MONTH IN REVIEW

❑ "Stand fast therefore in the liberty by which Christ has made us free, and do not be entangled again with a yoke of bondage. Indeed I, Paul, say to you that if you become circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. And I testify again to every man who becomes circumcised that he is a debtor to keep the whole law. You have become estranged from Christ, you who attempt to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avail anything, but faith working through love.

"You ran well. Who hindered you from obeying the truth? This persuasion does not come from Him who calls you. A little leaven leavens the whole lump. I have confidence in you, in the Lord, that you will have no other mind; but he who troubles you shall bear his judgment, whoever he is.

"And I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why do I still suffer persecution? Then the offense of the cross has ceased. I could wish that those who trouble you would even cut themselves off!

"For you, brethren, have been called to liberty; only do not use liberty as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' But if you bite and devour one another, beware lest you be consumed by one another!"

—Galatians 5:1-15

❑ "In Christ alone my hope is found, He is my Light, my strength, my song; this Cornerstone, this solid ground, firm through the fiercest drought and storm. What heights of love, what depths of peace, when fears are stilled, when strivings cease. My Comforter, my All in all, here in the love of Christ I stand.

"In Christ alone, who took on flesh, fullness of God in helpless Babe! This gift of love and righteousness, scorned by the ones he came to save. 'Til on the cross as Jesus died, the wrath of God was satisfied. For all our sin on Him was laid, here in the death of Christ I live.

"There in the ground His body lay, Light of the World, by darkness slain; then, bursting forth in glorious day, up from the grave He rose again! And as He stands in victory, sin's curse has lost its grip on me; for I am His and He is mine, bought with the precious blood of Christ."

—Keith Getty, Stuart Townend

❑ "It was not for societies or states, that Christ died, but for men."

—C.S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory*

❑ "Jesus...told people that their sins were forgiven….This makes sense only if He really was the God whose laws are broken and whose love is wounded in every sin.

"…I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish thing that people often say about Him: 'I'm ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don't accept His claim to be God.' That is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic—on a level with the man who says he is a poached egg—or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But let us not come with any patronising nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to."

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

❑ "The Bush Administration knows that the terms 'fundamentalist Islam' and 'Islamofascism,' which many use loosely to explain today's terrorism, are really references to some of the effects produced on Muslims by the Wahabi sect. This sect is a heresy that seeks to conquer the Islamic world—and only incidentally make war on the rest of us. Most mosques built in the world today, including in the United States, are Wahabi. Using Saudi billions, the sect has taken control or is close to control of Islamic organizations from West Africa to the American prison system from Western Europe to the Pacific islands. In Pakistan, where a generation ago only 1% of the people considered themselves Wahabis, today 25% do. Nor, for the past two centuries, has it been possible to disentangle Wahabis and Saudis politically or financially. All Saudi royals are Wahabis (socio-politically if not intellectually), and all Wahabi hierarchs are somehow part of the royal family. Moreover, regardless of personal beliefs, Wahabism is the royal family's sole claim to legitimacy outside the tribes of the Nejd region of east-central Arabia."

—Angelo M. Codevilla, *Claremont Review of Books*, Winter 2005/2006, p. 24

❑ "Q. Your fellow Darwinians argue that they, too, only want to teach science—but you say that there is a religious element in what many of them do. Explain.

"A. I don't think there's any question about that. If you look at some of the popular books, like [Stephen] Gould's or the [Richard] Dawkins stuff, and Ed Wilson's *On Human Nature* — all of these at some level transcend the purely scientific. I do think that

— UPCOMING EVENTS —

SUMMER PROGRAM DATES

Summer is quickly approaching. The dates and places for the 2006 summer program are set. Call or write for your application, or download an application from our website.

Colorado: May 21-June 2; June 4-June 16; June 18-June 30; July 9-July 21; July 23-August 4; August 6-18; August 20-September 1.

Tennessee—Bryan College: July 9-July 21; July 23-August 4.

Ohio—Cedarville University: June 18-30.

