

October 2002



# The JOURNAL

---

A Summit Ministries Publication

---

Therefore we also, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and sin which so easily ensnares us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. Hebrews 12:1, 2

## From The President's Desk

Once again my wife and I would like to take this opportunity to thank each of our Journal readers who sent us sympathy cards (and even donations for Sudan) in honor of our son, Brent. The cards and notes meant a great deal to us and we are pleased to see such an outpouring of love for our son. Needless to say we miss him even more so since the end of the Summit season. The cards and letters we received from former Summit students were especially gratifying. Brent indeed touched the lives of countless students through the years as he ministered at the Summit.

Below are just a few of the hundreds of notes and comments regarding Brent who went to be with his Savior and Lord, July 18, 2002.

“We were so sorry to hear about the passing of Brent. He had a tremendous impact on many of the students who attended Summit Ministries. He was a true inspiration and a testimony for Christ. I have now sent two sons through your program and it has been life-changing for both. Thank you for the work you do. You will be in my prayers as I know how painful losing a loved one can be.” P.P. Highland Ranch, CO

“I came to Summit last year really feeling defeated and doubtful of my faith. By the time I left I once again stood firm in my belief in Jesus Christ. I count it a privilege and a blessing to have known Brent and also to have taken part in the cause for Sudan. I hope and pray that the cause won't die with him. I don't think he would want it to!” A.L.

“Though I have only been introduced to Brent once, I know what an integral part of Summit he was. He will be sorely missed, but his life and accomplishments will be appreciated for a long time. I just wanted to pass on an encouraging word about how much my wife and I appreciate and admire the work of all those affiliated with Summit Ministries. In developing future leaders with a solid Christian worldview, you are performing one of the most important long term ministries for the future of this country. God bless.” J. and L.R, Forth Wroth, TX

“I would like to send \$20 to put toward the Sudan project in honor of Brent and in Jesus’ name. My prayers are with you and the ministry that is before you. Know that your son has turned my eyes upon Jesus at Summit during those two weeks and for the rest of my life on earth. Praise God Brent is in Heaven worshipping our Creator and Father.” P.M.

“I enjoyed meeting Brent for the first time and talking to him in April at the Adult Conference. Since I am also a diabetic I could understand some of the problems he was going through. It was obvious that in spite of his health problems he was warm and sincere in his caring for others. It was a great encouragement to me to see how much God had done through him. I was impressed with how he met the challenges he faced in life with his eyes on God.” J.G., Knoxville, TN

“Even though we have never met you, our hearts reach out to you through our prayers at this time as we learned about the passing on to glory of your son, Brent. We have a son, Stephen, who is about Brent’s age and has a serious liver disease and needs a transplant. God is touching his life in a deep way, and we read Brent’s testimony to him for encouragement.” B. and N.B.

### **Amazing Grace: A Tribute to Brent**

By Clark Bowers

He passes on, immortal song, named Brent, and also “Sting,”  
A tribute of, that matchless love, Invisible Choir now sing.

Of classic hymns, and loose young limbs, on courts of wood a win’in’  
A Noebel friend, who ‘till the end, inspired all those about him.

Of motorbikes, and Pikes Peak hikes, to the Summit from the valley,  
Brent bore his load, and through it showed, in day we should not dally.

Of Texas girls, and old Red hills, spring’s fun and fall’s full flavor,  
A life designed, with truth in mind, a witness to our Savior.

His eyes of blue, and faith that's true, thrice tested in the fires,  
Along he went, his time was spent, with strength that seldom tires.

Sin's passed-on curse, cruel at its worst, gave birth to Brent's black blindness;  
His life endured, until 'twas cured, through Christ's eternal kindness.

Yet, humor too, could break right though, in laughter of contagion,  
How was it done? A race that's won, in midst of earth's lost legion.

Right from the start, he had a heart; blind eyes can still shed tears,  
But to the frost, he was not lost, kept warmth through long cold years.

An American man, fought for Sudan, A Christian for all brothers,  
This boy lost sight, but took not flight, from foe, or friend or other.

