

•the journal



June 2010

Volume 10 Issue #6



summit
O FORD

IN THIS ISSUE:

- » pg. 2 | Summit Oxford Update: Michael Ward
- » pg. 3 | Letter from the Editor: David A. Noebel
- » pg. 4 | Highlights from around the Globe
 - * *Christianity, Economics, Climate Change, and Politics*
 - * *More articles can be found in the online version of The Journal at summit.org*

“Therefore we also, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses [i.e., ‘heroes of the faith’], let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which so easily ensnares us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.”
—Hebrews 12:1–2 (NKJV)

SUMMIT OXFORD UPDATE

a word from Revd Michael Ward, author of *Planet Narnia*

2

C.S. Lewis on Christian Scholarship

by Michael Ward

As an Englishman living and working in Oxford, I meet a great number of Americans. Many are members of Oxford University; many are tourists. In the past two years I have greatly enjoyed getting to know a particularly fine example of the species: the Summit American.

I now have lectured several times for the Summit Oxford Study Centre about my work on C.S. Lewis. I have even had the chance to visit the home of Summit Ministries in Colorado, where I discovered how appropriate the name 'Summit' really is. *Altitude sickness was a new experience for me!*

Summit Oxford students, like most students in Oxford, tend to be more than usually intelligent. But the typical Summit Oxford student, so I have noticed, has another dimension. He or she is not only smart, but also *purposeful*. Summit Oxford aims to promote 'scholarship for the sake of the church and the culture'. The students I have met evidently keep at the forefront of their minds the transformative effect that they may have on the church and on the culture at large as highly educated members of God's kingdom on earth.

The subject of my own studies, C.S. Lewis, is a good figure to consider when thinking about the life of the Christian scholar. He was a brilliant student at Oxford who taught there for nearly thirty years before finishing up his career as Professor of Medieval and Renaissance Literature at Cambridge. He published six books with Oxford University Press and three with Cambridge University Press. He became a Fellow of the British Academy and received five honorary doctorates. By any standards, his was a remarkably successful career.

But in what way was Lewis's scholarship Christian? How does scholarship fulfil the commands to love God and one's neighbour? I see three main ways in which his work was Christian. I list them in ascending order of importance.

At the most basic level, Lewis's scholarship was Christian by being diligent and honest. In saying this, I am not implying that non-Christian scholarship is lazy or untrustworthy. I am saying that standards of hard work and straightforwardness apply to Christian scholars as much as they apply to all scholars. There is no justification for Christians cutting corners because 'God will forgive me'. There is no justification for avoiding unpalatable facts that don't easily chime with Christian preconceptions.

Stepping up to the next rung, we see that Lewis's professional scholarship as a literary critic was Christian because, even though it never explicitly espoused Christianity, it rested on the assumption that Christianity is true. As he wrote in an essay called 'Christian Apologetics':

What we want is not more little books about Christianity, but more little books by Christians on other subjects — with their Christianity latent. . . . It is not the books written in direct defense of Materialism that make the modern man a materialist; it is the materialistic assumptions in all the other books.

At the third and highest level — the summit, if you like — Lewis's scholarship was Christian because it was undertaken for non-utilitarian reasons. This is a very important point and one that requires explanation. He meant that scholarship should be part of the good life, an activity of 'free men'. Scholarly studies should be undertaken 'for their own sake', for pure and disinterested reasons, simply because we are free and like to know and understand things, not only because they have to achieve certain ends, however worthy those ends might be.

Of course, seeking knowledge and beauty for their own sake 'does not exclude their being for God's sake' (as Lewis wrote in 'Learning in War-Time'). The point Lewis is making is that scholarship is a good thing even if we cannot see its immediate evangelistic relevance. 'That relevance may not be intended for us but for our betters — for men who come after and find the spiritual significance of what we dug out in blind and humble obedience to our vocation.'

Christian scholarship is diligent and honest, is purposeful, and is a good endeavour even when we cannot see its immediate utility. If scholarship is your calling, Summit Oxford (www.summitoxford.org) should be among your destinations.



The Revd Dr Michael Ward is Chaplain of St Peter's College, Oxford. He is the author of *Planet Narnia: The Seven Heavens in the Imagination of C.S. Lewis* (Oxford University Press) and co-editor of *The Cambridge Companion to C.S. Lewis* (Cambridge University Press).

Under the tutelage of Oxford University faculty and the guidance of the Summit Oxford Director, this program equips and encourages a new generation of Christian scholars to be salt and light in the academy and throughout the culture. If you know capable and committed university students who could profit from a term at Summit Oxford, please let us know. If you desire to help finance this visionary program, please don't hesitate to contact us (see the reply device in this *Journal*).

summit
OXFORD

from the PRESIDENT'S DESK

a word from Dr. Noebel

3

I've been thinking ... well, I've been reading and thinking. I've been reading Erwin Lutzer's latest work *When A Nation Forgets God: Seven Lessons We Must Learn From Nazi Germany*. Published by Moody Publishers, the Moody Church pastor analyzes how the church in Germany fell under the sway of Adolph Hitler. Here's the bad news: "By far the majority of the Lutheran churches sided with Hitler and his spectacular reforms." The good news: "But a minority, under the leadership of Bonhoeffer and Niemoller, chose to pull away from the established church to form the 'Confessing Church.'"