Plan to attend or send that teenager in your life to a camp like no other for a worldview education by your leading worlview source.

often evolutionists, at least in the public domain, move over past science into secular religion or secular humanism.

"Q. What is 'evolutionism'?

"A. As I've defined it, it's making a secular religion out of evolution. It's seeing evolution as having a transcendent meaning, having an upward meaning for humans—progress. I'm not saying evolutionists put on fancy dress and go up to the altar and things like that. [But] if you think of a religion as giving you a certain world perspective with moral direction, then it seems to me this is what traditional social Darwinism used to do. Get it absolutely clear: I'm not saying that people like Ed Wilson are neo-social Darwinists. But I do see something more than just science going on here."

—Michael Ruse, *Dallas News.com*, January 29, 2006

Some of our summer faculty: Dr. Norm Geisler, Dr. Jeff Myers, Dave and Mary Jo Nutting, Chuck Edwards, Dr. Frank Beckwith, Eric and Leslie Ludy, Greg Koukl, Dr. J.P. Moreland, Del Tackett, Kevin Bywater, Dr. Chris Osborne, Dr. Michael Bauman, Mark Cahill, Mike Haley, Dr. Wayne House, Dr. Duane Gish, and David Noebel.

❑ "The philosopher Robert George of Princeton argues that IDers [Intelligent Designers] have, to be sure, performed a useful service in their critical program. They have better than most shown how natural selection comes up short as a universal meta-explanation. And they have also highlighted how many of today's popularizers of Darwinism, for example biologists Richard Dawkins and the late Stephen Jay Gould, have misused Darwinian theory as a battering-ram against religion. Dawkins, for one, famously stated that 'Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist,' and that 'if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane.'

"Well, if the point of Darwinism is to refute the existence of God, as these popularizers tend to claim, then it too would have to be excluded from the science curriculum. The Supreme Court, after all, has ruled that the state must remain neutral between religion and irreligion. In their more heated polemics, Darwin's popularizers paint themselves into this intellectual corner.

"However that may be, George raises serious questions about the constructive aspect of the IDers' program, the point at which they attempt to replace natural selection with intelligent design. As George points out, there's nothing wrong with making an inference from biological complexity to an intelligent designer, an inference that is perfectly rational, even if it is not 'scientific' per se. Aquinas, after all, was a great rationalist. 'It is important for IDers to avoid buying into an imperialistic understanding of science, which says that if it's not the scientific method it's not rational,' he comments. What's needed is not a 'scientific' refutation of Darwin, but a philosophic understanding of what Darwinian theory says, and what it does not say.

"Stephen Barr, a theoretical physicist at the Bartol Research Institute of the University of Delaware, and a frequent contributor to the journal *First Things* on matters of science and culture, also believes that some IDers have strayed beyond the confines of science strictly understood. As he comments, 'The design hypothesis is a perfectly reasonable one, but it is an explanation outside of natural science.' Like George, he believes some IDers have erred in trying to shoehorn the design thesis into science curriculums. In doing so, moreover, they make a mistake similar to that of Darwin's popularizers, claiming more for their theory than the science itself allows. 'There are dogmatists on both sides of the debate,' Barr observes.

"The former head of the President's Council on Bioethics, Leon Kass, has also been following this debate. A physician and Harvard-trained biochemist, Kass credits IDers for drawing attention to various difficulties in orthodox Darwinian theory, as well as for understanding the human stakes involved in such questions. And he believes IDers are generally right in raising the question of causality—a question that should in fact be at the center of a true science of nature. In other words, these are genuinely important questions. 'But the IDers' assertion that the only possible answer is a Designer-God is not warranted.

continued on Page 5

The *Journal* is the monthly publication of American Christian College d/b/a Summit Ministries, a non-profit, educational, religious corporation operating under the laws of the states of Oklahoma and Colorado. Correspondence:
P.O. Box 207, Manitou Springs, Colorado 80829
Phone: (719) 685-9103 • Fax: (719) 685-9330
E-mail: journal@summit.org
Although there is no charge for this publication, it costs Summit Ministries approximately $20 per year per subscription. The *Journal* is edited by David A. Noebel, and printed by Golden Belt Printing of Great Bend, Kansas.

