

The
SUTHERLAND
INSTITUTE
ADDING VALUE TO UTAH

October 25, 2005

***Intolerable Tolerance:
When Tolerance Turns
Against the Family***

Authored by: Bryce Christensen, Ph.D.

Dr. Bryce Christensen is a Professor of English at Southern Utah University and member of the Sutherland Institute Board of Scholars. He is also a contributing editor to *The Family in America* and author of *Divided We Fall: Family Discord and the Fracturing of America*, forthcoming from Transaction. This essay is reprinted with permission from the Howard Center for Family, Religion, and Society, June 2005.

Cite as Christensen, *Intolerable Tolerance*, 2005 Sutherland J. L. & Pub. Pol'y L3-, at <http://www.sjlpp.org/documents/intolerabletolerance.pdf>

Intolerable Tolerance

by Bryce Christensen, Ph.D.

"Since others have to tolerate my weaknesses," wrote the 20th-century American editor William Allen White, "it is only fair that I should tolerate theirs." [1] For any imperfect and reflective person, tolerance indeed counts as an attribute essential to a harmonious personal and public life.

With good reason, writer Wilbert E. Scheer has identified tolerance as "the oil that takes the friction out of life." [2] Unfortunately, however, in recent years the tolerance spoken of by White and Scheer has been replaced in American public life by a radically new attitude bearing the same label. And far from taking the friction out of life, this new version of Tolerance is fast filling American life with corrosive ideological friction, as it undermines the virtues that sustain family life and compels Americans to tolerate the intolerable consequences of family failure.

In any traditional understanding of moral probity, tolerance took its place as an important secondary virtue, one that provided a much-needed civil margin around primary virtues. As White's explanation of toleration makes clear, tolerance emerges as a necessary concession to human fallibility, an accommodation to the human error in every life and a recognition of each individual's precious (if at times painful) freedom to learn through personal error. But in traditional morality, tolerance — though necessary — never merited the praise accorded to more positive virtues. As the British novelist Edward M. Forster perceptively explained, "[Tolerance] is negative. It merely means putting up with people, being able to stand things." [3] Given this understanding of tolerance, neither White nor Forster nor any of their contemporaries ever supposed that it could replace primary virtues such as honesty, fidelity, and courage. But exposed to the cultural poisons of recent decades, tolerance has now mutated into something troublingly different. It is now not only one of the primary virtues; it is the primary virtue, the possession of which excuses man, woman, and child from the cultivation of any other virtue.

No longer a necessary but negative accommodation to inevitable human error, the new Tolerance advertises itself as a very positive virtue. But this new Tolerance is positively deceptive. It is deceptive in that it elides the difference between tolerance and acceptance, deceptive in that it entangles its adherents in philosophical contradictions, deceptive in that it provides rhetorical cover for the ideological ambitions of those who advance it, deceptive in that it justifies complete intolerance toward any who would frustrate these ambitions, and deceptive in that it hides the intolerably high costs it imposes on society.

Without sliding into attitudes that White, Scheer, Forster, or any other moral traditionalist would recognize as intolerant, those who would now defend the family from the onslaught of Tolerance sloganeers must understand both the deceptions inherent in their slogans and the painful consequences of allowing such deceptions to prevail.

Tolerance and Acceptance

The first deception characteristic of the sloganeers of the new Tolerance is that of consistently eliding

the difference between tolerance and acceptance. Traditionally, tolerance meant making allowances for other's errors and mistakes; for the new sloganeers of Tolerance, it means accepting every choice as morally equivalent. Tolerance once meant an attitude of patience and forbearance toward those who failed to live up to social ideals; the new Tolerance means denying the existence of such ideals. For those who now fly its banner, the new Tolerance no longer means simply granting public space for others' moral and religious convictions; the new Tolerance now means actually endorsing all beliefs as equally (un)true. In place of the tolerance that required discretion and humility in affirming moral absolutes, the new tolerance demands that Americans jettison the very notion of moral absolutes in favor of an indiscriminating acceptance of every option on the moral smorgasbord.

