

TAKING

SIDES

Clashing Views
on Controversial

Social Issues

Ninth Edition

Kurt Finsterbusch
George McKenna



Taking SIDES

Clashing Views on
Controversial
Social Issues



Ninth Edition

Edited, Selected, and with Introductions by

Kurt Finsterbush

University of Maryland

and

George McKenna

City College, City University of New York

Dushkin Publishing Group/Brown & Benchmark Publishers
A Times Mirror Higher Education Group Company

To Karl, Tina, Rachelle, and Craig, who are venturing forth on the sea of life to find their destiny while giving richly to people along the way

Photo Acknowledgments

- Part 1 Digital Stock
Part 2 UN PHOTO 148 578/John Isaac
Part 3 UN PHOTO 155551/R. Vogel
Part 4 UN PHOTO 150,094/Yutaka Nagata
Part 5 DPG/B&B
Part 6 UN PHOTO 153429/John Isaac

Cover Art Acknowledgment

Charles Vitelli

Copyright © 1996 by Dushkin Publishing Group/Brown & Benchmark Publishers,
A Times Mirror Higher Education Group Company,
Guilford, Connecticut 06437

Copyright law prohibits the reproduction, storage, or transmission in any form by any means of any portion of this publication without the express written permission of Dushkin Publishing Group/Brown & Benchmark Publishers and of the copyright holder (if different) of the part of the publication to be reproduced. The Guidelines for Classroom Copying endorsed by Congress explicitly state that unauthorized copying may not be used to create, to replace, or to substitute for anthologies, compilations, or collective works.

Taking Sides ® is a registered trademark of Dushkin Publishing Group/
Brown & Benchmark Publishers, A Times Mirror Higher Education Group Company

Manufactured in the United States of America

Ninth Edition

10 9 8 7 6 5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Taking sides: clashing views on controversial social issues / edited, selected, and with introductions by Kurt Finsterbusch and George McKenna.—9th ed.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Social behavior. 2. Social problems. I. Finsterbusch, Kurt, comp. II. McKenna, George, comp.

0-697-31295-X

302
95-83865



Printed on Recycled Paper

PREFACE

The English word *fanatic* is derived from the Latin *fanum*, meaning temple. It refers to the kind of madmen often seen in the precincts of temples in ancient times, the kind presumed to be possessed by deities or demons. The term first came into English usage during the seventeenth century, when it was used to describe religious zealots. Soon after, its meaning was broadened to include a political and social context. We have come to associate the term *fanatic* with a person who acts as if his or her views were inspired, a person utterly incapable of appreciating opposing points of view. The nineteenth-century English novelist George Eliot put it precisely: "I call a man fanatical when . . . he . . . becomes unjust and unsympathetic to men who are out of his own track." A fanatic may hear but is unable to listen. Confronted with those who disagree, a fanatic immediately vilifies opponents.

Most of us would avoid the company of fanatics, but who among us is not tempted to caricature opponents instead of listening to them? Who does not put certain topics off limits for discussion? Who does not grasp at euphemisms to avoid facing inconvenient facts? Who has not, in George Eliot's language, sometimes been "unjust and unsympathetic" to those on a different track? Who is not, at least in certain very sensitive areas, a *little* fanatical? The counterweight to fanaticism is open discussion. The difficult issues that trouble us as a society have at least two sides, and we lose as a society if we hear only one side. At the individual level, the answer to fanaticism is listening. And that is the underlying purpose of this book: to encourage its readers to listen to opposing points of view.

This book contains 40 selections presented in a pro and con format. A total of 20 different controversial social issues are debated. The sociologists, political scientists, economists, and social critics whose views are debated here make their cases vigorously. In order to effectively read each selection, analyze the points raised, and debate the basic assumptions and values of each position, or, in other words, in order to think critically about what you are reading, you will first have to give each side a sympathetic hearing. John Stuart Mill, the nineteenth-century British philosopher, noted that the majority is not doing the minority a favor by listening to its views; it is doing *itself* a favor. By listening to contrasting points of view, we strengthen our own. In some cases we change our viewpoints completely. But in most cases, we either incorporate some elements of the opposing view—thus making our own richer—or else learn how to answer the objections to our viewpoints. Either way, we gain from the experience.

