

The mad, mad world of liberal logic

When liberals confuse causes and effects, their ability to draw reasonable conclusions falls apart.

Special to The Observer
They've got it all wrong. Liberals, that is. Every solution they propose to a problem only creates more of the same.

Take sex education. To their way of thinking, "Because teens will have sex, we must provide sex education" — a line of reasoning that on the surface sounds plausible. But examine this argument carefully and you'll see the reverse is true: Because we're teaching teens how to have sex, so many teens are having sex. The reasoning is exactly the opposite of what it should be.

This wacko way liberals have of explaining things is known as convoluted logic, and many otherwise intelligent, educated people fall for it. Since the '60s, the left wing's specious reasoning has flummoxed conservatives, when all they need do is take a crash course in logic.

For starters, realize that logic is a science. To be precise, *the science of cause and effect*. By establishing valid cause-and-effect relationships, we can understand why things happen, which is critical to our ability to accurately predict the consequences of certain actions.

Anyone who graduated from high school before 1970 will recall that the foolproof way to test the validity of an argument is through a syllogism. If you know how to use this nifty scientific device invented by Aristotle, you'll have an ace up your sleeve next time some liberal tries to pull a verbal fast one.

In its most popular form, a syllogism consists of two premises followed by a conclusion. The ex-

ample used in old textbooks is: "All men must die. Socrates is a man. Therefore, Socrates must die."

As you can see, the first premise is a universal truth, while the second premise contains an individual belonging to the category under examination. So long as the first rule is *true in all cases*, then the individual must share that condition, and any conclusion drawn will prove valid.

The sex ed prescription is based on a favorite liberal rationalization that "everybody's doing it," a premise that is *not* universally true. In fact, the majority of teens don't engage in sex, so any conclusion drawn from this premise is absolutely invalid.

If you stop to think about it, the logic here seems to be, "Because teens will have sex, we must teach them to have sex," a line of thinking that resembles a maniacal dog chasing its tail. The consequence of this lamebrain logic has been an explosion in teen pregnancy, abor-

*When you reverse
cause and effect, the
cause of the problem
becomes the cure.*

tion, STDs, date rape, child abuse and now infanticide. But if you teach children to read, they'll read. If you teach children to have sex, they'll have sex. Viewed as a scientific experiment, sex ed has proved an unmitigated disaster.

The deadly nature of convoluted logic now becomes apparent, for when you reverse cause and effect, *the cause of the problem becomes the cure*. In this case, teaching teens how to have sex has only

caused more teens to have sex. Sex ed is a classic example of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Here in Charlotte, the recent Showdown at the Mecklenburg Commissioners Corral over taxpayer funding of sex counseling for teen-agers pitted the Logic-Challenged Bunch — Parks Helms, Lloyd Scher, Becky Carney and Darrel Williams — against the Five Men of Sound Mind — Hoyle Martin, Bill James, Joel Carter, George Higgins and Tom Bush. The good news is that the good guys won, and with their courageous stand may usher in a New Age of Reason to local politics.

Hopefully, the willingness of these five right-thinking commissioners to buck the politically correct for the scientifically correct will prove a communicable disease, and other sensible Charlotteans, Democrat and Republican, will challenge the convoluted reasoning that has caused so many societal problems. For instance, does poverty cause crime, or does crime cause poverty? Reverse the cause and effect, and you'll find the only valid answer.

No doubt most conservatives would attest that debating liberals on such issues often makes their eyes cross, but as G.K. Chesterton quipped, "Arguments with the insane nearly always end badly for the person in his right mind." Next time you find yourself going round the verbal mulberry bush with liberals, reverse the cause and effect in their proposition. Chances are they've based their argument on a premise that's not universally true, and *for that reason*, the solution they come up with will only exacerbate the problem.

Observer columnist Nan Bauroth, a former Wall Street executive, is a journalist, marketing consultant and conservative commentator. Her column runs on the second Tuesday of every month. Write her c/o The Observer, P.O. Box 30308, Charlotte, NC 28230-0308 or by e-mail at nbauroth@mindspring.com

