



September 2007

The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication



Session 6, 2007 - Colorado

"A wise man will listen and increase his learning, and a discerning man will obtain guidance."
—Proverbs 1:5

MONTH IN REVIEW

❑ “The proverbs of Solomon son of David, king of Israel: For gaining wisdom and being instructed; for understanding insightful sayings; for receiving wise instruction [in] righteousness, justice, and integrity; for teaching shrewdness to the inexperienced, knowledge and discretion to a young man—a wise man will listen and increase his learning, and a discerning man will obtain guidance—for understanding a proverb or a parable, the words of the wise, and their riddles. The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge; fools despise wisdom and instruction.”

—Proverbs 1:1-7

❑ “‘And what is this valley called?’ ‘We call it now simply Wisdom’s Valley: but the oldest maps mark it as the Valley of Humiliation.’”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Pilgrim’s Regress*

❑ “Though flesh (in a sense) ‘knows what spirit knows,’ only ‘spirit knows it knows.’ Only when we look back from supernature do we see what nature really meant.”

—C.S. Lewis, *William and the Arthurian*

❑ “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*

❑ “The more I study science the more I am impressed with the thought that this world and universe have a definite design—and a design suggests a *designer*. It may be possible to have design without a designer, a picture without an artist, but *my* mind is unable to conceive of such a situation.

“Evidences of design are everywhere about us; the forces producing the design are the so-called ‘laws of nature,’ many of which science has disclosed to us and many of which still await discovery. The greatest aspect of design visible to us is in the ordered movement of the stars and planets in this solar system and in other solar systems extending on and on through space—a design almost incomprehensibly large. At the other extreme we find all matter composed of invisible atoms, each of which in turn is a solar system almost inconceivably small, with electrons swinging in orbits around the atomic nuclei somewhat as planets circle about the sun. And everywhere in between these extremes we find evidence of design. Atoms are arranged in definite pat-

terns to form molecules. Molecules arrange themselves in perfect patterns to form crystals. While design is most regular and easily seen in the inorganic world, it is also apparent in living things. The outward patterning observable in the bodies of plants and animals is a reflection of the inner patterning of organs, tissues, and cells; and this patterning in turn is a reflection of the patterning of genes in chromosomes. And the genes are composed of complex but regular arrangements of atoms. And so it goes—everywhere there is design. Everything is conforming to definite forces acting upon it, is obeying natural laws applicable to its particular state. Whence come these natural laws? There we find the Creator.”

—Paul Amos Moody, *Introduction to Evolution*, p. 497, 498

❑ “Richard Dawkins is not pleased with God: ‘The God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all of fiction. Jealous and proud of it; a petty, unjust unforgiving control-freak; a vindictive, bloodthirsty ethnic-cleanser; a misogynistic homophobic racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal....’

“Well, no need to finish the quotation; you get the idea. Dawkins seems to have chosen God as his sworn enemy. (Let’s hope for Dawkins’ sake God doesn’t return the compliment.)

“*The God Delusion* is an extended diatribe against religion in general and belief in God in particular; Dawkins and Daniel Dennett (whose recent *Breaking the Spell* is his contribution to this genre) are the touchdown twins of current academic atheism. Dawkins has written his book, he says, partly to encourage timorous atheists to come out of the closet. He and Dennett both appear to think it requires considerable courage to attack religion these days; says Dennett, ‘I risk a fist to the face or worse. Yet I persist.’ Apparently atheism has its own heroes of the faith—at any rate its own self-styled heroes. Here it’s not easy to take them seriously; religion-

— UPCOMING EVENTS —

SPRING ADULT CONFERENCE

Mark your calendar for Summit’s one-week worldview crash course at Glen Eyrie Conference Center. This conference, to be held February 17-22, 2008, is one you won’t want to miss. Contact 877-488-8787 or www.gleneyrie.org/summit for more information.

www.summit.org

Be sure to visit our website for product specials, articles, current events, and Summit student blogs.

