

June 2003



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

Then Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, "Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious; for as I was passing through and considering the objects of your worship, I even found an altar with this inscription: TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Therefore, the One whom you worship without knowing, Him I proclaim to you."

Acts 17:22-23

From The President's Desk

The U.S. Supreme Court is about to determine the legal status of sodomy (sex between males). The one sin that the apostle Paul says plagued the pagan world (Romans) is now about to be approved by America's highest court. Robert Bork's *Slouching Toward Gomorrah* has finally arrived. Sodomy is no longer in the suburbs, but right down town or mainstream.

While the homosexual defender (and they are legion) will protest, it is my conviction that going down the sodomy trail is a one-way street to perdition and the death of Western culture.

Likewise speaking to this disaster is the editor of *Human Events* in its April 7, 2003 edition. Says Terence P. Jeffrey:

"Not infrequently Antonio Scalia lights up the Supreme Court with a lightning bolt of common sense. He did it again last week during oral arguments in *Lawrence v. Texas*.

"This is the case that in determining whether homosexual behavior is a 'right' may explode the foundation of law.

“Famed Harvard lawyer Laurence Tribe wrote the brief submitted in the case by the American Civil Liberties Union. ‘Americans,’ he said, ‘have a fundamental right to be free from government regulation of consensual sexual conduct in the home.’

“Paul Smith, attorney for petitioners John Lawrence and Tyron Garner - who were fined \$200 in Houston for activities I will not describe here - restated the proposition in his own brief. ‘Among the liberties protected by the Constitution,’ he said, ‘is the right of an adult to make choices about whether and in what manner to engage in private consensual sexual intimacy with another adult, including one of the same sex.’

“Some may wonder why this issue is arriving only now in the Court. Didn’t we settle this long ago—like, say, in a Woodstock mud put? Isn’t “anything goes” sexuality official Baby Boom doctrine?

“We certainly don’t want police in our bedrooms do we?

Well, as lawyer Smith discovered, Justice Scalia missed all that rot.

“The lightning bolt of Scalia’s common sense crashed down on Smith as he was explaining that the problem with the Texas law banning homosexual conduct is that it represents an effort by the majority to impose their morality on the minority.

“ ‘But society always...makes these moral judgments,’ said Scalia. ‘Why is this different from bigamy?’

“Indeed, if people have a ‘right’ to ‘consensual sexual conduct in the home’ why can’t a man take two wives? Why not three? Why can’t everybody pick the conglomeration of consensual partners that suits their peculiar appetite? As long as it’s done in the home, not in the street, it’s a fundamental right. Right?

“Wrong, said lawyer Smith.

“Excuse me?

“Right there before God, man and Ruth Ginsburg, the lawyer arguing for ‘the right of an adult to make choices about whether and in what manner to engage in private consensual sexual intimacy’ conceded that some consensual arrangements could be prohibited. ‘Now, bigamy,’ he said, ‘involves protection of an institution that the state creates for its own purposes, and there are all sorts of potential justifications about the need to protect the institution of marriage that are different in kind from the justifications that could be offered here involving merely a criminal statute that says we’re going to regulate these peoples’

behaviors...’

“So here is the real proposition before the Court: If a man has sex with a man, he is expressing a right. If he has sex with two women, he is still expressing a right. But if he marries the two women first the state can punish him to protect matrimony.

“The current petitioners may believe this. But one suspects their bedfellows in the cause will soon be clamoring for logical consistency. They will give Scalia a straight answer. To his question: ‘Why is this different from bigamy?’ They will answer: It is not. Bigamy, too, is a fundamental right.

“Where does it end? Who can tell—given that a ruling for the petitioners could cause catastrophic collateral damage to the foundation of law itself? All men, said the Founders, ‘are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.’ If all consensual adult sex is one of those rights, either God gave it to us or the Founders were wrong and some force other than God is the author of our liberty.

