Because Lincoln's purpose was to dedicate a
cemetery, he left implicit most of his references
to the political situation that was on the minds
of his listeners. Because Jefferson knew he was
justifying rebellion for King George III but also
for the future, he spelled out explicitly why the
colonies were breaking with England.

CLAIMS OF VALUE:

Lincoln's address is a period piece that recalls a
dark chapter in American history, but Jefferson's
Declaration has had a much greater impact as an
inspiration for other reform movements
worldwide.

Different as the two historical documents are,
both the Gettysburg Address and the Declaration
of Independence were effective in achieving
their respective purposes.

PRACTICE

1. Read the following essay and then write two different thesis statements
that you could support about it, one a claim of fact and the other a claim
of value.

*Let's Have No More Monkey Trials*

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER

The half-century campaign to eradicate any vestige of religion from pub-
lic life has run its course. The backlash from a nation fed up with the
A.C.L.U. kicking crèches out of municipal Christmas displays has created
a new balance. State-supported universities may subsidize the activities of
student religious groups. Monuments inscribed with the Ten Command-
ments are permitted on government grounds. The Federal Government is
engaged in a major antipoverty initiative that gives money to churches. Re-
ligion is back out of the closet.

But nothing could do more to undermine this most salutary restoration
than the new and gratuitous attempts to invade science, and most particu-
larly evolution, with religion. Have we learned nothing? In Kansas, conserva-
tive school-board members are attempting to rewrite statewide standards
for teaching evolution to make sure that creationism's modern stepchild,
intelligent design, infiltrates the curriculum. Similar anti-Darwinian manda-
tes are already in place in Ohio and are being fought over in 20 states. And
then, as if to second the evangelical push for this tarted-up version of cre-
ationism, out of the blue appears a declaration from Christoph Cardinal
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Schönborn of Vienna, a man very close to the Pope, asserting that the sup-
posed acceptance of evolution by John Paul II is mistaken. In fact, he says, the
Roman Catholic Church rejects "neo-Darwinism" with the declaration that
an "unguided evolutionary process—one that falls outside the bounds of di-
vine providence—simply cannot exist."

Canno? On what scientific evidence? Evolution is one of the most
powerful and elegant theories in all of human science and the bedrock of
all modern biology. Schönborn's proclamation that it cannot exist un-
guided—that it is driven by an intelligent designer pushing and pulling
and planning and shaping the process along the way—is a perfectly leg-
imate statement of faith. If he and the Evangelicals just stopped there
and asked that intelligent design be included in a religion curriculum, I
would support them. The scandal is to teach this as science—to pretend,
as does Schönborn, that his statement of faith is a defense of science. "The
Catholic Church," he says, "will again defend human reason" against "scien-
tific theories that try to explain away the appearance of design as the
result of 'chance and necessity;"" which "are not scientific at all." Well, if you
believe that science is reason and that reason begins with recognizing
the existence of an immanent providence, then this is science. But, of course,
It is not. This is faith disguised as science. Science begins not with first prin-
ciples but with observation and experimentation.

In this slippery slide from "reason" to science, Schönborn is a direct
descendant of the early 17th century Dutch clergyman and astronomer
David Fabricius, who could not accept Johannes Kepler's discovery of el-
liptical planetary orbits. Why? Because the circle is so pure and perfect
that reason must reject anything less. "With your ellipse," Fabricius wrote
Kepler, "you abolish the circularity and uniformity of the motions, which
appears to me increasingly absurd the more profoundly I think about it." No
matter that, using Tycho Brahe's most exhaustive astronomical obser-
vations in history, Kepler had empirically demonstrated that the planets
orbit elliptically.

This conflict between faith and science had mercifully abated over the
past four centuries as each grew to permit the other its own independent
sphere. What we are witnessing now is a frontier violation by the forces of
religion. This new attack claims that because there are gaps in evolution,
they therefore must be filled by a divine intelligent designer.

How many times do we have to rerun the Scopes "monkey trial"? There
are gaps in science everywhere. Are we to fill them all with divinity? There
were gaps in Newton's universe. They were ultimately filled by Einstein's
revisions. There are gaps in Einstein's universe, great chasms between it and
quantum theory. Perhaps they are filled by God. Perhaps not. But it is cer-
tainly not science to merely declare it so.

