• the OUTNO



Volume 9 Issue #10



IN THIS ISSUE:

- » Summit Alumni Spotlight | pg. 2
- » Highlights from around the Globe | pgs. 4–7 Biblical Christianity, Economics, and Ethics

"Who can find a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies." - Proverbs 31:10

SUMMIT ALUMNI SPOTLIGHT a word about Summit Alum Noah Riner

Noah Riner made national headlines unexpectedly in 2004 as Dartmouth College student body president by using Jesus as an example of character during his convocation speech to incoming freshman.

"I definitely knew that a lot of people would disagree with me in terms of calling lesus the best example of character and also claiming Him as Savior," Noah admits. "I didn't anticipate the reaction being ... as passionately opposed to me as it was, though. [I]t was hard [for people] to believe that somebody, some educated, intelligent person believed in God, believed in Jesus Christ and was willing to talk about it," he explained.

As a result of this controversy, Noah was a guest on Focus on the Family Daily Broadcast, the Laura Ingraham Show, and the David Wheaton Show.

Noah grew up in Louisville, Kentucky, the second youngest child in a family of eight. His dad is a Baptist preacher, and attending Summit Ministries Student Leadership Conferences is practically a family tradition. Before giving his speech at Dartmouth, Noah even called Dr. Noebel for resources and prayer support.

Noah credits his family and the training he received at Summit for his leadership and courage. He attended Summit in the summers of 2000 and 2001 and recalls some of his favorite times as singing "Amazing Grace" every day with Brent Noebel, hearing Dr. Jeff Myers talk about Christian leadership, and going whitewater rafting with the close friends he made.

Noah asserts that "the best thing Summit provided was the knowledge that there is a Christian way to think about the real issues of the world."

Noah and Brittany standing in front of the theater of Ephesus, the location where a riot occurred because of Paul's preaching (Acts 19:29).

Noah graduated from Dartmouth in 2006 and joined the international consulting firm Booz Allen Hamilton. He lives with his wife Brittany in Palo Alto, California. Noah has been a speaker at a number of Christian youth conferences, challenging students to stand up for their faith. After being married less than a year, Noah and Brittany established their own nonprofit called Three Oaks Leadership, Inc.

The mission of Three Oaks Leadership, Inc. is to challenge exceptional Christian high school students to attend highly selective universities and to develop their faith, leadership abilities, and academics to their utmost for the glory of God.

Noah and Brittany use Three Oaks Leadership, Inc. to provide college consulting, spiritual mentoring, and leadership training to develop Christian students who are equipped to engage the world from a Christian perspective.

Three Oaks Leadership, Inc. also provides scholarships to students to attend Summit each summer because "Summit is the leading organization training students in apologetics."

Noah is currently pursuing an MBA at the Stanford Graduate School of Business.

Attention all Parents and Alumni:

A Summit Alumni Society is in the works and we need your help collecting the names and updated contact information of alumni. Many have moved since attending Summit, changed their names due to marriage, and a variety of other things that have caused us to lose touch with them. Please help us create a comprehensive Alumni Directory and Alumni Society by sending us the names and contact info for all the alumni you know. You can use the enclosed reply device, email info@summit.org, or call 866.786.6483 to give us the information.

Please don't delay! We'd like to have our database updated by the end of October. Thanks for your help!

from the PRESIDENT'S DESK a word from Dr. Noebel

We've just completed 10 student leadership conferences for the summer of 2009, and I am pleased to report that they were some of the best sessions we've ever had over our 47 years in this ministry. The 7 sessions in Colorado were full to overflowing, and attendance is growing in Tennessee (2 sessions) and Virginia (1 session). The demand in Colorado was so great that we are planning for 8 sessions in 2010, beginning May 16 and ending September 3. We may also be announcing another two-week session in Green Lake, Wisconsin, at the Green Lake Conference Center.

I also received the following note from a grateful mother, and I share it to encourage all Journal readers to be thinking of prospective students for 2010:

We just want to tell you how thankful we are for your ministry. Our son attended your conference at Liberty University this year. He is a rising high school senior and a typical teenage boy who tends to be 'lazy' when it comes to studying and any type of schoolwork. Needless to say we did not know how he would respond to the workload that your conference requires — he loved every minute of it and is still talking about it! He loved the speakers and showed concern for them. I cannot say enough good things about your program.

[N]ot only did J. grow spiritually, but it opened his eyes (and ours as well) to the false teachings that our kids are being exposed to in colleges. He has always wanted to attend a public university here in South Carolina, but since the Summit conference, he now wants to attend a Christian school where he will be taught the truth. My husband and I are praising God for this and look forward to sending him to you again next year. May God continue to bless you as you minister in His name.