“Seventeen years ago, in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, when Laurence Tribe first argued for this right, Justice Byron White, writing for the Court, said, ‘it would be difficult, except by fiat, to limit the claimed right to homosexual conduct while leaving exposed to prosecution adultery, incest, and other sexual crimes even though they are committed in the home. We are unwilling to start down that road.’

“Chief Justice Warren Burger scoffed at Tribe’s claim. ‘To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right,’ he said, ‘would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.’

“The power to do that resides now with five judges.”

Month In Review

Q Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was provoked within him when he saw that the city was given over to idols. Therefore he reasoned in the synagogue with the Jews and with the Gentile worshipers, and in the marketplace daily with those who happened to be there. Then certain Epicurean and Stoic philosophers encountered him. And some said, ‘What does this babbler want to say?’

“Others said, ‘He seems to be a proclaimer of foreign gods,’ because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection.

“And they took him and brought him to the Areopagus, saying, ‘May we know what this new doctrine is of which you speak? For you are bringing some strange things to our ears. Therefore we want to know what these things mean.’ For all the Athenians and the foreigners who were there spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing.

“Then Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, ‘Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious; for as I was passing through and considering the objects of your worship, I even found an altar with this inscription:

TO THE UNKNOWN GOD.

“Therefore, the One whom you worship without knowing, Him I proclaim to you: God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands. Nor is He worshiped with men’s hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things. And He has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and has determined their preappointed times and the boundaries of their dwellings, so that they should seek the Lord, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being, as also some of your own poets have said, “For we are also His offspring.” Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Divine Nature is like gold or silver or stone, something shaped by art and man’s devising. Truly, these times of ignorance God overlooked, but now commands all men everywhere to repent, because He has appointed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He has ordained. He has given assurance of this to all by raising Him from the dead.’ ”

—Acts 17: 16 - 31

Q The ancient man approached God (or even the gods) as the accused person approaches his judge. For the modern man the roles are reversed. He is the judge: god is in the dock. He is quite a kindly judge: if God should have a reasonable defense for being the god who permits war, poverty and disease, he is ready to listen to it. The trial may even end in God’s acquittal. But the important thing is that Man is on the Bench and God is in the Dock.”

— C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q A search of military and historic academic libraries has identified sixty-seven Prayer Books written for the benefit of our Armed Forces, and spanning four centuries. The dates of publication indicate that printings cluster around the wars in which American Armed Forces have served. Almost one third of the books were published during the Civil War. Fifteen were published during World War II. One WWII book, *The Service Prayer Book*, lists 239,500 printed from December 1940 to October 1942, including the 1st and 14th editions. The publishers we contacted were unable to give us additional information about print runs. Publishers were commercial companies, church affiliates, as well as the Government Printing Office.

The Prayer Book most frequently found in libraries was Daniel A. Poling's *Armed Forces Prayer Book*, published in 1951. This book contains prayers of our highest-ranking officers, with their reasons for selecting or writing the prayer they submitted. Based on the principle leadership by example, these prayers were compiled and edited by Daniel Poling for wide distribution to the ranks."

—Ronald D. Ray, Edna J. Turner, *VMI Amicus Curiae*, 4th Circuit Court of Appeals

Q The Alpha and the Omega of the Christian worldview is knowledge of God (2 Cor 2:14; 4:6; Eph 1:17; Col 1:10; 2 Pet 1:2-3, 8; 3:18) and a knowledge of the truth (1 Tim 2:4; 2 Tim 2:25; Titus 1:1). Above all, at the very center of a Christian worldview is the Lord Jesus Christ, 'in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge' (Col 2:3). Nothing can be fully understood if God is not known first.

"These beautiful words from the pen of Kate B. Wilkinson (1859-1928) should be reflected in every Christian's daily prayer regarding the use of his/her mind.

May the mind of Christ my Savior

Live in me from day to day,

By His love and pow'r controlling

All I do and say.

