



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

He is not here; for He is risen, as He said. Matthew 28:6

Month in Review

Q “From that time Jesus began to show to His disciples that He must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised the third day.”

–Matthew 16:21

Q “Concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.”

–Romans 1: 3, 4

Q “For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.”

–I Corinthians 15: 3, 4

Q “The Resurrection is the central theme in every Christian sermon reported in the Acts. The Resurrection, and its consequences were the ‘gospel’ or good news which the Christians brought; what we call the ‘gospels,’ the narratives of Our Lord’s life and death, were composed later for the benefit of those who

Q “Our Saviour’s resurrection . . . is truly of great importance in Christianity; so great that His being or not being the Messiah stands or falls with it: so that these two important articles are inseparable and in effect make one. For since that time, believe one and you believe both; deny one of them, and you can believe neither.”

–John Locke

Q “The resurrection of Christ is therefore emphatically a test question upon which depends the truth or falsehood of the Christian religion. It is either the greatest miracle or the greatest delusion which history records.”

–Philip Schaff

Q “The resurrection of Christ is the very citadel of the Christian faith. This is the doctrine that turned the world upside down in the first century, that lifted Christianity preeminently above Judaism and the pagan religions of the Mediterranean world. If this goes, so must almost everything else that is vital and unique in the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ: ‘If Christ be not risen, then is your faith vain.’”

–Wilbur M. Smith

had already accepted the *gospel*. They were in no sense the basis of Christianity; they were written for those already converted. The miracle of the Resurrection, and the theology of that miracle, comes first; the biography comes later as a comment on it. Nothing could be more unhistorical than to pick out selected sayings of Christ from the gospels and to regard those as the datum and the rest of the New Testament as a construction upon it. The first fact in the history of Christendom is a number of people who say they have seen the Resurrection.”

–C. S. Lewis, *Miracles*, p. 514 in *Quotes* (#1291)

Q Joseph of Arimathea in the gloom of a Friday night

Visited Pontius Pilate—the envoy of Roman might.

“There was a man named Jesus nailed to a cross to-day,”

Said he, “and I ask permission to care for his lifeless clay.

“Little I know about him, but I’ve heard that his life was clean.

I am told that because of his teachings men hated this Nazarene.

Those who are called his apostles still fear what the mob may do,

So I ask your august permission to care for a fellow Jew.”

And Pilate who trusted Joseph and honored him, promptly said:

“I will give you a guard of soldiers. Go now and bury the dead.”

Thus strangely is history fashioned. From one kindly deed there came

To the rich man of Arimathea eternal glory and fame.

Q “The resurrection is of crucial practical importance because it completes our salvation. Jesus came to save us from sin and its consequence, death (Rom. 6:23). The resurrection also sharply distinguishes Jesus from all other religious founders. The bones of Abraham and Muhammad and Buddha and Confucius and Lao-Tzu and Zoroaster are still here on earth. Jesus’ tomb is empty.”

–Peter Kreeft and Ronald K. Tacelli

Q “Christianity does not hold the resurrection to be one among many tenets of belief.

Without faith in the resurrection *there would be no Christianity at all*. The Christian church would never have begun; the Jesus-movement would have fizzled out like a damp squib with His execution. Christianity stands or falls with the truth of the resurrection. Once disprove it, and you have disposed of Christianity.

“Christianity is a historical religion. It claims that God has taken the risk of involving Himself in human history, and the facts are there for you to examine with the utmost rigour. They will stand any amount of critical investigation.”

–Michael Green

Q The above quotes from Locke, Schaff, Smith, Kreeft and Green (along with dozens more) are found in Josh McDowell’s *The New Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. It is a wealth of material worth your read. We also highly recommend Norman L. Geisler’s *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*.

Q “Relativists believe they’ve discovered the ultimate weapon against the sense of right and wrong—a hydrogen bomb for the culture war and a doomsday machine against conscience. What is it? The accusation of ‘intolerance.’

“If you think public officials ought to tell the truth, then you’re ‘intolerant and judgmental.’ If you say man cannot live without God, you’re ‘intolerant and arrogant.’ If you support the idea that marriage means one man and one woman, you’re ‘intolerant and prejudiced.’