I find it disturbing that the Obama administration is trying to use churches, including evangelical churches, for its own political purposes.

The May 3, 2010 issue of *The Weekly Standard* carries an article by Meghan Clyne entitled "The Green Shepherd" describing how the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships is seeking to enroll gullible Christian churches in its efforts to control the climate—paraded under the guise of fighting poverty and injustice.

One of the "Green Shepherds" chosen by the Obama administration to deceive evangelicals is none other than the Rev. Jim Wallis!

Clyne's article's subtitle summarizes the administration's underlying political goal: "The White House Wants Churches to Advance Its Climate Change Agenda." She points out that while Wallis wrote in December 2006 that "Republicans shamelessly politicized the faith-based initiative" Wallis himself is now "a member of Obama's faith-based council and has also met with congressional Democrats to help them frame their policies in more morally appealing terms." These Wallis-trained Democrats will in turn make "inroads with religious voters." Sound similar to Hitler's making inroads with the Lutherans of his day?

Here is Students for a Democratic Society's Jim Wallis, defender of Fidel Castro, and a party to the proliferation of Communist revolutions throughout Central America, moving amongst the evangelicals and deceiving them left and left! Wallis has been a radical ever since he graduated from Michigan State University. (If you're interested in more commentary on Wallis and his *Sojourners* magazine, see "Barack Obama's 'Red' Spiritual Advisor" article posted on Summit's website under the President's desk.)

Wallis' ability to deceive reaches high into evangelical circles. For example, an article posted on the *Sojourners* blog entitled "Beyond Charity: Living a Life of Compassion and Justice" written by the wife of Willow Creek pastor Bill Hybels says the following: "The battle against injustice is a tough and ugly war. While I am proud that Willow has

entered that war, the truth is we have just begun to fight. ... I look forward to the day when we as a church will be known for being the greenest church on the planet, not just because we enjoy the beauty of God's creation, but because we know that climate change is a justice issue." Included in her suggested reading list is Jim Wallis and his *Sojourners* magazine.



This idea that climate change is a justice/injustice issue is one hundred percent in synch with the President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, which "envisions the 'partnership' between government and religious institutions as a means of spreading the administration's environmental warnings, rather than just a way to help churches feed the hungry and clothe the poor." No wonder Clyne closes her article with the comment, "Perhaps it's only reasonable that global

warming activists would turn to God for help as the scientific case for their position collapses."

But let me be blunt and suggest that Mrs. Hybels would be better informed if she would read Theodore Dalrymple's *Life at the Bottom*, Peter Bauer's *Equality, the Third World, and Economic Delusion*, and Thomas Sowell's *Intellectuals and Society*.

In fact, if she were to read Sowell's work she would discover at least one secret to lifting the poor out of poverty, which we can assume is her desire in attaining "social justice" since she never clearly articulates what she means by the term. Writes Sowell, "Under new economic policies beginning in the 1990s, tens of millions of people in India have risen above that country's poverty level. In China, under similar policies begun earlier, a million people a month have risen out of poverty."

Unfortunately this is not welcomed news by the radical left because these economic policies are capitalistic and hence politically incorrect. Sowell quotes French writer Raymond Aron who admits that intellectuals want to see prosperity only "through State intervention" and "the revolutionary code" and hence are resentful over such capitalistic victories. Better poor under socialism than well off under capitalism seems to be their motto!

Indeed, a fellow lecturer told me of his recent trip to Cuba where "social justice" reigns supreme. Everyone in Cuba works for the government and receives \$15 a month (doctors receive \$18) which barely buys beans and rice and a little cooking oil. The 500 pastors he taught for a week said that Cuba today is an island prison and no can escape. People are starving even though their waters are alive with

continued on next page

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

highlights from around the globe

4

fish, but no fishing boats are allowed since they would be used to escape from paradise to the evil United States.

This is the Cuba that the Rev. Jim Wallis and his *Sojourners* crowd hold up as an example of “social justice.” Question: Is this Mrs. Hybels’ understanding of “social justice”? Why doesn’t she make it her short term mission trip to rescue some of those 500 wives of those 500 preachers who are begging for help to escape their prison of poverty and hopelessness?

According to Olavo de Carvalho, nearly a dozen Latin American countries are presently being ruled by Communist or pro-communist parties. Are evangelical Christians so ignorant and/or misinformed of what is entailed in so-called “social justice” policies that they are willing to sacrifice the poor for an idea that hasn’t worked in nearly 5,000 years of recorded history?

Well, I’m still thinking! What I think is that Mrs. Hybels and her husband need to read Erwin Lutzer’s *When A Nation Forgets God* and then attend a two-week session at the Summit this summer!

BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

✝ And what more shall I say? For the time would fail me to tell of Gideon and Barak and Samson and Jephthah, also of David and Samuel and the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, worked righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, became valiant in battle, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again.

Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. Still others had trial of mockings and scourgings, yes, and of chains and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn in two, were tempted, were slain with the sword. They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented—of whom the world was not worthy. They wandered in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth.

And all these, having obtained a good testimony through faith, did not receive the promise, God having provided something better for us, that they should not be made perfect apart from us.

