



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

Do not be deceived: Evil company corrupts good morals. Awake to righteousness, and do not sin. 1Corinthians 15:33

From The President's Desk

I thought it best to revisit the issue on why a Christian parent should consider sending their son or daughter to one of the Summit's two week programs accenting the Christian Worldview and Christian leadership. While not in any particular order of reasons let me enumerate the most obvious.

1) Most Christian teenagers (that is, teens who have named the historical person of Jesus Christ as their Savior, Redeemer, Lord, King, Sovereign, Head, Sustainer, etc.) do not have a meaningful grasp of what it means to have in their own possession a Christian worldview. Summit's two-week program can help them.

2) Most Christian teenagers lack leadership skills. Summit can help.

3) Most Christian teens have absolutely no idea how their Christian faith will be challenged by America's Secular Humanist educational system (sometimes called government schools). Summit will help them identify the major issues here and explain the areas most deadly to their Christian faith.

4) Most Christian teens have no idea that their Christian faith is being subverted by another religious faith. Summit will prove to any open minded student that Secular Humanism is just as religious as Christianity.

5) Most Christian teens need their Christian faith grounded when it comes to the areas of reason, revelation, science, philosophy, common sense, etc. Summit can help them get a firm grasp in these areas.

6) Most Christian teens need help in the areas of moral relativism, modernism, postmodernism, biological evolution, creationism, etc. Summit can help them figure out the issues involved.

7) Most Christian teens need to know that there are other teenagers who see life from a Christian perspective. Summit brings together some of the finest Christian teenagers for this very purpose. One parent called me many years ago and said something to the following: if Summit taught nothing worthwhile but was only there to bring Christian teenagers together for two weeks it would be worth it. The fact is that we do bring these teens together for fun and fellowship, but also for serious study, contemplation and action.

8) Many Christian teens need help figuring out where to go to college or university. Summit can help them sort out their alternatives. While we do recommend Christian colleges and universities, many times we recommend certain departments in our Secular Humanist schools. In fact, we tell our students that some Christian colleges can be as deadly to their Christian faith as Harvard.

9) Many Christian teens need to expand their horizon and vision. Summit can help them do so as we open up various mission fields, etc.

10) Many Christian teens and their parents (and grandparents) have written us and told us how powerful an impact Summit's two-week programs have had on their lives. While we receive such mail nearly daily, I did just receive a note from a student who was here 20 years ago who is still using the materials taught and is now an administrator in a Christian school.

11) Most Christian teens have no idea about the Muslim worldview and its assault on Western Civilization. Summit will help in this area.

12) Most Christian teens have little idea about the influence of Jesus Christ on Western Civilization. Summit will help explain why Jesus Christ (even according to Newsweek magazine) is the most influential figure of Western Civilization.

13) Most Christian teens have no idea how the influence of Jesus Christ is being challenged by the beliefs of Darwin, Marx, Freud, Nietzsche, Dewey, Rorty, etc. Summit will help sort out the score card.

I'm sure I missed some other good reasons why Christian parents should consider a two-week course of study for their son or daughter, but let me close with a comment or two from an

article that appeared in The Weekly Standard (Dec. 23, 2002, p.19f) entitled “Making It: Love and success at America’s finest universities.”

First of all, every Christian parent thinking of sending their most precious possession to one of our finest institutions of higher learning needs to read this article by David Brooks, a professor at Yale University.

Second, the article gives a host of reasons why every Christian teen needs two weeks at the Summit before hoofing off to such institutions.

Third, one comment from Prof. Brooks really caught my attention. Saith he, “When one reads about America’s colleges in the media, especially in the conservative media, one gets the impression that the top universities are left-wing hothouses, filled with multicultural radicalism and fevered anti-American passion. That’s not true. Most professors are liberals, and it’s true that in its wisdom American society has decided to warehouse its radical lunatics on university campuses—in specialized departments that operate as nunneries for the perpetually alienated....Students know who the radical professors are (they are a loud but small minority on each campus). On the whole the students are condescending toward them.”

The problem is that many Christian students do not know what “liberal professor” means even if they sense that something is seriously wrong with the perpetually alienated prof who appears in class in drag with his eyebrows plucked and his fingernails painted. The truth is that “liberal” in educational parlance means “humanist.” Richard Rorty is a liberal professor. Richard Rorty is a humanist. What does Rorty have in mind for our young Christian student?

