

•the journal

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

February 2011
Volume #11
Issue #2



While it [the property] remained [unsold], was it not your own? And after it was sold,
was [the money] not in your control? Why have you conceived this thing in your heart?
—Acts 5:4 (NKJV)

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Would you grant me an observation? Christian influence on Western civilization is almost nonexistent. Now that the secularists have convinced much of the public that homosexuality is a normal, healthy, moral lifestyle, this particular portion of the cultural battle is lost.

Not too many years ago, gays just wanted to be left alone. Then queer studies (gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender) crept into America's universities (Yale and Harvard, e.g.) and seemed to gain overnight legitimacy. Gay activists cranked up their volume to "we're queer, we're here, get used to it." Gay marriage brazenly begged for legal status on many state ballots. With Obama's election and with very little public outcry, queering elementary school programs popped up in public school curricula (thanks to safe schools czar and homosexual Kevin Jennings). And today it's the law of the land that gays can serve "openly" in the United States military.

This state of affairs almost parallels Germany in the 1930s when homosexuals made a determined effort to infiltrate both the government and the military. (See Kevin Abrams and Scott Lively, *The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party*.)

Take, for example, the case of Julia Ward. As a student at Eastern Michigan University she was expelled from its counseling program for expressing her religious convictions about homosexuality to some of her professors.

Oklahoma Senator Tom Coburn sums up our current situation: "The gay community has infiltrated the very centers of power in every area across this country, and they wield extreme power" (*The American Conservative*, February 2011, 16).

Now that the military has been won over, is there a cultural institution left that can stop the advance of this perversion?

The leadership of the National Council of Churches actually visited the White House the day before the November elections to encourage President Obama in his pro-abortion, pro-homosexual, pro-socialist direction! The San Francisco/Harvard portion of the Democrat Party is largely a party of secularists, socialists, and sodomites. Patrons and sympathizers of San Francisco's gay bars and diseased bathhouses have become the dominant "elite" morality in America. The election of a gay president is only a matter of time.

The homosexual lobby and its legal forces (see Lambda Legal) will have the Pentagon eating out of their hands. Christian chaplains will be silenced with charges of hate speech for referring to passages from Genesis 19 or Romans 1. Pamphlets and work books from the Pentagon will glorify the gay lifestyle among the troops much like public school curricula are normalizing it among our elementary school children.

America is toying with moral destruction. Even some evangelicals are calling for civil unions, and few are speaking truth to power. All of this, however, does not change the truth that sodomy is a sin and an abomination. It is an insult to God, who created us male and female (Mark 10:6), and an insult to women.

It's troubling to observe the shortsightedness in the pro-gay argument. Isn't it the anti-military faction of our Congress that pushed for repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell? (Nancy Pelosi's San Francisco "morality" has always been highly anti-military! Back in 2005 the city declared itself to be a military free zone!) One can properly conclude that those pushing "open" gayness on the military are not doing so to strengthen it!

And isn't it interesting that the defenders of Darwin's theory of evolution and the survival of the fittest are also the defenders of the biologically dead end of homosexuality? This obviously does not pass "the sniff" test!

Every religion in the history of the world has spoken out against homosexuality. Some denominations have even split over the ordination of actively practicing homosexual clergy. And denouncing the Roman Catholic Church for its history of pederasty among priests seems downright hypocritical if it's true that there are no moral absolutes, that all sexual practices are normal, and that all morality is socially constructed.

Why are there no enlightened secularists condemning John Maynard Keynes for his practice of pederasty? (It must be because they're in Keynes "socialist" pocket just as the military is now in the gay rights pocket.) George Washington is screaming from his grave!

Jesus reminds us that rampant sin in Noah's day led to the earth's destruction by flood and rampant sin in Lot's day led to Sodom and Gomorrah's destruction by fire and brimstone (Luke 17). But immediately before both catastrophes, people were carrying on with their decadent lifestyles as if all were well. Jesus even hinted that just before His return, the whole world would once again be wallowing in the likes of downtown Sodom and Gomorrah!

Well, now, that was a jeremiad I didn't intend to pursue!