Thus, educators who say they are "bringing tolerance and diversity into the classroom" actually aim to "help all students develop more positive attitudes" toward those who differ from them in race, culture, family structure, or sexual orientation.[4] Such educators explain that adoption of a curriculum focused on "teaching diversity" means children must be "taught 'the positive aspects' of different households" and must be led in "discussions on accepting different family structures." [5] Some of the more candid evangelists for Tolerance even admit that they want "people [to] move beyond tolerance to embrace and rejoice in diversity." [6] The Tolerance at work here is light years away from the "negative" virtue Forster recognized as essential, but limited.

Of course, those who would move their fellow Americans "beyond tolerance" also aim to move them beyond good and evil, beyond truth and falsehood. The search for veritas which long has defined one of the most ennobling of human aspirations simply disappears when the apostles of Tolerance take over. Thus when confronted by the charge of moral relativism, two theorists of Tolerance can hide their retreat from truth with only the most pathetic of sophistries: "Teaching a tolerance for diversity implies that there are many morally correct and functional lifestyles and thus implies that a well-educated individual has enough information to be able to choose which lifestyle best fits his or her needs." [7] In this way, advocates of the new Tolerance sophistically justify lifestyle expedience as the ultimate moral standard.

But then moral justifications do not have to deliver much consistency or rigor to satisfy the champions of the new Tolerance. For moral traditionalists — whose understanding of tolerance meant accommodation to inevitable human fallibility — truly tolerating a wide range of beliefs and behaviors did not mean embracing the logic used to defend those various beliefs or behaviors. Hence, traditional moralists could be tolerant without being philosophically inconsistent. But because the new Tolerance actually means acceptance of everyone's beliefs and behaviors, it invariably requires its adherents to jettison the principle of non-contradiction, foundational to logical thought since Parmenides. For when the new Tolerance requires those who profess it to accept every family form and all types of sexual behavior, it also requires acceptance of radically incommensurable moral premises.

When today's progressive thinkers claim that their Tolerance allows them to fully accept the domestic lives of, say, both conservative Catholic families and New Age lesbian couples, they betray an embarrassing intellectual incoherence. Consistent thinking means either accepting foundational Catholic doctrine identifying sexual relationships outside of wedlock as a sin or repudiating that doctrine. To claim that Tolerance allows acceptance of traditional family life and full acceptance of domestic life that flouts the doctrinal premises of traditional morality is not to advance to a higher social philosophy; it is merely to repudiate the burden of thought and to descend into intellectual paralysis.

Without question, Americans have long enjoyed the entertaining bravado of Walt Whitman when he asks, "Do I contradict myself? / Very well then I contradict myself / (I am large, I contain multitudes)."[8] But no one should suppose that a coherent moral life can be based upon such poetic swaggering, even if it now bears the name of Tolerance.

But for its loudest advocates, the new Tolerance does not actually always entail the philosophical confusion that would seem inevitable in trying to embrace incompatible moral premises. For among many of its most outspoken champions, the profession of Tolerance is deeply insincere and serves merely as rhetorical camouflage, hiding their true ideological ambitions, ambitions that require them to attack, not accept, the moral premises of traditional family life. True tolerance requires those who practice it to pause thoughtfully before asserting their own moral convictions and to assert those convictions with humility and deference. But the new Tolerance requires no such restraint for those who deploy it as rhetorical camouflage while relentlessly attacking traditional understandings of marriage and family life, intolerantly characterized as mere prejudice and attacked as obstacles to sexual liberty and unfettered individualism. Among the apostles of this new Tolerance, Americans are in fact witnessing the emergence of a more-tolerant-than-thou form of self-righteousness, more unyielding than any of the old forms of bigotry.

The New Self-Righteousness

It is this inflexible new self-righteousness that emboldens champions of the new Tolerance to boast that, yes, they are "intolerant of intolerance." [9] Though they may congratulate themselves on the rhetorical cleverness of an apparently paradoxical phrase, those who claim they are "intolerant of intolerance" have actually exposed philosophical premises barren of everything but hypocrisy. For if Tolerance is now to serve as the new prime virtue, why does it fail its first test — namely that of providing a guide for dealing with those with divergent views on the value of Tolerance? Worse, why is it that being "intolerant of intolerance" inevitably justifies special privileges for advocates of liberal-left social orthodoxy while intolerantly marginalizing and censoring all social traditionalists?

