

MONTH IN REVIEW

❑ “Listen, Lord, and answer me, for I am poor and needy. Protect my life, for I am faithful. You are my God; save Your servant who trusts in You. Be gracious to me, Lord, for I call to You all day long. Bring joy to Your servant’s life, since I set my hope on You, Lord.

“For You, Lord, are kind and ready to forgive, abundant in faithful love to all who call on You. Lord, hear my prayer; listen to my plea for mercy. I call on You in the day of my distress, for You will answer me.

“Lord, there is no one like You among the gods, and there are no works like Yours. All the nations You have made will come and bow down before You, Lord, and will honor Your name. For You are great and perform wonders; You alone are God.

“Teach me Your way Lord, and I will live by Your truth. Give me an undivided mind to fear Your name. I will praise You with all my heart, Lord my God, and will honor Your name forever. For Your faithful love for me is great, and You deliver my life from the depths of Sheol.”

—Psalm 86:1-13

❑ “And can it be that I should gain an interest in the Savior’s blood? Died He for me, who caused His pain? For me, who Him to death pursued?

“He left His Father’s throne above, so free, so infinite His grace! Emptied Himself of all but love, and bled for Adam’s helpless race! ’Tis mercy all, immense and free, for, O my God, it found out me.

“Long my imprisoned spirit lay fast bound in sin and nature’s night. Thine eye diffused a quickening ray; I woke—the dungeon flamed with light! My chains fell off, my heart was free, I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.

“No condemnation now I dread: Jesus, and all in Him, is mine! Alive in Him, my living Head, and clothed in righteousness divine. Bold I approach the eternal throne, and claim the crown, through Christ my own.

“Amazing love! How can it be that Thou, my God, shouldst die for me?”

—Charles Wesley

❑ “Authority, reason, experience; on these three, mixed in varying proportions all our knowledge depends. The authority of many wise men in many different times and places forbids me to regard the spiritual world as an illusion. My reason, showing me the apparently insoluble difficulties of materialism and proving that the hypothesis of a spiritual world covers far more of the facts with far fewer assumptions, forbids me again. My experience even of such feeble attempts as I have made to live the spiritual life does not lead to the results which the pursuit of an illusion ordinarily leads to, and therefore forbids me yet again. I am not now saying that no one’s reason and no one’s experience produce different results. I am only trying to put the whole problem the right way round, to make it clear that the value given to the testimony of any feeling must depend on our whole philosophy, not our whole philosophy on a feeling.”

—C.S. Lewis, *Christian Reflections*

❑ “Some said he [David Livingstone] should only preach the gospel, instead of developing a holistic ministry; he responded by writing that a missionary should not be ‘a dumpy sort of man with a Bible under his arm. I have labored in bricks and mortar, at the forge and carpenter’s bench, as well as in preaching and medical practice....I am serving Christ when shooting a buffalo for my men, or taking an astronomical observation.’”

—Marvin Olasky, *World*, August 6, 2005, p. 40

❑ “Livingstone became the most famous missionary of the past two centuries—and soon after his death the British government reached a treaty with the Sultan of Zanzibar that essentially ended the slave trade. Other adventurous and holistic missionaries followed in his footsteps, and one result is the warmth toward the gospel that many in Zambia and other African countries display.

“Livingstone once prayed that ‘the time would come when rich men and great men would think it an honor to support whole stations of missionaries [in Africa], instead of spending their money on hounds and horses.’ Has that time come for affluent America? Will churches spend money wisely and compassionately? And will more pioneers head toward this new frontier?”

—Marvin Olasky, *World*, August 6, 2005, p. 40

❑ “Moses would not have been pleased. The Supreme Court seemed to be halting between two opinions when, on June 27, the justices narrowly upheld a Texas Ten Commandments display while striking down another display in Kentucky. Each was a 5-4 decision. Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justices Scalia, Thomas, and Kennedy voted to uphold both displays, while Justices Souter, Stevens, Ginsburg, and O’Connor voted to strike down both. Justice Breyer cast the deciding vote for the Texas display and against the Kentucky display.