But I fear that our nation is sinking into a moral abyss from which there is no escape. This makes our mission here at the Summit all the more timely and essential.

Although I don't agree with President Theodore Roosevelt's "state capitalism" approach, I do agree with his stance on national morality: "Every thinking man, when he thinks, realizes that the teachings of the Bible are so interwoven and entwined with our whole civic and social life that it would be literally—I do not mean figuratively, but literally—impossible



for us to figure what that loss would be if these teachings were removed. We would lose almost all the standards by which we now judge both public and private morals.”

Allowing gays to serve openly in our military is another nail in the coffin of America’s Christian morality. (Continuing to kill off a million of our unborn each year proves that our nation’s leaders already disdain biblical morality.)

If there is any good news in any of this, it is that we at the Summit have no intention of compromising the importance of biblical morality in all areas of life—public and private. I’m praying that our Lord will bless our efforts and help us resist the voices that pressure us to “modernize” our moral code and conduct.

A Challenge from Doc

You’ll find in this issue of The Journal Summit’s 2011 Student Worldview Conferences brochure—both for your information and for you to pass on to someone you think would benefit from attending one of our 2-week summer conferences. When you give this information to a young person, a parent, a youth pastor, or a Christian teacher, you’re helping us do what we do best—train Christian youth to live and defend their faith and worldview and to become influencers for Christ and His gospel. If you would like additional brochures, please call us at 866.786.6483. Thank you for helping us train the next generation of Christians to stand strong in their faith.

—David A. Noebel

BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession. And he kept back part of the proceeds, his wife also being aware of it, and brought a certain part and laid it at the apostles’ feet.

But Peter said, “Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and keep back part of the price of the land for yourself?

While it remained, was it not your own? And after it was sold, was it not in your own control? Why have you conceived this thing in your heart? You have not lied to men but to God.”

Then Ananias, hearing these words, fell down and breathed his last. So great fear came upon all those who heard these things.

And the young men arose and wrapped him up, carried him out, and buried him.

—Acts 5:1–6 (NKJV)

One of the dangers of having a lot of money is that you may be quite satisfied with the kinds of happiness money can give and so fail to realize your need for God. If everything seems to come simply by signing checks, you may forget that you are at every moment totally dependent on God.

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

ECONOMICS

There’s no evidence that entire cultures or nations, or even individuals, can or should grow prosperous by charity. Again, the only known way to create widespread wealth is through capitalism.

Of course, big campaigns to “end poverty as we know it” are hip. They inspire concerts and crusades. They warm our hearts. They give us a compassion fix. In contrast, the things that can actually help the poor sound about as glamorous as unsweetened oatmeal—property rights, rule of law, personal virtues like diligence and thrift, ingenuity, cultural values like trust, an orientation to the future, and a willingness to delay gratification. Yawn. Unlike the crusades and petitions, however, they create wealth. We know this. We Christians need to decide if we want to keep advocating what is hip and fashionable, or the oatmeal-variety stuff that actually works.

Choosing the oatmeal option behind door number two might seem to marginalize the Christian mission to help the poor, but it does not. Ministries that treat humans as fully spiritual beings rather than mere mouths to feed, that encourage economic freedom rather than government largesse, that teach the poor to fish, that instill Christian values—which ultimately transform culture—will do far more to reduce poverty in the long run than all the cool celebrity-led campaigns put together.

—Jay W. Richards, *Money Greed, and God: Why Capitalism Is the Solution and Not the Problem*, p. 57

EDITOR’S NOTE America’s official national debt as of January 1, 2011, was 14,244,292,000,000.00. The true debt is closer to \$76 trillion!

Max Weber should have located the sources of capitalism not in Calvinism alone, but in Christianity more broadly. A contemporary sociologist, Rodney Stark, has done just that. In *The Victory of Reason: How Christianity Led to Freedom, Capitalism, and Western Success*, Stark argues (like Weber, against current fashion) that a society’s beliefs, far more than its real estate, shape its destiny. That claim alone is controversial; but Stark doesn’t stop there. He bucks a second trend, arguing that we in the West owe our political and economic freedoms to Christian ideas: “The success of the West,” Stark argues, “including the rise of science, rested entirely on religious foundations, and the people who brought it about were devout Christians.”