DR. NOEBEL’S TRAVEL SCHEDULE

Impact 360, Pine Mountain, GA, October 22-24, 2007
Worldview Weekend, Rockford, IL, November 16-17, 2007
Summit Australia, Melbourne, January 13-19, 2008
West Houston Bible Church Worldview Conference - Houston, TX, March 10-12, 2008
Iowa Prayer Breakfast, Clive, IA, March 19-20, 2008

bashing in the current Western academy is about as dangerous as endorsing the party's candidate at a Republican rally.

"Dawkins is perhaps the world's most popular science writer; he is also an extremely *gifted* science writer. (For example, his account of bats and their ways in his earlier book *The Blind Watchmaker* is a brilliant and fascinating *tour de force*.) *The God Delusion*, however, contains little science; it is mainly philosophy and theology (perhaps 'atheology' would be a better term) and evolutionary psychology, along with a substantial dash of social commentary decrying religion and its allegedly baneful effects. As the above quotation suggests, one shouldn't look to this book for evenhanded and thoughtful commentary. In fact the proportion of insult, ridicule, mockery, spleen, and vitriol is astounding. (Could it be that his mother, while carrying him, was frightened by an Anglican clergyman on the rampage?) If Dawkins ever gets tired of his day job, a promising future awaits him as a writer of political attack ads.

"Now despite the fact that this book is mainly philosophy, Dawkins is not a philosopher (he's a biologist). Even taking this into account, however, much of the philosophy he purveys is at best jejune, [weak, insubstantial]. You might say that some of his forays into philosophy are at best sophomoric, but that would be unfair to sophomores; the fact is (grade inflation aside), many of his arguments would receive a failing grade in a sophomore philosophy class. This, combined with the arrogant, smarter-than-thou tone of the book, can be annoying. I shall put irritation aside, however and do my best to take Dawkins' main argument seriously."

—Alvin Plantinga, *Books & Culture*, March/April 2007, <http://www.christianitytoday.com/bc/2007/002/1.21.html>

❑ "Chapter 3, 'Why There Almost Certainly is No God,' is the heart of the book. Well, why does Dawkins think there almost certainly isn't any such person as God? It's because, he says, the existence of God is monumentally improbable. How improbable? The astronomer Fred Hoyle famously claimed that the probability of life arising on earth (by purely natural means, without special divine aid) is less than the probability that a flight-worthy Boeing 747 should be assembled by a hurricane roaring through a junkyard. Dawkins appears to think the probability of the existence of God is in that same neighborhood—so small as to be negligible for all practical (and most impractical) purposes. Why does he think so?"

"Here Dawkins doesn't appeal to the usual anti-theistic arguments—the argument from evil, for example, or the claim that it's impossible that there be a being with the attributes believers ascribe to God. So why does he think theism is enormously improbable? The answer: if there were such a person as God, he would have to be enormously *complex*, and the more complex something is, the less probable it is: 'However statistically improbable the entity you seek to explain by invoking a designer, the designer himself has got to be at least as improbable. God is the Ultimate Boeing 747.' The basic idea is that anything that knows and can do what God knows and can do would have to be incredibly complex. In particular, anything that can create or design something must be at least as complex as the thing it can design or create. Putting it another way, Dawkins says a designer must contain at least as much information as what it creates or designs, and information is

inversely related to probability. Therefore, he thinks, God would have to be monumentally complex, hence astronomically improbable; thus it is almost certain that God does not exist."

—Alvin Plantinga, *Ibid*.

❑ All serious students seeking to understand Richard Dawkins' war against God are directed to Plantinga's full article in *Books and Culture* or the website mentioned above.

