



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.
Genesis 1:27

From The President's Desk

Your editor cannot recommend Jonathan Wells *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?* too highly. Wells takes on the 10 most widely used arguments favoring Darwinian evolution and refutes each one chapter after chapter.

While space does not allow a complete review of his work the following review that appeared in *Human Events* (December 1, 2000) is a good summary of Wells important work. The reviewer is Angus Menuge, associate professor of philosophy at Concordia University Wisconsin.

"In this powerfully written book, Jonathan Wells critiques 10 of the leading icons that have been used to support Darwinism. An icon is a representation or likeness, and so it is something either true or false, helpful or unhelpful. Icons are not necessarily bad, but they can exaggerate the certainty of science. In Stephen Jay Gould's words, 'Ideas passing as descriptions lead us to equate the tentative with the unambiguously factual.'

"An icon can also be a devotional picture, an expression of religious or ideological veneration. In that case, misplaced zeal may enshrine an icon that falsifies reality.

"The icon may become what Francis Bacon called an *idol* of the mind, a prejudice that obstructs understanding of the natural world. Most dangerous are what Bacon calls the idols of the theater, preconceptions derived from 'the various dogmas of philosophies and also from wrong laws of demonstration' leading to 'so many stage plays, representing worlds of

[scientists'] own creation after an unreal and scenic fashion' (*The New Organon*, XLIV). Wells' thesis is precisely that the icons of evolution have become idols that distort the facts and lead to 'scenic' explanations disconnected from reality.

"Indeed, Wells' critique of dogmatic Darwinism parallels Bacon's attack on Aristotelian science. Bacon advised that 'Nature, in order to be commanded, must be obeyed' (*The New Organon*, III). Obeying nature means listening to what it is really saying. Wells agrees. Scientists should not be tied to a dogmatic starting point such as Dobzhansky's maxim that 'nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution' (Wells, 245)

"Rather, they should assert that 'nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evidence' (Wells, 248). Bacon blasted the Aristotelian approach because it 'flies from the senses and particulars to the most general axioms, and from these principles, the truth of which it takes for settled and immovable, proceeds to judgment' (*The New Organon*, XIX).

"This is precisely the criticism Wells levels against the Darwinist who 'starts with a preconceived idea and distorts the evidence to fit it' (Wells, 247). As Imre Lakatos argued, real science does not immunize a theory from falsification by 'monster barring.' Rather, it shatters myths that attempt to anticipate nature and lets the evidence speak. This is illustrated by each of the 10 icons Wells examines.

"In 1953, the Miller-Urey experiment seemed to show how the building blocks of life could arise from lightning in earth's primordial atmosphere. Diagrams of the apparatus used are a continuing icon in contemporary college textbooks. Yet geochemists have known for over 10 years that the experiment makes false assumptions about the earth's atmosphere.

"The experiment works only in the absence of oxygen, but geochemists have found evidence that oxygen was present. Instead of accepting this difficulty, dogmatists have claimed that since chemical evolution of life must have happened this way, the early atmosphere must have lacked oxygen! As Bacon put it in his day, 'The logic now in use serves rather to fix and give stability to the errors. . .than to help the search after truth' (*The New Organon*, XII).

"Textbooks also portray Darwin's tree of life, showing all species as the result of descent with modification from common ancestors. Unfortunately, this icon has been dislodged by both fossil and molecular evidence. The fossil record shows an extraordinary explosion of distinct body plans in the early Cambrian, which has not changed with the discovery of pre-Cambrian fossils.

"Attempts to save Darwin's tree using molecular evidence have shown instead that life is better represented as a complex thicket. If Darwinism were really advancing a testable theory, these facts would falsify it. Instead, they are treated as 'problems' that will eventually be explained away.

"This kind of answer is uncomfortably reminiscent of Marxism: When predictions of capitalist downfall repeatedly failed, an endless cast of extenuating circumstances was paraded before us.



Month In Review



Q Then God said, "Let us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created them; male and female He created them. Then God blessed them, and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth."

And God said, "See, I have given you every herb that yields seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit yields seed; to you it shall be for food. Also to every beast of the earth, to every bird of the air, and to everything that creeps on the earth, in which there is life, I have given every green herb for food; and it was so. Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good. So the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

—Genesis 1:26-31

Q "No philosophical theory which I have yet come across is a radical improvement on the words of Genesis, that 'in the beginning God made Heaven and Earth.'"

