

## HAPPY THANKGIVING

❑ “As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God? My tears have been my meat day and night, while they continually say unto me, Where is thy God? When I remember these things, I pour out my soul in me: for I had gone with the multitude, I went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holyday. Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted in me? hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him for the help of his countenance.

“O my God, my soul is cast down within me: therefore will I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and of the Hermonites, from the hill Mizar. Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts: all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me. Yet the LORD will command his lovingkindness in the day time, and in the night his song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life.”

—Psalm 42:1-8, KJV

❑ “People need the Lord, People need the Lord;  
At the end of broken dreams, He’s the open door.  
People need the Lord, people need the Lord;  
When will we realize people need the Lord.”

—Greg Nelson and Phill McHugh

❑ “God is basic Fact or Actuality, the source of all other facthood. At all costs therefore He must not be thought of as a featureless generality. If He exists at all, He is the most concrete thing there is, the most individual, ‘organised and minutely articulated.’ He is unspeakable not by being indefinite but by being too definite for the unavoidable vagueness of language.”

—C.S. Lewis, *Miracles*

❑ “God...has purposes and performs particular actions,...does one thing and not another, [is] a concrete, choosing, commanding, prohibiting God with a determinate character.”

—C.S. Lewis, *Miracles*

❑ “The ancient man approached God (or even the gods) as the accused person approaches his judge. For the modern man the roles are reversed. He is the judge: God is in the dock. He is quite a kindly judge: if God should have a reasonable deference for being the god who permits war, poverty and disease, he is ready to listen to it. The trial may even end in God’s acquittal. But the important thing is that Man is on the Bench and God in the Dock.”

—C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

❑ “After a decade of fighting for same sex ‘marriage,’ some homosexual activists are breaking their silence to say it’s time to fight for benefits for all kinds of relationships.

“Families and relationships ‘know no borders and will never slot narrowly into a single existing template,’ several activists said in a statement issued last month called ‘Beyond Marriage: A New Strategic Vision For All Our Families and Relationships.’

“Because marriage is ‘not the only worthy form of family or relationship,’ it ‘should not be legally or economically privileged above others,’ according to the statement, which was signed by 270 homosexual rights activists and heterosexual allies, such as Princeton University professor Cornel West and feminist icon Gloria Steinem.

“Other kinds of relationships that they say deserve marriage-like benefits include senior citizens who aren’t married but live together; single-parent families; blended families; ‘committed, loving households in which there is more than one conjugal partner;’ ‘queer couples who decide to jointly create and raise a child with another queer person or couple, in two households;’ and non-sexual **cohabiters**, such as friends or siblings, the statement said.

“A lot of people are being left out’ in the same-sex ‘marriage’ discussion because their families and relationships ‘don’t fit’ with marriage, said National Gay & Lesbian Task Force activist Amber Hollibaugh, one of 18 drafters of the statement.”

—Cheryl Wetzstein, *The Washington Times*, August 9, 2006, p. A2

❑ “Janice Crouse, a scholar with Concerned Women for America, said the Beyond Marriage statement was ‘smart,’ ‘sophisticated,’ ‘savvy’ and ‘dangerous.’

“‘[T]hey have framed things in their new vision in a way that is less strident. It’s much more acceptable. They talk about ‘daring to dream,’ having room for all, so the language they use is very soft rhetoric,’ Mrs. Crouse said. ‘But underneath the soft rhetoric is a hard wrecking ball’ aimed at core concepts about marriage and family.

“‘I don’t think the public is ready for same-sex marriage...I don’t think they’re ready for polygamy, and I don’t think they want to legally or economically support various definitions of family,’ she said.

“The average American may not realize it, but the ideas espoused in the Beyond Marriage statement are being strongly debated in family law and academic circles.

“America remains a marriage-oriented culture—in 2001, roughly 90 percent of Americans 45 or older had married at least once. But the 2000 census also showed that the nuclear family of a married father and mother living with their own children went from being the most common household type to the second-most common. (Single people are now the most common household type.)

