

MAN AND MESSAGE THEORY: THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

C. DIANE POWELL, B.A.,M.A.
1928 IDLEWILD
WICHITA, KANSAS 67216

KEYWORDS

gender, feminism, message theory, sociobiology

ABSTRACT

ReMine argues that the existence of biological universals, such as vitamins and DNA/RNA, points to a Designer [66][67]. ReMine's 'biotic message theory' not only furnishes us with a more satisfactory explanation for biological complexity, it provides man with a more satisfying explanation for his own sense of purpose by locating meaning in the intention of the Designer to communicate with man. Man's unique bio-cultural nature severely challenges naturalistic social theories such as sociobiology and feminism. In contrast, it accurately predicts the unique dual role of man in regard to the biotic message in that he serves as both part of the medium and as the interpreter of the biotic message. Human reproductive behavior is largely determined by two key human biological universals, sexual reproduction, a cross-species biological universal, and the lengthy dependency of offspring, a uniquely human trait. Biologically-based gender roles provide the foundation of the human family unit which is critically needed in order to support offspring during a lengthy developmental period [63][64]. In message theory, biological survival is essential for the transmission of the message. However, because of the critical role man serves as interpreter, he must do more than survive biologically, he must be able to discover the message which has been encoded for him within the natural realm. Naturalistic philosophies, such as sociobiology and feminism, have had destructive consequences for the family by undermining religion and morality which serve a key role in supporting marital commitment and parental caretaking. Both sociobiology and feminism are unable to explain or deal satisfactorily with universals such as sexual reproduction and the long dependency of offspring. As a result, both approaches reveal frequent use of bias and numerous contradictions as they attempt to explain the data using their assumptions.

INTRODUCTION

In his treatise, *The Biotic Message*, ReMine argues that the existence of cross-species biological universals, such as vitamins, DNA/RNA and amino acids, points to a common and intentional origin for all living things, that is, to a Designer [66][67]. He argues that such regularities are entirely unexpected from the random nature of evolutionary processes. ReMine makes two central claims; that life was 'reasonably designed' for survival since message transmission depends upon it, and that a non-naturalistic message ["I and I alone created you."] has been bio-encoded into the substance of life as a communication to man. ReMine's assertion of the 'reasonableness of design' is his response to the evolutionary argument that certain designs do not reflect the engineering perfection that would be expected from a divine designer. Instead, ReMine concludes that those irregular or 'odd' features, such as the platypus, are not evidence of imperfection, but represent a kind of 'personal signature' left on the biological landscape for us by our Designer.

Man's unique bio-cultural nature means that he serves a unique and dual role in regard to the biotic message. By virtue of his physicality, he serves a role as part of the fabric on which the message is written. However, his most significant role is as a receiver of the message since it was designed for him. Only man possesses the critical faculties of rationality and transcendence needed to interpret the message. By virtue of his transcendence, he stands outside of, and above, the rest of the created realm. Only then can he discover the biotic message which has been encoded for him within the created world. Man's unique biological nature reflects his role in respect to the biotic message. The human species is "unexpectedly" diverse genetically, however, it is

variability which has no consequences for survival [21]. While this fact is considered 'heretical' by many biologists [21], it is not unexpected from the perspective of message theory, and indeed, is entirely consistent with it. Also, man is the only successful species which has remained unified as one species and never diversified, or 'radiated' into separate species [41]. Noonan observed that following cultural conflicts, the winners and losers interbreed and within a few generations become "indistinguishable" from one another [57]. As a result of these facts, mankind can be described as; individually unique, culturally diverse, and existing as a singular species.

In his book, *Reason In The Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education*, Philip E. Johnson [37] identifies the implications of evolution for man. One of the most challenging aspects of naturalism has been its complete failure to satisfy man's inherent need for purpose [37][73]. Even those ideologically committed to evolution have been unable to resist the appeal of design, frequently referring to the illusion or appearance of design in nature [2, p.91][26, p.22][69, p.15]. Spilsbury exposes the deep chasm that exists between the basic character of man and that of evolutionary theory [73]. Futuyma notes that "the message of evolution" is that man was not designed and has no purpose [quoted by 37, p.8]. Harvard paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson asserted that the "guiding premise" of evolution is that "man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did not have him in mind" [quoted in 37, p.9]. ReMine's "biotic message theory" [66][67] not only offers man a more satisfactory explanation for biological complexity, it also furnishes him with a more satisfying explanation for his own sense of purpose.

Naturalistic social philosophies, sociobiology [45] and feminism [Carden, cited in 44][49] portray man as a victim of either his biology or his culture, and thus undermine his sense of significance and moral accountability. Anthropologist Freeman points to human rationality as a major obstacle for sociobiology, asserting that sociobiology is "irredeemably deficient" in regard to man due to his capacity for "non-genetically determined alternative action" [quoted by 29, pp.70-71]. Even more important in evaluating naturalism is the fact that: "Man depends, to a very great extent, on the idea he has of himself, and...this idea cannot be degraded without at the same time degrading man" [Gabriel Marcel, quoted in 39, p.181]. In his book, *Whatever Happened to Sin?*, physician Karl Menninger notes that the concept of moral accountability has been eroded by the "presumption" that man was not entirely accountable for his actions [51, p.177]. Ravin observed that while acts of self-sacrifice have been highly regarded by most cultures, sociobiologists consider such acts to be without genetic potential and thus to be "aberrations destined for oblivion" [quoted by 39, p.333]. In fact, ReMine observes that evolutionists regard morality and ethics as merely illusions [66]. Radical feminism, in particular, promotes self-centeredness, rejecting traditional religion and traditional gender roles, and the ethic of self-sacrifice [6][22].

While the assumptions of sociobiology and feminism cannot be tested empirically, their arguments can be examined for their capacity to explain human reproductive behavior. When ReMine examined the arguments of evolution he found that evolution frequently contradicted both the facts and itself [66][67]. He also found that those who promoted evolution frequently resorted to biased interpretations when they could not explain universal observations [66][67]. This same problem can be predicted for both sociobiology and feminism. While the transmission of "the biotic message" depends upon the survival of life in general, the specific survival of man is of key importance since no other organism is capable of deciphering "the biotic message." In contrast, evolution not only fails to offer any purposefulness, it is unable to make any satisfactory explanation but can only offer a tautology, or restatement: "it survives [simply] because it survives" [66, p. 98]. Given the critical nature of parental caretaking, naturalistic theories will always have negative consequences for human survival since they degrade his sense of identity and moral accountability.