—Hebrews 11:32–40 (NKJV)

The central miracle asserted by Christians is the Incarnation. They say that God became Man. Every other miracle prepares for this, or exhibits this, or results from this. Just as every natural event is the manifestation at a

particular place and moment of Nature’s total character, so every particular Christian miracle manifests at a particular place and moment the character and significance of the Incarnation. There is no question in Christianity of arbitrary interferences just scattered about. It relates not a series of disconnected raids on Nature but the various steps of a strategically coherent invasion—an invasion which intends complete conquest and “occupation.” The fitness, and therefore credibility, of the particular miracles depends on their relation to the Grand Miracle; all discussion of them in isolation from it is futile.

—C.S. Lewis, *Miracles*

If it [Incarnation] happened, it was the central event in the history of the Earth.

—C.S. Lewis, *Miracles*

In Christ alone, who took on flesh,
Fullness of God in helpless Babe.
This gift of love and righteousness
Scorned by the ones He came to save.
‘Til on that cross as Jesus died
The wrath of God was satisfied;
For all my sin on Him was laid,
Here in the death of Christ I stand.

No guilt in life, no fear in death,
This is the pow’r of Christ in me.
From life’s first cry to final breath,
Jesus commands my destiny.
No pow’r of hell, no scheme of man
Can ever pluck me from His hand.
‘Til He returns or calls me home,
Here in the pow’r of Christ I’ll stand.
Here in the pow’r of Christ I’ll stand!

—Stuart Townend, Keith Getty

ECONOMICS

\$ Bernie Madoff is still alive as of this writing. He is the world’s reigning champion, title holder in the Ponzi league. Yet, compared to America’s system of public finance, his scheme was penny ante ... chickenfeed. The nature of the scheme is most easily understood by looking forward rather than backward. President Obama announced two weeks before he was sworn in that Americans faced “trillion dollar deficits for years to come.” Already, the estimate of the deficit for 2009 was \$1.18 trillion. Some experts predicted a deficit over \$2 trillion. At least one guessed that it would come in over \$3 trillion, if not in 2009 then the following year.

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

highlights from around the globe

5

These huge deficits did not seem to disturb the sleep of the homeland bound citizens. A trillion-dollar annual deficit, over five years, would add about \$50,000 to each family's burden of debt. But some intuition assured Americans that they will never have to pay it. By instinct alone, they knew it was a Ponzi scheme.

—William Bonner & Addison Wiggin,
The New Empire of Debt, p. 314–15



America's empire of debt rests on many huge deceptions that we have described in this book:

- That one generation can consume—and stick the next with the bill.
- That you can get something for nothing.
- That the rest of the world will take American IOUs forever—no questions asked.
- That house prices will forever go up.
- That American labor is inherently more valuable than foreign labor.
- That the American capitalist system is freer, more dynamic, and more productive than other systems.
- That other countries want to be more like America, even if it is forced on them.
- That the virtues [thrift, balanced budgets, work ethic] that made America rich and powerful are no longer required to keep it rich and powerful.
- That domestic savings and capital investment are no longer necessary.
- That the United States no longer needs to make things for export.
- In particular, deception that sent credit expansion soaring between 2001 and 2005 came eagerly from America's own central bank. By setting its key lending rate below the current inflation rate, the Fed misled almost everyone.

—Ibid., p. 271



And now, the pax wrought by the American empire works against America. Asian factories are newer and more modern. Asian workers are younger and cheaper. Now, every business day that passes, the Asians grab a little more of the U.S. market. And every business day puts Americans \$2 billion further beholden to its mostly Asian creditors.

—Ibid., p. 210



Even as late as the early '60s, John F. Kennedy could still appeal to heroic urge without drawing a laugh. "Ask not what your country can do for you," he said in his inaugural address, "ask what you can do for your country."

But 11 years later, Richard Nixon, like Nero before him, began the process of debasing the money. That was a solution, too; the United States had spent too much. Nixon would worry about the fire code later. First he opened up with the firehose: He defaulted on America's promise to exchange dollars for gold at the statutory rate.

We are in the twenty-first century now. Barbarous reflections rise up like swamp gas. The whole place stinks of them. Bernanke and Obama offer solutions. But their plans to save the world from a correction are little more than a swindle of the next generation. They offer to bail out the mistakes of one generation with debt laid onto the next.


"Regarding the current financial meltdown," writes Rony Teitelbaum, "it is very clear that two main factors underlie the political reactions to the crisis, the first being pressure originating from ties between the financial and the political elect, manifested by taxpayer bailouts of large institutions that continue to deliver bonuses to the executives and donate to political campaigns. For those of us who are not blind, these are clear signs of political corruption which would have made the worst Roman emperor blush. The second factor is political pressure originating from the mass public. The kind of solutions offered so far, and I may add which were received with very warm enthusiasm, were tax rebates and gasoline tax holidays. These are actions aimed at a public who 'impatiently expected quick and obvious results,' to quote Cary's description of Roman society in AD 300. [*A History of Rome*]."