With good reason, social traditionalists have learned to be very wary of those who profess a Tolerance that is part of an insidiously Orwellian Double-speak. The way this new Tolerance actually serves to enforce ideological orthodoxy has become increasingly clear in universities that create entire departments firmly closed — as columnist George Will has remarked — against any who "think that the nuclear family proves the best unit of social well-being." [10] The Orwellian workings of this new Tolerance also explain how high school Diversity Facilitators can now practice "pro-gay censorship" to silence any students whose conservative social views might "water down" the "positive message" they want to deliver about homosexuals. [11]

And though advocates of the new Tolerance loudly claim they want to promote social diversity, columnist John Leo detects a systemic preference in their activism for "people with the same attitudes" on key issues such as abortion and homosexual liberation. Thus, the new Tolerance actually means advocacy for the views of selected constituencies from the "left to the far left" with "no Republican or conservative representation at all." When the apostles of the new Tolerance run the show, social conservatives — whether Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Mormon, Moslem, or Confucianist — quickly learn that they face discrimination if not outright intolerance. [12] As they push the causes of radical feminism and homosexual rights, the advocates of Tolerance are more than willing to gag social conservatives, then shove them out of sight and into a closet.

Though advocates of the new Tolerance typically claim that they simply want to widen options for individual choice, that claim will hardly bear scrutiny. For when individuals choose traditional social commitments, they soon learn that the architects of the new Tolerance have assigned them only a narrow and marginal place in their blueprint for society. Worse, those who choose traditional commitments soon learn that architects of the new Tolerance tolerate them only so long as they help subsidize social pathology. Subsidies for social pathology naturally multiply when Tolerance prompts policymakers to frame statist policies that both foster alternative lifestyles and compensate for the harmful consequences of such lifestyles. For when the alternate family forms they support incubate lethal diseases and push women and children into poverty, the apostles of Tolerance worry very little about how much individual freedom taxpayers lose as the government coercively collects funds to treat those diseases and alleviate that poverty.[13] The new Tolerance simply does not tolerate alternative lifestyles on April 15th, the day the tax bill comes due for all of the social costs that result from the disintegration of the traditional family. Lockstep conformity is the only legal response to the demands of the taxman collecting revenues for the public programs that swell when families disintegrate.

It is not voluntary charity that pays for the various government supports for single mothers — welfare funds, job training, child-care subsidies, food stamps, child-support collection agencies — which collectively have helped create what sociologists Randal Day and Wade Mackey have called "the mother-state-child family." Day and Mackey indeed express concern about how the growth of the mother-state-child family has hurt traditional fathers, whose struggles to support their own wives and children are exacerbated by the state-imposed tax burdens that force them also to support single mothers and their children.[14]

But Americans will wait a long time to hear the new apostles of Tolerance express concern over the financial plight of traditional fathers or traditional families. In fact, a penetrating look at the social movements at work under the banner of Tolerance actually suggests a social agenda far more hostile to traditional families than simply an anything-goes libertarianism. Behind the preferential treatment that the new Tolerance accords sexual libertines, homosexuals, and radical feminists, the careful observer may detect something like the utopian impulses that create the thoroughly anti-family societies depicted in works such as Anthony Burgess's *The Wanting Seed*, Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, or Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. It is certainly not difficult to see in the rhetoric and actions of today's Tolerance mongers the pro-homosexual propaganda, the sexual libertinism, and the hostility to traditional wedlock that Burgess, Zamyatin, and Huxley depicted as part of the utopian state's war against family life.[15] It is likewise easy to think of these dystopian authors' portrayal of mind-controlling tyranny when contemplating the thought police that the champions of Tolerance have now put on patrol in classrooms and media outlets to guard against any expression offensive to sexual liberationists, homosexuals, or feminists.[16]

But loss of intellectual freedom counts as only one of the truly intolerable consequences of the new gospel of Tolerance. For as a more than trivial cause of family disintegration in recent decades, the new Tolerance must bear much of the blame for the child poverty, academic failure, physical and psychological illness, drug abuse, teen suicide, street crime, domestic violence, and other social pathologies spawned by this disintegration.