We are receiving responses like this from parents as well as students. I will continue to share them with you over the coming months not only to encourage you, but also to remind you to send us names and addresses of teens you believe have leadership potential and who would benefit from 2 weeks at the Summit next summer.

One of our Summit professors, Dr. Mike Adams, who teaches at UNC, Wilmington, wrote an article for Townhall. com (Aug. 20) in which he referred to his recent experience at the Sum-



mit. Reflecting on conversations with Summit students at all hours of the day and night, he reports, "Students who attend UNC by the Sea are very different than the ones I teach at Summit. The former are not likely to have been home schooled. And relatively few attended private schools. So, as products of the public school system, they have spent little time discussing spiritual matters. Most of their teachers are fearful of offending the ACLU."

Professor Adams reports having "more (and a greater number of) intelligent conversations with Summit students in a single day than I do with my UNC students over the course of a year." As a result, he's planning to change his approach at UNC by inviting guest speakers, including some from Chuck Colson's prison ministry, to challenge his students. He plans to ask the speakers to "share data with the class comparing the success of religious versus secular prison rehabilitation programs."

In addition, Professor Adams plans to invite Summit speaker Frank Turek to lecture "on legislating morality," natural law, and the "possibility of having an ordered society without acknowledging the existence of God." It would not surprise him, however, if some students were to file a formal complaint "claiming I have created a 'hostile environment." Such is the situation at some of our finest institutions of higher leaning!

Undaunted, Professor Adams insists he will follow through on these changes in order to provide his UNC

> students a solid education. We sincerely wish him success.

In closing let me thank the Summit family again (and again!) for your prayers, concerns, and support for this ministry.

Before I sign off, allow me to draw your attention to the Alumni Society, mentioned in the box on page 2. I sincerely need your help updating the contact information of the Summit alumni you know. Please see the box for details and respond by the end of this month.



BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

+ Who can find a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies. The heart of her husband safely trusts her; so he will have no lack of gain. She does him good and not evil all the days of her life. She seeks wool and flax, and willingly works with her hands. She is like the merchant ships, she brings her food from afar. She also rises while it is yet night, and provides food for her household, and a portion for her maidservants. She considers a field and buys it; from her profits she plants a vineyard. She girds herself with strength, and strengthens her arms. She perceives that her merchandise is good, and her lamp does not go out by night. She stretches out her hands to the distaff, and her hand holds the spindle. She extends her hand to the poor, yes, she reaches out her hands to the needy. She is not afraid of snow for her household, for all her household is clothed with scarlet. She makes tapestry for herself; her clothing is fine linen and purple. Her husband is known in the gates, when he sits among the elders of the land. She makes linen garments and sells them, and supplies sashes for the merchants. Strength and honor are her clothing; she shall rejoice in time to come. She opens her mouth with wisdom, and on her tongue is the law of kindness. She watches over the ways of her household, and does not eat the bread of idleness. Her children rise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praises her: "Many daughters have done well, but you excel them all." Charm is deceitful and beauty is passing, but a woman who fears the LORD, she shall be praised. Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates.

—Proverbs 31:10–31, NKIV

• • • • • • • • • • •

A society in which conjugal infidelity is tolerated must always be in the long run a society adverse to women. Women, whatever a few male songs and satires may say to the contrary, are more naturally monogamous than men; it is a biological necessity. Where promiscuity prevails, they will therefore always be more often the victims than culprits. Also, domestic happiness is more necessary to them than to us. And the quality by which they most easily hold a man, their beauty, decreases every year after they have come to maturity, but this does not happen to those qualities of personality—women don't really care two pence about our looks-by which we hold women. Thus in the ruthless war of promiscuity women are at a double disadvantage. They play for higher stakes and are also more likely to lose. I have no sympathy with moralists who frown at the increasing crudity of female provocativeness. These signs of desperate competition fill me with pity.

-C.S. Lewis, God in the Dock

ECONOMICS

"Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery."

"Little else is requiste to carry a state to the highest degree of opulence from the lowest barbarism but peace, easy taxes, and a tolerable administration of justice; all the rest being brought about by the natural course of things."

"If I were asked the difference between Socialism and Communism, I could only reply that the Socialist tries to lead us to disaster by foolish words and the Communist drives us there by violent deeds."

"Socialism is inseparably interwoven with totalitarianism and the abject worship of the State."

-Winston Churchill

The United States is functionally bankrupt. Our collective capacity to deal with this astonishing fact is seemingly nonexistent. Our national politics have become show business, exhibiting a complete refusal to strategically respond to this reality.