❑ "'God is a delusion—a psychotic delinquent' invented by mad, deluded people. That's the take-home message of *The God Delusion*. Although Dawkins does not offer a rigorous definition of a delusion, he clearly means 'a belief that is not grounded in evidence—or, worse, that flies in the face of the evidence. Faith is 'blind trust, in the absence of evidence, even in the teeth of evidence.' It is a 'process of non-thinking.' It is 'evil precisely because it requires no justification, and brooks no argument.' These core definitions of faith are hardwired into Dawkins's worldview and are obsessively repeated throughout his writings. It is not a Christian definition of faith but one that Dawkins has invented to suit his own polemical purposes. It immediately defines those who believe in God as people who have lost touch with reality—as those who are *deluded*.

"Dawkins rightly notes how important faith is to people. What you believe has a very significant impact on life and thought. That makes it all the more important, we are told, to subject faith to critical, rigorous examination. Delusions need to be exposed—and then removed. I agree entirely. Since the publication of my book *Dawkins' God* in 2004, I am regularly asked to speak on its themes throughout the world. In these lectures, I set out Dawkins' views on religion and then give an evidence-based rebuttal, point by point."

—Alister McGrath, Joanna McGrath, *The Dawkins Delusion*, p. 17, 18

❑ "As anyone familiar with antireligious polemics knows, a recurring atheist criticism of religious belief is that it is infantile—a childish delusion which ought to have disappeared as humanity reaches its maturity. Throughout his career Dawkins has developed a similar criticism, drawing on a longstanding atheist analogy. In earlier works he emphasized that belief in God is just like believing in the Tooth Fairy or Santa Claus. These are childish beliefs that are

continued on Page 5

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.



From the President's Desk

Dr. David A. Noebel

I received a letter in July that our whole Summit family will enjoy reading since our whole Summit family is just as responsible for this Marine Corps officer as I am. I ask each of you reading this letter to pray for him daily.

“Dear Dr. Noebel:

“It’s hard to believe it has been 18 years since I attended The Summit in the summer of 1989. Who knew after listening to Don McAlvany talk about the communist manifesto that we’d see the Berlin Wall fall only five months later? Talks of increasing liberalism in the press and the attack on Christianity met me on my departure from Colorado Springs Airport on the newsstand, with the cover of *Time* depicting a crucifix of Christ in a beaker of urine. As I look back at what happened during that year, it seems like another world has been emplaced since then.

“When I arrived at camp I was a youngster, 15 years old, with my parents having just divorced after 22 years of marriage. I came to camp with a love of science and history and a heart gripped by Christ. I found many friends whom I would communicate with for the next several years, though I wonder now why I didn’t keep in touch after another ten years. I would begin my junior year of high school the following fall not knowing that those next two years would carry me down what seemed like an alternate life to the one I thought I should have been living.

“Revisiting my life while flying here over the desert of Iraq, I began with vivid memory to recount the things that have made me the man I have become. I have always revered that one of the greatest milestones in my Christian walk has been attending The Summit that summer. And like the leper healed by Christ and returned to Him to give thanks, I now return to you in this letter to say thank you for your obedience to Christ. Thank you for providing me and countless others a forum where our hearts and minds could be opened to the heart and mind of Christ; to learn that our minds are at enmity against God, and that armed with His knowledge, we could defeat the fiery darts that seek to destroy our faith in Him.

“Dr. Noebel, not a single day has gone by since I left The Summit in which I have not used something I learned there, either to teach someone else, or combat a lie I was being taught. I still have all my notes and handouts. If the need for The Summit was great in 1989, how much more so now! The information I was taught there helped me to receive a B.S. in Biology without having my faith wrecked by evolution. My g.p.a. reflects I didn’t tow the party line, but that didn’t matter to me. More importantly I was

armed with the knowledge to see right through every world view that was trying desperately hard to be crammed down my throat. It was amusing to sit in class, and even now watching the evening news, and see and hear these views so ridiculously stated.

“Now more than ever we need students and adults to be armed with this same information. It’s alarming how many Christians have their minds hijacked by the world’s viewpoint, while its doctrines are even taught in pulpits. An 18 year old with a basic logic course under his belt could dissolve 99% of these humanistic view points. The bottom line is what The Summit teaches works, even 18 years later. The Summit curriculum has served me daily in both my Christian walk and every profession I’ve operated in, and today as a Marine Corps Officer. My oldest daughter is now five and I’m counting the years until she can attend The Summit.

