

July 2003



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

Unless the LORD builds a house, its builders labor over it in vain; unless the LORD watches over a city, the watchman stays alert in vain.

Psalm 127:1

From The President's Desk

All Journal readers know that Summit Ministries is concerned about the Secular Humanist influence on America's college and university campuses. Our ministry seeks to prepare Christian teens to survive the liberal-left influence on the campuses and we are continually on the lookout for materials to aid our Christian students.

The following article by Phyllis Schlafly (The Washington Times, March 29, 2003, p. A 13) gives a good view of what our teens are up against and we recommend the organization that Mrs. Schlafly mentions—Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) for good research on the problem.

“Gone are the days when academic freedom was the watchword of college campuses. Today, thought control is the dominant theology on campuses, often hiding behind the mantras of diversity and multiculturalism.

“The American Enterprise magazine's survey of the political affiliations of professors in 19 major universities confirms similar surveys. The tally: Cornell, 166 professors registered in the Democratic Party or another party of the left, and only six registered with Republicans or another party of the right; the Harvard score is 50-2; Penn State 59-10; Stanford 151-17; Brown 54-3; University of California-Berkeley 59-7; UCLA 141-9; University of Texas 94-15.

“More than two-thirds of colleges and universities have speech codes even though, at least at public universities, they are unconstitutional. The codes are aimed at forbidding the free speech of conservatives, Christians, and humor magazines (since the Politically Correct brigade and the feminists have no sense of humor).

“Speech codes are as silly and intolerant as the British speech code at Stockport College which made international news by banning 40 ‘offensive’ words and phrases. Lady and gentleman are banned because of ‘class implications,’ history and chairman are sexist, ‘normal couple’ is simply unacceptable, and ‘slaving over a hot stove’ is offensive to the plight of real slaves.

“Colleges and universities have hired highly paid itinerant facilitators to train incoming freshmen to feel guilty if they are white and to think politically correct thoughts about race and diversity. Two of the films widely used at these Soviet-style re-education sessions are ‘Skin Deep,’ which presents intolerance and racism as the norm in America, and ‘Blue-Eyed,’ a 90-minute tirade designed to humiliate people with blue eyes and empower people with brown eyes.

“Get ready for the next round of left-wing Commencement speakers.

“Cornell has already announced it has signed up that rowdiest of leftists, James Carville.

“Al Gore and Madeleine Albright were recent Commencement speakers at Harvard, Robert Reich and Janet Reno at the University of California-Berkeley, Hillary Clinton and Jimmy Carter at the University of Pennsylvania, Gloria Steinem and Whoopi Goldberg at Wellesley. At most prestigious colleges, students never hear a conservative Commencement speaker.

“Diversity includes requiring freshman at Northern Arizona University to read ‘Science and the Case for Animal Rights’ by Steven M. Wise so students can learn that animals can be ‘persons.’ But multiculturalism does not permit the campus newspaper at the University of California-Riverside to publish a cartoon critical of the large numbers of foreign teaching assistants who speak only broken English.

“Nor does multiculturalism permit criticism of Hispanic students working for the Aztlan movement calling for revolutionary liberation from ‘gringos.’ When the conservative campus paper the Patriot printed a critical story, its staff was personally harassed, some received death threats, the office was broken into, and 3,000 copies of the magazine were stolen.

“At the women’s studies program at the University of South Carolina, students must acknowledge the existence of racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism and other institutional forms of oppression of women before being permitted to participate in class discussions.

“Alas, this is typical of the 900 women’s studies courses taught nationwide.

“The textbooks in women’s studies programs teach that women are the victims of a male-dominated society, that marriage is an ‘instrument of oppression,’ and that fathers are ‘foreign male elements’ who stand between mothers and daughters. This was the conclusion of an Independent Women’s Forum review of five of the most widely used textbooks and 30 course outlines from major universities.

“The obscene show touted by feminists as the way to observe Valentine’s Day, ‘The Vagina Monologues,’ will be staged on 667 college campuses this year (up from 550 last year). The original version eulogizes the ‘good rape’ of a 13-year-old girl by a 24-year-old woman who plies her with alcohol and leads her to conclude ‘I’ll never need to rely on a man.’

“At Georgetown University, the student who dared to write a critical review for the campus newspaper was fired.

