

January 2003



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we implore you on Christ's behalf, be reconciled to God. For He [God] made Him [Christ Jesus] who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him. 2 Corinthians 5:20, 21

From The President's Desk

The following commentary by Patrick J. Buchanan appeared on the WorldNetDaily.net site, November 25, 2002. Needless to say, Judge Moore needs our prayer and encouragement.

Since that fateful day Dwight Eisenhower named Earl Warren chief justice, the U.S. Supreme Court has been engineering a social revolution.

Seizing legislative power, the court legalized pornography, declared abortion a constitutional right, abolished the death penalty for a generation and prohibited a once-Christian people from paying public homage to their God. Yet, Americans have not rebelled.

Why not? Because they were raised to believe the court was the final judge of what the Constitution says, and to defy it is to dishonor the Founding Fathers. Andy Jackson would have hanged judges like Warren, Brennan, Blackmun and Douglas as high as Haman.

Missing in our 50-year struggle against judicial dictatorship has been a Sam Adams, with the courage and kidney to go down to the docks and toss His Majesty's tea into the harbor. But in the new chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court, we may have found such a man.

Roy Moore, a Vietnam vet, was lately a judge in Etowah County. Presented a carving of the Ten Commandments, Moore proudly hung the plaque in his courtroom, where it attracted the horrified notice of the ACLU, which found a federal judge to order Moore to take it down.

If the feds want this plaque down, said Moore, tell them to send U.S. Marshals to tear it down. Moore's defiance was electrifying. And Gov. Fob James backed Moore up, saying that if the feds sent in marshals, he, his state troopers and the Alabama National Guard would meet them on the courthouse steps.

The prospect of Janet Reno leading units of the 82nd Airborne to Etowah County to rip the Ten Commandments off a courtroom wall was exhilarating. But a higher court averted a showdown by ruling the plaque could stay.

Moore was a hero across Alabama, and decided to run for chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court. Moore won. And the night before he took the oath, he had moved into the rotunda of the judicial building in Montgomery a 5,300-pound block of granite on which was carved the Ten Commandments Moses brought down from Mount Sinai.

Moore's coup stunned Morris Dees, the McGovernite fund-raiser who runs a racket called the Southern Poverty Law Center. Dees went to court to demand that the commandments be purged. "This monument was snuck in during the middle of the night, and they can sneak it out just as easily," he ranted. 'It's a gross violation of the rights of the citizens of Alabama.' Since the citizens of Alabama elected Moore and nobody elected Dees, it would seem Dees speaks only for the usual minority of malcontents.

Unfortunately for Dees, a copy of a confidential letter he sent to a fellow attorney in the case was mailed to the counsel for Moore. In it, Dees revealed himself as a Christian-basher. 'You might remember that from the start,' he wrote his colleague, 'was laying our trial theme—i. e., how this was the act of a lone religious nut in partnership with a fanatical church.'

The 'nut' is Justice Moore. The 'fanatical church' is Coral Ridge Ministries of TV evangelist Dr. James Kennedy. But Dees did find a like-minded U.S. judge, Myron Thompson, who has ordered Judge Moore to remove the commandments within 30 days. Wrote Thompson, 'The court is impressed that the monument and its immediate surroundings are, in essence, a consecrated place, a religious sanctuary, within the walls of the courthouse.'

Moore has appealed Thompson's ruling, and the granite block with the carving of the commandments remains in the rotunda as the Dec. 17 deadline for its removal approaches. The stage is set for a constitutional confrontation.

If Moore refuses to remove the monument, and both sides go up to the Supreme Court, the issue will come down to this: Either the Supreme Court will back Moore and the Ten Commandments will remain in the rotunda or the court will give a final order to remove the Ten Commandments.

If the judge refuses, U.S. marshals may be ordered to go in and remove the monument. Would Bush instruct U.S. marshals to carry out such an order? Would Alabama Gov. Bob Riley follow Fob James and send the Alabama National Guard to impede the marshals?

Would Bush federalize the Alabama Guard or send in U.S. troops to take down the Ten Commandments from the rotunda in Montgomery, with thousand of Christians roaring their enraged opposition?

This one is going down to the wire. And for once, Christians and traditionalists have a champion willing to put himself on the line. The next civil-rights revolution in America may be Christians standing up to an anti-Christian bigotry that has captured the third branch of the American government.”

