in the postmodern arsenal may be one derived from modern science — quantum mechanics.

Werner Heisenberg, a German physicist, is best known for his 1932 Nobel Prize work in the development of quantum physics. In 1927, he developed the Uncertainty Principle which states the position and velocity of a subatomic particle are impossible to exactly measure at the same time, even theoretically.

He was attempting to study the particles of the atom. He wanted to measure both mass and energy. The problem was that if he accurately measured mass he could not determine velocity accurately and vice versa. The accurate measurement of one observable characteristic involves a great deal of uncertainty in the measure of the other. *Simply stated, we can never know all there is to know.* [Italics added] This experiment led to what has become known as Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle.²

When I first read this lecture, I wondered how in hell (pun intended) any reputable scholar could jump so quickly from

Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty to the all-inclusive axiom that *we can never know all there is to know*. To the contrary, the intuitive conclusion here is that one or more unknown factors are influencing the subatomic experiment. To assume the impossibility of correctly performing a calculation or making a viable observation of any given phenomenon is scientifically lazy and philosophically absurd! Any child can see that there is something else happening at the quantum level and the correct answer is to explore and discover the unknown variable(s). Rather than waste your time reviewing my own numerous refutations to this posit, I defer to an expert in the field:

Einstein was dissatisfied with the reliance upon probabilities. But even more fundamentally, he believed that nature exists independently of the experimenter, and the motions of particles are precisely determined. It is the job of the physicist to uncover the laws of nature that govern these motions, which, in the end, will not require statistical theories. The fact that quantum mechanics did seem consistent only with statistical results and could not fully describe every motion was for Einstein an indication that quantum mechanics was still incomplete. Alternative interpretations have since been proposed and are now under serious consideration.³

Failure to discuss Einstein's position left an essential element of the debate out of our doctoral courses. On the other hand, moving Heisenberg's reasoning from the hard physical sciences into the soft social sciences seemed a natural thing to do:

Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle and Einstein's Relativity have humbled our expectations for prediction. The principle of uncertainty has helped us to understand that the observer cannot be separated from what is observe[d], [t]his is obvious in physics and much more so in social science.⁴

Progressive scholars continually refer to the fact that the observer of society is also a member of it. Consequently, postmodern deconstructive techniques have evolved the problem of performing experiments in sociology beyond the simple idea of *observer bias* to one wherein the observer is also a participant among the people and cultures in the experiment.

Perceiving the observation, no matter how minutely, allows the fallacious parallel that Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty must also apply to social science.

The Marxist tactic of victimization is also evident as progressives proclaim, "Those who occupy the decisive power positions are ready to use their power to impose the traditional definitions of reality on the population under their authority."⁵ Such arguments beg the question as to how the powerful obtained their power. Could it be possible that they understand certain basic tenets of an external objective reality? Could it further be possible that they are able to harness particular sub areas of truth to their benefit and power? Taking the postmodern perspective and rejecting external reality, such a thing would not be possible. The powerful would have to obtain their power by blind luck if there was no singular reality to bind them to the people on whom they "impose" their power.

The postmodern alternative suggests that the powerful are able to draw the powerless into their realities. To do so, however, it would be necessary to recognize some external factor to reality, some commonality, which facilitates the ability to draw others in the first place. Having so capitulated, it naturally follows that if *some* level of external reality exists, this reality might also be *singular* in nature. Having lost the argument, postmodern scholars proceed to invoke Sophist tactics.

"Whatever. . ."

As mentioned in the previous chapter, postmodern epistemology holds nothing new. Again, its roots trace back to the beginning of Western epistemology, itself. The strategies employed therein are singularly conducive to arguing any position from any angle and that is, as we previously discovered, why this line of anti-reasoning developed in the first place.

The Sophists cynically avowed that they taught truth, not for its own sake, but as a means to an end. Indeed they pretty nearly taught that there was nothing absolutely and universally true, that there

were no principles abstractly valid, no canons of conduct everywhere and under all circumstances binding.⁶

Here we see one of the earliest rejections of the concept of external universal truth. One of the greatest negative consequences of such an epistemology is the follow-on rejection of the concept of an external and universal deity. If reality is multiplicitous, how can there be only one God?

They recognised no distinction between the idea of right and the formal laws in which it might find itself embodied. Because they saw these forms differing at different times and among different peoples they rejected the idea that there are abstract principles of justice which are everywhere valid, and which furnish the moral basis for all those specific rules of conduct which are ethically defensible.⁷

The postmodern premise that *what is right for you may not be right for me* is particularly Sophist. By framing the debate in this manner, progressives are free to reject universal principles such as justice and morality. Debates in postmodern discourse seldom reach conclusion, let alone any sense of acquired unity among the participants. Coming to a stall, the dialogue often concludes with the phrase, “Whatever. . .” Summarily destroying one of the greatest of all human endeavors — the pursuit of truth — with a single word, all intellectual energy expended in the discourse becomes nothing more than a waste of time.

Man, they said, is the measure of all things. Properly interpreted this might be true, but not as construed by the Sophists. By man they meant mankind as distributively viewed, not as universally conceived. That is, according to their view each individual, with all his accidental and peculiar desires and characteristics, was qualified, upon the basis of those desires and characteristics, to pass judgment upon what it was right and wrong for him to do.⁸

Having dismissed the idea of universally binding principles was only the first step in justifying moral relativism. The second step involved promoting the Sophist idea that we are nothing more than the sum of our own experiences. In this

manner, postmodern epistemology justifies the right of people to isolate themselves from adherence to social norms.

Instead, therefore, of seeking instruction from the deepest truths of philosophy, they declared that guidance is to be obtained wholly from an examination of the concrete conditions of time and place. Instead of being instructed to see principles of natural or universal right embodied in the civil laws and customary morality of his country, the citizen was taught to discover only particular decrees which were in the main the product of the selfish desires of those who had originally issued or sanctioned them. *Such a theory as this was absolutely destructive to the principles upon which morality and justice were generally conceived to rest.* [italics added]⁹

In the attempt to empower individualism further, the postmodern proponent makes the same mistake as the Sophist by failing to acknowledge and address the primary issue of human imperfection. In a perfect world where no one made mistakes that resulted in violating another person's rights, environment, or existence, the viability of personal moral autonomy might be acceptable. Unfortunately, our propensity to *look out for number one* blinds us to the needs of others and such violations do occur. These violations therefore necessitate adherence to a set of definable and enforceable moral principals in every society. Indeed, some of these principals stand universally. Among them, we find restrictions against murder and theft. Failure to adhere to such philosophical truths under the guise of living for one's self enslaves the postmodernist to a perpetual state of ignorance. Denying the existence of a single external reality dooms the deceived to endlessly repeating the most evil mistakes of human history.

Deconstruction

A proponent of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party, 20th century philosopher Martin Heidegger first coined the term *deconstruction*. This term is one of the many new words Heidegger conjured in his rejection of the standard terminology of philosophical rhetoric. His premise was that we could not understand the external world for what it really is because our

linguistic traditions fall short of revealing truth. As slaves to our linguistic preconceptions, we can never discern the truth of the external world.

It was French philosopher Jacques Derrida, however, who moved the concept of deconstruction to the forefront of postmodern dialogue. Derrida also moved the principle from a method of reverse engineering a construct to a philosophical position someone takes. Rejecting the modern premise that a speaker means what he or she says deconstructionists point to the fact that it is impossible to say everything about any given subject. Taking apart every word and rearranging the order of the sentence creates many different meanings. Therefore, the entire oration is non sequitur. In reality, this is analogous to arguing with a clever and insolent child. Moving beyond the concept of using your words against you, the child of deconstruction will tangle your words into subjects and objects that have absolutely nothing to do with what you said. Far from delivering the dialogue into the realm of some unexplored reality, the deconstructionists' linguistic techniques intentionally obfuscate the truth and confuse the entire communication process in order to prove that whatever one pontificates is actually unknowable in the first place.

