

MONTH IN REVIEW

❑ “And you were dead in your trespasses and sins in which you previously walked according to this worldly age, according to the ruler of the atmospheric domain, the spirit now working in the disobedient. We too all previously lived among them in our fleshly desires, carrying out the inclinations of our flesh and thoughts, and by nature we were children under wrath, as the others were also. But God, who is abundant in mercy, because of His great love that He had for us, made us alive with the Messiah even though we were dead in trespasses. By grace you are saved! He also raised us up with Him and seated us with Him in the heavens, in Christ Jesus, so that in the coming ages He might display the immeasurable riches of His grace in His kindness to us in Christ Jesus. For by grace you are saved through faith, and this is not from yourselves; it is God’s gift—not from works, so that no one can boast. For we are His creation—created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared ahead of time so that we should walk in them.”

—Ephesians 2:1-

10

❑ “Christ’s work of making New Men [is like]...turning a horse into a winged creature....It is not mere improvement but Transformation.

“It is a change that goes off in a totally different direction—a change from being creatures of God to being sons of God. The first instance appeared in Palestine two thousand years ago.

“...I have called Christ the ‘first instance’ of the new man. But of course He is something more than that. He is not merely a new man, one specimen of the species, but *the* new man. He is the origin and centre and life of all the new men.”

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

❑ “What can you ever really know of other people’s souls—their temptations, their opportunities, their struggles? One soul in the whole creation you do know: and it is the only one whose fate is placed in your hands. If there is a God, you are, in a sense, alone with Him. You cannot put Him off with speculations about your next door neighbours or memories of what you have read in books. What will all that chatter and hearsay count (will you even be able to remember it?) when the anaesthetic fog which we call ‘nature’ or ‘the real world’ fades away and the Presence in which you have always stood becomes palpable, immediate, and unavoidable?”

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

❑ “That Islam sees the world as an open-ended conflict between the Land of Peace (*Dar al-Islam*) and the Land of War (*Dar al-Harb*), which must be conquered by *jihad*, is the most important bequest of Muhammad to his heirs. Ever since his time Islam has been a permanent threat to all non-Muslim polities around it.”

—Serge Trifkovic, *Defeating Jihad*, p. 30

❑ “This war is being fought, on the Islamic side, with the deep belief that the West is on its last legs. The success of its demographic onslaught on Europe enhances the image of ‘a candy store

with the busted lock,’ and that view is reinforced by the evidence from history that a civilization that loses the urge for self-perpetuation is indeed in peril.”

—Serge Trifkovic, *Defeating Jihad*, p.

291

❑ “Today the spiritual heirs to the pro-communists, pro-fascists and pro-Nazis in politics, the academy and the media establishment act as Islam’s apologists, character witnesses and fellow travelers. They explain away, with identical scholastic sophistry and moral depravity, the dark and violent implications of the source texts, the Kuran and the Hadith, the deeply unnerving career of Muhammad, and 14 centuries of conquests, wars, slaughters, subjugation, decline without fall, spiritual and material misery, slavery, abuse of women and murderous fanaticism.”

—Serge Trifkovic, *Defeating Jihad*, p. 294

❑ “There were heated denunciations of the American government, angry pleas for the immediate arrest of American imperialism, and widespread support for more aggressive political activism to resist the injustices daily perpetrated by America abroad and at home. It was no run-of-the-mill anti-war hate fest but the first national conference of Historians Against the War (HAW), events more closely related than they may at first appear.

“HAW, notwithstanding its claims to scholarly prestige, is an activist organization. Formed in 2003 for the explicit purpose of opposing the U.S.-military offensive against Saddam Hussein, the HAW professed to be ‘deeply concerned about the needless destruction of human life’ as well as ‘the egregious curtailment of civil liberties and human rights at home and abroad, and the obstruction of world peace for the indefinite future.’ A fount of indignation on the subject of U.S. militarism, HAW could not be troubled to pass judgment on dictatorial Iraq.

