

November 18, 1997

Professor David Gelernter
Computer Science Department
Yale University
New Haven CT 06520

Dear Professor Gelernter:

I caught your interview by Brian Lamb on Booknotes this past Sunday evening. I was especially impressed by what you had to say about the role of the homemaker, and about the imperfections of the media. I fully agree with your thoughts, and don't see how anyone could have said it better.

As to the importance of the wife and homemaker, both my wife and I were brought up where the mother stayed home and nurtured the children, in turn we operated in the same way, and have passed this outlook on to our children, chiefly by example. As opposed to suburbia, with its big houses and manicured lawns and the kids inside watching TV, we generally had a yard full of kids, with the boys playing football -- but no little league participation -- or else digging holes in the yard. More than this, divorce was taboo in our families, and used to be in most families.

I therefore further mention a couple of items, with which you may already be familiar. One is the book by Arlie R. Hochschild titled *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. The other is the study about the devastating effect of divorce on children, conducted over a period of many years by Judith S. Wallenstein, founder and director of the Center for the Family in Transition at Corte Madera CA, and Julia Lewis of the psychology dept at San Francisco State University.

I place the blame on intellectualism, which purports to use "reason" to arrive at its conclusions. But as I continue to point out, the processes of reason require that we deal either in tautologies or else in error. (As known almost from the beginning, in Aristotelian logic the conclusion is buried in the premise.) Thus "reason" can take off in any direction, as aptly demonstrated by the parlor game of "telephone" or "pass it on." And arrive at any conclusion desired -- or start with the conclusion and work backwards.

And to be called science, strictly speaking, the experiments or observations must be repeatable and the data reproducible -- a situation best illustrated by planetary motion and the equations which are able to reproduce this motion. All the rest, the theories, hypotheses, and conjectures or speculations, reside in the aeries of the imagination. Including evolutionism, or "creation by evolution," which is nothing more than an oxymoron. But which has invaded our institutions and schools by being called "science."

Which gets around to religion, and which by exclusion should be apart from science. Only our new religion is embodied as intellectualism, rationalism, relativism, humanism, secularism, scientism, evolutionism, or whatever you want to call it. But religion, strictly speaking, deals with

O-BK

the supernatural, otherworldly, or metaphysical (meaning beyond science). Thus it took Kant about 800 pages in his *Critique of Pure Reason* to get around to the necessity for God, but he finally had to admit it

And I also wish to distinguish between morals and ethics, the former being of Divine origin, the latter man-made -- that is, made-up. In sum, there is more to religion than doctrine, ceremonials, testimonials, and such exercises as antinomianism or "justification by faith" (or by faith "alone"). For Biblical statement is concerned with "how we should then live" -- which is sanctified by Divine authorization. (I argue that Faith and Works are tautological, the one meaning the other.)

I apologize for getting so wound up and wordy about these things, but I believe they are important, and are ignored in the mainstream media. (In fact, I don't see how you got your book published, in view of what you had to say about homemakers and the like.) I try to stir up things as much as I can, as per the enclosures, and managed to mention this tautology business in my book on *Analytic Thermodynamics: Origins, Methods, Limits, and Validity*, published in 1991.

(The enclosures, attached just for meanness, are mostly from the *Laramie Boomerang*, named after founder/publisher/editor/reporter/columnist/humorist Bill Nye's mule.)

Needless to say I keep at it, and am preparing a draft of some material in which I relate intellectualism with decay. I start off with the irrefutable injunction about tautologies versus error, and along the way get into such matters as Fermat's conjecture, which can be set up as a tautology and knocked down, and wind up in the political morass. There are some interesting "for instances" such as J.D. Unwin's findings in *Sex and Culture*, published by Oxford in 1934, Alistair Cooke's *America* in which he paraphrases Gibbon, and of course Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West*. (Will Durant called Spengler an "intellectual who hates intellectuals.")

I'll probably pass along a copy of this letter to Brian Lamb, if I can find his address. I'm pretty much a proponent of Booknotes, save when he interviews such as Clinton or some liberal read intellectual -- and then I promptly change channels. I figure I don't need to hear the other side of the story, since I'm bombarded with it every day, all day long.

If you haven't yet tossed all this stuff by the time you've reached here, maybe now is the time.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]
Laramie WY 82070
[REDACTED]