Although he led, he kept his head; his pride did not destroy,  
By Shepards' two, he followed through; in pain they showed him joy.

So much he gave, came through the grave, in night his days did proffer,  
From beaming smile, and witty style, lighthouse of God's good offer.

Bjorn's sad wail, no wind—no sail, recalling how we've diminished,  
In that sound we hear, a message clear, Brent's labor, at last, has finished.

The workers left, although bereft, must tend to harvest ready,  
When sowings done, reaping begun, good fruit rewards the steady.

Like Christ he knew, as all too few, death should not give us fright,  
In darkness thrust, each man must trust, in the Son's invisible Light.

Sure victory won, the song Brent sung, against this world's disaster,  
Amazing Grace, a life that's lived, in sight of ever after.



Month In Review



Q “Therefore we also, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which so easily ensnares us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.

“For consider Him who endured such hostility from sinners against himself, lest you become weary and discouraged in your souls. You have not yet resisted to bloodshed, striving against sin. And you have forgotten the exhortation which speaks to you as to sons: ‘My son, do not despise the chastening of the Lord, nor be discouraged when you are rebuked by Him; for whom the Lord loves He chastens, and scourges every son whom He receives.’

“If you endure chastening, God deals with you as with sons; for what son is there whom a father does not chasten? But if you are without chastening, of which all have become partakers, then you are illegitimate and not sons. Furthermore, we have had human fathers who corrected us, and we paid them respect. Shall we not much more readily be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live? For they indeed for a few days chastened us as seemed best to them, but He for our profit, that we may be partakers of His holiness. Now no chastening seems to be joyful for the present, but painful; nevertheless, afterward it yields the peaceable fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it.

“Therefore strengthen the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, and make straight paths for your feet, so that what is lame may not be dislocated, but rather be healed.

“Pursue peace with all people, and holiness, without which no one will see the Lord: looking carefully lest anyone fall short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up cause trouble, and by this many become defiled.

—Hebrews 12:1-15

Q “John Wesley traveled on horseback the equivalent of ten times around the world’s equator. He preached as often as fifteen times a week for fifty years. He authored more publications than any writer in the English language until the contemporary science fiction writer Isaac Asimov. He read books while making his horseback journeys. When he was past eighty, he complained that he could not read and work more than fifteen hours a day.”

—John Haggai

Q “Man is now a horror to God and to himself and a creature ill-adapted to the universe not because God made him so but because he has made himself so by the abuse of his free will.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*

Q “God has made it a rule for Himself that He won’t alter people’s character by force. He can and will alter them—but only if the people will let Him. . . .He would rather have a world of free beings, with all its risks, than a world of people who did right like machines because they couldn’t do anything else. The more we succeed in imagining what a world of perfect automatic beings would be like, the more, I think, we shall see His wisdom.”

—C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q “God created things which had free will. That means creatures which can go either wrong or right. Some people think they can imagine a creature which was free but had no possibility of going wrong; I cannot. If a thing is free to be good it is also free to be bad. And free will is what has made evil possible. Why, then, did God give them free will? Because free will, though it makes evil possible, is also the only thing that makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having. A world of automata—of creatures that worked like machines—would hardly be worth creating. The happiness which God designs for His higher creatures is the happiness of being freely, voluntarily united to Him and to each other in an ecstasy of love and delight compared with which the most rapturous love between a man and a woman on this earth is mere milk and water. And for that they must be free.’

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

Q “The challenge of Naturalism [nature alone is real; God isn’t] is, therefore, not just to come up with a convincing theory of the moral life (an analysis of moral concepts, utterances and so forth). If what I have said is true, Naturalism will not be able to do that. But suppose it could. Its work would not be done, but would hardly have begun. It would still have to create a moral culture by which people could live. It would still have the task of providing a body of moral understanding by which ordinary as well as extra-ordinary human beings could direct their own lives. Naturalism has always promised to do this through its leading spokespersons, and continues to do so today—through distinguished individuals such as Professor Larry Arnhart. We wish them well. Theirs is a tremendously important undertaking. But they have much to do. Let them now do it.