Let's look at the simple numbers of our national debt. Our on-the-books national debt is \$11.6 trillion. But offthe-books federal debt, including Medicare and Social Security, is \$107 trillion. This is not a made-up number; this is the money we should have in the bank, according to the federal government's own accountants, to pay for our current promises to our retirees and future retirees, and this doesn't include unfunded obligations that we have to the pensions and benefits promised to federal workers and veterans. Nor does it include huge unfunded pension and benefit obligations for other public employees at levels below the federal government.

But let's just add the \$11 trillion to the \$107 trillion, and we get \$118 trillion. These are big numbers but still just fifth-grade math. Now our total annual national output, or gross domestic product (GDP), is about \$14.3 trillion. Total federal receipts, or income if stated in business terms, are about \$2.5 trillion. This means that our debt to federal income ratio is about 47, and that ratio assumes that the federal revenues are free to retire the obligations, which they are not. We must pay for defense and a myriad of other programs. Again, in business terms, there is no free cash flow to pay these massive obligations.

Our total national private net worth, according to the Federal Reserve Board, is about \$51.5 trillion. That means our federal unfunded liabilities represent 2.3 times our

collective net worth. That's pretty darn broke.

Ask any accountant, banker, or anyone remotely familiar with simple accounting knowledge if we can service this debt, and the collective answer is a resounding "no." Any business with these ratios would be a complete basket case, hopelessly bankrupt. Unlike General Motors Corp., there is no one with the wherewithal to bail out the USA.

If anyone can write an intelligent response to how we can handle this massive problem, please respond. I would love to see the plan. I once asked one of my federal senators, Sen. Tom Harkin, Iowa Democrat, how we would handle this nightmare, and he simply replied, "We'll grow our way out of this."

Senator, I challenge you to lay out this cheery scenario. We are not politically set up to grow at 8 percent or 9 percent like China. We would have to adopt extremely aggressive pro-growth policies, and those are not politically acceptable at this time.

Even if we significantly slash the federal entitlements by half, we cannot fix this problem. Even if we increase federal receipts from the 50 year average of 18 ½ percent of GDP to say 27 percent, killing private-sector growth, we cannot fix the problem.

We are collectively broke. It is a horrible legacy we are leaving to our children.

Can common sense be restored?

—Mike Whalen, The Washington Times, August 11, 2009, p. A19

.

By the end of 2009, the US taxpayer will have subsidized the American global warming industry to the tune of \$79 billion—with trillions more to come. According to a new report, the figures reveal that the US government has established a near-monopsony that is hugely distorting climate science in favor of "self-serving alarmism."

Climate Money, published by the Science and Public Policy Institute (SPPI) in July, is the first report to compile the cost to the US taxpayers of national climate-related policies taken from figures in the government's own documents. Author Joanne Nova points to a "well funded, highly organized climate monopoly" that, she says, is wasting billions of dollars through the lack of any proper science "audit." That audit, she maintains, is instead being conducted by "unpaid volunteers" who have exposed the climate industry's "major errors time and again."

Most scathing is the accusation that the massive public expenditure has "created a powerful alliance of self-serving vested interests" drawn by the prospect of lucrative profits soon to be garnered from carbon trading.

Climate Money states that the US government has "poured in \$32 billion for climate research—and another \$36 billion for development of climate-related technologies" over the last 20 years. Yet, "after spending \$30 billion on pure science research, no one is able to point to a single piece of empirical evidence that man-made carbon dioxide has a significant effect on the global climate." The report makes the telling point that a burgeoning industry employing thousands and receiving billions in free government handouts simply has no "real incentive to 'announce' the discovery of the insignificance of carbon's role."

Nova also perceives a "ratchet effect", whereby pro-(anthropogenic—man-made—global warming)

The letter below was sent to one of Summit's speakers, Greg Koukl, who spoke at our Summit Australia conference.

We met in 2005 in Toowoomba, Australia and I have listened to every podcast since. I was 19 at the time and working in the video department at the church where you spoke as a part of Summit. We got to speak a few times that week and I remember approaching you at the end of the week and thanking you for your nature and demeanor throughout the process. I just wanted to let you know that in many ways, what you and others spoke about that weekend allowed me to be a Christian.

I say allowed, because Summit was literally the first time I had ever seen logical people speaking rationally about what I thought should have been one of the most rational and interesting topics before mankind, the nature of life and God. Simply put, it was the first time I had seen Christians who could think.

