

April 2004



The

JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

There was in a certain city a judge who did not fear God nor regard man.

Luke 18:2

From The President's Desk

Ladies and Gentlemen—the President of the United States. Read and digest carefully.

“Eight years ago, Congress passed, and President Clinton signed, the Defense of Marriage Act, which defined marriage for purposes of federal law as the legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife.

“The act passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 342-67 and the Senate by a vote of 85-14.

“Those congressional votes, and the passage of similar defense of marriage laws in 38 states, express an overwhelming consensus in our country for protecting the institution of marriage.

“In recent months, however, some activist judges and local officials have made an aggressive attempt to redefine marriage. In Massachusetts, four judges on the highest court have indicated they will order the issuance of marriage licenses to applicants of the same gender in May of this year.

“In San Francisco, city officials have issued thousands of marriage licenses to people of the same gender, contrary to the California Family Code. That code, which clearly defines marriage as the union of a man and a woman, was approved overwhelmingly by the voters of California.

“A county in New Mexico has also issued marriage licenses to applicants of the same gender.

“And unless action is taken, we can expect more arbitrary court decisions, more litigation, more defiance of the law by local officials, all of which adds to uncertainty.

“After more than two centuries of American jurisprudence and millennia of human experience, a few judges and local authorities are presuming to change the most fundamental institution of civilization. Their actions have created confusion on an issue that requires clarity.

“On a matter of such importance, the voice of the people must be heard. Activist courts have left the people with one recourse. If we’re to prevent the meaning of marriage from being changed forever, our nation must enact a constitutional amendment to protect marriage in America. Decisive and democratic action is needed because attempts to redefine marriage in a single state or city could have serious consequences throughout the country.

“The Constitution says that ‘full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts and records and judicial proceedings of every other state.’

“Those who want to change the meaning of marriage will claim that this provision requires all states and cities to recognize same-sex marriages performed anywhere in America.

“Congress attempted to address this problem in the Defense of Marriage Act by declaring that no state must accept another state’s definition of marriage. My administration will vigorously defend this act of Congress.

“Yet there is no assurance that the Defense of Marriage Act will not itself be struck down by activist courts. In that event, every state would be forced to recognize any relationship that judges in Boston or officials in San Francisco choose to call a marriage.

“Furthermore, even if the Defense of Marriage Act is upheld, the law does not protect marriage within any state or city.

For all these reasons, the defense of marriage requires a constitutional amendment.

“An amendment to the Constitution is never to be undertaken lightly. The amendment process has addressed many serious matters of national concern, and the preservation of marriage rises to this level of national importance.

“The union of a man and woman is the most enduring human institution, honored and

encouraged in all cultures and by every religious faith. Ages of experience have taught humanity that the commitment of a husband and wife to love and to serve one another promotes the welfare of children and the stability of society. Marriage cannot be severed from its cultural, religious and natural roots without weakening the good influence of society.

“Government, by recognizing and protecting marriage, serves the interests of all.

“Today, I call upon the Congress to promptly pass and to send to the states for ratification an amendment to our Constitution defining and protecting marriage as a union of a man and woman as husband and wife.

“The amendment should fully protect marriage, while leaving the state legislatures free to make their own choices in defining legal arrangements other than marriage.

“America’s a free society which limits the role of government in the lives of our citizens. This commitment of freedom, however, does not require the redefinition of one of our most basic social institutions.

“Our government should respect every person and protect the institution of marriage. There is no contradiction between these responsibilities.

“We should also conduct this difficult debate in a manner worthy of our country, without bitterness or anger.

“In all that lies ahead, let us match strong convictions with kindness and good will and decency.

“Thank you very much.”

Month In Review

Q “Then He spoke a parable to them, that men always ought to pray and not lose heart, saying: ‘There was in a certain city a judge who did not fear God nor regard man. Now there was a widow in that city; and she came to him saying, “Get justice for me from my adversary.” And he would not for a while; but afterward he said within himself, “Though I do not fear God nor regard man, yet because this widow troubles me I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.” ’ ’ ”

—Luke 18:1-5

Q “Choose judges that are able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness.”