“Naturalism has managed to occupy the intellectual high ground, and in the minds of many the moral high ground, in contemporary society—especially within the academy. It has put the Inquisition as well as the Moral Majority in its place. It is now the authority.

“If you want to see how true this is just consider: The leading question of this conference on ‘The Nature of Nature’ is posed on page 1 of the program booklet. Here it is: ‘Is the [physical] universe self-contained or does it require something beyond itself to explain its existence and internal function?’ If, now, you sit in on the courses here at Baylor University, or any other institution of higher learning with an association with religion, you will find that

the courses are all taught on the assumption (possibly excepting those in religion, but even that is not necessarily so) that the physical universe is self-contained and does not require something beyond itself to explain its existence and internal function.

“The course content in schools with a religious association is exactly the same as in schools with none. This is, commonly, a point of pride among faculty at schools with a religious association. That is exactly what I mean when I say that Naturalism has now won and is the authority.

“So, let it lead. Not-being-superstitious-any-more will hardly serve as an adequate positive basis of moral understanding and moral development. Having been saved from the Moral Majority, how will we be saved from the immoral minority—or is that the majority? From Spinoza to Voltaire to Condorcet to Buchner and Hackel, to Dewey and Hook, and into the present, the promise of Naturalism has been one of genuine moral enlightenment. That is why it always has been and remains today a tangibly missionary movement.

“But we cannot any longer live on promises. If Naturalism is to be taken seriously in the capacities it wishes to be taken seriously, the promissory notes have come due. Naturalism must now turn them into cash. The need now is to stand and deliver. Let concrete and abstract, individual and social, moral understanding and guidance come forth from the views of Darwin, Dawkins, Dennett, Searle, Wilson and Arnhart. Let them tell us, corporately and individually, how to become persons of good will, reliably guided by moral obligation to do what is right and honorable.”

—Dallas Willard, *Philosophia Christi*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2002, p. 26, 27

Q If anyone seriously thinks the naturalists (materialists, Secular humanists) have a decent hold on the moral life please consult: Benjamin Wiker, *Moral Darwinism* (Inter Varsity Press, 2002) and Joyce Milton, *The Road to Malpsychia* (Encounter Books, 2002). No family-friendly publication can print out the moral lives of these naturalists including Ernst Haeckel, Margaret Sanger, Alfred Kinsey, Rousseau, Machiavelli, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Timothy Leary, Carl Rogers, Aldons Haxley, etc. Unfortunately these giants of moral illiteracy determine the moral agenda of our public schools (especially the homosexualization of America).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—Educational Research Analysts, Longview, Texas 75607-7518

Q “In evolutionary theory, higher life forms arise over time. Not just more species, but more orders, classes, and phyla appear. Evolutionary theory must explain how genetic information increases, thereby causing new or improved organs to develop.

“Some evolutionary biologists think this occurs gradually, as minor mutations accumulate. Others believe it occurs in brief spurts, when major mutations change many characteristics quickly. Still others think it may happen both ways.

“Neither process however is known to increase genetic information. Small mutations only restructure existing DNA or reshuffle previous chromosomes. Scientists have not observed how (or whether) large mutations cause evolution.

“Zoologist Pierre Grassé states: ‘If evolution takes place without the acquisition of new genes, we must assume that the first living creature contained in itself enough genes to engender, by mutation of them, all past, present, and future faunas and floras. This is absurd.’

“Evolutionary theory has not explained how life forms acquired new genes. This does not necessarily mean evolution did not occur. But it does mean that science has not yet shown evolution to be a demonstrated process of nature.”

—Educational Research Analysts, Longview, Texas 75607-7518

Q “Evolutionary biologists theorize that life began on an early earth whose atmosphere may have consisted of water vapor, methane, ammonia, nitrogen, hydrogen, and carbon monoxide—from which lightning formed amino acids. With no oxygen present these amino acids would not decay before combining into proteins and cells.