Organization of the book Each issue has an issue *introduction*, which sets the stage for the debate as it is argued in the YES and NO selections. Each issue

concludes with a *postscript* that makes some final observations and points the way to other questions related to the issue. In reading the issue and forming your own opinions you should not feel confined to adopt one or the other of the positions presented. There are positions in between the given views or totally outside them, and the *suggestions for further reading* that appear in each issue postscript should help you find resources to continue your study of the subject. At the back of the book is a listing of all the *contributors to this volume*, which will give you information on the social scientists whose views are debated here.

Changes to this edition This new edition has been significantly updated. This edition represents a considerable revision. There are nine completely new issues: *Is the Moral Decline of America a Myth?* (Issue 1); *Does the News Media Have a Liberal Bias?* (Issue 2); *Is There a Date Rape Crisis in Society?* (Issue 5); *Should Society Be More Accepting of Homosexuality?* (Issue 6); *Are the Poor Responsible for Their Poverty?* (Issue 9); *Should Affirmative Action Policies Be Discontinued?* (Issue 10); *Is Choice a Panacea for the Ills of Public Education?* (Issue 15); *Does Population and Economic Growth Threaten Humanity?* (Issue 19); and *Are Standards of Living in the United States Improving?* (Issue 20). Of the issues retained from the previous edition, three have been changed so completely that we consider them to be new: *Is Feminism a Harmful Ideology?* (Issue 4); *Should Traditional Families Be Preserved?* (Issue 7); and *Does Welfare Do More Harm Than Good?* (Issue 14). In addition, either the YES or the NO selection has been replaced in three issues to bring the debates up to date: *Does Third World Immigration Threaten America's Cultural Unity?* (Issue 3); *Is Government Dominated by Big Business?* (Issue 12); and *Is Incapacitation the Answer to the Crime Problem?* (Issue 18). In all, there are 26 new selections. The issues that were dropped from the previous edition were done so on the recommendation of professors who let us know what worked and what could be improved. Wherever appropriate, new introductions and postscripts have been provided.

A word to the instructor An *Instructor's Manual With Test Questions* (multiple-choice and essay) is available through the publisher for the instructor using *Taking Sides* in the classroom. A general guidebook, *Using Taking Sides in the Classroom*, which discusses methods and techniques for integrating the pro-con approach into any classroom setting, is also available.

Acknowledgments We received many helpful comments and suggestions from our friends and readers across the United States and Canada. Their suggestions have markedly enhanced the quality of this edition of *Taking Sides* and are reflected in the new issues and the updated selections.

Our thanks go to those who responded with suggestions for this edition:

Kathy H. Edwards
Marshall University

Donald F. Anspach
University of Southern Maine

Joanne Ardovini-Brooker
Western Michigan University

Charles E. Butler
University of Oklahoma

David L. Carlson
Concordia College

Vibha Chandra
Santa Clara University

Darrell J. Cook
Benedictine College

W. Edward Folts
Appalachian State University

Jack Franklin
University of Houston

Hugo A. Freund
Drexel University

Willie Hamilton
Mount San Jacinto College

Dean R. Hoge
Catholic University

Terry Huffman
Taylor University

Karen Jennison
University of Northern
Colorado

Andrew Kampiziones
Florence-Darlington
Technical College

Lane Kenworthy
Rochester Institute of
Technology

Kenneth C. Land
Duke University

James M. Makepeace
College of St. Benedict

Robert D. Manning
American University

Harold W. Moses
Bethune Cookman College

Ronald J. Oard
Mount St. Mary's College

Jane A. Penney
Eastfield College

Adrian Rapp
North Harris College

John A. Reilly
Columbia-Greene
Community College

Judy Rosenthal
Pennsylvania State
University-Du Bois

Charles Seidel
Mansfield University

Bhavani Sitaraman
University of Alabama-
Huntsville

Carole H. Stumbaugh
Georgia State University

William Thompson
East Texas State University

Johannes Van Vugt
St. Mary's College of
California

iv / PREFACE

We also wish to acknowledge the encouragement and support given to this project over the years by Rick Connelly, former president and publisher of the Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc. We are grateful as well to Mimi Egan, publisher for the Taking Sides series. Finally, we thank our families for their patience and understanding during the period in which we prepared this book.