“Instead, the organization has devoted its energies to assailing the alleged ‘lies’ of the Bush administration while rehabilitating the reputation of antebellum Iraq and shrilly declaring a rhetorical war against the ‘War on Terrorism,’ whose prosecution by the United States unsettles HAW’s 1800-plus members far more than its targets. Long a fixture at anti-war rallies, HAW is a

— 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-June 30.

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

participating member of United for Peace and Justice (UFPJ), a leading coalition of anti-war groups. At UFPJ's Second National Assembly, convened last February in St. Louis, Missouri, HAW was a prominent attendee.

"That same activist ethos pervaded HAW's recent conference. Held between February 17 and 19 at the University of Texas at Austin, it was titled 'Empire, Resistance, and the War in Iraq.' Even more revealing was the subtitle: 'A Conference for Historians and Activists.' For despite the fig leaf of its billing as a 'scholarly' event, aimed at examining the Iraq war from a 'historical perspective,' the conference was little more than a prolonged grievance session for activists to parade their radicalism and issue yet another call for the politicization of American higher education.

"Far from atypical were the remarks of keynote speaker Howard Zinn. The America-loathing Marxist and retired Boston University professor used the occasion to deliver himself of a broadside against the U.S. government. Not only was President Bush a liar, according to Zinn, but, in the words of HAW-member Judy Atkins, he also claimed that '[t]he biggest lie that many people fall for is that there is a common national interest between the common people and the government.' Zinn additionally set forth the more ambitious agenda of the HAW conference. Besides liberating the country from the oppressive Bush administration, he counseled, likeminded academics had an occupational duty to 'take our history.' Lest there be any doubt about the direction history should be taken, Zinn stressed that but a single approach would suffice: a distinctly Marxist focus on the 'clash of classes.'

"Where Zinn urged a new dedication to the cause of politicized education, the conference's other keynote speaker, Andrea Smith, a radical feminist and a assistant professor in Women's Studies and American Culture at the University of Michigan, took aim at those who dared to dissent from academic orthodoxy with respect to the wisdom of military intervention. Smith singled out for opprobrium feminists who supported the U.S.-led overthrow of Afghanistan's Taliban regime. One report quoted Smith sneering that a bombing campaign could never liberate women. Enlarging on that theme, Smith asserted that the real threat to women came not from the governments like the Taliban but from concepts like the nation state."

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, March 3, 2006

□ "A grandfatherly figure, his bearded face wrinkled into a smile, peers down from billboards around town.

"It is surprise enough that the man is Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, the once-exiled writer, Nobel Prize winner and, of late, octogenarian scold. It is even more so that the billboards advertise his adaptation—broadcast on state television, no less—of one of his fiercely anti-Soviet novels, *The First Circle*.

"Solzhenitsyn, has been called the conscience of the nation, but his reputation has risen and fallen as tumultuously as Russia itself since the collapse of the Soviet Union. *First Circle* has once again placed him on the national stage, reaching an audience that would have been inconceivable to him four decades ago, when he smuggled the book out of the Soviet Union.

"The show, a 10-part series that began Jan. 29 and ends [February 9], is part of an industry here catering to what seems to be a growing interest in adaptations of the great works of Russian

literature, some of them books that were banned in Soviet times. It began with Dostoyevsky's *Idiot* in 2004, includes less familiar Soviet-era works like *Master and Margarita* and *The Gold Calf*, and will reach a climax of sorts this spring with the broadcast of a Russian adaptation of *Doctor Zhivago*.

"The first episode of *The First Circle* was the most watched program in the nation last week, narrowly edging out 'Terminator 3,' according to TNS Gallup Media. By this week, though, it had slipped to fifth place, at least in Moscow—national figures were not yet available. But it was still attracting 15 million viewers a night.