— C. S. Lewis, *Miracles*

Q "Because God created the Natural—invented it out of His love and artistry—it demands our reverence."

— C. S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q "In order that we finite beings may apprehend the Emperor He translates His glory into multiple forms—into stars, woods, waters, beasts, and the bodies of men."

— C. S. Lewis, *Williams and the Arthuriad*

Q "Science and lies cannot coexist. You don't have a scientific lie, and you cannot lie scientifically. Science is basically the search of truth."

— Bruce Alberts, U.S. National Academy of Science, in Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. xi

Q "In March 1999 I attended a conference on 'Genes and Development' in Basel, Switzerland. About fifty European biologists and philosophers of science were present, all of them critical of the neo-Darwinian doctrine that genes control embryo development.

"One of the speakers began her talk with some jokes about the obligatory confessions of faith in Darwinism that are expected of speakers at scientific conferences. She went on to explain that DNA sequences do not even uniquely determine the sequence of amino acids in proteins, much less the larger features of cells or embryos. During the question-and-answer session that followed, a participant pointed out that most biologists already know this. She asked: 'Then why don't they say so publicly?' The participant responded that it would 'reduce their chances of getting money.'

"Later, at lunch, the lecturer told me about an experience she had had a few months earlier at a conference in Germany. There she had made some remarks critical of neo-Darwinian evolution, after which a prominent American biologist and textbook-writer had taken her aside. He had told her that she would be wise not to criticize neo-Darwinism if she ever found herself speaking to an American audience, because they would write her off as a creationist—even though she's not. She laughed as she told me the story; obviously, she was more amused than intimidated.

"I was amused, too—but also saddened. It seems that scientists in Germany, like scientists in communist China, have more freedom to criticize Darwinism than scientists in America. Yet we are constantly told that scientists welcome critical thinking, and that America treasures freedom of speech. Except, apparently, when it comes to Darwinian evolution."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 192, 3

Q "It [embryo drawings found in America's biology textbooks] looks like it's turning out to be one of the most famous fakes in biology."

— Michael Richardson, *Science*, in Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. xi

Q "Darwinism encourages distortions of the truth."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. xii

Q "Much of what we teach about evolution is wrong."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, Subtitle of Book

Q "The Miller-Urey experiment [creating life in a test tube] is still featured prominently in textbooks, magazines, and television documentaries as an icon of evolution. Yet for more than a decade most geochemists have been convinced that the experiment failed to simulate conditions on the early Earth, and thus has little or nothing to do with the origin of life."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 10

Q "So we remain profoundly ignorant of how life originated. Yet the Miller-Urey experiment continues to be used as an icon of evolution, because nothing better has turned up. Instead of being told the truth, we are given the misleading impression that scientists have empirically demonstrated the first step in the origin of life."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 14

Q "The latest edition of *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, a graduate level textbook by National Academy of Sciences President Bruce Alberts and his colleague, features the Miller-Urey apparatus and calls it 'a typical experiment simulating conditions on the primitive Earth.' The accompanying text asserts that organic [living] molecules 'are likely to have been produced under such conditions. The best evidence for this comes from laboratory experiments.'"

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 26

Q "Neo-Darwinist Ernst Mayr boldly proclaimed in 1991 that 'there is probably no biologist left today who would question that all organisms now found on the earth have descended from a single origin of life.' Yet Darwin knew – and scientists have recently confirmed – that the early fossil record turns the evolutionary tree of life upside down. Although you would not learn it from reading biology textbooks, Darwin's tree of life has been uprooted."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 31

Q "The Cambrian explosion [phyla and classes appear right at the start] stands Darwin's tree of life on its head."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 42

Q "The Cambrian explosion demonstrates that the highest categories of animals appeared first, thus turning Darwin's tree of life upside down. The molecular evidence, far from saving it uproots it entirely. Yet, the tree of life still dominates the iconography of evolution, because Darwinists have declared it to be a fact."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 54

Q "In 1999, a Chinese paleontologist who is an acknowledged expert on Cambrian fossils visited the United States to lecture on several university campuses. I attended one lecture in which he pointed out that the 'top-down' pattern of the Cambrian explosion contradicts Darwin's theory of evolution. Afterwards, scientists in the audience asked him many questions about specific fossils, but they completely avoided the topic of Darwinian evolution. When our Chinese visitor later asked me why, I told him that perhaps they were just being polite to their visitor, because criticizing Darwinism is unpopular with American scientists. At that he laughed, and said: 'In China we can criticize Darwin, but not the government; in America, you can criticize the government, but not Darwin.'"

