

•the journal

» pg. 2 | Letter From the Editor
» pg. 3 | A Look at Our World
* *More Articles Online*

January 2011
Volume #11
Issue #1



Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new.

—2 Corinthians 5:17 (NKJV)

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

I don't know where to begin this New Year's letter because it's difficult to prioritize the many events that are impacting our Christian worldview. One thing I know I want to share with you, though, is a wonderful letter I received from a couple of Summit's loyal supporters that I'm sure will encourage you as you think about the student worldview conferences planned for 2011.

Two hundred students have already pre-enrolled for this summer! This means that anyone who is planning to attend should apply as soon as possible.

Summit grads will remember that our emphasis is on the six "evangelistic" worldviews that are vying for their allegiance. There are other worldviews, of course, but only six are seriously seeking followers, and the collision of these worldviews is evident throughout the world today.

And while knowing something about the underpinnings of these worldviews does help us understand our times (1 Chronicles 12:32), it does little to explain why some conservatives, of all people, are leading the charge for gay marriage! Until recently, this "freedom" has been pursued only by liberals, radicals, and Marxists.

The homosexual *Washington Blade*, however, reports that "conservatives have taken the leadership role in achieving marriage equality." And who are these conservatives? Glenn Beck, Elisabeth Hasselbeck, Laura Bush, Dick Cheney, Ted Olson, Margret Hoover, and S.E. Cupp, among others. I cannot imagine how these Christians interpret the biblical command, "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable" (Leviticus 18:22 NIV). For context, read Leviticus 18 and 20. Of course, Romans, chapter 1 is pretty clear too!

In the interest of protecting marriage between a man and a woman, I urge you to read "America on the Brink" by David Kupelian in the November 2010 issue of *Whistleblower* magazine. The ancient world, as the article notes, was replete with homosexual activity. Now conservatives, who should know better, are leading us back into the past where "ubiquitous perversity and wanton sexuality, including homosexuality and sex with children, has dominated most of the world throughout history."

Dennis Prager helps us understand why the sensate world hates Jews, for as he notes, "Judaism alone declared homosexuality wrong."

As I have said for many years, if homosexual behavior is ever considered normal, moral, and healthy, our nation is heading straight into the dustbin of history.

I won't hesitate to teach these truths to our students this summer. And this brings me to the letter from a couple in Gresham, Oregon, that I referred to earlier.

Dave and I are celebrating our 10th year of promoting Summit and Worldview Academy. We recruited eight students for Worldview and three for Summit this season, and it looks like next season may be our largest Summit group yet...This was a tough year financially for students due to the economy. None of our 11 (Worldview and Summit) students' families was able to help their children financially, which meant our little ministry had to come up with all the tuition costs. We were very grateful for the scholarship that Summit provided for two of our students. This was also the first year that we had to provide airfare for our three Summit students. But we consider it a privilege to be a part of all of this.

We are always looking for potential Oxford recruits. Our son, Kelly, after graduating from George Fox University a couple of times, was in the first Summit group at Oxford a few years ago. He loved it, and we all agree that it was a worthy investment.

We now have two students who attended Summit this year who are interested in the Oxford program, and we will be talking more about the program with them in the future. It is interesting that both of these young women are from un-churched families....

Brandon's sister, Cassie B., attended Summit as well in our largest group a few years ago. In a conversation with Cassie last summer, she told me that Summit had "changed her life." At the time she called me, she was about to leave for South America, where she was going to do mission work. She told me that it was because of Summit that her life had taken this turn.

Ferrin C. is now a youth pastor at a dynamic church in Missouri, and has been to Afghanistan twice on mission trips. The list goes on and on. And this is all from a little Baptist church in Oregon (the most un-churched state in the US, we are told) of about 150 people.

Dave and I are so pleased to be able to play our little part in God's plan for these wonderful young people. God bless you and your staff for all that you do, and thank you for letting us play a small part in it at our end.

—In His Service, K.C.



We at the Summit are exceedingly thankful for people such as these who are so dedicated to reaching the next generation of Christian youth. I trust their letter (altogether 4 pages) will encourage you to do likewise. If a small church in Oregon can accomplish this much, let's challenge ourselves to do the same.

Jenna Haggar, a former Summit student (2005, 2006) and staff member (2007), made history last November by becoming the youngest woman ever elected to the South Dakota State Legislature.