*continued on next page*

“Other kinds of lifestyles appear to be gaining in popularity,

## — UPCOMING EVENTS —

### SPRING CONFERENCE

Mark your calendar for the 2007 Spring Adult Conference. The conference will be held at Glen Eyrie in Colorado Springs, April 1-6. We would love to see you, your pastor, or school administrator attend this conference. Call today (719-685-9103) for a brochure or check our website at [www.summit.org](http://www.summit.org).

such as living alone but having multiple sexual partners; cohabiting outside marriage; marrying, divorcing and remarrying, even multiple times; and engaging in same-sex relationships or polyamorous relationships in which it's common to have multiple sexual partners.

"Many family-law authorities, researchers and academics see these alternative family forms as an inevitable evolution. In a 2004 paper on the 'deinstitutionalization of American marriage,' Johns Hopkins University scholar Andrew J. Cherlin wrote that it was possible—but unlikely—that the nation would return to a 1950s view of marriage.

"What's more likely, he wrote, is that marriage and cohabitation will become equal in status and/or marriage will 'fade' away and be replaced by 'pure relationships' that are held together by voluntary commitment.

"Maggie Gallagher, president of the Institute for Marriage and Public Policy, said she wasn't surprised to hear that some homosexual activists aren't satisfied with just pushing for same-sex 'marriage'—and she said some polls indicate that as many as 30 percent of homosexuals oppose same-sex 'marriage.' Also, a recent report by the institute found relatively few homosexual couples taking advantage of 'marriage' where it's available.

"The marriage-benefits-for-all statement looks like an effort to court new allies, such as senior-citizen groups or minority groups, who might be interested in universal benefits, she said. Still, it will probably be a 'hard sell,' she said, because the public—which has overwhelmingly supported marriage constitutional amendments—isn't even ready to accept changes in marriage."

—Cheryl Wetzstein, *The Washington Times*, August 9, 2006, p. A2

❑ "Feminists are trying to use the United Nations to impose a radical agenda—including legalized prostitution...around the world, a conservative leader said yesterday.

"The U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) has become a weapon in the hands of 'socialist feminists,' Wendy Wright told a women's conference at the Heritage Foundation.

"CEDAW is 'The Equal Rights Amendment on steroids,' said Mrs. Wright, president of Concerned Women for America. 'This is getting the U.N. involved in our homes, our families, our marriages.'

"Though signed by President Carter in 1979, CEDAW has never been ratified by the Senate, but activists on the U.N. CEDAW committee are using the treaty to enforce an agenda of population control and homosexual rights on other nations, Mrs. Wright said.

"The CEDAW committee has 'told China they must decriminalize prostitution,' and 'told Mexico to change their laws against abortion,' and even told the governments of Muslim nations that they must interpret the Koran according to CEDAW, Mrs. Wright said at the monthly luncheon of the Conservative Women's Network, co-sponsored by Heritage and the Clare Boothe Luce Policy Institute.

"Furthermore, she said, feminist groups have urged that the International Criminal Court be used 'as a way to criminalize offenses against CEDAW.'

"'Why did [feminists] get involved with the U.N.? It's a natural fit,' Mrs. Wright said, describing the 'top-down' power of the United Nations as a vehicle for nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to press for the implementation of policies favored by feminists as 'human rights.'

"Feminists 'cannot win on their issues democratically,' Mrs. Wright said. 'At the U.N., they like to create rights....They operate under the concept that government creates rights.'

"A U.N. spokesman yesterday defended CEDAW as 'a legal instrument that is upheld by a large number of member states at the United Nations' and 'endorsed by governments running across the political and religious spectrum.'

"'The issue of women's rights is a part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which all nations adhere,' said Farhan Haq, spokesman in the New York office of the U.N. Secretary-General.