Q “In Luke’s Gospel, Jesus tells a parable involving ‘a certain judge, who neither feared God nor regarded man’. A disillusioned observer of the current judicial scene in the United States, coupled with an awareness of the behavior of the Senate Judiciary Committee, might suspect that it is now becoming a requirement for judicial appointment, especially to the federal courts, that a judge or justice neither fear God nor regard man. January 22 was the 31st anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the abortion decision of a Supreme Court in which seven of the nine justices paid no heed to the fact that every abortion kills a human being, a man or homo in Latin. Thus the German Constitutional Court was quite correct in saying in 1975, ‘The usual language, termination of pregnancy, cannot conceal the fact that abortion is a homicidal act.’

“The killing of innocent human beings is prohibited by the commandments of God and violates natural law. There is no exception made for age or feebleness. If the seven justices who created Roe had feared God or respected His commandment, could they have so easily failed to regard man? Recent hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee, with several members determined to preserve Roe at all costs, make it evident that possessing either of these two qualifications, fearing God and regarding human beings, disqualifies one for appointment to the federal judiciary.

“A state judge who sought to honor the Ten Commandments for their role in shaping American life and law, and who persisted in this determination despite an order from a federal judge, Roy A. Moore of Alabama, was divested of his seat and subjected to other penalties: a fine testimony to the danger of fearing God more than men in today’s American judicial system. When God gives the law, judges should take heed. When men make the law, be they emperors, governors, or judges, with no heed for God and His laws, or even for the laws of nature created by God, then the society is on the road to tyranny and cries out for divine judgment.

“What can be done to recall our judiciary to truth—to acknowledge as human that which is human—to respect for man, and to the fear of God? There is no mechanism for this in American law. In any event, the judges now have the power to make new laws when the old ones do not satisfy them. After 1945, when Germany had been devastated and many of her leaders executed as war criminals, the new German Federal Constitution was deliberately shaped with attention both to natural law and to the Christian tradition. When the United States Constitution was adopted, most Americans took both respect for God and attention to natural law for granted and did not write them into our basic law. Now, like so many of the Germans of Hitler’s day, we are forgetting God and disregarding His laws. Of course no American government has even begun to go so far as the Nazi government did. But without all awareness of responsibility to the divine Judge, there is no built-in guarantee that we will not go too far. A beginning has been made with decisions such as Roe on abortion and Lawrence and Goodridge on homosexuality, and unless we can return to moral sanity, there is

no natural limit to prevent us from going further. Perhaps September 11, 2001, should be taken as a warning that if God does not protect us, we cannot protect ourselves. Forgetting God, rejecting all thought of Creation in our schools, denying natural law with regard to sexuality, removing the Ten Commandments and all other religious symbolism from every public place, can hardly be thought wise in a day when, more than ever before, we need greater protection than that which our computers, guns, and bombers can give us. Fear God, regard man!”

—Harold O. J. Brown, Religion and Society Report, February 2004, p. 5, 6

Q “There is an innate connection between being pro-abortion and pro-homosexual in that both activities violate the laws of God and of nature.”

—Harold O. J. Brown, Religion and Society Report, February 2004, p. 6

“Unfortunately the actions of our courts, whatever the religious convictions or lack thereof of the jurists, operate on the assumption that there is no God, and hence no law of God, no Creation, and no natural law. Therefore, the judges can do whatever they please...since we may no longer acknowledge God, the voice of the judge is final.”

—Harold O. J. Brown, Religion and Society Report, February 2004, p. 6

“September 11, 1683, was the day that the Polish-Lithuanian relief army—20,000 Polish hussars and 8,000 Lithuanians—arrived at the crest of the Kahlenberg, above Vienna, and , rushing onto the plain below, scattered the 130,000-man strong Turkish siege army that was on the point of breaking the city wall and conquering the city. The Turks had been successfully fighting off efforts by a German relief army already on the scene, but the arrival of King John Sobieski and his 28,000 cavalrymen turned the tide. Thus September 11 was the date when the tide of Turkish-Muslim advance into Eastern Europe was checked and reversed. September 11, 2001, was the date of the terrorist attacks on New York City and Washington D.C., and the beginning of America’s war on terrorism.”

—Religion and Society Report, February 2004, p. 8

Q “Let us begin by supposing that Nature is all that exists. Let us suppose that nothing ever has existed or ever will exist except this meaningless play of atoms in space and time: that by a series of hundredth chances it has (regrettably) produced things like ourselves—conscious beings who now know that their own consciousness is an accidental result of the whole meaningless process and is therefore itself meaningless...”