From the President's Desk

Dr. David A. Noebel

When a court in Pennsylvania is called upon to determine a scientific and philosophical issue one has to guess that Darwinism is nearing its end. Instead of allowing the marketplace of ideas to determine the outcome of the evolution vs. Intelligent Design issue, the Darwinists have decided to hide behind the courts' skirts.

Before the Darwinists feel the last word has been spoken, I would strongly suggest each one read David Berlinski's article "On the Origin of Life" (excerpts on page 5) in the Jewish publication *Commentary* (February 2006). No intelligent person could read such a piece and come away saying, "Isn't chance wonderful!!"

Coming at the debate from another direction is Allan H. Ryskind, editor of *Human Events*. Here is his article as it appeared in *Human Events* (January 30, 2006, p. 7).

"The two scariest words in the English language? Intelligent Design! That phrase tends to produce a nasty rash and night sweats among our elitist class.

"Should some impressionable teenager ever hear those words from a public school teacher, we are led to believe, that student may embrace a secular heresy: that some intelligent force or energy, maybe even a god, rather than Darwinian blind chance, has been responsible for the gazillions of magnificently designed life forms that populate our privileged planet.

"You don't have to be a liberal to be spooked. Two of our nation's most illustrious conservative elitists—Charles Krauthammer and George Will—have become terrified by the doubts about Darwinism. Krauthammer's argument boils down to this: ID is just a 'tarted up version of creationism'—and such a 'religious' view has no business entering a classroom dealing with a really holy subject such as Darwin. Even if a student is inexorably led by the science to believe that ID is a possibility, according to Krauthammer's logic, neither the student nor his teacher should be allowed to blurt out something so inappropriate in a biology class.

Missing Truth

"Will has nothing but scorn for the lower human life forms who think ID should be mentioned, even if just shyly whispered, in a public school setting. When the Kansas State Board of Education decided to allow—but not require—ID discussions in science classes, Will raged that the board 'is controlled by the kind of conservatives who make conservatism repulsive to temperate people.' (Are these the words of a 'temperate' man?) Those repugnant conservatives had the audacity to proclaim that evolution is not a fact—'But it is,' Will sniffed.

"Really? Well, let's just see if only dimwitted (and repulsive) conservatives think the case for Darwinian theory is weak. Literally hundreds of geneticists, biologists, paleontologists, chemists, mathematicians and other scientists—whose religious views vary from agnostic to evangelical—say the theory is not a fact. Among them: Lev V. Beloussov and Vladimir L. Voelkov, two prominent Russian biologists from Moscow State University; Dr. Richard Sternberg, an evolutionary biologist at the Smithsonian Institution; and Dr. David Berlinski, a mathematician with post-doctoral training in molecular biology. (Berlinksi's scholarly article in the February issue of *Commentary* will prove an unpleasant read for evolutionists.)

"The Discovery Institute recently produced a list of over 400 scientists of varying faith and non-faith—including those from such prestigious institutions as Princeton, MIT and Cornell—who signed onto a statement stressing they were 'skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life.'

"Even many evolutionists, it seems, are uncertain that Darwinian theory is scientific fact. There is the famous story of the late Colin Patterson, who had been a senior paleontologist at the British Natural History Museum and the author of the museum's general text on evolution. Patterson gave a remarkable lecture in 1981 at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City—all of it nicely retold by Tom Bethell in his book, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science* (Regnery—a *HUMAN EVENTS* sister company). A brilliant essayist and scholar, Bethell has been a long-time critic of evolution and, unlike Will, has a science degree from Oxford University.

"Patterson informed his audience of mostly expert biologists that he had studied evolution for some 20 years and suddenly realized that 'there was not one thing I knew about it. … So either there was something wrong with me, or there was something wrong with evolutionary theory.'