“Please pass on to your staff and new lecturers my personal thanks for what they do and have done. I doubt this side of heaven they may ever grasp the impact they have had on men’s and women’s lives while teaching at The Summit. May they continue to teach and preach with great conviction and authority. I sincerely pray that the anointing of Christ and the manifestation of the presence of God would continually be found in the meeting places of The Summit; and that Scripture would be fulfilled, that as you lift up Christ there, men and women would be drawn to Him.

“Blessings in Christ.

“Semper Fidelis,” —Mike

This month we will begin our second year of Summit Semester. This is a three-month course of study conducted on a campus approximately 10 miles south of Pagosa Springs, Colorado and taught primarily by Dr. Michael Bauman with assistance from Dr. J.P. Moreland and Dr. Donald Williams.

The program is primarily geared for high school graduates before they head off to college (although some college students will take the course).

Summit Ministries is committed to helping the twenty students attending this year’s program with scholarship money of approximately \$2,500 per student, and we are asking our Summit family to help meet this challenge. One of Summit’s board members has already pledged \$40,000, so if each one reading this would contribute just \$25 or \$50, we could meet our expenses. Thank you!

Between now and the end of the year, a temporary change in the law continues to provide a special planning opportunity for individuals who are age 70 ½ or older, receive distributions from an IRA, and intend to make charitable gifts in 2007.

If you meet these qualifications, you can make distributions directly from your IRA to one or more charities [e.g., American Christian College d/b/a Summit Ministries] without the distributions being included in taxable income and subject to withholding. An additional benefit is that the funds transferred from your IRA to a charity count towards your mandatory withdrawal for 2007.

Making current charitable contributions from an IRA rather than other assets may be especially appropriate if you:

- are required to take distributions but do not need them for living expenses, or
- do not itemize deductions, or
- plan to leave money to charity from your IRA at death anyway, or
- would not be able to deduct all of your charitable contribu-

tions because of deduction limitations, or

- may lose some of your itemized deductions because of your income level.

Certain limitations apply to these non-taxable charitable distributions from an IRA:

- You must be at least 70 ½ years of age when the gift is made.
- Total gifts for 2007 cannot exceed \$100,000 per IRA owner/beneficiary.
- They must be made directly from your IRA to a public charity, and they cannot be to a supporting organization or a donor advised fund.
- The gifts must be outright. For instance, they cannot be used to establish a gift annuity or fund a charitable remainder trust.

This opportunity is currently scheduled to expire at the end of 2007. If you would like more information about this and other ways to make a charitable gift from an IRA, please contact Mary Hines at (719) 685-9103.

continued from Page 3

abandoned as soon as we are capable of evidence-based thinking. And so is God. It's obvious, isn't it? As Dawkins pointed out in his 'Thought for the Day' on BBC Radio in 2003, humanity 'can leave the crybaby phase, and finally come of age.' This 'infantile explanation' belongs to an earlier superstitious era in the history of humanity. We've outgrown it.

"Hmmm. Like many of Dawkins's analogies, this has been constructed with a specific agenda in mind—in this case, the ridiculing of religion. Yet the analogy is obviously flawed. How many people do you know who began to believe in Santa Claus in adulthood? Or who found belief in the Tooth Fairy consoling in old age? I believed in Santa Claus until I was about five (though, not unaware of the benefits it brought, I allowed my parents to think I took it seriously until rather later). I did not believe in God until I started going to university. Those who use this infantile argument have to explain why so many people discover God in later life and certainly do not regard this as representing any kind of regression, perversion or degeneration. A good recent example is provided by Anthony Flew (born 1923), the noted atheist philosopher who started to believe in God in his eighties."