“The cases were slightly different. The Texas monument had been placed on the state capitol grounds by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in 1961 and stood amid at least 16 other monuments and 21 other markers commemorating people, ideals, and events that compose Texan identity. The Kentucky display was installed in 1999 in a ceremony with religious overtones, and stood by itself until challenged. After the challenge, officials surrounded the Ten Com-

— UPCOMING EVENTS —

ADULT CONFERENCE

Please mark your calendars for the spring Adult Conference on March 19-24 at Glen Eyrie Conference Center in Colorado Springs. Summit will provide the same faculty offered during our summer sessions. Watch this space or our website for details.

WORLDVIEW WEEKEND

For a worldview crash course or booster shot, please attend a Worldview Weekend. For a complete listing of conferences and registration information, please log on to www.worldviewweekend.com. Dr. Noebel will be speaking at the following conferences.

Jefferson City, MO	September 30-October 1
Dayton, OH	October 14-15
Indianapolis, IN	November 18-19

mandments with framed copies of the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Star Spangled Banner, the National Motto, the Preamble to the Kentucky Constitution, and a picture of Lady Justice. But in the view of five Supreme Court justices, this addition was too little and too late to purge the display of the religious taint they deem unconstitutional. The Court concluded that the Ten Commandments are a religious document and that the county officials established the display for a religious purpose, so the display violates their interpretation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

“Some say these decisions don’t matter too much, because we are still free to display the Ten Commandments in our churches, synagogues, and homes. They miss the point. Yes, the Commandments do belong in our homes and churches, but they also belong in the public square. For the Ten Commandments are the moral foundation of law. They summarize the basic principles on which our legal system was based: *respect for life*, as found in the Commandment ‘Thou shalt not kill’ and in our homicide statutes; *respect for property*, as found in the Commandment ‘Thou shalt not steal’ and in our theft and property laws; *respect for truth* as found in the Commandments ‘Thou shalt not bear false witness’ and ‘Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain’ (which prohibits perjury as well as blasphemy); *respect for family*, as found in the Commandments ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery’ and ‘Honor thy father and thy mother’ and in the central role of the family in our legal system as the basic unit of society; and *respect for God*, as the source of governmental authority and also as the source of human rights.

“The central historical documents of our legal system have consistently recognized this, from the Book of Dooms of King Alfred the Great and the Magna Carta to (in more recent times) the Mayflower Compact and the Treaty of Paris of 1783 by which England recognized American independence. The Declaration of Independence based our right to independence on ‘the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God,’ our claim to equality on our having been ‘created equal,’ and our human rights on their endowment by the ‘Creator.’ The signers of the Declaration appealed to the ‘Supreme Judge of the Universe’ for the rectitude of their intentions and rested upon a ‘firm reliance upon Divine Providence’ for their protection. Under the ACLU’s analysis of the Establishment Clause, the Declaration of Independence is unconstitutional! Surely this was not the intent of the Founding Fathers.”

—John Eidsmoe, *The New American*, August 8, 2005, p.20f.

❑ “Several countries have recently set aside February 12, Charles Darwin’s birthday, as a special day to remember him. Evolutionists in America are calling for its adoption here too, and have tried to use the day to promote his work.

“Certainly Charles Darwin was a major figure in world history. Few people have ‘changed the world’ as he did. While he wasn’t the first to propose evolution, or even natural selection as evolution’s cause, when he published his book, *Origin of Species*, it captured the fancy of western scholarship like no other work. After a time it fully caught on, and now his ideas dominate thought. It extends not only into biology, but into geology, archaeology, sociology, astronomy, theology, economics, etc. Almost everything is thought to undergo gradual change over time,

by means of random, natural processes. Truly it has become an entire worldview, affecting virtually every discipline. Maybe he deserves a day of remembrance.

“As we consider this proposal, let’s remind ourselves of the nature of biological systems and the main mechanisms of Darwinian change of one type into another; mutation and natural selection.

“All forms of life which exist today are unimaginably complex. Even the simplest form of life is not at all simple. Even the simplest living thing is more complex than a super-computer. Furthermore, each form of life has its own unique genetic code, the DNA. The genes residing here dictate how the organism develops, functions, and reproduces. In order for one type of life to evolve into another, new genes must be obtained, presumably through random mutation of existing genes. Evolution claims that the most fit of these new genes can then be selected by natural selection. The accumulation of such better genes leads to new traits, features, and eventually organisms.

