



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

He has shown you, O man, what is good; and what does the LORD require of you, But to do justly, to love mercy, And to walk humbly with your God. Micah 6:8

From The President's Desk

Tim LaHaye and I argue in *Mind Siege* (ch. 8) that Secular Humanism is a religion.

Henry Morris in this *Impact* article argues that evolution itself is a religion.

This article is so good I could find no place to cut it off. And for our Summit students we leave the end notes here as well.

"The writer has documented in two recent *Impact* articles^{1,2} from admissions by evolutionists that the idea of particles to people evolution does not meet the criteria of a scientific theory. There are no evolutionary transitions that have ever been observed, either during human history or in the fossil record of the past; and the universal law of entropy seems to make it impossible on any significant scale.

"Evolutionists claim that evolution is a scientific fact, but they almost always lose scientific debates with creationist scientists. Accordingly, most evolutionists now decline opportunities for scientific debates, preferring instead to make unilateral attacks on creationists. 'Scientists should refuse formal debates because they do more harm than good, but scientists still need to counter the creationist message.'³

"The question is, just *why* do they need to counter the creationist message? Why are they so adamantly committed to anti-creationism?

"The fact is that evolutionists believe in evolution because they *want* to. It is their desire at all costs to explain the origin of everything without a Creator. Evolutionism is thus intrinsically an atheistic religion. Some may prefer to call it humanism, and New Age evolutionists may place it in the context of some form of pantheism, but they all amount to the same thing. Whether atheism or humanism (or even pantheism), the purpose is to eliminate a personal God from any active role in the origin of the universe and all its components, including man. 'The core of the humanistic philosophy is naturalism—the proposition that the natural world proceeds according to its own internal dynamics, without divine or supernatural control or guidance, and that we human beings are creations of that process. It is instructive to recall that the philosophers of the early humanistic movement debated as to which term more adequately described their position: humanism, or naturalism. The two concepts are complementary and inseparable.'⁴

"Since both naturalism and humanism exclude God from science or any other active function in the creation or maintenance of life and the universe in general, it is very obvious that their position is nothing but atheism. And atheism, no less than theism, is a religion! Even doctrinaire-atheistic evolutionist Richard Dawkins admits that atheism cannot be proven to be true. 'Of course we can't prove that there isn't a God.'⁵

"Therefore, they must *believe* it, and that makes it a religion. The atheistic nature of evolution is not only admitted, but insisted upon, by most of the leaders of evolutionary thought. Ernst Mayr, for example, says that: 'Darwinism rejects all supernatural phenomena and causations.'⁶

"A professor in the Department of Biology at Kansas State University says: 'Even if all the data point to an intelligent designer, such a hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic.'⁷

"It is well known in the scientific world today that such influential evolutionists as Stephen Jay Gould and Edward Wilson of Harvard, Richard Dawkins of England, William Provine of Cornell, and numerous other evolutionary spokesmen are dogmatic atheists. Eminent scientific philosopher and ardent Darwinian atheist Michael Ruse has even acknowledged that evolution *is* their *religion*!

" 'Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion—a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality...Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.'⁸

"Another way of saying 'religion' is 'worldview,' the whole of reality. The evolutionary worldview applies not only to the evolution of life, but even to that of the entire universe. In

the realm of cosmic evolution, our naturalistic scientists depart even further from experimental science than life scientists do, manufacturing a variety of evolutionary cosmologies from esoteric mathematics and metaphysical speculation. Socialist Jeremy Rifkin has commented on this remarkable game.

" 'Cosmologies are made up of small snippets of physical reality that have been remodeled by society into vast cosmic deceptions.'⁹

"They *must* believe in evolution, therefore, in spite of all the evidence, not because of it. And speaking of deceptions, note the following remarkable statement. 'We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs,...in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated commitment to materialism...we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.'¹⁰

"The author of this frank statement is Richard Lewontin of Harvard. Since evolution is not a laboratory science, there is no way to test its validity, so all sorts of just-so stories are contrived to adorn the textbooks. But that doesn't make them true! An evolutionist reviewing a recent book by another (but more critical) evolutionist, says: 'We cannot identify ancestors or "missing links," and we cannot devise testable theories to explain how particular episodes of evolution came about. Gee is adamant that all the popular stories about how the first amphibians conquered the dry land, how the birds developed wings and feathers for flying, how the dinosaurs went extinct, and how humans evolved from apes are just products of our imagination, driven by prejudices and preconceptions.'¹¹

