

Journal - Day 16 - 05/06/2003



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>

Day 16 - Chapter 5 - The Reformation - Continued

Audio:

1. **Mind set of secularization** 19:31 - 22:36 on
73_13662_DrRaviZacharias__UnpluggingTruthinaMorallySuicidalCulturepart1.32.mp3
 1. Religious ideas, institutions, and interpretations have lost their social significance.
 2. Even if you claim to be a religious person, that is alright provided you don't bring those ideas into society. Keep them private and to yourself.
 3. Dentistry was painless, bicycles were chainless, carriages were horseless, and then many laws effortless.
Next cookery was fireless, telegraphy was wireless, cigars were nicotineless, and coffee caffeineless.
Soon oranges were seedless, putting green was weedless, college boy was hatless, and proper diet fatless.
New motor roads are dustless, new religion is godless.
4. **Question:**
 1. How do we ever debate publically any issue when the ethic is meant to be kept private?
5. 5/6/2003
 1. Renaissance
 2. Reformation
 3. United Nations

Journals:

I did not get to the journal soon enough to record any notes to the audio outside of those 3 lines. Those were general topics we spoke of.

The students were very distracted today. The most distracted they have been since we've started this class. Very jovial, very happy, very distracted.

Some of the answers were somewhat troublesome. Troublesome in terms of my disappointment with the kind of answers we had. For example, they not only did not see a problem with a three parent family, but felt this could be advantageous because a three parent family would only need to do 33% instead of 50% of the family duties.

Questions asked:

1. None.

Discussions:

Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/undocs.html#CPR>

- I It forbids
 - I [propaganda advocating either war](#)

[Article 20.1 - Any propaganda for war shall be prohibited by law.]

- I As a right, may we turn this around and say, "You shall not be threatened by war".
- I Yes- No- Man's Want-6
- I If we have a right to not expect war, then what do we not need?
 - I A standing army.
 - I * No. Could not recruit.
 - I * No. Have to propagandize to get funding.
- I What if the entire world accepts this "right" except one country?
 - I * They would be condemned
 - I * They would go around taking over countries.
 - I * Money people could make their money worth nothing.
 - I We used an alliteration where one youth had an army of 5,000,000 men. The 2nd youth had an army of 12,000,000 men. A third youth had an army of 5,000 men. The 4th student had an army of 25,000,000 men. The youths #1,2, and 3 were all arguing about ownership of some land. Youth #4 was not involved with the dispute.
 - I How would #3 approach #2 about the problem?
 - I * Diplomatically, with a veiled threat of military action if necessary.
 - I How would #1 approach #2 about the problem?
 - I * Diplomatically, appealing that there is no reason for violence. The mere suggestion of military action would be unethical and heethanistic. :)
 - I If #4 is not involved in the dispute, how might they effect the outcome?
 - I * Recruit as an ally.
 - I * If negotiation break down, they can make any of the parties a winner.
 - I * At the least, #4 can negate the others military options.
 - I If no one can propaganda war, can the option be debated?
 - I If not, then how does this reconcile with our right to freedom of expression and of opinion?
 - I * No. Because if they listen to you, you are propagandizing.
 - I If the country does not officially speak out for war but the people, perhaps led by the press, are calling for war, is that permissible?
 - I Can a powerful military be interpreted as "propaganda for war"?
 - I * Yes
 - I * Pride
 - I What function does war have in national and international relations and dialog?
 - I Is there something which can be called a "just" war?
 - I Presume we are guilty of promoting "propaganda for war"?
 - I What's the consequence? What is the enforcement?
 - I Either stop talking about war or we are going to declare war on you?
 - I Economic embargo?
 - I How to enforce an embargo?
 - I Is this statement true - "The standing army has 2 purposes. The 1st is for defense, and the second is political."
 - I What does this statement mean, first.
 - I Vote ?

I hatred based on race, religion, national origin, or language

[Article 20.2 - Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.]