Kurt Finsterbusch
University of Maryland

George McKenna
City College, City University of New York

INTRODUCTION

Debating Social Issues

Kurt Finsterbusch
George McKenna

WHAT IS SOCIOLOGY?

"I have become a problem to myself," St. Augustine said. Put into a social and secular framework, St. Augustine's concern marks the starting point of sociology. We have become a problem to ourselves, and it is sociology that seeks to understand the problem and, perhaps, to find some solutions. The subject matter of sociology, then, is ourselves—people interacting with one another in groups.

Although the subject matter of sociology is very familiar, it is often useful to look at it in an unfamiliar light, one that involves a variety of theories and perceptual frameworks. In fact, to properly understand social phenomena, it *should* be looked at from several different points of view. In practice, however, this may lead to more friction than light, especially when each view proponent says, "I am right and you are wrong," rather than, "My view adds considerably to what your view has shown."

Sociology, as a science of society, was developed in the nineteenth century. Auguste Comte (1798–1857), the French mathematician and philosopher who is considered to be the father of sociology, had a vision of a well-run society based on social science knowledge. Sociologists (Comte coined the term) would discover the laws of social life and then determine how society should be structured and run. Society would not become perfect, because some problems are intractable, but he believed that a society guided by scientists and other experts was the best possible society.

Unfortunately, Comte's vision was extremely naive. For most matters of state there is no one best way of structuring or doing things that sociologists can discover and recommend. Instead, sociologists debate more social issues than they resolve.

The purpose of sociology is to throw light on social issues and their relationship to the complex, confusing, and dynamic social world around us. It seeks to describe how society is organized and how individuals fit into it. But neither the organization of society nor the fit of individuals is perfect. Social disorganization is a fact of life—at least in modern, complex societies such as the one we live in. Here, perfect harmony continues to elude us, and "social problems" are endemic. The very institutions, laws, and policies that produce benefits also produce what sociologists call "unintended effects"—unintended and undesirable. The changes that please one sector of the soci-

ety may displease another, or the changes that seem so indisputably healthy at first turn out to have a dark underside to them. The examples are endless. Modern urban life gives people privacy and freedom from snooping neighbors that the small town never afforded; yet, that very privacy seems to breed an uneasy sense of anonymity and loneliness. Take another example: Hierarchy is necessary for organizations to function efficiently, but hierarchy leads to the creation of a ruling elite. Flatten out the hierarchy and you may achieve social equality—but at the price of confusion, incompetence, and low productivity.

This is not to say that all efforts to effect social change are ultimately futile and that the only sound view is the tragic one that concludes “nothing works.” We can be realistic without falling into despair. In many respects, the human condition has improved over the centuries and has improved as a result of conscious social policies. But improvements are purchased at a price—not only a monetary price but one involving human discomfort and discontent. The job of policymakers is to balance the anticipated benefits against the probable costs.

It can never hurt policymakers to know more about the society in which they work or the social issues they confront. That, broadly speaking, is the purpose of sociology. It is what this book is about. This volume examines issues that are central to the study of sociology.

CULTURE AND VALUES

A common value system is the major mechanism for integrating a society, but modern societies contain so many different groups with differing ideas and values that integration must be built as much on tolerance of differences as on common values. Furthermore, technology and social conditions change, so values must adjust to new situations, often weakening old values. Some people (often called conservatives) will defend the old values. Others (often called liberals) will make concessions to allow for change. For example, the protection of human life is a sacred value to most people, but some would compromise that value when the life involved is a 90-year-old comatose man on life-support machines who had signed a document indicating that he did not want to be kept alive under those conditions. The conservative would counter that once we make the value of human life relative, we become dangerously open to greater evils—that perhaps society will come to think it acceptable to terminate all sick, elderly people undergoing expensive treatments. This is only one example of how values are hotly debated today. Three debates on values are presented in Part 1. In Issue 1, Everett C. Ladd challenges the common perception that morals have declined in America, while James Patterson and Peter Kim provide empirical support for the declining morality thesis. In Issue 2, the news media, which is a major influence on people’s values, is analyzed for its bias. H. Joachim Maitre objects to the news media for being too liberal, while Martin A. Lee and Norman Solomon main-