"Thus he decided to put this question to various groups of experts: 'Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing, any one thing that you think is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology seminar at the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time and eventually one person said: "I do know one thing—it ought not to be taught in high school."' Bethell stresses that Patterson 'never repudiated' his statements, though he never truly repudiated evolution either."

To be continued next month

continued from Page 3
There is simply no evidence in support of this proposition.'

"It seems pretty clear that ID, as a public teaching, is going to meet the same fate as creation science. This modern update of an older understanding will not soon be taught as part of the science curriculum in our public schools. And this may be a good thing, in so far as it isn't really 'science' anyway. What's unfortunate is that the ideology of Darwinism—that is, the mistaken notion that Darwin defeated God—not only reigns culturally supreme, but also apparently increasingly has the legal backing of the state.

"The policy question 80 years ago, in the famous Scopes trial, was whether a public school teacher ought to be allowed to teach students about Darwin's theory of evolution. The question of today is nearly the opposite—whether anything other than orthodox Darwinism will be taught in the public schools. This marks not so much enlightenment's progress as a narrowing of our intellectual horizons."

—Adam Wolfson, *The Weekly Standard*, January 16, 2006, p. 15, 16

❑ "In the grand progression by which life arose from inorganic matter, Miller Time has been concluded. It is now 3.8 billion years ago. The chemical precursors to life have been formed. A limpid pool of nucleotides is somewhere in existence. A new era is about to commence.

"The historical task assigned to this era is a double one: forming chains of nucleic acids from nucleotides, and discovering among them those capable of reproducing themselves. Without the first, there is no RNA; and without the second, there is no life.

"In living systems, polymerization or chain-formation proceeds by means of the cell's invaluable enzymes. But in the grim inhospitable pre-biotic, no enzymes were available. And so chemists have assigned their task to various inorganic catalysts. J.P. Ferris and G. Ertem, for instance, have reported that activated nucleotides bond covalently when embedded on the surface of montmorillonite, a kind of clay. This example, combining technical complexity with general inconclusiveness, may stand for many others.

"In any event, polymerization having been concluded—by whatever means—the result was (in the words of Gerald Joyce and Leslie Orgel) 'a random ensemble of polynucleotide sequences': long molecules emerging from short ones, like fronds on the surface of a pond. Among these fronds, nature is said to have discovered a self-replicating molecule. But how?

"Darwinian evolution is plainly unavailing in this exercise or that era, since Darwinian evolution *begins* with self-replication, and self-replication is precisely what needs to be explained. But if Darwinian evolution is unavailing, so, too, is chemistry. The fronds comprise 'a *random* ensemble of polynucleotide sequences' (emphasis added); but no principle of organic chemistry suggests that aimless encounters among nucleic acids must lead to a chain capable of self-replication.

"If chemistry is unavailing and Darwin indisposed, what is left as a mechanism? The evolutionary biologist's finest friend: sheer dumb luck."

—David Berlinski, "On The Origins of Life," *Commentary* Magazine, February, 2006, p. 29

❑ "At the conclusion of a long essay, it is customary to summarize what has been learned. In the present case, I suspect it would be more prudent to recall how much has been *assumed*:

"First, that the pre-biotic atmosphere was chemically reductive; second, that nature found a way to synthesize cytosine; third, that nature also found a way to synthesize ribose; fourth, that nature found the means to assemble nucleotides into polynucleotides; fifth, that nature discovered a self-replicating molecule; and sixth, that having done all that, nature promoted a self-replicating molecule into a full system of coded chemistry.

"These assumptions are not only vexing but progressively so, ending in a serious impediment to thought. That, indeed, may be why a number of biologists have lately reported a weakening of their commitment to the RNA world altogether, and a desire to look elsewhere for an explanation of the emergence of life on earth. 'It's part of a quiet paradigm revolution going on in biology,' the biophysicist Harold Morowitz put it in an interview in *New Scientist*, 'in which the radical randomness of Darwinism is being replaced by a much more scientific law-regulated emergence of life.'