Difficult lives produce some of humanity's most noteworthy individuals. In the process of obtaining notoriety, many of these people become either heroes like Abraham Lincoln or devils like Adolf Hitler. As with so many other postmodern pundits, Derrida's philosophy extends from a personally disturbed past.

Experiencing partial facial paralysis and difficulty seeing as a result of Lyme disease, he [Derrida] selects works of art concerned with vision and blindness for a Louvre exhibit and produces *Memoirs of the Blind: The Self-Portrait and Other Ruins* (1990, transl. 1993) as a complementary text. In *Circumfession: Fifty-Nine Periods and Periphrases* (1991, transl. 1993), he responds to Geoffrey Bennington's analytic Jacques Derrida with a running, indeed a run-on, evocation of his own life, of his position as a circumcised Jew "who rightly passes for an atheist," of his education and upbringing in French Algeria, of his conflicted relationship to his dying mother and his own children.¹⁰

Once again, we see another by-product of the Father of Lies, a twisted position or convolution of logic purported by pained souls and excitedly accepted by high-minded progressive intellectuals as some brilliant form of enlightenment. Postmodern doctoral scholars tend to believe that their standing in the top 2% of academia brings them to a level of knowledge unattainable by the masses. This appears to give them license to preach some of the most horrific philosophical nonsense imaginable.

Symbolism and Linguistics

One particularly aggravating hallmark of the postmodern scholar's expose is the garish nature of discourse upon which any given idea incoherently expounds. Does the previous sentence sound laborious? Try this:

Modern common sense seems to concede the limits of individualism and distinguishes between the private and the public, between the sphere of individual discretion and the sphere of collective regimentation. But far from delimiting and clarifying individualism, the public-private distinction is itself an almost artfully complex confusion of the question where to locate authority and responsibility in the modern project. To begin with, there are two divergent distinctions between the public and the private; we may call them the economic distinction and the social distinction. Each designates an area for the exercise of individualism. The social distinction delimits the private realm as the sphere of commodious individualism; the economic distinction marks out the private sector as the field where rugged individualism will prosper. As it turns out, in fact, the social distinction serves to conceal the debilities of commodious individualism while the economic distinction exploits rugged individualism to justify the violence and injustice of the modern economy.¹¹

Herein, as in most other postmodern writings, the debate is ubiquitously obtuse, obscure, and (in the author's own words) "merely deconstructive or endlessly prefatory."¹² What marks this paragraph as particularly postmodern is the fallacious charge of victimization leveled in the last sentence: "the

violence and injustice of the modern economy.” In order to hide what the public would otherwise recognize as the most glaring and obvious similarities to its Marxist origins, postmodern scholars have adopted Michel Foucault’s tactics of linguistic obscurity. Pseudo-intellectual postmodern scholars gain acceptance and notoriety within their own circles by adherence to this particular linguistic paradigm. To those of us choosing to remain in the *real world*, their idiocy is transparent.

According to Professor Eagleton, postmodernism celebrates discontinuity.¹³ This is a seductive way of saying that postmodern critiques are both disingenuous and destructive. They are disingenuous in the way postmodern linguistic arguments abuse a speaker’s words. Intentionally twisting quoted material entirely out of context and developing an alternative script that sounds utterly aloof and extremely academic, the original project becomes abject nonsense. Any serious reading of Foucault will illustrate this point. Postmodern critiques are destructive in the way they divert attention away from the central posit of a discourse and drive the conversation in directions diametrically opposed to the original intent in some fallacious attempt to derive new meaning.

In the preface to his book, *Reality Isn’t What It Used To Be*, Walter Truett Anderson recounts watching a sea otter eating an abalone and bobbing on the ocean waves. This reminded him of the sea of symbolism upon which, he asserts, humanity bobs and weaves — mostly unaware of its presence.¹⁴ With this entrance, the author proceeds to expound the postmodern ideology using the tactic of analyzing human existence via linguistic convention. Like-minded proponents of this constructivist approach reject the possibility of universal reality. Failure to reach universal human agreement on an external reality allows the premise that singularity must be illusory as well. Instead, mental constructs derived from each persons understanding of their native language provide the basis for individual concepts of reality.

Deconstructive linguistic tactics are conducive to promoting and defending the construct that reality is not singular and external — it is multiplicitous, internal, and created moment by

moment. Examples promulgated by Benjamin Lee Whorf (1956) and Richard Rorty (1991), in the microcosm, may seem seductively convincing. Alternatively, Professor Groothuis correctly points out “postmodernists . . . revel in obscure language and arguments.”¹⁵ The following passage is a particularly noteworthy example of this.

New contributions to epistemology, metaphysics and ethics result in transformations of theoretical assumptions about notions of selfhood, rationality, and moral action that hardly leave any disciplines of knowledge unaffected. Along with their innovating vigour, these transformations often introduce to the host discipline the polemic which made them possible in the first place. In this vein, the shift from subjectivity to language and culture has not only encouraged a reconsideration of a subject-centred educational ideal in favour of a postmodernist alternative. It has also prompted that 'economical' approach which *reduces all other possible ideals to a pliable and manageable singularity in order to reject them* [italics added] as 'traditional' or 'logocentric' in one blow.¹⁶

Intentionally esoteric in nature, these approaches are, at best, deceitful. Citing the ageless conflict about belief itself, postmodern scholars devolve all belief systems into mere social constructs by blaming the concept of belief for social strife on the global scale. According to Anderson, “We do not know how to live in a world of socially constructed realities, yet we find it increasingly difficult to live in anything else.”¹⁷ Postmodern scholars who “find it increasingly difficult to live in anything else” are nothing more than people who refuse to face reality and deal with it.

Linguistic Twists of Postmodern Law

I might have jokingly equated such twists of logic to the tactics employed by O. J. Simpson’s defense attorneys had it not been for research indicating that such postmodern devices are actually being *taught* in American law schools today. According to Dennis Patterson, Distinguished Professor of Law and Philosophy at Rutgers University School of Law:

[I]t is misleading to speak of the empirical content of an individual statement. . . . Furthermore, it becomes folly to seek a boundary between synthetic statements, which hold contingently on experience, and analytic statements, which hold come what may. Any statement can be held true come what may, if we make drastic enough adjustments elsewhere in the system.¹⁸

To be sure, this statement is central to the postmodern paradigm and yet its logic is illusory at best. “Drastic adjustments” in any system of experience may not leave the boundary wherein truth resides and still be true. Professor Patterson continues his argument for postmodern linguistics similarly. “To put the postmodern [linguistic] alternative in a nutshell, the modernist picture of Sentence-Truth-World is replaced with an account of understanding that emphasizes practice, warranted assertability, [*sic*] and pragmatism.”¹⁹ Unfortunately, the professor’s model falls short when one understands that warranted assertions cannot always be placed in the same realm of definition as truth (unless, of course, you are a lawyer). Hence, this “replaced . . . understanding” is totally invalid.

A common tactic of defense lawyers is to obscure the prosecutor’s evidence with warranted assertions such as, “someone else could have been at the scene of the crime.” Statistical evidence such as a large number of other people in the city park where the crime occurred may *warrant* this assertion but it will not necessarily be *true* that the defendant is innocent. Returning to the Simpson analogy, consider Johnnie Cochran’s enthymeme, “If the glove doesn’t fit, you must acquit’ . . . Hidden premises [such as you *must* acquit] are often an effective way to obscure a questionable or fallacious premise in reasoning.”²⁰ Postmodern linguistic manipulation has truly poisoned American jurisprudence.