—Alister McGrath, Joanna McGrath, *The Dawkins Delusion*, p. 19, 20

□ While Richard Dawkins proudly announces the paperback edition of *The God Delusion* in the August/September 2007 issue of *Free Inquiry* he avoids like the plague any mention of Alvin Plantinga's or the McGrath's critique of his book. Dawkins also avoids mentioning Anthony Flew, a contributing editor of *Free Inquiry*, who left his atheism after a lifetime of pondering whether or not God exists. Flew decided the evidence was overwhelming in favor of the proposition "God exists." Incidentally, the arguments that Plantinga and the McGraths level at Dawkins equally apply to Christopher Hitchens' *god Is Not Great*. We'll have much more on Hitchens' book in later issues of the *Summit Journal*.

□ "The general design of the [history of the world] series was unmistakably [Lord] Acton's. Instead of the usual division by countries, or centuries, the volumes consisted of general topics, usually based on some overriding idea that united the histories of several countries. Some of his divisions, for instance, were: the Renaissance, the Reformation, the religious wars, absolute monarchy, and revolution. Acton was convinced that there were 'some twenty or thirty predominate currents of thought or attitudes of mind' that provided the structure of modern history and held the key to explaining it. The majority of these ideas, he thought, were either religions or substitutes for religion.' Acton saw to it that his contributors did not neglect to deal (in their own way, or course) with such influential ideas as Puritanism, ultramontaniam, Lutheranism, Anglicanism, rationalism, utilitarianism, positivism, materialism, Whiggism, communism, and so on. This approach to history seems second nature to us now, but in Acton's own time it represented a new departure, and many were fearful of where it would end."

—Robert Schuettinger, *Lord Acton*, p. 174

□ "The possibility of science itself depends on the immateriality of thought. It depends on the mind's independence from the bombardment of matter. Otherwise, there is no truth, there is only 'it seems to me.' Not only the possibility for recognizing truth and error, but also the *reasons* for doing science rest on a picture of human freedom and dignity (of the sort promulgated by biblical religion) that science itself cannot recognize. Wonder, curiosity, a wish not to be self-deceived, and a spirit of philanthropy are the *sine qua non* of the modern scientific enterprise. They are hallmarks of the living human soul, not of the anatomized brain. The very enterprise of science—like all else of value in human life—depends on a view of humanity that science cannot supply and that foolish scientific prophets deny at their peril, unaware of the embarrassing self-contradiction."

—Leon R. Kass, *Commentary* magazine, April 2007, p. 43

□ “In living systems, polymerization or chain-formation proceeds by means of the cell’s invaluable enzymes. But in the grim inhospitable pre-biotic, no enzymes were available. And so chemists have assigned their task to various inorganic catalysts. J.P. Ferris and G. Ertem, for instance, have reported that activated nucleotides bond covalently when embedded on the surface of montmorillonite, a kind of clay. This example, combining technical complexity with general inconclusiveness, may stand for many others.

“In any event, polymerization having been concluded—by whatever means—the result was (in the words of Gerald Joyce and Leslie Orgel) ‘a random ensemble of polynucleotide sequences’’: long molecules emerging from short ones, like fronds on the surface of a pond. Among these fronds, nature is to have discovered a self-replicating molecule. But how?

“Darwinian evolution is plainly unavailing in this exercise or that era, since Darwinian evolution *begins* with self-replication, and self-replication is precisely what needs to be explained. But if Darwinian evolution is unavailing, so, too, is chemistry. The fronds comprise ‘a *random* ensemble of polynucleotide sequences’ (emphasis added); but no principle of organic chemistry suggests that aimless encounters among nucleic acids must lead to a chain capable of self-replication.

“If chemistry is unavailing and Darwin indisposed, what is left as a mechanism? The evolutionary biologist’s finest friend: sheer dumb luck.

“Was nature lucky? It depends on the payoff and the odds. The payoff is clear: an ancestral form of RNA capable of replication. Without that payoff, there is no life, and obviously, at some point, the payoff paid off. The question is the odds.