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

This contradicts the received wisdom, which considers Christianity the benighted enemy of freedom and progress.
—Ibid., p. 148

Recently a group of economists headed by Rafael Di Tella of the Harvard Business School studied a squatter settlement in Argentina in which some squatters acquired legal right to their land while their neighbors did not. They discovered that owning property changes the way people look at the world. The property owners were more likely to trust others, and to believe that individuals could achieve something good if they worked hard. This makes sense. Property owners have a vested interest in the health and stability of the social order that makes their property possible. They have something to gain and something to lose. They treat the same plot of land differently.

For decades, there has been a close correlation between the wealth of a country's citizens and the strength of that country's property laws. In general, the more a country (which includes the government and its citizens) protects private property, the more prosperous the citizens of that country will be.
—Ibid., p. 95

Young people in Europe are right to be angry; but, like love, anger is often misdirected. So it is in this case: for the young rioters are angry not at those who constructed the giant Madoff scheme that is the European social model, but at those who, because of financial force majeure, have now to dismantle it, in part if not in whole, and will therefore prevent young people's full participation in it. What they want is for everything to remain the same, clearly an impossibility.

The angry young people, not unnaturally, want the same privileges that their parents awarded themselves in the high-minded name of social justice, on the live-now-pay-later principle. Why should they, the younger generation, have to live harder, more arduous, less secure lives than their elders lived? If their parents enjoyed free education, secure employment with guaranteed holidays and sick pay, and early retirement with generous unfunded pensions linked to the rate of inflation—what the French call *les acquis*—why should not they? Is not an ever-rising standard of living, with more and more entitlements, and holiday destinations within the reach of all, the fundamental law of the universe, to say nothing of the meaning of life?

Compared with many Western European politicians, Madoff was an honorable man, for he solicited, rather than coerced, the contributions of which he was the principal beneficiary. European politicians were able to use the full force of the law to shore up their Madoff schemes. But European populations were not innocent in the whole vast fraud: They voted for the people who, they thought, were offering

them something for nothing, or rather for nothing for which they would have to pay; the bill would fall to future generations to settle.

—Anthony Daniels, *National Review*, Dec. 31, 2010, p. 18

We are all socialists now. In many ways our economy already resembles a European one....[A]s boomers age and spending grows, we will become even more French.

—*Newsweek's* Educational Site, Feb. 7, 2009

ETHICS

Christian military chaplains and troops are being placed in an intolerable position with the latest Congressional action pertaining to “gays” in the military. No chaplain in good conscience can tell his or her heterosexual troops that homosexuality is a moral, natural, and healthy lifestyle. Yet to disagree with the policy is to be charged with “hate” speech, probable dismissal, and worse.

Gay activists, however, will not be satisfied until the Pentagon publishes and distributes to all military units a full defense of homosexuality to be used to re-educate all officers and troops. To gay activists, “gay” includes the entire lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and queer family! All these lifestyles will be publicly defended by the U.S. government, and the Christian, conservative base will be forced to pay for it.

Liberalism and its allies (ACLU, Communist Party USA, etc.) have shown their true colors by putting sodomy even before the START Treaty. The Democrat Party has become the party of socialism and sodomy, following in the footsteps of one of its heroes, John Maynard Keynes, a socialist and a sodomite.

I would not be surprised to hear that Kevin Jennings (of *Queering Elementary Education* fame) has been appointed the new military czar to make the military safe for a practice that every religion in the history of the world has condemned, and for good reason, as an insult to the Creator in particular and women in general.

—David A. Noebel

Not that [William McGowan's] *Gray Lady Down* is a bad read. Remember the *New York Times*' coverage of the rape accusations against the Duke lacrosse team? Remember the ins and outs of its relation with Judith Miller during the runup to the Iraq war? Remember Jayson Blair, whose “widespread fabrication and plagiarism represent a profound betrayal of trust and a low point in the 152-year history of the newspaper,” as the *Times* itself ended up having to admit? McGowan reminds us of those stories and much more besides. Particularly in the chapters on race, homosexuality, and the culture wars, *Gray Lady Down* recounts all the little bits—the slant-

ing of prose, the prettifying of photographs, the assigning of beats—that add up to an astonishing amount of dishonesty at the newspaper: a raging left-wing agenda masked by the claim to be objectively reporting the news.