“College thought control is not merely political. The attack on morality is so savage it sometimes even breaks into the New York Times. One Times headline read: ‘No big deal, but some dorm rooms have gone coed,’ with the push coming ‘from gay groups that said it was ‘heterosexist’ to require roommates to be of the same sex.’ Another Times headline described the Naked Dorm at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, which advertises itself as a diverse, multicultural, political active dormitory for men and women where clothing is ‘optional.’

“Students who are victimized by the new thought control should contact the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), an organization dedicated to the First Amendment and academic freedom.

“FIRE is piling up a series of successes in discrediting the intolerant Politically Correct campus Gestapo.”

Month In Review



Q LORD, You have searched me and known me. You know when I sit down and when I stand up; You understand my thoughts from far away. You observe my travels and my rest; You are aware of all my ways. Before a word is on my tongue, You know all about it, LORD. You have encircled me; You have placed Your hand on me.

“This extraordinary knowledge is beyond me. It is lofty; I am unable to reach it. Where can I go to escape Your Spirit? Where can I flee from Your presence? If I go up to heaven, You are there; if I make my bed in Sheol, You are there. If I live at the eastern horizon or settle at the western limits, even there Your hand will lead me; Your right hand will hold on to me. If I say, ‘Surely the darkness will hide me, and the light around me will become night’—even the darkness is not too dark for You. The night shines like the day; darkness and light are alike to You.

“For it was You who created my inward parts; You knit me together in my mother’s womb. I will praise You because I am unique in remarkable ways. Your works are wonderful, and I know this very well. My bones were not hidden from You when I was made in secret, when I was formed in the depths of the earth. Your eyes saw me when I was formless; all my days were written in Your book and planned before a single one of them began. God, how difficult Your thoughts are for me to comprehend; how vast their sum is! If I counted them, they would outnumber the grains of sand; when I wake up, I am still with You.”

—Psalm 139:1-18

Q There is no escape...If we are to continue to make moral judgments (and whatever we say we shall in fact continue) then we must believe that the conscience of man is not a product of Nature. It can be valid only if it is an offshoot of some absolute moral wisdom, a moral wisdom which exists absolutely ‘on its own’ and is not a product of non-moral, non-rational Nature.”

—C.S. Lewis, Miracles

Q Let us begin by supposing that Nature is all that exists. Let us suppose that nothing ever has existed or ever will exist except this meaningless play of atoms in space and time: that by a series of hundredth chances it has (regrettably) produced things like ourselves—conscious beings who now know that their own consciousness is an accidental result of the whole meaningless process and is therefore itself meaningless...

“In this situation there are, I think, three things one might do:

(1) You might commit suicide...

(2) You might decide simply to have as good a time as possible. The universe is a universe of

nonsense, but since you are here, grab what you can. Unfortunately, however, there is, on these terms, so very little left to grab—only the coarsest sensual pleasures...

(3) You may defy the universe. You may say, ‘Let it be irrational, I am not. Let it be merciless, I will have mercy. By whatever curious chance it has produced me, now that I am here I will live according to human values. I know the universe will win in the end, but what is that to me? I will go down fighting...’

“I suppose that most of us, in fact, while we remain materialists, adopt a more or less uneasy alternation between the second and the third attitude...All Naturalism leads us to this in the end—to a quite final and hopeless discord between what our minds claim to be and what they really must be if Naturalism is true...It is when one has faced this preposterous conclusion that one is at last ready to listen to the voice that whispers: ‘But suppose we really are spirits? Suppose we are not the offspring of Nature?’ ”

—C.S. Lewis, *Present Concerns*

Q Winston Churchill was asked to give a commencement address. He was introduced, and he stood up and said firmly, ‘Never quit!’ and he sat down. This was probably the shortest commencement address in history.”

—Roy B. Zuck, *The Speakers Quote Book*, p. 287

Q Never give in. Never, never, never, never. On nothing great or small, large or petty—never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense.”

—Winston Churchill

Q Two frogs, fell into a can of cream,

Or so I’ve heard it told;

The sides of the can were shiny and steep,

The cream was deep and cold.

‘O what’s the use?’ croaked Number One.

‘It is fate, no help’s around.

Good-bye my friends! Good-bye sad world!’

And weeping still, he drowned.

But Number Two, of sterner stuff,

Dog-paddled in surprise,

Then while he wiped his creamy face

And dried his creamy eyes,

‘I’ll swim awhile, at least,’ he said—

Or so I’ve heard it said;

‘It really wouldn’t help the world

If one more frog were dead.’