“In this situation there are, I think, three things one might do:

(1) You might commit suicide...

(2) You might decide simply to have as good a time as possible. The universe is a universe of nonsense, but since you are here, grab what you can. Unfortunately, however, there is, on these terms, so very little left to grab—only the coarsest sensual pleasures...

(3) You may defy the universe. You may say, 'Let it be irrational, I am not. Let it be merciless, I will have mercy. By whatever curious chance it has produced me, now that I am here I will live according to human values. I know the universe will win in the end, but what is that to me? I will go down fighting...'

"I suppose that most of us, in fact, while we remain materialists, adopt a more or less uneasy alternation between the second and the third attitude... All Naturalism leads us to this in the end—to a quite final and hopeless discord between what our minds claim to be and what they really must be if Naturalism is true... It is when one has faced this preposterous conclusion that one is at last ready to listen to the voice that whispers: 'But suppose we really are spirits? Suppose we are not the offspring of Nature?'"

—C. S. Lewis, *Present Concerns* (1948)

Q "David Horowitz's analysis of the left is insightful and astute, but he has one key point wrong. 'Hatred of self' is not 'the root of the radical cause.' The root is just the opposite: egotism, narcissism, boomeritis, false pride and extreme self-centeredness. It is nothing less than arrogant self-importance that would rather, as Milton put it in *Paradise Lost*, rule in hell than serve in heaven.

"It is that extreme self-love which is so drunk on itself that it thinks it can do no wrong, knows better than everyone else, and believes it is morally empowered to force its will onto all others because it is so special. Like Satan's wish for the universe, it would remake the world in its own image. Political communism is the quintessential form of it, with its denial of the existence of God, soul or anything beyond the physical, material world.

"Now ask: Who is leading the assault on God in America? Who wants to turn America into an ungodly society? It's the liberal left, Horowitz's 'neocommunists,' the forces of arrogant self-love.

"So 'hatred of self' is an inaccurate diagnosis of the mentality behind the neocom left. It is hatred of God and all which follows from that, especially recognition of the religious and moral foundations of America which our Founders saw as the only possible basis for their objective: constructing a society reflecting heaven on Earth. That is why there are four references to God in the Declaration of Independence. They make clear that our Founders saw God, not government, as the source of our freedom, sovereignty, rights, justice and

human dignity.

“Only when the left recognizes the existence of God and God’s presence at the center of their own existence will they recognize in any meaningful way that God is at the center of everyone else also. What follows from that recognition will be reverence for everyone’s inalienable right to life, liberty and the lawful pursuit of happiness.”

—John White, *Insight*, March 2-15, 2004, p. 4

Q “God’s creation of the Earth, Noah and the flood, Moses at the Red Sea: These pivotal stories from the Old Testament still resonate deeply with most Americans, who take the accounts literally rather than as a symbolic lesson.

“An ABC News poll released Sunday found that 61 percent of Americans believe the account of creation in the Bible’s book of Genesis is ‘literally true’ rather than a story meant as a ‘lesson.’

“Another 60 percent believe in the story of Noah’s ark and a global flood, while 64 percent agree that Moses parted the Red Sea to save fleeing Jews from their Egyptian captors.

“The poll, with a margin of error of 3 percent, was conducted Feb. 6 to 10 among 1,011 adults.

“ ‘These are surprising and reassuring figures—a positive sign in a postmodern world that seemed bent on erasing faith from the public square in recent years,’ said the Rev. Charles Nalls of Christ the King, a Catholic-Anglican church in the District.

“ ‘This poll tells me that America is reading the Bible more than we thought. There had been a tendency to decry or discount Bible literacy among the faithful,’ he continued.

“ ‘But this indicates a strong alliance among Americans with the inerrant word of God, as opposed to simply the inspired word of God, as viewed in the context of faith tradition,’ Father Nalls said.

“The levels of belief in the stories, however, differed among Christians.

“The poll found that 75 percent of Protestants believed in the story of creation, 79 percent believed in the Red Sea account and 73 percent in Noah and the ark.