"A fascinatingly honest admission by a physicist indicates the passionate commitment of establishment scientists to naturalism. Speaking of the trust students naturally place in their highly educated college professors, he says: 'And I use that trust to effectively brainwash them...our teaching methods are primarily those of propaganda. We appeal—without demonstration—to evidence that supports our position. We only introduce arguments and evidence that supports the currently accepted theories and omit or gloss over any evidence to the contrary.'¹²

"Creationist students in scientific courses taught by evolutionist professors can testify to the frustrating reality of that statement. Evolution is, indeed, the pseudo-scientific basis of religious atheism, as Ruse pointed out. Will Provine at Cornell University is another scientist who frankly acknowledges this. 'As the creationists claim, belief in modern evolution makes atheists of people. One can have a religious view that is compatible with evolution only if the religious view is indistinguishable from atheism.'¹³

"Once again we emphasize that evolution is *not* science, evolutionists' tirades notwithstanding. It is a philosophical worldview, nothing more. Another prominent evolutionist comments as follows: '(Evolution) must, they feel, explain everything...A theory that explains everything might just as well be discarded since it has no real explanatory value. Of course, the other thing about evolution is that anything can be said because very little can be disproved. Experimental evidence is minimal.'¹⁴ Even *that* statement is too generous. Actual experimental evidence demonstrating true evolution (that is, macroevolution) is not 'minimal.' It is nonexistent!

"The concept of evolution as a form of religion is not new. In my book, *The Long War Against God*,¹⁵ I documented the fact that some form of evolution has been the pseudo-rationale behind every anti-creationist religion since the very beginning of history. This includes all the ancient ethnic religions, as well as such modern world religions as Buddhism, Hinduism, and others, as well as the 'liberal' movements in even the creationist religions (Christianity, Judaism, Islam).

"As far as the twentieth century is concerned, the leading evolutionist is generally considered to be Sir Julian Huxley, primary architect of modern neo-Darwinism. Huxley called evolution a 'religion without revelation' and wrote a book with that title (2nd edition, 1957). In a later book, he said: 'Evolution...is the most powerful and the most comprehensive idea that has ever arisen on earth.'¹⁶ Later in the book he argued passionately that we must change 'our pattern of religious thought from a God-centered to an evolution-centered pattern.'¹⁷ Then he went on to say that: 'the God hypothesis...is becoming an intellectual and moral burden on our thought.' Therefore, he concluded that 'we must construct something to take its place.'¹⁸

"That something, of course, is the religion of evolutionary humanism, and that is what the leaders of evolutionary humanism are trying to do today.

"In closing this summary of the scientific case against evolution (and, therefore, for creation), the reader is reminded again that all quotations in the article are from doctrinaire evolutionists. No Bible references are included, and no statements by creationists. The evolutionists themselves, to all intents and purposes, have shown that evolutionism is not science, but religious faith in atheism."

References

1. Morris, Henry M. "The Scientific Case Against Evolution—Part I," (Impact #330, December 2000), pp. i-iv.
2. Morris, Henry M. "The Scientific Case Against Evolution—Part II," (Impact #331, January 2000),

pp. i-iv.

3. Scott, Eugenie, "Fighting Talk," *New Scientist* (vol. 166, April 22, 2000), p. 47. Dr. Scott is director of the anti-creationist organization euphemistically named The National Center for Science Education.

4. Ericson, Edward L. "Reclaiming the Higher Ground," *The Humanist* (vol. 60, September/October 2000), p. 30.

5. Dawkins, Richards, replying to a critique of his faith in the liberal journal, *Science and Christian Belief* (vol. 7, 1994), p. 47.

6. Mayr, Ernst, "Darwin's Influence on Modern Thought," *Scientific American* (vol. 283, July 2000), p. 83.

7. Todd, Scott C., "A View from Kansas on the Evolution Debates," *Nature* (vol. 401, September 30, 1999), p. 423.

8. Ruse, Michael, "Saving Darwinism from the Darwinians," *National Post* (May 13, 2000), p. B-3.

9. Rifkin, Jeremy, "Reinventing Nature," *The Humanist* (vol. 58, March/April 1998), p. 24.

10. Lewontin, Richard, Review of *The Demon-Haunted World*, by Carl Sagan. In *New York Review of Books*, January 9, 1997.