An hour or two he kicked and swam,

Not once he stopped to mutter,

But kicked and kicked and swam and kicked,

Then hopped out, via butter!’ ”

—T.C. Hamlet

Q When things go wrong, as they sometimes will,

When the road you’re trudging seems all uphill,

When the funds are low and the debts are high,

And when you want to smile, but you have to sigh.

When care is pressing you down a bit—

Rest if you must, but don’t you quit.

Life is queer with its twists and turns,
As everyone of us sometimes learns,
And many a failure turns about
When he might have won though he stuck it out.
Don't give up, though the pace seems slow—
You may succeed with another blow.
Often the goal is nearer than
It seems to a faint and faltering man;
Often the struggler has given up
When he might have captured the victor's cup
And he learned too late, when the night's slipped down
How close he was to the golden crown.
Success is failure turned inside out—
The silver tint of the clouds of doubt,
And you never can tell how close you are,
It may be near when it seems afar;
So stick to the fight when you're hardest hit—
It's when things seem worst that you mustn't quit.”

—Roy B. Zuck, *The Speaker's Quote Book*, p. 288

Q Nothing in this world can take the place of persistence. Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with talent. Genius will not; unrewarded genius is almost a proverb. Education will not; the world is full of educated derelicts. Persistence and

determination alone are omnipotent. The slogan ‘press on’ has solved and always will solve the problems of the human race.”

—Calvin Coolidge

Q Women like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton regarded free love, abortion, and easy divorce as disastrous for women and children. They would have regarded women who actively promoted those causes as foolish or deranged.

“What made 1970s feminism such an anomaly was a puzzling combination of two things that don’t ordinarily go together: anger against men and promiscuity; man-hating and man-chasing.

“I remember that it was around this time that some of my students at Boston College Law School began to ask me if I was a feminist. My answer, then and now, is yes—if that means I am specially concerned about a range of issues that disproportionately affect women. But, as the mother of three young children in those days, I had to admit I was baffled by the groups that were purporting to speak for women. Organized feminism had almost nothing to say to women like me who were trying to juggle work and family obligations. In fact, many of its spokeswomen went out of their way to denigrate marriage and motherhood. Moreover, as a lawyer, I would see that the chief beneficiaries of the divorce reforms they backed so enthusiastically were ex-husbands and second wives.

“The feminism of the 1970s was decisively shaped by a demographic phenomenon that brought heartbreak and disappointment to two large groups of women. The first group was the cohort of women born in the early years of the post-World War II baby boom. These young women were caught in what demographers call the ‘marriage squeeze’—the shortage of potential mates that resulted from the sharp jump in birthrates that began in 1947. There simply were not enough baby boys born during the war years to provide husbands for the bumper crop of girls born in 1947, ’48, and ’49 (given the then-custom for women to marry men a year or two older than themselves). When these girls started dating (in the 1960s), there were 1.7 million more of them than there were men in the age group where they ordinarily would have expected to find husbands. Just imagine what a painful experience that must have been for young women who had been socialized for domesticity, girls who had grown up in the 1950s to expect life as it was portrayed in the *Ladies Home Journal* and *Good Housekeeping*. They had no idea why things weren’t working out the way they were supposed to.

“The increased competition for mates, coinciding with the arrival of the birth control pill, helps to explain a number of things, such as the collapse of sexual taboos as young women began to offer free samples and to pursue men previously considered off limits (such as other women’s husbands). The ripple effects were vast and affected nearly everyone. Inevitably,

there were abuses by men of their suddenly dominant position in the mating market. Many women of Betty Friedan and Bella Abzug's generation found themselves alone and in difficult circumstances when their husbands divorced them to marry younger women. That created a second large group of angry women, and 1970s feminism was off to the races."

—Mary Ann Glendon, *First Things*, June-July 2003, p. 20, 21

Q It's no wonder that four out of five young women today are so turned off by these negative attitudes toward men, marriage, and motherhood that they reject even the term 'feminism.' The title of Elizabeth Fox Genovese's book *Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life*, taken from the interviews with dozens of women in all walks of life, says it all.

"It is now apparent to nearly everyone that what Betty Friedan calls the 'sex stuff' does matter, and that it matters very much. As the bills for the sexual revolution pile up, it looks as if the late nineteenth and early twentieth century feminists were closer to the mark. The price for the nation's prolonged bacchanal has been high, especially for women and children. There's been a high cost in terms of women's health, including an epidemic of infertility caused by sexually transmitted infections, and a startling rise in cervical and oral cancers among young women from the same cause.