“The letters in the DNA code have been deciphered recently but it hasn’t really been decoded or read. Its complexity far exceeds human intelligence.

“Note that all of this is thought to operate by random, natural processes. No intelligent input is required. Darwin had trained to be a pastor, but as his concept took shape, he renounced his belief in a personal, intelligent Creator God in favor of random forces of nature to design complex life. As his life progressed he essentially became what we now call an atheist, insisting that no Designer was responsible for the design we see.

“But is it reasonable to claim that complexity which far surpasses human comprehension can be achieved by random mutation? Is this school of thought worthy of a special day of recognition?

“The Bible has something to say about atheistic thinking. ‘The fool has said in his heart, There is no God’ (Psalms 14:1). A fool in Scripture is not an idiot, but an atheist. It is foolish to ascribe complexity to random forces. Those who embrace evolution may be brilliant, but how foolish to believe that complexity can arise by random, thoughtless processes. ‘Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools’ (Romans 1:22).

“This being realized, foolishness certainly doesn’t need a special day. Actually, many have noted that there already is such a day. It’s in April each year.”

—John D. Morris, *Back to Genesis*, April 2005

q “Christoph Cardinal Schonborn, the Catholic archbishop of Vienna, wrote an op-ed for the *New York Times* arguing that while
continued on Page 4

The *Journal* is the monthly publication of American Christian College d/b/a Summit Ministries, a non-profit, educational, religious corporation operating under the laws of the states of Oklahoma and Colorado. Correspondence:

P.O. Box 207, Manitou Springs, Colorado 80829

Phone: (719) 685-9103 • Fax: (719) 685-9330

E-mail: journal@summit.org

Although there is no charge for this publication, it costs Summit Ministries approximately \$20 per year per subscription. The *Journal* is edited by David A. Noebel, and printed by Golden Belt Printing of Great Bend, Kansas.



“Dear Dr. Noebel:

“Our youngest daughter, Heidi, just returned from her session at Summit Ministries, and as our three older children did, she experienced two wonderful weeks of intense teaching combined with fun and Christian fellowship.

“We thought you might enjoy hearing what some of your Summit ‘graduates’ are doing. Our oldest son, Colin, attended Summit the summer of 1997. He then attended Biola University’s Torrey Honors Institute and graduated with a political science degree. Although accepted to law school, he felt God changing his plans, and obtained his EMT license. He then went on to join the Navy as a corpsman and has just returned from his first tour of duty in Iraq, where he was involved with the taking of Fallujah. He will be married next week to a lovely young lady who also graduated from the Torrey Honors Institute at Biola University. Colin will return to Iraq the end of August. He plans on obtaining his nursing degree.

“Kristi attended Summit the summer of 1999. She also attended the Torrey Honors Institute at Biola University, graduating summa cum laude. Our daughter, Heidi, told you that Kristi has just completed her first year at Brigham Young Law School. She is the only Christian in the entire law school – and everyone there knows she is a Christian. They come to her when they want to know what the Bible says about a subject, and she was inter-

viewed on Brigham Young’s radio station about her Christianity. Kristi was a Witherspoon Fellow at the Family Research Council her last year at Biola and is currently serving as a legal intern with the Office of General Counsel for the White House.

“Laurie attended Summit the summer of 2002. She is currently attending George Fox University in Newburg, Oregon, as a Biblical studies major. She is hoping to enter the field of criminal forensics. Heidi will be attending Biola University this fall as a psychology major. All of our children have also been on medical missions trips with us as we work short term each summer with Project Compassion.

“We thought it might encourage you to know how Summit Ministries has been influencing our family and our children. We are most grateful for your dedication and commitment to training the youth of our nation, and we pray that the Lord will continue to give you strength and wisdom as you serve Him for His glory.” Blessings, Drs. Karl & Jane A.