Professor Patterson’s relativistic position is certainly understandable considering his belief that “[l]aw is an activity driven by assertion . . . our interest lies in propositions of law.”²¹ Law *should* be an activity driven by justice — not some pseudo-Marxist notion of postmodern linguistic manipulation. Law as “an activity driven by assertion” led (among other

things) to the unwarranted postmodern premise that a citizen's right to privacy is constitutionally mandated. On the face of the argument, it should be clear to anyone that the reason the founding fathers did not express such a right is that the conduct of criminal and treasonous activity usually occurs in private. A nation cannot long survive with such a burdensome legal mandate because it deprives the government of an essential element of self-protection. The phrase 'right to privacy' first appears in the 1965 Supreme Court decision of *Griswold vs. Connecticut*. "Justice Hugo Black, in his dissent . . . attacked the way [Justice] Douglas had turned constitutional law into semantics by replacing the language of actual rights with the phrase 'right to privacy.'" ²² This fallacious right to privacy becomes the tool of evil when the rights to pornography, homosexuality, and abortion become law.

When Black Becomes White

One of the most remarkable tactics used in defending postmodernism is the way in which lies become truth and truths become lies. In closing, Professor Patterson states:

Many dismiss postmodernism as just another form of relativism. A moment's reflection on the argument demonstrates the emptiness of this charge. It is difficult to see how the label 'relativist' describes a position that argues for objectivity, truth, and reference in the theory of meaning. One only hopes that, in time, truth will prevail.²³

The notion that postmodern linguistic tactics argue "for objectivity, truth, and reference" sounds utterly absurd until he adds the phrase "the *theory* of meaning." Once again, the postmodern protagonist holds the singularity of truth to be anomalous — nothing more than a theory of meaning. This postmodern proclamation that 'black' is 'white' is a familiar tactic in the legal profession. Having admitted that "[t]he investigation of truth in law turns out to be the effort to describe what lawyers do with language"²⁴ there is no reason to wonder why Professor Patterson takes the postmodern position. The fact remains that black is not white and postmodern philosophy *is*

relativistic. We can, however, agree with him on one point:
“One only hopes that, in time, [T]ruth will prevail.”

CHAPTER THREE

Conformity is the professional deformation of intellectuals. . . . And this sheeplike conformity to the current received ideas of the intellectual trendsetters is all the more debilitating in that it is carefully masked and vehemently denied.

Paul Johnson

END OF THE MODERN ERA

Named for its originator, René Descartes, the Cartesian era moved both the *actual* acquisition of knowledge and the philosophical argument *about* the acquisition of knowledge beyond the realm of Scholasticism. The Scholastics referenced historical authorities to defend or refute any particular premise. Scholasticism was concerned with explaining events in the physical world primarily, but not exclusively, in theological terms rather than making new discoveries. Norman Podhoretz properly points out that “the school of thought rejected by modern science . . . was almost as deeply rooted in the Greeks, especially Aristotle, as in the Bible.”¹

[I]n the four centuries since Copernicus proved that the Earth revolves around the sun rather than the other way around, more has been learned about the natural world than was known in all the ages of human existence that came before them.²

Descartes believed that rational thinking and inductive logic were necessary to derive truth. The key to this philosophy was its move away from spiritual explanations for things to a logical and systematic approach to acquiring knowledge. As noted in the first chapter, the primary question changed from *why* things work the way they do to one of explaining *how* they work. Descartes taught modern thinkers to doubt everything. This skeptical epistemology would eventually spawn the centerpiece of modern scientific research — the null hypothesis. While this new epistemology had the unfortunate side effect of adding to

the growing list of excuses for marginalizing religion, it brought about a new way of thinking that would allow great minds to unlock many of the mysteries of the physical universe.

Cartesian doubt was in large part the consequence of an early meeting between the reality of faith and the reality of science. . . . As the Enlightenment unfolded, Cartesian doubt gave way to scientific debunking mixed with a spirit of social creativity. The Enlightenment believed the world would achieve constant improvement if people would use their rational minds to scrutinize social beliefs mercilessly and throw them away like worn-out shoes when they no longer served. . . . The dominant conflict of the time was between faith and reason, with reason — that is science — on the rise. Doubt was what fueled scientific inquiry, but the product appeared to be certainty: science, for many people in the modern era, merely replaced religion as the source of absolute truth.³

The scientific method attempts to reduce complex systems into smaller elements for ease of understanding. Consequently, *reductionism* refers to the concept of understanding a whole by examining its parts. As an example, a reductionist will explain that water is made of hydrogen and oxygen. A favored, indeed essential, tactic of postmodern proponents is to label the modern experiment a failure of this “Cartesian/reductionist” epistemology. Employing linguistically deconstructive tactics, progressive scholars suggest that analyzing the parts of any system destroys the nature of that system thereby making knowledge of the system unattainable. In other words, reducing the subject under analysis into separate parts fails to provide answers to essential questions about the nature and essence of the subject because that essence is destroyed in the process of analytical reduction. This is an odd rendition of *Systems Thinking* now chic among the postmodern avant-garde.

The World According to Gaia

Postmodern attempts to move the American psyche away from the successes of its Judeo-Christian social paradigm are myriad and duplicitous in the extreme. The number of ideas developed throughout history to enhance personal motivation and the sense of community are amazing and progressives use

every one of them in their tactical deception. Ecological extremism is another major postmodern ruse. Man's modern era domination of nature is the central complaint here. Professor Borgmann describes advances in technology that allowed for rapid expansion in the New World while lamenting the purported devastation wrought on his home town of Missoula, Montana.

The presence of a railroad depot was the condition of survival for just about every town on this continent. The railroad not only brought commercial prosperity; it also sucked the life from the rural culture beyond its lines. In towns served by a railroad, the depot became a center of curiosity and entertainment. It rivaled school, church, and city center as the central point of public life.⁴

Notice the progressive scholar's attempt to frame the narrative in the form of a conflict. Laying railroad tracks scarred the living face of Mother Earth. Evil modern industrialists sucked the life out of quaint, peaceful, and eco-friendly small towns. They closed the schools and boarded up the churches leaving the town folk with nothing to do but stand by the railroad tracks all day long waiting for the train to roll through. While this parody is obviously exaggerated, it provides a sense of the subliminal message of the liberal agenda. When viewed in the light of reality, it is easy to dismiss such propaganda for the absurdity that it truly is.

The postmodern revision of history is unrelentingly one-sided. It is true that building transcontinental railroads took its toll in human capital and changed the American landscape but whether the project was an achievement or an atrocity is simply a matter of adhering to either an optimistic or pessimistic perspective. Similarly, progressive activists assault every other modern endeavor.

Railroad building was not modernity's last assault on the American continent. In the late 1950's the federal government embarked on the construction of the interstate highway system: I-90 now roughly parallels the railroads as it approaches and leaves Missoula. A four-lane, controlled-access highway is a much broader and more massive structure than a railroad. Hence highway construction was

even more aggressively intrusive on the land than its railroad predecessors, even though it was gentler on the laborers, who benefited from heavy machinery and advanced logistics. At the same time, air traffic settled on the country, and Missoula enlarged its airport to accommodate jets. While air traffic lanes are, of course, less tangible than railroads and highways, they have made transportation a ubiquitous presence on this continent. There is no refuge anywhere from the atmospheric and acoustic litter of airplanes.⁵

As an alternative to modern “Cartesian/reductionism”, postmodern epistemologists (surely a contradiction in terms) prefer to twist a viable and effective organizational paradigm called *Systems Thinking* to their unscrupulous advantage. Again, the postmodernist complains that modern science destroys what it attempts to analyze in the process of dissection because the whole cannot exist as separated parts. Of particular interest to this discussion are the thoughts of one of the great postmodern systems thinkers of our time, physicist Fritjof Capra, who moves systems thinking from the realm of physics into sociology. Decrying reductionism as “shallow” and “human-centered,” he proposes a Gaia paradigm as the preferred alternative. “Deep ecology does not separate humans — or anything else — from the natural environment. . . . Ultimately, deep ecological awareness is spiritual or religious awareness.”⁶ There is something darkly revealing in his metaphor of life as a *spider web*.