"By praying and then living this way, the Christian's mind will never be wasted but, rather, invested in glorifying God by bringing one's worldview into line with the worldview of God's Scripture. That is why all Christians are enjoined to 'think biblically!' and thus recover a Christian worldview."

—Richard L. Mayhue, *Think Biblically!*, p. 53

Q The paleontologist and cladist Henry Gee, a student of Colin Patterson, one of England's great Darwinian iconoclasts (who constantly questioned the scientific claims of Darwinism), has explained this new taxonomy as a necessary response to the insurmountable problem of Deep Time—that the distant past cannot be recounted. He wants to keep tree-of-life studies empirical, not wishful or speculative. 'Once we realize that Deep Time can never support narratives of evolution, we are forced to accept that virtually everything we thought we knew about evolution is wrong,' he writes. And that includes the very attempt to build a tree [of life] ...

“Understandably, the creationists have watched the cladistic revolution and the new genome frontier with interest and frequent amusement. First, the tree of life argues for absolute continuity, but its followers have gone over to cladistics, which seems to be saying that continuity, or ancestry, is no longer the realm of science. Thus, continuity looks philosophical, not empirical. Second, the molecular work in a cladistic context seems to point to the existence of genetic types—shades of the ‘kinds’ spoken of in Genesis. Suddenly, in the space age, the old-fashioned systems of Linnaeus and Cuvier, with their divine underpinnings and all, are beginning to look pretty good.”

—Larry Withan, *By Design*, p.182-183

Q Although retired from formal university duties, I was in no sense ‘on the shelf’. On the contrary, my work as an author and traveling lecturer was far more absorbing than anything I had done before the pivotal year 1988, when I first explored the gaping logical flaw in Darwinism. With the first publication of *Darwin on Trial* in 1991 I assumed the leadership of a tiny group of scholars sometimes called the Intelligent Design Movement, with a strategy we called the Wedge (explained in the introduction to my book *The Wedge of Truth*). Our bold claim was that scientific credence, when evaluated without an overwhelming bias toward materialism, does not support the Darwinian creation story that has effectively become a state supported religion in modernist culture. On the contrary, the evidence actually supports the supposedly discredited view that an intelligent designer outside of nature had to be involved in biological creation. Our major problem was not finding the evidence but getting our argument past the manmade philosophical barrier embedded in the very definition of science that forbids the consideration of evidence that may point to the role of an intelligent cause in biological creation. Nonetheless the evidence is there, and we needed only a fair opportunity to make our case.”

— Phillip E. Johnson, *The Right Questions*, p. 79, 80

Q On the contrary, our culture is more accurately described in Amaury de Riencourt's observation that—in our acceptance of androgyny and unisexual values, our emphasis on the

seductive attributes of women rather than their worthiness as mothers, our devaluing of maternity, our sanctioning of abortion, and our declining birth rate—we resemble the Greek and Roman Empires in their decline. Documenting how triumph of the first full-fledged feminist movement led Roman women to scorn childbearing as ‘unworthy of their talents,’ de Riencourt concludes that with the decline in marriages and fertility, Romans committed ethnic suicide. Similarly, Greece was described by Polybius in the second century B.C. as ‘subject to a low birthrate and a general decrease of the population...Men had fallen into such a state of luxury, avarice and indolence that they did not wish to marry, or, if they married, to rear the children born to them...and by small degrees cities became resourceless and feeble.’

“Totalitarian movements always seek to weaken family institutions so that men, women, and children will become equally subordinate to the State. De Riencourt has described how, from the Spartan dictatorship through Leninist Russia to the National Socialism of Hitler’s Germany, the patriarchal autonomous family was attacked as a dangerous barrier protecting individuals against an all-powerful government. Although their propaganda may stress family sanctity, as Christopher Lasch observed, totalitarian regimes depend on the ‘decay of patriarchal authority’; a society in which ‘the few tyrannize over the many’ follows the collapse of that familial authority. Unfurling its totalitarian colors, contemporary feminism has similarly feigned concern for families while denouncing as women’s worst enemy the patriarchal authority most likely to produce strong and enduring families.