Month In Review

Q “But I do not want you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who have fallen asleep, that you sorrow as others who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so God will bring with Him those who sleep in Jesus.

“For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain until the coming of the Lord will by no means precede those who are asleep. For the Lord Himself will descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trumpet of God. And the dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And thus we shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And thus we shall always be with the Lord. Therefore comfort one another with these words.”

—1 Thessalonians 4:13-18

Q “It seems to me impossible to retain in any recognizable form our belief in the Divinity of Christ and the truth of the Christian revelation while abandoning, or even persistently neglecting, the promised, and threatened, Return. ‘He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead,’ says the Apostles’ Creed. ‘This same Jesus,’ said the angels in Acts, ‘shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven.’ ‘Hereafter,’ said our Lord himself (by those words inviting crucifixion), ‘shall ye see the Son of Man...coming in the clouds of heaven.’ If this is not an integral part of the faith once given to the saints, I do not know what is.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The World’s Last Night*

Q “Voltaire, the French infidel, was more honest than some modern ‘Christian’ preachers. When he received a letter from a man who said he had ‘succeeded in getting rid of the idea of hell,’ Voltaire replied, ‘Congratulations—I wish I could.’ ”

Q “The professor of naturalism [Secular Humanism] rejoicing in the display of his dialectical resources is like a voyager, pacing at his own pleasure up and down the ship’s deck, who should suppose that his movements had some important share in determining his position on the illimitable ocean. And the parallel would be complete if we can conceive such a voyager pointing to the alertness of his step and the vigour of his limbs as auguring well for the successful prosecution of his journey, while assuring you in the very same breath that the vessel, within whose narrow bounds he displays all this meaningless activity, is drifting he knows not whence nor whither, without pilot or captain, at the bidding of the shifting winds and undiscovered currents.”

—Arthur J. Balfour, *Theism and Humanism* (1914), Inkling Book, Seattle, 2000

Q “There are some who think that the achievement sung by Lucretius [DeRevam Natura] is lessened by showing that the ancients who believed in atoms had no experimental warrant for their convictions. And this is perfectly true. They had not. Nor had Bacon, nor Gassendi, nor Hobbes, nor Boyle, nor Newton. But this only brings into clearer relief the point I desire to emphasize. If experience did not establish the belief, whence came it? If it represents nothing better than an individual guess, why did it appeal so persistently to leaders of scientific thought, and by what strange hazard does it turn out to be true? It is certainly curious that Tyndall, in a once famous address to the British Association at Belfast, should have sketched the story from Democritus to Lucretius, and from Lucretius to 1874, without ever putting these questions to his audience, or, so far as I know, to himself.”

—Arthur J. Balfour, *Theism and Humanism* (1914), Inkling Book, Seattle, 2000

Q “But the man-moulders of the new age will be armed with the powers of an omniscient state and an irresistible scientific technique: we shall get at last a race of conditioners who really can cut out all posterity in what shape they please...

“The Conditioners, then, are to choose what kind of artificial Tao they will, for their own

good reason, produce in the Human race. It is not that they are bad men. They are not men at all. Stepping outside the Tao they have stepped into the void.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*

Q “Here [in Secular Humanism] are all the elements for a religious faith that shall not be confined to sect, class, or race. Such a faith has always been implicitly the common faith of mankind. It remains to make it explicit and militant.”

—John Dewey, *A Common Faith* [1934], p. 87

Q “As Colin Russell tells it in his book *Cross-Currents: Interactions Between Science and Faith*, the idea of a war between science and religion is a relatively recent invention—one carefully nurtured by those who hope the victor in the conflict will be science. In late nineteenth-century England, several small groups of scientists and scholars organized under the leadership of Thomas H. Huxley to overthrow the cultural dominance of Christianity—particularly the intellectual dominance of the Anglican church. Their goal was to secularize society, replacing the Christian worldview with scientific naturalism, a worldview that recognizes the existence of nature alone. Though secularists, they understood very well that they were replacing one religion by another, for they described their goal as the establishment of the ‘church scientific.’ Huxley even referred to his scientific lectures as ‘lay sermons’.”