Capra immediately lures his audience into a state of victimization. Defining the modern era by the domination of “[p]atriarchy, imperialism, capitalism, and racism,”⁷ he reminds his readers of the historical parallels between our concepts femininity and nature. He then points out that both have been subjugated to “exploitation in the various hierarchical, militaristic, capitalist, and industrial forms.”⁸ Conceding the misrepresentation of women and the natural world, Capra’s Gaia-centered vision still misses the point. Understanding the nature of women from the Co-Creator perspective is an amazing revelation explored, in detail, in Chapter 9.

Farewell to the American Dream

Until the great American experiment, individuality was subservient to the common bond of community. Conceived and developed with sensitivity for both community and individuality in the same creative breath American society was born. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such a paradigm was unique. Initially establishing the original colonies for religious reasons, Protestant Christianity quickly spread to the New World. The ideology of an individual's reasoned faith being the basis for a one-on-one relationship with his Creator was the antithesis of the Old World paradigm where either the Church or the State were considered to be the proper center of one's allegiance. Dissent against Old World government resulted in persecution. This spawned the original influx of immigrants to the New World.

As colonies were established, they became the de facto social identity. The new society foreswore aristocracy for personal achievement. To obtain power in the New World, one had to *earn* it by working hard, being inventive, and maintaining the solid moral character necessary to obtain the trust of one's business partners. Many of our cultural assumptions — our sense of identity, purpose, and moral focus stem from these small societies. The 'pioneer spirit' has been associated with the American psyche since the nation's inception. Freedom from the oppression of political tyrants, overpopulated areas, and menial jobs with their low wages and squalid working conditions lured people from the Old World. Arriving in the New World, colonists discovered an open frontier that held seemingly limitless opportunities.

Organizationally, the Quakers and Puritans are the primary originators of American culture. They established the colonies from which our Federalist heritage would eventually spawn. The needs of those original pioneer settlements brought about the businesses that thrived therein. In the small communities of the time, acquisition of a personal fortune was not the sort of objective that it is today. First priority was survival of the colony. Consequently, every citizen needed to be a productive member of the pioneer community. The individual's goal was to

succeed *within* the community rather than excel beyond it. The needs of the pioneer community warranted an inclusive spirit since survival in the New World necessitated that all parties help each other succeed.

In the beginning, confederations were loose or non-existent and most of the citizenry consisted of artisans and craftsmen. The vast majority were in business for themselves and from these beginnings the spirit of individual entrepreneurship was buried so deeply in the American identity that its allure still holds primacy today. In the main, business was done person-to-person. A man's word was his bond and his identity within the community was tightly interwoven with his trade. So central was this spirit of community that the main measure of a man's wealth was his good character. It was from this social mindset that the founding fathers would ultimately secure a new nation. Indeed, the founders repeatedly warned that our democracy would not survive a citizenry devoid of personal honor and discipline, a strong sense of community, and grateful hearts that lean mightily on the providence of their divine Creator.

While the colonists were individual entrepreneurs, this is not to say that the corporate spirit was absent. Much of the capital required to establish the colonies came from investors who remained in Europe. Those who came to do the work were promised a share of the profits for their labor. Great commerce arose from the transit of vast quantities of goods and raw materials from the New World back to the expanding industrial base of the Old. As time progressed, however, debts and taxation weighed heavily on the colonists for myriad reasons and revolution was the end result. This is not, however, the version of history our children are being taught in the postmodern educational system.

The Revisionists

Postmodern historians tell quite a different story. Commonly referred to as *revisionist history*, the Euro-Caucasian struggle for autonomy, freedom, and independence has been summarily deconstructed by progressive activists since the 1960s. Unlike their less fortunate peers who make up a

majority of the homeless population in this country, those pot smoking, lysergic acid taking, free-love adolescents and young adults who survived the sixties now run the college campuses on which they previously provoked violent confrontations with the Army National Guard and local police. Their anti-establishment voices now fill our children's ears with twisted half-truths, outright lies, and evil rhetoric designed to undermine the very fabric of traditional American society.

[M]any younger scholars entering the academic world had been activists in the militant "New Left" of the late 1960s and early 1970s or sympathetic with its radical goals. This new generation of radical scholars regarded the United States, not the USSR, as the chief menace in the world. These radical academics thoroughly changed the ideological atmosphere of the scholarly world.⁹

The postmodern scholar's perspective of modernity is intentionally shallow. Excluding important details is an essential tactic of deconstruction. Progressive historians commonly refer to Copernicus, Columbus, and Luther as the great institutors of change from medieval times. Copernicus decentralized humanity from the universe, Columbus broke the boundaries of the known world, and Luther disconnected laity from the Church and made Christianity primarily a relationship between the individual and God. The primacy of the concept of individualism was the ultimate result of the transition into the modern era.

Portraying Francis Bacon as fiercely opposing the confusion in medieval-era scientific analysis, as well as the acceptance of pain and suffering incurred from natural life processes, the progressives describe the rise of modernity as a period of aggressive expansion, exploitation, and victimization. "Bacon not only taught modernity to stand up to the ancient scourges of humanity; he also identified the New World discovered by Columbus as an adversary that had to be brought to its knees."¹⁰ Descartes introduced the premise that method and procedural analysis could solve the world's problems and progressives pessimistically refer to this as the "triumph of procedure over substance."¹¹

Recalling that religion is the bane of postmodernism, problems throughout history are routinely blamed on the religious philosophies of the time. Discharging belief in God as simply an excuse for one culture to dominate another culture, postmodern scholars dismiss the repeated references of Bacon and Descartes to God as “immaterial decorations, mere concessions to tradition.”¹²

In Bacon’s view, the new philosophy was no threat—not to religious faith, not to the wit of man and not to the social order. By separating out “the absurd mixture of matters divine and human” that the Scholastics had concocted, all the new philosophy did was “to render unto faith the things that are faith’s.” To understand the word of God, we now had to “quit the small vessel of human reason, and put ourselves on board the ship of the Church, which alone possesses the divine needle for justly shaping the course.” Furthermore, in submitting to the limits of human reason, we would lay bare the true wonders of God’s creation, and we would thereby ultimately be led to worship Him all the more.

This prediction may have been sincere *or, more likely, a clever piece of apologetics*, [italics added] but in any case it turned out to be wrong about the effect of the new philosophy on religious belief.¹³

The same holds true for the works of Locke:

Locke drew up a design that spelled out the social implications of the modern project. As Bacon was searching for the “proper foundations” and Descartes was determined to “start again from the very beginning,” so Locke was concerned with recasting political power by deriving it from its “original,” that is, from its fundamental condition. This he found in the state of nature, governed by reason, which in turn derived from God. Once more the modern project seems to be suspended from divine authority. But the reformation movements, beginning with Luther, had shaken and shattered the communal authority of religion. What looks like a religious mooring in Locke’s *Treatise* is but a traditional embellishment.¹⁴

Ascribing the progressive scholar’s personal viewpoint to historical characters is an all too common postmodern occurrence as well as an academically disingenuous thing to do.

Such impressions of the early modern philosophers are held by, at best, an agnostic. History holds that Descartes was Roman Catholic. Consequently, inclusion of God in his thinking was a perfectly natural occurrence. It is true that Bacon's & Locke's empiricist philosophy and Descartes' rationalist philosophy stepped Western epistemology away from reliance on the Church to form personal knowledge. To say, however, that these philosophers were somehow irreligious is counterintuitive to all but the postmodern skeptic whose deconstructive agenda includes the eradication of America's Christian heritage. "God, Locke says (he might as well have said nature or reason), gave the world 'to the use of the industrious and rational. . .'"¹⁵ Why might Locke as well have said anything other than God? Might that be because the postmodern scholar, himself, does not accept the premise? Or is he sure that Locke was simply appealing to the masses? If so, where is the proof? To be sure, none was presented in class and, once again, doctoral learners were expected to unquestioningly accept the atheistic postmodern paradigm.