tain that it is actually too conservative. In Issue 3, Peter Brimelow argues that the current levels of immigration are too high and that the immigrant cultures are too different from American culture to be assimilated. Thus, immigration is threatening America's cultural unity. Francis Fukuyama, in opposition, maintains that many of the new immigrants have very strong family values and work ethics, which will strengthen—not weaken—American culture.

SEX ROLES, GENDER, AND THE FAMILY

An area that has experienced tremendous value change in the last several decades is sex roles and the family. Women in large numbers have rejected major aspects of their traditional gender roles and family roles while remaining strongly committed to much of the mother role and to many feminine characteristics. In fact, on these issues women are deeply divided. The ones who seek the most change identify themselves as feminists, and they have been at the forefront of the modern women's movement. Now a debate is raging as to whether or not the feminist cause really helps women. In Issue 4, Robert Sheaffer attacks feminism as intellectually unsound and doomed to failure because its goals conflict with biological realities. William H. Chafe identifies many positive changes that feminists have brought about and many changes that are still needed. Issue 5 focuses on date rape, which is an issue that has only recently begun to be taken seriously. One crusader who has made the topic more visible is Robin Warshaw. In Issue 5, she reports research showing that date rape is quite common and is usually suffered in silence. As a result, little has been done to change the situation. Katie Roiphe questions statistics that indicate that there is date rape crisis and argues that women should take more responsibility for what takes place sexually on dates. Issue 6 deals with the gay rights movement and discrimination against homosexuals. Richard D. Mohr argues that homosexuals are unjustly treated. He further contends that homosexuality is neither immoral nor unnatural and that it should be tolerated and respected. Carl F. Horowitz argues that the more blatant behaviors of many homosexuals are deeply offensive to heterosexuals and that communities have the right to control the undesirable behavior of gay men and lesbians. Issue 7, which has been much debated by feminists and their critics, asks, Should traditional families be preserved? David Popenoe is deeply concerned about the decline of the traditional family, while Judith Stacey thinks that such concern amounts to little more than nostalgia for a bygone era.

STRATIFICATION AND INEQUALITY

Issue 8 centers around a perennial sociological debate about whether or not economic inequality is beneficial (functional) to society. George Gilder claims that it is, while William Ryan argues that inequalities should be greatly reduced. Closely related to this debate is the issue of why the poor are poor.

The "culture of poverty" thesis maintains that most long-term poverty in America is the result of a common culture among the poor. The implication is that those who always seek immediate material gratification will not climb out of poverty, even if they are helped by welfare and other social programs. Others see most of the poor as victims of adverse conditions; they consider the culture of poverty thesis a way of "blaming the victim." Issue 9 offers two very different views on this issue, with Edward Banfield arguing that "lower-class culture" does perpetuate poverty, and Jonathan Kozol arguing that very adverse conditions of life or personal pathologies and health problems are the primary causes of poverty.

Today one of the most controversial issues regarding inequalities is affirmative action. Is equality promoted or undermined by such policies? Arch Puddington and Roger Wilkins take opposing sides on this question in Issue 10. The final issue under the topic of stratification deals with those who are closest to the bottom of American society: the homeless. Who are the homeless, and why do they live in the streets? This is a divisive issue because people have very different feelings toward and notions about the homeless. In Issue 11, Myron Magnet minimizes their numbers and portrays them as largely socially and mentally pathological. Jonathan Kozol maximizes their numbers and depicts the majority of them as regular people who have been very unfortunate.