“Among evangelical Protestants, those figures were 87 percent, 91 percent and 87 percent, respectively. Among Catholics, they were 51 percent, 50 percent and 44 percent.

Gauging American religious beliefs has been prevalent in other recent surveys as well.

“A Harris poll of 2,201 adults charting ‘Religious and Other Beliefs of Americans 2003’ found last year that 93 percent of the nation’s Christians believe in miracles, 95 percent in heaven, 93 percent in the virgin birth of Christ and 96 percent in Christ’s resurrection.

“In another survey of 2,306 adults released in October, Harris also found that 42 percent felt God was a male, while only 1 percent said God was female. Another 38 percent said God was neither male nor female, and 11 percent said God was both genders.

“The poll also found that 48 percent said God was a ‘spirit or power that can take on human form but is not inherently human,’ 9 percent said God was ‘like a human being’ and 27 percent said God ‘does not take on human form.’

“Meanwhile, a Gallup poll of 1,004 adults released Dec. 30 found that 61 percent of Americans believe ‘religion can answer all or most of today’s problems,’ although 64 percent felt that religion is losing its influence on the nation.

“Another Gallup poll released in November found that six out of every 10 Americans said religion was ‘very important’ in their lives—compared with 28 percent of Canadians and 17 percent of the British”

—Jennifer Harper, *The Washington Times*, February 17, 2004, p. 1

Q “Dear Summit,

“I am a 24-year-old guy from Denmark.

“About 6 years ago (1998) I was an exchange student in the U.S. While there I became a Christian and two months later through the friendliness of a family from church got the awesome opportunity to go and spend two weeks at Summit during the summer.

“It made such an impact on me to meet so many Christians, and many of them became friends that I still keep in contact with. The teaching and the experiences at Summit created something very important in me, being the infant Christian I still was. Experiencing real worship for the first time even made the fact that I was missing half of the world cup in soccer seem like such an unimportant factor.

“I remember the experience being so encouraging to me, that even when the hard times came, I was in many ways so strengthened in my newly found belief that there really was something for God to continue building on.

“So what has happened since 1998?”

“Today I am still very much a Christian. In fact, I am now a well-respected youth leader and speaker in my church here in Copenhagen. I’ve had the wonderful experience of leading many people to Jesus, and even when life has brought me through some great trials, Jesus has kept hold of me. And in fact, He has brought me closer to Him during those time.

“By God’s grace I’ve grown continuously in my Christian life and I am thankful for that. However Summit will always in some ways be something very special to me.

“If there is any way that I can contribute something back for what I received six years ago, I’ll be happy to stop by sometime, either to inspire like I was inspired...or to simply help as a staff in some way.

“For now, I just wanted to say thanks, Carsten H. Copenhagen, Denmark”

Q Summit’s summer sessions are presently being filled and we encourage you to send in your applications now. You can write PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, CO 80829 or call 719-685-9103 for your brochure and application. You may also download the application from www.summit.org. The Summit sessions are open to students 16 years old and older. We strongly recommend these two-week sessions for all Christian students in our nation’s public high schools and colleges.

Q “Last fall, one of the world’s most talented movie directors died at the age of 101. According to obituaries, she was ‘daringly innovative,’ and a ‘genius.’ Not only that, but she was one of the first women to become famous as a director.

“But there were no misty-eyed television tributes to this director and no posthumous film festivals organized to celebrate her career. And it’s a safe guess that no one at this year’s Academy Awards will share fond memories of the woman whom some have called ‘the devil’s director.’

“In her long life, Leni Riefenstahl never lived down her 1934 documentary Triumph of the Will, which presented a glowing vision of Adolph Hitler and the Nazi government. She believed Hitler was the savior of Germany, and she worked closely with him to create what many people have called the greatest propaganda film ever made.

“Riefenstahl would spend the rest of her life arguing that she was never actually a member of the Nazi party and claiming that she didn’t know Hitler’s real agenda. But it didn’t matter. Nor did it matter that she was a brilliant filmmaker who invented techniques that are still used today. Riefenstahl’s directing career was essentially over. Nobody would work with her or

finance her projects. It would be forty-eight years before she was able to release one last film.