SOCIAL DESIGN & ITS ALTERNATIVES

Design and Sexual Reproduction

Human reproductive behavior is critically determined by two key biological universals: sexual reproduction, a cross-species biological universal; and the lengthy dependency of offspring, a uniquely human trait. While the first universal unites man with the rest of creation, the second distinguishes him from it. ReMine affirms the significance of sexual reproduction for message theory: "It is extremely widespread and its genetic mechanics are similar throughout. This feature alone does a magnificent job of unifying life. Yet the most plausible of evolutionary theories predicts that sex should not even exist" [66, p. 434]. While evolution predicts neither of these traits, both are intrinsic to the character of man and are not only consistent with message theory but critical to it. Man's unique bio-cultural nature is reflected in the fact that both sexual

reproduction and child development critically depend upon complex combinations of instinctive and culturally plastic behavior [21][69].

From the perspective of design, sexual reproduction structures the human family. The critical importance of sexual reproduction to human society is pointed to by British writer G. K. Chesterton who wrote: "Sex is an instinct that produces an institution....That institution is the family: a small state or commonwealth which has hundreds of aspects, when it is once started, that are not sexual at all..." [13, p.188]. Successful human reproduction requires both biologically-differentiated and socially-differentiated roles, that is, the joint efforts of parents are required to form an interdependent social unit devoted to the social and economic support of dependent offspring. These gender roles are so useful that they have persisted worldwide in spite of changing conditions and challenges [64]. Anthropologist Dr. Bernard Campbell asserts that: "The human family is the simplest social unit with complete division of labor between adult individuals. It is to the fact that the roles of man and woman are fully complementary that the family owes its continuance and stability" [quoted in 20, p. 264]. These gender roles are supported by innate sex differences, both biological and motivational, and social reinforcement mechanisms [7] [28] [63] [64]. These innate sex differences are reflected in every major organ system, including skeletal, muscular, endocrine, metabolic and neurological [1][38], and prepare males and females for their reproductive roles, including the creation of an interdependent social unit [63].

The woman's greater biological investment in childbearing and nursing necessitates the creation of this interdependent social unit which then provides the social setting for the rearing of children. By acting as primary caretaker, women provide the critical care young children need, and this allows the male a more focused pursuit of the families' needs for provision and protection. Women's childcare role has been shown to significantly impact their occupational choices, putting them at a disadvantage in the employment market [7][11][17][18]. Mackey notes that "...women do not readily assume behaviors that interfere with childrearing" [47, p.143]. Popenoe notes that the male as provider is a universal phenomenon although the male as exclusive provider is an historical exception [61]. Mackey [47] documented an inverse relationship between the needs of the community for men to function as provider/protectors and their opportunity to spend time with their children. Cohen [cited in 36] and Pruett [65] both confirm the significance of practical factors such as work schedules in determining the opportunities for fathering. Gilder argues that the male's identity, role, and even his presence in the home depends upon his ability to provide [27, p.59]. The male is equipped for his role with a greater drive to overcome obstacles, and greater physical muscularity [28][44][61]. As a consequence of this role specialization, the male is both permitted and required to make a more focused pursuit of the families' needs for protection and provision [47]. This pattern has been documented around the world and labeled "the gender division of labor" [7][18][28].

Fatherhood research has brought a renewed appreciation for the unique qualities of fathers [32][47][58]. Pruett attributes the rarity of paternal nurturance to two causes, societal pressure which distances men and focuses them on "male duties" such as provision and protection, and on their own unwillingness to be vulnerable [65]. Regarding fatherhood, Ross Parke suggests: "we didn't just forget about fathers by accident; we ignored them on purpose because of our assumption that they were less important than mothers in influencing the developing child" [quoted in 10, p.42]. In his book, *Life Without Father*, Rutgers professor David Popenoe [61] considers a critical contribution of fathers to be their capacity to teach children two key character traits, self-control and empathy [61, p.154]. Popenoe argues persuasively that fathers have a critical role to play in promoting honesty and self-sacrifice, traits which "must be purposefully taught and reinforced through close personal relationships and good example" [61, p. 14]. Popenoe points to the complementary parenting styles of mothers and fathers.

Men typically emphasize play more than caretaking, and their play is more likely to involve a rough-and-tumble approach. In attitude and behavior, mothers tend to be responsive and fathers firm; mothers stress emotional security and relationships, and fathers stress competition and risk taking; mothers typically express more concern for the child's immediate well-being, while fathers express more concern for the child's long-run autonomy and independence [61, pp.11-12].

Gilder argues that the role of social fatherhood is a "cultural invention rather than a biological imperative" [27, p.92]. Given the status-seeking characteristic of males, documented by Goldberg [28], it is critical that fatherhood be adequately reinforced by the culture. Gilder notes that "monogamy, marriage, and man as the essential provider" serve as external reinforcements for the father's role [27, p.74]. Gilder labels this reciprocal interdependency "the sexual constitution" [27, p.74]. He writes in his book, *Sexual Suicide*, that the historic

marshaling of religion and law in support of marriage as a social norm has not been just to "promote intimacy and companionship" but to "ensure civilized society" [27, p.74]. The relationship of sexual reproduction to the care of dependent offspring is pointed to by Kingsley Davis:

The genius of [marriage] is that, through it, the society normally holds the biological parents responsible for each other and for their offspring. By identifying children with their parents, and by penalizing people who do not have stable relationships, the social system powerfully motivates individuals to settle into sexual unions and take care of ensuing offspring [quoted in 61, p.37].

Design and Dependency

While man's lengthy dependency poses an obstacle for naturalistic explanations, it provides the ideal opportunity for bonding and instruction. An essential part of this lengthy dependency is the critically helpless condition of the newborn. While this exposure to tremendous biological risk appears to be counterproductive to human survival, it does in fact represent the specific means by which man is created as a rational, but socially dependent individual. Spilbury points to the prolonged dependency of human offspring as an example of the "problematic relationship between genetic and cultural evolution" since this "...genetically evolved delay in reaching maturity 'presupposes' that an appropriate education will be socially instituted" [73, p.46]. While this requirement challenges any naturalistic explanation, it affirms not only the fundamental nature of the human family, but what it means to be human.