Some may discount Tolerance as a cause of family disintegration, believing that the advocates of the new Tolerance have merely accepted a multiplication of non-traditional families that they did not cause. But social analyst Christopher Jencks has very good reason for tracing family disintegration — especially among poor blacks — to shifts in "elite attitudes toward sex, marriage, divorce, and parenthood." And, of course, in recent years those elite attitudes have been characterized by the new

Tolerance. "Couples with neither money nor education," Jencks remarks, "have always had more trouble keeping their marriages together than more privileged couples." Nonetheless, many poor couples made the heroic efforts necessary to keep their marriages and families together because their cultural leaders continually told them it was worth doing so. But as prominent figures in law, the media, and entertainment have become advocates of the new Tolerance, they have begun to send the message that Americans who are "morally superior" look down not on "anyone who ha[s] a baby without marrying...[but rather] on anyone who disapprove[s] of unwed mothers." Poor couples hearing that message from the "Tolerant" cultural elite have predictably given up making those heroic efforts to keep their marriages and families together. Divorce and illegitimacy rates have soared as a consequence.[17]

The High Cost of 'Tolerance'

And living with the consequences of family failure has meant tolerating the intolerable. Family disintegration forces Americans to tolerate — for instance — intolerably high rates of child poverty, especially among black children. A 2005 study conducted by economists from the University of California, Davis, compellingly documents the economic hardship caused by family breakup: "Both white children and black children experience large reductions in income when their parents divorce," the researchers report, though they acknowledge that the economic effect is both deeper and longer lasting for black children. White children see their family income "fall by approximately 30% during the two years after a parental divorce; black children see it plummet by 53%." Even three or more years after a parental divorce, the income of affected black households "remains 47% lower than it would have been if the parents had remained together." [18] This is the kind of intolerable social evil that the new apostles of Tolerance are forcing Americans to live with — despite their loud protestations of special concern for impoverished minorities.

And there are, unfortunately, many other intolerable consequences of the family disintegration the new Tolerance has helped catalyze.

Intolerably depressed educational achievement, for instance, has grown distressingly common in recent years among children reared in broken homes, making it very hard for them to escape from impoverished circumstances. A 1992 study compellingly documented the way "residing in a non-intact family has adverse effects on [students'] ability to graduate from high school," with graduation rates of only 67% for those living in single-parent homes and 65% for those living in stepparent families, compared to 85% for peers in intact families.[19] Even when they do not drop out of school, students from stepfamilies and single-parent homes miss significantly more classes and earn significantly lower grades than peers from intact families.[20]

And though children from broken homes may never enjoy the privilege of spending an hour in a graduation ceremony, the chances are intolerably high that both they and their parents will spend many miserable hours enduring physical or mental illness.

"Marital status," remark the authors of a 1985 study, "is related to the health status of all the family members, including both parents and children." [21] A 1995 study, in fact, determined that experiencing parental divorce before age 21 is "associated with a 44% increase in mortality risk," shortening the life of a white male or female by an average of 4.5 years.[22] And the intolerable harm that family disintegration is now visiting upon American adults and children shows up in psychological as well as physical symptoms. Psychologists find that, compared to married peers, unmarried mothers are "almost three times more likely to have experienced a major depressive disorder." [23] Characterized by

researchers as "moody, sad, and nervous," children of single-parent families account for between 50 and 80 percent of the patients in some mental-health institutions.[24] What is more, even after adolescence, adults reared in broken homes suffer from a "significantly lower level of general psychological well-being" than peers reared in intact families.[25]

Given the intolerably high incidence of physical and mental illness among teens reared in broken homes, it should come as no surprise that many seek out the illusory escape of illegal drugs. The authors of a 2003 study find that teens whose parents have split up are one-and-a-half times more likely to use illicit drugs by age 14 as are peers from intact families and are more than two-thirds more likely to use illicit drugs at any time during their life. The authors of this study suggest that children who suffer from parental separation/divorce (like those who suffer from other adverse childhood experiences) may suffer from "feelings of helplessness, chaos, and impermanence and may have problems self-regulating affective states." As a consequence, they may turn to illicit drug use "as an avenue to escape or dissociate from the immediate emotional pain, anxiety, and anger that likely accompany such experiences." [26]