Circa 2009, there is hardly a soul in the entire world who has not been corrupted by the *barbarie della riflessione* [barbarism of reflection] of the late imperial period. Both patricians and plebes are for bailouts. Both business and labor back stimulus programs. The taxpayers and the politicians who rule them are of one mind. Liberal, conservative, rich, poor, Republican, Democrat all speak with a single voice: "Screw the next generation!"

The Golden Age of American capitalism is over, in other words. In the space of half a century it passed from gold, to silver, to paper . . . and is now somewhere between plastic and navel lint.

—Ibid., p. 318–19

CLIMATE CHANGE

 If the Obama administration has its way, the gospel of climate change will be coming to a pulpit near you. That at least seems to be the dream of the President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships—a 25-member group of leaders from across the reli-

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

highlights from around the globe

6

gious spectrum that is part of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships.

Last month, the council spent a day at the White House briefing senior administration officials on its “final report of recommendations” for improving collaboration between the government and religious organizations. The 164-page document, entitled “A New Era of Partnerships,” takes up the “priority areas” identified by President Obama—Economic Recovery and Domestic Poverty, Fatherhood and Healthy Families, Environment and Climate Change, Global Poverty and Development, and Interreligious Cooperation.

Poverty, families, interreligious co-operation: All pretty standard. But what does an office created to help better provide social services to the needy have to do with climate change?

—*The Weekly Standard*, May 3, 2010, p. 14



As a former director of Bush’s faith-based office, Jim Towey, notes: “I can see that there’s a spiritual imperative to take good care of the earth . . . but it’s a tradeoff. If you’re going to direct [congregations’] attention toward that, it comes at the expense of the poor. Who’s advocating for them?”

Towey also points to the double-standard when it comes to criticism of Obama’s faith-based office and Bush’s. Opponents accused Bush of seeking to exploit churches for the administration’s political ends; the evangelical activist pastor Jim Wallis, for instance, wrote in December 2006 that “Republicans shamelessly politicized the faith-based initiative.” Yet Wallis is a member of Obama’s faith-based council and has also met with congressional Democrats to help them frame their policies in more morally appealing terms. The director of Obama’s faith-based office—a young Pentecostal preacher named Joshua DuBois—was tapped for the post fresh off his time as director of religious affairs for Obama’s presidential campaign. DuBois’s deputy, Mara Vanderslice, was director of religious outreach during John Kerry’s presidential run in 2004 and started a consulting firm aimed at helping Democrats make inroads with religious voters.

The use of churches and congregations to advance the administration’s climate-change agenda, Towey says, “looks a lot like this is simply a political outreach initiative.” He adds: “The faith-based office was supposed to be a common-ground effort with Republicans and Democrats working to assist the poor—and that’s just long gone.”

—*Ibid.*, p. 15


Perhaps it’s only reasonable that global-warming activists would turn to God for help as the scientific case for their position collapses. As if Climategate had never

happened, the council report asserts with blind faith: “Adequately addressing global climate change—through better and more extensive partnerships with non-profits and other efforts—will result, for example, in less migration, fewer refugee crises, and greater food security.” The swollen Red Sea will part, the waters of Noah’s greenhouse-gas-fueled flood will recede, and the meek shall inherit the earth. All it takes is a little federal infiltration of America’s houses of worship.

—*Ibid.*

Editors Note: We recommend the following organizations for a balanced, healthy discussion of “climate change.” a) The Science and Environmental Policy Project (S. Fred Singer, President); b) The Heartland Institute; c) The Cornwall Alliance (Cal Beisner, Spokesman). The most dishonest “climate change” organization is the Chicago Climate Exchange with connections to Barack Obama, Al Gore, and Goldman Sachs. If possible, watch the Glenn Beck television show of April 26, 2010 for a full exposure of the CCX and its affiliations. The raw truth is that global warming is as much of a hoax as global cooling was in the 1970s. But it will destroy the capitalistic economic system if allowed. See Thomas Sowell’s *Intellectuals and Society* for a full defense of capitalism and why intellectuals can’t stomach it. Great study!

POLITICS

 Opponents of the popular expression of conservative opposition to big government, the tea party, regularly note that tea partiers are overwhelmingly white. This is intended to disqualify the tea parties from serious moral consideration.

But there are two other facts that are far more troubling:

The first is the observation itself. The fact that the Left believes that the preponderance of whites among tea partiers invalidates the tea party movement tells us much more about the Left than it does about the tea partiers.

It confirms that the Left really does see the world through the prism of race, gender, and class rather than through the moral prism of right and wrong.

One of the more dangerous features of the Left has been its replacement of moral categories of right and wrong, and good and evil with three other categories: black and white (race), male and female (gender), and rich and poor (class).

Therefore the Left pays attention to the skin color—and gender (not just “whites” but “white males”)—of the tea partiers rather than to their ideas.

One would hope that all people would assess ideas by their moral rightness or wrongness, not by the race, gender, or class of those who hold them. But in the world of the

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

highlights from around the globe

7

Left, people are taught not to assess ideas but to identify the race, class, and gender of those who espouse those ideas. This helps explain the widespread use of ad hominem attacks by the Left: Rather than argue against their opponents' ideas, the Left usually dismisses those making the argument disagreed with as "racist," "intolerant," "bigoted," "sexist," "homophobic," and/or "xenophobic."