“Like a powerful acid, the accusation of intolerance eats away at traditional morality, leaving nothing behind but threads. It seems that in today’s culture the only way to be tolerant is to be morally ‘neutral’ – to avoid moral judgments altogether and let everything slide.

“Well, don’t give up hope. University of Texas Professor Jay Budziszewski sets forth the ultimate defense against the relativist’s ultimate weapon: the power of logic. You see, those who shout ‘intolerance’ are abusing the word in three ways, and all three are logical fallacies.

“The first of these, what Budziszewski calls the ‘Let-it-Be’ Fallacy, is that tolerance just means tolerating, and the more you tolerate, the more tolerant you are. But logically that can’t be true, because if it were, you would have to tolerate even intolerance.

“According to the ‘Skeptical’ Fallacy, having convictions about right and wrong is intolerant, so the more you doubt, the more tolerant you are. But that can’t be true either, because if it were, it would be wrong to hold the conviction that tolerance is good.

“True tolerance is not a total lack of judgment. It’s knowing what should be tolerated—and refusing to tolerate that which shouldn’t.”

–Charles Colson, “Break Point”,
February 14, 2000

Q “The story wasn’t totally buried by the media—but it might as well have been. After all, the embarrassment it produced was fairly profound.

“The discovery that a noteworthy fossil [archaeoraptor] find was instead a fake produced a flurry of finger-pointing. Over the last few months, experts in the field of paleontology had been excited beyond measure over the discovery of some bones in China that, to their way of thinking, proved that there once had been a species of dinosaurs that flew. *National Geographic* planned a cover story about the remarkable discovery.

“Then came the bad news. The discovery was phony. An opportunistic Chinese farmer, finding several sets of old bones in a shed, managed to rearrange them in such a manner that he was later able to persuade a buyer that one tail structure from some large but unidentified fowl belonged at the back end of an apparently legitimate dinosaur. That’s all it took to convince some pretty high-powered scientists that this remarkable animal was once covered with feathers instead of with scales, and that it had indeed been airborne.

“Whether the buyer, who smuggled the

“According to the ‘Apologetic’ Fallacy, speaking out about your convictions is the most intolerant you can be, so the more timid you are, the more tolerant you are. But this mistake is as silly as the other two because, if it were true, you would be too timid to speak out even about the importance of being intolerant.

“We see, then, that the relativist’s idea of ‘moral neutrality’ simply contradicts itself at every point. So why do we constantly hear the accusation of intolerance?

“Well, in the first place, the accusation is never applied consistently. It’s applied selectively as a way to demoralize Christians and other defenders of traditional morality. For the accuser, too, makes judgments about right and wrong; it’s just that his moral judgments are the only ones he wants people to be able to make. He judges that public officials don’t have to be honest, that man can live without God, and that marriage doesn’t mean a relationship limited to a man and a woman.

“The second reason is that the accusation makes the accuser feel virtuous, because he gets to call the other person intolerant. Not only that, he feels free because he’s under the illusion that he has no responsibility for his own moral judgments – after all, it’s always the other person who is ‘judgmental.’

“We need to know that it isn’t intolerant to make moral judgments, because we have to make judgments just to know what to tolerate. Jay Budziszewski’s new book, *The Revenge of Conscience*, is an excellent resource for improving your understanding of these issues and defeating the arguments of relativism.

bones out of China, was the gullible goof of this story, or perhaps just as canny as the Chinese farmer, has not yet been reported. Maybe both of them are simply part of China’s new awareness of free-market economics!

“What is of far greater concern is the equanimity and virtual silence with which such stories are greeted in our society today. The media, academia, the professional establishment, and common people as well all respond as if this deception were just a minor glitch—and as though all the major parties involved are still to be believed. Again and again, we are lied to about serious subjects—and we throw it off as if it were some joke about a distant Chinese farmer who discovered some bones in a shed.

“But the joke’s on us. We’re the gullible ones.”

–Joel Belz, *World Magazine*,
February 19, 2000, p. 18

Q The following letter from Storrs L. Olson (Smithsonian) to Peter Raven (*National Geographic* magazine) relates to the archaeoraptor scandal. It was dated November 1, 1999. It speaks for itself.