11. Bowler, Peter J., Review of *In Search of Deep Time* by Henry Gee (Free Press, 1999), *American Scientist* (vol. 88, March/April 2000), p. 169.

12. Singham, Mark, "Teaching and Propaganda," *Physics Today* (vol. 53, June 2000), p. 54.

13. Provine, Will, "No Free Will," in *Catching Up with the Vision*, Ed. By Margaret W. Rossiter (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. S123.

14. Appleyard, Bryan, "You Asked for It," *New Scientist* (vol. 166, April 22, 2000), p. 45.

15. Morris, Henry M., *The Long War Against God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1989), 344pp.

16. Huxley, Julian, *Essays of a Humanist* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 125.

17. Ibid., p. 222.

18. Ibid.

Month In Review

Q "For thus says the Lord: 'Just as I have brought all this great calamity on this people [Judah] so I will bring on them all the good that I have promised them. And fields will be bought in this land of which you say, "It is desolate, without man or beast; it has been given into the hand of the Chaldeans." Men will buy fields for money, sign deeds and seal them, and take witnesses, in the land of Benjamin, in the places around Jerusalem, in the cities of Judah, in the cities of the mountains, in the cities of the lowland, and in the cities of the South; for I will cause their captives to return,' says the Lord."

–Jeremiah 32: 42-44

Q "Property is a mark of civilization."

–Ludwig von Mises

Q "The many blessings of a private-property system have never been properly analyzed, probably because of this peculiar history. It is a vast subject, and an introduction of this nature can only outline those benefits. But there are four great blessings that cannot easily be realized in a society that lacks the secure, decentralized, private ownership of goods. These are: liberty, justice, peace and prosperity. The argument of this book is that private property is a necessary (but not a sufficient) condition for these highly desirable social outcomes.

"Of these, the relationship between liberty and property is by now fairly well understood. Leon Trotsky long ago pointed out that where there is no private ownership, individuals can be bent to the will of the state, under threat of starvation. The Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman has said that "you cannot have a free society without private property." Yet this elementary truth was not understood a hundred years ago, when intellectuals began to think of private property as a dispensable institution. It was the practical experience of Communism that made all the difference. Those who lived under its tyranny soon understood that without property rights, all other rights mean little or nothing. Angels and spirits surely do not need property, but human beings have not yet attained that incorporeal state.

"Private property is a compromise between our desire for unrestricted liberty and the recognition that others have similar desires and rights. It is a way to be free, 'and yet secure from the freedom of others,' as the American University law professor James Boyle has written. Privacy these days is a much admired good, and American courts have discovered a right to it in the penumbras and emanations of the Constitution. Yet it is obvious that privacy

cannot be attained without an anterior respect for private property.

"Rights are held against the state, and property is an important bulwark against state power. Ownership in a society that protects and respects property will tend to be unequal, to be sure, and for over a hundred years property has been represented as an *expression* of power; but like all genuine rights, property rights protect the weak against the strong. Some early arrivals in the United States marveled that smallholders were as secure in their possession as the rich were in theirs. ('The law of the land is so constituted, that every man is secure in the enjoyment of his property,' a group of German settlers in Maryland said in 1763. '[T]he meanest person is out of reach of oppression from the most powerful.') Recent immigrants have been delighted to find that you can buy property in the United States without paying bribes. The call for secure property rights in Third World countries today is not an attempt to help the rich. It is not the property of those who have access to Swiss bank accounts that needs to be protected. It is the small and insecure possessions of the poor. This key point was well understood in the first and best of the social encyclicals of the Catholic Church. In *Rerum Novarum* (On the Condition of the Working Classes), published in 1891, Pope Leo XIII wrote that the 'fundamental principle of Socialism, which would make all possessions public property, is to be utterly rejected because it injures the very ones whom it seeks to help.'

–Tom Bethell, *The Noblest Triumph*, p. 9, 10

Q "[One looking at] Christian activities which are, in a sense, directed toward this present world...would find that this religion had, as a mere matter of historical fact, been the agent which preserved such secular civilisation as survived the fall of the Roman Empire; that to it Europe owes the salvation, in those perilous ages, of civilised agriculture, architecture, laws, and literacy itself. He would find that this same religion has always been healing the sick and caring for the poor; that it has, more than any other, blessed marriage; and that arts and philosophy tend to flourish in its neighborhood."