"CEDAW calls for 'full equality between men and women.' In the United States, feminist leaders have blamed Republican conservatives for the Senate's refusal to ratify CEDAW. Former Sen. Jesse Helms, North Carolina Republican, was a strong opponent of the treaty and in 2002, Rep. Lynn Woolsey, California Democrat, charged that Mr. Helms had 'held CEDAW hostage so that women across the globe continued to be victimized and brutalized.'

"At the Heritage Foundation yesterday, Mrs. Wright praised John R. Bolton, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, who she said 'has had a tremendous effect.' Calling him articulate and outspoken, she said the Senate should vote to confirm Mr. Bolton, whose recess appointment to the U.N. post is due to expire in January."

—Robert S. McCain, *The Washington Times*, August 11, 2006, p. A12

❑ "You are my strength when I am weak, You are the Treasure that I seek, You are my All in All.  
Seeking you as a precious jewel, Lord to give up, I'd be a fool. You are my All in All.

Jesus, Lamb of God, worthy is Your name.

Jesus, Lamb of God, worthy is Your name.

Taking my sin, my cross, my shame, rising again I bless Your name. You are my All in All.

When I fall down, You pick me up; when I am dry, You fill my cup. You are my All in All." —Dennis L. Jernigan

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

Nearly all our *Summit Journal* readers know that we see the world through worldview eyes. We see primarily six worldviews vying for the hearts and minds of the whole world at the present time—Christianity, Islam, Secular Humanism, Marxist Humanism, Cosmic Humanism (New Age), and Postmodernism.

How any knowledgeable Christian can miss the collision of these six worldviews is beyond me, but apparently the task of pushing back the clouds of darkness and ignorance never ends on this side of heaven itself.

I remember when Immanuel Velikovsky caused such a stir in the early '50s with his bombshell of a book *Worlds in Collision*. How dare a scholar like Velikovsky with three Ph.Ds take on Darwin's theory of human origins called evolution. But he did! In fact, in more modern times Ann Coulter in her book *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* (which I highly recommend!) raised a stir amongst the intellectual elite for taking on. . . Darwin! Although she was highly criticized for calling four women "harpies," her real sin was scientifically proving Darwin's theory of evolution to be a myth!

No wonder a Chinese scientist said that one difference between the U.S. and China is in China one can criticize Darwin, but not the government, while in the U.S. one can criticize the government, but not Darwin!

Well, in my latest work *Understanding The Times: The Collision of Today's Competing Worldviews*, I not only take on Dar-

win, but Darwin's friends—Marx, Freud, Nietzsche, Dewey, Foucault—and for good measure Mohammad himself! *Understanding The Times* (revised and updated) is a comprehensive look at all six worldviews presently being played out before our very eyes. Talk about a ring-side seat at the very dawn of the "clash of civilizations"—here it is. Hopefully we can move thousands of Christians from their ring-side seat into the arena itself.

I would like to make an offer that every reader of this *Journal* (hopefully) can't refuse. I would like to place the 2006 edition of *Understanding The Times* in each reader's hands and I can do this for a gift to this ministry of \$25. Since it is nearly Christmas-time, why not consider giving this book as a Christmas gift to your friends and family? In fact, you could even give it to your Muslim or atheistic friends since it is respectfully written, though obviously pro-Christian. A box of 12 copies of *Understanding The Times* could represent 12 such gifts for family, friends, and co-workers, offered here for the reasonable price of \$250 (postage and handling included). I cannot imagine any other \$20 gift that could give such a necessary wallop of truth and a defense of the Christian worldview at the same time.

In the meantime, please pray for this ministry as we seek to settle our Christian young people in the truth of Christianity and expose them to the five worldviews that have proven extremely hostile to their spiritual and intellectual well-being.

□ "During the Cold War, American intelligence loved getting its hands on defectors from communism. The reasoning was that these people had the best information about the plans of the other side, information that would help America defeat them.

"In the present war against what President Bush has properly labeled 'Islamic fascism,' defectors are just as valuable.