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 58

Q "[Kael Ernst] von Baer objected to nineteenth-century Darwinists because they accepted evolutionary theory before they even began looking at embryos. Many modern Darwinists haven't changed. . . This is why, despite repeated disconfirmation, Haeckel's biogenetic law and faked drawings haven't gone away." — Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 101

Q "Haeckel's [fake] drawings appear not only in Futuyma's book and the book by Curtis and Barnes, but also in the latest edition of *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, by National Academy of Sciences President Bruce Alberts and his colleague."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 102

Q "In the March 2000 issue of *Natural History* magazine, Stephen Jay Gould responded to Michael Behe, a biologist who had criticized Haeckel's embryos in the August 13, 1999 *New York Times*. Gould acknowledged that Haeckel faked his drawings, 'to cut to the quick of this drama,' Gould wrote, 'Haeckel had exaggerated the similarities by idealization and omission. He also, in some cases – in a procedure that can only be called fraudulent – simply copied the same figure over and over again.'"

—Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 108

Q "Tales of scientific fraud excite the imagination for good reason. Getting away with the academic equivalent of murder and then being outed a century after your misdeeds makes even better copy."

— Stephen Jay Gould in Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 108

Q "Open almost any biology textbook dealing with evolution, however, and you'll find the peppered moth presented as a classical demonstration of natural selection in action – complete with faked photos of moths on tree trunks. This is not science but myth making."

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 155

Q "From time to time, [University of Chicago biologist] Jerry Coyne wrote, 'evolutionists re-examine a classical experimental study and find, to their horror, that it is flawed or down right wrong.' According to Coyne, the fact that peppered moths do not rest on tree trunks 'alone invalidates Kathlewell's release – and – recapture experiments, as moths were released by placing them directly onto tree trunks.'"

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 153

Q "And as for the claim that the Galapagos finches impressed Darwin as evidence of evolution, [Frank] Sulloway wrote, 'nothing could be further from the truth.'"

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 161

Q "Does the National Academy of Sciences endorse 'arguments of this kind' that exaggerate the evidence? A 1999 booklet published by the National Academy described Darwin's finches as 'a particularly compelling example' of the origin of species. The booklet goes on to explain how the Grants and their colleagues showed 'that a single year of drought on the islands can drive evolutionary changes in the finches,' and that 'if droughts occur about once every 10 years on the islands, a new species of finch might arise in only about 200 years.'

"That's it. Rather than confuse the reader by mentioning that selection was reversed after the drought, producing no long-term evolutionary change, the booklet simply omits this awkward fact. Like a stock promoter who claims a stock might double in value in 20 years because it increased 5 percent in 1998, but doesn't mention that it decreased 5 percent in 1999, the booklet misleads the public by concealing a crucial part of the evidence.

"This is not truth-seeking. It makes one wonder how much evidence there really is for Darwin's theory. As Berkeley law professor and Darwin critic Phillip E. Johnson wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* in 1999: 'When our leading scientists have to resort to the sort of distortion that would land a stock promoter in jail, you know they are in trouble.'"

— Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 174, 5

Q "The rulers of knowledge are so puffed up with pride they imagine that even God is subject to their rules."

— Phillip E. Johnson, *The Wedge of Truth*, p. 165

Q "In 1998 Larson and Witham repeated the survey for elite scientists, defined specifically (since the directory no longer gives stars to the greater scientists) as those who have been elected to membership in the National Academy of Sciences. For this group the secularization hypothesis was abundantly confirmed. Disbelief in supernatural theism among Academy members was over 90 percent, and for biologists it was 95 percent. Remember, these responses were anonymous. If biologists had to stand up publicly in front of their scornful peers to answer, the percentage of avowed supernatural theists would probably be even smaller.