Listen to Rorty carefully, “When we [liberal] American college teachers encounter religious fundamentalists [Christians], we do not consider the possibility of reformulating our own practices of justification [for our leftwing agenda] so as to give more weight to the authority of the Christian scriptures. Instead, we do our best to convince these students of the benefits of secularization [humanism].”

Elsewhere he says that he considers Christian students in his class lucky to escape the grip of “their frightening, vicious, dangerous parents.” (Brandom’s Rorty and his Critics, p. 22)

That is the issue that concerns us at Summit Ministries and why we believe every parent needs to provide a two-week course of study for their child in order to understand the educational matrix they are entering.

Our 2003 Summit brochures and applications are available for the asking. Call us at (719) 685-9103; Write us at P. O. Box 207, Manitou Springs, CO 80829, or check us out www.summit.org.

And for parents who feel you could use some reinforcement as well don't forget to write for our Adult/Educators Conference brochure. This is a one-week seminar held at the Navigator's beautiful conference center in mid-March.

Month In Review

Q “But someone will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come?

“Foolish one, what you sow is not made alive unless it dies. And what you sow, you do not sow that body that shall be, but mere grain—perhaps wheat or some other grain. But God gives it a body as He pleases, and to each seed its own body.

“All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of animals, another of fish, and another of birds.

“There are also celestial bodies and terrestrial bodies; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differs from another star in glory.

“So also is the resurrection of the dead. The body is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown in a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, ‘the first man Adam became a living being.’ The last Adam became a life-giving spirit.

“However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural, and afterward the spiritual. The first man was of the earth, made of dust; the second Man is the Lord from heaven. As was the man of dust, so also are those who are made of dust; and as is the heavenly Man, so also are those who are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly Man.”

—1 Corinthians 15: 35-49

Q “As I look back on my life, I see it as one long obstacle course with myself as the main obstacle.”

—Jack Paar

Q There are two sins of man that are bred in the bone and that continually come out in the flesh. One is self-dependence and the other is self-exultation.”

—Charles H. Spurgeon

Q The goal of life is not to gain freedom but to find your master.”

—P.T. Forsythe

Q “I’ve conquered an empire but I’ve not been able to conquer myself.”

—Peter the Great

Q “Man is trying to make something for himself rather than something of himself.”

—Jascha Heifetz

Q To be enslaved to oneself is the heaviest of all servitudes.”

—Seneca

Q “All theology of the liberal type involves at some point—and often involves throughout—the claim that the real behavior and purpose and teaching of Christ came very rapidly to be misunderstood and misrepresented by His followers, and has been recovered or exhumed only by modern scholars....This daily confirms my suspicion of the same approach to Plato or the New Testament. The idea that any man or writer should be opaque to those who lived in the same culture, spoke the same language, shared the same habitual imagery and unconscious assumptions, and yet be transparent to those who have none of these advantages, is in my opinion preposterous. There is an a priori improbability in it which almost no argument and no evidence could counterbalance.

—C.S. Lewis, *Christian Reflections*

Q “Ultimately, capitalism is human nature at work—that is, man’s greediness allowed to follow its course—whereas socialism is an attempt to institutionalize and enforce fraternity. It seems obvious by now that a society in which greed is the main motivation of human acts, for all of its repugnant and deplorable aspects, is incomparably better than a society based on compulsory brotherhood.”

—Leszek Kolakowski, “What is Left of Socialism”, *First Things*, Jan. 2003, p. 3

Q “I agree that capitalism really is human nature at work, but only Marxist materialists reduce the definition of human nature to ‘man’s greediness.’ As a proponent of capitalism living in a basically capitalist society, I have engaged in countless ‘human acts’ this week, and I can think of none (okay, maybe one or two) that were motivated mainly by greed. Can thankfulness, cruelty, piety, anger, pity, lust, whimsy, vanity, duty, pride, love, etc. not motivate human acts in capitalist societies? Or must I, as a proponent of capitalism, go to church greedily, read bedtime stories to my children greedily, send money to Lutherans for Life greedily, go jogging along the river greedily, root for the Packers to beat the Bears greedily, clean the garage greedily, build a fire in my fireplace even though it is sixty-five degrees outside greedily, and read the same book of English Romantic poetry for the fiftieth time greedily? If so, how would socialism deal with such pervasive greed? By taking away my fireplace and running shoes?