*Fourteenth Amendment Marxism*¹⁶

Progressive postmodernists lament the failure of what they claim to be an ultimate objective of the Enlightenment: "fair equality of opportunity for women, blacks, Native Americans, homosexuals, and minorities generally."¹⁷ Herein, question arises as to the inclusion of populations based on personal choice with populations devoid of such choice by virtue of physiology. Categorizing homosexuals with racial minorities is disingenuous in the extreme because no empirical evidence has ever been produced that proves sexual preference to be genetically based and not simply a psychological preference.

Extending the argument further, finding a genetic link to homosexual proclivity would still fail to prove the inclination any less immoral and unacceptable than did the genetic proclivity towards alcoholism. Certain human tendencies are inherently self-destructive and must be denied regardless of genetics. Sexual immorality leads to the spread of disease and death to say nothing of associated psychological maladies. In

the end, however, the comparison of homosexuality to alcoholism on a genetic basis is non sequitur on the grounds that alcoholics suffer from a chemical dependency that creates a *physical link* between genetics and the syndrome that has never been found in homosexuality. Alcoholism is a disease whereas immoral homosexual behavior is a choice.

Beyond the anomalous medical side of the debate, the legal dilemma between equal rights and personal freedom was duly noted by the drafters of the Constitution. Can freedom and equality coexist? “[T]he ‘law’ of freedom and the ‘law’ of equality were understood by the Framers to be fundamentally in conflict with each other — a conflict that the socialist experiments of the last century have demonstrated with tragic affect.”¹⁸ In the act of assuring that every citizen has the same resources, it is incumbent on the government to redistribute wealth — a common liberal battle cry. Unfortunately, the history of the twentieth century inexorably proves this social tactic a failure on two major points. State control of wealth left Soviet citizens unmotivated and led to participation in black-market activities for increased profit while the public sector languished in squalor. The American welfare system has demonstrated that giving resources to an unmotivated underclass provides no incentive for the recipients to become productive citizens. Indeed, many of the laws designed to protect the proper distribution of welfare aid did little more than enslave the underprivileged by not allowing them to find work or get married. With little or no education, many women in poverty perceived production of children out of wedlock to be a viable method for increasing welfare payments while never realizing that the expenses incurred in raising them far outstripped their meager government benefits.

[W]e casually speak of the “haves” and “have-nots,” terms that presume the “social injustice” the Left proposes to redress, while at the same time inflaming the passions of social resentment. . . . In a society of liberal politics and economic markets, it would be more appropriate to speak of the “dos” and the “do nots,” the “cans” and “cannots,” the “wills” and will nots”. . . that individuals can and do make their own destinies, even in circumstances they may not

control. Yet . . . we could hardly use these accurate descriptive terms without being simultaneously assaulted by the suspicion that the very usage reflects a mean-spirited attitude on our part which “blames the victim.” Such is the power of political language. To recognize linguistic gravities like these is another way of recognizing the cultural hegemony of the Left.¹⁹

Corporate Evil

Postmodern scholars defame Cartesian order as the rational and methodical approach to overcoming nature and victimizing the planet. In their revision of history, Cartesian order enabled the application of modern scientific methods that ultimately defined the organization of labor and subsequently victimized the working class. Citing the works of Frederick Taylor (*The Principles of Scientific Management*), Henri Fayol (*General Principles of Management*), and Max Weber (*Bureaucracy*), they build their case for the alleged modern-era enslavement of individuals under the heavy-handed, overbearing master of humanity called the corporation. Progressive academics deconstruct this amazingly productive social achievement claiming that, “[t]he rational and mechanical functioning of such a structure is analogous to that of a machine.”²⁰

The genius of the corporation is its fusion of humanity and technology, of individual aspiration and giant machinery. . . . where the entire responsibility for a well-defined and coherent part of the corporation is entrusted to one individual. The person in a line position. . . . has a prospect of rising in the hierarchy and commanding an ever more inclusive part of it. In this way, individuals identify themselves with the corporation. . . . The great corporations have been a pervasive force in social integration in American society. Their success is evident from their share of this country’s economy. Although they constitute less than a tenth of a percent of all firms, they control half of the total economy.²¹

This oppressive mechanistic metaphor inevitably invites the old Marxist ideology of class warfare. Proclaiming the dehumanizing of humanity during the modern era, the postmodern scholar writes, “Though corporations were often founded and structured by outstanding individuals, the

corporation in its mature form transforms individuals into anonymous managers and workers.”²² It is not enough to deride the business sector for what the author thinks it has done wrong, further complaint arises from what Corporate America has done right.

In the nineteenth century, however, the organic interchange of the public and the private came under stress and was finally destroyed. Destruction came in the guise of ostentation. This was the time when department stores, libraries, and opera houses were erected as magnificent settings in which the public could gather and enjoy itself. But the people who filled these spaces became silent, passive, and distracted. No longer actors and connoisseurs of public spectacles, they had begun to turn into recipients and consumers of commodities, produced for them by experts.²³

Such never-ending tirades against the modern era proves the old adage that *you can't win for losing*: American corporations dominate the economy; American industry robs an individual's identity; Americans no longer participate in society, all they do is consume what their corporate masters feed them. Next on the postmodern hit list comes the derision of modern high-rise buildings, interstate highways, planes, and trains, and automobiles, *oh my!*

As engineering feats, they dominate, if they do not suffocate the public space. If we do not admire them, they nonetheless overwhelm our attention. Yet their reason for being is entirely that of a means — means of moving and storage. Thus the public realm of the late twentieth-century United States has become both hypertrophied and atrophied, both excessively developed in its sheer physical presence and devoid of intrinsic or final dignity, bereft of celebration or festivity.²⁴

It is amazing the lengths to which progressive academicians will go in order to suppress the American spirit. “Universities, intellectuals, think tanks, and government departments have put a lot of poison into the reservoirs of national discourse.”²⁵ The great gifts and wonders of modern American ingenuity are turned into evils of monstrous proportions. Revisionist historians tell our impressionable young children that they are

descended from a long line of primitive religious zealots, aggressive invaders, and genocidal maniacs.

Mixing truths with lies is the most common tactic of evil. Correctly observing that individualism heavily asserts itself in the way Americans use their leisure time, progressives report that television is responsible for an increase in leisure time to 28 or 29 hours a week.²⁶ Next, they complain that this sedentary activity is isolationist in nature and increasingly devoid of communal celebration. This sets the stage for another socialist proposition:

Commodious privacy remains both strong and unloved. Work, however, the descendant of rugged individualism, appears to be well regarded.

That seems natural enough. Work is hard, serious, and constructive; leisure is certainly commodious, perhaps frivolous if not parasitic. To work is to be vigorously in touch with reality; it is to acquire substance and property.²⁷

Commodious privacy refers to individual leisure time devoid of interaction with others. Postmodern complaints about commodious privacy fail to take into account those private activities that are conducive to individual spiritual renewal. Modern Americans devote individual leisure time to so many other things beyond television. The atheistic scholar's mind, however, is not predisposed to consider myriad other forms of commodious privacy — particularly those activities of a spiritual nature such as nature walks, reading the Torah, Bible or Koran, Eucharistic Adoration, etc. This lack of appreciation for individuality, spirituality, and commodious privacy conveys the spirit of Karl Marx who said, "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness."²⁸ Similarly disturbing is the reference to leisure as "parasitic."

Disdain for Capitalism

In accordance with its Communist forbearers, postmodern ideology scorns accumulation of private wealth. Blind to the

necessities of capitalistic ventures that are, to date, the most efficient means for promoting the public good, postmodern scholars rail against the private sector of the American economy.