P.S. After reading this letter, if you know of any students who would benefit from coming to Summit Ministries, please send us their names and addresses and we will send them an application and brochure for the Summer of 2006. **Please send them to:** Summit Ministries, ATTN: Prospective Students, PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, CO 80829.

continued from Page 3

the Church has no objection to ‘evolution,’ that does not mean it accepts everything that travels under that name. The *Times* then ran follow-up stories on whether the Church was turning away from modern science. But the discussion is mired in confusion. The cardinal used some needlessly provocative, and some needlessly obscure, phrasing: ‘Evolution in the sense of common ancestry might be true, but evolution in the neo-Darwinian sense—an unguided, unplanned process of random variation and natural selection—is not. Any system of thought that denies or seeks to explain away the overwhelming evidence for design in biology is ideology, not science.’ It should be obvious that ‘evolution’ is not the only word in this passage with a contested meaning. The merits of the cardinal’s argument turn also on the meaning of ‘random’ and ‘design’ (to say nothing of ‘ideology’ and ‘science’). What he is saying, as we read him, is that various natural phenomena suggest, even if they do not prove, the existence of a Creator, and that the Church cannot accept any theory of evolution that precludes the role of Providence in the development of human life. Schonborn’s views, as expressed, are compatible with the possibility that God set a process of natural selection in motion for the purpose of creating mankind. The argument from design, theologically ancient, did not presuppose any biological

facts that have been disproven. The Church will neither repudiate it nor put God in exile. It is somewhat astonishing that anyone expects otherwise.”

—*National Review*, August 8, 2005, p.12

□ “President Bush invigorated proponents of teaching alternatives to evolution in public schools with remarks saying that schoolchildren should be taught about ‘intelligent design,’ a view of creation that challenges established scientific thinking and promotes the idea that an unseen force is behind the development of humanity.

“Although he said curriculum decisions should be made by school districts rather than the federal government, Bush told Texas newspaper reporters in a group interview at the White House on Monday that he believes that intelligent design should be taught alongside evolution as competing theories.

“ ‘Both sides ought to be properly taught...so people can understand what the debate is about,’ he said, according to an official transcript of the session. Bush added, ‘Part of education is to expose people to different schools of thought.... You’re asking me whether or not people ought to be exposed to different ideas, and the answer is yes.’

“These comments drew sharp criticism Tuesday from liberals, who said there is no scientific evidence to support the theory of intelligent design and no educational basis for teaching it.

“The White House said Tuesday that Bush’s comments were in keeping with positions dating to his Texas governorship, but aides say they could not recall him addressing the issue while president. His remarks heartened conservatives who have been asking school boards and legislatures nationwide to teach students that there are gaps in evolutionary theory and explain that life’s complexity is evidence of a guiding hand.

“Opponents of intelligent design say there is no legitimate debate. They see the case increasingly as a political battle that threatens to weaken science teaching in a nation whose students already are falling behind.

“The most prominent debate on the issue is under way in Kansas, where the conservative state Board of Education is expected to require the teaching of doubts about evolution to public high school students. A challenge to the teaching of intelligent design is scheduled for trial in Dover, Pennsylvania, and a federal court in Georgia said textbook stickers questioning evolution were unconstitutional.”

—*The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, August 3, 2005, p. A7

❑ “Propagandists repeatedly insist that the ‘debate’ about global warming is over, that humans have dramatically changed the Earth’s weather and need to make radical amends and that there is a scientific consensus about all such ‘facts.’ But the propagandists are wrong, and in the ‘global warming tug of war,’ there is no reason for George W. Bush to allow himself to be ‘dragged modestly closer to’ the alarmist position.

“Yet the president is moving in the alarmist direction, albeit not as fast as environmental doomsayers would like. Indeed, the Bush White House is boasting that the U.S. ‘is investing more than any other nation for climate change programs.’ Since 2001, brags the White House ‘Fact Sheet,’ the administration ‘has spent over \$20 billion on climate change activities, and proposes \$5.5 billion more for 2006.’ And the president himself even said at a news conference in Denmark on his way to the G-8 summit, ‘I recognize that the surface of the Earth is warmer and that an increase in greenhouse gases caused by humans is contributing to the problem.’

“Supposedly the Bush administration is being forced to catch up to the scientific consensus, but contrary to the media-created perception, there is no consensus. Last April, Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.), chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, informed his colleagues that a 2001 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report, cited by global warming alarmists as evidence of scientific consensus, does no such thing. Inhofe noted: ‘Dr. Richard Lindzen, a professor of meteorology at MIT, and member of the NAS panel that produced the report, expressed his amazement’ about the misrepresentation of the report when he wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* that ‘the NAS report showed “there is no consensus, unanimous or otherwise, about long-term climate trends and what causes them.”’ Inhofe continued: ‘Yet to this day, the media continues to report exactly the opposite.’