"The Israel Project, an international nonprofit organization devoted to educating the press and the public about Israel, recently made a former leading imam and radical Islam expert available for media interviews and I had a chance to speak with him. He goes by the name of Sam Soloman.

"Soloman was brought up in the Islamic tradition and became a 'recruiter,' which he says is something like an assistant teacher. One of his responsibilities was 'brainwashing people in the Koran.'

"Soloman is in double trouble. Not only did he abandon Islam and the terrorists' objectives, he has also become a Christian, which has marked him for death.

"Soloman speaks with knowledge, credibility and conviction.

He has memorized large sections of the Koran and tells me, 'There's not a single verse in the Koran talking about peace with a non-Muslim, with the Jews and the Christians. Islam means submission. Islam means surrender. It means you surrender and accept Islamic hegemony over yourselves....'

"I ask him about the best strategy for fighting it: 'It cannot be combated simply by force. It needs to be combated ideologically, spiritually (as well as) through arms.'

"Soloman says the outlets for Islamic ideology are religious—seminaries, the madrassas (Koranic schools) and especially the mosques.

"He asks Americans to inform themselves about the real teachings of Islam and not to fall for what various Islamic groups say it teaches. Soloman says, 'The simplest Islamic book you open' teaches that all unbelievers (in Islam) are profane people. 'Because of the (Koranic) text and what it says, it incites violence.' He begins quoting verses from memory too quickly to write them all down. One is, 'Slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them captives and besiege them and lie in wait for them

in every ambush.’ (Surah 9:5)

“‘This kind of tactic of taking verses out of context can be used against any religious faith,’ says Ibrahim Hooper, spokesman for Washington, D.C.-based Council on American-Islamic Relations, an Islamic civil rights and advocacy group.

“These verses deal with the real experience of the Muslim community at the time when they were under attack. It’s not a general injunction to go out and harm people. The only people who take it that way are those who wait to promote hostility toward Islam and Muslims. They would object if the same thing were done to their faith.’

“Yes, but virtually all Christians *and* Jews denounce the infinitesimal few who claim to be Jewish or Christian and use their holy books to justify violence against others as a direct command from God.

“Soloman says Americans must demand from the leading Islamic hierarchy such as the Muslim World League and the Union of Imams, a fatwa that makes it clear ‘that this is not what the text means and that these texts are no longer effective. They have passed their date. But if they remain effective and eternally valid, then in America we have a serious problem.’

“Soloman adds, ‘The Islamic organizations have their missionaries and there are active or sleeping cells in this country.’

“Americans must see past their natural reluctance to paint all members of a group with a broad brush and realize our failure to act now against this clear and present danger in the ways Sam Soloman recommends will lead to a disaster for us that is far worse than our Cold War enemies had envisaged.”

—Stephen Chapman, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, August 21, 2006, p. M9

□ “In the past few months, the growing conflict between Sacramento’s Slavic Christians and its politically savvy homosexual community has erupted on campuses, at school board hearings and on the grounds of the Capitol.

“Russian-speaking hecklers lined the march of this year’s Gay Pride parade downtown. At least 15 Slavic students were suspended in April for wearing shirts proclaiming, ‘Homosexuality is sin.’ This spring, Slavic Christians packed board meetings in three local school districts to make clear their opposition to homosexuality.

“Homosexuals are starting to respond in kind. A dozen staged a counter protest in July, demonstrating outside the region’s largest evangelical Slavic church during Sunday morning services.

“Homosexuals say the Slavic protesters have hit them with signs, spit on them and displayed a menacing lack of civility.

“‘They’re more and more brazen with their signs and their numbers,’ said Tina Reynolds, a lesbian activist. ‘It’s much more in our face, and I’m beginning to feel like something’s going to happen.’

“The region’s large Russian-speaking Christian community, refugees who fled religious persecution in the former Soviet Union, say they are exercising the freedom of speech to spread their beliefs.