—Nancy R. Pearcey and Charles B. Thaxton, *The Soul of Science*, p. 19

Q “A few years ago, the eminent Harvard political scientist Samuel Huntington published in *Foreign Affairs* a widely noted article called ‘The Clash of Civilizations.’ Looking at contemporary international relations from a geopolitical vantage point, he predicted a clash of the world’s major civilizations: the West, the Islamic world and the Confucian East. Huntington’s article provoked a response from one of his own most brilliant former students—Swarthmore’s James Kurth. In an article in the *National Interest* entitled ‘The Real Clash’, Kurth argued persuasively that the clash that is coming—and that has, indeed, already begun—is not so much among the world’s great civilizations as it is within the civilization of the West, between those who claim the Judeo-Christian worldview and those who have abandoned that worldview in favor of the ‘isms’ of contemporary American life—feminism, multiculturalism, gay liberationism, lifestyle liberalism—what I here lump together as a family called ‘the secularist orthodoxy’.”

—Robert P. George, *The Clash of Orthodoxies*, p. 3

Q “One day while browsing through a library in Colorado Springs, [Julian]Huxley came across some essays by Lord Morley in which he found these words: ‘The next great task of science will be to create a religion for humanity.’ Huxley was challenged by this vision. He wrote, ‘I was fired by sharing his conviction that science would of necessity play an essential part in framing any religion of the future worthy of the name.’ Huxley took up Morley’s challenge to develop a scientific religion. He called it ‘Evolutionary Humanism’.”

—Norman L. Geisler, *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, p. 346

Q “[Walt] Whitman and [John] Dewey were among the prophets of this civic religion. They offered a new account of what America was, in the hope of mobilizing Americans as political agents. The most striking feature of their redescription of our country is its thoroughgoing secularism. In the past, most of the stories that have incited nations to projects of self-improvement have been stories about their obligations to one or more gods. For much of European and American history, nations have asked themselves how they appear in the eyes of the Christian God. American exceptionalism has usually been a belief in special divine favor, as in the writings of Joseph Smith and Billy Graham. By contrast, Elijah Muhammad and Leslie Marmon Silko are examples of inverted exceptionalism: in their visions, white America will be the object of special divine wrath.

Dewey and Whitman wanted Americans to continue to think of themselves as exceptional, but both wanted to drop any reference to divine favor or wrath.”

—Richard Rorty, *Achieving Our Country*, p. 15

Q “Postmodernism has provided an environment that is more accepting of supernatural belief. But this environment has not stopped the leaky pipe of Christianity—the leak that resists the Teflon paste and waterproof tape and just keeps dripping. Even as the reservoirs of the faithful keep rising, the seepage continues—a steady dribble that no postmodern plumbers’ compound can remedy. Indeed, in this era of postmodern spirituality, which ranges from New Age fuzziness to charismatic fervor, old-fashioned orthodoxy might almost appear reasonable. But skeptics of the humanistic bent are not impressed by a reasonable religious belief. And despite all the eulogies to ‘secular humanism’ and scientific naturalism,

modernism is not dead and postmodernism has not taken its place. Humanism is alive and well. And this philosophical creed continues to be, I would argue, the underlying reason for walking away from faith.”

—Ruth A. Tucker, *Walking Away from Faith*, p. 16

Q “The [Secular] humanistic system of values has now become the predominant way of thinking in most of the power center of [American] society. It has outstripped Judeo-Christian precepts in the universities, in the news media, in the entertainment industry, in the judiciary, in the federal bureaucracy, in business, medicine, law, psychology, sociology, in the arts, in many public schools and, to be sure, in the halls of Congress. Indeed, the resources available to secular humanists throughout society are almost unlimited in scope, and they are breaking new ground almost every day.”

—James C. Dobson, *Children At Risk*, p. 22

Q “There is an anti-American credo, which abhors American political and governmental institutions and this nation’s capitalistic economy. Their value system is at war with Judeo-Christian tradition upon which this country was founded and is centered in Secular Humanism and moral relativism.”

—Rush H. Limbaugh III, *The Way Things Ought To Be*, p. 261

Q “Still, deconstructing Western civilization remains a central mission of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Its professors regularly denounce Eurocentrism and competition, and students sign up for popular courses like ‘Education for Social and Political Change.’ A recent conference on student research featured a panel discussion on the topic ‘Cuban Education: Our Role Model?’”

—Joyce Milton, *The Road to Malpsychia*, p. 257

Q “Christianity was the main historical rival of Epicurean materialism after the first century A.D., and it was largely responsible for driving it underground by the time of the fall of the

Roman Empire. When Epicureanism was revived in the Renaissance, the two immediately resumed their battle....So, whether we are Christians or not, it is simply a historical fact that the shape of our scientific and moral debates over the last half millennium can only be understood as the result of the two principal antagonists, Christianity and Epicureanism.”