“Of course, money is the underlying factor leading to much of the errant reporting. When science is subsidized and industries and advocates seek tax changes and policy favors, politick-

ing becomes keen. Indeed, as already noted, the Bush administration admits it has already spent more than \$20 billion on climate-change programs. There is intense pressure to keep that gravy train rolling.

“Green lobbies whose positions seem diametrically opposed to the Bush administration turn out to be on the federal payroll. For instance, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) maintains, ‘Global warming is fast becoming the number one environmental problem of our time,’ and has pushed legislation that would set mandatory caps on carbon-dioxide emissions, which the administration publicly opposed. Yet, the NRDC and Environmental Defense, according to a report by the George C. Marshall Institute, were among the top recipients of nearly \$125 million in grants given by the government for climate-change projects from 2000 to 2002.

“Corporate interests are also learning how to game the system. Holman Jenkins in the *Wall Street Journal* for July 6 described how British Petroleum (BP) began promoting its cost-cutting moves as ‘emission cuts’ of carbon dioxide. There came a ‘dawning realization’ that a company ‘might actually get paid twice for these efficiency gains.’ BP’s lobbyists began promoting a bill on Capitol Hill that ‘would grant tax breaks for companies that reduce CO₂ emissions.’

“And, as it turns out, much of the international pressure behind global warming initiatives was really more of an economic political gambit; it was not environmentally motivated. Many of the nations berating the U.S. for not attaining Kyoto Treaty limits on emissions have fallen far short of meeting their commitments. (Such countries, keep in mind, ratified the treaty—while the U.S. A number of U.S. public-policy groups, in a letter to Congress, pointed out: ‘Emissions have been rising in many EU member nations and in Canada more rapidly than in the United States, despite lower economic and population growth.’

“A major objective of this campaign is to drive down U.S. productivity. If the U.S. had been idiotic enough to impose the emission levels demanded by the UN-sponsored Kyoto Treaty, it would have cost up to \$400 billion annually in reduced GDP, according to an estimate by the U.S. Energy Information Administration—against a possible ‘gain’ of 0.07 degrees C. in lower global temperature five decades down the road.”

—William P. Hoar, *The New American*, August 8, 2005

❑ “Can you say ‘perverse’? Planned Parenthood in Indiana and Kansas is effectively fighting to protect child rapists from potential prosecution in two high-profile cases. For an organization devoted to women’s interests to be in this position is a cautionary tale of abortion-rights extremism.

“In Indiana, the attorney general wants the records of girls under age 14 who have visited Planned Parenthood clinics. Let that sink in: We’re talking about 12- and 13-year-old girls. It is a crime to have sex with a child under 14 in the state. Under law, individuals with reason to believe a child is a victim of sex abuse are required to report it to the proper authorities. In Kansas, the attorney general is carrying on the same fight (he is also looking for evidence of illegal late-term abortions).

“An Indiana judge has just upheld the Indiana attorney general’s request, though the case is under appeal. ‘The great public inter-

est,' the county superior judge wrote, 'in the reporting, investigation and prosecution of child abuse trumps even the patient's interest in privileged communication with her physician because, in the end, both the patient and the state are benefited by the disclosure.'

"The loopy free-sex advocates might imagine that, after sex-ed courses on how to put a condom on a banana, 13-year-old girls blissfully explore with 13-year-old boys. Forget that this vision makes most parents gag—it's not how it works. Teen sex often involves adult men exploiting teen girls. The father is an adult in an estimated 60 percent or more of births to teen-age girls. A California study found fathers in births to junior-high-school mothers were on average nearly 7 years older.

"Why would a feminist organization not be eager to cooperate in a fight against sexual exploitation of young girls? Well, Planned Parenthood represents that wing of the feminist billed as 'sex positive.' Although that phrase doesn't quite capture it. Planned Parenthood is developing the 'statutory rape-positive' wing of feminism.

