

Fr. Perozich comments —

I find these articles insightful in exposing why people think the way that we do. The bold is my own highlighting of some points. Unfortunately Aristotle is no longer respected in the Catholic Church in the Thomistic writings as in years past, leading Catholics into a vacuum to be filled with the culture over faith.

For this reason many Catholics think we know better in that adultery, homosexuality, income redistribution, insurance for health care, communion for all, one world religion are rights simply because some leaders claim that they are.

What has been foisted on us is the Alinsky technique of desensitization, jamming, and conversion.

Desensitization first bombards us with constant messaging so we become numb to what we previously found abhorrent.

Jamming is the attack on our character for not agreeing with the abhorrence.

Conversion to the new idea is the result of the former two.

Dennis Prager notes in the second article,

People who excel in one thing are tempted to think they are smart about everything, but that is almost never the case. There is no reason at all to assume that people who excel in anything (other than wisdom) are wiser than anybody else. And here's the kicker (no pun intended): People who think they are wise because they excel at something unrelated to wisdom are fools.

Hold to your faith, and resist the cultural trends that have infected Holy Church even to higher levels.

WHEN POLITICS RESHAPES THE CULTURE

Hadley Arkes

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

The scene: Outside the Supreme Court of the U.S. in March 2014. I was on my way to the Court to take in the oral argument in the Hobby Lobby case.

The question was whether the Green family, owners of the Hobby Lobby stores – and providing already generous medical coverage to their employees – would be obliged, under Obamacare, to provide coverage for contraception and abortion. The family bore serious moral objections to abortion, reinforced by their religious convictions. Eventually, a closely divided Court would come down on the side of the Greens.

But outside the Court that day was a circus of demonstrators, including **many young women who had left their sobriety at home.** One of the more prominent signs said, **“My employer should have nothing do with my contraception.” To which I thought: The Green family could not have agreed more.**

But the scene sparked the question: **How did we get to this point?** Almost fifty years earlier, in the *Griswold* case, the Court had struck down a law barring the sale of contraceptives to married couples. That holding was soon extended to unmarried couples. **In a kind of natural translation, a restriction of freedom by the law was regarded as “wrongful,” and so the action it restricted was translated as “rightful,” and from there the access to contraception was regarded as a “right.” And no less now than a “constitutional right.”**

As that moral logic unfolded, that right was now incorporated in the souls of these young women outside the Court as: **a “right” so deeply entwined with personal freedom that it was a “good” to be savored by every woman, even if**

someone else had to pay for it. This was not a matter of dollars and cents, for many women pay more for their smartphone than their contraception. More important than the charges levied on Mr. Green was **the need to compel him to acknowledge the deep rightness of contraception and abortion.**

I raise this matter now because we have seen the most curious reaction on the part of some conservatives as they have persistently lost in the courts on the issues of abortion, same-sex marriage, and “sexual orientation.” With the sense of losing in the “culture wars,” some conservatives have professed to turn away from politics and the courts, with the new, summoning line that “politics is downstream from culture.”



*

According to this argument, we've lost in the courts because we have lost in the culture, and so the object is to change the

culture. But that line of argument misses at once what has been plainly before us: **the Supreme Court, pronouncing with the authority of law on the things rightful and wrongful, has been the main Engine in the coarsening and corruption of our culture.** And our friends miss this point because they have never absorbed Aristotle's understanding, at the very beginning of political philosophy, on the necessary connection between the logic of morals and the logic of law.

The sensibilities of those young women outside the Court in March 2014 had been shaped by the moral dynamic unloosed by the Court on contraception. In the same way, the culture of pornography that now envelops us flowed inescapably once the Court took it upon itself to dismantle those laws in the States that offered a rough but useful restraint on the diffusion of pornography.

And in that vein, how do we explain that state of affairs in which **people who have been to the priciest colleges affect no awareness of the facts of embryology on the offspring in the womb, and claim nothing less than a "right" to kill an innocent small human being, as it suits their own private interests?**

As Aristotle recognized, a community governed by "law" springs directly from the nature of that creature quite given to reasoning and argument over matters of right and wrong. If we come to the judgment that it is wrong for a parent to torture a child, *for whom is it wrong?* The matter put forth as a moral question brings an answer in a moral voice: that it would be wrong, for anyone for everyone. And therefore, as reasoning went, we would be justified in forbidding that torture for anyone with the force of law.

When Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it forbade racial discrimination even in private businesses open to transactions with the public as "public accommodations." With that Act, the matter of racial discrimination was removed from the

domain of private taste and treated as a matter of moral consequence and public obligation.

And sure enough, just a few years later, a heavy majority of the public in the South, as well as the North, had come to accept that teaching of the law. Had the culture of the South changed so dramatically, or did the change have something to do with the fact – as Aristotle long ago understood – that the law cannot help teaching moral lessons?