[\(Continued on Page 5\)](#)

The Journal / October, 1998 3

From the President's Desk

Dr. David A. Noebel

Please read the following editorial from the *New York Post*. It was written by Ray Kerrison, September 25, 1995. Eight months later a Christian University confirmed upon Chancellor Ramon Cortines an honorary degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, “for his outstanding career in education.”

This University stated in a “To Whom It May Concern” letter: “As with any honorary degree recipient, the administration performed due diligence. Some concerns were raised. However, a careful investigation found these objections to be based solely on rumor.”

Judge for yourself if you would find objections to Ramon Cortines to be baseless.

I’d like to hear from our readership on this issue. Should Christian Colleges and Universities be allowed to get away with such unconscionable activity?

If any of our readership is interested in which particular Christian University would present such an individual to its student body for approval drop me a line and I’ll definitely respond!!

I am, as you can tell, editorially ticked! No wonder we are losing the cultural war! We can’t even trust our own side to show good judgment; or am I just over reacting? Perhaps the Ramon Cortines’s of the world should occupy or head the departments of our colleges and universities. What do you think?

The *New York Post* article:

“Scholls Chancellor Ramon Cortines, who quits office at the end of this week, is leaving New York City and its public education system with two outrageous ‘gifts.’

“The first is a candid confession that he implemented the school condom and homosexual agenda with more vigor than his predecessor, Joseph Fernandez.

“He owned up at a New York magazine luncheon with former Mayor Ed Koch a

“Instead, he chose stealth. The sneaky way. He gloated to New York magazine, ‘I think people were pleasantly surprised that I moved in a quiet way.’

“What a man. What a chancellor. What an example for 1 million schoolkids. And what a great Board of Education that let him get away with it.

“And that leads us to Cortines’ second parting gift: an eighth-grade ‘multicultural perspective’ of U.S. and New York state history now being shipped to the schools.

“Included are 11 pages of gay and lesbian propaganda that one school official told me is ‘10 times worse than anything in the ‘Rainbow’ curriculum.

“Billed as a ‘learning activity,’ its theme purports to be a history of the ‘struggle for equality’ for homosexuals. In fact, the real purpose is to brainwash children, legitimize the lifestyle and recruit.

“Students are required to immerse themselves in the gay and lesbian civil rights movement, study its history, discrimination, bias, etc. They’re asked to ‘assess the impact of prejudice and discrimination of the lives of gay men and women.’

“They’re told to design a poster expressing their opinion of ‘bias crimes.’

“The brainwashing is not even subtle. The course features news accounts – from *The New York Times*, naturally – of how ‘Colorado homosexuals feel betrayed’ by the repeal of gay-rights legislation.

“The kids are then assigned this loaded task: ‘Use the space provided to write a letter to the editor expressing your opinion of recent gay-rights legislation.’

“Students are questioned about whether they approve or disapprove of the rights of gays and lesbians to serve in the military. We’ll give you two guesses as to how they are

couple of weeks ago.

“A writer asked Cortines, ‘Your predecessor found himself tripped up by hot-button social issues like condoms and the ‘Rainbow’ curriculum. Did you make a conscious decision to back off them?’

“‘No,’ said Cortines. ‘As people will tell you, I’ve been stronger than he was. I’ve pushed the agenda; it just wasn’t my priority.’

“Give the chancellor an A-plus for treachery. It’s not often that high-profile public officials openly gloat of how they deceived their constituents.

“Fernandez was run out of New York on a tide of parental anger for corrupting children with a sex-ed and gay-propaganda program so explicitly filthy and perverse that some of it could not be printed in these pages.

“Remember the admonition, ‘Do it, it’s fun?’

“Nobody better understood the circumstances of Fernandez’s downfall than Cortines. Yet, here by his own admission, he came to the chancellorship determined not only to continue where Fernandez left off, but to pursue it even more vigorously.

“The betrayal is shattering. At the start of his term two years ago, Cortines never would have dared tell the public he planned to push condoms and homosexuality ‘stronger’ than Fernandez.

expected to respond.

“Teachers are instructed to make students explain their answers to more than 20 questions – covering such topics as the Stonewall Inn riot, the cops actions, the situation of gay people in America, and if public schools should play a role in educating people about homosexual problems.