"Morowitz is not a man inclined to wait for the details to accumulate before reorganizing the vista of modern biology. In a series of articles, he has argued for a global vision based on the biochemistry of living systems rather than on their molecular biology or on Darwinian adaptations. His vision treats the living system as more fundamental than its particular species, claiming to represent the 'universal and deterministic features of *any* system of chemical interactions based on a water-covered but rocky planet such as ours.'

"This view of things—metabolism first, as it is often called—is not only intriguing in itself but is enhanced by a firm commitment to chemistry and to 'the model for what science should be.' It has been argued with great vigor by Morowitz and others. It represents an alternative to the RNA world. It is a work in progress, and it may well be right. Nonetheless, it suffers from one outstanding defect. There is as yet no evidence that it is true."

—David Berlinski, "On The Origins of Life," *Commentary* Magazine, February, 2006, p. 33

❑ "It may surprise some readers to find the Founders [Washington, Jefferson, Adams, etc.] keenly interested in theological issues (see Adams generally) or as willing to rewrite Scripture (see Franklin's revision of some verses from the first chapter of Job). But perhaps the most notable conclusion to be drawn from *The Founders on Religion* [by James H. Hutson] is the complete agreement of the Founders on two subjects in particular.

"One is what Hutson calls 'the social utility of religion,' as consider Washington: 'True religion affords to government its surest support.' And Jefferson: 'The Christian religion…is a religion of all others most friendly to liberty.' And Witherspoon: 'True and undefiled religion' is 'the great foundation of public prosperity and national happiness.'

"The other subject is that of Providence. Like the social utility of religion, it has its own chapter. But it also makes proud appearances, often by synonym, in many others. And talk about a religion gap: Where the Founders were united on Providence—'the

invisible hand, which conducts the Affairs of man,' and 'which has in many Instances appear'd for us,' saith the redoubtable Washington—we, or at least the two political parties, are divided. For while Republicans are not shy about invoking Providence, and understanding 'a finger of that Almighty hand' (Madison) still at work today in the affairs of man, Democrats, at least those at the national level, seldom speak of such things anymore. That's something to ponder, when pondering the relative strength in the electorate of the two parties, and our political future."

—Terry Eastland, *The Weekly Standard*, January 30, 2006, p. 43

❑ "The Democrats are trying to 'reframe' their message to make people think they believe abortion is wrong. I think this is going to be a hard sell if they plan to continue ferociously defending abortion-on-demand right up until the moment the baby's head is through the birth canal.

"But both the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* have recently run op-eds by liberals calling for Democrats to abandon their single-minded devotion to *Roe* v. *Wade.*

"In the *Post,* Richard Cohen said it was time for liberals to 'untether abortion rights from *Roe*.' Cohen admitted that conservatives (and 'some liberals,' he claimed implausibly) have a point when they say abortion ought to be decided by the states. This is another way of saying abortion is not a constitutional right. Kate Michelman: Call your abortion mill!

"In the *New York Times,* William Saletan gently counseled feminists that it was time to admit: 'It's bad to kill a fetus.' And they say liberals have no values!

"Even Jimmy Carter, the Democrats' idea of an Evangelical Christian, has allowed that 'I don't believe that Christ would approve of abortions.' (Though Carter added—that Christ would approve of abortion if 'the mother's life or health was seriously endangered or the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest'—or if Jesus really, really needed the feminists to vote for him.)

"It's been a long time coming, but the Democrats are finally throwing the NARAL ladies off the boat.

"One by one, the Democratic Party keeps having to abandon all the insane positions that have made it the funny, silly party we've come to know and love.

"The gun-control fanatics were thrown overboard after President Bill Clinton and a Democratic Congress passed the 1994 crime bill that banned so-called 'assault weapons'—i.e., otherwise completely legal semiautomatic weapons that looked scary to Dianne Feinstein.

"As a result, the Democrats lost Congress for the first time in 40 years and lost the South forever. When is the last time you heard a Democrat use the words 'gun control'?

"In l995, the new Republican Congress sent a welfare reform bill to Clinton, a man who had campaigned on 'mend it, don't end it' and then refused to do anything about it.