“Even though it only amounts to a minor point in his article, Dr. Kolakowski’s moral critique of capitalism—that it allows greed to go unchecked—betrays the mindset of the academic left because it imputes to capitalism the function of religion. It is like criticizing the U.S. Postal Service for delivering too much hate mail, but then reluctantly acknowledging that ‘for all its repugnant and deplorable aspects’ our postal system is better than systems that censor the mail and deliver it late. Capitalism, like the postal service, is not a religion, and so it neither can nor should measure up to the moral demands placed upon it by disillusioned Marxists seeking a new way. For such religious seekers, capitalism is not large and pretentious enough to fill the moral void left by Marxism’s demise, but no other major religion is cramped and narrow enough to focus entirely on greed, class, and power struggles as the essences of the human condition. My motivation in writing this letter (apart from all-consuming avarice) is to suggest that Dr. Kolakowski look neither to capitalism nor to the ghost of socialism but somewhere else for, among other things, ‘a statement of solidarity with the underdogs and the oppressed, as a motivation to oppose Social Darwinism, as a light that keeps before our eyes something higher than competition and greed.’ ”

—(The Rev.) Peter A. Speckhard, Faith Lutheran Church, Green Bay, Wisconsin”

—First Things, Jan. 2003, p. 3, 4

Q “Republicans are the party of the religious, while Democrats are the party of secularists. That you may well protest, puts the matter altogether too simply. You are right. But the foregoing generalization is not far off the mark, and is getting closer. Such are the findings of an important article in the Public Interest, ‘Our Secularist Democratic Party,’ by Louis Bolce and Gerald De Maio, two social scientists at Baruch College, New York. The dramatic shift was first evident in the Democratic Convention of 1972, when over a third of white delegates fit the definition of secularist, compared with only five percent of the general population falling into that category. For purposes of the study, a ‘secularist’ is someone who rejects scriptural authority, has no religious affiliation, never attends a religious service or prays, and says religion provides no guidance in his daily life. A ‘traditionalist’ is defined by the obverse on each of those scores. (The majority of Americans, it should be noted, are designated as ‘religious moderate’ who fall between the secularist and traditionalist camps.)

“The authors call the difference between secularists and traditionalists ‘the religious gap.’ ‘The religious gap among white voters in the 1992, 1996, and 2000 presidential elections was more important than other demographic and social cleavages in the electorate; it was much larger than the gender gap and more significant than any combination of differences in education, income, occupation, age, marital status, and regional groupings.’ A quarter of white respondents in the study have strongly negative feelings toward ‘the religious right’ and ‘fundamentalists.’ The authors write: ‘The results indicate that over the past decade persons who intensely dislike fundamentalist Christians have found a partisan home in the Democratic Party. Clinton captured 80 percent of these voters in his victories over President Bush in 1992 and over Senator Robert Dole four years later; Gore picked up 70 percent of the anti-fundamentalist vote in the 2000 election. One has to reach back to pre-New Deal America, when the political divisions between Catholics and Protestants encapsulated local ethno-cultural cleavages over prohibition, immigration, public education, and blue laws, to find a period when voting behavior was influenced by this degree of antipathy toward a religious group.’

“From 1990 to 2000, the New York Times and the Washington Post ran fourteen stories noting the traditionalist-secularist divide between Republican and Democratic parties. In the same time period, they ran 392 articles on the gender gap. In the three presidential elections, white women on average gave Democrats nine percent more of their vote than did white men, while ‘the average gap separating secularists and religious traditionalists in these same elections was 42 percentage points.’

“Why do journalists talk so much about assertive believers taking over the Republican Party, and are relatively silent about the takeover of the other party by assertive secularists? ‘One explanation,’ the authors say, ‘involves the difficulties journalists might have in taking notice of an outlook that is so close to their own.’ They know they don’t belong in the traditionalist camp, but they have no position of their own. They are neutral, which is to say they are normal, which is to say they are at home with the people they know and work with in the secularists camp. In a national survey, a majority of media executives and editors said that conservative Christians had ‘too much power and influence,’ and a third thought they posed a ‘threat to democracy.’ Not one in the media elites perceived secularists as a threat.”