“The last question is: ‘Based on what you have read here, how much further do gays and lesbians have to go to secure equal rights in our city, state and nation?’

“This course is especially pernicious and corruptive because it does not even raise the question of homosexual morality, much less discuss it.

“Parents must wonder why New York’s public school system is obsessed with homosexuality. What is the source for this relentless indoctrination of schoolchildren?

“Simple. Education here is muscled by radical homosexuals with the cooperation of unprincipled chancellors and the acquiescence of a spineless board more interested in politics and power than providing children with a basic, upright education.

“Cortines, by his own admission, deceived this city by furtively pursuing an agenda that had been overwhelmingly rejected by parents. He is the ultimate in arrogant, elitist educators who think that they know best and that parents are idiots.

“The city is well rid of him.

“But his monumental doublecross may serve one useful purpose: It should alert the city to the potential perfidy of school chancellors. The candidate to replace Cortines should be sharply questioned and closely monitored.

“Charlatans should not be rewarded.”

Dear Peter,

I thought that I should address to you the concerns expressed below because your committee is at least partly involved and because you are certainly now the most prominent scientist and the National Geographic Society.

With the publication of “Feathers for T. rex?” by Christopher P. Sloan in its November issue, *National Geographic* has reached an all-time low for engaging in sensationalistic, unsubstantiated, tabloid journalism. But at the same time the magazine may now claim to have taken its place in formal taxonomic literature.

Although it is possible that Mr. Czerkas ‘will later name’ the specimen identified on page 100 as *Archaeoraptor liaoningensis*, there is no longer any need for him to do so.

Because this Latinized binomial has apparently not been published previously and has now appeared with a full-spread photograph of the specimen ‘accompanied by a description or definition that states in words characters that are purported to differentiate the taxon,’ the name *Archaeoraptor liaoningensis* Sloan is now available for purposes of zoological nomenclature as of its appearance in *National Geographic* (International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Article 13a, i). This is the worst nightmare of many zoologists—that their chance to name a new organism will be inadvertently scooped by some witless journalist. Clearly, National Geographic is not receiving competent consultation in certain scientific matters.

Sloan’s article explicitly states that the specimen in question is known to have been illegally exported and that ‘the Czerkases now

confidently as we say that humans are mammals’ is not even suggested as reflecting the view of a particular scientist or group of scientists, so that it figures as little more than editorial propagandizing. This melodramatic assertion had already been disproven by recent studies of embryology and comparative morphology, which, of course, are never mentioned.

More importantly, however, none of the structures illustrated in Sloan’s article that are claimed to be feathers have actually been proven to be feathers. Saying that they are is little more than wishful thinking that has been presented as fact. The statement on page 103 that ‘hollow, hairlike structures characterize protofeathers’ is nonsense considering that protofeathers exist only as a theoretical construct, so that the internal structure of one is even more hypothetical.

The hype about feathered dinosaurs in the exhibit currently on display at the National Geographic Society is even worse, and makes the spurious claim that there is strong evidence that a wide variety of carnivorous dinosaurs had feathers. A model of the undisputed dinosaur *Deinonychus* and illustrations of baby tyrannosaurs are shown clad in feathers, all of which is simply imaginary and has no place outside of science fiction.

The idea of feathered dinosaurs and the theropod origin of birds is being actively promulgated by a cadre of zealous scientists acting in concert with certain editors at *Nature* and *National Geographic* who themselves have become outspoken and highly biased proselytizers of the faith. Truth and careful scientific weighing of evidence have been among the first casualties in their program, which is now fast becoming one of the grander

plan to return it to China.’ In Washington, in June of 1996, more than forty participants at the 4th International Meeting of the Society of Avian Paleontology and Evolution, held at the Smithsonian Institution, were signatories to a letter to the Director of the Chinese Academy of Sciences that deplored the illegal trade in fossils from China and encouraged the Chinese government to take further action to curb this exploitation.

There were a few fossil dealers at that meeting and they certainly got the message. Thus, at least since mid-1996 it can hardly have been a secret to anyone in the scientific community or the commercial fossil business that fossils from Liaoning offered for sale outside of China are contraband.