Erickson observed that the helpless infant motivated the caretaking of his parents through his unique appearance [quoted in 65, p.78]. It is the infant's unique features; the wobbly limbs, high forehead, short face, and chubby cheeks, which act as a "biological releaser" for parental caretaking [56][65]. In fact, it is these same features which make teddy bears and pandas so appealing. Twenty-five years ago, Lorenz investigated the preference of subjects for an "infant schema" both in a realistic and in an exaggerated version where the domed head and chubby cheeks were more pronounced [cited in 77]. Adults always preferred the exaggerated form, young females did so by the age of 10-13 years, and young males by the age of 18 [cited in 77]. Wickler interpreted these findings as evidence for a more general "child-protection" mechanism, suitable for any species whose young require such lengthy care [77]. A preference for the exaggerated form implies that the basis is an innate pattern rather than mere familiarity [77, p. 161]. More recently, English researchers Morris, Reddy and Bunting discovered that adults preferred the most "infantile" teddy bear, while infants did not. They found that children develop this preference after the age of four, and that it grew stronger with age, especially in girls [cited in 31, pp.44-45].

The human infant has been prepared in many ways to respond socially to his caretakers. In contrast to the delayed neurological maturity of those muscles needed for mobility, "the neurological maturity of the sucking and that of the grasping reflexes is particularly striking" [41, pp.7-8]. At birth his facial muscles are fully formed and functional, and he is soon able to mimic adult expressions of emotion [Ekman & Oster, cited in 19, p. 257]. From their research on the "newborn/father" bond Greenberg and Morris found that such infant behaviors as grasping, opening or closing the eyes, and moving its mouth were seen by fathers as responses to him and thus were instrumental in promoting bonding and care [32]. Using videotape, Edward Tronick, chief of the Child Development Unit at Children's Hospital in Boston, documented a complex sequence of approach/ avoidance behaviors in six-week-old infants as they helped to establish the proper "interactional distance" with their caretakers [cited in 30, p. 27]. Goodman reported that mothers and infants are amazingly responsive to each other [30]. For example, infants only hours or days old can identify their own mother's voice and identify her scent [30, p. 27][56]. Morris also found that most mothers could recognize and respond to the cries of their own infants even while they were asleep [56, pp. 78-79].

Sociobiologists have been astonished at the incredible helplessness of the human newborn, likening it to "an embryo" [72, p.227] or "an external fetus" [69, p.340]. Montagu argues that given the extremely rapid rate of early development the human should enjoy a longer period of uterine gestation [54]. To match the physical development of the newborn chimpanzee, the human infant would have to remain in the womb for another 21 months, making for an impossible birth [Miller, cited in 69, p.340]. While apes typically give birth by themselves in a couple of hours, the human birth process can be much longer in duration and much more hazardous [56]. Unlike apes, the newborn human's skull is covered with curved bony plates which are designed to allow for some compression during birth [56]. Gaps are covered with an extremely tough fibrous membrane capable of withstanding all but the most direct of blows [56, p.34].

Man's unique speech capacity requires an enlarged pharynx for the formation of vowels. However, this same structure also makes it possible for humans to choke to death since the paths for food and air cross each other [33, p.82]. Vocal tract expert Crelin [12] reports that the vocal tract or pharynx in newborn humans is positioned higher than in the adult. Although technically 'immature,' this structure is perfect for the nursing infant since it lets him breathe and swallow at the same time [12]. Unlike adults, such infants have no voluntary control over breathing and cannot breathe through their mouths should their noses become blocked [12]. Crelin notes that this critical fact has remained "conspicuously absent from the current biology and medical textbooks, including those on human embryology," in spite of many recent technical studies [12, p.58]. This fact appears to have been largely overlooked and has relevance for the risk during infancy of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) [12]. During the period of from 4 to 6 months of age infants achieve voluntary control over respiration, the same period of time during which the incidence of SIDS is greatest [12, p.90]. Since 1992 a back sleeping position has been recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics [75] as a means of reducing this risk.

Montagu observes that, unlike the apes, man experiences a prolonged immaturity that lasts far beyond childhood [56, p.122]. Restak observes that human offspring experience a much longer period of neurological plasticity during which the brain is "more open to the influence of environment and culture...less 'hardwired' " [68, p.71]. While brain growth for an ape stops prior to the end of the first year, well before sexual maturity, brain growth for humans continues fairly rapidly for a full six years, and is not complete until about the 23rd year, several years after sexual maturity [55, p.33]. The ape's more rapid physical maturation has also presented one of many obstacles to language researchers intent on establishing the capacity of apes to learn language [62]. Based on a technique using incremental growth markings in teeth, Benyon and Dean concur that, unlike human children, australopithecine did not experience a prolonged developmental period [cited in 16, p.14]. Since the skulls of young apes and humans appear deceptively similar, Falk charges that Dart failed to appreciate the immaturity of his specimen and consequently overemphasized its humanlike features [16, p. 12].

Montagu notes that at birth an infant's critical enzyme systems are unfinished [54]. While most mammalian young are born with few of these enzymes, humans are unique in that none are present [54, p.126]. At birth the gastric enzymes present are capable of digesting colostrum and breastmilk but nothing more demanding [54, p.126]. These critical enzymes and nutrients are supplied by human breastmilk which also offers a host of other health and psycho-social benefits to mother and child [3][56][71]. Although considered routine and physiological, adequate social support is critical for the success of breastfeeding [3][58]. Baumslag notes that due to the widespread neglect of this critical provision, the federal government has finally declared it a national objective to promote breastfeeding as the United States has one of the lowest breastfeeding rates and one of the highest infant mortality rates of any industrialized nation [3, p.xv].

Sexual Reproduction-an Unsolved Mystery?

Sociobiologists have been particularly baffled by human reproductive behaviors, such as abortion, celibacy and homosexuality [21][33]. One of the most 'inexplicable' behaviors is sexual reproduction since it represents the loss of mutations upon which evolution depends. The key to this issue hinges on the nature of mutations themselves, that is, are they the 'stuff' evolution is made of? Or are they harmful mistakes to be avoided? Noonan admits that mutations "disrupt the activity of organized sets of genes" [57, p.38]. Michod [52, p.xxii] and Bell [4, p.103] both theorize a reparative function for sex, that is, a capacity to restore the DNA.

It is perhaps understandable that sociobiologists have been baffled by the evolutionary origin of sexual reproduction, regarding it as an 'accident' or leftover [4, p.90]. It does in fact act as a conservative force, eliminating half of the potential mutations in every generation. Whereas this exacts a tremendous evolutionary cost, it functions to preserve the original design. Sociobiologists have been unable to find any perceived benefit which will outweigh this cost. Noting that the origin of sex is a problem without a solution, Michod exclaims: "The theory of evolution could not explain one of the most universal and ubiquitous features of the natural world!" [52, p.77]. Even with the help of mathematical modeling, Michod can only offer an extremely implausible theory, one where the advantage of sex depends on a "fickle" world where the relevant conditions "flip-flop" each and every generation, a solution without any relevance to the real world [52, p.xvii]. Bell discusses Michod's "flip-flopping" conditions and concludes that "it seems absurd to suggest that they are sufficiently common to explain the ubiquity of sexual reproduction" [4, p.107].