Perhaps that's a little of an exaggeration, but your lecture on "Truth is Not Ice-Cream," as well as Michael Bauman's "The Meaning of Meaning" were about Chris-

It was what I needed to realize there was truth behind the "emotions" of Christianity that I witnessed at my church and others. For the first time I saw that people could be smart at the same time as being Christians and in fact, that Christianity is the most logical answer to life's really tough questions.

So thank you! I am 22 now and I have spread the good word of Stand To Reason as much as I can and I have grown in my faith a lot thanks to listening to you and your guest speakers. I now listen to and read a wide variety of Christian thinkers like William Lane Craig, Peter Kreeft and Ravi Zacharias as well as the old classics like Lewis and Chesterton—all because four years ago you "left a stone in my shoe."

Thanks again—your friend in Australia

theory is "reported, repeated, trumpeted and asserted" while anti-AGW findings, often the work of unfunded, retired scientists, "lie unstudied, ignored, and delayed."

> —Peter C. Glover, Michael Economides, Human Events, August 10, 2009, p. 13

• • • • • • • • • • •

The left does not perceive that poverty is the human norm and therefore asks, "Why is there poverty?" instead of asking the economic question that matters: Why is there wealth? And the obvious result of the left's disinterest in why wealth is created is that the left does not know how to create it.

The reason the left asks why there is poverty instead of why there is wealth is that the left's preoccupying ideal is equality—not economic growth. And those who are preoccupied with equality are more troubled by wealth than by poverty. Ask almost anyone on the left—not a liberal, but a leftist like Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi-which society they consider more desirable, a society in which all its members were equally lower middle class or one in which some were poor, most were middle class, and some were rich (i.e., America today). And whatever they say, in their hearts, the further left they are the more they would prefer the egalitarian society.

The left everywhere seeks to make as big and powerful a state as possible. It does so because only the state can redistribute society's wealth. And because only a strong and powerful state can impose values on society. The idea of small government, the American ideal since its inception, is the antithesis of the left's ideal.

The cap-and-trade bill's control of American energy and the "ObamaCare" takeover of American health care will mean an unprecedented expansion of the state. Add increased taxes and the individual becomes less and less significant as the state looms ever larger. Americans will be left to decide little more than what they do with vacation time—just as Western Europeans do. Other questions are largely left to the state.

The left imposes its values on others whenever possible and to the extent possible. That is why virtually every totalitarian regime in the 20th century was left-wing. Inherent to all left-wing thought is a totalitarian temptation. People on the left know that not only are their values morally superior to conservative values, but that they themselves are morally superior to conservatives. Thus, for example, the former head of the Democratic Party, Howard Dean, could say in all seriousness, "In contradistinction to the Republicans, we don't think children ought to go to bed hungry at night."

Therefore, the morally superior have the right, indeed the duty, to impose their values on the rest of us: what light bulbs we use, what cars we drive, what we may ask a prospective employee, how we may discipline our children, and, of course, how much of our earnings we may keep.

It is dishonest to argue that the right wants to impose its values to anywhere near the extent the left does. This can be demonstrated to a fifth-grader: Who wants more power—those who want to govern a big state or those who want to govern a small state?

The president of the United States and much of the Democratic Party embody these left-wing principles. Right now, America's only hope of staying American rather than becoming European lies in making these principles as clear as possible to as many Americans as possible. The left is so giddy with power right now, we actually have a chance.

—Dennis Prager, Human Events, July 27, 2009, p. I

• • • • • • • • • • • • •

ETHIGS

The secular left claims we are evolutionary accidents who managed to crawl out of the slime and by "natural selection" stand erect and over millions of years out-smart our ancestors, the apes. If that is your belief, then you probably think health care should be rationed. Why spend lots of money to improve—or save—the life of someone who evolved from slime and has no special significance other than the "accident" of becoming human? Policies flow from such a philosophy, though the average secularist probably wouldn't put it in such stark terms. Stark or not, isn't this the inevitable progression of seeing humanity as maybe complex, but nothing special.

The opposing view sees human beings as unique creations. Even Thomas Jefferson, identified by historians as a Deist who doubted the existence of a personal God, understood that if certain rights (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness) do not come from a source beyond the reach of the state, then the state could take those rights away. Those who believe that God made us and also makes the rules about our existence and our behavior will have a completely different understanding of life's value and our approach to affirming it until natural death.

It is between these two distinctly different worldview goal posts that the battle is taking place. Few from the "endowed rights" side are saying that a 100-year-old with an inoperable brain tumor should be given extraordinary and expensive care to keep the heart pumping, even after brain waves have gone flat. But there is big difference between "letting go" and "snuffing out." The unnatural progression for many on the secular left is to see such a person as a "burden." In an age when we think we should be free of burdens—a notion that contributes to our superficiality and makes us morally obtuse—getting rid of a granny might seem perfectly rational, even defensible. But by doing so, we

assume an even greater burden: the role of God in deciding who gets to live and who must die. Anyone who has seen the film "Bruce Almighty" senses how difficult it is to play God.