Most, if not all, major natural history museums in the United States have policies in effect that prohibit their staff from accepting any specimens that were not legally collected and exported from the country of origin. The National Geographic Society has not only supported research on such material, but has sensationalized, and is now exhibiting, an admittedly illicit specimen that would have been morally, administratively, and perhaps legally, off-limits to researchers in reputable scientific institutions.

Prior to the publication of the article “Dinosaurs Take Wing” in the July 1998 *National Geographic*, Lou Mazzatenta, the photographer for Sloan’s article, invited me to the National Geographic Society to review his photographs of Chinese fossils and to comment on the slant being given to the story. At that time, I tried to interject the fact that strongly supported alternative viewpoints existed to what National Geographic intended to resent, but it eventually became clear to me that National Geographic was not interested in anything other than the prevailing dogma that birds evolved from dinosaurs.

Sloan’s article takes the prejudice to

scientific hoaxes of our age—the paleontological equivalent of cold fusion. If Sloan’s article is not the crescendo of this fantasia, it is difficult to imagine to what heights it can next be taken. But it is certain that when the folly has run its course and has been fully exposed, National Geographic will unfortunately play a prominent but unenviable role in the book that summarized the whole sorry episode.

Sincerely,

Q “The rejection of God in our schools is just one small example of the triumph of atheism.”

—Paul C. Vitz, *Faith of the Fatherland*, p. xi

Q “Two University of Washington scientists have rattled mainstream academia with a radical hypothesis: Conditions necessary for the development of life above the microbe level are so complicated that Earth may be the only home of complex life in the universe. Paleontologist Peter D. Ward and astronomer Donald C. Brownlee last month released *Rare Earth* (Springer-Verlag), a book that arrives at that unpopular conclusion through analysis of new findings in science.

“That man probably has no co-citizens of the cosmos flies in the face of both evolution-based, establishment science and the musings of the popular culture. Since 1960, when a young astronomer named Frank Drake began scanning the skies for signs of alien life (and was later joined by popularizer Carl Sagan), Americans have become increasingly fascinated with the possibility of future visitations from flying saucers bearing little green men. Hollywood has extended the spectrum, showing us everything from cuddly Ewoks to slobbering, dagger-toothed aliens.

an entirely new level and consists in large part of unverifiable or undocumented information that ‘makes’ the news rather than reporting it. His bald statement that ‘we can now say that birds are theropods just as

The Journal / October, 1998 5

“Writing from an evolutionary perspective in *Rare Earth*, Mssrs. Ward and Brownlee say our small, blue globe and its inhabitants may be the only game in town. Scientific evidence now points increasingly to the precision fine-tuning necessary for a planet to sustain life. Consider a few of the many virtues of Earth’s real estate: a perfectly placed moon to control tides, climate, and tilt; a gargantuan shield (Jupiter) from the streaking asteroids and meteorites that routinely pulverize other planets; a rare, heavy-element sun with a rare elliptical orbit; a delicately balanced atmosphere, including just enough carbon to enable rich biodiversity.

“‘We have finally said out loud what so many have thought for so long—that complex life, at least, is rare,’ Mr. Ward told the *New York Times*. Citing such newly discovered galactic hazards as lethal waves of X-rays, gamma rays, and ionizing radiation, he added: ‘I don’t think there’s any life in the centers [of galaxies] at all.’ Mr. Brownlee doesn’t think there’s much chance of life on the edges of the galaxies either.

“Chance, notes astronomer Guillermo Gonzales, is exactly what the *Rare Earth* hypothesis reduces by default. ‘Every time you find a new example of a finely tuned parameter that you need for life, that makes the chance explanation of origins less and less likely,’ says Mr. Gonzales, who is Mr.

Q We’ll pass along the answer from *Christianity Today* when we hear from that publication. Our answer is: churches should continue to proclaim what the Bible teaches – Lauren Winner should not be in bed with her “lover” – but should marry the guy! *Christianity Today* should find her another job . . . first! She should not be a “staff writer” for any Christian publication.

Q “One of the biggest shifts over the last 50 years reflects a huge cultural difference. In 1950, when people were asked if it is okay “for a girl to telephone a boy to ask for a date, say, to take her out to a movie,” 62 percent said, “No.” Twenty-eight percent hold that view today.