The private sector is hospitable neither to self-determination nor to a vigorous engagement with nature. Young people do not look to the labor market as a field for creative self-realization. Instead, they look for available slots in the gigantic economic machinery to insert their labor. They do so anxiously if they are ambitious, sullenly if they are hopeless. Once they have found work, what they confront is not the challenge of soil, rock, or timber but the incessant demands of technological devices, impersonal supervisors, and anonymous customers. They certainly find no natural balance between the industry and rationality of their work and the rewards of their labor.²⁹

The reason most young people do not look to the labor market for creative self-realization is that for them, as for those who came before them, entry-level work is a training ground. Progressive scholars paint an unrealistic picture of the job market in order to lure the unskilled, untrained, and uneducated into a state of victimization. The idea is to make them think that they automatically deserve six-figure incomes and a private office and the reason they do not get them is that the evil corporate *machine* is keeping them down. The idea that young postmodern workers prefer working the soil to learning technological skills is typical of the naive Gaia mentality. While agricultural industry is a noble endeavor, a cursory check of college majors provides a less romanticized idea of what interests young workers.

Postmodern derision of the private sector economy has, as its primary aim, the replacement of American capitalism with a socialist state. Evidence in the political arena abounds including calls for a national healthcare system; advancing the rights of minors on a scale equal to adults; and opposition to so-called U.S. imperialism. In order to undermine the core values of American society, postmodernists must convince American students that the system is corrupt and pervasive.

Why are we so zealous, then, about the private sector? We persist in designating a large part of the economy as private so that we can disavow public responsibility for its evils and claim individual merit for its blessings. As a civic body we are reluctant to countenance and cure the deprivations of the poor, the damage to the environment, and the trivialization of culture that are the depressing concomitants of our advanced industrial economy. At the same time, applauding the rich and powerful who claim their privileges as the fruits of their rugged individual efforts, we sanction our positions or our aspirations.³⁰

Americans designate a large part of the economy to the private sector because history shows that totalitarian/socialist regimes de-motivate the citizenry into a state of complacency that stifles creativity and promotes clandestine black markets. Claims that Americans are reluctant to help the poor and protect the environment are nothing short of libelous! Private sector and religious institutions do much more to enhance society than the government-mandated programs supported by the socialist-oriented leaders of the American Democratic Party. Still, they rage against the very paradigm that made America the world's sole Superpower at the end of the twentieth century.

The festering ambiguities of individualism, though they have been culturally and morally injurious, remained politically and economically tolerable as long as the economy was productive and the consumption was moderate. But lately, commodious individualism has become unbridled. At the same time the rugged individualists' insistence on splitting apart what can only prosper through cooperation is slowing the economy and putting it, in a historical and international perspective, at a troubling disadvantage. Individualism has always been ambiguous. Now, at last, it is becoming questionable.³¹

Have we not heard this before? Travel back to the year 1847:

Modern Industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of laborers, crowded into the factory, are organized like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army, they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they

slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooker, and, above all, in the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.³²

The intentionally destructive rhetoric of the postmodern scholar emulates Marxist ideology right down to the mechanistic metaphors they both incorporate! There is a simple reason for this that should be abundantly clear to the reader by now — they are essentially one and the same. Postmodern claims to the contrary are mere subterfuge. Again, the tactics of the Father of Lies — proclaiming lies as truth and truths as lies — can be observed in the majority of both communist and postmodern/progressive rhetoric.

The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The increasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes.³³

Today, it is technology, rather than machinery, that the proponents of victimization blame for the ills of the worker. Charlotte Iserbyt, Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement at the U.S. Department of Education during the first Reagan Administration, coined a phrase that properly describes this postmodern illusion. For half a century postmodern scholars have been *dumbing down* American students and creating a generation of people who cannot even defend themselves from the deconstructive educational onslaught. However, these same postmodern scholars are now being caught in their own web. One side effect of creating an inept academic regimen for the students has been the increasing propensity for laziness and slovenly work among the newest progressive academics. Instead of putting any effort into artful subterfuge, as did their Marxist and Sophist forbearers, the latest generation of postmodern scholars simply

rehash the same old arguments that sent Russia, Cuba, and North Korea into the ash heap of history.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society, capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois, abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.³⁴

In case you find yourself reeling from the overwhelming evidence in this chapter, welcome to the club. For those thinking, “No, This can’t be right!” let us quickly recap the two paradigms: postmodern scholars deride “festering ambiguities of individualism” that are “culturally and morally injurious” while Marx declared that “the abolition of . . . individuality . . . independence, and . . . freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.” Postmodern scholars and progressive politicians want us to “progress” beyond traditional American values. The only way to do this is to convince our children that what they have is bad and what a postmodern future offers is better. Consequently, lies become truths and truths become lies. Revisionist historians who turned to psychedelic drugs in the sixties now turn our heroic and moral forefathers into reckless opportunists. Postmodern sociologists who embraced free-love in the sixties now embrace homosexuality as a social norm and child pornography as a first amendment right.

Communism as social fact is dead. But communism as a pleasant figment of the “progressive” worldview lives on, giving a phantom life to the illusions and historical distortions that sustained that murderous and oppressive ideology. The intellectual Cold War, alas, is not over. Academic revisionists who color the history of American communism in benign hues see their teaching and writing as the preparation of a new crop of radicals for the task of overthrowing American capitalism and its democratic constitutional order in the name of social justice and peace. Continuing to fight the Cold War in history, they intend to reverse the victory of the

West and convince the next generation that the wrong side won, and to prepare the way for a new struggle.³⁵

From Knowledge to Meaning

In order to overcome the morals and traditions of American society, the intent of postmodern philosophy is to shift the focus of public discourse from one of knowledge to one of meaning. Advancing the premise that there is no such thing as external truth, the concept of knowledge fades into the ether. Since truth does not exist, how can we know anything as an absolute? In the postmodern mind, we cannot. Since we no longer *know* that homosexuality is immoral and unnatural, we no longer lay claim to such exclusive moralist ideologies. Do you see where this is going and what its larger implications for society are?

Shifting the conversation from knowledge to meaning also allows a shift away from personal responsibility. What is true for you is not necessarily what is true for anyone else. Faith and morality become exclusively relative to the person who subscribes to them. The pre-modern and modern era bonds of communal agreement on such socially imperative issues are broken. However, when postmodernism is understood for what it truly represents, the question arises as to how it has permeated into the foreground of academia. This section examines the subtle strategy employed by the Father of Lies to seduce brilliant human minds into this relativistic web of deceit, spiritual decay, and social destruction.

In order to convince people to move in a given direction and away from what they know, the first thing that must be done is to convince them that something is wrong. The primary argument of postmodernism is that modernism has failed to solve all of our problems so it follows that modernism is ultimately a failure.

Although under siege, much that is modern continues to provide the dominant structure of our world situation. Yet at the margins there are encouraging signs of displacement, of new patterns and paradigms reshaping behavior and perception. To simplify, there are two varieties of postmodernism that, while distinct, are also linked. There is, first of all, critical postmodernism, the realization that the secular, technologically driven dynamic of consumerism

and global markets is no longer, if it ever was, capable of producing either human happiness or any promise of a bright future, that we are increasingly menaced by the dangers of modernist implosion, and that the most that can be done within the modern framework is to resist the lure of false hope that is achieved by fastening onto some kind of coherent grand narrative that offers some new universal solution.³⁶

Critical postmodernism refers to consumerism and markets using derisive Marxist terms. Workers are said to be victimized by their bosses so that class warfare ultimately becomes the battle cry. A good example was provided by Dr. David C. Korten in June of 2003. He told the National Council of Churches that the American economic system was developed to keep the rich rich and the poor poor.