"Not one Democrat resigned from the Clinton Administration when Clinton turned out to be molesting the help and committing lots of felonies. But a whole slew of them resigned to protest Clinton's signing the Republicans' welfare reform bill.

"You never hear a peep out of Democrats anymore about restoring government welfare programs to their former glory.

"Now it's the abortion ladies' turn.

"As Saletan informed feminists in his *Times* column:

" 'You can tell yourself that the pro-choice majority stayed home in the last election, or that they voted on other issues, or that Democrats botched the debate. But those excuses are getting tired. Sixteen years ago, as the behavior of voters and politicians showed, abortion was clearly a winning issue for you. Now it isn't. You have a problem.'

"It's finally happened: Abortion stopped a bleeding heart.

"I guess Sandra Day O'Connor's demand that 'the contending sides' on abortion 'end their national division' and accept the court's diktat in *Roe* didn't work out for her.

"As Abraham Lincoln said of another moral blight on the nation supported by Democrats: You can 'repeal the Declaration of Independence—repeal all past history— you still cannot repeal human nature. It will still be the abundance of man's heart, that slavery extension is wrong; and out of the abundance of his heart, his mouth will continue to speak.'

"Or, as Justice Antonin Scalia said, the court's refusal to overrule the lawless *Roe* decision would not stand because of 'the twin facts that the American people love democracy and the American people are not fools.'

"With even liberals backing away from *Roe,* apparently the last group of people on Earth to realize the Supreme Court's abortion jurisprudence is a catastrophe is going to be the Supreme Court."

—Ann Coulter, *Human Events*, January 30, 206, p. 6

❑ "I wish to thank you for countless things of which I can never repay. I have been enriched immensely by the Summit this past summer (session #6) and adequately prepared for the secular university. I was challenged and stretched to read and grow and come to understand why I believe what I believe, identify the world's humanistic attacks to my beliefs, and find the vitality of 'being prepared in season and out of season.'

"The Summit has given me so very much. Books: *Mind Siege, The Battle For Truth,* and the monthly Summit *Journal.* I also received a sizeable scholarship in order to attend a seminar this summer. Your kind and helpful staff and leadership was and has been so very helpful and generous especially in the mailing of my Bible which I left at the session over the summer. Jen, you were a true blessing!

"I feel I could go on and on about how much The Summit has meant to me, though I don't have the time (as a busy college student), nor do you. I hope this gift in some way is able to signify how much I appreciate all I've been given and perhaps cover postage of my Bible's shipping and handling. Thanks again for your Christ-like service and for bearing the Light of Truth in a darkening world.

"Prayerfully,"

M.T., Freshman, Kansas State University

❑ "'China is lifting a million people a month out of poverty.'

"It is just one statement in an interesting new book, *The Undercover Economist*, by Tim Harford. But it has huge implications.

"I haven't checked out the statistics but they sound reasonable. If so, this is something worth everyone's attention.

"People on the political left make a lot of noise about poverty and advocate all sorts of programs and policies to reduce it but they show incredibly little interest in how poverty has actually been reduced, whether in China or anywhere else.

"You can bet the rent money that the left will show little interest in how Chinese by the millions are rising out of poverty every

year. The left showed far more interest in China back when it was run by Mao in far left fashion—and when millions of Chinese were starving.

"Those of us who are not on the left ought to take a closer look at today's Chinese rising out of poverty.

"First of all, what does it even mean to say that 'China is lifting a million people a month out of poverty'? Where would the Chinese government get the money to do that?

"The only people the Chinese government can tax are mainly the people in China. A country can't lift itself up by its own bootstraps that way.

"If the Chinese government hasn't done it, then who has? The Chinese people.

"The only thing that can cure poverty is wealth. The Chinese acquired wealth the old-fashioned way: They created it.

"After the death of Mao, government controls over the market began to be relaxed--first tentatively, in selected places and for selected industries. Then, as those places and those industries began to prosper dramatically, similar relaxations of government control took place elsewhere, with similar results.