“Today’s patriarchal decline under the aegis of a triumphant feminism has resulted in the sanctioning of single motherhood and its encouragement by the welfare system that has effectively displaced husband and father. This system recalls Margaret Mead’s discussion of the practice in Nazi Germany of rewarding illegitimacy with especially sunny nursing homes for mother and child, a step the state took towards complete severing of the male’s bond with woman and offspring. Thus Mead concluded, ‘The most successful large scale abrogations of the family have occurred not among simple savages, living close to the subsistence edge, but among great nations and strong empires.’

“To contemporary feminists, the traditional family is the same obstacle to women’s freedom and equality that Russian Bolsheviks believed it was to Communism.”

— F. Carolyn Graglia, *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief Against Feminism*, p. 277-278

Q To have convinced myself that market production was more gratifying than caring for my children, attending to the needs of my husband, and managing my home would have required me either to deceive myself about what I really did in the workplace or to value a job for its monetary rewards.

“That not all women flourish in the marketplace is evidenced by a female attorney’s description of her life, which appears in an article about a group commuting in a van to

Washington, D.C. It is an eighty mile round trip; in winter, they leave home in the dark and return in the dark; they see each other more than they see their spouses. What sounds to me like a trip from hell, however, is the highlight of the day for this woman. Her companions are ‘an alternate family’; her ‘hectic job leaves scant time for socializing at work’; she is ‘so weary’ at night that she often will just ‘collapse in front of the TV set.’ Watching the morning traffic grind to a halt, she observed: ‘This is the most exciting part of my day.’ ‘After this we all go sit in our little offices and wait patiently to get back in the van.’ Ah, what joyful liberation from domesticity! In all my years as a mother at home, not one day was so uninteresting that I would have looked forward to that van ride.”

— F. Carolyn Graglia, *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief Against Feminism*, p. 113-114.

Q Midge Decter has observed that a young woman embarked on sexual adventure usually seeks a man ‘who will play husband to her’. The participants, however, often have widely varying views of what their premarital sexual relationships imply. A 1975 survey conducted at a midwestern university disclosed that while eighty per cent of the women engaging in sexual intercourse hoped to marry their partner, only twelve per cent of the men shared this expectation. Young women should contemplate this study every day; nothing better demonstrates women’s willingness to deceive themselves as to men’s intentions.”

— F. Carolyn Graglia, *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief Against Feminism*, p. 199.

Q For anyone seeking to understand and challenge the feminist worldview, I cannot endorse *Domestic Tranquility* too highly. It is a superb analysis of issues surrounding feminism and nearly all her conclusions are well within the framework of a Christian worldview. Highly Recommended.

Q If there isn’t such a place already, there ought to be a Center for the Study of Studies. It seems from just a casual perusal of specialized Websites that there must be a hundred or so studies released each day that appear to have some bearing on human life. As often as not, one study contradicts another, and you begin to suspect over time that studies reveal nothing more than the researcher’s expectations.

“There are people who make a living—and a decent one, no doubt—gathering up and analyzing studies in a particular field. At the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in Cambridge, Mass., for instance, a group of researchers looked into climate studies for the last thousand or so years to get a fix on the century just past. They looked at 240 studies, representing the work of thousands of scientists.

“From this formidable array of information, Harvard-Smithsonian researchers concluded that the last century was not so hot. The world was generally warmer in the 500 years between 800 A.D. to 1300 A.D. than it was in the last century.

“Hello? Does this mean that the thousands of global-warming scare stories were bunk, and all the resultant legislation is just another of society’s self-inflicted headaches? Judge for yourself: After 1300, the world generally got colder, a cycle that ended about 1900. So, quite naturally, the world then got a little warmer than it had been for those last 600 years. We are talking natural cycles.