It is not surprising that sociobiology has been unable to explain something as universal as sexual reproduction since its claim that genes are directly linked to human social behavior cannot be tested [45]. Since the assumptions of sociobiology cannot be empirically researched, scientists can only speculate regarding the adaptiveness of various traits [45, p.244]. Holcomb discusses the variety of contradictory roles for genes which sociobiologists have proposed and asserts that: ".....there are only two things genes can do: provide directions for the manufacture of proteins, and make more genes" [35, p.406]. As a result of such confusion, evolutionary explanations have frequently been "incompatible with those made by learning, cognitive, and psychodynamic theories" [72, p.246]. Forsyth notes that sociobiologists focus narrowly on the "essential reproductive features of each sex" and that "it is clearly impossible to explain the complexity of man in this fashion" [21, p. x].

The fact that sociobiologists cannot satisfactorily explain the origin of sexual reproduction is even more baffling given man's clear cultural preoccupation with the subject. Ridley claims that the "central theme" of man's evolution has been sexual and that understanding human nature depends on understanding how sexuality evolved [69]. He states that, for man, sex is an "overexposed and troublesome procreative pastime" [69, p.4]. Michod considers the relationship between the sexes to be "the invisible central point of all action and conduct" and that it "peeps out everywhere in spite of all veils thrown over it" [52, p.xiii]. Margulis and Sagan write: "Sexuality, in all its multiple guises and subtleties, has been an incessant preoccupation of people" [48, p.225]. Freud wrote: "Science has so little to tell us about the origin of sexuality that we can liken the problem to a darkness into which not so much as an hypothesis has penetrated...." [quoted in 52, p.135]. Bell has labeled this mystery "...the queen of problems in evolutionary biology" [4, p.19]. According to Bell, after a century of Darwinism, only the superficial details have been addressed, leaving large areas unexplored, including "some of the most fundamental questions in evolutionary biology" [4, p.19]. The fact that evolution cannot even begin to explain a feature that is this fundamental carries a weighty message of its own concerning the usefulness of its assumptions.

Bias and Social Constructionism

Feminism cannot explain human universals such as sex differences and gender roles because they have rejected their innate basis [44][60][64]. The most profound and incontrovertible evidences for sex differences pertain to the biology of the brain since these differences are established during fetal development prior to any social conditioning [44][53][61]. Levin states: "The more feminist epistemologists emphasize the radical difference between male and female thinking, the harder it is to explain these differences in terms of socialization" [44, p.188]. Feminist bias in academia has been particularly profound and disturbing. According to legal scholar Robert H. Bork, feminist bias regarding scholarship "seems indomitable" [6, p.21]. Popenoe writes: "You would never know it from reading today's typical social science textbook, but there is a large and growing body of biological evidence for an array of fundamental male-female differences" [61, p.10]. According to Goldberg, Mead has repeatedly denied in writing that her research disproved the existence of sex differences [cited in 6, pp.11-12]. However, when Goldberg examined introductory sociology textbooks, he found that thirty-six out of thirty-eight began their sex role chapters with a discussion of Mead's work as if it demonstrated the environmental nature of male and female behavior [cited in 6]. Bork concluded that due to their "ideological commitment" these authors had denied the innate physiological basis for "masculine and feminine behaviors" and had misrepresented Mead's actual findings [6, pp.11-12].

A basic tenet of feminism is that women and men ought to be socially interchangeable. According to Judith Lorber, founder of *Gender and Society*: "The long-term goal of feminism must be no less than the eradication of gender as an organizing principle of postindustrial society" [quoted in 9, pp. 43-44]. Feminists maintain that the best way to reduce the importance of gender is by calling more attention to it, a strategy Coltrane regards as "paradoxical" [9, p. 43-44]. Levin [44], Ridley [69] and Bork [6] have all cited the inevitable contradiction of "Women's Studies" which bases its claim on the existence of women's unique "ways of knowing," while at the same time, rejecting the existence or social significance of sex differences. Bork notes that "feminist science" has made no explanations which can be tested [6]. Bork points to one of the most dangerous assertions of academic feminism: "Radical feminist inanities about science, rationality, linear thinking, etc., rest on the allegation that knowledge and modes of reasoning are socially constructed; that is, that there are no objective truths and no single valid method of reasoning. That is a very convenient position for someone making irrational assertions" [6, p.210].

Feminists subscribe to Emile Durkheim's theory that an infant at birth has no sexual character or identity but that gender identity is "socially constructed" as a result of cultural conditioning [cited in 49, pp.160-161][6].

A long-term follow-up of a classic case of gender reassignment has just been published by Milton Diamond, Director of the Pacific Center for Sex and Society at the University of Hawaii at Manoa [14]. Diamond and Sigmundson expose the fallacy of the social constructionist view of gender. Due to an accident during circumcision, one of two twin brothers lost his penis. The parents were advised by medical experts at Johns Hopkins that, given the difficulty of surgical restoration, they should elect to raise their child as a girl. At that time, two assumptions were part of prevailing medical opinion in such cases, that infants were sexually neutral for at least the first year, and that normal psychosexual development depended on the normal appearance of the genitals. John Money, Professor of Medical Psychiatry and Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins, reported at a scientific conference in 1972 that the conversion had apparently been successful [42]. However, this was not true and, in fact, the child had resisted these attempts from the beginning [14][42].

This case has frequently been cited throughout the literature as evidence for the validity of the "social constructionist" view of gender [14]. The subject grew increasingly resistant to the behavioral expectations, rejected the hormonal therapy started at puberty, and only then learned from his father the truth concerning his identity. He elected with his family to reverse the sex reassignment. Based on these facts as well as other cases, Diamond and Sigmundson conclude that: "...there is no known case where a 46 chromosome, XY male, unequivocally so at birth, has ever easily or fully accepted an imposed life as an androphilic female regardless of the physical and medical intervention" [14, p.13]. These doctors assert that there is no support for the "postulates" of psychosexual neutrality at birth or that healthy psychosexual development depends on the appearance of the genitals [14].