–C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q "But by any secular standard, Jesus is also the dominant figure of Western culture. Like the millennium itself, much of what we now think of as Western ideas, inventions and values finds its source or inspiration in the religion that worships God in his name. Art and science, the self and society, politics and economics, marriage and the family, right and wrong, body and soul—all have been touched and often radically transformed by Christian influence."

Q "The leading authorities of Secular Humanism may be pictured as the starting lineup of a baseball team: pitching is John Dewey; catching is Isaac Asimov; first base is Paul Kurtz; second base is Corliss Lamont; third base is Bertrand Russell; shortstop is Julian Huxley; left fielder is Richard Dawkins; center fielder is Margaret Sanger; right fielder is Carl Rogers; manager is 'Christianity is for losers' Ted Turner; designated hitter is Mary Calderone; utility players include the hundreds listed in the back of *Humanist Manifesto I* and *II*, including Eugenia C. Scott, Alfred Kinsey, Abraham Maslow, Erich Fromm, Rollo May, and Betty Friedan.

"In the grandstands sit the sponsoring or sustaining organizations, such as the American Humanist Association; the American Ethical Society; the American Ethical Union, Fellowship of Religious Humanists; Society for Humanistic Judaism; Humanist Society of Friends; the Center for Inquiry Institute; the American Civil Liberties Union; the Emergency Civil Liberties Union; the National Academy of Sciences; the National Center for Science Education, Inc.; National Association of Biology Teachers; National Organization of Women; Planned Parenthood; SEICUS; the National Education Association (and all state affiliates); the major television networks, high-profile newspapers, and news magazines, the U.S. State Department; the Department of Education; Ford Foundation; Rockefeller Foundation; Turner Foundation; Carnegie Foundation; Samuel Rubin Foundation; W. Alton Jones Foundation; Ploughshares Foundation; Merck Foundation; Playboy Foundation; Hewlett Foundation; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (and scores more); the League for Industrial Democracy; the United Nations; UNESCO; the World Federalist Association; the Fabian Society of Great Britain; the Frankfurt School; the left wing of the Democratic Party; the Democratic Socialists of America; Harvard University; Yale University; University of Minnesota; University of California (Berkeley); and two thousand other colleges and universities."

–Tim LaHaye and David Noebel, *Mind Siege*, p. 70, 71

□

Q "Many foundations had turned against the system that had made them possible, as Henry Ford II recognized when he quit the Ford Foundation board in disgust in 1977. 'In effect,' he wrote in his resignation letter, 'the foundation is a creature of capitalism, a statement that, I'm sure, would be shocking to many professional staff people in the field of philanthropy. It is hard to discern recognition of this fact in anything the foundation does. It is even more difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities, that are the beneficiaries of the foundation's grant programs.'

"Did Ford exaggerate? Not according to Robert Schrank, a Ford program officer during the 1970s and early 1980s. Schrank, a former Communist, recalls the 'secret anti-capitalist orientation' of his fellow program officers. 'People were influenced by the horror stories we Marxists had put out about the capitalist system,' he says; 'it became their guidance.'

"Naturally, Henry Ford's resignation had no effect; the doctrine of independence from the donor had taken full root. As McGeorge Bundy coolly remarked: 'He has a right to expect people to read his letter carefully, but I don't think one letter from anyone is going to change the foundation's course.' "

–Heather MacDonald, *The Burden of Bad Ideas*, p. 12

Q "Just two or three well chosen lines from the pen of the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein would be enough to stop a materialist dead in his tracks: 'What is good is also divine. Queer as it sounds, that sums up my ethics. Only something supernatural can express the Supernatural.' 'People keep forgetting to go right down to the foundations. They don't put the question marks down *deep* enough.' 'We feel that when *all possible* scientific questions have been answered, the problems of life remain completely untouched.' 'It is not how things are in the world that is mystical, but that it exists.'

–Edward T. Oakes, *First Things*, April 2001, p. 12

Q "A federal court has upheld the state motto, 'With God, all things are possible.'

"The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals overturned a previous decision from a three-judge panel. The court ruled nine to four that the motto is constitutional. That decision can be appealed.

"State attorneys argued that the motto is religion-neutral, but the ACLU argues that not only does the phrase, 'With God, all things are possible' come from the Christian Bible, but also it is a direct quote from Jesus Christ.