“What’s fascinating about this story is that the artistic community’s reaction to Riefenstahl undermines everything many of them say they believe. It’s fashionable to claim that art is above all moral consideration and that it justifies itself. So what happens to the director who fled the country to avoid being jailed for statutory rape, or the director who pals around with Communist dictators? What happens to the films that present a deliberately distorted portrayal of religion, or the documentary that shamelessly twists the facts to make a point that Hollywood approves of? They get showered with awards. Anybody who complains is reminded that artistic achievement trumps every other consideration.

“But it doesn’t, and the case of Leni Riefenstahl shows the lie. What she did is no different than what many others have done since her time—using their talent to serve an immoral cause. It just happened that this one was one Hollywood disagreed with.

“Sometimes artists have to be blunt to open our eyes to truths that we’d rather not see. Some of the greatest Christian artists have done just that. But that’s very different from whitewashing evil and lying about the facts. Just like any other discipline, the arts are subject to the moral laws that are written on our hearts. And when we don’t realize that, we end up with films like *Triumph of the Will*.

“Because of Riefenstahl’s brilliance as a filmmaker some film professors still use *Triumph of the Will* as a teaching tool. I hope they’ll continue to do so, so students can see excellence put to an evil use. We don’t need another generation of artists who celebrate all kinds of evil—from gratuitous, sickening violence to pedophilia—all in the name of art. If Leni Riefenstahl’s twisted masterpiece can teach people that art is not higher than morality, then ‘the devil’s director’ will have unwittingly done more good than most contemporary directors put together.” —Chuck Colson, *Breakpoint*, February 23, 2004

Q “The ancient rabbinic text is clear about the punishment for those who twisted sacred law and misled the people of Israel.

“Offenders would be stoned and then hung by their hands from two pieces of wood connected to form a ‘T.’ The Talmud once included this example from the Sanhedrin: On the eve of Passover they hung Jesus of Nazareth,’ said the passage, which was censored in the 16th century to evade the wrath of Christians. ‘The herald went out before him for 40 days saying, “Jesus goes forth to be stoned, because he has practiced magic, enticed and led astray Israel. Anyone who knows anything in his favor, let him come and declare concerning him” And they found nothing in his favor.’

“If armies of Jewish and Christian scholars insist on arguing about Mel Gibson’s explosive movie ‘*The Passion of the Christ*,’ it would help if they were candid and started dealing with

the hard passages in Jewish texts as well as the Christian scriptures.

“At least that’s what David Klinghoffer thinks.

“The Orthodox Jewish writer—whose forthcoming book is titled *Why the Jews Rejected Christ*—believes these lines from the Talmud are as troubling as any included in the Christian Gospels. They are as disturbing as any image Gibson might include in his controversial epic.

“The Talmudic text seems clear. Jesus clashed with Jewish leaders, debating them on the meaning of their laws. They hated him. Many wanted him dead.

“It is possible, Klinghoffer said, to interpret these documents as saying that Jesus’ fate rested entirely with the Jewish court. The use of language such as ‘enticed and led astray’ indicated that Jesus may have been charged with leading His fellow Jews to worship false gods.

“There are more details in this confusing drama. Writing in 12th-century Egypt, the great Jewish sage Maimonides summed up the ancient texts.

“ ‘Jesus of Nazareth,’ he proclaims, in his Letter to Yemen, ‘impelled people to believe that he was a prophet sent by God to clarify perplexities in the Torah, and that he was the Messiah that was predicted by each and every seer. He interpreted the Torah and its precepts in such a fashion as to lead to their total annulment, to the abolition of all its commandments and to the violation of its prohibitions.

“ ‘The sages, of blessed memory, having become aware of his plans before his reputation spread among our people, meted out fitting punishment to him.’

“Is that it? What role did the Romans play? In terms of historic fact, Klinghoffer emphasized, it’s almost impossible to find definitive answers for such questions. But the purpose of the Jewish oral traditions that led to the Talmud was to convey religious belief, not necessarily historical facts.

“ ‘If you really must ask, “Who is responsible for the death of Jesus?” then you can only conclude that both the Gospels and the Talmud agree that the Jewish leaders did not have the power to execute Him,’ Klinghoffer said.

“ ‘Did they influence the event? The religious texts suggest that they did, the historic texts suggest that they did not. It’s hard to know...But if Gibson is an anti-Semite, then to be consistent you would have to say that so was Maimonides.’