Jenna ran as an independent for the House of Representatives for one of two seats in a three-way race, challenging the two incumbent democrats in a steep uphill battle. She knocked on thousands of doors in her downtown Sioux Falls district, listening to the ideas and frustrations of voters and sharing a positive message of communication, service, and accountability.

People responded enthusiastically, and soon “Jenna Haggar” signs could be seen at nearly every block and intersection. Many voters remarked this was the first time any candidate or elected official had knocked on their door.

When the results came in on election night, shockwaves went throughout the state: Jenna was the top vote getter by a landslide, 7% ahead of the next closest candidate.

Perhaps more importantly, Jenna’s victory means the incumbent, who was outspoken on GLBT issues and advocated for expansion of abortion rights, will no longer have a seat in the state’s legislature.

For her victory, Jenna credits many supportive friends and family, plenty of hard work, and a message that resonated with voters. She says Summit was invaluable in shaping her view of leadership. “I thank God for the opportunity to be a servant leader and put into practice all that I learned at Summit Ministries. I ask for your prayers for God’s wisdom in the months and years ahead.”



CHRISTIANITY

For the love of Christ compels us, because we judge thus: that if One died for all, then all died; and He died for all, that those who live should live no longer for themselves, but for Him who died for them and rose again.

Therefore, from now on, we regard no one according to the flesh. Even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer. Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new. Now all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation, that is, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Him-

self, not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation.

Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we implore you on Christ’s behalf, be reconciled to God. For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

—2 Corinthians 5:14–21 (NKJV)

It costs God nothing, so far as we know, to create nice things: But to convert rebellious wills cost Him crucifixion.

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

I’m forgiven because You were forsaken.

I’m accepted, You were condemned.

I’m alive and well, Your Spirit is within me

Because You died and rose again.

Amazing love, how can it be that You, my King, would die for me?

Amazing love, I know it’s true. It’s my joy to honor You.

Amazing love, how can it be that You, my King, would die for me?

Amazing love, I know it’s true. It’s my joy to honor You. In all I do I honor You.

—B.J. Foote

SOCIALISM

Given all that we’ve learned of Obama’s history, I believe the best way to understand the president’s policies is to see them as a series of steps designed to slowly but surely move the country closer to a socialist ideal. Yet precisely because Obama moves gradually, without an announced ideological plan, the ultimate meaning of his policies will always be subject to dispute. The danger, in fact, is that we will be irreversibly down the path toward socialist transformation before we recognize as a nation what’s at stake. The strategy of achieving socialism through a series of “non-reformist reforms,” so popular among America’s community organizing elite, is premised on precisely that deception.

The notion that Obama is a socialist—that he never abandoned his early radicalism but only learned to promote it in piecemeal fashion—makes better sense of his overall record than the claim that he is a pragmatist. Obama’s college socialism, the influence of socialist conferences on his career, his choice of a profession dominated by socialists, and his extensive alliances with the most influential stealth-socialist community organizers in the country give the game away. Obama has adopted the gradualist socialist strategy of his mentors, seeking to combine comprehensive government regulation of private businesses with a steadily enlarging public sec-

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

tor. Eventually, this will transform American capitalism into something resembling a socialist-inspired Scandinavian welfare state. Accumulating differences of degree will add up to a fundamental difference in kind. Wealth will be substantially redirected away from individuals, local communities, and businesses, toward the state and public-employee unions instead. Power will shift decisively toward government and away from the private sector.

So the president is carrying out the ideals of his community organizer past from a new position. The socialist organizers who taught and inspired Obama favored plans to quietly transform America's economic system with "non-reformist reforms"—programs that appear as minor adjustments to capitalism but in fact undermine the system itself. This strategy was favored by Obama's socialist mentors and associates at New York's Socialist Scholars Conferences, the Midwest Academy, and ACORN. To believe that Obama is a socialist merely assumes his continued commitment to a world he has long described as his lodestar. Now that we understand the hidden socialist underpinnings of community organizing, as well as the fact that organizers in general—and Obama in particular—have done everything in their power to hide that socialist subtext, it's tough to take the president's self-representation as a pragmatist at face value.

Yet even if we grant that Obama was once a socialist—and remains one in his heart of hearts today—would that commitment necessarily have policy consequences? Would Obama's socialism affect the way he governed, or would political necessity force him to act the part of a standard-issue liberal Democrat instead? This is a false choice. It is perfectly possible for socialists to work within the Democratic Party.