POLITICAL ECONOMY

Sociologists study not only the poor, the workers, and the victims of discrimination but also those at the top of society—those who occupy what the late sociologist C. Wright Mills used to call "the command posts." The question is whether the "pluralist" model or the "power elite" model is the one that best fits the facts in America. Does a single power elite rule the United States, or do many groups contend for power and influence so that the political process is accessible to all? In Issue 12, John C. Berg argues that the business elite have a dominating influence in government decisions and that no other group has nearly as much power. Jeffrey M. Berry counters that liberal citizen groups have successfully opened the policy-making process and made it more participatory. Currently, grassroots groups of all kinds have some power and influence. The question is, how much?

The United States is a capitalist welfare state, and the role of the state in capitalism (more precisely, the market) and in welfare is examined in the next two issues. Issue 13 considers whether or not the government should step in and attempt to correct for the failures of the market through regulations, policies, and programs. Ernest Erber argues that an active government is needed to protect consumers, workers, and the environment; to bring about greater equality; and to guide economic and social change. Milton and Rose Friedman argue that even well-intended state interventions in the market usually only make matters worse and that governments cannot serve the public good

as effectively as competitive markets can. One way in which the government intervenes in the economy is by providing welfare to people who cannot provide for their own needs in the labor market. Issue 14 debates the wisdom of current welfare policies. In it, Charles Murray contends that many welfare programs of the Great Society have mired people in dependency, spawned illegitimacy, and should be abandoned. Mark Robert Rank interviews many welfare recipients and finds that most of them are driven to welfare by economic crises. Welfare, he asserts, is too stingy to entice people to its way of life.

Education is one of the biggest jobs of government as well as the key to individual prosperity and the success of the economy. For decades the American system of education has been severely criticized. Recently the criticism has brought education into an ideological debate over the proper role of the government, private enterprise, and markets in public education. In Issue 15, John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe argue that under the current system, governments cannot run schools well, because they must rely too much on bureaucratic controls, which prevent teachers from doing their jobs well. They conclude that school choice and the competition it induces will remove most of the counterproductive, top-down controls and will reward performance. Bill Honig argues that radical educational reforms are not necessary because the reforms of the 1980s have largely overcome the problems of stifling bureaucracy. He fears that the school choice program would greatly increase educational inequality.

CRIME AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Crime is interesting to sociologists because crimes are those activities that society makes illegal and will use force to stop. Why are some acts made illegal and others (even those that may be more harmful) not made illegal? Surveys indicate that concern about crime is extremely high in America. Is the fear of crime, however, rightly placed? Americans fear mainly street crime, but Jeffrey Reiman argues in Issue 16 that corporate crime—also known as “white-collar crime”—causes far more death, harm, and financial loss to Americans than street crime. In contrast, John DiIulio points out the great harm done by street criminals, even to the point of social disintegration in some poor neighborhoods. Much of the harm that DiIulio describes is related to the illegal drug trade, which brings about such bad consequences that some people are seriously talking about legalizing drugs in order to kill the illegal drug business. Ethan A. Nadelmann argues this view in Issue 17, while David T. Courtwright argues that legalization would greatly expand the use of dangerous drugs and increase the personal tragedies and social costs resulting therefrom. Finally, Issue 18 examines the extent to which deterrence or tough sentencing of criminals reduces crime. The debate is whether American society should focus on deterrence by meting out sentencing on a tougher and more uniform basis or whether the emphasis should be on re-

habilitating criminals and eliminating the social conditions that breed crime. These alternatives are explored in the debate by Morgan O. Reynolds and D. Stanley Eitzen.

THE FUTURE: POPULATION/ENVIRONMENT/SOCIETY

Many social commentators speculate on "the fate of the earth." The environmentalists have their own vision of apocalypse. They see the possibility that the human race could overshoot the carrying capacity of the globe. The resulting collapse could lead to the extinction of much of the human race and the end of free societies. Population growth and increasing per capita levels of consumption, say some experts, are leading us to this catastrophe. Others believe that these fears are groundless. In Issue 19, Lester R. Brown and Julian L. Simon argue over whether or not the world is threatened by population and economic growth.