American sociologist Melford Spiro sought evidence for cultural determinism on the Israeli kibbutz but instead of finding support for the modification of human nature, he discovered "the influence of human nature on culture" [quoted in 6, p.199]. Roiphe denies that women's desire for children is some oppressive myth or "social construct" and describes it as "some unstoppable species urge" [70, p.47]. Fox-Genovese writes that "feminists have sorely misunderstood the importance of motherhood to most women" [22, p.189]. Popenoe notes that "a generation of social scientists has argued that fatherhood is merely a 'socially constructed' phenomenon" [61, p.164]. However, researchers on fatherhood have argued that the consistent cross-cultural evidence for fathering behavior, including bonding, supports a biological basis for it [32][47][58][65]. Bork writes in his book, *Slouching to Gomorrah*: "One of the major implications of this view [social constructionism] is that human sexuality has no natural form but is culturally conditioned" [6, p.197]. After all, what "culture can construct, it can deconstruct" [6, p.198].

Margaret Mead's tale of socially sanctioned premarital sexuality is another myth perpetrated in the name of cultural determinism. Anthropologist Derek Freeman recounts how he was entreated by educated Samoans "to correct the mistaken depiction of the Samoan ethos" [24, p.xv]. Freeman states: "This conclusion is indeed so preposterously at variance with the realities of Samoan life that a special explanation is called for.....all of the indications are that the young Margaret Mead was, as a kind of joke, deliberately misled by her adolescent informants" [24, p.240]. Ridley notes that although her empirical research turned out to be "wishful thinking," it nevertheless seriously impacted the approach of mainstream anthropology which remains to this day "committed to the view that there is only a blank human slate" [69, p.318].

Levi-Strauss noted that after claiming for fifty years that the nuclear family was a comparatively recent evolutionary development, anthropologists are now finally convinced that the nuclear family is "a universal phenomenon" present in every type of society [43, p.334]. Nineteenth century proponents of social evolution had argued that the sexual promiscuity of primitive tribes prevented them from recognizing fatherhood. Since evolutionary anthropologists considered the behavior of contemporary primitive tribes to be a window into our own evolutionary past, Bronislaw Malinowski refuted this view based on the evidence that the Aborigines distinguished between casual and legal sexual unions. He argued that the family was a universal human institution because it met a universal human need, the care of dependent young, and that no society could long endure which did not link reproduction with "the fact of legally-founded parenthood" [quoted in 8, p.99]. Popenoe points to Malinowski's finding that the critical role of the social father is not a "European or Christian prejudice" but instead is observed worldwide as a "universal sociological law" [quoted in 61, p.36].

Radical Feminism and the Family

Following her own election defeat, broadcaster and journalist Sherry Henry investigated the political attitudes of American women and concluded that they were much more motivated by concerns for the health, education and economic welfare of their families than they were by arguments for "equality" or "abortion rights" [34]. Based

on her interviews with independent career women, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese reports that despite certain benefits such as equal pay, many women refuse to identify themselves as "feminists" [22, p. 2]. She identified the most serious failure of feminism to be their preference for considering "...women as independent agents rather than as members of families" [22, p. 28]. Fox-Genovese notes that many women "worry that feminist solutions are contributing to the disintegration of families rather than helping to reconstruct them. They believe, in other words, that what they see as problems, feminists see as ideals" [22, p. 28].

In her book, *Our Treacherous Hearts: Why Women let men get their way*, British author and broadcaster Rosalind Coward explains how the "complicity" and approval-seeking behavior of women undermines the feminist agenda [11]. She observes in women's behavior a "deep-rooted, fundamental complicity with traditional family structures and expectations" [11, p.9]. Coward reports that although feminists have consistently argued that men must be confronted and changed, in reality, the "...absence of confrontation is surprising..." [11, p.7]. Coward notes that women seem reluctant to buy into a system that is about self-advancement and money rather than a moral, ethical, or emotional purpose for their lives [11]. She has also observed that there seems to be "a backlash against attempts to transform sexual relations—a backlash greater than in any other aspect of male-female relations" [11, p.147].

Levin warned that the radical social agenda sought by feminists depended on federal programs such as affirmative action, comparative worth and the Equal Rights Amendment, all of which would threaten democratic freedoms [44]. Over forty years ago, Nicholas Pastore examined the writings of two dozen leading American and British scientists and determined that eleven out of twelve of the environmentalists were politically liberal and that eleven out of twelve of the hereditarians were conservative [cited in 39, p. 13]. Pateman notes that while some feminists have promoted the welfare state as "the main recourse of women" [59, p.199] others have argued that it is merely the exchange of one kind of dependence for another. Pateman warns women that: "The power and capriciousness of husbands is being replaced by the arbitrariness, bureaucracy and power of the state..." [59, p.200]. Fox-Genovese considers it ironic that so many of the "feminist solutions" to sexual violence are in fact the "restoration" of the same paternal authority they have been protesting. She also warns: "But the authority they favor is not that of fathers over families, but of the government over us all" [22, p.164]. Fox-Genovese has also noted that, paradoxically, those nations which provide best for women and children are the same nations which "place significant limitations on abortion, and which none of them defines as a woman's 'right' " [22, p.244].

The Family Deconstructed

Describing the expected impact of evolutionary philosophy on parental caretaking, Fox-Genovese asserts that: "it is difficult to extract a moral obligation from the view of the world as an unending struggle for the survival of the fittest..." [22, p.79]. She notes that "Darwinian evolution" undermines the fundamental dignity and worth of man [22, p.70]. Fox-Genovese argues that because infants experience such a long stage of dependence it is critical that parents "be inspired, persuaded, or coerced" into caring for them [22, p.92]. Even though children naturally offer some positive reinforcement, Fox-Genovese observes that all cultures know instinctively that this alone is inadequate and consequently they "...portray the relations between parents, especially mothers, and children as a moral obligation" [22, p.92].

Support for motherhood is often neglected since it seems to be more automatic in some ways. However, the results of failing to support motherhood can be tragic. Fraiberg notes that various social disorders and diseases are much more frequent when a child's early need for security has not been satisfied [23]. Fraiberg concludes that without the development of healthy emotional attachment, "there can be no conscience" [23, p.70]. Desmond Morris reports that research with European prisoners has revealed that nearly all had experienced great instability during their early years and were exposed to a "confusing series of adult minders" often involving more than five changes in "mother-figure" [56, pp.159-160]. Morris concludes that motherhood must be of critical importance to the developing child and asserts that "these findings are a powerful condemnation of modern theories that see motherhood as a culturally invented trap" [56, p.160]. Morris describes the child as "pre-programmed" for this focus on his mother, and suggests that the child's healthy social and mental development depends upon it [56, p. 160].