"Solzhenitsyn was greeted as a prodigal son when he returned from exile in 1994, only to see his later works—*Russia in Collapse*, an apocalyptic political attack on society's ills in 1998, and *Two Hundred Years Together*, on Judaism in Russia in 2004—met with public indifference. He once had his own talk show, until it was canceled because of low ratings.

"This would-be prophet has played no significant role in Russia's political dialogue since coming back,' a commentator for the official Russian Information Agency, Anatoly Korolev, wrote in August 2004.

"Now, 18 months later, in the twilight of an immeasurably influential career, he is back before the public in a society that has not always known what to make of its most famous living writer."

—*New York Times International*, February 9, 2006, p. A3

□ "A survey of Canadian readers by Indigo Books, a national Canadian retailer, discovers that Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* has defeated 'some of literature's most venerable sellers.' Conducted over the summer, an online poll of 7,000 readers found the Brown book proclaimed 'the best of all time.'

"It's hard to imagine any current fact that better illustrates the disheveled state of Christian education. For by almost any standard of New Testament scholarship, *The Da Vinci Code* is unmitigated nonsense, and any Christian with the barest knowledge of the history of the New Testament would know this. Yet it has been passed off by the author as historically credible, and many millions of people believe him, an embarrassing number of them practicing Christians.

"Today, almost any cock-and-bull fabrication about Jesus Christ can be published and offered for sale, with a host of dubious 'modern scholars' testifying to its possible authenticity, and can quickly run to the top of the best-seller lists, put there in part

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

Here is Part II of Allan H. Ryskind's "Darwinist Ideologues Are on the Run" article as it appeared in *Human Events* (January 30, 2006, p. 7). The Darwinists are having a very difficult time explaining "spontaneous generation" and how one species "gradually" evolves into a new one. It's about time our "Christian" evolutionists repented and admitted science is not on their side!

"Irving Kristol is a prominent, brainy, Jewish social critic and the godfather of neoconservatism. He can hardly be accused of being a 'literalist' when it comes to the Bible, as evolutionists so frequently try to portray their critics. In a Sept. 30, 1986, article in the *New York Times*, Kristol observed the following:

"Though Darwin's theory on how man and animals were created 'is usually taught as an established scientific fact, it is nothing of the sort. It has too many lacunae. Geological evidence does not provide us with the spectrum of intermediate species we would expect. Moreover, laboratory experiments reveal how close to impossible it is for one species to evolve into another, even allowing for selective breeding and some genetic mutation.' Does anyone have the nerve to suggest Kristol is a close-minded, religious dogmatist as well?

"So here's the crux of the matter: If a theory as shaky as Darwin's is a mandatory subject in the public schools, why shouldn't public school teachers be at least allowed, if not compelled, to inform their students that many reputable scientists, although still a distinct minority, believe that something else, including Intelligent Design, is worthy of some consideration?

"The Kansas school board that caused poor George Will to unravel did not try to impose a single view of creation on the state's public school system. The board majority is very unlike the rigid Darwinists in that regard. In November 2005, the board, by a 6-to-4 vote, drafted new scientific standards for education in the high schools. Far from eradicating the study of evolution, these 'intemperate' board members made it a requirement, explaining that the new 'curriculum standards call for students to learn about the best evidence for modern evolutionary theory....' But the members also called for

students 'to learn about areas where scientists are raising scientific criticisms of the theory.'

"These serious criticisms have now risen to a level where the board majority felt it would be positively remiss if those views weren't also discussed in the classrooms. Isn't this as American as apple pie? (Interestingly, Board Chairman Steve Abrams, a veterinarian, informed this writer that he set aside three days of hearings for pro-evolutionist experts, and three days for the skeptics, with each side allowed to cross-examine the other. The pro-evolutionist experts refused to testify and be questioned. The skeptics testified and faced cross-examination.)