—Stanley Kurtz, *Radical-in-Chief: Barack Obama and the Untold Story of American Socialism*, pp. 355f.

MARXISM

Much has been made of [John] Sweeney's political radicalism. A card-carrying member of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), Sweeney opened the AFL-CIO's door to Communist Party organizers for the first time since the 1950s, allowing Communists to distribute literature at his conventions and recruit workers to their cause. As an organizer, Sweeney has all but abandoned the private sector, whose shrinking industrial base offers little room for union growth. The "New Voice" Movement targets government workers through public-sector unions such as AFSCME and SEIU, whose business model relies upon a perverse feedback loop which rewards government unions financially the farther left they drift.

Because they represent government workers, unions such as AFSCME and SEIU have a vested interest in supporting Democrat politicians who promise to raise taxes and put more people on the government payroll. The more

people federal, state, and local governments hire, the more members public-sector unions can acquire, and the more taxpayer money they can garnish from those union members' government paychecks in the form of mandatory dues. The formula is working, for the time being. Because the public sector is currently the only part of the US economy whose payrolls are growing, government unions such as AFSCME and SEIU are the only unions increasing their membership. Their success, in turn, exerts a leftward pressure on the labor movement as a whole.

—David Horowitz, Richard Poe, *The Shadow Party: How George Soros, Hillary Clinton, and Sixties Radicals Seized Control of the Democratic Party*, pp. 166–67

It also fuels the broader radical movement in society at large. When anti-globalization rioters shut down Seattle during the 1999 meeting of the World Trade Organization, leftists were thrilled at the sight of Sweeney and McEntee and their union followers marching in solidarity with anarchists, eco-terrorists and Ruckus Society vandals amid the smoke of burning storefronts and the stench of tear gas. Enraptured by Sweeney's militancy and the promise of a "blue-green coalition" of unions and eco-activists, liberal journalists neglected to scrutinize the business side of Sweeney's "New Voice" operation. This was a serious oversight, for behind the façade of street marches and protest songs, organized crime has regained its chokehold over American labor.

Sweeney's tolerance for mob activity carries a strong element of self-interest. His older local, SEIU 32-BJ, was founded by Lucky Luciano. FBI investigators have identified the local as a center of Genovese crime family activity. Years after leaving Local 32-BJ to become SEIU president, Sweeney continued drawing a salary from the local—a second salary, in addition to what he was paid as president. Gus Bevona, Sweeney's hand-picked successor to head Local 32-BJ made sure that Sweeney got his cut. Such "double-dipping" is a time-honored tradition among unions—but not one that inspires confidence in Sweeney's "progressive" leadership.

Adding to this already sordid picture is the fact that known mob cronies such as Teamsters president Ron Carey and LIUNA president Arthur Armand Coia have played significant roles in Sweeney's "New Voice" movement from the beginning. As one insider explained to a reporter, "Picking Sweeney is a signal. The fact that he lived with Bevona and had his hand in the cookie jar makes it clear to people like Coia that, hey—we may be talking revolution in the streets, but we ain't talking about cleaning up unions."

—Ibid., pp. 167–68

EDITOR'S NOTE: On November 17, 2010, President Obama named AFL-CIO President Emeritus John Sweeney as a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

For *The Journal* readers wishing to figure out what is happening in the United States let me suggest the following works: *You Can Still Trust the Communists (to Be Communists)* by your editor; *The Shadow Party* by David Horowitz and Richard Poe; *Radical-in-Chief* by Stanley Kurtz; and *Shadow World* by Robert Chandler.

SOCIOLOGY

Perhaps the definitive work on the rise and fall of civilizations, was published in 1934 by Oxford anthropologist J.D. Unwin.

In *Sex and Culture*, Unwin studied 86 human civilizations ranging from tiny South Sea island principalities to mighty Rome. He found that a society's destiny is linked inseparably to the limits it imposes on sexual expression and that those sexual constraints correlate directly to its theological sophistication and religious commitment.

Unwin noted that the most primitive societies had only rudimentary spiritual beliefs and virtually no restrictions on sexual expression, whereas societies with more sophisticated theologies placed greater restrictions on sexual expression and achieved greater social development.

In particular, cultures that adopt what Unwin dubbed "absolute monogamy" proved to be the most vigorous, economically productive, artistically creative, scientifically innovative, and geographically expansive societies on earth.