“Scientists however note various problems in this theory. For example, ozone forms when sunlight strikes oxygen in the upper atmosphere. With no oxygen in the early atmosphere, no ozone layer would have shielded organic materials from destructive bombardment by solar ultraviolet rays.

“Some therefore suggest that lightning could have formed the first amino acids several feet under water, away from ultraviolet rays. But lightning cannot penetrate that far under water to form amino acids, and the excess water would have kept amino acids from combining into proteins.

“Evolutionary biologists in turn propose that lightning formed amino acids in the atmosphere. The amino acids then fell onto hot, dry volcano rims, there combined into proteins, and  
□ washed by rain into pools of water to complexify ultimately into living cells. Yet heat breaks down proteins and destroys amino acids.

“Laboratory tests of this theory fail in two ways to simulate nature. First, their electric spark is much less potent and concussive than lightning. Second, they quickly separate from the energy source any amino acids formed, whereas in nature the more likely repeated exposure to it would destroy them.

“Moreover, the type of amino acids formed in such experiments does not support the theory. These tests always produce a mixture of right-and left-handed amino acids, which differ in their molecular structure. Almost all proteins of living organisms, however, contain only left-handed amino acids.”

—Educational Research Analysts, Longview, Texas 75607-7518

Q “Linnaeus in the 1700s classified life forms according to their structural similarities. In the 1800s, Darwin accepted Linnaeus’ system, but gave it an evolutionary interpretation. Darwin thought that the more structurally similar life forms are, the more recent common ancestors they had.

“Homologous organs have similar structures but different functions, such as the human arm, whale flipper, and dog foreleg. Evolutionary biologists cite homologous organs as evidence



of evolution. They say descent from common ancestors is the only scientific explanation for such similarities.

“This assumes two things. It assumes that similar structures are better explained by common ancestry than by repeated independent development. It also assumes that similar structures accurately reflect true relationships among life forms.

“It is thought, however, that the fore-and hind-limbs of land vertebrates did evolve separately—namely, from the pectoral and pelvic fins of a fish. Yet both have one long bone in the upper limb and two in the lower, two bones in the big toe and three in the others, and five digits.

“Moreover, comparative biochemistry and comparative genetics may contradict relationships based on comparative anatomy. The cytochrome c amino acid sequence of rattlesnakes, for example, more closely resembles those of humans and monkeys than that of turtles, a fellow reptile.

“Such data raise questions about whether common ancestry best explains structural similarities, about whether similar structures best indicate true relationships among life forms, and about whether homologous organs are necessarily evidence of evolution.”

—Educational Research Analysts, Longview, Texas 75607-7518

Q “No one has ever observed one basic kind of plant or animal naturally change into another basic kind.”

—Duane Gish, Ph.D., *The Scientific Evidence for Creation*

Q “Michael Ruse, an evolutionist and a philosopher of science was one of the main witnesses for evolution in the 1981 Arkansas federal trial concerning the constitutionality of the equal time law for creation and evolution passed by the Arkansas legislature (declared unconstitutional by Judge William Overton). At that time he argued strenuously that evolutionary theory was science free of any religious implications while creation theory was exclusively religious. This served as the main basis for Judge Overton’s decision. Twelve years later, Ruse was one of the speakers at the February 13, 1993, symposium on ‘The New Antievolutionism’ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science annual meeting in Boston. His speech, revealing a very significant change in his previous position, stunned the audience. Contributing to this change was an exchange between evolutionists and creationists, involving, among others, Ruse and Phillip Johnson. Ruse made clear that he was still as much an evolutionist as ever. Concerning the exchange with Johnson and others, Ruse stated, ‘But we did talk much more about the whole question of metaphysics, the whole question of philosophical bases. And what Johnson was arguing was that, at a certain level,

the kind of position of a person like myself, an evolutionist, is metaphysically based at some level, just as much as the kind of position of let us say somebody, some creationist, someone like Gish or somebody like that. And to a certain extent, I must confess, in the ten years since I performed, or I appeared, in the creationism trial in Arkansas, I must say that I've been coming to this kind of position myself.'