There is no more direct assault on the family than the killing of the unborn and no more serious indictment against radical feminism than the centrality of abortion for modern feminism [34][70]. Feminists reject pro-life feminism, contending that the "denial of abortion constitutes the single greatest form of violence against women" [22, pp. 12-13]. It is especially bizarre that feminists want to claim abortion as a "natural" as well as a

"constitutional right" [22, p.73]. In response, Fox-Genovese asserts that any "compelling argument for natural law" depends upon an "appeal to God as an absolute standard for human dignity" since without this the issue depends entirely on personal preference [22, pp.79-80]. Fox-Genovese notes that although various cultures throughout history have tacitly accepted abortion as a form of population control, it has never been "celebrated" [22, p. 70].

The twentieth century had barely dawned when British writer G. K. Chesterton observed that "the decay of the family was not merely due to a lack of traditional morals or mere human weakness but also to the rise of a whole new doctrine against the family" [13, p.15]. Chesterton noted that despite the modern despair over marriage, advertisers had recognized and exploited the innate appeal of the family [cited in 13, p.13]. Medved credits the popular culture with undermining the commitment to marriage and family by creating illusions about the satisfactions of both single and married life [50]. Medved states that easy divorce reflects the "disposability" of marriage and in effect devalues the unique contribution of women to marriage and family [50, p.20].

Bork notes the hostility of feminism towards traditional religion [6, p.206] which they view as an invention designed to control women [6, p.206]. Doyle credits conservative religion in America with preserving the traditional gender role structure and retarding the progress of women in government [15]. Classical scholar Martha Nussbaum wrote: "It is in families where the cruelest discrimination against women takes place" [quoted in 6, p.204]. Feminists not only oppose traditional religion and the family, they oppose the ethic of self-sacrifice [11][22][34]. Medved [50] and Popenoe [61] credit the rise of individualism and the decline of religion and morals with bringing a tragic rise of divorce in American society. Joseph Epstein cites the general decline in the credibility of religion for the current divorce trend [cited in 50, p. 20]. Medved argues that radical feminism has not been kind to women, asserting that: "...the truly feminist position is promarriage and anti-divorce" [50, p.40]. Roiphe asserts that to the extent that feminism contributed to the view that "families were not necessary....it is complicit in the ills we see everywhere" [70, pp. 53-54].

Dana Mack, Affiliate Scholar with the New York-based Institute for American Values, has condemned the anti-family policies of our American legal system in her book, *The Assault on Parenthood: How Our Culture Undermines the Family* [46]. Mack credits the hypercritical attitude towards parents based on Freudianism with generating a hostility to the family among American legal and social welfare professionals [46, p.32]. After parental authority in the home has been undermined, there is now a growing tendency to increase parental legal liability for children's misdeeds yet there is no clear definition of parental fitness [46]. Mack also cites as an example the over-reporting of child abuse due to the vague language of the Mondale law [46].

Cultural determinists view the family as an artifact of culture rather than some innate social structure. In fact, Stacey writes: "One of the most valuable achievements of feminist theory has been its effort to 'deconstruct' the family as a natural unit, and to reconstruct it as a social unit" [74, p.222]. Legal analyst Fineman asserts: "the family in contemporary law is no longer accorded doctrinal protection as an entity. Family law now favors 'protecting' individuals and promoting social ends like equality between the sexes and between divorcing parents" [18, p. 6]. Mack also notes the modern legal emphasis on separateness and individuality rather than on the family as a unit [46]. Martha Fineman explains how the no-fault status of divorce has actually strengthened men's control within the family—both before and after divorce, both economically and in regard to child custody. Fineman writes, "...the patriarchal definition of family has not been displaced...it continues to affect reform and rhetoric in the area of divorce" [18, p.12]. While the gender-based division of labor works well as long as the family is intact, Furstenberg and Cherlin assert: "Unfortunately, there is no formula for converting a two-parent household economy into two separate units" [25, p. 47].

Fineman contends that women have been disadvantaged by the assumption of equality [18]. Because men and women view the divorce process differently, men frequently trade custody for economic advantages, while women give up financial advantages in order to ensure custody [18]. As a result, even when legal custody is shared, mothers were fourteen times more likely to have residential custody [18]. Compared with divorce law in the Western world, Glendon notes the "paradox" of the American treatment of divorce which has made it quicker and easier to get a divorce but provides less family assistance afterward for coping with the aftermath [cited in 25, p.97]. Wallerstein notes that psychologists, lawyers, and judges have all been surprised to find that a father's relationship with his children prior to divorce did not predict what it would be afterward [cited in 18, p.203]. All too often when men are divorced from their wives they are also divorced from their children. Since so many fathers fail to pay court-ordered child support, it is clear that the state cannot ensure that they will. Both Fineman [18] and Pateman [59] note that the state has been incapable of ensuring economic support or physical safety for families. Based upon his research on the growing underclass in America, Taylor [76] concludes that

government programs are simply unable to sponsor critical social values such as self-reliance, self-control and faithfulness to children and spouse.

Although primed by her training as a clinical psychologist to prepare a "morally-neutral" book on the subject of divorce, Medved's early research revealed to her that the very suggestion of divorce was "debilitating" and the results "catastrophic" [50, pp.3-4]. Weitzman asserts that divorced persons exhibit more psychological distress and are subject to higher rates of physical illness, premature mortality, suicide, and accidents than married persons of comparable ages [cited in 50, p.197]. Gilder noted the greater propensity of single men for various social delinquencies [27]. To the charge that the process of selecting marriage has left only those who are unable or unwilling to conform to societal expectations, Popenoe asserts, "...careful epidemiologic studies have shown that marriage has a protective effect for men independent of the "marriage-selection factor" [61, p.13].

Wallerstein and Kelly concluded from their study that the divorced family is "less adaptive economically, socially, and psychologically to the raising of children than the two-parent family [quoted in 50, pp.242-243]. University of Nebraska sociologist Alan Booth reports that the children of divorce were much more likely to have become sexually active than those students who were from intact families or those where a parent had died [cited in 50, p.243]. Mack notes that many parents consider the courts' official sanction of teenagers' "sexual rights" to be "among the most egregious aspects of the legal system's assault on families" [46, p.94]. Childcare researcher Karl Zinsmeister asserts that: "the mother-father-child household is humankind's universal childrearing institution" [quoted in 60, pp.13-14]. Zinsmeister also states: "the surge of fatherlessness and family decay that began about 25 years ago correlates closely to the surges in crime, drug use, child poverty, and educational dropout that currently bedevil American society" [quoted in 60, pp.13-14]. Based upon his three decades of work as a social scientist David Popenoe asserts that whereas social science research is rarely conclusive, "I know of few other bodies of data in which the weight of evidence is so decisively on one side of the issue: on the whole, for children, two-parent families are preferable to single-parent and stepfamilies" [61, p.162].