But illegal drugs provide no true or lasting escape from intolerable pain, anxiety, and anger. Over time, such drugs actually exacerbate such intolerably negative emotions. And when they discover that drug pushers offer them no real help, where else can the harried children of broken homes turn? All too many seek release from the pressures of an intolerably difficult life by taking their own lives. Because scholars have identified "turmoil in American families" as a prime reason that the suicide rate skyrocketed among teens and young adults during the latter decades of the 20th century, it is entirely predictable that broken homes would account for a high percentage of suicide deaths (52% in one representative California study).[27]

Nor is all of the intolerable violence incubated in broken homes self-directed. Too much of this violence spills into the streets, claiming tens of thousands of innocent victims every year. Though the decades-long "birth dearth" has finally reduced the number of young American males enough to push rates for violent crime down from the stratospheric levels reached in the Eighties, these rates still remain intolerably high — especially in the inner city — by traditional standards. And the decay in American family life figures prominently as a reason for this violence.

Sociologists who have looked closely at the intolerably prevalent level of gang-related crime in inner city areas have concluded that "boys reared in father-absent homes gravitate to gangs and gang activities," apparently in part because these fatherless boys lack a healthy domestic exemplar of masculine identity and are therefore trying to "demonstrate compensatory masculine development," a kind of pathological "'hypermasculinity' evident in aggressive gang activities." [28] No wonder social historian David Courtwright focuses on family disintegration in his analysis of intolerable levels of inner-city crime: "The root cause of the wave of black inner-city male violence that began building during the 1960's and 1970's and rose again in the late 1980's and early 1990's," he writes "was the decline of stable two-parent families and the institution of marriage in the context of an entrenched culture of poverty in an isolated, youthful subsociety with diminishing opportunities and a chronically low gender ratio." [29] Nor, in a post-Columbine nation, should Americans ignore the research showing that it is students from single-parent or disrupted families who are the ones most likely to bring firearms to school. [30]

Not all of the intolerable violence kindled by family disintegration, however, is found in the street crimes committed by gangs or in the classroom shootings committed by alienated boys with guns. An

intolerable level of violence against women and children is characteristic of far too many American homes, often turned into domestic battlefields by family disintegration. Even progressive-thinking sociologists not initially inclined to regard marriage as superior to non-marital cohabitation have learned — to their own astonishment — that cohabitation exposes women to a risk of "extreme violence" that is five times as great as that faced by their married peers.[31] Like their mothers, children also often suffer intolerable abuse when stable wedlock disappears. Social scientists report a clear "association between physical abuse of children and deviance from normative family structure," with researchers finding that "battered babies are likely to be reared in broken homes" and that premarital pregnancy, illegitimacy, and absence of the child's father are among the most common "precursors of baby battering." [32] Available child-abuse data indeed indicate that children living in single-parent families are more than twice as likely to experience physical abuse than peers in two-parent homes.[33] Sociobiologists Martin Daly and Margo Wilson have calculated that "preschoolers living with one natural and one stepparent were 40 times more likely to become child abuse cases than were like-aged children living with two natural parents." [34] A 1996 study even established that the domestic violence so intolerably harmful to women and children occurs most often in "disadvantaged neighborhoods" in which a large fraction of the households are headed by single females.[35]

"Zero Tolerance"

Quite understandably, Americans have responded to the increasing prevalence of crime, violence, and drug use not with the irenic language of tolerance, but rather with angry slogans of "Zero Tolerance." [36] While their zeal against the real evils of violence and drug use is understandable and even laudable, many of the public officials and corporate executives now enforcing "Zero Tolerance" policies against violent acts and illegal substances are still continuing to cede public and workplace authority to the apostles of the new lifestyle Tolerance. Few of the "Zero Tolerance" warriors against violence and drugs seem even to recognize how seriously they are handicapped in their war so long as they quietly acquiesce in a lifestyle Tolerance that undermines family life and so incubates the very problems they would extirpate. Indeed, when the issues in question are domestic violence or violence against women, the apostles of Tolerance somehow manage to get themselves appointed as captains of the "Zero Tolerance" crusades — without having to answer any serious questions about their own philosophical incoherence or their own moral culpability.[37]

When public officials press ahead with "Zero Tolerance" policies in the current social environment, they often appear merely "silly" to critics who see them expelling students for bringing an aspirin or rubber band into the classroom.[38] And they usually appear merely irrelevant to the apostles of the new Tolerance, who remain entirely unfettered in using the classroom to promote "positive attitudes" toward the sexual libertinism that destroys families and so fosters the use of real drugs and real weapons.