“Fifty years ago, nearly three-fourths of the nation (73 percent) indicated they were “a member of a church or synagogue.” But by 1979, the number of church members had dropped to roughly two-thirds (68 percent), the same as today.

“While in 1950, 39 percent of the population reported attending church or synagogue “in the last seven days,” 45 percent now report doing so. In the last seven years, the number of weekly churchgoers has climbed 5 percent, from 31 to 36 percent. Of those stating a religious preference, 54 percent were Protestant, 27 percent Catholic, 2 percent Jewish, 1 percent Orthodox and 1 percent

Brownlee's colleague in the University of Washington astronomy department. Mr. Gonzales, a foremost national expert of stars, was the source for much of the stellar evidence presented in *Rare Earth*. He is also a senior research fellow at the Discovery Institute, a Seattle-based think tank specializing in the 'intelligent design' theory of origins—an interpretation of scientific evidence that says life appears to have been engineered by an intelligent agent. Intelligent design theory is gaining ground on Darwinism as a competing theory of origins.”

—*World Magazine*,

February 19, 2000

Q “In the 1960's, Helen Gurley Brown, the editor of *Cosmopolitan* magazine, struck a blow for promiscuity by writing *Sex and the Single Girl*. Today, Lauren Winner, a senior writer for *Christianity Today*, strikes a blow for promiscuity in the church by writing “Sex and the Single Evangelical.”

“The title ‘Senior Writer for *Christianity Today*’ conjures up images of learned and seasoned Christians such as Carl Henry and James Boice, who wrote for the magazine in its glory years. Elsewhere on the Web, Miss Winner offers her testimony, where we learn that she is only in her 20s and has been a Christian for only two years. Nevertheless, she has been on a career fast track in professional evangelicalism, with her resume also listing her as writer-in-residence for *Christianity Today*'s sister publication, *Books, and Culture: A Christian Review*. (Note: The latest *Christianity Today* downgrades her job title on the masthead to ‘staff writer.’)

“So what are we to think of ‘Sex and the Single Evangelical’? Should churches change what they teach about extramarital sex, just because many of their members do not live up to those teachings?”

—*World Magazine*, February

Mormon.”

—*Insight*, February 14,
2000

Q “As you read this letter, a drama is being played out in California that has serious implications for the institution of the family, not only in the Golden State but throughout the nation. On March 7, voters will go to the polls to consider Proposition 22, known as the Protection of Marriage Initiative. If this pro-family measure passes, it will add these fourteen crucial words to the California Family Code: “Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.”

“This electoral decision is monumental in scope. A ‘yes’ vote by the citizens of our most populous state would affirm the validity of the traditional family as designed by God at the dawn of human existence. But if Proposition 22 fails, the unraveling of that time-honored institution would accelerate. Homosexual marriages that might become legal in other states would be binding in California as well. The initiative is critical right now because a few weeks ago, the liberal Supreme Court of Vermont directed the state legislature to either allow homosexuals to ‘marry,’ or to establish some form of domestic partnership that would create a quasi-marital relationship. It was a major victory for gays and lesbian activists because it represents the first big domino to fall. They have lost previous efforts to re-define marriage at the voting booths in Maine, Hawaii and Alaska, demonstrating that the majority of the people in those states oppose their agenda. But as is so often the case, a handful of unelected, leftist judges have imposed their will on the culture. Now by defeating the Protection of Marriage Initiative in California, activists would achieve one of their greatest victories in an era of unprecedented gains.

“Who would have believed even a

19, 2000

decade ago that leaders in dozens of countries around the world would be moving toward so-called 'homosexual marriage' and other objectives that had almost no support at the outset. Indeed, the President of the United States is personally committed to that radical agenda. Bill

6 The Journal / October, 1998

Clinton meets regularly with activists, speaking at their fund-raising events and promising vigorous support for their goals. Pictured below is the President at a meeting last December 16, during which he pledged himself again to the principle of homosexuals in the military.