You're against race-based affirmative action? No need to argue the issue because you're a racist. You're a tea partier against ever-expanding government? No need to argue the issue because you're a racist.

As a Leftist rule of thumb—once again rendering intellectual debate unnecessary and impossible—white is wrong or bad, and non-white is right and good; male is wrong and bad, and female is right and good; and the rich are wrong and bad, and the poor right and good. For the record, there is one additional division on the Left—strong and weak—to which the same rule applies: The strong are wrong and bad, and the weak are right and good. That is a major reason for Leftist support of the Palestinians (weak) against the Israelis (strong), for example.

This is why, to cite another example, men are dismissed when they oppose abortion. The idea is far less significant than the sex of the advocate. As for women who oppose abortion on demand, they are either not authentically female or simply traitors to their sex. Just as the Left depicts blacks who oppose race-based affirmative action as not authentic blacks or are traitors to their race.

In this morally inverted world, the virtual absence of blacks from tea party rallies cannot possibly reflect anything negative on the black and minority absence, only on the white tea partiers.

But in a more rational and morally clear world, where people judge ideas by their legitimacy rather than by the race of those who held them, people would be as likely to ask why blacks and ethnic minorities are virtually absent at tea parties just as they now ask why whites predominate. They would want to know if this racial imbalance said anything about black and minority views or necessarily reflected negatively on the whites attending those rallies.

And if they did ask such un-PC questions, they might draw rather different conclusions than the Left's. First, they would know that the near-absence of blacks and Hispanics no more implied racism on the part of tea partiers than the near-absence of blacks and Hispanics in the New York Philharmonic implies racism on the part of that orchestra.

Second, they might even, Heaven forbid, conclude that it does not reflect well on the political outlook of blacks and Hispanics that they so overwhelmingly identify with ever-larger government. Leftist big-government policies have been disastrous for black America just as they were in the countries that most Hispanics emigrated from. But like the gambling addict who keeps gambling the more he loses,

those addicted to government entitlements keep increasing the size of the government even as their situation worsens.

Finally, if one eschews the "racism" explanation and asks real questions, one might also conclude that America generally, and conservatives specifically, have failed to communicate America's distinct values—E Pluribus Unum, In God We Trust, and Liberty (which includes small government)—to blacks and Hispanics.

Unfortunately, however, no real exploration of almost any important issue in American life is possible as long as the Left focuses on the race, gender, and class of those who hold differing positions. And that will not happen. For when the Left stops attacking people and starts arguing positions, we will see what the Left most fears: blacks and Hispanics at tea parties.

—Dennis Prager, *Front Page Magazine*, April 27, 2010



It's really hard to create political incentives that will keep legislators from overspending. Conservatives should know this, because we've tried it before. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act of 1985, which enacted automatic federal spending cuts if the deficit exceeded predefined targets, went through hell, high water, and the federal courts before its provisions were allowed to kick in. But when they did kick in, they worked. They worked with a hard and furious vengeance: The deficit was reduced from \$332 billion in 1986 to \$153 billion in 1989, from 5.2 percent of GDP to 2.8 percent of GDP. In fact, Gramm-Rudman worked so well that Congress, facing real spending constraints for the first time, killed the act replacing it with the toothless Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

—*National Review*, May 3, 2010, p. 42



Britain, after 13 years of Labour rule, has become two nations on many levels. The average public-sector worker earns more than his private-sector counterpart for the first time. London and the south still resemble the Britain of the Thatcher years. They power the rest of the economy. Meanwhile, parts of the north of England, as well as Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, are almost "Sovietized." Seventy percent of Northern Ireland's income is accounted for by state activity.

—*Ibid.*, p. 29

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



American Christian College
dba Summit Ministries
PO Box 207
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Newton, KS
PERMIT 867

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 INSTITUTE

Summit Semester



Summit Semester.

Because how to think influences what you believe

At Summit Semester, students will continue to establish a biblical worldview in a 3 month academic retreat. Held in a Rocky Mountain Lodge, students, staff, and Christian scholars build a community that will nurture spiritual formation and strengthen intellectual thought.

Snow Wolf Lodge, Pagosa Springs, CO

September 10 – December 04, 2010

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.

PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, Colorado 80829 | **Phone:** 719.685.9103 | **Fax:** 719.685.9330 | **E-mail:** journal@summit.org

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

more highlights from around the globe

9

HISTORY

Virginia governor Bob Mc Donnell declared April 2010 Confederate History Month. Virginia is the cradle of that history—Richmond, Appomattox, Jackson, Lee—and the Confederacy's drama and its virtues (bravery, honor) should be remembered. But McDonnell inserted, only after others' objections and his own apology, one salient aspect of Confederate History, slavery. Why mention it? Because the Confederacy did. "The prevailing ideas entertained by [Jefferson] and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old constitution, were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature. . . . It was an evil they knew not well how to deal with, but the general opinion of the men of that day was that, somehow or other in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery—subordination to the superior race—is his natural and normal condition This stone which was rejected by the first builders 'is become the chief of the corner'—the real 'corner-stone'—in our new edifice." —Alexander Stephens, vice president of the Confederate States of America, March 21, 1861.