The apostles of the new Tolerance are hardly troubled that few see how their new gospel is generating the intolerable pathologies now targeted by "Zero Tolerance" campaigns. After all, widespread philosophical confusion actually provides the evangelists of Tolerance with an ideal environment for doing their dubious work. Because many of them believe in Tolerance only as a misleading slogan useful for hiding an ideological assault on traditional moral principles, they do not even need to enlarge the public reservoirs of true tolerance to achieve their objectives. The zealots of Tolerance can press toward their real if rarely acknowledged social objectives if they can simply perplex and paralyze the defenders of the traditional moral principles undergirding family life.

Those who now wave their banners of Tolerance need not inculcate in the general public the precious old virtue that bore that name nor even the dubious new ideology that has stolen its label. They need only to badger and befuddle Americans with their misleading slogans long enough that most slide into the kind of tired surrender that once prompted Ogden Nash to wonder, "Which is mine — /Tolerance or a rubber spine?" And as more and more schools and corporations adopt the catechisms of the new Tolerance, more and more Americans will discover how easily they can please their powerful new catechists. A few perfunctory words or gestures can provide an ideologically acceptable veneer for the weary apathy that once prompted W. Somerset Maugham to declare, "Tolerance is only another name for indifference." [39]

But in a nation plagued by intolerable levels of child poverty, violence, drug abuse, and psychological illness, Americans can perhaps learn more valuable things than how to mask indifference by feigning Tolerance. With so many terrible social ills threatening our collective well being, perhaps even learning the true old virtue of tolerance should not be our highest priority. For if — as Edmund Burke once declared — "there is a limit at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue," [40] the time is clearly past for tolerating the sophistry that weakens family life and so multiplies intolerable social evils.

Simple compassion will always entail some measure of leniency towards and understanding of those who fail to live up to marital and family ideals. In other words, compassion will always mean expressions of the traditional virtue of tolerance. But compassion does not require acquiescence in the sophistry of the new Tolerance, a sophistry now bringing intolerable suffering down on the heads of those whose confusion about domestic morality is exposing them and others to entirely unnecessary poverty, pain, illness, and violence. The time has come for a "Zero Tolerance" campaign against the anti-family sophistry of the new Tolerance.

Religious Consensus

Americans may utterly refuse to tolerate anti-family sophistry not only because of the intolerably horrific social costs of family disintegration, but also because of the remarkably strong consensus about family morality among the country's diverse religious communities, including its burgeoning non-Christian communities. The striking congruence of the moral teachings of diverse religious traditions with respect to the traditional family that Christian apologist C.S. Lewis has limned in his landmark book *The Abolition of Man* (cf. "Duties to Parents, Elders, Ancestors," "Duties to Children and Posterity," and "Sexual Justice" in "Illustrations of the Tao") ought to reassure Americans that they are hardly being bigoted or intolerant when they stand up for the family. [41] What is more, by refusing to tolerate the destructive mendacities of the new Tolerance, Americans will realize many much-needed social benefits — even some they may not expect.

For not only will repudiating the family-destroying sophistry of the new Tolerance reduce intolerable social evils such as child poverty, crime, physical and mental illness, and domestic violence, but it will also actually promote civic virtues that flourish best in intact marriages and families. Since sociologists have established that married persons are generally more committed than unmarried peers to "volunteering, civic association membership, voting, and religious participation," [42] Americans can realistically hope for a renaissance of civic culture when they start denying the apostles of Tolerance freedom to wage war on wedlock. Revoking the teaching privileges of the antifamily zealots who promote the new Tolerance may even deliver a piquant surprise: a 1980 psychological study revealed that compared to peers reared in single-parent homes, children reared in intact families manifest higher levels of individual tolerance. [43]

Endnotes:

1. White quoted in "Famous Quotations — Tolerance," Nonstop English, 22 March 2005 <http://nonstopenglish.com/reading/quotations>.
2. Scheer quoted in "Famous Quotations about Tolerance," Zaadz, 22 March 2005 <http://www.zaadz.com/quotes>.
3. Forster quoted in "Famous Quotations — Tolerance," op. cit.
4. See Sara Bullard, "Sorting Through the Multicultural Rhetoric," *Educational Leadership* Dec. '91/Jan. '92: 4-7.
5. See Liz Willen, "'Rainbow' Gone; Storm Not: New teachers' guide doesn't please critics," *Newsday* 7 June 1994: A5.
6. See Jon Barrett, "A Mother's Mission," *Advocate* 16 March 1999: 20-22.
7. Elizabeth Socha Davis and Pauline G. Boss, "Using Class Profiles to Teach Tolerance for Diverse Values in Family Relationships," *Family Relations* 30 (1981): 590.
8. Walt Whitman, *Song of Myself*, in *Leaves of Grass (1891-1892)*, ed. Harold W. Blodgett and Sculley Bradley (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965), 88.
9. Cf. Pamela Lyons, "Intolerant of Intolerance" [Letter], *The Oregonian* 3 Oct. 2000: C6.
10. George Will, "Academic Stuck to the Left," *Washington Post* 28 Nov. 2004: B7.
11. See John Leo, "Behavior controls and speech controls are signs of our times," *Grand Rapids Press* 19 Oct. 2002: A16; see also "'Anti-gay' students must keep quiet: Lawsuit filed against district's 'diversity training,'" *WorldNetDaily* 29 March 2005. 5 April 2005 <http://www.worldnetdaily.com>.
12. John Leo, "'Diversity,' in fact, isn't very diverse," *Grand Rapids Press* 2 Feb. 2002: A12.
13. Cf., for instance, Jane Eiser, "U.S. AIDS Policy Focuses on Too Few," *Knight Ridder Tribune News Service* 13 July 2004: 1; David Crary, "The Nation: Quality Child Care Needed — for a Bargain Price," *Los Angeles Times* 2 Nov. 2003: A28.
14. Randal D. Day and Wade C. Mackey, "Children as Resources: A Cultural Analysis," *Family Perspective* 20 (1985): 258-262.
15. Cf. Bryce Christensen, "The Family in Utopia," *Renascence* 44 (1991): 31-44.
16. Cf. Jonathan Yardley, "Thought Police Spring to Action on the Campus," *The Record* 26 Nov. 2001: L7; Norah Vincent, "Commentary: Liberal Media Ignore What They Don't Want to Hear," *Los Angeles Times* 14 Feb. 2004: B17.
17. Cf. Christopher Jencks, "Deadly Neighborhoods," *Rev. of The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy* by William Julius Wilson, *The New Republic* 13 June 1988: 28-29, emphasis added.
18. Marianne E. Page and Ann Huff Stevens, "Understanding Racial Differences in the Economic Costs of Growing Up in a Single-Parent Family," *Demography* 42 [2005]: 75-90.
19. Gary D. Sandefur, Sara McLanahan, and Roger A. Wojtkiewicz, "The Effects of Parental Marital Status during Adolescence on High School Graduation," *Social Forces* 71 (1992): 103-121.
20. Barry D. Ham, "The Effects of Divorce and Remarriage on the Academic Achievement of High School Seniors," *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage* 42.1/2 (2004): 159-178.
21. John Guidubaldi and Helen Cleminshaw, "Divorce, Family Health, and Child Adjustment," *Family Relations* 34(1985): 35-41.