“‘We have tasted the power of democracy—now we go and protest,’ said George Neverov, 33, a Baptist who emigrated from Uzbekistan in 1991 and lives in Carmichael, California.

“Community leaders estimate that 100,000 Russian-speaking residents live in the Sacramento region, about a third of them evangelical Christians, mostly Ukrainian Baptists or Pentecostals.”

—*The Washington Times*, August 9, 2006, p. A2

□ “There is no more misused political expletive today than the word ‘Fascism’ or ‘fascist.’ President Bush’s global war on terrorism is against, in his words, ‘Islamic fascism.’ White House press secretary Tony Snow often uses the phrase as a curse word. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has attacked administration critics of seeking to appease ‘a new type of fascism’ without defining the old type. And there is the upcoming book by Jonah Goldberg, ‘Liberal Fascism: The Totalitarian Temptation from Mussolini to Hillary Clinton.’

“So what is ‘fascism’ and where did the name come from? And is it reasonable to give a meaningless political name to a phenomenon—terrorism?

“Back in the last century it became a mark of true liberalism to warn against the imminence of fascism in America. Walter Lippmann, a noted commentator at the time, warned about fascism without defining his terms, or specifying whether he meant Italian, German, Spanish or Peron ‘fascism.’ Another commentator at the time said this pernicious system would come to America as ‘friendly fascism.’

“To this day, almost eight decades after Benito Mussolini’s 1922 march on Rome and establishment of his dictatorship, there is still no definition of fascism. In fact, as Professor Henry Ashby Turner has written: ‘Anyone who reads many studies of fascism as a multinational problem cannot but be struck by the frequency with which writers who begin by assuming they are dealing with a unitary phenomenon end up with several more or less discrete sub-categories....The general term fascism is in origin neither analytical nor descriptive.’

“For George Orwell, author of *1984* and *Animal Farm*, the word ‘fascism’ was ‘almost entirely meaningless.’ His view: ‘In conversation, of course, it [fascism] is used even more wildly than in print. I have heard it applied to farmers, shopkeepers, fox-hunting, bull-fighting....Kipling, Gandhi, Chiang Kai-Shek, homosexuality, astrology, women, dogs, and I do not know what else.’

“Unlike Marxism, socialism or communism, which have an immense and significant literature (like Marx’s *Das Kapital* or Lenin’s multivolume works), fascism as an ideology has no extensive literature, except for an article in the Italian Encyclopedia written by Giovanni Gentile who described himself as a ‘the philosopher of Fascism,’ and ghostwrote ‘A Doctrine of Fascism’ for Mussolini.

“Just as Nazism had a symbol, the swastika, fascism had its symbol, the traditional fasces, a bundle of birch rods tied together with a red ribbon as a cylinder around an ax and carried during parades in ancient Rome. Unlike the swastika, which covered every German indoor and outdoor space, the fasces weren’t used much and were rarely seen, not much of a public competitor for the swastika.

“Fascism as a form of government has no meaning in today’s political market. And adding an adjective like ‘Islamofascism’

doesn't make it so. What the Islamic terrorists are doing is not 'fascism,' it's terrorism, pure and simple based on their reading of the Koran supported by guest appearances of Osama bin Laden."

—*The Washington Times*, September 15, 2006, p. A19

□ "Grove City College publishes an excellent newsletter titled 'Visions and Values.' Its July 2006 edition features an interview with Dr. Richard Pipes, acclaimed Russian historian and Harvard University professor of sovietology. The interview was conducted by Grove City College professor of political science Dr. Paul Kengor.

"Pipes, who served on the National Security Council during the Reagan administration, explained that there are actually only a few communists among academics. At first glance, that's a puzzling observation, given the leftist bias at most college campuses. Pipes and Kengor explain the puzzle in a way that makes perfect sense.

"While academic leftists, and I'd include their media allies, are not communists, they are anti-anti-communists. In other words, they have contempt for right-wingers, conservatives or libertarians who are anti-communists. Why? Academic leftists, and their media allies, are in agreement with many of the stated goals of communism, such as equal distribution of wealth, income equality and other goals spelled out in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Leftist elites love the ideas of communism so much that they are either blind to, or tolerant of, its many shortcomings.