—Joseph Bottum, *The Weekly Standard*

EDITOR'S NOTE: For an in-depth look at how the U.S. media has betrayed America, read James L. Tyson's *Target America: The Influence of Communist Propaganda on U.S. Media*. Tyson was a Harvard graduate (1939) and a Naval intelligence officer.

Politics

On November 2, the American electorate delivered a stinging rebuke to Pres. Barack Obama and the Democrats. According to a post-election survey conducted for the Faith and Freedom Coalition by Public Opinion Strategies, 32 percent of all voters were self-identified conservative Christians, and they cast 78 percent of their ballots for Republican candidates and only 20 percent for Democrats. Nearly 9 million more religious conservatives went to the polls than in the midterm elections four years ago.

—Ralph Reed, *National Review*, Dec. 31, 2010, p. 38

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid sent out a press release last week headlined “111th Congress Accomplishments.” It quoted a couple of Democratic Party cheerleaders calling this the greatest Congress since 1965-66 (Norm Ornstein) or even the New Deal (David Leonhardt), and listed in capital letters no fewer than 30 legislative triumphs: Health Care Reform, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, a Jobs Package (HIRE Act), the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, Food Safety, the Travel Promotion Act, Student Loan Reform, Hate Crimes Prevention, and so much more.

What the release did not mention is the loss of 63 House and six Senate seats, and a mid-December Gallup poll approval rating of 13%. Never has a Congress done so much and been so despised for it.

While this may appear to be a contradiction, it is no accident or even much of a surprise. The liberal wing of the Democratic Party had been waiting since the 1960s for its next great political opening, as we warned in an October 17, 2008 editorial, “A Liberal Supermajority.” Critics and some of our readers scored us at the time for exaggerating, but in retrospect we understated the willful nature of that majority.

Democrats achieved 60 Senate votes by an historical accident of prosecutorial abuse (Ted Stevens), a stolen election (Al Franken) and a betrayal (Arlen Specter). They then attempted to do nearly everything we expected, regardless of public opinion, and they only stopped because the clock ran out.

The real story of 2010 is that the voters were finally able to see and judge this liberal agenda in its unvarnished form. For once, there was no Republican president to muddle the message or divide the accountability. The public was able to compare the promise of 8% unemployment if the government spent \$812 billion on “stimulus” with the 9.8% jobless result. They stood athwart liberal history in the making and said, “Stop.”

—*The Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 31, 2010, p. A10

Amid the drawdown of American troops and the nominal end of U.S. combat operations in Iraq, the nation's 1.5 million Christians say they are living in constant fear. Muslim insurgent groups have killed about 800 Christians with countless others taken hostage.

More than half of Iraqi Christians have fled their homes, most of them exiled to neighboring Jordan and Syria, experts say. Many more plan to flee. In 2003, the number of Christian families living in the Iraqi capital was 40,000; now, barely 50 reside there, according to figures given to Aid to the Church in Need, a Christian charity.

Iraq's Christians are “on the verge of extinction,” says John Eibner, the CEO of Christian Solidarity International-USA who recently returned from an aid mission to the Nineveh Plain and Mosul.