Absolute monogamy is a very strict moral code. Under absolute monogamy, sex can occur only within one-man/one-woman marriage. Premarital and extramarital sex are not tolerated and divorce is prohibited.

Understandably, the only societies that practice absolute monogamy are the ones that take their religion very seriously. Whether monotheistic or polytheistic, they believe devoutly in God or gods, and they order their society according to divine moral laws.

Unwin himself was raised in Christian England, but he did not appear to be a believer in orthodox Christianity. Nevertheless, he was honest enough to acknowledge what his research revealed—that absolute monogamy, the key to societal health, is deeply consistent with the sexual regulations laid out in the Bible, particularly in the moral code Unwin described as "Pauline."

Unwin's contemporary, British historian Arnold Toynbee, was much more explicit about the centrality of religion in history. Toynbee's masterpiece, his 12-volume *Study of History*, charted the rise and fall of 26 civilizations. In Toynbee's view, "The course of human history consists of a series of encounters...in which each man or woman or child...is challenged by God to make the free choice between doing God's will and refusing to do it."

Why exactly does absolute monogamy, the Pauline moral code, bring vitality to a society? Absolute monogamy fosters cultural growth by solving what anthropologist

Margret Mead called the "central problem of every society"—that is, to "define appropriate roles for the men." Monogamous civilizations require men to choose either lifelong celibacy or the responsibilities of a husband: fidelity, breadwinning, and fatherhood. Most men choose to marry, to their good fortune, because married men tend to be healthier, happier, and more productive than bachelors.

Those committed husbands create stable marriages, which offer the greatest opportunity for raising healthy, productive children who can keep a society strong and growing.

Likewise, the great economist Joseph Schumpeter attributes the success of capitalism not to the entrepreneur's lust for money or status, but to his love of family. To Schumpeter, the central pillar of any healthy civilization is the self-sacrificing married man who doesn't spend his income on his pleasures, but prefers "to work and save primarily for his wife and children."

And in *Family and Civilization*, Harvard historian Carle Zimmerman concludes that "the creative periods in civilization have been based upon" the strongest form of family, which he terms the "domestic" type: "The domestic family affords a comparatively stable social structure and yet frees the individual sufficiently from family influence to perform the creative work necessary for a great civilization."

If devotion to God, a Pauline moral code, and strong marriages and families are the key to cultural success, then what causes civilizations to decline?

Zimmerman warns of "periods of family decay in which civilization is suffering internally from the lack of basic belief in the forces which make it work." Unwin's explanation would be that if people lose their faith in God, they tend to lose their motivation to live by the strict moral code.

In *This Present Age*, sociologist Robert Nisbet writes, "What sociologists are prone to call social disintegration is really nothing more than the spectacle of a rising number of individuals playing fast and loose with other individuals in relationships of trust and responsibility." Moral standards begin to erode when a society's members chafe at the discipline imposed by absolute monogamy and begin to gratify their personal impulses without regard for the consequences inflicted on others.

In other words, in an amoral, hedonistic society, you can't trust the people you need to trust, not even your spouse. Moreover, if people can make and break relationships at will, with no legal repercussions or social stigma, they are much more likely to abandon their marriages—at their children's expense—when the going gets tough. Husbands with roving eyes are much more likely to trade in their wives for new models.

Thus, the founder of Harvard's sociology department, Pitirim Sorokin, warned that if individualistic selfishness and self-seeking are not checked, a society will lapse into a state of "sexual anarchy." In *The American Sex Revolution*,

for more articles like these, subscribe to our “worldviews in the news” RSS feed at www.summit.org/subscriptions/

Sorokin writes that “both man and society are degraded” as a culture becomes “sexually obsessed:”

The members of such a society are habituated to look at the opposite sex as a mere instrument for pleasure...To these individuals, talk of human dignity, religious, and moral commandments, and rules of decency is just bosh...The society degrades the values of womanhood and manhood, of motherhood and fatherhood and venerable age, of marriage and family, and even of love itself.

—Brian Fitzpatrick, *Whistleblower*, Nov. 2010, pp. 38f

ECONOMICS

The draft recommendations of the president’s commission on deficit reduction call for closing popular tax deductions, higher gas taxes, and other revenue raisers to drive tax collections up to 21% of GDP from the historical norm of about 18.5%. Another plan, proposed last week by commission member and former Congressional Budget Office director Alice Rivlin, would impose a 6.5% national sales tax on consumers.