Many of our friends may have dreams of going off to make the films that reshape the moral sensibilities of the public. And I dearly hope they will. But it would be a foolish turning away from the deepest things we know if we lose the sense that it is utterly necessary for us to have something to “put on the table” for enactment or judgment, in legislatures and in courts. For in putting it on the table, we compel a discussion—and challenge people to think anew.

***Photo:** Gary Blakeley/Thinkstock

- *The Catholic Thing* - <https://www.thecatholicthing.org> -

Hadley Arkes is the Ney Professor of Jurisprudence Emeritus at Amherst College and the Founder/Director of the James Wilson Institute on Natural Rights & the American Founding. His most recent book is Constitutional Illusions & Anchoring Truths: The Touchstone of the Natural Law. Volume II of his audio lectures from The Modern Scholar, First Principles and Natural Law is now available for download.

Article printed from The Catholic Thing: <https://www.thecatholicthing.org>

URL to article: <https://www.thecatholicthing.org/2019/07/16/when-politics-reshapes-the-culture/>

KEEP READING THE NEXT ARTICLE BELOW

We All Wanted to Love the Women's Soccer Team

7/16/2019 12:01:00 AM - Dennis Prager

For the first time in my life, I did not root for an American team. Whatever the sport, I have always rooted American. But if those who called into my radio show were representative of my audience, many millions of Americans made the same sad choice.

It takes a lot for people like me not to root for an American team. But Megan Rapinoe, the foul-mouthed star of the team, and her fellow players made it possible.

The U.S. women's team disgraced itself. Either its members were cowed into submission by Rapinoe or they agreed (or, at least, never disagreed) with her attacks on the president, her reference to the White House as the "f---ing White House," her refusal since 2016 to participate in the national anthem and her repeatedly shouting during the team's parade in New York City, "New York, you're the motherf---ing best!"

For example, Rapinoe said, "Every member of the team that I have talked to would not go" to the White House.

Rapinoe is a great soccer player. Other than that, she is unimpressive. She comes across as arrogant, a fool and a lowlife.

Why a fool? Because she thinks she has something important to say to the American people and that we need to hear it because she is a great soccer player. She is not alone in this conceit. Tom Steyer and other billionaires think the same thing about themselves: that because they are better at making money than almost everybody, they must be wiser than almost everybody.

People who excel in one thing are tempted to think they are smart about everything, but that is almost never the case. There is no reason at all to assume that people who excel in anything (other than wisdom) are wiser than anybody else. And here's the kicker (no pun intended): People who think they are wise because they excel at something unrelated to wisdom are fools.

And why is Rapinoe a lowlife? What would you label any adult who constantly used the F-word in public (especially during events when children are expected to be present or watching)? Or does being a star -- like the foul-mouthed Robert De Niro -- make you less of a lowlife?

The American women's soccer team is unified in protesting on behalf of "equal pay for equal work." They regard their team as a perfect example because its members receive less money than members of the U.S. men's soccer team -- despite the fact that the women have a much better record.

But there is a reason the male players earn more. Among other things -- such as the women's team's vote for financial security in the form of guaranteed salaries rather than revenue share -- men's soccer generates far more money than women's soccer.

According to the Los Angeles Times: FIFA's "2018 financial report said it earned revenue of \$5.357 billion from the men's tournament in Russia. ... Forbes estimated the Women's World Cup will generate about \$131 million for the four-year cycle ending in 2022."

So, unless people should be paid according to gender (which they now are in Norway) rather than according to revenue and profits, male soccer players will earn more money than female soccer players.

There are only two ways to equitably ensure male and female players earn the same amount of money. One is to pool all the money earned by both teams and then distribute an equal amount

to all the players, men and women. The other is to end sex-based teams: Men and women compete to play on one team (composed of both men and women), and any woman who makes the team is guaranteed the same income as any man on the team.

Until then, the women's soccer team and the left want to have their cake and eat it, too. (Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, for example, tweeted this non sequitur: "Here's an idea: If you win 13-0 -- the most goals for a single game in World Cup history -- you should be paid at least equally to the men's team.") They want women to have their own soccer teams -- because biology has made it impossible for almost any woman to successfully compete with men in sports -- yet earn the same amount as men do. But the reality is more people will watch men play soccer, just as more people watch major league baseball than minor league baseball -- which is why major league baseball players earn more money than minor league players. But if we applied the equal-pay-for-equal-work principle to baseball, minor league and major league players would be paid the same amount.

With their politicization of their victory, their expletive-filled speech and their publicly expressed contempt for half their fellow citizens, the women of the U.S. women's soccer team succeeded in endearing themselves to America's left. But they earned the rest of the country's disdain, which is sad. We really wanted to love the team.

What we have here is yet another example of perhaps the most important fact in the contemporary world: Everything the left touches it ruins.

Dennis Prager is a nationally syndicated radio talk-show host and columnist. His latest book, published by Regnery in April 2018, is "The Rational Bible," a commentary on the book of Exodus. He is the founder of Prager University and may be contacted at dennisprager.com.