“The variety of data examined to reach this conclusion is most impressive and seems worth noting for the record: borehole data, cultural data, glacier advances/retreats, geomorphology, isotopic analysis from lake sediments or ice cores, tree or peat cellulose, corals, stalagmite or biological fossils, net ice accumulation including dust or chemical counts, lake fossils and sediments, river sediments, melt layers in ice cores, phenological and paleontological fossils, pollen, seafloor sediments, luminescent analysis, tree-ring growth and shifting tree-line position plus tree stumps in lakes, marshes and streams.

“It’s not the intention of this columnist to suggest that any sort of study or scientific finding justifies inundating ourselves in industrial smog and pollution. But shouldn’t those propagandizing kids and other gullible citizens with fears of becoming crispy critters due to man-made ‘global warming’ somehow be held accountable? Why is it illegal to threaten someone with a gun but okay to threaten them with junk science?”

— Insight Magazine, April 29 - May 12, 2003, p. 16,17

Q The Bush administration and a California school district yesterday asked the Supreme Court to reverse the federal appeal court ruling that banned the reciting in schools of the Pledge of Allegiance with the phrase ‘one nation under God.’

“Attorney General John Ashcroft, who vowed to ‘spare no effort to preserve the rights of all our citizens to pledge allegiance to the American flag,’ said that appeal filed yesterday afternoon defends centuries of tradition.

“ ‘Our government and people can acknowledge the important role religion has played in America’s foundation [and] history,’ as reflected by the national motto ‘In God We Trust,’ Mr. Ashcroft said.

“Solicitor General Theodore Olson told the high court the reference to God that congress added to the Pledge in 1954 does not amount to government promotion, or ‘establishment,’ of religion forbidden by the Constitution.

“ ‘Whatever else the Establishment Clause may prohibit, this court’s precedents make clear that it does not forbid the government from officially acknowledging the religious heritage, foundation and character of this nation,’ Mr. Olson wrote in a petition asking the court to hear

the government's appeal of a 2-1 decision by the 9th U.S. Court of Appeals.

“ ‘That is what the Pledge of Allegiance does. The Pledge is, therefore, constitutional,’ he said in papers filed in the names of federal officials and the Elk Grove, Calif., school district.

“The 9th Circuit court set off a nationwide furor when it ruled on June 26, 2003, that the Pledge itself was unconstitutional because it included the reference to God.

“That opinion was amended Feb. 28 to declare unconstitutional a California law requiring daily patriotic observances that may include the Pledge of Allegiance.

“But both opinions contain the same conclusion: ‘The statement that the United States is a nation “under God” is an endorsement of religion. It is a profession of religious belief, namely, a belief in monotheism.’

“Sacramento atheist Michael Newdow sued on grounds that his daughter, who was 8 at the time, should not have to hear the words ‘under God’ in the teacher’s recitation of the Pledge.

“The girl’s mother and legal custodian, Sandra Banning, objected to involving the child in the lawsuit and said the girl does not oppose God or the Pledge. The court did not let the mother withdraw the lawsuit, however.

“The California policy requiring teacher-led recitation every day with a reference to God ‘violates the Establishment Clause,’ the 9th Circuit said.

“Efforts to have an expanded ‘en banc’ review of that decision by an 11-judge panel of the 9th Circuit failed, but six of the nine judges who favored rehearing declared the original ruling ‘wrong, very wrong.’

“Their lengthy dissent in February said the judgment’s flawed reasoning also would consign ‘to the chopping block’ the Gettysburg Address, the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the fourth verse of ‘The Star-Spangled Banner.’

“Mr. Ashcroft listed those references yesterday and predicted the Supreme Court will see it his way.

“ ‘Two decisions of the Supreme Court have said without qualification that the Pledge is constitutional. No justice has expressed any other view,’ Mr. Ashcroft said.