"These feminists are unwilling to pass judgment on any sex in any circumstances, don't care if parents are cut out of the equation entirely, believe the right to an abortion trumps any other consideration, and embrace a notion of privacy so sweeping it includes men who have, under law, raped their young sexual partners. If only Michael Jackson were interested in girls instead of boys, he might, in the right circumstances, have a friend in Planned Parenthood.

"Privacy is a mere excuse not to provide the records. It is not at all unusual for criminal prosecutions to involve medical records. And no one will make public the names of the girls—which are provided to the authorities, not the news media. 'We've been doing these investigations since the 1970s, and there's never been a case where we have not maintained the confidentiality of records,' Indiana Attorney General Steve Carter told a local columnist. In Kansas—where the case is pending before the state Supreme Court, Attorney General Phill Kline authored the state's rape shield law when he was in the legislature. It is not the girls who will be in jeopardy, but any adult abuser.

"This fight is so important because our culture relentlessly sexualizes children. The message, for instance, of Britney Spears' act before she came of age was 'teen girls are hot.' Pop culture won't change, but the law can at least try to send an opposite signal.

"Key Democrats from Hillary Clinton to Howard Dean have of late said their party needs to become more moderate on abortion. They could add substance to the rhetoric by opposing Planned Parenthood's position in these cases. Of course, that will never happen. The abortion absolutists control the Democratic Party, a sad fact for those Americans who have more qualms about abortion, but a happy one for men who impregnate 13-year-olds."

—Rich Lowry, *The Washington Times*, June 8, 2005, p. A19

□ "After years of being excluded from their children's education, parents in Montgomery County, Md., formed Citizens for a Responsible Curriculum and won the battle to have their views respected on sex education. Why were the views of parents ever held in disrespect and why was the force of a federal lawsuit needed to a basic right, control over the education of one's children?"

"I wonder if it has occurred to anyone, parents or real educators, that maybe the best sex-ed curriculum is none at all? Many of today's parents were not alive then, but before sex-ed came into the classroom, a short passage from the Psalms was read in the daily opening exercises of public schools in Maryland. When the word of God became unwelcome, the vacuum created soon filled with what today has become tantamount to pornography disguised as 'health education.'

"Casual promiscuity, AIDS, rampant sex-transmitted diseases, teen-age abortion, teen-age suicide, in-your-face promotion of homosexuality and the mocking of Judeo-Christian principles were heretofore virtually unknown. A comparison of the statistics before and after would make a shocking case in favor of the removal of sex education from schools to its rightful place in the home, where it can be put in proper perspective.

"You might say, yes, but today's children live in a decadent culture. Ask yourself which came first, and were those responsible for today's culture (publishers, rock musicians, pornographers, promoters of homosexuality, clothing manufacturers, media people, judges, etc) not the product of their sex education? Children grow up and take their place in society acting on what they have been taught. Which came first, the teaching of sex as a recreational activity or the very profitable promoting of it, the chicken or the egg? A reasonable person could assume the former.

"Today's children are encouraged to question their 'sexual identity' and to experiment with various 'lifestyles.' Sex, degraded to a recreation activity, is virtually mandated; abstinence is ridiculed. Kindergarten children are read stories about same-sex 'marriage' and fourth-graders are taught contraception. Judeo-Christian principles are mocked. The safest way to present pornography to children is in the schools.

"The health of a generation (or two) has been undermined both with at least 23 varieties of sexually transmitted diseases and the loss of self-respect through promiscuity. The overwhelming number of STD cases are in the under-25 age group.

"If the sex-ed curriculum does not reflect the truth about the social and personal consequences of promiscuous behavior, about the need for students to respect their bodies and souls, there should be no curriculum at all and sex-ed should become exclusively a home-school subject.

"Sooner or later, everyone sits down to a banquet of consequences and the proof is in the pudding. The outcome of 'outcome-based education' is this: a pornographic society made possible by allowing the corruption of innocent children.

"The alarm bell has finally been rung by parents, one lawyer, and one reasonable judge. Through their monumental determined efforts, they have given real hope for major change."

—Elizabeth W. Nottrodt, *The Washington Times*, June 12, 2005, p.B5

□ "Anglican bishops in Africa who are refusing millions of dollars from liberal American Episcopal sources to protest homosexual clergy say the price of their protest has been higher than they thought.