"What scares the pants off the Darwinians today is that the Bush Supreme Court may validate the Kansas-style scientific standards that have already been embraced by at least four other states. The Darwinians were deliriously happy when the High Court ruled against a Louisiana statute in 1987 requiring the state's public schools to give 'balanced treatment' to 'creation science' (sometimes equated with 'intelligent design') and 'evolution science.' It amounted to imposing religion, said the court majority. But Antonin Scalia, with Chief Justice William Rehnquist in agreement, said this was nonsense. The evidence, said Scalia, was overwhelming that the law's framers were not trying to impose religion in the classrooms.

"The act's reference to 'creation' is not convincing evidence of religious purpose,' said Scalia, 'because the proponents and witnesses repeatedly stressed that the subject can and should be presented without religious content. *We have no basis on the record to conclude that creation science need be anything other than a collection of scientific data supporting the theory that life abruptly appeared on Earth.*' (Emphasis added.)

"Scalia, in short, blew both Krauthammer's and Will's reasoning about the teaching of 'creation science' and 'intelligent design' out of the water. Kansas and the other states, in truth, have done nothing more odious than attempt to permit a whiff of scientific freedom to enter the classrooms. With the High Court now about to have four justices in the Scalia mode, the Darwinist ideologues,

continued from Page 3

through the ignorance and gullibility of devout and committed Christian people.

“When Mark Noll, the articulate and wholly authoritative professor of history at Wheaton College, published his *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* nine years ago, he was not writing about illiterate Christians, but of educated and often otherwise literate ones who did not regard their faith as imposing obligations on their mind. God was about loving people. What did thinking have to do with it?

“A great deal, writes C.S. Lewis in his *Mere Christianity*. Christ wants ‘every bit of intelligence we have to be alert at its job and in first-class fighting trim. . . . The fact that what you are thinking about is God himself (for example when you are praying) does not mean that you can be content with the same babyish ideas which you had when you were a 5-year-old.’

“He refuted Charles Kingsley’s: ‘Be good, sweet maid, and let who will be clever.’ Rather, says Lewis, ‘being good involves being as clever as you can.’

“If Christians, whether Protestant or Catholic, were instructed in the faith to the level which a modern, increasingly anti-Christian society demands of us, Dan Brown’s concoction of pseudo-biblical claptrap would have been laughed off the market as soon as it appeared.

“The average high-school educated Christian would have known that the Gnostic gospels represent the legendary phase of Christianity. Jesus Christ, among other things, was a human being, lived a human life at a specific point in human history, was sentenced to a particularly hideous death on the charge of blasphemy and, according to the records left by his followers, rose triumphant over death itself—‘beating down death,’ as the Orthodox Christians say, ‘by death,’ i.e., by his own death.

“As with all historical figures, especially in the ancient world, there are two kinds of accounts of Christ’s life. The first, the four Gospels, are highly verifiable on historical grounds—meaning that they are known to have been written within a time period that would enable them to have been first- or second-hand accounts. If you reject the Gospels because you don’t believe in miracles, fair enough. However, your rejection is not based on historical, but on theological grounds. Historically, all four Gospels are entirely credible.

“As the years passed, however, legends grew up around Jesus—legends written a hundred or sometimes 150 years after he died. These are the so-called ‘Gnostic’ gospels. The early Christians rejected them for inclusion in the New Testament because they knew them to be largely fictitious. Today, popularizers like Brown and a cadre of dubious ‘modern scholars’ have seized upon them as the basis of a reconstruction of Christian history and the Christian faith. Because of the interest that has always focused on Jesus, they sell well. But they are poppycock, and we should know this.

“They should also serve as a warning to us. Unlike any of our forefathers, Christians must live today under an unprecedented avalanche of information, some valuable, much useless, a great deal absurd and some actively poisonous. More than ever, we need Christian schools. But we must be sure that what we teach in them is Christianity. We must be sure they are not really secular schools whose Christianity consists entirely of crosses and biblical pictures

on the wall. Christianity should touch, influence, even shape every subject taught. For we are in the midst of an ideological war, as crucial as any military one, and victory will greatly depend on what goes on in those Christian classrooms.”