Visit the
SUMMIT MINISTRIES
Exhibit Booth

At one of these 4 outstanding
Homeschool Conventions

Memphis, March 3 – 5

Greenville, March 17 – 19

Cincinnati, March 31 – April 2

Philadelphia, June 23 – 25

Each of these conventions features a

**WORLDVIEW Teen Track led by
JOHN STONESTREET**

www.GreatHomeschoolConventions.com

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

“What we gave American lives to liberate this country for was not this,” says Carl Moeller, president and CEO of Open Doors with Brother Andrew, a Christian aid group active in Iraq. “Most Americans would be appalled at the lack of liberty in a country we fought and died to liberate, and that we are watching slowly disintegrate into sectarian chaos. The church is bleeding.” Survivors of the Oct. 31 attack tell blood-curdling stories about the viciousness of the al-Qaida gunmen. One of the assailants shot a pregnant woman after her dying husband tried to protect her and their unborn child. Another ordered a young parishioner to convert to Islam on the spot, then shot him in the head. Al-Qaida has said it wants to drive Christians out of Iraq and from Muslim lands in general. Former GOP Rep. Pete Hoekstra of Michigan said he believes the U.S. government’s response to the persecution of Christians in Iraq and throughout the Middle East is half-hearted and embarrassing.

“I think it’s fine that President Obama is trying to build bridges to the Muslim world,” he tells *Newsmax*. “But where is the same passion for protecting Christians and Jews in the Middle East? It’s almost scandalous that America is not talking about his.”

—*Newsmax*, Jan. 2011, p. 36–37

U.S. companies are sitting on \$2 trillion in cash, and the Obama Administration has just made telecommunications a less attractive place to invest. To health care and financial services, add one more industry that the federal government has drawn into that huge gray cloud called “economic uncertainty.”

Yesterday’s action is breathtaking: At a stroke, the Democratic-controlled Federal Communications Commission circumvents Congress, defies the courts, and declares itself overlord of the Web.

Under the “net neutrality” rules adopted by FCC Chairman Julius Genachowski and two fellow Democrats on the five-member panel, Verizon, AT&T, Comcast, and other Internet service providers will have less say over how they manage their networks and serve customers going forward.

The rules prohibit Internet providers from blocking legal websites, a principle the industry already voluntarily adheres to. More problematic are rules that would allow the FCC to determine if an Internet service provider is engaged in “unreasonable” discrimination in terms of prioritizing traffic on its network. Republican Commissioner Robert McDowell, who voted against the new regulations, noted in a statement yesterday that “reasonable” is not only a subjective term but “perhaps the most litigated word in American history.”

Earlier this year, a federal court ruled that the agency lacked legal authority from Congress to regulate Internet service providers. More than 300 Members of Congress from both parties have urged the FCC to stand down on net neutrality regulations. That number surely will rise next year. There is no compelling reason to subject the Internet to more regulation. New devices and applications proliferate. Competition among broadband providers is robust, barriers to market entry low, and evidence of market failure nonexistent.

What the FCC has done here is a naked lunge for political power. It forces every player in this crucially important industry to first clear what they can and can’t do with their Washington masters. Minimizing the inevitable damage ought to be a top priority of the next Congress.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 22, 2010, p. A18

Exposing “the radical left’s best kept secret” is the aim of a new report on the Tides Foundation and Tides Center, a network of wealthy political activists with connections to President Obama whose objective is no less than to transform the U.S. into a socialist nation.

“Together they provide tens of millions of dollars annually to some of the most extreme, destructive charities in America,” declares the report by Trevor Loudon for the Capital Research Center, a Washington, D.C.-based nonpartisan education and research organization.

Loudon, known for his New Zeal blog, which has broken numerous stories about Obama’s radical ties, says “the people of the Tides network are not merely wealthy donors or long-serving political hacks. While they transmit large donor contributions to progressive causes, they also transform those causes by retooling the mechanisms of ‘social-change philanthropy’ and rebuilding the infrastructure of the political Left,” he writes.

The Tides Foundation, founded in San Francisco in 1976, and its affiliated Tides Center form a network of the leading brokers of the unfolding “Obama Revolution,” Loudon writes, that promises “nothing less than the complete transformation of our economy,” as Obama expressed it during the 2008 campaign in announcing his energy plan for America.

Tides money flows to thousands of far-left independent public charities, lobby organizations, and “projects,” including the notorious community organizing group ACORN, David Brock’s Media Matters for America, and the Center for Constitutional Rights.

Anonymity is one key to Tides’ success, the report says, noting donors are not required to reveal the recipients of their contributions.