“For the moment no one knows how precisely to compute those odds, if only because within the laboratory, no one has conducted an experiment leading to a self-replicating ribozyme. But the minimum length or ‘sequence’ that is needed for a contemporary ribozyme to undertake what the distinguished geochemist Gustaf Arrhenius calls ‘demonstrated ligase activity’ is known. It is roughly 100 nucleotides.

Whereupon, just as one might expect, things blow up very quickly. As Arrhenius notes, there are 4^{100} or roughly 10^{60} nucleotide sequences that are 100 nucleotides in length. This is an unfathomably large number. It exceeds the number of atoms contained in the universe, as well as the age of the universe in seconds. If the odds in favor of self-replication are 1 in 10^{60} , no betting man would take them, no matter how attractive the payoff, and neither presumably would nature.

—David Berlinski, *Commentary* magazine, February 2006, p. 29, 30

□ Summit students interested in Science, Theology, and Philosophy would do well to read Leon R. Kass, “Science, Religion, and the Human Future” along with David Berlinski’s “On the Origins of Life.” Both articles speak volumes to Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens.

□ “Back in the day, the many atheists I knew went about their unbelieving lives in a quietly sardonic, but non-combative way: They’d abandoned organized religion, but sought no quarrel with

those who stayed. They explained their non-belief to their children, but let them join the boy scouts.

“Everything old is new again, but different. Yesterday’s live-and-let-live atheism has morphed into today’s truculent ‘atheism with attitude,’ where God is not only dead, but—postmodern glee having replaced Nietzschean gloom regarding His demise—with good riddance to Him.

“The new atheists call themselves the ‘brights,’ which makes believers and even agnostics the ‘dims.’ I daresay deist Albert Einstein would raise a shaggy eyebrow at being so characterized. But he’s not alone: About half of scientists believe in God, and they are dismissed as Uncle Toms by the swaggering brights.

“A feature article in last Saturday’s *Post* detailed some of the movement’s infrastructure: the new atheism’s high priests (whose Eureka! tone suggests they invented atheism, though it’s as old as religion), Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins, Christopher Hitchens, et al.; their Bibles: *The End of Faith*, *The God Delusion*, *god is Not Great* and other books, as well as magazines such as *Canadian Free Thinker*; their houses of anti-worship, like Toronto’s ‘Centre for Inquiry’ and the American Atheist Alliance International; and even their agitprop for kids: CDs such as Friendly Neighborhood Atheist (roll over, Mr Rogers!) and Beware of Dogma.

“Brights have even opened summer camps. Old-style atheists sometimes sent their children to socialist camps. But summer camps specifically devoted to indoctrinating children in anti-religious faith rather than instilling a positive secular faith? This is something new. (Memo to Johnny in cabin #7: A copy of the Psalms was discovered under your mattress. Report to the re-education tent at once!)

“The brights’ most potentially consequential political thrust, though, is their sly appropriation of martyrish victimspeak, the kind that other collective rights groups have successfully leveraged for political gains.

“Atheist Daniel Dennett, author of *Breaking the Spell*, says that it takes considerable courage to attack religion these days: ‘I risk a fist to the face or worse. Yet I persist.’ Others speak of feeling ‘marginalized.’

“But the political handwriting on the wall is especially evident in this statement by American activist Herb Silverman: ‘What I would really like is for atheists to come out of the closet because we are so demonized in our culture.’

“‘Culture’? ‘Closet’? Uh oh. The ideological appropriation of ‘rights’ vocabulary is the canary in the identity-politics ‘equality’ mine. Once gay persecution is adduced, can the cry for official atheist equity be far behind?

“In grievance-collecting, it’s a case of ‘say the right word, and you’ll be heard.’ True, atheists in democratic countries can’t conjure up grim tales of the truncheon’s midnight thud on the door, but in our politically correct culture, ‘feelings’ of disempowerment or victimization often achieve moral parity with the real thing. So I’m betting it won’t be long before our heartstrings will be tugged by activist atheists who claim that Stephen Harper’s saying ‘God bless Canada’ makes them feel ‘violated,’ or complaining that reading Christianity-stuffed *Heidi* makes their children feel psychologically ‘abused.’