—Ted Byfield, *WorldNetDaily.com*, October 1, 2005

□ “Though I grow weary of pointing it out, let’s do it again. Let’s examine some numbers readily available from the Census Bureau’s 2004 Current Population Survey and ask some questions.

“There’s one segment of the black population that suffers only a 9.9 percent poverty rate, and only 13.7 percent of its under-5-year-olds are poor. There’s another segment that suffers a 39.5 percent poverty rate, and 58.1 percent of its under-5-year-olds are poor.

“Among whites, one segment suffers a 6 percent poverty rate, and only 9.9 percent of its under-5-year-olds are poor. The other segment suffers a 26.4 percent poverty rate, and 52 percent of its under-5-year-olds are poor. What do you think distinguishes the high and low poverty populations among blacks?

“Would you buy an explanation that it’s because white people practice discrimination against one segment of the black population and not the other or one segment had a history of slavery and not the other? You’d have to be a lunatic to buy such an explanation. The only distinction between both the black and white populations is marriage—lower poverty in married-couple families.

“In 1960, only 28 percent of black females ages 15 to 44 were never married and illegitimacy among blacks was 22 percent. Today, the never-married rate is 56 percent and illegitimacy stands at 70 percent. If today’s black family structure were what it was in 1960, the over-all black poverty rate would be in or near single digits. The weakening of the black family structure, and its devastating consequences, have nothing to do with the history of slavery or racial discrimination.

“Dr. Charles Murray, an American Enterprise Institute scholar, argues in an article titled ‘Rediscovering the Underclass’ in the Institute’s On the Issues series (October 2005) that self-destructive behavior has become the hallmark of the underclass. He says that unemployment in the underclass is not caused by the lack of jobs but by the inability to get up every morning and go to work. In 1954, the percentage of black males, age 20 to 24, not looking for work was nine percent. In 1999, it rose to 30 percent, and that was at a time when employers were beating the bushes for employees. Murray adds that ‘the statistical reality is that people who get into the American job market and stay there seldom remain poor unless they do something self-destructive.’

“I share Murray’s sentiment expressed at the beginning of his article where he says, ‘Watching the courage of ordinary low-income people as they deal with the aftermath of Katrina and Rita, it is hard to decide which politicians are more contemptible—Democrats who are rediscovering poverty and blaming it on George W. Bush, or Republicans who are rediscovering poverty and claiming that the government can fix it.’

“Since President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty, controlling for inflation, the nation has spent \$9 trillion on about 80 anti-poverty programs. To put that figure in perspective, last year’s U.S. GDP was \$11 trillion; \$9 trillion exceeds the GDP of any nation

except the United States. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita uncovered the result of the War on Poverty—dependency and self-destructive behavior.

“Guess what the president and politicians from both parties are asking the American people to do? If you said, ‘Enact programs that will sustain and enhance dependency,’ go to the head of the class.”

—Walter E. Williams, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, October 29, 2005, p. M6

□ “How is marriage doing in America? Professor Norval Glenn of the University of Texas at Austin surveyed 1,503 Americans 18 years or older and recently released the results in the National Fatherhood Initiative Marriage Survey. (www.fatherhood.org/doclibrary/nms.pdf).

“Americans remain profoundly pro-marriage. Eighty-nine percent agree ‘All things being equal, it is better for children to be raised in a household that has a married mother and father.’ Only 12 percent describe marriage as ‘an old-fashioned, outmoded institution.’

“Sixty percent of Americans are married, and 86 percent of the never-married say they hope to marry someday. Ninety-three percent say they would remarry their spouses.

“Nonetheless, the proportion of Americans in stable, ‘very happy’ first marriages has dropped 20 percentage points since 1973, according to Mr. Glenn’s calculations from the General Social Surveys of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. Delayed marriage, increased divorce, and a slight decline in marital happiness are the reasons.