—Benjamin Wiker, *Moral Darwinism*, p. 28

Q “In the United States of America, our traditional, Western, Judeo-Christian culture is collapsing. It is not collapsing because it failed. On the contrary, it has given us the freest and most prosperous society in human history. Rather, it is collapsing because we are abandoning it. Starting in the mid-1960s, we have thrown away the values, morals, and standards that define traditional Western culture. In part, this has been driven by cultural radicals, people who hate our Judeo-Christian culture. Dominant in the elite, especially in the universities, the media, and the entertainment industry, the cultural radicals have successfully pushed an agenda of moral relativism, militant secularism, and sexual and social ‘liberation’.”

—William S. Lind, et. Al., *Marine Corps Gazette*, December 1994, p. 37

Q “How did the West decline from its triumphal march to its present sickness? ...The mistake must be at the root, at the very basis of human thinking in the past centuries. I refer to the prevailing Western view of the world which was first born during the Renaissance and found its political expression starting in the period of the Enlightenment. It became the basis for government and social science and could be defined as rationalistic humanism, or humanistic autonomy: the proclaimed and enforced autonomy of man from any higher force above him.”

—Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *A World Split Apart*, p. 11

Q “As humanism in its development became more and more materialistic, it made itself increasingly accessible to speculation and manipulation, at first by socialism and then by Communism. So that Karl Marx was able to say in 1844 that ‘Communism is naturalized humanism.’ This statement turned out to be not entirely meaningless. One does see the same stones in the foundations of a despiritualized humanism and of any type of socialism: endless materialism; freedom from religion and religious responsibility, which under Communist regimes reaches the stage of anti-religious dictatorship; concentration on social structures, with a seemingly scientific approach (this is typical of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth

century and of Marxism)...If humanism were right in declaring that man is born to be happy, he would not be born to die. Since his body is doomed to die, his task on earth evidently must be of a more spiritual nature. It cannot be unrestrained enjoyment of everyday life. It cannot be the search for the best ways to obtain material goods and then cheerfully get the most out of them. It has to be the fulfillment of a permanent, earnest duty, so that one's life journey may become an experience of moral growth, so that one may leave life a better human being than one started it. It is imperative to review the table of widespread human values....If the world has not come to its end, it has approached a major turn in history, equal in importance to the turn from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. It will exact from us a spiritual upsurge, we shall have to rise to a new height of vision to a new level of life where our physical nature will not be cursed as in the Middle Ages, but even more importantly, our spiritual being will not be trampled upon as in the Modern Era.”

—Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *A World Split Apart*, p. 12, 13

Q “The fundamentalist parents [i.e., Christians] of our fundamentalist students think that the entire ‘American liberal Establishment’ is engaged in a conspiracy....These parents have a point....When we American college teachers encounter religious fundamentalists, we do not consider the possibility of reformulating our own practices of justification so as to give more weight to the authority of the Christian scriptures. Instead, we do our best to convince these students of the benefits of secularization....Rather, I think these students are lucky to find themselves under the benevolent Herrschaft of people like me, and to have escaped the grip of their frightening, vicious, dangerous parents.”

—Richard Rorty, *Rorty and His Critics*, p. 21, 22

Q “The most influential educators of our time—John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, George Counts, Harold Rugg, and the lot—are out to build a New Social Order....There is not enough room, however, for the New Social Order and religion....It clearly won't do, then, to foster within some schools a respect for an absolute, intractable, unbribable God, a divine Intelligence who is utterly unconcerned with other people's versions of truth and humorlessly inattentive to majority opinion. It won't do to tolerate a competitor for the allegiance of man. The State prefers a secure monopoly for itself. It is intolerably divisive to have God and the State scrapping for disciples. Religion, then, must go....The fight is being won. Academic freedom is entrenched. Religion is outlawed in the public schools. The New Social Order is larruping along.”