"Most women have understood all along that *Roe v. Wade* would not, as Friedan once predicted, 'make women whole.' For the past thirty years, all three leading polling organizations have consistently told us that a large majority of Americans, women even more than men, disapprove of the majority of abortions that are performed in this country. In recent years, that disapproval has increased significantly. The latest Zogby poll, reported in November 2002, reveals not only that Americans in general are becoming more conservative in their views about abortion, but that young people are significantly more pro-life than their parents. The strongest supporters of abortion rights in the United States, as any nineteenth-century feminist could have predicted, are not women—but men in the age group of eighteen to twenty-five. Nevertheless, the most pro-life part of the population is people under thirty."

—Mary Ann Glendon, *First Things*, June/July 2003, p. 21

Q 'As a simple empirical matter, we are all sodomites now, but only homosexuals bear the burden of the legal and social stigma.' Thus says Andrew Sullivan in a long article in the *New Republic* occasioned by the Texas law against sodomy now before the Supreme Court. As he has done many times before, Mr. Sullivan presents himself as a Catholic who is trying to help the Church update its antiquated views on human sexuality. And again he misrepresents, and then triumphantly rebuts, a crazy-quilt of arguments which he attributes to Aquinas and other worthies, including contemporary natural law theorists.

"Mr. Sullivan, who is a conservative on some matters, is, in principle if not in disposition, a

sexual libertine. This is disguised from some by his sleight of hand in contending that ‘gay marriage’ would bring homosexual excesses under the domesticating influence of a conventional institution. But he leaves no doubt that such unions are but one of innumerable choices homosexuals might make in the pursuit of ‘sexual adventure and passion and experimentation.’ He allows that ‘taking this to extremes can be destructive,’ but who is to say what is extreme, especially if such adventure is private, adult, and consensual? Answering that question was exactly the project of Michel Foucault with his ‘limit experiences’ in the bathhouses of San Francisco before he died of AIDS. The above statement by Sullivan could as well have been made by Norman O. Brown in his defense of the unbridled libido, which he marketed as ‘polymorphous perversity.’ Mr. Sullivan likely deems the positions of such as Foucault and Brown to be extreme, meaning that they are not to his taste, although he has written elsewhere about the erotic charms of anonymous sex with strangers.

Mr. Sullivan is a self-declared sodomite. In his writing about his own proclivities and practices, he presents himself as a conservative sodomite. Manifestly uneasy about being a bad Catholic, he does not, like other bad Catholics, confess his sin, but writes endlessly about why the Church is wrong and he is right about what he and others do. Perhaps sensing that he is not getting much of anywhere with that argument, he resorts to declaring, ‘we are all sodomites now.’ The discerning reader will recognize that as the *tu quoque* defense (You’re one, too), the last refuge of the defender of the indefensible.”

—Richard John Neuhaus, *First Things*, June/July 2003, p. 61, 2

Q A legislature can no more turn sodomitical unions into marriages than it can turn dogs into cats; it can only unravel the institution of marriage by sowing confusion about its purposes.”

—J. Budziszewski, *What We Can’t Not Know*, p. 188

Q To make proper use of something that has been designed, we have to know how it works. That means knowing how each feature contributes to the fulfillment of its functions. In the body, the heart is for pumping blood; each valve, nerve, chamber and vessel does its part to move the blood along. Every doctor understands this: no sensible surgeon tries to make the heart pump air instead of blood. The reason is simple: when you thwart a thing’s design, it no longer does what it is supposed to do. It either works badly, stops working, or breaks. Something goes terribly wrong.

“These things can be observed, and so become another source of moral knowledge. Because every part of us has meaning, our very bodies have a language of their own; they say things by what we do with them. Bone speaks to bone, organ to organ, skin to skin. A smile means something friendly; you cannot give that meaning to a slap in the face. You can use a kiss to betray, but only because the kiss, in itself, means something else. Conjugal sex means self-

giving, making one flesh out of two. By contrast, when a man puts the part of himself which represents new life into the cavity of another man which represents decay and expulsion, at the most basic of all possible levels he is saying 'Life, be swallowed in death.' We cannot overwrite such meanings with different ones just because we want to.