“Who are likeliest to be in very happy first marriages? The college-educated are about twice as likely as high school dropouts; the ‘very’ religious are also about twice as likely as those who are only slightly or not at all religious. People who marry directly without first cohabiting are also about twice as likely to succeed in marriage as those who live together.

“What’s the best age to get married? Earlier than most people think. Teen marriages are high-risk. But the most successful age for marriage was not the late 30s but the mid-20s. ‘When the quality of marriage is taken into account, however, first marriages of persons in their mid-20s emerge as distinctly more successful than those entered into either earlier or later in life,’ the report notes, saying this finding ‘has not been previously recognized.’ If you are 23 and find the right person, you are plenty old enough to make a happy marriage.

“Americans are as anti-divorce as they are pro-marriage. Ninety-four percent of Americans agree divorce is a serious national problem; 59 percent think society would be better off if divorces were harder to get; 71 percent disagree with the statement ‘Either spouse should be allowed to terminate a marriage at any time for any reason.’ Seventy-three percent support a one-year waiting period ‘to give the couple a chance to reconsider their decision to divorce.’ But only 44 percent agreed that, in the absence of violence or extreme conflict, parents should stay together at least until their children are grown. (I wonder if some found this wording confusing.)

“Moreover, even divorced Americans express considerable ambivalence about their divorces. More than three-fifths of di-

vorced Americans say they wish they or their spouse had worked harder to save the marriage. (Men were likelier to blame themselves: 35 percent of ex-husbands and 21 percent of ex-wives say they wish they had worked harder.)

“The NFI Marriage Survey also provides new evidence the college-educated now are especially resistant to the attitudes of the divorce culture. ‘College-educated respondents,’ the report notes, ‘were less likely than those with less education to say that living together before marriage is a good thing, and they were more likely to say that parents should stay married until their children are grown.’

“A separate study by University of Maryland sociologist Stephen P. Martin found divorce rates among the college-educated have declined by half since their peak in the 1970s. He labels this growing evidence of a ‘divorce divide.’

“Many factors are no doubt responsible (the better economic position of college-educated men springs to mind). But the NFI Marriage Survey suggests another possibility: an information gap. The college-educated are undoubtedly the principal consumers of new social science evidence that divorce hurts kids, and that living together doesn’t reduce the risk of divorce.”

—Maggie Gallagher, *The Washington Times*, December 3, 2005, p. A 11

□ Excerpts from the May 27, 2005 document, “Notice on Further Strengthening Marxist Atheism Research, Propaganda and Education,” issued by the Communist Party of China:

* “Facing the new task of reform, development and stability, the new demand of the people on spiritual and cultural life, the new situation on targeting the cultic organization of ‘Falun Gong’ and various pseudo-science and superstition, and the new trend toward Western hostile forces’ attempt to ‘westernize’ and ‘disintegrating’ China in the name of religion, we need to further strengthen Marxist atheism research, propaganda and education.”

* “Attention shall be centered on the party cadres and juveniles. And relevant work shall be done persistently and incessantly, with an effort to create healthy social values, and good social environment, under which science and civilization are advocated, fatuity and superstition are opposed, and evil teachings and heterodox are boycotted.”

* “Aiming at the phenomenon of fatuity and superstition, which exists among some people, we shall strengthen the research, propaganda and education of natural science, particularly the basic knowledge about life, helping people understand the universe, the origin of life, the rule on human evolution, and correctly deal with various natural phenomena, natural disasters, birth, aging, disease and death.”

* “To publicize Marxist atheism, we shall positively use films, TV programs, books, electronic publications, and other things to people’s taste, and firmly ban all illegal publications, which disseminate superstitions and evil teachings.”

* “We shall firmly implement the party’s policy on freedom of religious belief, respect people’s freedom to believe religion or not believe religion, and make distinction between religion and superstition.”