—William F. Buckley, *Let Us Talk of Many Things*, p. 9, 10

Q “An interesting, quite recent form of superbly done Machiavellianism occurred in the seven-part series *Evolution* aired on PBS in September 2001. It was designed as an extended propaganda campaign on behalf of evolution, ready to ship afterward in video form with teacher packets to every school in the nation. The soothing message: evolution and religion can co-exist happily (as long as religion behaves and does not question the doctrines of evolution). Materialists Richard Dawkins and Daniel Dennett both appear in this series, neither breathing a word of their true beliefs about the effect of Darwinism on religion—that, of course, would have caused a strong public reaction against the doctrine of evolution. Dawkins, of course, believes that the doctrine of evolution leads directly (and happily) to atheism, so that ‘Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist.’ As mentioned previously, Dennett celebrates Darwinism as a ‘universal acid’ which ‘eats through just about every traditional concept’ with the happy result that religion is on the way to becoming a mere cultural artifact, to be preserved as long as it remains toothless. Their contrived silence on PBS’s documentary was pure Machiavellianism. (Alas, when the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were attacked by terrorists on September 11—just prior to the airing of the series—Dawkins could not contain himself, and rallied against the ‘faith-heads,’ each equipped, thanks to religion, with an ‘afterlife-obsessed suicidal brain,’ manifesting the true evil of all religion ‘of the Abrahamic kind’ that ‘teaches the dangerous nonsense that death is not the end.’ The world will only be safe, asserted Dawkins, when everyone is a materialist, rejecting any notion of an afterlife. This was a rather embarrassing public relations slip for PBS, but it shows us the Machiavellian two-platoon strategy quite clearly.)”

—Benjamin Wiker, *Moral Darwinism*, p. 149, 150

Q “The first thing to see, as I said before, is that Christianity is indeed engaged in a conflict, a battle. There is indeed a battle between the Christian community and the forces of unbelief. This contest or battle rages in many areas of contemporary culture—the courts, in the so-called media and the like—but perhaps most particularly in academia.

“You may have noticed that at present the Western Christian community is located in the twentieth-century Western world. We Christians who go on to become professional scientists and scholars attend twentieth-century graduate schools and universities. And questions about the bearing of Christianity on these disciplines and the questions within them do not enjoy much by way of prestige and esteem in these universities. There are no courses at Harvard entitled ‘Molecular Biology and the Christian View of Man.’ At Oxford they don’t teach a course called ‘Origins of Life from a Christian Perspective.’ One can’t write his Ph.D. thesis on these subjects. The National Science Foundation won’t look favorably on them. Working on these questions is not a good way to get tenure at a typical university; and if you are job

hunting you would be ill-advised to advertise yourself as proposing to specialize in them. The entire structure of contemporary university life is such as to discourage serious work on these questions.

“This is therefore a matter of uncommon difficulty. So far as I know, however, no one in authority has promised us a rose garden; and it is also a matter of absolutely crucial importance to the health of the Christian community. It is worthy of the very best we can muster; it demands powerful, patient, unstinting and tireless effort. But its rewards match its demands; it is exciting, absorbing and crucially important. Most of all, however, it needs to be done. I therefore commend it to you.”

—Alvin Plantinga, *Intelligent Design Creationism and Its Critics*, ed. Robert T. Pennock, p. 140-142

Q “On Thanksgiving day, Huxley, as the convocation speaker, declaimed: ‘Evolutionary man can no longer take refuge from his loneliness in the arms of a divinized father-figure whom he has himself created, nor escape from the responsibility of making decisions by sheltering under the umbrella of Divine Authority....’ He added that ‘evolutionary truth’ would free humans from ‘subservient fears’ and show the way to ‘our destiny and our duty’. It was quite like Sir Julian to go on in this way, in flowery secular-humanist rhetoric, but in the American Midwest his ‘secular sermon’ (delivered in a chapel!) did not go down particularly well, especially with the press, and Huxley’s atheism and the general Darwinist pep rally were noted darkly by a small group of outraged evangelicals. A stream of anti-evolution literature followed, notably John C. Whitcomb and Henry Morris’s *The Genesis Flood*, the forerunner of the ‘scientific creationism’ movement, which in another three decades would pounce hungrily on the flaws in Kettlewell’s experiments.