"Design is obvious not just in our bodies but across the whole range of human powers and capacities. The function of fear is to warn; of minds, to deliberate and know; of anger, to prepare for the protection of endangered goods. Everything in us has a purpose; everything is for something. A power is well-used when it is used for that purpose and according to that design. Thus the virtue of courage is not being fearless, but fearing rightly: For the right reasons, in the right way, and to the right degree, neither more nor differently.

—J. Budziszewski, *What We Can't Not Know*, p. 86, 7

Q When the U.S. Supreme Court declared that 'At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life,' it was expressing the Sophist charter. In the context in which it was uttered, the purpose of the statement was to justify the liberty to kill unborn babies. Taken at its face, however, such language can justify doing anything you please. It's true that I flew a jet airliner into the World Trade Center, but I was defining my concept of existence. It's true that I raped my neighbor, but I was working out my concept of meaning in the universe as I see it. It's true that I drowned my toddlers, but I was fulfilling my concept of the mystery of human life. If the Supreme Court has not yet drawn these conclusions, it hardly matters. The conclusions follow from the Court's premises.

"If Sophists are to run the courts and the civil service, they need plenty of help. From somewhere there must come a steady stream of people who think as they do, to fill vacancies as they open up. Universities fill this need. Ordinary people who have not spent time on college campuses find it difficult to believe just how thoroughly they subvert the mind and how little they train it. When the average person tunes in to a news and interview program and hears Professor Prevalent compare terrorists with policemen, dismiss the teaching of Western Civilization, or explain why a crackdown on live sex performances would have a chilling effect on free speech, he tends to have thoughts like the following: 'He couldn't have said what I thought he said,' 'There must be something here that I don't understand.' 'He couldn't be typical of university professors,' 'Thank God my kid's teachers aren't like that,' or 'My kid wouldn't be taken in anyway.' The correct responses are that he probably did, there probably isn't, he certainly is, they probably are, and he probably is already.

"The curriculum of the university is but a tithe of what it teaches. It is a total-immersion counterculture whose methods of indoctrination include classroom style, freshman orientation, speech codes, mandatory diversity training, dormitory policies, guidelines for registered student organizations, mental health counseling, and peer pressure. Not all faculty

and administrators are quite like Professor Prevalent. Some are even more extreme, and some, of course, are less. But if the modern university is not theoretically Sophist, it is operationally Sophist, and the extremists hold the high ground. Faculty who think differently are ashamed to oppose them, and administrators who do are afraid to rock the boat.”

—J. Budziszewski, *What We Can't Not Know*, p. 168, 9

Q The American Civil Liberties Union is asking that a Bible be removed from a granite memorial that sits in front of a Texas courthouse because it might offend non-Christians, reports the *Houston Chronicle*.

County Judge Robert Eckels told the *Houston Chronicle* he would review the request but doesn't think the memorial is a 'violation of the separation of church and state or sponsorship of a religious activity.'

The memorial has been in front of the Harris County Civil Courts Building for 47 years, according to the *Chronicle*, and was built in 1956 to honor a business owner who helped the poor. It is maintained by a local mission group.

“Randall Kallinen, an attorney with the ACLU, says he thinks the presence of the Bible sends a message that those practicing other faiths aren't welcome in the courthouse.

“ ‘What about all the other religions who see that Bible? Does that mean they're not welcome or their religion is not respected?’ he asked, according to the *Houston paper*. ‘Civil courts are supposed to be fair and nonprejudicial. Putting one religion ahead of the other doesn't seem to be fair or nonprejudicial.’

“Activists from American Gay Atheists vandalized the memorial in the late 1980s, according to the *Chronicle*, breaking the glass case housing the Bible and replacing it with a pornographic magazine.

“The ACLU has been involved in many attempts to remove any hint of religious symbols from public property and buildings, including several displays of the Ten Commandments.”

—WorldNetDaily.com, May 30, 2003

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 priests 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 postpubescent). Not all ‘gays’ are pedophiles, but pedophilia—called ‘intergenerational love’ by homosexuals—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 the get-tough policy affects only some violations of celibacy. It doesn’t affect sex with men and other priests. As long as sodomite priests are often winked at, and certain seminaries continue to be hothouses for flamers 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 loyal Catholics.”

—The Weekly Standard, May 26, 2003, p. 30

Q Chimpanzees are more closely related to people than to gorillas or other monkeys and probably should be included in the human branch of the tree of life, a research team says.

