

Plausible theory?

It warmed my heart to read the editorial (ODE, March 12) on creationism.

It's good to know that someone is standing up against the seeming juggernaut of the theory of evolution.

For too many years, proponents of theories opposing it have struggled in anonymity against evolution's popular appeal and "scientific evidence."

The *Emerald* is on the right track in supporting the rights of our students in public schools to be taught theories other than evolution concerning the origin of life.

However, you do a disservice in limiting your support to biblical creationism. Theories other than those of creationism and evolution exist. While not as popular, many of these are just as valid.

One such theory is holothurism. Holothurism teaches us that there is one species of life on this planet that is not native, that of the sea cucumber.

Sea cucumbers (or holothurians) are hyperintelligent, extra-dimensional beings that possess considerable psychokinetic abilities.

Upon their arrival on this planet, the holothurians combined said psychokinetic abilities with their ample knowledge of genetics. Making use of amino acids and other proto-organic material present in the Earth's oceans, they began to engineer new species of life.

This activity continued for 126,000 years, culminating about 5,000 years ago with the

holothurians' construction of the bottle-nose dolphin. (Humans were created some 1,500 years earlier when an orangutan experiment went awry.)

Although I have no room to present the reams of scientific data that confirm this theory, I am able to say that only an incredibly intelligent life form could conceive of a defense mechanism that consists of hurling one's own internal organs at an enemy.

I hope to see the *Emerald* staff extend their open minds to holothurism and myriad other scientifically backed theories.

I look forward to the day when children are given the opportunity to learn about holothurism in the public schools.

I am sure that this will put holothurism on an equal footing with evolution and creationism. With the help of such tolerant people as the staff of the *Emerald*, I know that day is not far off.

Matthew Wiehr
Anthropology

I'm not a ...

Tuesday's *Emerald* featured a tacky piece by Jesse Bohrer-Clancy (ODE, March 12). Clancy, like a literary bull in a china shop, squared off against the global Christian community, focusing on homosexuality.

In between periodic confrontations with good taste, Clancy enlightened us by sharing what the Bible really says about homosexuality, what God thinks about it and what we

ought to think about it — all of which, surprisingly, are in perfect agreement with Clancy.

Clancy starts out with the recent decision of the school board in Utah to ban all extracurricular clubs rather than risk a lawsuit by allowing a club for gay teenagers.

This is exactly what the school board would have been doing. The board at least did the smart thing: They saw a huge fight coming and ducked it.

What if they had let the kids form their club? Suddenly every irate Mormon parent in Utah would be threatening to pull his or her student from school.

Ban the club? Now you've got a discrimination lawsuit on your hands. Rather than face that kind of tempest, the school board lost some face and closed the issue.

That doesn't seem homophobic — at worst they're cowards, and at best they're savvy folks who know from experience what it's like to get between a mob of angry mothers and a lawyer.

Clancy's second mistake is to

take the moral debate about homosexuality where it doesn't belong: inside the Christian construct.

Debate legal, philosophical and universally moral implications all you want, but once we've established the hypothetical truth of Christianity and the authority of the Bible as the basis for our discussion, you're on my turf.

Clancy uses flawed biblical logic to try to prove his point, which presumably is that God condones homosexuality. He quotes Old Testament passages from Leviticus about the Law of Moses, written to the children of Israel during the Exodus.

Clancy reasons that because condemnations of homosexuality in Leviticus appear side by side with the food, clothing and sexual rules that comprised the law, today's Christian is a hypocrite.

Clancy, have you ever read the Bible? I mean, the whole thing. If the answer is yes, then my advice is to read it again.

If you'll turn a couple of pages past Malachi, you'll notice a fair

portion of the book, called the New Testament, is devoted to just the idea that you're attempting to discuss.

To summarize: The coming of Christ fulfilled the law.

It has nothing to do with certain laws being "outdated," or picking and choosing. The law of Moses served its purpose, and then its authority ended.

Refer to I Corinthians 6:9. "Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God."

I don't normally use the Bible to defend my beliefs, and I don't think it is an authoritative source of law. It is, however, an indisputably authoritative source of Christian teaching. By attempting to use the Bible to justify his own morality, Clancy is telling me what I should believe as a Christian. Which, as he has demonstrated, he has no business doing.

Colby Phillips
Pre-journalism



"THE DRAMA!"

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

No New Taxes!

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

No New Taxes!

THE MICKEY'S PARTY

Burp!

Throughout history, we've lived under a two-party system. So Mickey's—the crisp, smooth beer in the big-mouth bottle—would like to introduce a new party. Where a government of great minds isn't the cornerstone of society...beer is.



JOIN THE PARTY.