To teach faith as science is to undermine the very idea of science, which
is the acquisition of new knowledge through hypothesis, experi-
mementation, and evidence. To teach it as science is to encourage the super-
cilious caricature of America as a nation in the thrall of religious
authority. To teach it as science is to discredit the welcome recent ad-
vances in permitting the public expression of religion. Faith can and
should be proclaimed from every mountaintop and city square. But it has
no place in science class. To impose it on the teaching of evolution is not
just to invite ridicule but to earn it.
Parents Need Help: Restricting Access to Video Games
BARBARA DAFOE WHITEHEAD

A century ago, Jane Addams and other progressive reformers in Chicago responded to the dangers of the industrial age by creating laws and institutions that would protect children from the unwholesome lures of the city streets. Her work is rightly honored. A similar, and equally important, struggle is being waged in Illinois today. On the surface, it's about the sale of video games to kids. It's also a debate about a deeper question: To what degree does the responsibility for teaching good values to children fall solely on parents? Should some of that responsibility be shared by the state?

Those who make and sell video games say parents alone should bear the responsibility. On the other side is Illinois Governor Rod Blagojevich. He's trying to outlaw the sale of excessively violent or sexually explicit video games to children under eighteen. In his effort to restrict such sales he's making the argument that raising children is a shared responsibility: "Parenting is hard work and the state has a compelling interest in helping parents raise their children to be upstanding men and women."

The governor firmly believes that parents have the primary responsibility for teaching their children right from wrong. He believes just as firmly that parents should not have their efforts subverted by the avalanche of "amusements" that tell kids it is fun to blow people up. "Too many of the video games marketed to our children teach them all of the wrong lessons and all of the wrong values," Blagojevich writes in a "letter to Illinois parents" posted on the state's informational Web site (www.safegamesillinois.com). "These games use violence, rage, and sexual aggression as play. That is not acceptable. When kids play, they should play like children, not like gangland assassins."

The governor's reference to gangland assassins is not an overstatement. One video game, the top-selling, industry-award-winning Grand Theft Auto: San Andreas, features gang warfare and the killing of prostitutes. Another, released on the forty-first anniversary of the Kennedy assassination, gets players to step into the shoes of Lee Harvey Oswald and to aim at the president's head as his motorcade rolls by. "Content descriptors" for video games also suggest how lurid the violence can be. These games include depictions of "blood and gore (mutilation of body parts)," "intense violence (human injury or death)," and "sexual violence (depictions of rape and other sexual acts)."

No sooner had Blagojevich unveiled his proposal than he faced powerful opposition from the entertainment industry. The Illinois Retail Merchants Association, the National Association of Theater Owners, the Entertainment Software Rating Board, and the Motion Picture Association of America took strong exception to the legislation. Imposing a curb on the free market is not the way to protect kids, these critics argued. Instead, parents should screen what their kids are buying and playing. As one lobbyist put it: "Retailers can't be held accountable for lack of oversight by parents."

This is a distortion of the governor's position, and of the problem. No one denies that parents have the primary responsibility for monitoring their kids. Blagojevich points out, though, that the sophisticated technology of video games makes that very hard to do. Consequently, it's up to the state to step in on the side of parents and children to help them cope.

The industry argument would be plausible if it were still 1955. Back then, it was easier for parents to exercise strict oversight. The big, boxy home entertainment technologies of that era—radio, television, and record players—produced images and sounds that parents could see and hear. They came with OFF buttons for parents to push and plugs for parents to pull. All that has changed. The new entertainment technologies include a dizzying and ever-multiplying array of small, portable, individual, kid-friendly devices that defy close parental supervision. It was easy for parents to check on a half-hour TV show. It's much harder to review a video game. The games feature successive levels of difficulty; players must qualify at a lower level before earning the right to move to a higher level. So it takes time and practice before acquiring the skill to progress to the highest level of the game—which may also be its highest level of violence. To ensure that a video game isn't excessively violent, a parent would have to be looking over a child's shoulder until the highest level of play was finally revealed. This could take days.

Moreover, it isn't as if parents and the video-game industry meet each other on a level playing field. This is a multibillion-dollar industry that spends all its time and money devising ever more ingenious ways to market to kids over the heads of their parents and to deliberately undermine the ability of parents to regulate what their children are seeing. And in a tactic called "age compression," the marketers target their appeals to ever-younger kids. Like the youth sex revolution, the youth marketing revolution has migrated down the age scale. Even four-year-olds know what is cool.

To be sure, the industry's Entertainment Software Rating Board has voluntarily established its own ratings system. The trouble is: It isn't enforced. A study by the Federal Trade Commission found that early teens were able to buy games rated M (Mature 17+) 69 percent of the time.

It is telling that the makers and sellers of video games have responded so quickly and vigorously to Governor Blagojevich's very modest proposal. Clearly the corporate sector finds it in its interest to prompt kids to engage in fantasy rape, beheadings, and mass murder. And why should we expect otherwise? Its interest is the bottom line. Violence sells. But isn't it in the compelling interest of the community to curb such violent play?