—*National Review*, May 3, 2010, 4

Editors Note: For a full telling of the slavery issue see Thomas Sowell's *Black Rednecks and White Liberals*. While the West is pillared for practicing slavery Sowell notes two unmentionables: 2) the whole world practiced black slavery and b) the west ended the practice.

SOCIOLOGY

Then I started to notice inconsistencies and hypocrisies in the ideologies of the far left. They were critical of capitalism and the free market, citing economic inequities, yet they could never pinpoint a better alternative. There was no recognition of the fact that people from oppressive regimes are diving through hoops to immigrate to our free society. The leftist political elite was especially hypocritical, fattening itself off of the victimization of others, twisting facts, and politicizing them for votes. They live a life of luxury off taxpayer dollars of which the lions share comes from the affluent — that they condemn. After the wine and caviar, they sanctimoniously parade themselves as champions of the poor, encouraging the victim complex and institutionalized learned helplessness through State handouts. Then they gleefully play the far left media like a fiddle, which makes them like the good guys to the public. Their hidden motto: strengthen the State, weaken the population.

—Christine Williams, *Front Page Magazine*, April 27, 2010

A true feminist cares about the dignity and advancement of women everywhere. A healthy mind, a healthy soul, and a healthy body is what I try to strive for and would like to see other women achieve the same. Personal choice determines outcome and education and awareness influence choice. The problem with radical leftist feminists: they are faux feminists who despise their own femininity; don't like to talk about male-female differences, put down other women's choices that differ from their own, and couldn't care less about the plight of women abroad who don't even have the right to choose; women who are getting burned alive, acid thrown in their faces, given as child brides, stoned for getting raped, mutilated, and murdered to preserve the "honor" of a family.

These faux feminists also fight for a woman's right to abortion on demand. The real question is: whose demand? Women are often coerced by someone at a very vulnerable time with no rights to informed consent and this is downplayed in our culture. In China, women are actually forced to have abortions with the one child policy. Where are the radical feminist voices here, to encourage education for the moral, ethical, and economic advancement of women everywhere?

The problem is that most radical feminists need to sort out their own inner rage. Many of them have their reasons to be angry, but when a cause is driven by resentment instead of genuine caring, nothing good and lasting can be accomplished.

—Ibid.



In the United Kingdom, "civilized society" cedes turf remorselessly: the highest drug use in Europe, highest incidence of sexually transmitted disease, highest number of single mothers; marriage is all but defunct, except for toffs, upscale gays, and Muslims. Britain's social disintegration ought to be a major election issue, but the governing class is always the most insulated and thus the last to notice, even when the "underclass" is all over the map. Alan Jay Lerner's biggest hit concerned a man who took a "Creature from the gutter" and transformed her into an English lady. Today, an entire country is down-wardly mobile.

—Mark Steyn, *National Review*, May 2, 2010, p. 56

MORE ON THE ECONOMY

These are the leading culprits who actually caused the subprime mortgage collapse which then caused the current worldwide deep recession.

1. Jimmy Carter pushed for and signed into law the Community Reinvestment Act which forced banks to lower their standards so that previously unqualified people could get a mortgage.

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

more highlights from around the globe

10

2. Bill Clinton then doubled-down on the Community Reinvestment Act and greatly lowered mortgage standards to allow a lot more unqualified borrowers to get loans.

3. Bill Clinton's Attorney General, Janet Reno, then intimidated banks with threats of legal action if they did not give loans to unqualified borrowers who would not have the income to pay the loans back.

4. A member of the Clinton administration, Franklin Raines was then put in charge of Fannie Mae by Bill Clinton. Fannie Mae bought up a majority of the bad loans made by banks to unqualified borrowers. Raines then falsified Fannie Mae financial reports so he could collect bonuses which totaled over \$90 million for 5 years.

5. Senator Chris Dodd, head of the Senatorial Financial Committee, suppressed efforts by President George W. Bush and congressional Republicans to rein in the corruption at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. He got a very favorable loan by a bank associated with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. He got large political campaign contributions from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

6. Barney Frank, head of the House of Representatives Banking Committee, also suppressed efforts by President George W. Bush and Congressional Republicans to investigate corruption at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

7. Barack Obama, while he was an attorney, filed lawsuits against banks on behalf of ACORN in order to force banks to give loans to people who could not afford to pay them back. Obama, while he was a U.S. Senator, also suppressed efforts by President George W. Bush and Republican Congressmen to investigate and rein in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

—*National Review*, May 3, 2010, p. 21



When liberals advocate a value-added tax, conservatives should respond: Taxing consumption has merits, so we will consider it—after the 16th Amendment is repealed.

A VAT will be rationalized as necessary to restore fiscal equilibrium.

But without ending the income tax, a VAT would be just a gargantuan instrument for further subjugating Americans to government.

Believing that a crisis is a useful thing to create, the Obama administration—which understands that, for liberalism, worse is better—has deliberately aggravated the fiscal shambles that the Great Recession accelerated.

During the downturn, federal revenue plunged and spending soared. And, as will happen for two decades, every day 10,000 more baby boomers are joining the ranks of recipients of Medicare and Social Security, two programs with unfunded liabilities of nearly \$107 trillion.