Commitment in every way creates more satisfactory environments for rearing children. Berkowitz [5, p.246] reports that spousal abuse is less when a couple has legally committed themselves to each other in marriage vs. mere cohabitation. Popenoe affirms that "sexually faithful partners" raising their own biological children were the least violence-prone settings [61, p.74]. Wilson and Daly found that preschoolers living with one natural and one stepparent were 40 times more likely to be abused [cited in 61, p.71]. Thomas Sowell notes a much higher mortality rate for infants whose parents are not married, and writes: "The differences between married and unmarried reflects differences in attitudes, and attitude differences have consequences which can literally be fatal to infants" [quoted in 76, p. 297]. Popenoe reports that the presence of the child's natural father in the home appears to be a deterrent to sexual abuse since the majority of it occurs whenever there is less supervision, access by unrelated males, and the child's emotional needs are unmet [61, p. 66].

Popenoe refers to a conclusion which has shown up repeatedly in the research literature: "The relationship [between family structure and crime] is so strong that controlling for family configuration erases the relationship between race and crime and between low income and crime" [Galston & Kamark, quoted in 61, p.9]. Taylor also refers to a 1988 study which found that "not having a father in the house is a much more reliable sign of future criminality than either race or poverty" [76, p.297]. Dan Korem, investigative journalist and world-class magician, regards the gang as a pseudo-family and deceptive illusion [40]. He has successfully applied the findings of Hungarian sociologist Maria Kopp who found that youths at risk for suicide were also at risk for other self-destructive behaviors, such as gang involvement. She identified this tendency as the "Missing Protector Factor" [cited in 40]. Successful intervention has included assigning a "protector" to youths at risk.

CONCLUSIONS

Because both sociobiology and feminism are based on evolution, they both display many of the same characteristics that ReMine found when he examined evolution, that is, they resort to bias when they are unable to explain the observation. Frequently, contradictory explanations are offered since they have rejected any explanation consistent with design. Specifically, both clearly fail to explain or deal satisfactorily with universals. The simplest and most dramatic failure is that of sociobiology to explain how sexual reproduction can exist given its power to dilute mutations. However, from the perspective of design and message theory, there is no problem. Sexual reproduction conserves the genetic character and structures the human family. The incredibly vulnerable state of human infants is unexpected from the perspective of sociobiology, and unwelcome from the perspective of radical feminism. Vulnerable and dependent offspring

critically require the support of the family, that is, parents who are committed to each other and to their offspring. Naturalism undermines this commitment in obvious ways by rejecting the social support system offered by traditional religion for the family, and indirectly by denying the importance of morality and self sacrifice.

The promotion of naturalistic social philosophies such as sociobiology and feminism has had tremendously negative consequences for the family. For example, while feminism has sought to "deconstruct" marriage and the family, it has resulted in many ways in the "deconstruction" of society in general. The tenet of "social constructionism" reflects an incredible arrogance as it essentially denies that man is a created being and asserts his right to control himself. Neither of these have any scientific foundation. However, they do have significant political applications and hold the potential to undermine democratic freedoms, both religious and economic.

While the biological risks and demands for care associated with human offspring offer challenges to naturalism, these same factors are critical to what it means to be human as they provide the ideal opportunities for bonding and instruction. Message theory critically depends upon these factors since it is man who must be ready to discover the biotic message which has been sent to him. Man's unique bio-cultural nature provides incredible challenges to naturalistic evolution but specifically prepares him to serve a unique dual role in regard to the biotic message since he serves as both part of the medium and as the interpreter of the message. Naturalistic explanations do more than fail to account for the bio-cultural complexities of man, they deny him his purpose and place in the universe. Because man's awareness of his essential role in message reception plays a strategic role in preparing him to interpret it, naturalism offers a material threat to man's ultimate purpose.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, M. A. Sex Differences in Human Performance. 1987, John Wiley & Sons:NY.
- [2] Barnett, S. A. Biology and Freedom, 1988, Cambridge University Press,
- [3] Baumslag, N. Milk, Money and Madness, 1995, Bergin & Garvey, Westport, Conn.
- [4] Bell, G. The Masterpiece of Nature, 1982, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- [5] Berkowitz, L. Aggression, 1993, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- [6] Bork, R.H. Slouching Toward Gomorrah, 1996, HarperCollins, NY.
- [7] Chafetz, J. S. Gender Equity, 1990, Sage, Newbury Park.
- [8] Collier, J.M., Z.Rosaldo, & S.Yanagisako. Is There a Family?, B.Thorne & M.Yalom, Editors, Rethinking the Family, 1982, Longman Inc., NY, pp. 25-39.
- [9] Coltrane, S. Theorizing Masculinities in Contemporary Social Science, H. Brod & M. Kaufman, Editors, Theorizing Masculinities, 1994, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 39-60.
- [10] Coltrane, S. Family Man, 1996, Oxford University Press, NY.
- [11] Coward, R. Our Treacherous Hearts, 1992, faber & faber, London.
- [12] Crelin, E. The Human Vocal Tract, 1987, Vantage Press, NY.
- [13] de Silva, Alvaro, Editor, Brave New Family, 1990, Ignatius Press, San Francisco.
- [14] Diamond, M. & H. K. Sigmundson. March, 1997, Sex Reassignment at Birth, internet document, <http://www.afn.org/~sfcomm/ndfml.htm>, pp. 1-20. [Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Medicine, March, 1997, Vol. 151, pp. 298-304].
- [15] Doyle, R. Women in Politics throughout the World, Scientific American, (1/98), p. 35.
- [16] Falk, D. BrainDance, 1992, Henry Holt & Co., NY.
- [17] Farrell, W. The Myth of Male Power, 1993, Berkley Books, NY.
- [18] Fineman, M. A. The Illusion of Equality, 1991, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- [19] Fitzgerald, H., E.Strommen, & J.McKinney, Developmental Psychology, 1982, Dorsey Press, Homeward, Ill.
- [20] Fordham, J. M. & A. S. The Assault on the Sexes, 1977, Arlington House, New Rochelle, NY.
- [21] Forsyth, A. A Natural History of Sex, 1986, Charles Scribner's Sons, NY.
- [22] Fox-Genovese, E. Feminism is not the Story of My Life, 1996, Doubleday, NY
- [23] Fraiberg, S. H. Every Child's Birthright, 1977, Bantam Books, NY.
- [24] Freeman, D. Margaret Mead and Samoa, 1983, Harvard U. Press, Cambridge, MA.
- [25] Furstenberg, Jr. F.F. & A.J. Cherlin. Divided Families, 1991, Harvard University Press:Cambridge.
- [26] Ghiselin, M.T. The Economy of Nature and The Evolution of Sex, 1974, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- [27] Gilder, G. Sexual Suicide, 1973, Quadrangle, NY.