"Clinton said during this event, 'I ask you to stay with me and to make a good effort. I think we've got a much better chance to pass (pro-gay and lesbian legislation) in 2000, and I hope you will help me with that.' Then he added, 'I have said many times, I wish we could have done more [to promote the homosexual agenda,] but I'm glad we did what we did.' Wouldn't it be wonderful to have a national leader who was this supportive of the traditional family and the moral principles that undergird it?

"In keeping with his pledge, the President is expected to do everything he can to help his activist friends defeat Proposition 22 in the closing days before March 7. He will not be the only prominent Democrat to enter the fray. California's attorney general took it upon himself to change the name of the referendum from the Definition of Marriage Initiative, which was signed by 700,000 citizens who placed it on the ballot. Instead he called it "The Limit on Marriages Initiative." That revision will hurt its chances of passage,

your ministry is that the young man is one she met in college and yet he too has gained confidence in his faith through learning about 'Understanding The Times' as a student attending the ministry of Foundation for Traditional Values Student Statesmen Institute.

"Daniel wants to be active in politics and the cultural wars we face today and I can see that the reason he has the confidence to step into that arena is because of the truths you teach. Thank you.

"There are not enough thank yous to offer. You have made being a parent easier. You have helped bring peace to my heart. Like Jesus' mother, Mary, I feel as though my heart is full and I have you to thank.

"Please know that we hold you in our prayers and are doing what we can to get some other teens to this life changing program. La Rae M.

Q "I do not know if you will get a chance to read this but, as a Summit graduate '98, I want to express my gratitude to you. God really spoke to me during those two weeks and allowed me to leave with enduring and sustaining truths that have kept me walking strong in Christ. I learned how to love God with my mind and my studies in college have had a transforming effect on my life. My

because Americans don't like to be 'limited' in any way. California's governor, Gray Davis, and a majority of state representatives are also committed to the gay agenda. They have crammed through radical bills in the past few months that wouldn't have had a chance four years ago. Sheila Kuehl, an openly lesbian assemblywoman in California, described herself as 'euphoric' over what is happening to her movement. She said about the governor, '[His] action in signing [recent pro-homosexual] bills moved me beyond words. The importance of these laws to many thousands of people can't be underestimated.' This comment illustrates the zeal and momentum that the pro-family community in California is facing as the election approaches on March 7.

"Furthermore, we have just learned that homosexual activists in the Golden State are planning to capitalize on their victory if they are successful in defeating the Protection of Marriage Initiative. They have begun circulating petitions to get a constitutional amendment on the November 2000 ballot that would formally legalize same-sex marriage. Clearly, those with whom we disagree are committed to their cause. The question is, are we as dedicated to ours?"

—James C. Dobson, *Family News*,
February 2000

Q "Our daughter attended your summer Christian teen leadership program two years in a row in 1995 and 1996. Much of what she is as a young Christian woman is because of your ministry. The values she holds...the activity level...the responsibilities she accepts...are all because you reinforced the beliefs we taught at home.

"She has kept those values beyond high school and made them her own as she has been at college. Much of this I believe

relationship with friends, family and God have never been the same because of the wisdom God granted me at the Summit Ministries. I am hoping to continue how I can be a transformer for Christ and might attend Focus on the Family Institute like my sister did a few summers ago. Please do not lose heart because God is working in the ministry that you have started. In His Grip, Rachel B."

Q "Hi. My name is Allison F. and I attended the Summit in 1996. I am a freshman at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln and I wanted to tell you that your program has made a tremendous influence on my life. My father is a pastor of an evangelical Christian church and I feel fortunate to have been raised in a home where I was able to accept Christ as my Savior at a young age. The Summit, however, prepared me for a liberal education. I am a pre-law student and I had an Honors Sociology class last semester that attacked Christianity every week. I not only knew what I believed, but I knew exactly how to defend the Christian faith. I stood up to my professor every week and I know that I made him see my point of view. Thank you for your ministry. I never could have been so successful in that class if I hadn't been so prepared. It is a missionfield here and I feel very equipped because of your program. Love in Christ, Allyson F."

is because your work taught her why to believe and how to defend those beliefs in the cultural wars we face today. One of those beliefs was maintaining her purity until God brought a special young man into her life. God has now brought that special young man into her life. It is just a testimony of how special

The Journal / October, 1998 7