"Even foreigners were allowed to come in and invest in China and sell their goods in China. But this was not just a transfer of wealth.

"Foreigners did not come in to help the Chinese but to help themselves. The only way they could benefit, and the Chinese benefit at the same time, was if more total wealth was created. That is what happened but the political left has virtually no interest in the creation of wealth, in China or anywhere else, despite all of their proclaimed concern for 'the poor.'

"Since wealth is the only thing that can cure poverty, you might think that the left would be as obsessed with the creation of wealth as they are with the redistribution of wealth. But you would be wrong.

"When it comes to lifting people out of poverty, redistribution of income and wealth has a much poorer and more spotty track record than the creation of wealth. In some places, such as Zimbabwe today, attempts at a redistribution of wealth have turned out to be a redistribution of poverty.

"While the creation of wealth may be more effective for enabling millions of people to rise out of poverty, it provides no special role for the political left, no puffed up importance, no moral superiority, no power for them to wield over others. Redistribution is clearly better for the left.

"Leftist emphasis on 'the poor' proceeds as if the poor were some separate group. But, in most Western countries, at least, millions of people who are 'poor' at one period of their lives are 'rich' at another period of their lives—as these terms are conventionally defined.

"How can that be? People tend to become more productive—create more wealth—over time, with more experience and an accumulation of skills and training.

"That is reflected in incomes that are two or three times higher in later years than at the beginning of a career. But that too is of little or no interest to the political left.

"Things that work for millions of people offer little to the left, and ultimately the left is about the left, not about the people they claim to want to lift out of poverty."

—Thomas Sowell, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, January 12, 2006, p. M8

❑ "Federal judges have just hit parents with a triple whammy. Two appellate courts held parents have no right to stop offensive, privacy-invading interrogation of their own children in public schools. In a third case, the Supreme Court indicated it will not do anything to protect parents' rights concerning schools.

"It has become painfully clear many courts have adopted the notion the 'village' (i.e., in these cases, the schools) should raise children. Judges prefer to side with schools and against parents.

"When a New Jersey mother was horrified to learn her daughter and classmates had been asked how many times they tried to kill themselves, she sued to protect the rights of parents and pupils. She won on the first appeal to the U.S. 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals in C.N. v. Ridgewood Board of Education. But the school relentlessly litigated to assert its primary authority, and the court finally ruled in its favor.

"At issue was a 156-question survey, 'Profiles of Student Life: Attitudes and Behaviors,' which probed students' personal lives and activities. The survey included questions about sex, drugs, suicide, incriminating behavior, spirituality, tolerance and other personal matters.

"Questions 92-93 in this survey given to Ridgewood children demanded to know 'how many times' they 'had used cocaine' in their lives, or in the last 12 months, and the choices were 0, 1, 2, 3-5, 6-9, 10-19, 20-39, and 40+. This gave students the false impression casual cocaine use is common and acceptable.

"Misleading questions can have a powerful effect. Our legal system recognizes this by providing dozens of reasons for lawyers to object to questions in court to protect their witnesses from having to answer improper questions.

"Children lack the maturity to distinguish between questions they should or should not answer. Children are trained in school they must answer the teacher's questions or face discipline or a poor grade.

"Ask an adult when he stopped beating his wife, and you're told to get lost. Ask a child in the classroom how often he takes drugs or has sex, and the child will think he should answer.

"But judges who routinely uphold lawyers' objections to improper questions in court think it is OK to ask offensive questions of children in school. In the Ridgewood decision, the court agreed with the parents that student participation in the survey may have been mandatory and conceded the leading questions could be suggestive to students, but nevertheless ruled parents' and pupils' rights were not violated.

"The 9th Circuit went even further, marking the school door as the line where parents' rights end and the 'village' takes over. In Fields v. Palmdale School District in November, the judges ruled the right of parents 'does not extend beyond the threshold of the school door.'"