"In the court's ruling, Circuit Judge David A. Nelson writes the motto does not attempt to coerce people to one religion. 'It does not purport to compel belief or acquiescence. It does not command participation in any form of religious exercise. It does not assert a preference for one religious denomination or sect over others, and it does not involve the state in the governance of any church. It imposes no tax or other impost for the support of any church or group of churches. Neither does it impose any religious test as a qualification for holding

political office, voting in elections, teaching at a university, or exercising any other right or privilege. And, as far as we can see, its adoption by the General Assembly does not represent a step calculated to lead to any of these prohibited ends.' "

—*Ohio News Network*, March 17, 2001

Q "It started...Let's see, I think it started when Madeline Murray O'Hare complained she didn't want any prayer in our schools, and we said OK...Then someone said you better not read the Bible in school, the Bible that says thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, and love your neighbor as yourself. And we said, OK...

"Dr. Benjamin Spock said we shouldn't spank our children when they misbehave because their little personalities would be warped and we might damage their self-esteem. And we said, an expert should know what he's talking about so we won't spank them anymore...

"Then someone said teachers and principals better not discipline our children when they misbehave. And the school administrators said, no faculty member in this school better touch a student when they misbehave because we don't want any bad publicity, and we surely don't want to be sued. And we accepted their reasoning...

"Then someone said, let's let our daughters have abortions if they want, and they won't even have to tell their parents. And we said, that's a grand idea..

"Then some wise school board member said, since boys will be boys and they're going to do it anyway, let's give our sons all the condoms they want, so they can have all the fun they desire, and we won't have to tell their parents they got them at school. And we said, that's another great idea...

"Then some of our top elected officials said it doesn't matter what we do in private as long as we do our jobs. And agreeing with them, we said it doesn't matter to me what anyone, including the President, does in private as long as I have a job and the economy is good...

"And then someone said let's print magazines with nude pictures and call it wholesome down-to-earth appreciation for the beauty of the female body. And we said we have no problem with that...

"And someone else took that appreciation a step further and published pictures of nude children and then stepped further still by making them available on the Internet. And we said they're entitled to their free speech...

"And the entertainment industry said, let's make TV shows and movies that prompt profanity, violence, and illicit sex. And that encourages rape, drugs, murder, suicide, and satanic themes...And we said it's just entertainment, it has no adverse effect, and nobody takes it seriously anyway, so go right ahead...

"Therefore, now we're asking ourselves why our children have no conscience, why they don't know right from wrong, and why it doesn't bother them to kill strangers, their classmates, and themselves.

"Probably if we think about it long and hard enough, we can figure it out. I think it has a great deal to do with... 'We reap what we sow.' "

–Anonymous

Q "Adult-onset, ideologically-caused homosexuality—an increasingly important type which therapists rarely see and psycho-therapists have largely ignored—is described in the January 2, 2001 *New York Times*. In a Science section 'conversation with Anne Fausto-Sterling,' Anne is a formerly-married, now lesbian, professor of biology and women's studies at Brown University who works on human 'sexual plasticity.' She describes how her interest in gender issues, which began while she was married, led to her involvement in feminism, whose views about the relationship between the sexes—that men oppress women—'did what they did to lots of women in the 1970's: they infuriated me. My poor husband, who was a very decent guy, tried as hard as he could to be sympathetic. But he was shut out of what I was doing. The women's movement opened up the feminine in a way that was new to me, and so my involvement made possible my becoming a lesbian.' Her new status probably helped get her a 'women's studies' position at Brown. But she also added, 'I don't think loving a man is unimaginable.'

"Adolescent-onset, ideologically-caused homosexuality produces what Dr. Charles W. Socarides calls 'the Thanksgiving Massacre.' That's when youngsters come home in the middle of their first college semesters, to announce, often at the holiday dinner table, 'Hey, mom, hey dad! Be thankful? I have something to tell you. I'm gay!' This murders the hopes found in every family that their children be happily married with children of their own. These youngsters, away from home for the first time, have been seduced by a homosexual crowd 'that has taken on all the aspects of a cult.' And psychotherapy won't help them because, like the rest of that huge majority of homosexuals whom therapists never see, they do not want to change.

"Many colleges actively assist recruitment into homosexuality. At Harvard, for example, of which Dr. Socarides and I are both alumni ('43 and '42 respectively), a Presbyterian minister,

unaware of the fluidity of adolescent sexual feelings (whose changeability later in life Prof. Fausto-Sterling demonstrated), proclaimed his pride in helping 'those who are discovering that they are gay or lesbian, to help them understand that that's not an obstacle to their blessedness in God's eyes.'