"Larson and Witham reported their findings in a 1999 *Scientific American* article which included anecdotal information that summarized what just about everybody familiar with evolutionary science knows to be the case. Harvard professor Ernst Mayr, a National Academy member since 1954 and the acknowledged dean of evolutionary biologists (still active at the end of the century in his mid-nineties) had surveyed his own Harvard colleagues.

"'It turned out we were all atheists,' he recalls. 'I found that there were two sources.' One Mayr typified as 'Oh, I became an atheist very early. I just couldn't believe all that supernatural stuff.' But others told him, 'I just couldn't believe that there could be a God with all this evil in the world.' Mayr adds, 'Most atheists combine the two. The combination makes it impossible to believe in God.'"

— Phillip E Johnson, *The Wedge of Truth*, p. 88

Q "Larson and Witham label as 'irony' what seems more like deliberate deception to me. The National Academy's way of dealing with the religious implications of evolution is akin to the two-platoon system in American football. When the leading figures of evolutionary science feel free to say what they really believe, writers such as Edward O. Wilson, Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett, Carl Sagan, Steven Pinker, Stephen Jay Gould, Richard Lewontin and others state the 'God is dead' thesis aggressively, invoking the authority of science to silence any theistic protest. That is the offensive platoon, and the National Academy never raises any objection to its promoting this worldview."

— Phillip E. Johnson, *The Wedge of Truth*, p. 88

Q "Until very, very recently, public questioning of the social prohibition against pedophilia—to say nothing of positive celebration of child molestation—was practically non-existent in American life. The reasons why are not opaque. To most people, the very word "pedophilia"

summons forth a preternatural degree of horror and revulsion; and the criminal law that reflects those reactions has consistently treated the sexual molestation of minors as a serious and eminently punishable offense. So it is small wonder that, historically speaking, the taboo against using legal minors for sex was no more publicly controversial in the United States than the prohibitions against, say, cannibalism or bestiality. Those few partisans of the idea who did sometimes sally forth customarily found themselves regarded as the lowest of the social low, even by the criminal class.

"This social consensus against the sexual exploitation of children and adolescents, however—unlike those against, say, animal sex or incest—is apparently eroding, and this regardless of the fact that the vast majority of citizens do overwhelmingly abominate the thing. For elsewhere in the public square, the defense of adult-child sex—more accurately, man-*boy* sex—is now out in the open. Moreover, it is on parade in a number of places—therapeutic, literary, and academic circles; mainstream publishing houses and journals and magazines and bookstores—where the mere appearance of such ideas would until recently have been not only unthinkable, but in many cases, subject to prosecution.

"Four-plus years and many other challenges to the same taboo later, it is clear that this hypothesis got something wrong. For one thing, no sustained public challenges have arisen over other primal taboos. Even more telling, if nihilism and nihilism alone were the explanation for public attempts to legitimize sex with *boy* children, then we would expect the appearance of related attempts to legitimize sex with *girl* children; and these we manifestly do not see. Nobody, but nobody, has been allowed to make the case for girl pedophilia with the backing of any reputable institution. Publishing houses are not putting out acclaimed anthologies and works of fiction that include excerpts of men having sex with young girls. Psychologists and psychiatrists are not competing with each other to publish studies demonstrating that the sexual abuse of girls is inconsequential; or, indeed, that it ought not even be defined as 'abuse.'

"Two examples from the last few weeks will suffice to show the double standard here. In the November 12 *New York Times Book Review*, a writer found it unremarkable to observe of his subject, biographer Gavin Lambert, that when 'Lambert was a schoolboy of 11, a teacher initiated him [into homosexuality], and he "felt no shame or fear, only gratitude."' It is unimaginable that *New York Times* editors would allow a reviewer to describe an 11-year-old girl being sexually 'initiated' by *any* adult (in that case, 'initiation' would be called 'sexual abuse'). Similarly, in mid-December the *New York Times Magazine* delivered a cover piece about gay teenagers in cyberspace which was so blasé about the older men who seek out boys in chat rooms that it dismissed those potential predators as mere 'oldies.' Again, one can only imagine the public outcry had the same magazine published a story taking the same so-what approach to online solicitation, off-line trysts, and pornography 'sharing' between anonymous men and underage *girls*.

"No: As was true four years ago, contemporary efforts to rationalize, legitimize, and justify pedophilia are about boys. Forget about abstractions like nihilism; what the record shows is something more prosaic. The reason why the public is being urged to reconsider boy pedophilia is that this 'question,' settled though it may be in the opinion and laws of the rest of the country, is demonstrably not yet settled within certain parts of the gay rights

movement."