“One of those decisions lets children who disagree with the Pledge stand silently while it is recited. Mr. Newdow said his daughter’s religious liberty was violated simply by hearing the Pledge recited in school, by an authority figure with the stamp of government approval.

“The 9th circuit agreed with that argument but enforcement of its ruling was put on hold pending Supreme Court action. A decision on whether to accept the case could come before the court’s summer recess in June, but a decision would not be likely before next winter.

“In rare cases, the high court summarily decides some cases without hearing them, which resolves matters more quickly. Mr. Olson suggested the court use that option in this case, because the ruling is so far out of bounds.

“If the court refused to take the case, the 9th circuit decision would take effect and block 9.6 million public school students in nine Western states from reciting the Pledge.

—Frank J. Murray, *The Washington Times*, May 1, 2003

Q ‘If the Supreme Court says that you have the right to have consensual sex within your home, then you have the right to bigamy, you have the right to polygamy, you have the right to incest, you have the right to adultery. You have the right to anything.’”

“Thus did Sen. Rick Santorum express his opinion that the U.S. Supreme Court should not overturn the Texas anti-sodomy laws, under which homosexual activity is still criminal misconduct.

“Within hours, Democratic leaders, Big Media and ‘gay’-rights groups had demanded that Santorum apologize or be purged from the Republican leadership, in the style of Trent Lott.

“As of this writing, Santorum is still being lashed with curses of ‘bigot’ and ‘homophobe,’ as he tries to explain himself. Erica Clayton, his spokesperson, says the senator ‘has no problem with gay, lesbian, or transgender individuals.’ Well, Erica, he does now.

“As with Lott and Jim Moran, these episodes—where politicians are hauled before a modern inquisition, scourged and ordered to grovel and apologize, or be stretched on the rack—are instructive. For they reveal the real balance of moral power in a society at any given time.

“What does the trashing of Santorum tell us? That America is well along into a post-Christian and even anti-Christian era.

“Consider. In his statement, Santorum expressed both a legal and moral opinion. In the legal opinion, Santorum is saying that if the court overturns the Texas anti-sodomy law, and declares that a right to privacy protects all consensual sexual activity by adults, then all other laws that outlaw consensual sexual laws against incest, adultery and bigamy—also go out the window.

“Santorum is dead right. Indeed, it was fear of that result that led the court to uphold the Georgia anti-sodomy law in the 1980s.

“The moral component in Santorum’s remark is that ‘gay’ sex—like adultery, bigamy, polygamy—is wrong. This happens to be the moral position of John Paul II, Supreme Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church to which Santorum belongs, and of most Americans.

“What, then is Santorum’s problem? It is this: The traditional Christian moral code in which he believes and which informed his remark is no longer the moral code of the American elite. Indeed, it is detested by that elite as the codification of hatred and intolerance.

“America’s cultural and moral elite is almost wholly converted to the doctrine enshrined in the Humanist manifestos of 1933 and 1973. These documents hold that all voluntary sexual relations are equal, all are moral, none should be criminalized and any state that does so is bigoted. Moreover, all anti-sodomy laws should be overturned, and if voters are too benighted to do so, the court should step in and do it for them.

“To most observers, it would seem that it is Santorum—the target of vilification and demands for his ouster because of his views—who is the real victim of intolerance here.

“And indeed he is. But in the new dispensation, where the left now defines what is moral, Christianity and its code of moral conduct are the objects of hatred. Any who try to enforce that code are, de facto, bigots and unqualified for secular leadership of our society.

“We are getting close to a religious test for high office, a test that no believing, practicing Christian is going to be able to pass. Indeed, we are becoming a society where Christians are going to discover that they are strangers in their own country.

“Not so long ago, ‘gay’-rights groups were considered to be agents of immorality, trying to alter laws to give their immoral conduct the sanction of law. Yet the right did not deny them a right to propagandize or expel out from office, except in the voting booth.