—First Things, January 2003, p. 82

Q “In a column titled ‘A Jew Defends Evangelical Christians,’ the formidable Dennis Prager notes that liberals – Christian, Jewish, or other – are offended, and insist that others should be offended, by evangelical Protestants who say it is necessary to believe in Jesus Christ in order to be saved. Prager says Jews should not be offended. ‘Since all non-Christians are unsaved, this doctrine is in no way anti-Jewish. It is pro-salvation, not anti-anybody. The evangelical view of who is not saved is applicable, by definition, to all non-Christians. There is, therefore, no reason whatsoever for a Jew to be personally offended. It is no more applicable to Jews than to Hindus. When most evangelicals single out Jews, it is only to support them and Israel, and to reaffirm Jewish closeness. It takes paranoia, ignorance, and ingratitude for a Jew to join the anti-evangelical critics.’ He goes on to observe, ‘All those who condemn evangelicals for their belief in the necessity of affirming Christ for salvation are doing exactly what they accuse these Christians of doing – judging and condemning people solely for their beliefs. Here is the liberals’ rule: Christians may not judge others by their religious beliefs, but liberals may judge Christians by their religious beliefs.’ Finally there is this: ‘Evangelical Christians, almost alone, affirm that America has a divine mission, that this country has better values than Europe, that the United Nations is a moral wasteland, that God’s law is higher than international laws devised in New York or the Hague, that secularism is wonderful for government but fatal for society, that Israel must be protected against those who wish to exterminate it, that the Jews have a divinely chosen role in history, and that America must remain a Judeo-Christian country. If the only way a Christian can hold these precious beliefs is to maintain that faith in Jesus is the only way to salvation, here is one Jew who says: More power to you. Keep your faith strong. And thanks.’ ”

—First Things, January 2003, p. 85

Q “Maybe the reason we are having so much trouble solving the mind-body problem is that

reality contains an ingredient that we cannot know. We have only a very partial grip on both mind and brain, but if we could remedy this ignorance the solution to the problem would be immediate and uncontroversial. It's like one of those detective stories in which the detective has only limited information and cannot for the life of him see how to solve the mystery – the crime looks quite impossible to explain in his current state of information – but then he lights upon the crucial missing clue and everything falls into place. But with the mind-body problem, I surmised, the clue is not going to come to light, which explains why we have been mystified by it for centuries. It might come to light, I thought, but it would have to be very different from anything considered so far; it would certainly not be some minor tinkering with one of the theories currently around. And in my bones I felt that there was some deep-seated obstacle in our intellectual makeup that prevents us from discovering the missing clue.”

—The Making of a Philosopher, Colin McGinn, quoted in First Things, January 2003, p. 49

Q The significance of McGinn's quote is that the Oxford professor, though atheist and steeped in analytical philosophy, doesn't necessarily equate mind and brain which is the typical materialistic approach. In fact, he does not reduce the conscious mind and physical brain and admits it is not possible to give a complete account of consciousness in purely physical terms.

Q Islam is and always has been a religion of intolerance, a jihad without an end. Despite the way the apologists would like to depict it, Islam was spread by the sword and has been maintained by the sword throughout its history. William Muir, one of the greatest orientalist of all times (1819-1905), summed it up at the end of a long and distinguished career when he declared his conviction that the sword of Muhammad and the Qur'an are the most fatal enemies of civilization, liberty, and truth which the world has yet known.”

—Serge Trifkovic, The Sword of the Prophet, p. 132

Q “While fundamentalist Islam differs in its details from other utopian ideologies, it closely resembles them in scope and ambition. Like Communism and Fascism, it offers a vanguard ideology; a complete program to improve man and create a new society; complete control over that society; and cadres ready, even eager, to spill blood.”