"In practice, communism is nothing less than sheer barbarism that makes even the horrors of Nazism pale in comparison. Professor Rudolph J. Rummel of the University of Hawaii outlines that barbarism in his book *Death by Government*, a comprehensive detailing of the roughly 170 million people murdered by their own governments during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. From 1917 to its collapse in 1991, the Soviet Union murdered about 62 million of its own people. During Mao Zedong's reign, 35,236,000, possibly more, Chinese citizens were murdered. By comparison, Hitler's Nazis managed to murder 21 million of its citizens and citizens in nations they conquered. Adding these numbers to the 60 million lives lost in war makes the 20<sup>th</sup> century mankind's most brutal era.

"At home and abroad, leftists have done a thorough and commendable job documenting and condemning the horrors and crimes of Hitler and his fascist Nazi regime, but when have you heard them direct similar condemnation of Joseph Stalin, his successors and Mao Zedong? By and large, they've chosen to overlook the horrors of communism.

"The reason for their reluctance to condemn the barbarism of communism is simple. Pipes says, 'Intellectuals, by the very nature of their professions, grant enormous attention to words and ideas. And they are attracted by socialist ideas. They find that the ideas of communism are praiseworthy and attractive; that, to them, is more important than the practice of communism. Now Nazi ideals, on the other hand, were pure barbarism; nothing could be said in favor of them.'

"Often, when people evaluate capitalism, they evaluate a system that exists on Earth. When they evaluate communism, they

are talking about a nonexistent Utopia. What exists on Earth, with all of its problems and shortcomings, is always going to fail miserably when compared to a Utopia.

"The very attempt to achieve the utopian goals of communism requires the ruthless suppression of the individual and an attack on any institution that might compromise the loyalty of the individual to the state. That's why one of the first orders of business for communism, and those who support its ideas, is the attack on religion and the family.

"Rank nations according to whether they are closer to the capitalism end or the communism end of the economic spectrum. Then rank nations according to human rights protections. Finally, rank nations according to per capita income. Without question, citizens of those nations closer to capitalism enjoy a higher standard of living and a far greater measure of liberty than those in nations closer to communism."

—Walter E Williams, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, August 16, 2006, p. M6

□ "Americans remain a people of great faith: 95 percent believe in God and just 11 percent have no religious affiliation, according to a survey released yesterday by Baylor University.

"The survey gave a spectrum of the nation's spiritual leanings: 88 percent said God favors no particular political party, and seven out of 10 approved of prayer in schools.

"If you tell us you're a mainline Protestant, that alone tells us very little about your political views,' said Paul Froese, one of the study authors. 'But if you tell us about your image of God, we can tell a lot about you.'

"The survey by Texas-based Baylor, the largest Baptist University in the world, challenged the idea that the nation's faith is waning, questioning recent polls that have reported a near doubling of nonbelievers—from 8 percent to 15 percent since 1988. Those polls are 'often used by academics and the press to indicate a growing secularization in the United States,' the survey said.

"Baylor researchers factored in the rising number of non-denominational churches, mega-churches, local influences and behavior patterns, which have not been addressed by the National Election Studies or the General Social Surveys.

"Our results do not suggest religion is on the wane, but rather that Americans are losing a strong denominational identity,' said Kevin Dougherty, another study author.

"The findings indicated a burgeoning but diverse religious vitality. Even among the unaffiliated respondents, 63 percent said they believed in God or a higher power; a third said they prayed.

"Americans largely agree that God exists, but they do not agree what God is like, what God wants for the world or how God feels about politics,' said Christopher Bader also a report author.

"A sizable majority of Americans remain humble on the global stage: 69 percent do not think God holds the United States above other nations. The survey assessed respondents' image of God based on four categories—authoritarian, benevolent, critical or distant—each influencing moral and political beliefs.