The claim here, echoed by endless purveyors of conventional wisdom in Washington, is that these added revenues—potentially a half-trillion dollars a year—will be used to reduce the \$8 trillion to \$10 trillion deficits in the coming decade. If history is any guide, however, that won’t happen. Instead, Congress will simply spend the money.

In the late 1980s, one of us, Richard Vedder, and Lowell Gallaway of Ohio University co-authored an often-cited research paper for the congressional Joint Economic Committee (known as the \$1.58 study) that found that every new dollar of new taxes led to more than one dollar of new spending by Congress. Subsequent revisions of the study over the next decade found similar results.

We’ve updated the research. Using standard statistical analyses that introduce variables to control for business-cycle fluctuations, wars, and inflation, we found that over the entire post-World War II era through 2009 each dollar of new tax revenue was associated with \$1.17 of new spending. Politicians spend the money as fast as it comes in—and a little bit more.

We also looked at different time periods (e.g., 1947–2009 vs. 1959–2009), different financial data (fiscal year federal budget data, as well as calendar year National Income and Product Account data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis), different lag structures (e.g., relating taxes one year to spending change the following year to allow for the time it takes bureaucracies to spend money), different control variables, etc. The alternative models produce different estimates of the tax-spend relationship—between

\$1.05 and \$1.81. But no matter how we configured the data and no matter what variables we examined, higher tax collections never resulted in less spending.

This is exactly the opposite of what the tax-increase lobby in Washington is preaching today. For example, Erskine Bowles, co-chairman of the president’s deficit reduction commission, suggested at a briefing several months ago that there will be \$3 of spending cuts for every \$1 of tax increases. Sound familiar? Reagan used to complain that he waited his entire presidency for the \$3 of spending cuts that Congress promised for every dollar of new taxes he agreed to in 1982. The cuts never came.

We’re constantly told by politicians that tax increases must be put “on the table” to get congressional Democrats—who’ve already approved close to \$1 trillion of new spending in violation of their own budget rules over the last two years—to agree to make cuts in the unsustainable entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Our research indicates this is a sucker play. After the 1990 and 1993 tax increases, federal spending continued to rise. The 1990 tax increase deal was enacted specifically to avoid automatic spending sequestrations that would have been required under the then-prevailing Gramm-Rudman budget rules.

The only era in modern times that the budget has been in balance was in the late 1990s, when Republicans were in control of Congress. Taxes were not raised, and the capital gains tax rate was cut in 1997. The growth rate of federal spending was dramatically reduced from 1995–99, and the economy roared.

We suspect that voters intuitively understand this tax and spend connection, which is why there is such hostility to broad-based tax increases. “Polls consistently find that a majority of Americans believe any new taxes will be spent by the politicians,” pollster Scott Rasmussen told us recently in an interview.

The grand bargain so many in Washington yearn for—tax increases coupled with spending cuts—is a fool’s errand. Our research confirms what the late economist Milton Friedman said of Congress many years ago: “Politicians will always spend every penny of tax raised and whatever else they can get away with.”

—Stephen Moore, Richard Vedder, *The Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 22, 2010, p. A17

COMMUNISM

Russia’s parliament accepted Soviet dictator Josef Stalin’s responsibility for the 1940 Katyn massacre of 22,000 Polish prisoners—a declaration that Poland’s leaders welcomed, cautiously, as a step toward justice for an atrocity that still poisons the two countries’ relations.

After a two-hour debate heated by Communist objections, parliament acknowledged Friday that archives first unveiled

in the early 1990s “show that the Katyn crime was carried out on the direct orders of Stalin and other Soviet leaders.”

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin and former President Boris Yeltsin had conceded Stalin’s culpability, but parliament’s move was the first formal assertion by an official Russian body that linked the wartime leader to the killings in Russia’s Katyn Forest.

The resolution was timed to smooth the way for President Dmitry Medvedev’s Dec. 6 visit to Poland. Polish leaders, however, want Russia to accept legal responsibility for Katyn and declare it an act of genocide. Poland’s opposition demands a formal apology and compensation for families of the victims.

Polish Prime Minister Donald Tusk called the measure “an important political gesture.”

“The Polish government isn’t hiding, however, that we expect those gestures...to be followed by bolder steps,” he added.

More than seven months have passed since a plane crash in Western Russia killed Polish President Lech Kaczynsky, his wife, and dozens of other Polish dignitaries on their way to a commemoration at the site of the massacre. The tragedy prompted an outpouring of sympathy in Russia and raised hopes for warmer ties between historic adversaries.