“The New Morality, however, like most triumphant belief systems, is deeply intolerant. It simply cannot abide being called immoral. Thus, it must persecute, punish and purge.

“The Democratic Party has capitulated to this revolution. As for the Republicans, they are still rooted in the old Christian morality. But when they blurt out the old truths, they find themselves having to explain what they meant. And, as they do, they must mouth all the idiot-pieties of the new morality about ‘diversity,’ and all lifestyles being equal, and having no real quarrel with homosexuals, etc. This will continue until the GOP surrender is complete.

“The savaging of Santorum shows that a bold expression of belief in the old Christian moral

code and its proscription—i.e., that homosexuality is unnatural and immoral, ruinous to body and soul, a mark of a decadent society—is now forbidden.

And as one watches ‘gay’-rights spokespersons hurling anathemas at conservatives, who are trying inarticulately to explain what they really mean, the America we grew up in is truly dead and gone.

—Patrick J. Buchanan, World Net Daily, April 28, 2003

Q Media organizations from CNN to the New York Times have all recently admitted to years of lying about conditions in Iraq under Saddam Hussein. They explain that they faced either losing ‘access’ or subjecting their Iraqi employees—and, of more relevancy, themselves—to Saddam’s torture chambers.

“Stipulating for purposes of argument that the media were performing a service to anyone other than Saddam Hussein by being his pimp, rather than just pulling out, it still leaves another devilish question. Why, then, were these same news organizations—CNN and the Times in particular—so insistent that the United States take no action to remove Hussein from power, knowing what they now admit they knew?

“Liberals learned to live with Iraqi citizens being fed into plastic shredders, summary executions, maimings and unanesthetized ear-loppings. Only now have they found something truly fiendish going on in Iraq: Christian missionaries are proselytizing! On the basis of the raw terror on display at the New York Times, I gather the operating theory is that Iraqis who withstood Saddam Hussein’s sadistic tyranny for 30 years will be unable to withstand a Christian missionary.

“I don’t know. Liberals have resisted Christianity pretty well. Christians are already a majority in America, and we can’t even stop public school teachers from passing out condoms to fourth-graders or prevent Hollywood from producing movies that portray Christians as marauding skinheads.

“But in the left’s doomsday scenario, Arabs who have been stewing in Islamic theology their entire lives could watch a 20-minute video on the life of Christ and convert en masse. God only knows what trouble that could lead to.

“Interestingly, absolutely everyone concedes that a lot of Muslims are going to have to convert to some new religion. That’s the point of the much-ballyhooed claim that terrorists and their sympathizers are not practicing ‘true Islam.’ Well, they think they are. Muslims who share Mohammad Atta’s religious beliefs as it pertains to infidels are bossily informed that they are incorrect and ordered to practice ‘true Islam.’ Only if a Christian mentions Jesus Christ, evidently, does it constitute imperialism.

“In fact, the ‘true Islam’ ruse is straight out of the imperialist’s handbook. When the British colonized India, they encountered such charming Hindu practices as ‘suttee,’ which involved throwing the widow on her husband’s burning funeral pyre. Instead of convincing the Hindus that this hideous practice was a priori wrong, the British went to great length to produce ancient Sanskrit texts proving that the natives were not practicing ‘true Hinduism.’

“As Anthony Pagden describes it in the book *Peoples and Empires*: ‘The British ransacked Sanskrit texts and questioned local religious leaders in an effort to discover a “purer” form of Hinduism’ that would match—as Pagden puts it—‘their own notions of “morality.”’ (Pagden, who has taught at Harvard and has written for the *New York Times*, would be finished as a respected academic if he ever expressed a personal view as to the morality of burning women alive.

As luck would have it, the governor general of India, Lord Bentinck, made the exciting discovery that suttee was just such a distortion of the original Sanskrit! He outlawed it in 1829, proclaiming that he had restored the Indians to ‘true Hinduism.’