"Later he stated: 'And certainly, there's no doubt about it, that in the past, and I think also in the present, for many evolutionists, evolution has functioned as something with elements which are, let us say, akin to being a secular religion.'

"He referred to examples from T.H. Huxley, Julian Huxley, and Edward O. Wilson. In his closing remark, Ruse stated, 'But I am coming here and saying, I think that philosophically one should be sensitive to what I think history shows, namely, that...evolution, akin to religion, involves making certain a priori or metaphysical assumptions, which at some level cannot be proven empirically. I guess we all knew that, but I think that we're all much more sensitive to these facts now. And I think that the way to deal with creationism, but the way to deal with evolution also, is not to deny these facts, but to recognize them, and to see where we can go, as we move on from there.'

"Ruse should be commended for this forthright admission."

—Duane Gish. Ph.D., *The Scientific Evidence for Creation*

Q A fool that knows he is a fool, is one that knows he don't know all about anything. But the fool that don't know he is a fool, is the one that thinks he knows all about anything."

—Will Rogers

Q "Everyone is ignorant; only on different subjects."

—Will Rogers

Q "The atheist whose lawsuit temporarily succeeded in banning the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance in California schools yesterday said he now will challenge the 'In God We Trust' motto printed on U.S. currency.

" 'It's government imparting its religious views on American citizens,' said Michael Newdow, a 49-year-old emergency room doctor in Sacramento who holds a law degree and represented himself. 'I happen to be one of those who don't adhere to that majority view.'

"The federal appeals court decision Wednesday swept Dr. Newdow into a media storm and left his answering machine full of threatening messages. He wouldn't recount the threats,

saying only they were ‘personal and scary.’

“Yesterday, a day after declaring the Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional, one of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals judges put his ruling on hold indefinitely. It had ruled that reciting the Pledge’s ‘under God’ phrase in public schools violated the separation of church and state.

“It all started when Dr. Newdow had an epiphany buying soap in Florida six years ago. He looked down to see ‘In God We Trust’ on his money, got offended and starting filing lawsuits against the government for injecting religion into public life.

“ ‘The Constitution is a great idea,’ said Dr. Newdow Wednesday night. ‘The words were put there by very wise people, and I think it should be upheld. And when atheists are the majority in this country, those people who believe in God will be protected by this decision as much as I am’

“Dr. Newdow said his family was not particularly religious growing up, but he considers atheism a religion. If he ever believed in God, he said, he stopped about the time he found out Santa Claus and the Tooth Fairy were fake.

“Dr. Newdow said his ‘patriotic’ lawsuit was filed against the Elk Grove School District and Congress on behalf of his elementary school daughter. She was not required to recite the Pledge but he argued she was hurt by being forced to watch and listen to a government-enforced ritual that proclaimed God.

“ ‘The Supreme Court has said being in a situation where you are a schoolkid and a teacher is leading you in religious stuff, that is coercion,’ said Dr. Newdow, who believes the Pledge should be completely rewritten so that students and others could not inject ‘under God.’ ‘Whether or not you are forced to say anything, that is coercion.’

“Dr. Newdow estimated that he has spent 4,000 hours of his own time pursuing this and two other cases against the government for mixing religion and politics. He said he wants to stop the creeping incrementalism of government-backed religion.

“A U.S. district court recently threw out a lawsuit Dr. Newdow filed against President Bush for reputedly turning his 2000 inauguration into a quasi-religious event. He has another lawsuit pending to force Congress to stop making religious references in official resolutions.

“Should his suit over the Pledge reach the Supreme Court on appeal, Dr. Newdow said he still plans to represent himself.

“ ‘I’ve done OK so far,’ he said.

“If the case reaches the Supreme Court, Dr. Newdow said he believes that four justices – David Souter, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Stephen F. Breyer and John Paul Stevens—already side with him based on past church-state decisions. Dr. Newdow is optimistic about Justice Anthony M. Kennedy as well.