“It was fitting that the full mythologization of the peppered moth should have coincided with the centennial year, for Kettlewell’s experiment brought evolution to life in a fashion so simple even a schoolchild could grasp it. When the article ‘Darwin’s missing evidence’ by H. B.D. Kettlewell appeared in *Scientific American* in the same year, the peppered moths came to the attention of a popular audience in America for the first time. The catch-phrases coined in this article—‘evolution in action’ and ‘Darwin’s missing evidence’—would inevitably be repeated verbatim in hundreds of other articles, and in textbooks. ‘Had Darwin observed industrial melanism he would have seen evolution occurring not in thousands of years but in thousands of days—well within his lifetime,’ the article concluded. ‘He would have witnessed the consummation and confirmation of his life’s work.’ ”

—Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men*, p. 167, 168

Q “The 5 November 1998 issue of *Nature*, in a review written by Jerry A. Coyne, professor of ecology and evolution at the University of Chicago, of a new book by Michael E.N. Majerus. The book, called *Melanism: Evolution in Action*, was a watershed event. Methodically and incisively analyzing every flaw in Kettlewell’s experiments and in the industrial melanism paradigm, Majerus’s book left no doubt that the classic story was wrong in almost every detail. Peppered moths, if left to their own devices, surely do not rest on tree trunks; bird vision is nothing like human vision; Kettlewell was wrong about how peppered moths choose their resting sites; the high densities of moths he used may have skewed the results; the method of release was faulty, and on and on. The various predation and survey studies conducted after Kettlewell have not replicated his results particularly well, and other ‘factors’ kept having to be invoked to squeeze the data into the standard industrial melanism model. ‘The findings of [scientists since Kettlewell],’ Majerus concluded, ‘show that the precised description of the basic peppered moth story is wrong, inaccurate, or incomplete, with respect to most of the component parts.’

“The reader who makes his way through Majerus’s mountains of evidence is rather stunned to arrive at his verdict: that the basic story, while ‘undoubtedly more complex and fascinating than most biology textbooks have space to relate’, is perfectly fine. ‘My view of the rise and fall of the melanic peppered moth is that differential bird predation in more or less polluted regions, together with migration, are primarily responsible, almost to the exclusion of other factors.’

“Jerry Coyne, however, was ‘horrified’. The sheer magnitude of the problems itemized in the book filled him with dismay and something like shame. After all, he too had been teaching the ‘standard Biston story’ for years. When he dug out Kettlewell’s original papers he found that things were even worse than he thought. How was it that the experiment that Coyne called the ‘prize horse in our stable of examples’ had been accepted unquestioningly at this time?”

—Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men*, p. 283, 284

Q “This organization [American Humanist Association] is not required to file an annual return with the IRS because it is a religious organization.”

—Guide Star Pages in *Free Inquiry*, Fall 2002, p. 40

Q “God is a communicating God. He is the Word (John 1:1), and, in the form of Jesus Christ, ‘the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us’ (John 1:14). The Word created all things (John 1:3), and by His command all things came to be (Ps. 148:5). Since God seeks to be known in those things that are made, it is not surprising that evidence of a communicating being should be seen throughout His creation. Perhaps nowhere is this more obvious than in the structure of DNA.

“All human languages involve at least five characteristics: (1) hierarchal coding, (2) emergent modularity, (3) linguistic structure, (4) sending mechanisms, and (5) receiving mechanisms. Each of these will be considered in sequence.

“First, language utilizes a code. In English, for example, twenty-six letters form the building blocks of the language. A particular order of letters will ‘code’ for a word. The building blocks differ in different languages, but in every case they are placed in a particular order to code for some word. Language codes don’t just stop there, however. They are also hierarchal. A particular sequence of words is strung together to code for a particular phrase or an idea, and a particular sequence of phrases is strung together to code for a complete thought. Complete thoughts are strung together in a specified way to code for a full argument. At each level there is coding for a higher level.

“The DNA molecule has hierarchal coding as well. DNA includes a string of four different nucleotides (guanine, cystosine, adenine, and thymine)—the building blocks of DNA— analogous to the three building blocks of Morse Code (dots, dashes, and gaps). The four nucleotides of DNA are arranged in sequences of three (called codons) to code for the twenty or so amino acids used in living organisms— analogous, again, to Morse Code coding for the twenty-six letters of the English alphabet. This characteristic of DNA is so much like language that it is commonly called the ‘genetic code,’ and the name codon is given to the set of three nucleotides that codes for a particular amino acid.”

—Kurt P. Wise, *Faith, Form, and Time*, p. 99, 100

Q “Most organisms cannot get the atmosphere’s nitrogen gas to enter into any chemical reactions. Instead, God created some of the single-celled organisms in the world to be capable of breaking the powerful bonds of nitrogen molecules. In the process they produce nitrates as waste products—wastes that become the needed fertilizer for other organisms. Oxygen—so needed by animals—is actually a waste product of photosynthesis.