- [28] Goldberg, S. Why Men Rule, 1993, Open Court, Chicago.
- [29] Goldsmith, T. H., The Biological Roots of Human Nature, 1991, Oxford University Press, NY.
- [30] Goodman, S. Presumed innocents. Modern Maturity, (Dec. 91-Jan. 92), pp. 18-24.
- [31] Gornick, L. Science Classics. Discover, (June 1996), pp. 44-45.
- [32] Greenberg, M & N. Morris, Engrossment, Father and Child. S.H. Cath, A. R. Gurwitt, & J. M. Ross, Editors, 1982, Little, Brown & Co., NY.
- [33] Harris, M. Our Kind, 1987, Harper & Row, Publishers, NY.
- [34] Henry, S. The Deep Divide, 1994, Macmillan, NY.
- [35] Holcomb, H. R. III, Editor, Sociobiology, Sex, and Science, 1993, SUNY, Albany.
- [36] Hood, J.C., Editor, Men, Work, and Family, 1993, Sage, Newbury Park.
- [37] Johnson, P. E. Reason In The Balance, 1995, IVP Press, Downer's Grove, ILL.
- [38] Khan, A.U. & J. Cataio. Men and Women in Biological Perspective, 1984, Praeger:NY
- [39] Kohn, A. The Brighter Side of Human Nature, 1990, Basic Books, NY.
- [40] Korem, D. Suburban Gangs, 1994, International Focus Press, Richardson, Texas.
- [41] LaBarre, W. The Human Animal in biological perspective, 1954, The University of Chicago Press.
- [42] Leo, J. Boy, girl, boy again. U.S. News & World Report, (March 31, 1997), p. 17.
- [43] Levi-Strauss, C. The Family, H.L. Shapiro, Editor, Man, Culture and Society, 1971, Oxford University Press:London. pp. 333-357.
- [44] Levin, M. Feminism and Freedom, 1987, Transaction Books, New Brunswick.
- [45] Lewontin, R.C., S. Rose, & L.J. Kamin. Not in Our Genes, 1984, Random House, NY.
- [46] Mack, D. The Assault on Parenthood, 1997, Simon & Schuster, NY.
- [47] Mackey, W. C. Fathering Behaviors, 1985, Plenum Press, NY.
- [48] Margulis, L. & D. Sagan. Origins of Sex, 1986, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- [49] Masters, W.H., V.E. Johnson, & R.C. Kolodny. Human Sexuality, 1982, Little, Brown & Co., Boston.
- [50] Medved, D. The Case Against Divorce, 1989, Donald I. Fine, Inc., NY.
- [51] Menninger, K. Whatever Became of Sin? 1973, Hawthorn Books, NY.
- [52] Michod, R. E. Eros and Evolution, 1995, Addison-Wesley Publisher, Reading, Mass.
- [53] Moir, A. & D. Jessel. Brain Sex, 1991, Carol Pub, NY.
- [54] Montagu, A. The Human Revolution, 1965, The World Publishing Company, NY.
- [55] Morris, D. The Naked Ape, 1967, McGraw-Hill Book Company, NY.
- [56] Morris, D. Babywatching, 1992, Crown Publishers, Inc., NY.
- [57] Noonan, K. M. Evolution: A Primer for Psychologists, Sociobiology & Psychology, C. Crawford, M.S. Smith, & D. Krebs, Editors, 1987, LEA, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 31-56.
- [58] Parke, R. Fathers, 1981, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- [59] Pateman, C. The Disorder of Women, 1989, Stanford University Press:Stanford, CA.
- [60] Petrikin, J. S., Editor, Male/Female Roles, 1995, Greenhaven Press, Inc., San Diego, CA.
- [61] Popenoe, D. Life Without Father, 1996, The Free Press, NY.
- [62] Powell, C. D. Language Acquisition Rates for Man and Ape Contrasted, Proceedings of the 1992 Twin-Cities Creation Conference, Northwestern College, July 29-Aug 1, 1992, pp. 112-116.
- [63] Powell, C. D. Sex Differences in Light of Creation, Proceedings of the 1992 Twin-Cities Creation Conference. Northwestern College, July 29-Aug 1, 1992, pp. 106-111.
- [64] Powell, C. D. Mechanisms for Gender Role Stasis, Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Creationism, R. E. Walsh, Editor, 1994, Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, pp. 423- 432.
- [65] Pruett, K. The Nurturing Father, 1987, Warner Books, NY.
- [66] ReMine, W.J. The Biotic Message, 1993, St. Paul Science, P.O. Box 28006, St. Paul, MN 55128.
- [67] ReMine, W.J. The Biotic Message, Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Creationism, R. E. Walsh, Editor, 1994, Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, pp. 423-432.
- [68] Restak, R. M. The Infant Mind, 1986, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, NY.
- [69] Rindler, M. The Red Queen, 1993, MacMillan Publishing Co., NY.
- [70] Roiphe, A. Fruitful, 1996, Houghton-Mifflin Company, Boston.
- [71] Russell, R. D., Design in Infant Nutrition, ICR Impact #259. (Jan. 1995).
- [72] Smith, M. S. Evolution and Developmental Psychology, Sociobiology & Psychology, C. Crawford, M. S. Smith, & D. Krebs, Editors, 1987, LEA, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 225-248.
- [73] Spilsbury, R. Providence Lost, 1974, Oxford University Press, NY.
- [74] Stacey, J. Are Feminists Afraid to Leave Home?, J. Mitchell & A. Oakley, Editors, 1986, What is Feminism, Pantheon, NY, pp. 208-237.

- [75] Task Force on Infant Positioning and SIDS, **Position and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome [SIDS]**, Pediatrics, Dec. 1996, vol. 98, No. 6, (Pt. 1) pp. 1216-1218.
- [76] Taylor, J. Paved With Good Intentions, 1992, Carrol & Graf Publishing, Inc., NY.
- [77] Wickler, W. The Sexual Code, 1972, Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, NY.