“In a society where the rights of perceived victims are morally privileged over traditional cultural elites (in this case, believers),

political influence accrues to those who can make the best case for bias-based collective past suffering and current defenselessness against those perceived as powerful.

“Aggressively marketed grievance has worked for women and gays. The same strategy for brights will doubtless end in a government-funded Status of Atheists Council to undo the iniquities of 10,000 years of theocratic hegemony and repression. After that, we may yet see—don’t laugh until you’re sure it can’t happen—demands for reparations payout by churches and synagogues to redress the ignominy and shame now-atheist, former (involuntarily-designated) Christians and Jews suffered as children when force-fed the Ten Commandments in Sunday and Hebrew School. (Somehow, I do not envisage a similar campaign by Muslim atheists directed against the madrassas, not sure why.)

“When bullets whiz overhead, there are no atheists in foxholes. What the bitter, bloviating brights fail to realize is that the whole world’s a foxhole nowadays, and that their upthrust swollen heads make a better target for our mortal enemies—religion’s cancers and other, secular but equally totalitarian triumphalists—than those humbly bowed in gratitude for mankind’s loftiest ideals and supplication for the courage to defend them.”

—Barbara Kay, [Canadian] *National Post*, July 25, 2007

❑ “Now what about tolerance? When homosexual activists ask for tolerance they are implicitly admitting that there’s something wrong with their behavior. After all, you don’t need to ask people to ‘tolerate’ your good behavior. No husband and wife needs to ask others to ‘tolerate’ their wholesome marriage.

“Now I admit that I am intolerant of harmful behaviors. But we all are. No one in a civilized society can tolerate murder, rape, or theft, for example. But that’s not the issue with same-sex marriage. The issue in this debate is should we go beyond tolerance to endorsement? It’s one thing to permit homosexuality, it’s quite another to promote it by endorsing same-sex marriage.

“What I find extremely hypocritical is that homosexual activists demand tolerance from us while they are some of the most intolerant people in public life. They don’t tolerate those of us who think same-sex marriage is a bad idea. According to them, we’re just bigoted homophobes! They certainly don’t tolerate democracy or free speech when the results are not in their favor. That’s why they’re trying to impose their radical ideas without your consent by circumventing the people and going to the courts. That’s why they’re trying to shut you up by seeking legislation to make it a crime to speak out against homosexuality. They’ve succeeded in Canada and Sweden, and now they’re pushing that same ‘hate’ crimes legislation here in America. According to homosexual activists, only you have to be tolerant—they somehow have a moral right to impose their views on you without your consent or your voice!”

—Frank Turek, *Not So Gay: Why Everyone Will Be Hurt by Same-Sex Marriage*, p. 8

❑ “The theme of Saturday’s worldwide LiveEarth concerts was a call for action against climate change. The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change’s recent reports, heralded as the final word on global warming, inspired both organizers and performers, from Al Gore to Madonna.

“Opening the Washington concert leg, Mr. Gore denounced climate change skeptics ‘who don’t understand what is now at stake.’ Strong words from a public figure flaunting an Oscar comprised of junk science.

“Sadly, the IPCC encouraged deeply disturbing departures from sound scientific research that significantly undermines Live Earth’s alarmist message. Yet, the problems with the IPCC report go much further than politicized science. They extend to the core of the climate change debate, namely the degree of scientific certainty about the causes and consequences of global warming.

“**Scientific uncertainty:** What level of scientific certainty do IPCC’s global warming claims really have?”

“The gold standard level of scientific certainty is the 95 percent confidence level. “This allows a researcher to attest that he or she is 95 percent confident his or her findings are genuine and not due to chance. Claims that fail to meet this standard carry little scientific weight.

“Applying this scientific concept to the IPCC report reveals how uncertain are the alarmists’ claims. For example, not a single IPCC conclusion about the human sources of global warming meets a 95 percent confidence level standard.

