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Take the freshmen "to lunch, Dr. Gray"
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Column/Kirk McKinney

The Gospel of St. Jerry

I saw the Rev. Jerry Falwell, the renowned evangelist and creator of Moral Majority. I found myself on a talk show last week. He seemed to be extraneous, with an agenda that was not unlike my own. The pull to higher tuition, the pressure of raising tuition now?

The other day, while leafing through my library, I chanced upon a book by one of my favorite authors, Jonathan Swift: "I have been in France, said the famous American of my acquaintance in London: that a young healthy man and woman is a gift old, a most delicious, nourishing, appetizing, wholesome, good, toasted, roasted, baked or boiled, and I have no doubt, that it will serve us as a first course or a re- gale." Even modern freshmen will admit, at least once they become acclimated, that there is nothing more than an intellectual "child, at a year old." For them, at the age of 17 or 18, a freshman will provide com- munal sustenance, satisfied with what is ingredient. Of course, the use of commons could de- crease; they are expected. Of course, over- crowding, the cost of commons could de- crease. Falwell in his natural sur- rounding, a hub of education, is the most evangelist. Falwell is the man who wants to change the direction of the country. He exhorts us to read the Bible, study the Gospel, and send money in prance of the Lord. It seems Falwell is very fond of the Committee, he may remember Matthew 23:15: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you travel far and land to make a single pros- lyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourself." Jesus had harsh words for all this at about 3 o'clock on a Sunday afternoon. Where were Falwell and his Gospel-light- ned crusaders?

I guess the reverend has more pressing business than to make that trip to Russia, have a chat with President Reagan, sup- port that war in El Salvador. Then he has to keep those crusaders. He has to keep the Christian Broadcasting Network running efficiently enough.

To the Editor: I am Urania Bos and Cheryl Walr for their thought- ful and well written column, "Science the new religious" [April 29], and letter, "Notes Ecclesiast." [letter, April 29], in The Tech. These columns were a welcome change from the usual form which took up space activity space, 6,035 workload, of the arts and sciences are pale in comparison. The Tech is an MIT newspaper, but we wel- come more articles on political and more permanent topics.

I agree with Boland's thesis that the reason science and religion is properly conflated to religion, but this can only be seen in the context of the concept of the conflict. He is right about the dangers of expecting science to resolve such a problem edge. He correctly pointed out that science is used for resolving the conflict, but cannot reveal its origin and purpose. Religion and science are methods of inquiry valid in different areas. The success of science can be more to understanding the need for religious inquiry. However, I think Boland should have placed more empha- sis on science and religion as means for improving man's life. Science can be used to improve man's physiological and econom- ic well being. However, it cannot improve his ethical standards of behavior, as the place for re- ligion. The danger of science is that people will become preoccupied with it and forget the need for religion and "hearing God and keeping his commandments." In the middle ages, science was unable to do much for man's physical well being. So people Should learn that the role of religion is to provide the congregations with the stories of the Gospel. We wouldn't want any one of these followers slipping away from sal- vation, now would we? It's a tough job; it requires a $17,000 home, a big car, and a private jet for convenience. But someone has to do the Lord's work.

I think most people would be content to let Falwell fail away self-righteously. But he is danger- ous: He gives a bad name to mo- rality, to the Bible, and to Jesus. As he pushes his crusade across the country, he alienates hun- dreds of thousands of intelligent people by making them think the Falwell philosophy is justified by the Gospels.

But Falwell is far from the truth. And after reading 2 Corin- thians 11:3-6, it seems St. Paul might agree: "But I am afraid that the serpent deceived Eve by cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ. For I fear that when I come, perhaps Satan puts another Jesus than the one we preached, . . . or you accept a different gospel which was not ac- cepted, you submit to it readily enough.
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