“Obviously, Klinghoffer is not spreading this information in order to fan the flames of hatred. His goal, he said, is to provoke Jewish leaders in cities such as New York and Los Angeles to

strive harder to understand the views of traditional Protestants and Catholics. And it's time for liberal Christians to spend as much time talking with Orthodox Jews as with liberal Jews.

"It's time for everyone to be more honest, he said.

" 'I don't see anything that is to be gained for Judaism by going out of our way to antagonize a Mel Gibson or to antagonize as many traditional Christians as we possibly can. I think we have been yelling "Fire!" in a crowded theater,' Klinghoffer said.

" 'To put it another way, I don't think it's very wise for a few Jewish leaders to try to tell millions of Christians what they are supposed to believe. Would we want some Christians to try to edit our scriptures and to tell us what we should believe?'"

—Terry Mattingly, SBC Baptist Press, February 17, 2004

Q "Kindergartners and first-graders may not distribute to their classmates gifts that bear a religious message, according to a ruling by a federal appeals court.

"The 3rd U.S. District Court of Appeals recently ruled in favor of a New Jersey elementary school in forbidding a boy from giving out pencils with the message 'Jesus loves the little children' with a heart symbol substituted for the word love.

"The classroom is not a place for student advocacy, wrote Chief U.S. Circuit Judge Anthony J. Scirica, speaking for the court in *Walz v. Egg Harbor Township Board of Education*. The school, he said, has a 'legitimate area of control' regarding speech within school confines.

"And the younger the student, 'the more control a school may exercise,' he added.

"But the Charlottesville-based Rutherford Institute, which is representing Daniel Walz, now 9, plans to appeal the case to a full bench of 12 judges of the 3rd Circuit, and, if necessary, to the U.S. Supreme Court. The recent unanimous ruling, which was handed down Aug. 27, was made by three judges.

"At stake, said Rutherford president John Whitehead, is constitutionally protected speech. He called the 3rd Circuit ruling 'a dangerous trend.'

" 'I call it the 9/11 fallout,' he said. 'The court says the schools have complete authority to decide what they want said. If they do not like a kid's religion, they can pick on the kid. Or if a black kid says Martin Luther King was the greatest person alive, if a teacher didn't like that, he could just kick the message out.

" 'This idea that we have to watch everything and give the authorities power contradicts a

long line of Supreme Court cases,' Mr. Whitehead said. 'Even if the First Amendment is involved, the 3rd Circuit is saying control, control, control' goes to the schools.

"The case began in April 1998 when Daniel, then 4, and his pre-kindergarten classmates attended a party at school. All of the children brought treats to share. Daniel came with the pencils, which the teacher confiscated. Daniel's mother Dana Walz, who was in the classroom at the time as a chaperone, immediately appealed the matter to the principal.

"The principal, assistant superintendent and superintendent said Daniel could distribute the pencils only during noninstructional time because they did not want the school to be held responsible for endorsing Christianity.

"In December 1998, when Daniel and his kindergarten classmates had another party at school, Mrs. Walz contacted the school's lawyer beforehand to obtain permission for Daniel to distribute candy canes with the Christian-themed story attached to it. She was informed that Daniel could do so only outside during his free time.

"In December 1999, Mrs. Walz informed the school that her son wanted to distribute more candy with a Christian message attached to it. Again, she was turned down. The child ended up giving out the candy in the hallway.

"In May 2000, the Rutherford Institute filed a suit on behalf of the child, saying his First Amendment rights had been violated.

"In February 2002, U.S. District Court Judge Jerome B. Simandle, a federal judge based in Camden, N.J., sided with the school district, blaming the mother for being 'the driving force behind the distribution of these items and this lawsuit.'

"It was 'highly unlikely,' he wrote that then-4-year-old Daniel was 'able to independently read and advocate the dissemination of the message on the pencils.'

"Joe Betley, the lawyer representing the Egg Harbor Township School District, also said the mother's influence was a problem.

" 'The parents were using the classroom to proselytize,' he said. 'There is a difference between a kid's ability to understand the difference between what's endorsed by the school and what's allowed because the school is taking a neutral position.'"

—Julia Duin, *The Washington Times*, September 21, 2003, p. 1

Q The religion of humanism in the nations' public schools can stand no competition...not even from a pencil that says "Jesus loves the little children."