“There are, however, 26 claims termed ‘likely,’ meaning their chance of being true is greater than 66 percent. To put this into context, you might ask yourself how comfortable you would feel driving a car whose brakes worked only 14 times out of 20.

“This has importance for understanding how much genuine scientific knowledge, as opposed to mere political posturing, the IPCC report offers. For example, the key claim—that there has been significant human-caused warming over the last 50 years is merely ‘likely’ according to the IPCC.

“Not one of the IPCC’s seven projected man-made weather trends reaches a 95 percent confidence level. This fact makes implausible the claim that human activity is the driver of climate change.

“**Politicized science:** The IPCC’s Rules of Procedure mandate not the normal scholarly peer review process but ‘review by governments.’ Furthermore, the IPCC states that, ‘In taking decisions and approving, adopting and accepting reports, the Panel, its Working Groups and any Task Force shall use all best endeavors to reach consensus’

“Both rules suggest something other than a process committed to sound science. Science does not proceed by consensus or government review but by reliably replicable, public results always open to doubt and falsification.

“Injecting government review into the scientific process corrupts the process by switching from one in which science drives policy to one in which policy drives science. In truth, these rules reveal the IPCC process for what it really is: politicized science in the service of government, rather than science in the service of the truth.

“Some commentators say casting doubt on the science of climate change is the equivalent of Holocaust denial. Such thinking can only come from those who either fail to understand or choose to disown the scientific enterprise.

“At the heart of the scientific enterprise is a curious and always difficult tension between certainty and the possibility that certainty can suddenly dissolve. Respectful of that tension, the



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).

climate change skeptic asks for two things: first, to bring the normal standards of scientific evidence to the climate debate; and, second, to make certain there is not some politically driven and premature closure of what is a scientific controversy.

“Live Earth’s inconvenient truth is that Al Gore and his friends are wrong about the strength of the climate change evidence. Using normal scientific standards, there is no proof we are causing the Earth to warm, let alone that such warming will cause an environmental catastrophe. To claim otherwise is to be untrue to the skepticism at the heart of science.”

—Patrick Bosham, John Luik, *The Washington Times*, July 11, 2007, p. A20

☐ “This week the pope took on the Eastern Orthodox prelates and the Protestants of the West, for a purpose not yet altogether clear. Christians feel embattled in much of the world and Christian unity, prized any time, has rarely been more important than now. The remarks, not directly attributed to the pope himself, were couched in language that falls on untutored ears as close to argle-bargle, laced with dogma and contention, expressed in Latin and the arcane of lesser languages. The Associated Press, Reuters and other wire services translated this into language as blunt as certain of Pope Benedict’s remarks on other occasions. The pope, the Associated Press said, ‘reasserted the universal primacy of the Roman Catholic Church, approving a document that says Orthodox churches were defective and that other Christian denominations were not true churches...and Catholicism provides the only true path to salvation.’ Reuters reported that ‘the Vatican said Christian denominations outside Roman Catholicism were not full churches of Christ.’

“The targets of the pope’s condescension reacted with outrage.

‘[The pope’s statement] makes us question whether we are indeed praying together for Christian unity,’ a spokesman for the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, a fellowship of 75 million Protestants in more than a hundred nations, said in quick response. ‘It makes us question the seriousness with which the Roman Catholic Church takes its dialogues with the reformed family and other families of the church.’

“There’s really nothing new here, as certain American Catholics said, seeking to reassure their Protestant friends. The Vatican said the statement, organized as answers to five questions about Vatican II, was issued to correct certain misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine.”

—Wesley Pruden, *The Washington Times*, July 13, 2007, p. A4

The Evangelical response is found in Ephesians 2:8 – “For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast.” In other words, no church can save a soul—Baptist, Lutheran, Evangelical Free, Roman Catholic – only faith in Jesus Christ can save a soul. (See 1 Corinthians 15:1-4; John 1:10-13; Acts 4:12)