- I To turn this around to speak of it as a right, it might be "Thou shalt not say or do anything which causes bias to be formed against any nationality, race, or religious groups."
- I Yes- 1 No-5
- I How does this reconcile with our right to freedom of expression and of opinion?
 - I What if everything we say is "true" (*not slander*), but the effect is it attributes to hatred of a people group?
- I How does this reconcile with all our redneck, Polish, and other Catholic jokes?
- I How does this reconcile with our right to associate with whomever we wish, say, the KKK or Nazi groups?

It provides for the right of people to

- I choose freely whom they will marry and to found a family
 [Article 23.2 - The right of men and women of marriageable age to marry and to found a family shall be recognized.]
 - I Yes-6 No-0
 - I so India and other cultures which arrange marriages now have to change?
 - I Tell story of Pal who returned to India to marry a girl he met when he was 5 years old and had not seen since. An arranged marriage.
 - I Does this right not conflict with freedom of conscience, religion, and others?,
- I and requires that the duties and obligations of marriage and family be shared equally between partners
 [Article 23.4 - States Parties to the present Covenant shall take appropriate steps to ensure equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. In the case of dissolution, provision shall be made for the necessary protection of any children.]
 - I Yes-1 No-5
 - I Partners. Doesn't that mean 2 people?
 - I What about all these single parent families?
 - I * They share amongst themselves (just one)
 - I What about current lawsuits concerning Mom, Dad, and Mommy's lover as a three parent family?
 - I
 - I Also, what is with this shared equally business?
 - I * Each chore done 50%
 - I * Drinks coffee wife made, wife works during the evening, watches TV all the time.
 - I * Gets up in the morning, gets kids up while wife makes breakfast, takes the kids to school on way to school.
 - I Who judges what is equal?
 - I Where does a universal declaration of rights end and meddling begin?
 - I In which way should you care if the duties are not shared 50%.
 - I * The students wanted duties to truly be 50 / 50. So much so, that dad and mom would take turns running kids and cooking dinner.
 - I * When questioned on other than a traditional parents, such as a threesome, the youths were open to this because it would mean less work.
 - I Are there laws which can be put into effect to make it so?

- I What would be the penalty for only doing 30% or for over achieving?
- I Is this one of those nice sounding platitudes which have no practical value?
- I Teach us if you know better..
- I It guarantees the rights of children and prohibits discrimination based on race, sex, color, national origin, or language.
 [Article 24 - Every child shall have, without any discrimination as to race, color, sex, language, religion, national or social origin, property or birth, the right to such measures of protection as are required by his status as a minor, on the part of his family, society and the State. Every child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have a name.
 Every child has the right to acquire a nationality.]
 [Article 26 - All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.]
- I Yes-6 No-0
- I Seems like short, balding guys are on their own. Fatties too. Animal lovers and tree huggers are not covered either.
- I It also restricts the death penalty to the most serious of crimes
 [Article 6.2 - In countries which have not abolished the death penalty, sentence of death may be imposed only for the most serious crimes in accordance with the law in force at the time of the commission of the crime and not contrary to the provisions of the present Covenant and to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. This penalty can only be carried out pursuant to a final judgment rendered by a competent court.]
- I Yes-1 No-5
- I Restricts? How is a right something which is metered out?
 - I * Problem with what is a serious crime.
 - I * Serious crime could be killing a cat if that is written into law.
 - I * Genesis 9:6 God says exactly the penalty for killing someone.
- I Serious crime? Who decides? On what grounds?
- I Will the United Nations play god and determine what is worthy of a death sentence and impose their will on all nations and in all cultures?
- I What is the definition of a competent court?
 - I * Supreme court
 - I * Everyone has a degree
 - I *They judge and lawyers must know law.

Assignments:

Article 25

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

- I So why do anything?
- I Missing Child care

- I Why would anyone make food or food stamps if they had everything cared for them?
- I Some want more than standard.
- I It seems all is covered?
- I Is this universally true in all cases for all people?
 - I Those who will not accept Charity.
 - I People in other countries.
- I What social services are necessary? Don't they presume if they thought of them, then they are essential? ~~Who works on a project and thinks they are wasting their time?~~ Scratch that.
- I Is the UN stating inalienable rights or doling out Man's rights?
- I Is the UN meddling?
- I Are nations, why all signed up in 1948, getting any closer to making this come true?
- I Are they wrong and evil if they haven't?
- I Something to think about.....