"The university's chief minister (and Plummer Professor of Christian [sic] Morality, Rev. Peter Gomes, maintaining that God made him homosexual—although being celibate is his own choice—describes those opposing the legitimization of homosexuality as neurotic, religious bigots or stupid.

"Each Harvard dormitory had a designated gay tutor in 1995, when Dr. Socarides wrote his book. But the university's high point in legitimizing homosexuality was *Harvard Magazine's* January-February, 1998, cover article, "Gay Like Me," by Andrew Tobias ('68, M.B.A. '72), currently treasurer of the Democratic Party National Committee. Denying the fluidity of adolescent sexual feelings, Tobias celebrated (and the *Magazine* published) his claim that the homosexual feelings he had agonized over throughout his college years are 'the most natural thing in the world'—if you are born gay.

"The 'LUG phenomenon'—lesbian until graduation—is another example of the post-childhood college road to homosexuality. Co-eds date and have sex with other women, but only for four years. But after four years of same-sex sex, how ready will they be for heterosexual marriage? And having moved so often from one relationship to another, what's to make them stick with their men when they encounter the inevitable problems that come with any marriage?

"The ideological recruitment of college students and other adults into homosexuality is far more prevalent, and far more dangerous, than most people, including relatively conservative psychiatrists, realize. That's why those who consider sex as serious and even sacred, rather than trivial, who support passionate, faithful marriage and oppose promiscuity and homosexuality, must actively enter the political and media arena to proclaim the superior sexual joys of marriage and energetically rebut the lies about genetics and childhood experience by those who self-servingly claim that homosexuality is predetermined and inevitable."

—Nathaniel S. Lehrman, *Family Research Report*, Jan/Feb 2001, p. 1

Q "The recent ascension of yet another Beatles music anthology to the top of the charts coupled with numerous glowing and enthusiastic reviews for the restored re-release of their first motion picture, 'A Hard Day's Night,' is further evidence that America has, as of yet, to recover from the debilitating cultural blows which undermined it and the Western world

during the cataclysmic 1960s.

"Despite their shrewdly marketed public personas as innocent and fun-loving songsmiths and despite music which today seems relatively innocuous, the Beatles, nevertheless, were social revolutionaries. Many of their songs, often couched in cleverly worded lyrics, promoted vices such as drug use, encouraged promiscuity and frequently mocked Christianity, all of which, because of their immense popularity and influence led to the corruption and eventual ruination of countless lives.

"In an insightful and lively written book on the degenerate cultural impact of rock 'n' roll, Michael J. Matt discusses why the Beatles were not only successful, but describes what was at the heart of much of their music: 'Being more subtle than many rock bands, the Beatles were also more talented musically, and, thus, more effective. Their nihilism was packaged in catchy lyrics, encrypted poetry, quick, upbeat tunes, and a message that consisted of thinly veiled socialism and plenty of outright hedonism. Songs such as "Eleanor Ribgy" so defeatist, so cutting and demoralizing, were literally memorized by millions, and became worldwide hits for the Beatles...' [Michael J. Matt, *Gods of Wasteland: Fifty Years of Rock 'n' Roll* St. Paul: The Remnant Press, 2000, p. 54.]

"With such a mentality, and the ability to transmit it into the psyche of millions of young minds (and, apparently, today, older ones too), it is far from implausible to suggest that they and the rest of the popular music scene of the 1960s did more to undermine public morality than all of the judicial activism and welfare legislation enacted throughout the period. And without a conducive social atmosphere created by such music, it is doubtful that the sexual revolution and its perverse byproducts such as militant homosexuality and radical feminism would have ever flourished. Nor is it too far of a stretch to submit that the rampant moral corruption during the era paved the way for the triumph three decades later of the abominable Clinton-Gore administration.

"While initially there was criticism of the Beatles, their forerunners, and the more depraved acts that came in their wake, rock music has long since become accepted and incorporated in Western society. Although those on the right often rail against the more obscene rap lyrics and the antics of satanic rock acts, pop musicians have been praised by conservatives such as Ronald Reagan, and more troubling, have been treated as dignitaries by the current pope who has even presided over rock 'performances.'

"The left understood (and still does) that through mediums such as television, motion pictures, and music, they could accomplish their agenda despite setbacks in the political arena. While unsuccessful for a time in politics, they were, nevertheless, winning the important cultural battles and it was through the music of groups like the Beatles that society was gradually transformed. This is why the liberal-dominated press and media continue to fondly remember their silly movies and heap praise on their recycled greatest hits packages—

the Beatles were the foremost 'apostles' of the counterculture.