“Similarly, when Napoleon occupied Egypt at the end of the 18th century, he imposed a predominantly French culture, claiming he was merely restoring the Egyptians’ true culture. (The only French custom that still survives is the aversion to bathing.) Indeed, Napoleon even declared that the French not the Muslim warriors he had overthrown, were the ‘true Muslims.’

“Liberals don’t mind pompously asserting that the terrorists are not practicing ‘true Islam’ and demanding conversion to a form of Islam closer to their own ‘morality’ (as per Pagden). Like the prim Lady-Do-Rightlys of Britain, they insist they are not destroying a religion, but rather restoring it to its proper understanding.

“Inarguably, anyone who views flying planes into the World Trade Center as a matter of religious devotion is going to have to get a new religion. Could we at least stop pretending that the British colonial office approach of pandering ‘true Islam’ is any less ‘imperialistic’ than Franklin Graham’s missionaries showing videos on the life of Christ?

“Throughout the history of empire-building, Christians were a constant thorn in the side of the conquerors and slave-traders. They quaintly insisted that, as Pagden puts it, the biblical command ‘Love thy neighbor as thyself’ should be a real deterrent against pillage and the unwarranted expropriation of the goods of others, even when, as was generally the case, those others were not Christians.

“Though some colonialists used Christianity as a fig leaf for pillage, they were precisely as Christian as Cuba, China and North Korea are ‘democratic’ today. Someday, liberals will

denounce democracy, citing the atrocities of Red China as proof of what such a monstrous system of government can do.

“Christians who are willing to leave the safety and comfort of America to go to barbarous lands, risking disease, pestilence and murder, simply because they so love their fellow man—these are the miscreants who inflame and enrage liberals more than Saddam Hussein and his rape rooms ever did.”

—Ann Coulter, Frontline Magazine.com, April 24, 2003

Q For his entire career, Astronomer Dan Werthimer has been immersed in the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI), watching the field grow from an eccentric hobby to a respectable scientific discipline, with government funding, conferences and grad students. What it still lacks, though, is a subject matter. ‘I’ve been looking for aliens for 28 years, and I haven’t bagged one yet,’ he admits. Paradoxically, the field is awash in data—unaccountable terabytes of it, virtually all of it meaningless, including four years worth of random radio noise recorded by the 1,000-foot dish antenna at Arecibo, in Puerto Rico. Not even the world’s fastest supercomputer could make sense of it all. So Werthimer, along with computer scientist David Anderson at Berkeley’s Space Science Laboratory, enlisted a network of home and office desktop computers to sift through this vast electronic midden heap in search of one tiny artifact of civilization. More than 4 million people have lent their computers’ downtime to this project known as SETI@Home. Next week Werthimer, chief scientist for SETI@Home, will begin assessing the fruit of that effort. His expectations are, frankly, infinitesimal. But you don’t go into this field unless you’re an optimist.

“The effort is admirable, in any case. Beginning in 1998, while Arecibo traversed the sky observing pulsars and quasars, it also monitored a range of frequencies in the UHF band, centered on 1420 megahertz. ‘We didn’t get to say where the telescope points,’ Werthimer says, ‘but that’s OK, because nobody knows where to look anyway.’” The recordings made at Arecibo were chopped into 107-second segments and sent over the Internet to volunteers who had downloaded SETI@Home’s screen-saver program. At idle moments the program kicks in, sifting through the raw data for signals that stand out from the background sounds of the universe going about its business. About 4 billion candidate signals were identified in this process, and edited down to the 200 of greatest interest. Next week, for the first time, the project will have 24 hours of dedicated time at Arecibo to look for those 200 signals again, on the remote possibility that even one of them shows signs of an extraterrestrial intelligence at work. ‘It’s the kind of search any intelligent society has to do,’ says Bruce Murray, chairman of the Planetary Society, which helps fund SETI@Home. ‘But you can’t do it with the expectation that you’re actually going to find something.’

—Newsweek Magazine, March 17, 2003, p. 50