Yet disputes over Katyn persist. In October, Russia told the European Court of Human Rights, where it is being sued by victims’ families, that it has no legal obligation to explain or own up to the killings. Russia closed its own criminal probe in 2004 without charging anyone, on the grounds that the perpetrators were dead.

Without challenging that legal position, parliament called for declassifying still-secret files of the case in order to “restore the honorable names of all who died and...shed light on the circumstances of the tragedy.” It conceded that Moscow’s past efforts to pin the massacre on the Nazis had “provoked the wrath, grievance, and mistrust” of Poles.

“Our task today is to get this lie out of our way,” Konstantin Kosachev, chairman of parliament’s foreign relations committee said during the debate.

Communist lawmakers testily denied a Soviet role in the killings and warned that admitting otherwise would cost Russia billions of dollars in compensation—an estimate the resolution’s backers called vastly overblown. The communists tried to amend the text to delete Stalin’s name but were defeated.

Former Polish president Alexander Kwasniewski said the resolution and its timing are a reassuring signal that the Katyn issue “will be under President Medvedev’s special patronage.”

Mr. Medvedev’s critics in Russia are wary. “Speaking of Stalin’s guilt is a positive step, but there’s a danger it will stop there—that the resolution will be a substitute for legal steps,” said Alexander Guryanov, a Katyn specialist at Memorial, a Russian human-rights group. Memorial wants Russia to accept legal responsibility for Katyn as a war crime, identify the perpetrators and open all case archives.

The Russian leader faces demands by rights activists at home to look more broadly into Stalin’s repression. The newspaper *Vedemosti* reported that he would hear a proposal next week from his advisory council on human rights to declassify case files on millions of citizens Stalin’s regime spied on, search for mass graves of prisoners who died in its camps, and compensate survivors.

—Richard Boudreaux, Marcin Sobczyk,
The Wall Street Journal, Nov. 27–28, 2010, p. A129

Several members of the approximately eighty strong far left Congressional Progressive Caucus have documentable ties to the Communist Party USA or its front organizations.

These include, but are certainly not limited to caucus vice chair Dennis Kucinich, Caucus founder and Senate member Bernie Sanders and House members Corrine Brown, John Conyers, Danny Davis, Rosa Delauro, Barney Frank, Jesse Jackson Jr., Barbara Lee, Charles Rangel, Bobby Rush, and Maxine Waters.

Here’s another for the list—none other than Progressive caucus co-chair and California 6th district Rep Lynn Woolsey.

In a scan from the Communist Party’s newspaper *People’s Weekly World* from September 11, 1999 advertising a *People’s Weekly World* Gala Banquet, Woolsey is listed as a co-sponsor of the event.

Also listed on the left portion of the advertisement were longtime communist front supporters Rep. Barbara Lee and more well-known communists.

Lynn Woolsey is an influential Democrat. She serves on several Congressional Committees including Committee on Education and Labor.

Once Lynn Woolsey would have immediately been flagged as a security risk for openly supporting a Communist Party fund raiser.

Today the Communist Party USA supports Cuba and China and strongly opposes the U.S. war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Why then would a loyal U.S. Congresswoman be prepared to co-sponsor a Communist Party event?

—Trevor Loudon, Newzeal.blogspot.com, Nov. 29, 2010

RADICAL ISLAM

Over 120 Catholics were attending Mass in the Church of Our Lady of Salvation in Baghdad when terrorists attacked, firing wildly, killing two priests immediately and fatally wounding a third, then taking the congregation hostage. An affiliate of al-Qaeda in Mesopotamia claimed responsibility, putting out demand for the release of Islamists

to read the rest of this entry, please download the online version at www.summit.org/resources/the-journal/



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

Adult Worldview Conferences

In a world of constant crises and change, Christians must be able to explain how God's Word speaks to current ideas and issues. Prepare to engage successfully in this battle for hearts and minds.

Each day of our week-long conference is filled with challenging and informative sessions from some of the sharpest Christian thinkers in America. This conference can equip you to have an impact in the world and on the next generation of Christian leaders.