22. Joseph E. Schwartz et al. , "Sociodemographic and Psychosocial Factors in Childhood as Predictors of Adult Mortality," *American Journal of Public Health* (1995): 1237-1245.
23. Cf. Lorraine Davies, William R. Avison, and Donna D. McAlpine, "Significant Life Experiences and Depression Among Single and Married Mothers," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59 (1997): 294-308.
24. Cf. Gong-Soong Hong and Shelley I. White-Means, "Do Working Mothers Have Healthy Children?" *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 14 (1993): 163-181; see also Helen S. Merskey and G.T. Swart, "Family Background and Physical Health of Adolescents Admitted to an Inpatient Psychiatric Unit: I, Principal Caregivers," *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 34 (1989): 79-83.
25. Cf. Timothy J. Biblarz and Greg Gottainer, "Family Structure and Children's Success: A Comparison of Widowed and Divorced Single-Mother Families," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(2000): 533-548.
26. Shanta R. Dube et al. , "Childhood Abuse, Neglect, and Household Dysfunction and the Risk of Illicit Drug Use: The Adverse Childhood Experiences Study," *Pediatrics* 111[2003]: 564-572.
27. John S. Wodarski and Pamela Harris, "Adolescent Suicide: A Review of Influences and the Means for Prevention," *Social Work* 32[1989]: 477-484; cf. Franklyn L. Nelson, "Youth Suicide in California: A Study of Perceived Causes and Interventions," *Community Mental Health* 24(1988): 31-42.
28. Cf. Michael E. Connor, "Teenage Fatherhood: Issues Confronting Young Black Males," in *Young, Black, and Male in America: An Endangered Species*, ed. Jewelle Taylor Gibbs (Dover: Auburn House, 1988), 195; Patricia Moran and Allan Barclay, "Effects of Fathers' Absence in Delinquent Boys: Dependency and Hypermasculinity," *Psychological Reports* 62 (1988): 115-121.
29. David T. Courtwright, *Violent Land: Single Men and Social Disorder from the Frontier to the Inner City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 230.
30. Cf. David C. May, "Scared Kids, Unattached Kids, or Peer Pressure: Why Do Students Carry Firearms to School?" *Youth and Society* 31 (1999): 100-127.
31. Kersti Yllo and Murray A. Straus, "Interpersonal Violence Among Married and Cohabiting Couples," *Family Relations* 30(1981): 339-347; see also Jan E. Stets and Murray A. Straus, "The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples," Paper presented at the 1988 meeting of the American Sociological Association, 8 July 1988.
32. Cf. Selsyn M. Smith, Ruth Hanson, and Sheila Noble, "Social Aspects of the Battered Baby Syndrome," in *Child Abuse: Commission and Omission*, eds. Joanne V. Cook and Roy T. Bowles (Toronto: Butterworths, 1980), 217-220.
33. Cf. Jocelyn Brown et al. , "A Longitudinal Analysis of Risk Factors for Child Maltreatment: Findings of a 17-Year Prospective Study of Officially Recorded and Self-Reported Child Abuse and Neglect," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 22 (1998): 1065-1078.
34. Martin Daly and Margo Wilson, "Child Abuse and Other Risks of Not Living With Both Parents," *Ethology and Sociobiology* 3 (1982): 197-209, emphasis added.
35. Cf. Lauren J. Krivo and Ruth D. Peterson, "Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Urban Crime," *Social Forces* 75 (1996): 619-650.
36. Cf. Craig Savoye, "Putting Rock-Solid Faith in Zero Tolerance," *Christian Science Monitor* 20 June 2001: 12; Samuel Greengard, "Zero Tolerance: Making It Work," *Workforce* May 1999: 28-33.
37. Cf. Bridget Samburg, "Nipping Domestic Violence in the Bud; A Summit to Focus on Plugging Cutbacks," *Boston Globe* 3 Oct. 2004: 11.
38. "Zero Tolerance Turns Silly," Editorial, *Detroit News* 7 Oct. 2000: 7; Sean McCullem, "Zero Tolerance: Safer Schools or Unfair Rules?" *Literary Cavalcade* Sept. 2004: 20-21; "Harsh Medicine," Editorial, *Times-Picayune* 9 Dec. 2003: 4.
39. Maugham quoted in "Famous Quotations — Tolerance," op. cit.

40. Burke quoted in "Famous Quotations — Tolerance," *op. cit.*
41. Cf. C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man: Or Reflections on Education With Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools.* (1943; rpt. New York: Macmillan, 1978).
42. Cf. Corey L.M. Keyes, "Social Civility in the United States," *Sociological Inquiry* 72 (2002): 393-408.
43. Edgar Howarth, "Birth Order, Family Structure, and Personality Variables," *Journal of Personality Assessment* 44 (1980): 299-301.