"About one in three favor the authoritarian God. Of that num-

ber, more than 80 percent believe abortion is wrong if the family cannot afford the child or if the woman does not want the child.

“The authoritarian demographic also is the likeliest to approve spending money on the military (favored by 63 percent), to support the Iraq war (63 percent) and believe that Saddam Hussein had a hand in the September 11 attacks (54 percent).

“The survey also named a dozen ‘religious identity labels’ to further define the American spiritual landscape. Most respondents defined themselves as Bible-believing, followed by born again, mainline Christian, theologically conservative and evangelical.

“Amid all the lively faith, did the respondents actually attend church? The survey found that among evangelical Protestants, 45 percent attended religious services weekly or more often; the figure was 43 percent among black Protestants, 24 percent among mainline Protestants, 33 percent among Catholics and 7 percent among Jews.

“Twelve percent of evangelicals said they ‘never’ attend religious services; the figure was 14 percent among mainliners, 11 percent among blacks, 9 percent among Catholics and 29 percent among Jews.

“The survey of 1,721 adults was conducted Oct. 8 to Dec. 12. It has a margin of error of four percentage points.”

—*The Washington Times*, September 12, 2006, p. A3

□ “100 million Americans call themselves Evangelical Protestants by affiliation.”

“70% would allow prayer in schools.”

“47% describe themselves as ‘Bible believing,’ and 29% as ‘born again.’”

—Baylor University Survey

□ “The U.N. World Health Organization (WHO) reversed 30 years of policy yesterday, giving DDT a ‘clean bill of health’ for controlling malaria, and it asks environmental groups to support limited use of the insecticide to save the lives of African babies.

“‘DDT presents no health risk when used properly indoors,’ said Dr. Arata Kochi, director of the WHO’s malaria program. ‘Well-managed indoor spraying programs using DDT pose no harm to wildlife or humans.’

“Malaria rivals AIDS as the leading killer in sub-Saharan Africa. The mosquito-borne parasite kills an estimated 1 million people each year, mostly women and children under age 5.

“‘Help save African babies as you are helping save the environment,’ Dr. Kochi urged environmental groups at the National Press Club yesterday. ‘African babies...need your help.’

“Swiss inventor Paul Hermann Muller won the Nobel Prize for medicine in 1948 for discovering DDT, or dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane. The insecticide helped wipe out malaria in the developing world.

“With the publication of Rachel Carson’s 1962 anti-pesticide tome, *Silent Spring*, DDT became the world’s most vilified pesticide. It was banned from use in the United States in 1972 and abandoned in much of the world.

“Dr. Kochi said WHO stopped promoting DDT in the early 1980s. As its use declined, mosquito populations soared, and malaria deaths in Africa and Asia skyrocketed.

“An estimated 500 million become sick from malaria each year, making the disease one of the biggest obstacles to economic development in poor nations.

“Yesterday, the WHO revised its recommendations and said DDT is safe for humans and ‘remarkably effective’ when a small amount of DDT is sprayed in the indoor walls of houses and huts.

“The spraying, which lasts about six months, keeps mosquitoes from entering a building and kills them if they do.

“The WHO said DDT is a powerful weapon and should be used in combination with bed nets, better malaria medicines and other pesticides.

“Environmental and anti-pesticide groups said safer and more effective alternatives to DDT were available such as pyrethrum and recent studies suggest DDT is harmful to humans, especially children.

“‘It is about time the international community focused on combating malaria, but this approach takes us exactly in the wrong direction,’ Dr. Paul Saoko, director of Physicians for Social Responsibility in Kenya, said in a statement released by the Pesticide Action Network, which opposes the reinstatement of DDT.

“But those who campaigned for years to reinstate the use of DDT in the battle against malaria called yesterday’s announcement a tremendous victory.

“‘We are finally in a position to provide the maximum amount of protection to poor people in poor countries,’ said Dr. Donald Roberts, professor of tropical medicine at Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences in Bethesda.