Equip yourself.
Learn to equip others.

www.summit.org/adult | 866.786.6483

Glen Eyrie Castle
Colorado Springs, CO
February 27 – March 04

Bryan College
Dayton, TN
July 10 – 15



The Journal is the monthly publication of American Christian College (dba 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 | **URL:** www.summit.org | **E-mail:** journal@summit.org

in Iraq as well as Muslim girls rumored to have been kidnapped by Coptic Christians in Egypt. When Iraqi security forces arrived, at least two of the terrorists exploded suicide vests, killing many hostages. By the time the outrage was over, 44 Catholics, seven members of the security forces, and at least five terrorists were dead, and many more were wounded. Shocked survivors are unanimous that the intention is to drive Christians out of the Middle East altogether. There used to be at least 1 million Christians in Iraq, but probably half of them have already fled abroad. Archbishop Athanasios Dawood in London urges remaining Christians to quit and seek asylum elsewhere. For Pope Benedict XVI it was enough to say that these attacks “undermine trust and peaceful coexistence.” Two thousand years of Christianity in the region are winding down, and the rest is silence.

—*National Review*, Nov. 29, 2010, p. 11

HODGEPODGE

In October, NPR [National Public Radio] accepted a \$1.8 million grant from George Soros’s left-leaning Open Society Foundations. It was considered a watershed, especially when NPR president Vivian Schiller went on in short order to fire Juan Williams. But Soros isn’t that different from the people who already control and fund NPR. Matthew Shaffer, one of National Review Institute’s Buckley Fellows, dug up evidence relating to the political sympathies of board members of NPR, Inc., and its fundraising arm, the NPR Foundation. Almost every board member has demonstrably liberal political leanings, with heavy support for Democrats, pro-abortion groups, and environmental activism in particular. Chosen at random: NPR Foundation chairman Antoine W. van Agtmael doubles up as a trustee at the center-left Brookings Institution. Jane Katcher has given Democrats and EMILY’s List more than \$64,000 over the past decade. Sukey Garcetti is director of the RothFamily Foundation, an organization whose explicit “mission is commitment to progressive social change.” And so on, for almost 50 iterations. There’s one exception, one board member who has donated to a prominent Republican and no Democrats: Henry E. Catto contributed only to John McCain, to help him in his race against . . . J.D. Hayworth. We favor defunding NPR, so that it can adopt a more accurate name: National Progressive Radio.

—*National Review*, Nov. 29, 2010, p. 119

CARACAS, Venezuela—President Hugo Chávez said he will on Tuesday promote to the rank of “General in Chief” a controversial top general who is on a U.S. blacklist for alleged drugs and arms trafficking.

The general, Henry Rangel Silva, recently said the army wouldn’t accept anyone but Mr. Chávez as president even if he were to lose a re-election bid in 2012.

Mr. Chávez, speaking Sunday on his weekly “Hello, President” television show, said it will be his “honor” to promote on Tuesday Gen. Rangel Silva, who is currently operational chief of the armed forces, to a new rank that hadn’t been used prior to Mr. Chavez’s ascension to power.

In an interview with local press, Gen. Rangel Silva said that an opposition victory in the 2012 election wouldn’t and shouldn’t be accepted by the nation’s armed forces.

“It would be like selling out the country. The people aren’t going to accept that, not the armed forces and even less the people,” he said. The army, “doesn’t have half loyalty, but rather full loyalty...to the commander in chief,” Gen. Rangel Silva said.

He said that the military wouldn’t accept an opposition victory in 2012 because it is already committed to Mr. Chavez’s “life project” to create socialism in Venezuela.

Those comments drew a storm of criticism from Mr. Chavez’s opponents, who said the general’s comments showed that Mr. Chavez is priming the nation’s military to support him in a bid to stay in power even if he loses the elections two years from now.

The comments also drew fire from the Organization of American States, whose secretary general, Jose Miguel Insulza, said the remarks were “unacceptable.”

—Dan Molinski, *The Wall Street Journal*,

Nov. 16, 2010, p. A139

So pitch-perfect are Paul Shanklin’s socio-political musical parodies that one might think God has permitted rock ‘n’ roll to exist simply to provide grist for Shanklin’s mill. On his new album, *Barack Hussein Obama’s Songs of the Revolution*, the official satirist of Rush Limbaugh’s E.I.B. Network transforms Simon & Garfunkel’s “I Am a Rock” into Barack Obama’s “I Am Barack,” Billy Joel’s “She’s Always a Woman” into Bill Clinton’s “She’s Always a Hillary,” and Frank Sinatra’s “New York, New York” into “Khalid Sheikh Mohammed’s ‘New York, New York,’” the hilarity of which derives as much from Shanklin’s voice-print-worthy singing as it does his liberal-tweaking lyrics.