—*World Magazine*, December 4, 2004, p. 26, translated by the China Aid Association

❑ “But the question remains, are Americans stupid? Mental functions involve two different spheres: intelligence (mental ability) and knowledge (mental content). It is possible to have one without the other. Americans across the spectrum do seem to have intelligence, whether highly specialized mental abilities or down-to-earth common sense. They are certainly not so stupid as to allow intellectuals to rule over them. Americans do tend to be smart. Sometimes, though, they lack knowledge, or the knowledge they think with is untrue.

“Many Americans, for example, think morality is nothing more than a subjective preference, ungrounded in the real world outside themselves. They assume that God too exists only inside their heads, if He exists at all, and that He need not be consulted in practical matters. Many Americans either know nothing of the past or believe that the wisdom of the ages should be discarded on the grounds that it is not modern. Many Americans go so far as to reject the very existence of *any* objective truth, insisting that reality itself is nothing more than a construction of their minds, to be reconstructed in any way they please.

“Such a combination of ignorance, confusion, and hostility to knowledge is held today mainly by our smart people. It is precisely our intellectuals who are questioning the value of reason and the possibility of knowledge. We have thinkers without beliefs, fine minds with nothing in them.

“In America’s democratic republic, citizens of various intelligence levels can take part. In the Christian church too, people with the whole range of intellectual abilities can find welcome and fulfillment. Some level of knowledge, though, is important for citizenship in both the kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of heaven.

“Americans are smart enough, but it would be helpful for Americans—liberals, conservatives, Christians, and everyone—to know more, to be open to truths that go beyond their own limited interests, desires, and preferences. ‘My people are destroyed’ not for lack of intelligence, but ‘for lack of knowledge’ (Hosea 4:6).

—Gene Edward Veith, *World Magazine*, November 19, 2004, p. 31

❑ “Evolutionary scientists once agreed that the fossil record shows gradual evolution. Now, some deny that gradual change is evident in the fossil record. A few acknowledge that the evolutionary interpretation of the fossil record rests on circular reasoning.

“Harvard scientist Stephen Jay Gould says the fossil record does not show evolution occurring gradually. ‘The fossil record with its abrupt transitions,’ he writes, ‘offers no support for gradual change.’ He calls these repeated gaps ‘the trade secret of paleontology.’

“Gould favors the ‘punctuated equilibrium’ theory of evolution. This says that mutations suddenly produced new life forms too quickly for the fossil record to capture. In favorable environments, these ‘hopeful monsters’ survived as new species, genera, and families.

“Gradualist Ernst Mayr, however, calls this the ‘hopeless monster’ theory. Mayr says that ‘to believe that such a drastic mutation’ could survive and find a mate is like ‘believing in miracles.’ He argues that hopeful monsters would be freaks of nature, nothing more.

“British scientist Colin Patterson would test evolutionary theory against the pattern of nature. ‘But,’ he asks, ‘if we are taught, as we have been, to see that pattern through the spectacles of evolutionary theory, how could the pattern ever test the theory?’

“In circular reasoning people assume what they set out to prove. Evolutionary scientists date rocks by the stage their ‘index fossils’ represent in the assumed evolution of life. Thus the Standard Geological Column reflects evolutionary assumptions but does not prove them.

“Yale University evolutionary biologist Keith Thomson says of this reasoning, ‘There is circularity in the approach that first assumes some sort of evolutionary relatedness and then assembles a pattern of relations from which to argue that relatedness must be true.’”

—Mel Gabler/Neil Frey, “Fossils and Evolution”

❑ “Ponce, Puerto Rico (AP)—People who think the Constitution would break if it didn’t change with society are ‘idiots,’ U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia says.

“In a speech Monday sponsored by the conservative Federalist Society, Justice Scalia defended his long-held belief in sticking to the plain text of the Constitution ‘as it was originally written and intended.’

“‘Scalia does have a philosophy; it’s called originalism. That’s what prevents him from doing the things he would like to do,’ Justice Scalia told more than 100 politicians and lawyers from this U.S. island territory.