We are now witnessing some of the consequences of attempting to ban people with a God perspective from the public square. If there are no rules and no one to whom one might appeal when those rules are violated, we are on our own to set whatever rules we wish and to change them in a moment in response to opinion polls. Any appeals to a higher authority stop at the Supreme Court.

The explosive town-hall meetings are indications that Americans are trusting government less and less. So where should we go? The answer is in your wallet or purse. It's on the money. Right now it is little more than a slogan, but what if it became true: in God we Trust.

—Cal Thomas, The Washington Times, August 11, 2009, p. A17

• • • • • • • • • • • •

Back on May I, we warned you that President Obama's health care proposals could lead to bureaucrats deciding when to "pull the plug" on an individual's medical treatment. That awful day is drawing nearer.

In an April 28 New York Times interview, the president spoke of having government guide a "very difficult democratic conversation" about "those toward the end of their lives [who] are accounting for potentially 80 percent of the total health care bill out here." Those statements sounded a little creepy to us. Deciding who gets denied care at the end of life should not be dependent on government cost controls.

Presidential health care adviser Ezekiel Emanuel, brother of White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel and chairman of the Department of Bioethics at the Clinical Center at the National Institutes of Health, has argued that independent government boards should decide policy on end-of-life care. He also has defended rationing care more strictly for older people because "allocation [of medical care] by age is not invidious discrimination."

It is in that light that House Republicans warn against draft Section 1233 of the House Democratic health care bill as an area of deep concern. It provides for seniors, every five years, to be provided "advance care planning consultation" for "end-of-life services." House Minority Leader John A. Boehner of Ohio and Republican Rep. Thaddeus McCotter of Michigan warn that the provision "may start us down a treacherous path toward government-encouraged euthanasia."

If that fear sounds far-fetched, consider that similar things already are happening in several states. As Jeff Emanuel explains, (no relation to the Obama officials) a panel of the US 11th Circuit Court of Appeals this spring ruled that Georgia can override a doctor's decision about how much care is warranted for a handicapped child because the state is "the final arbiter" of medical decisions.

The situation is even worse in Oregon, which has legalized "assisted suicide." As radio host and author Mark Levin has publicized in his best-seller Liberty and Tyranny, the Oregon health plan last year refused to pay for a recognized drug to prolong the life of lung cancer patient Barbara Wagner even after her oncologist prescribed it. Yet the same bureaucrats told Ms. Wagner the plan would indeed cover doctor-assisted suicide if she chose that option.

Saving her life was deemed too expensive, but paying her to die was just fine.

A year ago, on July 28, 2008, FoxNews.com reported that such cases aren't unique in Oregon but are becoming almost commonplace. For instance, until he raised a ruckus, 53-year-old prostate cancer patient Randy Stroup of Dexter, Ore., was denied new treatments but offered full payment if he would just agree to be killed.

As Jeff Emanuel noted in a post at the Red State blog, Oregon's plan expressly does not cover "medical equipment or supplies which will not benefit the patient for a reasonable length of time." Reasonableness is determined by green-eyeshade, budget-crunching bureaucrats rather than by doctors.

Mr. Obama's government health care proposal easily could devolve into a similar nightmare. That's reason enough for lawmakers to give this awful legislation a merciful death.

—Editorial, The Washington Times, July 29, 2009, p, A20

• • • • • • • • • • • • • •

A great man once said that a society is measured by how it treats those in the dawn of life, those in the shadows of life, and those in the twilight of life. . . Because they are hidden, both in the dawn and in the shadows of life, we kill 400 late-term unborn children every day in America using methods that cause such agonizing pain to the child that it would be illegal under federal law if it was done to an animal."

> —Connie Hair, Human Events, Special Supplement, "The Facts About the Freedom of Choice Act"

for even more articles like these, visit summit.org and subscribe to our "worldviews in the news" RSS feed (updated daily)

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).

Did You Know?

There is an online PDF version of The Journal uploaded to our website around the first of every month.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES Adult Worldview Conferences



Because culture is always changing

Did you know that students aren't the only ones who need worldview training? It's true! That's why we are proud to offer a week-long worldview course for adults. Space is limited, so register today. Colorado Conference

Feb 28 - March 06, 2009

Colorado Springs, CO

Tennessee Conference

July 18 - July 23, 2010

Dayton, TN

To register, visit summit.org or call us at 719.685.9103

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.