“He said pyrethrum insecticides are more expensive and are far less effective over time. He called recent studies that imply DDT may impair development in breast feeding babies ‘bogus.’

“‘It is a choice between a proven benefit, saving millions of lives, and a hypothetical, speculative and minor risk,’ he said.

“Richard Tren, director of Africa Fighting Malaria, agreed.

“‘DDT is the most studied of man-made chemicals, and there is no evidence that it is unsafe for humans. Remember we are not spraying for fun. Malaria is a deadly disease,’ he said.”

—Tom Carter, *The Washington Times*, September 16, 2006, p. A6

□ “Islamic extremists in U.S. prisons have taken advantage of a lack of religious monitoring to embrace violent interpretations of the Koran, posing a threat of ‘unknown magnitude’ to national security, a report said yesterday.

“‘Prisons have long been places where extremist ideology and calls to violence could find a willing ear, and conditions are often conducive to radicalization,’ according to a study by George Washington University and the University of Virginia.

“‘With the world’s largest prison population and highest incarceration rate, America faces what could be an enormous challenge—every radicalized prisoner becomes a potential terrorist recruit,’ said the study, which was conducted for the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

“An estimated 2 million people are imprisoned in the United States, and 6 percent of them are Muslim, according to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.



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).

“Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut, the committee’s ranking Democrat, said homegrown terrorism is a ‘grave enough concern’ that Congress needs to consider whether to focus more attention and resources on it.

“‘What controls can we put into place to curtail such conversions? Unfortunately, the number of qualified Islamic chaplains, or imams, is insufficient,’ Mr. Lieberman said, noting that although more than 80 percent of religious conversions in prison are to some form of Islam, only 10 of the 200 chaplains in the federal system are devoted to Islam.

“The study said that just as young people may become radicalized by ‘cut-and-paste’ versions of the Koran via the Internet, ‘new inmates may gain the same distorted understanding of the faith from gang leaders or other influential inmates.’

“Although radicalization is neither unique to Islam nor a recent phenomenon, an inadequate number of Muslim religious services providers increases the risk, the study said.”

—Jerry Seper, *The Washington Times*, September 20, 2006, p. A3

❑ “Should you possess a perverse interest in coming face to face with the truly creepy—nay, sinister—poke around into the career of Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, the late Archbishop of Chicago, and see if you can say with a straight face that this was a pious, believing Catholic who did everything he could to uphold the honor of Christ and the church against the inroads of modern liberalism. Paul Likoudis of *The Wanderer* has described Cardinal Bernardin, a man of extraordinary influence in the American church, as ‘a bishop-maker who, working with former Arch-

bishop Jean Jadot, gave the American hierarchy its pronounced pro-gay orientation.’

“In the last two years of his life, Cardinal Bernardin’s closest priest friends from his native Diocese of Charleston all faced charges of molesting young boys. ‘As his friends back in Charleston continued bugging little boys,’ Likoudis remarked, ‘Bernardin used his influence, starting in 1968, as General Secretary of the U.S. Catholic Conference, to select bishops (many of whom are still ordinaries) who would, to put it charitably, condone and promote homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle and tolerate the sexual abuse of children by priests.’ As Bernardin was dying, incidentally, he requested that the Windy City Gay Men’s Chorus sing at the cathedral at his wake—which they eventually did, from a spot right next to the altar.

“The Bernardin saga is actually far worse than even these quotations suggest, but pursuing this matter is not our purpose here. What matters is that somebody, somewhere, thought this was the best of all possible candidates to guide and shape the souls of a major American archdiocese. Innocent explanations for this do not immediately offer themselves. At the very least, we can say there is something deeply wrong with this picture—and that if we want to know where things have gone wrong, or why the Catholic plausibility structure lies in ruins, we need not look terribly far.”

—Thomas E. Woods, Jr., *The American Conservative*, September 25, 2006, p. 32