In fact, the entire economic and financial system is structured to assure that the gap between rich and poor keeps growing. . . . worker pay remained pretty much even with inflation throughout the 1990s. The economic gains went to corporate profits, owners of stocks, and CEO compensation. This is not accidental. The tools of economic and financial analysis seek to assure that every public and corporate policy decision is made with the intent to maximize returns to money, which means to people who have or control money — call them the money people. If it appears that wages are rising, the Federal Reserve raises interest rates to slow the economy to increase unemployment and maintain a downward pressure on wages. The announced purpose is to prevent wage “inflation.” The unstated purpose is to make sure that the gains of economic growth and productivity are captured by money people rather than by working people.³⁷

Note the manner in which Dr. Korten presents his argument. He advances the Marxist/postmodern claim that the American government is out to screw the worker and help the “money people.” For those in the audience who want a bigger piece of the American pie without having to do the work, it is easy to agree with this premise on purely emotional bases. However, one glaring error presents itself. A claim (a *meaning*) is made but no evidence (*knowledge*) is presented to back it up. An audience primarily made up of liberal denominations that

already accept abortion on demand and homosexuality as social norms is now being sold the next bill of goods by the Father of Lies. With no empirical evidence to support the claim, these churchgoers are told that the American economic system is intentionally trying to keep them oppressed. Knowledge is replaced with meaning and *they* are now the victims!

Figures can Lie and Liars can Figure

Since a small number of capitalists hold most of the world's wealth, postmodernists and "progressives" point to this as proof of the modern era's failure. There are a couple of problems with this posit. First, someone in postmodern circles had better check their math. In 2000, the UN reported the total population of the planet to be 6,070,581,000. In 2005, the UN reported the total population to be over 6,453,628,000. 6,453,628,000 minus 6,070,581,000 equals 383,047,000 new people in 5 years. That is 76,609,400 more people every year. Therefore, in 2002 there were approximately 6,070,581,000 plus 153,218,800 or 6,223,799,800 people.

Determining the exact amount of money in the world is beyond the scope of this philosophical argument. However, we will use the 27.2 trillion dollars that Merrill Lynch reported as the total wealth of the world's 7.3 millionaires in 2002 as a starting point. With 7.3 million millionaires in a total population of 6.2 billion, that makes .1% of the population worth 27.2 trillion dollars. Spreading their money over the world's population gives every person \$4,387. According to other researchers, if the wealth of the world was spread evenly among the entire population of the planet, every person would have somewhere between four and eleven thousand dollars. What kind of gains could be expected in the human condition if every person had eleven thousand dollars in their pocket?

Such shortsighted speculation fails to consider the enormous resources necessary to take on the great projects that overcome some of humanity's greatest problems. If all we needed to do were feed ourselves and find shelter, the equal distribution of wealth would make a fine idea. However, humans have evolved beyond the basic survival instincts of the

animal kingdom. Eternally seeking greater meaning for our existence, we reach for the stars and probe the mysteries of the atom. In the process, we discover wonderful new things that continue our advancement and, unlike any other species that we have discovered in the animal kingdom to date, we even reach out to our Creator for greater meaning. Unfortunately, finding the cure for cancer, developing ecologically friendly power sources, and other such necessities require a huge concentration of financial resources. Need I go on?

Dr. Korten's statement that there is some covert conspiracy to keep wealth in the hands of the "money people" is short-sighted and lacks even the most rudimentary elements of meaningful evidence. Throwing up charts and graphs that show that the "money people" have the money does nothing more than illustrate the fact that the "money people" know how to *make* the money. Developing in-vitro surgical techniques that save babies from spina bifida, developing advanced farming techniques to feed expanding populations, and every other worthy human endeavor requires intensive capital and power to keep the projects going. Can the "money people" do more to help the underprivileged? Sure they can, but insisting that it is unfair for them to be so rich and so powerful in the first place is both petty and ridiculous because their leadership keeps the economy moving.

Dr. Korten's complaint is the perfect lead into another important factor of the postmodern argument. Victimization soon follows the idea of failed modernism and becomes the postmodern refrain:

Critical postmodernism has definitely helped us grasp the extent to which the world of socially constructed meanings is one that has, in Foucault's phrase, been molded by "the discipline of power," but such knowledge tends to leave us stranded on this island of critical insight, producing over time a disabling sense of despair and futility.³⁸

Postmodernists look at "money people" and people with power as the enemy of community. American leaders are defined as dominators and manipulators of society bent on

subserviating the working class for their own selfish purposes. To deny that some element of this actually exists in our society would be extremely naive. On the other hand, over generalizing the idea is dangerously disingenuous and extremely immature. It is to succumb to the baser animal instinct of self-preservation known as jealousy. Its root cause stems from an old animal fear. It grows from the apprehension that if someone else has something that we do not, we instinctively (not necessarily factually) feel cheated. Therefore, we are lacking and must have what they have. Parents see this in their children all of the time. Unfortunately, we grownups seldom realize that we do the same thing as adults. Indeed, many of my postmodern doctoral colleagues make a good living in this *victimization industry*!

Thank you for reviewing *All Hail the Death of Truth!* I sincerely hope you have enjoyed this preview. The entire book may be purchased in paperback or downloaded at <http://www.lulu.com/content/134912>

ENDNOTES

PREFACE

¹ (n.a.), "The State of the News Media 2004: An Annual Report on American Journalism," *Journalism.org*, Found online at http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/narrative_overview_publicattitudes.asp?media=1.

² Luke 9:23-24.

³ Matthew 20:16.

⁴ James Hillman, *The Soul's Code: In Search of Character and Calling* (New York: Random House, Warner Books edition, 1997).

⁵ Robert H. Knight, *The Age of Consent: The Rise of Relativism and the Corruption of Popular Culture* (Dallas: Spence Publishing, 1998), p. xii.

⁶ Bob Volpitto, "Onward, Christian Soldiers," *Democratic Underground.com*, March 1, 2002, ¶1. Found online at http://www.democraticunderground.com/articles/02/03/01_onward.html.

⁷ (n.a.), "Cardinal Ratzinger's Homily," *Vatican Radio: The Voice of the Pope and the Church in Dialogue with the World*, April 15, 2005. Found online at <http://www.oecumene.radiovaticana.org/en1/Articolo.asp?id=33987>.

CHAPTER ONE

¹ Richard A. Ogle, & Vincent Lazara (1999). *DOC 702 Inventing the World: How We Construct Meaning* (Phoenix: University of Phoenix, 1999), p. 23.

² Ibid.

³ (n.a.), "Republican Party 99% White, Behind Facade of Diversity," *Common Dreams Progressive Newswire*, September 1, 2004. Found online at <http://www.commondreams.org/news2004/0901-06.htm>.

⁴ (n.a.), "California, Arizona Voters Approve Initiatives In Favor Of Medical Marijuana," *Portland NORML Weekly News Release*, November 7, 1996. Found online at <http://pdxnorml.org/110796.html>.

⁵ "Split Colorado's electoral votes?" *Make Your Vote Count*, September 27, 2004. Found online at <http://www.makeyourvotecount.net/news.jsp>.

⁶ Albert Borgmann, *Crossing the Postmodern Divide* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993), p. 2.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ricardo Semler, *Maverick* (New York: Warner Books, 1995), pp. 3-4.

¹¹ Albert Borgmann, p. 2.

¹² (n.a.), "Philosophy 302: Ethics Nietzsche, 'Slave and Master Morality,'" *philosophy.lander.edu*, 2005. Found online at <http://philosophy.lander.edu/ethics/notes-nietzsche.html>.

¹³ Borgmann, p. 3.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 6.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 10.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 11.

¹⁸ Walter Truett Anderson, *Reality Isn't What It Used To Be: Theatrical Politics, Ready-to-Wear Religion, Global Myths, Primitive Chic, and Other Wonders of the Postmodern World* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1992), p. 44.

¹⁹ Merriam-Webster Unabridged Dictionary (2005). Found online at <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=Relativism&x=10&y=4>.