[
 [(Teacher's NOTE: This proposition works out well if you work it out, point by point, and plug the students into it. That is, certain students are the family parents and children, mayor of city, neighbor, princess of nation, etc. This makes it personal where their answers are in reference of "those groups" for all but the one where they especially identify. In that case, it is "their" reaction and they are explaining or excusing their actions.)

(Purpose here is to sneak up on a conclusion if we cannot do all we should do. We DO use some logic or rules of conduct to determine which events we respond to, how much, and which ones we do not. What is it?)

An Arab Moslem family has fallen on hard times and is starving to death in a small town in an Arab country.

Most people in this small town are not starving to death, and some are doing very well.

The neighbors know of their situation and avoid them.

The town's government know of the situation but have no programs to deal with their plight?

The local mosque knows of their situation and avoid them.

(Eventually, you may need to return to the family and work in some reason which is no fault of the family such as polio. If the students get too hung up on "just consequences", your discussions won't be as wide ranging as hoped.)

The Arab country is rich with their oil exports.

Many Arab countries have huge oil exports which bring in billions of \$.

Developed nations purchase the oil which provides billions to the Arab countries.

International Health groups are helping many people with food and medicine, but cannot help this family because the rules of engagement require the problem to be wide spread, not isolated.

Christian Missions do not have the resources to reach all those who need help -- or do they?

Christians eat out several times a week.]

- I Now, when the family dies of starvation, who is responsible?
- I Is anyone responsible?
- I If one group fails to uphold their responsibility, does the responsibility shift or does it stop right there?
- I Why do the International groups have rules of engagement?
 - I They cannot deal with all the starving people in the world. They have to use their resources judiciously.
- I Why add the final statement about Christians eating out?
 - I We didn't point out every groups possible excesses, so why present it

this way?

- I (Next time, include a sound byte from Mere Christianity about giving up on Self. Self wants to do God's will and hopefully have enough left over for self to do what it wants to do. 4th tape, side 2.)
- I Tell an analogy where we are bought by Christ. We have been commanded to help those who are starving. So, in light of that, who is responsible.
- I (Here was the teacher's opportunity to teach them about how we must deal with acts of Charity and to determine the rules by which we setup those rules of conduct. Didn't do quite so well this occasion.)

Next Week:

- I Audio:
 - I **Life Mag: What Men and Women believe about God** 15:30 - 18:11 on 73_6492_InvestedDignityReflectiveGlorypart1.32.mp3
 1. Article some years ago about what Men and Women believe about God / god.
 2. Some good, some bad
 3. Elderly women dying of Cancer (Christ)
 4. Minister with double lifestyle and reconciliation
 5. Young boy
 6. Prof. Peacock - Micro Biology - Exploring Creation
 1. Then we moved from Christianity to other areas.
 2. Man - Faith in Allah
 3. Man - Pantheistic world view
 4. Man - New Age movement
 5. The is most wrong headed of them all, summarizing his own.
 7. All these different views just muddled the picture.
 8. Existential philosophies.
 1. Fat books on Meaninglessness, assuming those who wrote it believe it to be meaningful.
 2. How do I know I exist?
 1. Whom is asking?
 - I We will not be doing many Rights next week. That thread seems to have run its course. The homework assignment, I hope, will provide lots of thought and discussion.
 - I We may do the "North Korean and Chinese Atrocities Against Christians Worsen" article because it also calls us to action. The theme for next week is, do we attempt to put out all the fires in the world ourselves? If not, then were and how do we set limits?
 - I Certainly need to complete the Rights discussion with this
 - I **Article 29**

These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

If I am reading this correctly, I would suspect the UN claims the UN trumps human rights. Not only presumptions, but prideful.



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>