“He said that, according to his judicial philosophy, there can be no room for personal, political or religious beliefs.

“Justice Scalia criticized those who believe in what he called the ‘living Constitution.’

“‘That’s the argument of flexibility, and it goes something like this: The Constitution is over 200 years old, and societies change. It has to change with society, like a living organism, or it will become brittle and break.

“‘But you would have to be an idiot to believe that,’ Justice Scalia said. ‘The Constitution is not a living organism; it is a legal document. It says something and doesn’t say other things.’

“Proponents of the living Constitution want matters to be decided ‘not by the people, but by the justices of the Supreme Court.’

“‘They are not looking for legal flexibility; they are looking for rigidity. Whether it’s the right to abortion or the right to homosexual activity, they want that right to be embedded from coast to coast and to be unchangeable,’ he said.

“Justice Scalia was invited to Puerto Rico by the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies. The organization was founded in 1982 as a debating society by students who thought professors at the top law schools were too liberal.”

—*The Washington Times*, February 15, 2006, p. A4

❑ “High on my list of annoyances are references to the United States as a democracy and the suggestion that Iraq should become a democracy. The word ‘democracy’ appears in neither of our founding documents—the Declaration of Independence nor the



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).

U.S. Constitution.

“Our nation’s founders had disdain for democracy and majority rule. James Madison, in Federalist Paper No. 10, said in a pure democracy, ‘there is nothing to check the inducement to sacrifice the weaker party or the obnoxious individual.’

“John Adams said, ‘Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There was never a democracy yet that did not commit suicide.’ Chief Justice John Marshall added, ‘Between a balanced republic and a democracy, the difference is like that between order and chaos.’ The founders knew that a democracy would lead to the same kind of tyranny suffered under King George III. Their vision for us was a republic.

“But let’s cut to Iraq and President Bush’s call for it to become a democracy. I can’t think of a worse place to have a democracy—majority rule. Iraq needs a republic like that envisioned by our founders—decentralized and limited government power. In a republican form of government, there is rule of law. Government intervenes in civil society to protect its citizens against force and fraud but does not intervene in the cases of peaceable, voluntary exchange.

“Democracy, what the Bush administration calls for, is different. In a democracy, the majority rules either directly or through its elected representatives. The law is whatever the government determines it to be.

“In Iraq, Arabs are about 75 percent of the population, Kurds about 20 percent and Turkomen and Assyrian the balance. Religiously, Shia are about 60 percent of the population, Sunni 35 percent with Christian and other religions making up the balance. If a majority-rule democracy emerges, given the

longstanding hate and distrust among ethnic/religious groups, it’s a recipe for conflict. Majority rule is a zero-sum game with winners and losers, with winners having the power to impose their wills on the minority. Conflict emerges when the minority resists.

“The political model for Iraq is Switzerland’s cantonal system. Historically, Switzerland, unlike most European countries, was made up of several different major ethnic groups—Germans, French, Italians and Rhaeto-Romansch. Over the centuries, conflicts have arisen between these groups, who differ in language, religion and culture. The resolution to the conflict was to allow the warring groups to govern themselves.

“Switzerland has 26 cantons. The cantons are divided into about 3,000 communes. Switzerland’s federal government controls only those interests common to all cantons—national defense, foreign policy, railways and the like. All other matters are controlled by the individual cantons and communes. The Swiss cantonal system enables people of different ethnicity, language, culture and religion to live at peace with one another.

“As such, Switzerland’s political system is well suited to an ethnically and religiously divided country such as Iraq.

“By the way, for Bush and others who insist on calling our country a democracy, should we change our pledge of allegiance to say ‘to the democracy, for which it stands,’ and should we rename ‘The Battle Hymn of the Republic’ to ‘The Battle Hymn of the Democracy’?

—Walter E. Williams, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, March 1, 2006, p. M7