— Mary Eberstadt, *The Weekly Standard*, January 1/8, 2001, p. 18, 19

Q "Homosexual activists promised that their agenda isn't about promoting a lifestyle, and it certainly isn't about sex. In schools across the country, however, reality is beginning to make a mockery out of their rhetoric.

"Since the early 1990s, activists have been arguing vehemently for access to public schools in order to make them a safer place for 'gay' and lesbian students. Leading the charge is the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), the nation's largest homosexual activist group that targets the public school system. Established as a national force in 1994, GLSEN now has over 85 chapters pushing the organization's agenda in communities across the country.

"GLSEN's activities are predicated upon a simple claim: homosexual kids are not safe in public schools because of the ignorance, prejudice and hatred of heterosexual classmates. The only answer, it says, is to teach everyone in the K-12 school system – administrators, teachers, and students – that homosexuality is normal, natural and healthy. Those in public schools should be tolerant of the diversity among their members, activists insist.

"Due in large part to GLSEN's tireless efforts, many of the nation's schoolchildren – as young as kindergarten age – are being taught to accept homosexuality as a wonderful variation within that lovely mosaic that is human sexuality. Many states have absorbed the organization's message of 'safety' as the justification for preaching tolerance and acceptance of homosexuality.

"Homosexual teachers themselves are told that they must begin the process of teaching their students to accept 'gay' and lesbian sexual orientation. For example, at GLSEN's annual national conference in Chicago this October, teachers were taught how to deftly incorporate their own homosexuality into their daily class time with children.

"Teachers in Massachusetts have already been doing just that. In Acushnet, lesbian middle school teacher Christine Hoyle was so proud of her efforts in instructing her students to accept homosexuality that she videotaped her classroom methods and showed them at a state conference at Tufts University, sponsored in part by GLSEN.

"In Newton, parents complained when they discovered that first-grade teacher David Gaita had 'come out' to his students and told them he was homosexual, and loved men 'the way your mom and dad love each other.' School Superintendent Jeffrey Young, however, defended Gaita. 'Had the teacher at that point said, "I'm married and have two kids," no one would have blinked an eye,' he said. 'There should not be a double standard for heterosexual and homosexual teachers.'

"While getting a mouthful of meal about tolerance, parents of public school children in Massachusetts were horrified to discover last Spring that the GLSEN conference at Tufts, which was also funded by the Massachusetts Department of Education, used state tax dollars to present explicit homosexual sex lessons to kids as young as 14. (See AFA Journal, June/

July, 2000.)

"GLSEN has always insisted that it merely wants 'gay' teens to feel safe in schools, and that its agenda does not include talking about sex to impressionable youth. Yet organization representatives were unable to explain the graphic sex talk when tapes of the conference sessions became public. On the tapes, 'gay' adult panelists could be heard discussing and even demonstrating hardcore homosexual sex practices to teens."

—*American Family Association Journal*, Nov.-Dec. 2000, p. 1, 2

Q "Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) has introduced legislation that would prohibit federally-funded school-based clinics from dispensing the abortion-causing 'Morning After Pill' behind the backs of parents. Currently, 180 schools are distributing the drug to students without their parents' knowledge or consent. Pro-life champion Rep. Tom Coburn, who is an obstetrician/gynecologist by profession, made some points on the House floor during debate on the Helms Amendment that are worth repeating here.

"Dr Coburn: 'I was in a town hall meeting in the southeast portion of my district. A 38-year-old father came in, and I have never seen anybody so mad in my life. I was the object of his rage, because his 12-year-old daughter had just shown him what she had been given at a clinic. 12 years old.' 'She was given Preven.' [The Morning After Pill] 'In case she needed it at some future time, she was given a bag of condoms. She was given Nonoxynol-9. And she was given oral contraceptives.'

"'What the father was mad about is that somebody would dare be able to invade the rights of his child and her health care without him knowing about it. And in front of 50 people, he stood there bawling, to say "what has happened to our country that parents are last? We heard about local control. What about parent control? What about putting parents back in charge?'