And as Limbaugh listeners know, Shanklin also delivers skits (like the recurring “Justice Brothers” routines featuring Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton), and on this album—as on Shanklin’s others—they provide ideal song-to-song segues. Not that the songs need the help. The highest high point: “Dancing Queen” by Abba transformed into “Banking Queen” by Barney Frank.

—*WORLD* magazine, Dec. 4, 2010, p. 31

It is true that you should take care of yourself. It is an important obligation of human life and of Christian life. Ul-

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

timately you are clearly dependent on God, but part of that dependence means taking care of yourself, well enough that you can be a worthy proponent and servant of the needs of others. Christians shouldn't become a burden on the rest of society. I think Christians are not a burden: They are a source of the bounties that the rest of society enjoys.

—George Gilder, *WORLD* magazine, Dec. 4, 2010, p. 29

Darwinian theory is just another materialist theory. There are tons of them—Marxism, Darwinism, Freudianism (based on the pleasure principle which is basically a materialist concept). All these theories have collapsed in the 21st century. Creation is a fact. The entire universe is oriented to produce creative human beings in the image of their Creator. His presence pervades it. All of the universe is perfectly designed, in some sense, to support human minds.

—Ibid.

GLOBAL WARMING

For some, global warming is the sinister cause of every problem plaguing the world—even the conflict between India and Pakistan.

This misapprehension has apparently taken hold of Richard Holbrooke, President Obama's special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan. According to Bob Woodward's new book, *Obama's Wars*, Holbrooke believes there is a "global warming dimension" of the India-Pakistan conflict.

"In one discussion about the tensions between Pakistan and India," Woodward wrote, "Holbrooke introduced a new angle. 'There's a global-warming dimension of this struggle, Mr. President,' he said."

Woodward wrote that Holbrooke's "words baffled many in the room." It's not hard to see why.

"There are tens of thousands of Indian and Pakistani troops encamped on the glaciers in the Himalayas that feed the rivers into Pakistan and India," [Holbrooke] said. "Their encampments are melting the glaciers very quickly. There's a chance that river valleys in Pakistan and perhaps even India could be flooded."

"Woodward reported that attendees were incredulous. 'After the meeting,' Woodward wrote, 'there were several versions of one question: Was Holbrooke kidding? He was not. Holbrooke subsequently detailed his concerns in a written report.'"

I among many others would surely like to read Holbrooke's report. I wonder if it notes the massive gaffe committed by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the scientific body responsible for, among other treasures, the Kyoto Protocol. Back in January, the IPCC was forced to retract a claim, buried in its dense 2007 climate change report, that the Himalayan glaciers would

very likely melt away by 2035 ("very likely" in the IPCC's rendering means more than a 90% chance of occurring). It turns out the IPCC was off by 300 years.

The mistake sparked an international outcry. Rajendra Pachauri, the controversial head of the IPCC, admitted that "the clear and well-established standards of evidence required by the IPCC procedures were not applied properly." One wonders what those procedures looked like.

In fact, the 2035 claim was based on a 2005 paper by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), an activist environmental group. WWF in turn got it from an Indian glaciologist who, according to the *Guardian* newspaper in London, conceded that his work was "speculative." Glaciologists interviewed by that paper said that "Himalayan glaciers contain so much ice it will be 300 years before it vanishes."

It turned out that the glacier gaffe was one of many undermining the credibility of the IPCC's 2007 report, and of the IPCC itself. I have followed the inner workings of the IPCC for years, so these revelations came as no surprise. Yet I would have hoped that a senior government official responsible for such a sensitive matter as relations between India and Pakistan would know better.

Even more troubling is Holbrooke's apparent acceptance of the notion that global warming poses national security threats, requiring the imposition of energy rationing schemes such as cap-and-trade, at home and abroad, to alleviate international conflict. But those schemes, as even the Environmental Protection Agency has confirmed, would do little to affect climate or Earth's temperature, and therefore would be of no consequence in international relations.

What they would do is harm America's economy through, among other things, higher costs for energy, food, and other consumer goods, more dependence on foreign oil, and further decline of our manufacturing base. That, not global warming, is the real national security threat.

—Sen. Jim Inhofe, *Human Events*, Nov. 1, 2010, p.20