—Phyllis Schlafly, *The Washington Times*, December 21, 2005, p. A17

❑ "Beginning with the Revolutionary War, when British agents and sympathizers attempted to derail independence, there have been people who have tried to infiltrate the United States for the purpose of undermining and destroying it. In modern times, communism and fascism have sent agents among us, but we discovered their plans and defeated them here and abroad.

"Now comes what may be the greatest threat: radical Islam, whose 'agents' may have established a base more solid and more dangerous than anything we've encountered before. The good

American Christian College
Journal
P.O. Box 207
Manitou Springs, CO 80829
(719) 685-9103
Journal@summit.org
www.summit.org

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Great Bend, KS
PERMIT 25

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

Receiving Duplicate Mailings?
Please note your correct name and address, and return all labels to Summit Ministries for correction.

Moving?
Please send us a change of address form (available at your local post office).

news is they speak openly of their intentions. The bad news is that many of us are not taking them seriously.

"Last week at the beginning of the London trial of radical imam Abu Hamza al-Masri, evidence was presented detailing how he encouraged his followers at the Finsbury Park mosque to kill non-Muslims.

"In lectures, recordings and writings, the imam said Adolf Hitler had been sent into the world to punish the Jews. Repeatedly, said the prosecutor, Abu Hamza told his followers they must fight for Allah and such fighting involves a religious mandate to murder Jews, kuffars (nonbelievers in Islam) and 'apostates,' such as leaders of Arab nations like Egypt. Abu Hamza has pleaded innocent to all 15 charges, including nine counts of solicitation of murder, four counts of using threatening, abusive or insulting words or behavior intended to incite racial hatred and two counts related to the possession of offensive sound recordings and possession of a copy of the Encyclopedia of the Afghani Jihad.

"The talks and written materials are not only about war. Abu Hamza also delivers diatribes about Britain's licensing laws, the use of additives in food, adultery, the role of women and the 'evils' of democracy.

"Prosecutors introduced as evidence a 1-volume 'blueprint for terrorism' they say was discovered in Abu Hamza's house. Among the targets for 'causing disturbance but not loss of life' are Big Ben, the Eiffel Tower and the Statue of Liberty. Chapter headings include 'The need to study the principles of war' and 'The duty of assassination and kidnap.' Other subheadings offer advice on reconnaissance, infiltration, ambush and how to manufacture explosive devices, open locks and train assassins. David Perry, prosecuting counsel, told the court, 'This is a manual, a blueprint for terrorism.'

"Perry said the document's 'execution section' recommends that Islamic agents be sent to any country intended as a target at least 10 years before jihad begins. This was the profile of terrorists depicted in last season's '24' series on Fox. In this fictional story, terrorist cells

were established in a middle-class American neighborhood where they remained dormant and appeared peaceful until a signal was given to conduct mayhem.

"On one tape, Abu Hamza discusses the killing of tourists in Egypt in November 1997, describing them as satanic. He says the tourist industry should be 'Islamicised' and added that while children should not be deliberately killed, their killing is permitted if they are in the target area. Suicide bombings are 'martyrdom,' he says. They are permitted 'if the only way to hurt the enemies of Islam is by taking your own life.'

"Among the many problems with this twisted religiosity is that the West does not know how many share it. Instead, political leaders repeat the bromide that Islam is a 'peaceful religion' and radicals are trying to hijack it. Are we being infiltrated by people who, on the outside, pretend to be peaceful and tolerant, but inside wish to undermine and overthrow our government?

"One clue may be found on a Canadian Muslim Web page (muslim-canada.org/muslimstats.html). In a discussion on Muslim population statistics, which includes a chart projecting that the world Muslim population will outgrow the Christian population by 2025, it is noted that Islam is growing nearly 3 percent per year, faster than the total growth in world population. While the ratio of older to younger people is weighted to the older in the West, the reverse is true among Muslims. In what some might consider an ominous conclusion, the Canadian-Islamic Web page states, 'An aging population tends to be introspective and sluggish, whereas a young population is more likely to be vibrant and energetic. This may or may not bode well for many countries and that will depend on whether their political structure is fragile or not.'