“Dr. Newdow grew up in the Bronx, N.Y., and moved to New Jersey when he was 7. He graduated from Brown University in Rhode Island in 1974.”

—The Washington Times, June 28, 2002, p. A 16

Q “By now, I would assume that almost every American has heard about the terrible decision handed down on June 26th by Judges Alfred Goodwin and Stephen Reinhardt in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. These arrogant men had the shocking audacity to rule that the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional because it includes the term ‘under God’—a phrase which was inserted by the U.S. Congress in 1954 and signed into law by then-President Dwight D. Eisenhower. No federal court in the intervening years has seen fit to issue such an order. Only now, with the liberal judiciary running amok in this land, have these two unelected and unaccountable judges had the temerity to do something this out of step with the nation. Although Judge Goodwin stayed (or suspended) his own order after receiving an unprecedented barrage of criticism, he remained unrepentant. He complained a few days after the ruling that the emails protesting the decision were ‘mindless.’

“Clearly, these liberal judges must have believed that, in view of all the other successful assaults on religious faith taking place in recent days, it was time to go for broke. A tempting prize was within their grasp. By issuing this ruling, they could not only have eliminated the reference to God in the Pledge but by implication, set in motion a judicial precedent that could make illegal every other instance in which the name of God shows up in public life. If upheld, the ruling could eventually sound the death knell for patriotic songs such as ‘God Bless America’ and ‘America the Beautiful,’ which proclaims ‘God shed His grace on thee.’ It would wipe the inscription ‘In God We Trust’ from our currency. It would make illegal the prayer spoken at the beginning of every session of the U.S. Congress. Indeed, when taken to its logical conclusion, it would presumably be illegal for the U.S. Supreme Court Marshal to shout, ‘God save the United States and this Honorable Court!’ at the start of each session. According to the curator of the court, that statement has likely been shouted since the first day of operation in 1790.

“The decision by Goodwin and Reinhardt is truly shocking in its presumption! If the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have not considered the use of God’s name to be a problem in their courtroom for the past 212 years, what earthly business did these two imperious judges from the Ninth Circuit have in issuing such a cockamamie edict? Even their own appeals court opens its session with the pronouncement, ‘God save the United States and this Honorable Court.’ I suppose it should not surprise us that this decision emanated from the

State of California, where the legislature and both the state and federal courts have become downright wacky.

“(And speaking of wacky, the case from which this controversy originally erupted is strange in itself. It started when Michael Newdow, a Sacramento, California atheist activist, filed suit against both the United States Congress for inserting the words ‘under God’ into the pledge in 1954, and against his local school district for a policy to have teachers lead students in the Pledge during class. Newdow claimed that his eight-year-old daughter, whom he claimed he was raising as an atheist, was injured whenever she has been compelled to ‘watch and listen’ as her teachers and classmates recite the Pledge. However, it recently has emerged that Newdow’s daughter and her mother (the parents never married) both attend Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California. Area pastors with whom Newdow’s daughter has come into contact have indicated that, not only is she not offended by references to God in the Pledge, but she believes in God herself! When confronted with the allegedly fraudulent nature of his case, Newdow back-pedaled, saying, ‘This is more about me than her. I’d like to keep her out of this.’)

“This case aside, let us consider just how off-the-wall the Ninth Circuit Court has become. In a four-year span (1996-2000), its decisions were reversed by the United States Supreme Court 63 out of 73 times. Judge Reinhardt was, himself, reversed five times in ONE term by a unanimous Supreme Court. What does that tell you?

“Our leaders in Washington were apparently just as shocked as we were by the anti-Pledge decision. Through his spokesman, President George W. Bush first called the ruling ‘ridiculous.’ He went on to publicly comment that the decision was out of step with the traditions and history of our country, saying ‘America is a nation that values our relationship with the Almighty. The declaration of God and the Pledge of Allegiance doesn’t violate rights. As a matter of fact, it’s a confirmation of the fact that we received our rights from God as proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence.’”