The last issue in this book tries to assess the status in America of people's standards of living. In Issue 20, Beth A. Rubin presents trends showing that Americans are losing out economically, socially, and psychologically. W. Michael Cox and Richard Alm, in contrast, argue that Americans have never had it so good. Although they may not make as much money in real terms, they buy more with their money and live longer and healthier lives.

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY

An important idea in sociology is that people construct social reality in the course of interaction by attaching social meanings to the reality they are experiencing and then responding to those meanings. Two people can walk down a city street and derive very different meanings from what they see around them. Both, for example, may see homeless people—but they may see them in different contexts. One fits them into a picture of once-vibrant cities dragged into decay and ruin because of permissive policies that have encouraged pathological types to harass citizens; the other observer fits them into a picture of an America that can no longer hide the wretchedness of its poor. Both feel that they are seeing something deplorable, but their views of what makes it deplorable are radically opposed. Their differing views of what they have seen will lead to very different prescriptions for what should be done about the problem. And their policy arguments will be based upon the pictures in their heads, or the constructions they have made of reality.

The social construction of reality is an important idea for this book because each author is socially constructing reality and working hard to persuade you to see his or her point of view; that is, to see the definition of the situation and the set of meanings he or she has assigned to the situation. In doing this, each author presents a carefully selected set of facts, arguments, and values. The arguments contain assumptions or theories, some of which are spelled out and some of which are unspoken. The critical reader has to judge the evidence

for the facts, the logic and soundness of the arguments, the importance of the values, and whether or not omitted facts, theories, and values invalidate the thesis. This book facilitates this critical thinking process by placing authors in opposition. This puts the reader in the position of critically evaluating two constructions of reality for each issue instead of one.

CONCLUSION

Writing in the 1950s, a period that was in some ways like our own, the sociologist C. Wright Mills said that Americans know a lot about their "troubles" but that they cannot make the connections between seemingly personal concerns and the concerns of others in the world. If they could only learn to make those connections, they could turn their concerns into *issues*. An issue transcends the realm of the personal. According to Mills, "An issue is a public matter: some value cherished by publics is felt to be threatened. Often there is a debate about what the value really is and what it is that really threatens it."

It is not primarily personal troubles but social issues that we have tried to present in this book. The variety of topics in it can be taken as an invitation to discover what Mills called "the sociological imagination." This imagination, said Mills, "is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another—from the political to the psychological; from examination of a single family to comparative assessment of the national budgets of the world.... It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self—and to see the relations between the two." This book, with a range of issues well suited to the sociological imagination, is intended to enlarge that capacity.

CONTENTS IN BRIEF

PART 1 CULTURE AND VALUES 1

- Issue 1. Is the Moral Decline of America a Myth? 2
- Issue 2. Does the News Media Have a Liberal Bias? 18
- Issue 3. Does Third World Immigration Threaten America's Cultural Unity? 36

PART 2 SEX ROLES, GENDER, AND THE FAMILY 57

- Issue 4. Is Feminism a Harmful Ideology? 58
- Issue 5. Is There a Date Rape Crisis in Society? 80
- Issue 6. Should Society Be More Accepting of Homosexuality? 96
- Issue 7. Should Traditional Families Be Preserved? 112

PART 3 STRATIFICATION AND INEQUALITY 129

- Issue 8. Is Economic Inequality Beneficial to Society? 130
- Issue 9. Are the Poor Responsible for Their Poverty? 156
- Issue 10. Should Affirmative Action Policies Be Discontinued? 172
- Issue 11. Do Social and Mental Pathologies Largely Account for Homelessness? 190

PART 4 POLITICAL ECONOMY 209

- Issue 12. Is Government Dominated by Big Business? 210
- Issue 13. Should Government Intervene in a Capitalist Economy? 230
- Issue 14. Does Welfare Do More Harm Than Good? 248
- Issue 15. Is Choice a Panacea for the Ills of Public Education? 266