²⁰ Dennis Patterson, "From Postmodernism to Law and Truth," *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*, January 1, 2003, Vol. 26, Issue 1, p. 55.

²¹ Ogle & Lazara, p. 23.

²² J.P. Moreland, "A Philosophical Review of Postmodernism for Christian Counselors," *Christian Counseling Today*, 2001, Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 14.

²³ Joel Smith, "Emancipating Sociology: Postmodernism and Mainstream Sociological Practice." *Social Forces*, University of North Carolina Press, September 1, 1995.

²⁴ David Hume, *Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth* (Charlottesville, VA: Center on Religion and Democracy, University of Virginia, 2001).

²⁵ John Winthrop, *Little Speech on Liberty* (Charlottesville, VA: Center on Religion and Democracy, University of Virginia, 2002).

²⁶ (n.a.), "John Winthrop; How the Puritan Settlement's First Governor Helped Define a Nation," *The Washington Times*, July 6, 2003.

²⁷ Walter Anderson, p. 4.

²⁸ Harbour Fraser Hodder, "The Eroticized Child," *Harvard Magazine*, March-April 1998.

-
- ²⁹ George F. Will, *The Woven Figure: Conservatism and America's Fabric 1994-1997* (New York: Scribner, 1997), p. 29.
- ³⁰ Charles E. Garrison, "Relativism and Absolutism: Keeping College Students Involved in the Examination of Truth," *College Student Journal*, Mobile, AL: Project Innovation, Inc. 1 June 2002, ¶6.
- ³¹ (n.a.), "Anita Bryant: Symptom of a Sick Society." *Briarpatch*, July 1978.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Ibid.
- ³⁴ Robert Knight, "If all else fails, silence them!" *WorldNetDaily.com*, September 1, 2004, ¶18.
- ³⁵ John 8:44. (NAB)
- ³⁶ (n.a.), "Sophists," *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2004 ed. ¶2. Found online at <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/s/sophists.htm>.
- ³⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Barry Burke, "Post-Modernism and Post-Modernity," *Encyclopedia of Informal Education*, 2000 ed. Found online at <http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-postmd.htm>.
- ⁴⁰ Ecclesiastes 1:9. (NAB)
- ⁴¹ Albert Borgmann, p. 12.
- ⁴² Ibid, p. 14.
- ⁴³ Ibid.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid, p.16.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid, pp. 16-17.
- ⁴⁷ Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. (1848) p. 8. Found online at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/manifest.pdf>.
- ⁴⁸ David Horowitz, *The Politics of Bad Faith: The Radical Assault on America's Future* (New York: The Free Press, 1998), p. 28.
- ⁴⁹ Walter Anderson, p. 31.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Norman Podhoretz, *The Norman Podhoretz Reader: A Selection of His Writings from the 1950s through the 1990s* (New York: Free Press, 2004), p. 457.

⁵² *The Trial of Galileo: A Chronology*, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law. ¶36. Found online at <http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/galileo/galileochronology.html>.

⁵³ Karl Marx (1818 - 1883), Urban Dictionary, under "Religion."

⁵⁴ Norman Podhoretz, pp. 458-459.

⁵⁵ Terry Eagleton, *After Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Basic Books, 2004), p. 154.

⁵⁶ Matt. 5:27-28.

⁵⁷ Matt. 10:37.

⁵⁸ Terry Eagleton, p. 154.

⁵⁹ (n.a.), "Say 'No' to Atheist's Push to Stop Inauguration Prayer!," *Faith in Action*, Found online at <http://www.grassfire.net/61/petition.asp?PID=7638513&NID=1>.

⁶⁰ Sean Hannity, *Deliver Us From Evil: Defeating Terrorism, Despotism, and Liberalism* (New York: Harper Collins, 2004), p. 47.

⁶¹ William J. Bennett, "Redeeming Our Time," *IMPRIMIS*, November 1995, Vol 24, Number 11, p. 1.

CHAPTER TWO

¹ Douglas Groothuis, "A Summary Critique: Postmodern Repentance," *Christian Research Journal*, 2004, Volume 27, Number 5, p. 45.

² Rick Fenwick, "Week 1 Lecture-Introduction," *ORG 701: Introduction to Systems* (Phoenix: University of Phoenix, 2003), ¶46-47.

³ David C. Cassidy, "Triumph of the Copenhagen Interpretation," *Hofstra University and the Center for History of Physics of the American Institute of Physics*, May 2002, ¶5. Found online at <http://www.aip.org/history/heisenberg/p09.htm>.

⁴ Banathy, B., "A Taste of Systemics," *The Primer Project, a Special Integration Group of the International Society for the Systems Sciences Web site*, (n.d.), ¶9. Found online at <http://www.iss.org/taste.html>.

⁵ Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality* (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1967), p. 121.

⁶ Westel Woodbury Willoughby, *The Political Theories of the Ancient World* (New York: Longmans Green 1903), p. 73.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Michael J. Kerlin, “Deconstruction In A Nutshell: A Conversation With Jacques Derrida,” *Theological Studies*, December, 1998, Vol 59, Issue 4, p. 743.

¹¹ Albert Borgmann, p. 40.

¹² Ibid, p. 2.

¹³ Terry Eagleton, p. 13.

¹⁴ Walter Anderson, p. viii.

¹⁵ Douglas Groothuis, p. 44.

¹⁶ Marianna Papastephanou, “Discourse Theory and its Implications for Philosophy of Education.,” *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, November 1999, Vol. 33, Issue 3, p. 419.

¹⁷ Walter Anderson, p. 4.

¹⁸ Dennis Patterson, p. 50.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ “Enthymeme,” *Wikipedia*, Found online at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enthymeme>.

²¹ Dennis Patterson, p. 54.

²² Mark. R. Levin, *Men in Black: How the Supreme Court is Destroying America* (Regnery Publishing, Washington DC, 2005), p. 58.

²³ Dennis Patterson, p. 55.

²⁴ Ibid, p. 53.

CHAPTER THREE

¹ Norman Podhoretz, p. 457.

² Ibid.

³ Walter Anderson, p. 33.

⁴ Albert Borgmann, p. 41.

⁵ Ibid, p. 34.

⁶ Fritjof Cappra, *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems* (New York: Anchor Books, 1997), p. 7.

⁷ Ibid, p. 8.

⁸ Ibid, p. 9.

⁹ John Earl Haynes & Harvey Klehr, *In Denial: Historians, Communism & Espionage* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2003), p. 14.

¹⁰ Albert Borgmann, p. 23.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid, p. 24.

¹³ Norman Podhoretz, p. 459.

¹⁴ Albert Borgmann, pp. 24-25.

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 45.

¹⁶ David Horowitz, p. 8.

¹⁷ Albert Borgmann. p. 26.

¹⁸ David Horowitz, p. 7.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 14.

²⁰ Albert Borgmann. p. 36.

²¹ Ibid, p. 37.

²² Ibid, p. 39.

²³ Ibid, p. 41.

²⁴ Ibid, p. 42.

²⁵ William Bennett, p. 4.

²⁶ Albert Borgmann. p. 44.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 45.

²⁸ Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977), ¶4.

²⁹ Albert Borgmann. p. 46.

³⁰ Ibid, p. 47.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Marx & Engles, p. 8.

³³ Marx & Engles, p. 10.

³⁴ Marx & Engles, p. 15.

³⁵ Haynes & Klehr, pp. 8-9.

³⁶ Richard Falk, "Politically Engaged Spirituality in an Emerging Global Civil Society," *ReVision*. Spring, 2003, Vol 25, Issue. 4, p. 2.

³⁷ David C. Korten, "Global Economics, Environmental Integrity, and Justice Reflections of an 'Economic Missionary'," *People Centered Development Forum*, June, 2003, ¶18. Found online at <http://www.pcdf.org/2003/NCC.htm>.

³⁸ Richard Falk, p. 2.