"To be honest, there is not enough money for the needs we have in Rwanda after the [1994] genocide,' said Rwandan Bishop John Rucyahana of the Diocese of Shyira, 'but if money is being

continued next page

used to disgrace the Gospel, then we don't need it.'

"The Rev. Alison Barfoot, assistant to the Anglican archbishop of Uganda, said the Anglican province has no working phones in its Kampala headquarters because it lacks the funds. Conservative American churches haven't pitched in enough—'definitely not to the extent of what we've given up,' she said.

"Bill Atwood, general secretary of Ekklesia Society, an international Anglican network, just returned from a tour of Tanzania, Malawi, Kenya, South Africa and Uganda and called the lack of money for Africans 'scandalous.'

"I just met with some archbishops a week ago,' he said, 'They were saying how painful it was, with people starving to death to make these choices.'

"Africa, which has 12 Anglican provinces each containing numerous dioceses, is the fastest-growing portion of the 70-million-member Anglican Communion, which includes the U.S. Episcopal Church. The 2003 election of New Hampshire Bishop V. Gene Robinson, who is divorced and living in a homosexual relationship, split the Anglican Communion.

"Since then, the archbishops of Nigeria, Kenya and Uganda, over-seeing 30.5 million Anglicans, announced they will not accept grants from the Episcopal Church. Some Rwandan and Tanzanian bishops are following suit."

—Julia Duin, *The Washington Times*

□ "Our secular popular culture is throwing a fit over President Bush's endorsement of teaching in public schools the controversies surrounding Darwinian theory.

"Note that the president did not recommend that the teaching of Darwinism be banned in public schools, merely that the theory of intelligent design (ID) ought to be taught as well. Bush said, 'I think part of education is to expose people to different schools of thought.'

"The main players in the ID movement are not even insisting on that much. Discovery Institute, for example, opposes the mandatory teaching of ID in public schools but favors requiring students to be exposed to criticisms of Darwin's theory.

"But whether you believe ID theory ought to get equal billing with Darwinian theory, some lesser treatment, or that students should at least be apprised of alleged chinks in the Darwinian armor, what's all the fuss about?

"Don't academics purport to champion free and open inquiry? What, then, are they so afraid of regarding the innocuous introduction into the classroom of legitimate questions concerning Darwinism?

"Their defensiveness toward challenges to their dogma is inexplicable unless you understand their attitude as springing from a worldview steeped in strong, secular predispositions that must be guarded with a blind religious fervor.

"Indeed, it appears many Darwinists are guilty of precisely that of which they accuse ID proponents: having a set of preconceived assumptions that taint their scientific objectivity.

"Don't take my word for it. Consider the words of Darwinist Richard Lewontin of Harvard. 'Our willingness,' confessed Lewontin, 'to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to understanding the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of

the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for the unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment to materialism. Materialism is absolute for we cannot allow a divine foot in the door.'

"So is God the real bogeyman for some Darwinists? Is that why they fight to suppress any theory, like ID, they fear might allow God's 'foot in the door'?

"And, if their science were unassailable, would they so vigorously resist its subjection to academic scrutiny by scientists no longer drinking the Darwin Kool-Aid? It's no secret that scientists who have broken from Darwinian orthodoxy have been ridiculed, suppressed and ostracized by much of the Orwellian scientific establishment.

"Many of ID's cynical detractors patronizingly frame this entire debate in terms of a struggle between faith and science. Intelligent Design, they say, is but a thinly disguised argument for Biblical creationism and its proponents threaten to obliterate the 'wall of separation' between church and state by cleverly sneaking creationism back into the schools inside the Trojan horse of ID.

"But that is simply false. ID is fundamentally science-based. The fact that scientific inquiry leads certain scientists toward a conclusion compatible with the Judeo-Christian worldview — that intelligent causes were behind the creation of the universe and life — does not disqualify them as scientists any more than the militant secularism of many Darwinists disqualifies them.

"Nor does ID's compatibility with the Judeo-Christian worldview require that it be classified as religious rather than scientific. If ID's theories were faith-based rather than science-based, the secular scientific community would have a stronger case in demanding they not be introduced into science classes.