—Daniel Pipes, quoted in The Sword of the Prophet, p. 133

Q “The only distinction between Islamic terror through the centuries—against Medinan Jews, Arabian pagans, Greeks, Serbs, Persians, Hindus, Armenians, African blacks, and countless others—and its twentieth century totalitarian counterparts, as practiced in the workhouses of the Final Solution and the Gulag, concerned methods. Unlike Arabs, Turks, and their local collaborators through the centuries, the mass murderers in European totalitarian powers adopted the ‘style’ of a developed industrial state. Their terror relied on complex equipment and intricate administration network, while Islamic terror was ‘primitive’ and ‘traditional.’ Nazis and Stalinists relied on coordinated plans, order, reports, invoices, lists, cost-benefit calculations and statistics. On the other hand, from Muhammad and Usman to Abdul Hamid, Mustafa Kemal, and the modern Sudanese Army, the orders have been mostly oral, the apparatus of terror arbitrary, the selection of targets and methods of killing sometimes random.

“Nazi and Stalinist terror was for the most part depersonalized and bureaucratic, it was cold, abstract, objective; the warriors for Islam were direct, personal and warm. Their terror was and is often directed against their first neighbors; it was and is passionate and subjective. The terror of the Reichkommissars and Politkommissars, with its somberness, discipline, and bureaucratic pendency, was ‘puritanical,’ while the Muslims in all ages and locations indulge literally in orgies of violence. The Malaysian Islamist leader Anwar Ibrahim was unintentionally frank when he declared ‘We are not socialist, we are not capitalist, we are Islamic.’”

—Serge Trifkovic, *The Sword of the Prophet*, p. 133

Q “Marxist-Fascist and Islamist projects have in common the lust for other people’s lives and property, and the desire to exercise complete control over their subjects’ lives. All three have been justified by a self-referential system of thought and belief that perverts meanings of words, stunts the sense of moral distinctions, and destroys souls.”

—Serge Trifkovic, *The Sword of the Prophet*, p. 135

Q “At the outset of the new millennium, the State Department report on human rights in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 2000 offers an accurate glimpse of what is in store for the rest of humanity if and when Islam is globally triumphant: ‘Freedom of religion does not exist. Islam is the official religion, and all citizens must be Muslim. Neither the government nor society in general accepts the concepts of separation of religion and state, and such separation does not exist. Under Shari’a, conversion by a Muslim to another religion is considered apostasy. Public apostasy is a crime punishable by death if the accused does not recant.

Islamic religious education is mandatory in public schools at all levels. All children receive religious instruction....Citizens do not have the right to change their government. The Council of Senior Islamic Scholars...reviews the government's public policies for compliance with Shari'a. The government [views] Islamic law as the only necessary guide to protect human rights. There is legal and systemic discrimination based on sex and religion.'

"The Saudi religious police, known as the Committee to Promote Virtue and Prevent Vice, routinely intimidate, abuse, and detain citizens and foreigners. The authorities abuse detainees, using beatings, sleep deprivation, and torture. 'Punishments include flogging, amputation, and execution by beheading, stoning or firing squad. The authorities acknowledged 120 executions during [2000], an increase from 100 in 1999.' The men were executed by beheading, and the women were executed by firing squad. There were 27 amputations in 2000, including 7 multiple amputations (right hand, left leg). Persons convicted of less serious offenses, such as alcohol-related offenses, or being alone in the company of an unrelated person of the opposite sex, are flogged with a cane."

—Serge Trifkovic, *The Sword of the Prophet*, p. 138, 9

Q "Fifty-one-year-old Mary Stachowicz was a soft-spoken, devout Catholic mother of four from Chicago. On November 15th, police recovered her body from a crawlspace under the apartment floor of her confessed murderer, 19-year-old homosexual Nicholas Gutierrez.

"Gutierrez's apartment was located above the funeral home where he and Mrs. Stachowicz worked. He beat, kicked, stabbed, and strangled Mrs. Stachowicz to death after she gently admonished him to leave the homosexual 'lifestyle.' According to police detective Lee Epplen, '[Gutierrez] said he had issues with his mother and the way Mrs. Stachowicz was talking to him gave him flashbacks of his mother that angered him.'

"As was the case with the 1999 rape-murder of 13-year-old Jesse Dirkhising by a pair of homosexual 'lovers', the mainstream media have effectively embargoed the Stachowicz murder. This stands in dramatic contrast to the 1999 robbery-murder of Matthew Shepard, which received saturation coverage as an indictment of 'homophobia.'"