—James C. Dobson, August 2002

Q “New research on Thomas Jefferson’s ‘wall of separation’ between church and state shows that Jefferson never intended it to be the iron curtain of today, which instead was built on anti-Catholic legal views in the 1940s.

“Though the new scholarship has received good reviews for exploding a ‘Jefferson myth’ about a wall against religion, others say it is too late to tear down a barrier that Americans feel comfortable with.

“ ‘What we have today is not really Jefferson’s wall, but Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black’s wall,’ said American University professor Daniel Dreisbach, whose forthcoming

book explores how Jefferson coined the ‘wall’ metaphor.

“Mr. Dreisbach’s arguments parallel those of University of Chicago law professor Philip Hamburger, whose new book also says Justice Black’s anti-Catholicism—learned in the Ku Klux Klan—influenced his 1947 ruling that the First Amendment created a ‘high and impregnable’ wall between religion and government.

“The two authors say the Founders did no such thing and that the ‘wall of separation’ has become a ‘lazy slogan’ for judges and politicians.

“In the Supreme Court’s 1947 Everson decision—prohibiting New Jersey to spend state education funds for religious education—Justice Black cited the phrase ‘wall of separation between Church & State,’ from Jefferson’s Jan. 1, 1802, letter to a group of Baptists in Massachusetts.

“The new scholarship argues that the Virginian used that metaphor in hope of winning support in New England—then a stronghold of the rival Federalists—rather than as the definitive interpretation of the First Amendment.

“ ‘Jefferson worked with his New England political advisers on the letter,’ said Mr. Dreisbach, who five years ago began looking at Jefferson’s original draft, the political advice and the electoral setting of the period.

“The letter actually ‘backfired’ by alienating the Baptists, he said. ‘The Baptists advocated disestablishment of the Congregationalists in New England, but they were not for separation of religion from public life.’

“This political interpretation of Jefferson’s ‘wall’ caused a national stir when it was part of a 1998 Library of Congress exhibit, to which Mr. Dreisbach contributed.

“Historian Robert Alley, who argues that Jefferson wanted a secular public square, rallied other scholars in protest, saying the exhibit ‘ignores the past 60 years of Supreme Court opinions that analyzed Jefferson’s phrase.’

“With the new books, more emphasis is being thrown on Justice Black’s use of Jefferson’s phrase.

“ ‘You can’t understand the period when Justice Black was on the court without understanding the fear American elites had of Catholic influence and power,’ said Mr. Dreisbach, who is not a Catholic.

“Alan Wolfe, director of the Boisi Center for Religion and Public Life at Boston College, is

impressed by the new findings but doubts they can make a difference.

“ ‘I think it is terrific scholarship, but I don’t think it can change anything,’ said Mr. Wolfe, who reviewed the Hamburger book and has surveyed public opinion of politics and religion.

“ ‘The “wall” idea has taken on a life of its own and is part of our custom and law,’ Mr. Wolfe said. ‘Americans love God and hate politics, so they ask, “Why mix the two?”’

“He said Catholics today are comfortable with church-state separation, as every religion must be in the United States. ‘One day, a group of [U.S.] Muslim thinkers will come up with an idea of “separation” that works for them.’

“Stanley Katz, a Princeton scholar, said the new data on the ‘Jeffersonian myth, will have a ‘profound impact on the current law and politics of church and state.’

“In the past two years, Supreme Court Justices Clarence Thomas and Antonin Scalia both have argued that modern anti-Catholicism produced the idea that ‘sectarian’ groups created conflict and must be walled off from public support.

“ ‘It was an open secret that “sectarian” was a code for “Catholic”,’ Justice Thomas wrote in a concurring opinion two years ago. ‘This doctrine, born of bigotry, should be buried now.’

“The term ‘sectarian’ was first used in a federal ruling on church-state issues in 1948. Mr. Dreisbach said public debate on the new scholarship may help reverse the conventional wisdom that society must be secular and religion confined to private opinion.

“ ‘Religious citizens should be able to compete in the marketplace of ideas on equal terms to other groups,’ he said.”

—Larry Witham, *The Washington Times*, August 5, 2002, p. 1