"But no amount of protest and name-calling from the scientific community will change the fact that ID proponents are not pseudo-scientists. You might be surprised to learn that over 400 scientists from all disciplines have signed onto a list of those expressing skepticism 'of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life.' And that list is growing, despite the persecution of some signers since they signed it.

"This is most interesting, in light of statements made in PBS's 'Evolution' series that no scientists disagreed with Darwinian evolution. I ask you: Which side is playing fast and loose with the facts?

"As one recent signatory, the prestigious Russian biologist Vladimir L. Voeikov said, 'The ideology and philosophy of neo-Darwinism, which is sold by its adepts as a scientific theoretical foundation of biology, seriously hampers the development of science and hides from students the field's real problems.'

"A short column is not the place to debate the merits of ID versus Darwinism, but it is an appropriate venue to offer the humble suggestion that the very essence of science — the search for causes — militates in favor of exposing students to modern criticisms of Darwinism. Introducing kids to scientific challenges to Darwinism and to the alternative ID theory would vindicate the scientific method and science itself. Opponents should lighten up, and the public should insist on a fair fight."



American Christian College
Journal
P.O. Box 207
Manitou Springs, CO 80829
(719) 685-9103
Journal@summit.org
www.summit.org

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Great Bend, KS
PERMIT 25

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

Receiving Duplicate Mailings?

Please note your correct name and address, and return all labels to Summit Ministries for correction.

Moving?

Please send us a change of address form (available at your local post office).

—David Limbaugh, *davidlimbaugh.com*, August 4, 2005

□ “An amazing thing about a good deal of higher education is how little one hears from the professors when it matters most. Take the idea that what is right and wrong is all a matter of perspective.

“The prominent—indeed, arguably most famous—American radical pragmatist philosopher, Richard Rorty, made it clear several years ago that no one can know right from wrong apart from how his or her community sees it. There is no right and wrong apart from one’s group. As Rorty put it, in his comment on the demise of the Soviet Union: ‘[We] cannot say that democratic institutions reflect a moral reality and that tyrannical regimes do not reflect one, that tyrannies get something wrong that democratic societies get right.’

“If you change the particulars, Rorty would have to agree that neither can we say that terrorists get it wrong when they murder children in London, Madrid or New York City.

“Of course, this kind of thinking is ancient, not at all new, but in most periods of human history the major thinkers rejected it. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, and Spinoza, to list just some of the greatest thinkers in the Western philosophical tradition, held that while it is difficult, human beings can learn basic truths.

“The American founders were among these, which is why they declared themselves in support of unalienable individual rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for everyone.

“But today, probably more so than ever before, the dominant idea in most universities is that it’s not possible to identify basic truths about ethics and politics. Multiculturalists teach this. Moreover, books such as those Rorty writes are brought out by the most prestigious publishers in the world. Yet, when bombs go off, one doesn’t find Rorty and his followers parading their

seriously crafted views to the general public. No matter how hard one looks to see if such missives have been published, there is nothing written by those folks about how it is false that terrorists ‘get something wrong that democratic societies get right.’

“Surely at this point one can wonder whether Rorty & Co. really mean what they claim to believe. Or perhaps they are merely teasing their students with outrageous ideas and when they leave work, they no longer take their ruminations seriously.

“But this is a luxury we cannot afford, to make reckless pronouncements about truth, justice, knowledge or virtue in our professional capacity but reject them when we step out of our offices into the real world. Because our students often do listen to what we say. And when they take the material with them into their lives, the stuff can turn out to be deadly for them and the rest of us.

The practical implications of the kind of view Rorty and other relativists propound amount to no less than that the positions of the terrorists and of the victims of terrorism are basically indistinguishable as to their merit or worth.

“Maybe Rorty & Co. would reply: but that doesn’t mean the victims must accept their victimization, must believe they shouldn’t resist. Such declamations, however, are unconvincing because the thrust of the original relativist idea is exactly that, namely, terrorists do not have positions that are worse than those of their victims. Such a view is debilitating and can confuse people about where one ought to stand on terrorism. It is, indeed, just the view terrorists would most likely want us to embrace so we become impotent, philosophically and ethically, as we try to come to grips with their vicious conduct.

“I think Rorty & Co. know this. This is why we do not hear from them in these times. But then they should remain silent at other times, too.”

—Tibor Machan, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, July 30, 2005, p. M9