"'We have had Title X (10) clinics for 25 years in this country. We have been teaching "safe sex" for 25 years. We are the highest nation in the world in sexually transmitted diseases; nobody comes close to us. We will have 15 million new cases of sexually transmitted disease this year, of which 9 million are *incurable* – 9 million! The methods that we teach at our Title X "safe sex" clinics will not protect our children. But we are going to dig our heads in the sand, and we are going to ignore it.

"'The number one cause of cervical cancer is one of them. [Sexually-transmitted diseases] We now know that one of those is involved with prostate cancer, the number 2 cancer with men. But we are going to ignore that. We are going to keep doing the same thing.'"

— Howard Phillips, *Issues and Strategy Bulletin*, November 30, 2000, p. 5

Q "The moral and political fabric of the United States continues to split. From the time of Plato, political philosophers have warned that democracies eventually tend to pit the non- or less productive members of society against the productive, the rebellious against the traditional, more responsible, more conservative members. The latest presidential election reveals further evidence of this split and suggests rough sledding in the coming decades.

"The U.S. is not a pure democracy like the ancient Greeks envisioned, with everybody participating in every social debate and having an equal vote in the resolution of disputes. But we are – slowly but surely – more closely approximating a true democracy. With the growth in size of the less productive and more rebellious class, the conflict between the two poles is growing.

"The 2000 presidential vote reflects this split. In many respects, the Democratic party champions the less productive and less conforming, while the Republican party favors the more productive and more traditional. Democrats promise to take more wealth from the productive (especially the 'wealthy') and give it to the less productive; the Republicans promise a smaller transfer (e.g., via cuts in tax rates). Democrats solidly support abortion and gay rights; Republicans tend to be opposed.

Age and Education

"Generally speaking, people tend to be more productive if they are better educated. In addition, the older one is, the more productive they tend to become. . . . Until around age 60 or so, when retirement and disability reduce productivity. In the presidential vote, as broken down by the *Voter News Service* from their exit polling (*Wall Street Journal* 11/9/00), the youngest (aged 18-29) and oldest (aged 60 and above) voters tended to side with the Democrats, while those in-between (30-59) voted more frequently Republican.

"Educational attainment traced a similar pattern. Those with less than a high school education voted 21% points more for Gore, while those with a college degree voted 6% points more for Bush. However, liberals remain firmly entrenched in the upper echelons of academia. Those with post-graduate degrees voted 8% more for Gore.

Income, Marriage/Family

"Yearly income was strongly correlated with voting for Bush: those making less than \$15,000 voted 20% more for Gore, but those making over \$100,000 voted 11% more for Bush.

"And those who were married or parents voted strongly for Bush. The married voted 9% more for Bush, the unmarried 19 percentage points more for Gore. Those with children under the age of 18 voted 7% more for Bush, while the childless sided 4% more for Gore. Those who said they were homosexual or bisexual voted 45 percentage points more for Gore.

Religion

"Finally, as indexed by religious attendance, those who attended weekly or more voted about

20 percentage points more for Bush, and those who never attended voted about 29% more for Gore. Among whites, Protestants were almost 2:1 for Bush, while Catholics voted 7% more for Bush. Jews, conversely, were 4:1 and the irreligious almost 2:1 for Gore."

— *Family Research Report*, December 2000

Q "Pornography has become one of the hottest growth industries in the nation. Corporate America has taken notice and is rushing in to make a profit on smut."

— *Insight Magazine*, January 8, 2001

Q "Thank you for your continual work to reach America through Summit Ministries, as well as the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade. Praise God He had risen up men like you. May He continue to add to your numbers.

"I wrote to you concerning a very intelligent young man who attended the Summit program in Colorado three years ago. I was so surprised by his feedback, but I am writing to tell you of our own daughters' feedback who did attend this summer at Bryan College. They had much rather have been in Colorado, but absolutely loved and were overwhelmed at the incredible teaching. They said they learned more in two weeks than their entire Christian education had afforded them.

"We have twin girls who began college this summer. Without any of my prompting, they took along their Summit Ministries notes, as well as your book *Understanding the Times*. We were thrilled at the impact of your ministry upon them, and how God is using them in college for His glory."

— Chrystie M., Duluth, Georgia

Q Please hurry if you are wanting to send your young person to Summit Ministries. We have limited space and much demand. Call today to request an application and mail it in soon!