“A closer examination of a cell reveals complex structures. Cell membranes surround all cells, providing protection and allowing only certain things in and out of the cell. Genetic information for repairs, reproduction, and the building of cellular structure is stored in DNA

molecules. More complex organisms have more DNA, and they pack it tightly into specially designed chromosomes. Every cell stores its DNA in a special region. In more complex organisms this region is protected with a specially-designed membrane (nucleus). Another region of each cell is devoted to producing ribosomes—the machines that construct amino acid chains from messenger RNA. Other regions of every cell are devoted to the folding and tagging of protein molecules. More complex organisms cordon off those sections of the cell with membranes (endoplasmic reticulum and golgi bodies) to increase efficiency of production.

“Every cell also has structures designed to extract energy from the environment. More complex organisms—requiring proportionately more energy—concentrate the energy extraction in special structures surrounded by their own membranes and containing some of their own DNA. These include mitochondria for extracting energy from glucose sugar and chloroplasts for extracting energy from the sun.

“A closer examination of cells reveals even more complexity. Each of the processes of the cell involves complex chemical reactions. The unwinding, unzipping, copying, re-zipping, and rewinding of the DNA requires a complex set of chemical machinery. The process of modifying and transporting the messenger RNA to the ribosomes requires another complex set of chemical machinery. The creation of an amino acid chain, the folding of proteins, the tagging of proteins, the transport of proteins, the selection of molecules to be taken in and let out of the cell, and the processes of extracting energy from the environment—all these require complex machinery. Further machinery is needed for the cell to assume and change its shape, to move, and to ingest items from outside the cell. The complexity, beauty, and elegance of these molecular systems is awesome and stunning.

—Kurt P. Wise, *Faith, Form, and Time*, p. 105, 106

Q “Priestly sex scandals in the U.S. Catholic Church were few and far between before seminaries began accepting homosexuals in the 1960s. The homosexual population of the U. S. is estimated at between 2 and 10%. Homosexuals in the priesthood are now estimated to be between 30 and 60%. A major study conducted by The Kansas City Star found that ‘priests are dying of AIDS at a rate at least four times that of the general U.S. population....’

“Is celibacy the culprit? No. The Times of London found that priests in the (Anglican) Church of England are dying of AIDS at a rate roughly 2 to 3 times greater than Catholic priests in the U.S.! Note well: The Church of England has always allowed priest to marry.

“Not surprisingly, 90 to 98% of the publicized cases of priestly pedophilia committed by U.S. Catholic priests involve boys (whether prepubescent or post pubescent). Not all ‘gays’ are

pedophiles, but pedophilia—called ‘intergenerational love’ by homosexual subcultures—is part and parcel of the homosexual subculture, which places great emphasis on youthful physique and is notoriously promiscuous, and whose publications commonly carry themes of adult-child sex.

“How did a number of seminaries get flooded with homosexuals? Not only because many bishops and religious orders have allowed seminaries to admit homosexuals—in direct violation of Vatican policy—but because certain vocations directors and seminaries reject a candidate, not because he’s homosexual but because he’s ‘homophobic’—they also reject candidates deemed ‘rigid’ (a code word for orthodox).

“In certain seminaries, professors openly dissent from Catholic teaching on homosexuality, and homosexual behavior is protected. And those orthodox, morally straight seminarians who managed to get in under the radar and who object to the scandalous goings-on are persecuted or forced out. Meanwhile, sodomites are ordained priests, and they protect and promote one another, forming what is widely known as ‘the Lavender’ Mafia,’ extending even into episcopal ranks.

“Thanks to the media, the U.S. bishops have finally had to take a strong stand against ‘sexual abuse of minors.’ But so far the get-tough policy affects only some priestly violations of celibacy. It doesn’t affect ‘consensual’ sex with boys, or sex with men and other priests. As long as certain seminaries continue to be hothouses for flammers and promote the dissent that justifies immorality, sexual license in the priesthood will continue. But it must and will be stopped, if not by the bishops then by us the laity.

“We at the NEW OXFORD REVIEW, an orthodox Catholic monthly magazine run by laymen, don’t sweep scandal under the rug. We deal with it, and with all the issues of concern to local Catholics.

—NEW OXFORD REVIEW, Human Events, November 18, 2002