PART 5 CRIME AND SOCIAL CONTROL 281

- Issue 16. Is Street Crime More Harmful Than White-Collar Crime? 282
- Issue 17. Should Drugs Be Legalized? 300
- Issue 18. Is Incapacitation the Answer to the Crime Problem? 320

PART 6 THE FUTURE: POPULATION/ ENVIRONMENT/SOCIETY 341

- Issue 19. Does Population and Economic Growth Threaten Humanity? 342
- Issue 20. Are Standards of Living in the United States Improving? 362

CONTENTS

Preface	i
Introduction: Debating Social Issues	xiv
PART 1 CULTURE AND VALUES	1
ISSUE 1. Is the Moral Decline of America a Myth?	2
YES: Everett C. Ladd, from "The Myth of Moral Decline," <i>The Responsive Community</i>	4
NO: James Patterson and Peter Kim, from "The Decline and Fall: An Alarmed Perspective," <i>The Responsive Community</i>	13
<p>Everett C. Ladd, president of the Roper Center for Public Opinion, argues that the evidence shows that the moral decline thesis is a myth. Businessmen and community volunteers James Patterson and Peter Kim maintain that America is in moral decline and that its central institutions are suffering.</p>	
<hr/>	
ISSUE 2. Does the News Media Have a Liberal Bias?	18
YES: H. Joachim Maitre, from "The Tilt to the News: How American Journalism Has Swerved from the Ideal of Objectivity," <i>The World and I</i>	20
NO: Martin A. Lee and Norman Solomon, from <i>Unreliable Sources: A Guide to Detecting Bias in News Media</i>	27
<p>Journalism professor H. Joachim Maitre argues that news reporters are liberals who allow their political views to seep into their reporting. Media critics Martin A. Lee and Norman Solomon argue that media bias in reporting is toward the conservative status quo.</p>	
<hr/>	
ISSUE 3. Does Third World Immigration Threaten America's Cultural Unity?	36
YES: Peter Brimelow, from <i>Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster</i>	38
NO: Francis Fukuyama, from "Immigrants and Family Values," <i>Commentary</i>	44
<p>Peter Brimelow, a writer and senior editor of <i>Forbes</i> and <i>National Review</i>, asserts that immigrants from non-European countries are steadily breaking down cultural unity in the United States. Francis Fukuyama, a former deputy director of the U.S. State Department's policy planning staff, argues that</p>	

today's immigrants may actually strengthen America's cultural foundations because they share many of America's traditional values.

PART 2 SEX ROLES, GENDER, AND THE FAMILY 57

ISSUE 4. Is Feminism a Harmful Ideology? 58

YES: Robert Sheaffer, from "Feminism, the Noble Lie," *Free Inquiry* 60

NO: William H. Chafe, from *The Paradox of Change: American Women in the Twentieth Century* 67

Robert Sheaffer, a consulting editor for *Skeptical Inquirer*, argues that feminists are attempting to impose an inappropriate equality on men and women that conflicts with basic biological differences between the genders. William H. Chafe, a professor at Duke University, maintains that the vast improvements that women have made and the obvious need to end continuing discrimination demonstrate the value of feminism.

ISSUE 5. Is There a Date Rape Crisis in Society? 80

YES: Robin Warshaw, from *I Never Called It Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting, and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape* 82

NO: Katie Roiphe, from "Date Rape's Other Victim," *The New York Times Magazine* 88

Journalist Robin Warshaw presents evidence indicating that a high percentage of college women are victims of date rape, though few report the crime to authorities. Author Katie Roiphe challenges the statistics about date rape and criticizes those who contend that there is a date rape crisis for undermining the autonomy of women.

ISSUE 6. Should Society Be More Accepting of Homosexuality? 96

YES: Richard D. Mohr, from *A More Perfect Union: Why Straight America Must Stand Up for Gay Rights* 98

NO: Carl F. Horowitz, from "Homosexuality's Legal Revolution," *The Freeman* 105

Philosophy professor Richard D. Mohr argues that homosexuality is neither immoral nor unnatural and that homosexuals should have the same rights as heterosexuals. Carl F. Horowitz, a policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation, argues that legal acceptance of homosexuality has already gone too far.