In the context of this concatenation of troubles, the administration's highest priority was to put an enormous new healthcare entitlement on the welfare state's rickety scaffolding. Why? Because the liberals' lunge to maximize government's growth depends on quickly creating a crisis that can be called a threat to the entitlement menu and to the currency as a store of value. Then the public can be panicked into accepting the addition of a VAT to the existing menu of taxes.

A VAT is collected on value added at stages during the process of production, but most of its burden is borne by consumers. They file no VAT returns, so its stealthiness delights the political class, which can increase it in small, barely noticed increments, with every percentage point yielding another \$100 billion.

Although the nation's welfare often varies inversely with that of the political class, a VAT would ameliorate a real problem: Americans consume too much and save too little. Furthermore, today's baroque tax code drives economic distortions and enables corruptions.

Corporations do not pay taxes; they collect them, passing the burden to consumers as a cost of production. And corporate taxation is a feast of rent-seeking—a cornucopia of credits, exemptions and other subsidies conferred by the political class on favored, and grateful, corporations.

Because the income tax is not broadly based, it radiates moral hazard: Its incentives are for perverse behavior. The top 1 percent of earners provide 40 percent of that tax's receipts; the top 5 percent provide 61 percent; the bottom 50 percent provide 3 percent. So the tax makes a substantial majority complacent about government's growth.

Increasingly, the income tax is codified envy. A VAT is the political class's recourse when the resources of the minority that is targeted by the envious are insufficient to finance ravenous government.

Because a VAT would shred Barack Obama's promise not to increase any tax on households with incomes less than \$250,000, he must hope the deficit reduction commission he created will provide cover for his apostasy. But 14 of the commission's 18 members must endorse any recommendation.

Good luck finding two votes for a VAT among the six Republican members—Sens. Judd Gregg, Tom Coburn, and Michael Crapo, and Reps. Paul Ryan, Dave Camp, and Jeb Hensarling.

And wait until the political class's most imperious masters, the elderly, are heard from. When they worked they paid taxes on their incomes; retired, they will resent—they are virtuosos of resentment—being taxed when they spend their savings.

Because a VAT potentially taxes everything, it would be riddled with exemptions. This is because it maximizes the

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

more highlights from around the globe

11

political class's opportunities for showing favoritism—by, for example, exempting certain “green” goods.

It also widens that class's scope for the pleasure of being bossy. For example, it could reduce a VAT's regressiveness—like rain, a VAT falls equally on the rich and the poor, but the poor devote a larger portion of their income to consumption—by exempting most foods but not those that the nanny state disapproves: “Put down that sugary soda and step away from the vending machine!”

Money is time made tangible—the time invested in the earning of it.

Taxation is the confiscation of the earner's time. Although some taxation is necessary, all taxation diminishes freedom. Adding a VAT without subtracting the income tax would constrict Americans' freedom much more than the health-care legislation does.

Because the 16th Amendment will not be repealed, adoption of a VAT would proclaim the impossibility of serious spending reductions and hence would be the obituary for the Founders' vision of limited government.

—George Will, *Newsmax*, April 19, 2010

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Gao Zhisheng is a human-rights lawyer and one of the greatest men in all of China. He has defended such abused and defenseless people as Falun Gong practitioners. And he himself has been abused, tortured at length and in unspeakable ways. In February 2009, the authorities “disappeared” him. It was unknown whether he was alive or dead. This March, they resurfaced him, and he had obviously been through yet more hell. Reserved and wan, he announced in an interview that he was through with dissidence. They had broken him. “I don't have the capacity to preserve,” he said. He wanted a more normal life with his wife and children. “Everybody will be disappointed” in his withdrawal from the field, he said. “Some people were really involved, concerned, supportive, making appeals. So when they read my words they will definitely feel disappointed. To them, I apologize. I'm extremely sorry.” He has nothing to be sorry about. But the Chinese government and its apologists in free countries do.

—*National Review*, May 3, 2010, p. 12

In March, the Palestinian Authority named a town square after Dalal Mughrabi, the terrorist who led the “Coastal Road Massacre”: Thirty-eight people were killed, including 13 children. Now the PA is planning to build its presidential compound on a street named for Yihyeh Ayyash, the suicide-bombing maestro known as “The Engineer.” Scores of innocent were killed in the attacks he planned. And to

think, some Israelis question the PA's willingness to live in peace, side by side.

—Ibid.

It is hard to grasp the hecatomb Poland suffered when the plane of Pres. Lech Kaczynski crashed trying to land in a fog in Smolensk, Russia. Kaczynski and dozens of Polish officials and dignitaries perished. The loss was compounded by irony: The victims were on their way to commemorate the Katyn Forest Massacre of 1940, when the Soviets murdered 20,000 Polish officers and professionals. The Soviets blamed the deed on the Nazis until 1990, and have not formally apologized even now. Vladimir Putin attended a commemoration of Katyn Forest three days before Kaczynski was to have arrived and spoke respectful words, though he also muddled the waters, saying it would be “a lie ... to place the blame for these crimes on the Russian people.” Who blames the Russian people? History blames Stalin. Poland, a nation of liberty and law, can survive its tragedies. Is your legacy so secure, Mr. Putin?

—Ibid.