—The New American, Dec. 30, 2002, p. 6

Q "George Wallace, Orval Faubus and Ross Barnett were men before their time. They were merely infamous Southern governors, trying to keep their public schools segregated. They failed, but only because they never got an education at Stanford, Penn or MIT.

“Jim Crow is back, only he’s supposed to be kinder, gentler and mellower. You might call him Jimmy Crow (or in some places, Jaime Crow). Whatever you call him, he’s the new big man on campus. Administrators have freshened up the label, and their dorms are not segregated houses, but ‘ethnic theme houses.’ Nevertheless, these are living accommodations determined by race, the latest trend in the soft bigotry of campus paternalism.

“At Stanford, these dorms require a glossary for identification. Muwekma-tah-ruk is Native American, Ujamaa is African-American and Casa Zapata is Chicano/Latino. The Asian-American house is called Okada, named for the author of a book about the treatment of Japanese Americans during World War II, when they were sent to live in ethnic-themed resettlement camps.

“Stanford students and administrators have been mildly embarrassed - there may be hope yet - since a civil rights organization exposed them in a study entitled: ‘The Stigma of Inclusion: Racial Paternalism/Separatism in Higher Education.’ The New York Civil Rights Coalition reports that color-coded universities encourage a ‘balkanized campus environment’ and that minority students at Stanford are ‘indoctrinated’ into a separate track for ‘special treatment’ that many of them did not ask for, or expect, when they applied for admission.

“ ‘From those who believe that theme dorms represent a divisive form of self-segregation, to those who see them as paternalistic attempts by universities to improve minority students’ chances of success in college,’ the Stanford Daily reports, ‘the system has a wide range of detractors.’

“Descriptions of segregated theme dorms at other colleges could fill a primer on diversity doublespeak. Some of the new segregationists suggest that an ethnic theme house is no different from clustering students in dancing, music, art, language or food. But ‘Chocolate City’ at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a black dorm, is not about brownies and chocolate fudge cake, but a dorm to promote black culture, identity and support for ‘our brotherhood.’

“The Latino Living Center at Cornell offers salsa and meringue, which may sound like dip and lemon pie, but they’re the popular Latin dances. In between the fancy footwork, the Latino students discuss the future of immigration policy and the problems of gang warfare in the inner-city barrios. The University of Pennsylvania calls its segregated dorm the W.E.B. Dubois College House, named for the famous black sociologist, to promote African-American culture. There’s even a hip-hop group. One resident likes the wide diversity based on skin color: ‘I was exposed to a real mixture - to Africans, African-Americans, and other black Americans like myself.’

“Stanford administrators say their multiethnic approach has evolved since the first black

theme house was established in 1970. Thirty years ago the purpose was to provide an ethnic neighborhood away from the ethnic neighborhood. Today, the emphasis, according to Thom Massey, assistant dean of the graduate life office, is on the positive celebrations of African-American culture for whites as well as blacks.

“Students who like such arrangements say they choose ethnic houses because they feel ‘safe’ and appreciate a comfortable support system provided by their own kind that gives them time to adjust to the larger culture on campus. This sounds to those of us with long memories like making sure some people know their place.

“The New York civil-rights report finds ethnic theme houses part of a larger disturbing ‘educational’ problem. Their survey of colleges reveals a segregationist agenda of race and ethnicity permeating every facet of campus life - academic courses, counseling, remedial programs and socializing, all hiding behind clever euphemisms and pretty facades of diversity.

“Ethnic houses actually encourage what they decry, by infantilizing students, pampering them in their ethnic insecurities, and creating a divisiveness through racial stereotyping. A Latino student gives away the insidiousness of this approach, describing how he found his blood roots at Amherst: ‘For me, there’s more consciousness of my background as a Latino male,’ he says. ‘Before I came to Amherst, I wasn’t thinking about race or class or gender or sexual orientation, I was just thinking about people wanting to learn.’