“The idea, sure to spark renewed debate about evolution and the relationship between humans and animals, comes from a team led by Morris Goodman at Wayne State University School

of Medicine in Detroit.

“Currently, humans are alone in the genus *Homo*. But Mr. Goodman argues, ‘We humans appear as only slightly remodeled chimpanzee-like apes.’ He says humans and chimps share 99.4 percent of their DNA, the molecule that codes life.

“The report was published in today’s online issue of Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

“The battle over how humans are related to chimps, gorillas and other monkeys has raged since 1859, when Charles Darwin described evolution in ‘On the Origin of Species.’

“The dispute between religious and scientific factions got its greatest publicity in 1925 when Tennessee schoolteacher John Scopes was convicted of teaching evolution.

“And it continues to this day. Kansas reinstated the teaching of evolution this year, 18 months after the state school board voted to drop it from classes. Alabama’s school board voted to put stickers on biology books warning that evolution is controversial.

“Mr. Goodman’s team didn’t address evolution directly but proposed that humans and chimps be considered branches of the same genus because of their similarities.

“A genus is a group of closely related species. The human species, *Homo sapiens*, stands alone in the genus *Homo*. But there have been other species on the branch, such as *Homo neanderthalensis*, or Neanderthal man.

“Chimpanzees are in the genus *Pan* along with pygmy chimpanzees.

“Mr. Goodman’s proposal would establish three species under *Homo*. One would be *Homo (Homo) sapiens*, or humans; the second would be *Homo (Pan) troglodytes*, or common chimpanzees, and the third would be *Homo (Pan) paniscus*, or bonobo chimpanzees.

“There is no official board in charge of placing animals in their various genera, and in some cases alternative classifications are available.

“ ‘If enough people get agitated by this and think it’s something to be dealt with, there may be a symposium that takes this as the central issue and determines if this is a reasonable proposal.’ Mr. Goodman said. ‘I think it’s a reasonable proposal, of course, or I wouldn’t have proposed it.’

“Richard J. Sherwood, an anthropologist at the University of Wisconsin, isn’t so sure.

“The fact that chimps and humans are closely related and share a common ancestor about 7 million years ago is well known, Mr. Sherwood said, but that doesn’t mean they belong in the same genus now.”

—The Washington Times, May 20, 2003, p. A 6

q An idea just came down upon me. If chimps are 99.4 percent human—why not allow a dozen or so to run the National Academy of Sciences, publish its evolutionary findings with even more authenticity and engage CNN to push its PR campaign to make chimps human beings. The TV ratings would be sky high as each chimp presented its case. Just a thought.

Q A third-generation Presbyterian minister who has built her own church’s membership despite declines nationwide and who supports the ordination of noncelibate gays and lesbians was elected Saturday as moderator of her denomination’s 215th General Assembly.

“The Rev. Susan Andrews of Bethesda, Md., became the first female parish pastor to hold the highest elected position in the Presbyterian Church (USA). The church opened its week-long General Assembly on Saturday in Denver.

“Andrews, the most liberal candidate, was elected with 53 percent of the vote on a second ballot.

“The Rev. Harold Kurtz, a conservative with missionary experience in Africa, won 35 percent. The Rev. James Foster Reese, a retired New York minister who spoke of trying to unify his often splintered denomination, earned 13 percent.

“On the first ballot, Andrews won about 46 percent of the vote. Because the church requires majority approval, a second ballot was held, and Andrews won when Reese supporters threw their support to her.

“The assembly will take on contentious issues, including whether to repeal its ban on the ordination of noncelibate homosexuals, whether those who defy the ban should be dealt with more harshly, and whether to adopt a more restrictive abortion stance.

“One man Saturday asked the candidates to address his gay son’s place in the church.

“Andrews said it is her ‘fondest dream’ that the church lifts its ban on ordaining noncelibate gays and lesbians in her lifetime. But she said she did not think this was the year to attempt it.

“Kurtz said of the gay ordination ban, ‘this is what the church has said and we have to abide by this.’ Reese did not address the issue.

“Andrews called for each Presbyterian Church to pursue ‘graceful growth in membership.’

Andrews replaces the Rev. Fahed Abu-Akel of Atlanta, the first Arab-American to head a major U.S. denomination.”

—Eric Gorski, DenverPost.com, May 26, 2003