ConocoPhillips agreed to sell its stake in a Canadian oil-sands project to China Petroleum & Chemical Corp. for \$4.65 billion, in a major North American expansion by a Chinese oil company.

The deal demonstrates China's increasingly assertive strategy to secure energy resources around the world. The country's rapid growth and emerging middle class enabled it to surpass the U.S. as the world's top automobile market last year, and its state-backed oil companies have been acquiring oil and gas reserves and storage globally.

Just last month, Cnooc Ltd., China's top offshore oil explorer, said it agreed to pay \$3.1 billion for a stake in one of the largest Argentine oil-exploration companies. Last year, Cnooc bought stakes in the Gulf of Mexico from Statoil ASA. The Chinese companies' successful investments stand in contrast to Cnooc's 2005 attempt to buy Unocal Corp., which the company abandoned after it sparked resistance in Washington.

Houston-based ConocoPhillips agreed to sell its 9.03% stake in the Syncrude Canada Ltd. oil-sands project. The move by Sinopec, as the international arm of China Petroleum & Chemical is known, further strengthens China's presence in Alberta's oil sands, an area that has enabled Canada to become the largest exporter of crude to the U.S.

In February, PetroChina Co. purchased a stake in an Athabasca Oil Sands Corp. project for \$1.89 billion.

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

more highlights from around the globe

12

Syncrude is the largest Canadian oil-sands project and produced an average of 280,000 barrels a day last year, or about 10% of Canada's oil production. It is a joint venture operated by Canadian Oil Sands Trust, Imperial Oil Ltd., Suncor Energy Inc., ConocoPhillips, Nexen Inc., Murphy Oil Corp., and Nippon Oil Corp.'s Mocal Energy.

The deal increases Conoco-Phillips's chances that it will be able to obtain \$10 billion from its asset sales, a target the company announced in October as part of a restructuring plan to shore up its finances.

The price almost doubles the best estimates analysts had for ConocoPhillips's Syncrude stake, said Fadel Gheit, an analyst with Oppenheimer & Co. Inc. "This is a very strong start," Mr. Gheit said. "Conoco beat everybody's expectations."

—*Wall Street Journal*, April 13, 2010, p. B1



Bernardine Dohrn, terrorist wife of Bill Ayers, member of The Weathermen and hostess with the mostest for Barack Obama, joined up with other useful idiots, Code Pink, to bring 'humanitarian aid' to Gaza.

Last month 1,300 pro-Palestinian activists from the US and Europe came to the region in the name of peace and social justice to demonstrate their solidarity with the Palestinians in Gaza. Led by the self-declared feminist, antiwar group Code Pink, the demonstrators' plan was to enter Gaza from the Egyptian border at Rafah and deliver "humanitarian aid" to the Hamas terrorist organization.

By humanitarian aid, they, of course, mean aid and comfort to our enemies. The fact that the trip was organized by Code Pink, a self-avowed Feminist group, brings the hypocrisy up to epic levels. The women of Hamas, evidently, seek to shatter the glass ceiling — with bombs.

We are all the daughters of Palestine, the daughters of steadfast Gaza. We will set out, booby-trapped. From every home, a bomb will set out, and it will explode among the sons of Zion.

The useful idiots don't even realize that Hamas, a terrorist organization intent on "wiping Israel off the map," is also oppressing some of its own people. But, see, this doesn't matter to Dohrn and her cronies. Hamas is anti-Israel and anti-America. This is all that matters to them.

The group tried to enter Gaza through Egypt, but was stopped by authorities and most were not allowed in. Of course, this was the fault of evil Israel and the United States.

—Lori Ziganto, *NewsReal*, January 20, 2010

Ninth Circuit federal appeals court. Liu is the most radical Obama nominee to date. His agenda is the so-called second Bill of Rights: mandatory wealth redistribution to guarantee a broad range of social welfare, including education, shelter, subsistence, and health care. (As Ed Whelan recounted on NRO, Liu has denounced "free enterprise," "private ownership of property," and "limited government" as "code words for an ideological agenda hostile to environmental, workplace, and consumer protections.") He would also impose same-sex marriage, racial quotas in education, and reparations for slavery. At 39 and with less than twelve years of legal experience under his belt, Liu is green. His demagoguery in opposing the Supreme Court nominations of Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Samuel Alito was unseemly. And worse, he is dishonest, withholding from the Judiciary Committee scores of his most incendiary statements. His nomination should be defeated.

—*National Review*, May 3, 2010, p. 8



The administration may purge such terms as "Islamic extremism" from the document that outlines U.S. national-security strategy. The wish not to offend Muslims has already given us such notorious neologisms as "man-caused disasters" and "overseas contingency operations" to describe jihadist atrocities and the War on Terror. To be fair, it was not Obamas who launched this descent into farce. The Bush administration, which branded Islam the "religion of peace: even as the dead of 9/11 were being retrieved, was the first to erase the terms jihad," "mujahideen," and "Islamofascism" from the government's lexicon. The linguistic silliness is not without consequence. By bleaching out the Islamist rationale for Islamist error, we consign ourselves to failing the first requirement of self-defense: Know thine enemy.

—*Ibid.*, p. 12

NEWSBITS

That lesson ought to be applied to President Obama's nomination of Berkeley law professor Goodwin Liu to the