“All this, says the New York Civil Rights Coalition, is a giant step backward for the civil rights movement: ‘The purpose of higher education is to remove narrow constrictions of the mind, to extirpate prejudice, to remove barriers to the open pursuit of knowledge. Separatism in all of its forms, but especially when it is aided and abetted by college and university officials and resources, is a betrayal of that mission.’

“Shame on them.”

—Suzanne Fields, *The Washington Times*, December 9, 2002, p. A 19

Q “A global analysis by more than 200 scientists shows wilderness areas cover nearly half of Earth’s land surface and are inhabited by a small part of the population of humans.

“The comprehensive analysis lead by Conservation International identified 37 wilderness areas on 46 percent of the Earth’s land, which are occupied by 2.4 percent of the world’s population, excluding densely populated urban centers.

“ ‘These very low density areas represent a landmass equivalent to the six largest countries on Earth combined—Russia, Canada, China, United States, Brazil and Australia—but have within them the population of only three large cities, a truly remarkable finding,’ said Russell Mittermeier, a primatologist and president of Conservation International.

“Wilderness was defined as areas of approximately 4,000 square miles with 70 percent or more of original vegetation intact.

“Republicans in the West welcomed the research and said they were surprised an international environmental group would agree with them on the abundance of wilderness left of the planet.

“ ‘Clearly this report debunks the claims of extremist environmentalists that the sky is falling when it comes to protecting our environment,’ said Rep. Scott McInnis, Colorado Republican and chairman of the House Resources subcommittee on forests and forest health.

“Rep. George P. Radanovich, California Republican, called it a ‘sad day’ for environmentalists.

“I guess the world isn’t coming to an end after all. Send Greenpeace and the Sierra Club my condolences.’ Said Mr. Radanovich.

“ ‘I am always pleased when sound science and research defeats liberal political science and hyperbole. As this analysis demonstrates, there is a very definite global balance between preservation and development,’ Mr. Radanovich said.”

—The Washington Times, Dec. 6, 2002, p. A 3

Q “A new study challenges the old theories that Mars once had abundant oceans, suggesting instead that asteroid collisions produced the riverbedlike contours on the red planet’s surface.

“The study, appearing today in this week’s issue of the journal Science, suggests that at several points in its history Mars collided with asteroids that carried minimal amounts of water, but conditions were too unfavorable for life to develop in the way scientists once believed.

“ ‘There are about 25 visible craters with diameters between 500 and 4,000 kilometers,’ says the report, produced by four researchers at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

“A collision with asteroids the size of a state would have caused hot meteors to land all over

the planet. Two things would have followed, according to Owen B. Toon, senior author of the study.

“First, the impact of the waterladen asteroid striking Mars’ surface would create steam in an atmosphere that was ‘hotter than a self-cleaning oven,’ Mr. Toon said in an interview. As the atmosphere gradually cooled, rain hitting the hot rocks all over the place would have melted ice, causing water to flow and create rivers.

“This theory is different from the one long held by scientists. The older theory suggests that the planet’s gullies, hills and riverbeds developed billions of years ago when an unknown heat source melted large pools of water, causing massive flooding at intervals throughout ancient history.

“Scientists speculated that Mars could have been, at one point, similar to Earth, a warm, wet place with flowing rivers and perhaps life. Over time it slowly lost its favorable climate, becoming the cold, dry rock it is now.

“The decline of the fair climate occurred, according to the older theory, when volcanic eruptions introduced carbon dioxide gas into the atmosphere. The carbon dioxide warmed the water, creating limestone.

“ ‘The problem with that story is that no one has found the limestone,’ Mr. Toon said, adding that the other problem arises out of the lack of carbon dioxide required to keep the atmosphere warm.

“However, Mr. Toon presents two pieces of tangible evidence for his theory.

“ ‘First of all the craters are sitting on Mars,’ he said. ‘We know it got hit.’

“The other evidence, he said, are the layers of debris recently discovered to be lying all over the planet, which ‘clearly fell out of the atmosphere,’

“Mr. Toon said the research may mean that life never had a chance to develop on Mars because there was never long-lasting oceans and long-lasting periods of warmth.

“ ‘Only during the brief years or decades after the impact events would Mars have been temperate, and only then might it have bloomed with life as we know it,’ his report says.”

—The Washington Times, Dec. 6, 2002, p. A 7