"Despite the fact that the Beatles are again reaping millions in new royalties, gaining another legion of adoring fans, and that the passage of time and the increased debauchery of rock 'n' roll has made them seem tamer, it does not change the essence of their music or all of the social havoc it induced. There is, thus, no need for those who seek a return to traditional society to celebrate their legacy; instead, the Beatles and the entire rock industry should be treated with scorn.

"While it is all well and good to debunk leftist icons, an alternative should also be offered. Happily, one can be readily found in the most sublime and inspirational form ever produced by man—classical music. Once the cultural enhancing works of such masters as Brahms, Beethoven, Bach, Palestrina, Mozart and Tchaikovsky are at the top of the charts, the Beatles and the rest of the rock 'n' roll era will be a distant and regrettable memory of a troubled time."

—James P. Philbin, *The Washington Times*, February 25, 2001, p. B5

Q "I was a liberal and a feminist. The chair of my department asked me to teach feminist philosophy, so I sent off for the textbooks thinking that they would be like other philosophy textbooks in which you would read pros and cons on controversial issues.

"You'd read about a philosopher who strongly believes in free will and one who strongly believes in determinism, so that a student comes away being able to argue both sides. The teacher's job was to give students a logical apparatus with which to analyze the arguments.

"That's what I thought feminist philosophy would be when I ordered those textbooks, expecting to examine arguments for and against abortion, affirmative action and surrogate motherhood. Instead, it was conspiracy theory about the patriarchy, and the articles were organized mutually to reinforce one another so that the student came away angry and paranoid about American society.

"One of their favorite themes was that America is a rape culture. Male hegemony is another, and that [women] are victims of a capitalist, heteropatriarchal, oppressive system. And that's fine, if you then have someone defend the capitalist heteropatriarchy. But they left that out.

"When I would debate my colleagues in philosophy it quickly would come down to disagreements about facts. They would claim that one in three American women is battered and that there are masses of women with eating disorders. They would give a picture of American society that was quite horrible and didn't fit with my experience and intuition.

When I started to check their facts, I found many of them to be wrong."

—Christina Hoff Sommers, *Insight*, March 12, 2001, p. 39

Q "The Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, internationally known for representing persecuted Christians around the world, died over the weekend at the age of 91 at his home in Southern California.

"He and his wife, Sabina, were both Jewish Romanians who converted to Christianity shortly after their 1936 marriage. But by the end of World War II, Romania had been taken over by communists. Starting in 1948, Mr. Wurmbrand was imprisoned for 14 years for leading an underground church and smuggling Bibles into Russia.

"Three of those years were in solitary confinement. The pastor learned Morse code during that time from another prisoner, who taught him through tapping on the wall. The pastor reciprocated by sharing the Gospel—in Morse code. His wife also was imprisoned for three years.

"The couple was allowed to leave Romania for the United States in the mid-1960s, and Mr. Wurmbrand's ensuing book, *Tortured For Christ*, became one of the first books to alert the West to what was taking place in communist prisons.

"He wrote other books and founded a ministry, Voice of the Martyrs, to publicize the persecution of Christians overseas.

"The Wurmbrands returned to Romania after the 1989 fall of the communist government where, they reported, their former prison was now a Christian bookstore.

"Mrs. Wurmbrand died last August at the age of 87. Mr. Wurmbrand's funeral is Saturday in Whittier, Calif."

—*The Washington Times*, February 21, 2001, p. A2

Q "Nelson Mandela has accused the African National Congress of being as intolerant and corrupt as South Africa's white leaders during the apartheid years.

"In an extraordinary attack on the country's black leaders yesterday, he said the party's

reputation had been tarnished by a series of financial scandals and abuses of power. Mr. Mandela said: 'Little did we suspect that our own people, when they got a chance, would be as corrupt as the apartheid regime. That is one of the things that has really hurt us.'

"Although Mr. Mandela stood down as president and ANC leader in 1999, he is one of the few people able to take a meaningful public stand against the government. With power becoming increasingly centralised under President Thabo Mbeki, who took over from Mr. Mandela, he said the ANC must ensure that 'the people in power are those who have credibility, who are clean'."

—Tim Butcher, *Electronic Telegraph*, March 3, 2001