As Joseph Farah’s G2 Bulletin reported in 2004, Sen. John Kerry’s wife, Teresa Heinz Kerry, working through the Howard Heinz Endowment, oversaw the donation of more than \$4 million to the Tides Foundation between 1995 and 2001.

But what makes the Tides network unique is that it combines the foundation's role as a donor-advised funder with the center's activities, "nurturing and sheltering many of its fledgling groups with legal advice and fundraising assistance," Loudon writes.

The Tides Foundation claims it has distributed \$400 million in grants to progressive nonprofits since 2000, but Loudon believes the true amount must be significantly higher.

He notes that according to the respected FoundationSearch.com philanthropy database, the Tides Foundation gave 14,246 grants totaling \$630.6 million from 1999 through 2008. And in 2008, Tides gave about \$84 million to U.S. nonprofits and about \$20 million to foreign nonprofits.

ACORN and some of its spinoffs have received from Tides grants totaling nearly \$1.2 million while the left-wing "media watchdog" Media Matters has received \$500,000.

The much smaller Tides Center, with net assets in 2008 of \$80 million, was set up in 1996 as an affiliate of the Tides Foundation. According to FoundationSearch.com, from 2005 through 2007 it gave 345 grants worth \$25.3 million.

The center, Loudon writes, is unique because it acts as a "fiscal sponsor" for some 200 new groups and individuals. Instead of funding the groups, the report says, it helps establish new groups by offering them the shelter of Tides' own charitable tax status and Tides' health and liability insurance.

Nonprofits that began as Tides "projects" include People for the American Way, Social Venture Network, Women Donors Network, and Grantmakers for Effective Organizations.

—Art Moore, "How the Leftwing Money Machine Works" in *Whistleblower*, Dec. 2010, p. 16–17

OK, riddle fans, here's a toughie: What's the difference between California voters and the passengers on the Titanic?

The passengers on the Titanic didn't vote to hit the iceberg.

Most Americans understand that California is sinking. What is almost incredible is that it has voted to sink.

On Election Day, 2010 Californians voted Democrats into every statewide position (one is still undecided). This is the party that singlehandedly has brought one of the world's greatest economies to near ruin. There may well be historical parallels to what Californians did—but I cannot think of any.

A listener called my radio show two days after the elections to tell me that his business is booming—thanks to Californians. His occupation? He's a real estate agent in Phoenix, Ariz.

The middle class has begun to leave California. It is, of course, impossible for most members of such a large group to leave a state; few people leave their family, their friends, their job, and their home except under the most dramatic circumstances. But this fact makes all the more noteworthy the exodus from California that has been taking place.

You have to wonder how many businesses and individuals would leave California if their friends and family could also leave, if they could find a comparable job elsewhere and if they could sell their homes without losing money. What you don't have to wonder about is who would stay under those conditions. The state of California would eventually be left largely with those groups who voted Democrat in this election: rich liberals (such as those who live in Nancy Pelosi's Marin County, in the bay area and in West Los Angeles); state and municipal workers (who vote Democrat in as direct a pay-for-vote scheme as a law-based society allows); those who rely on state and city governments for entitlements; and those Latinos who either fall into the last category or who unfortunately identify the Republican Party with anti-Latino sentiments because it opposes illegal immigration.

Those who believe in individual responsibility, the free market, and personal liberty are a minority in California. We greet each other as Americans would greet each other meeting in a foreign country.

We watch as one of the greatest places in the world—with its extraordinary natural beauty, almost uniquely beautiful weather, and agricultural abundance—wastes all of this as a result of having become a left-wing experiment. What is particularly saddening is to see a state whose success was achieved because it was a Mecca for the adventurous in spirit, do everything possible to crush that spirit and drive away those who have it.

There is a silver lining here: clarity. Americans living elsewhere need not elect liberal Democrats to know what will happen if they do. They only need to look at California if they want to see what happens to a state governed by the left (and, for that matter, they can look at Texas to see what happens to a state's finances when governed by the right).

The left and its teachers unions have ruined public education in California. The left and its public service unions have saddled the state with \$500 billion in unfunded pension liability. California's left-governed cities have set themselves up as "sanctuary cities" for those who have come into America illegally. And the left passes more and more rules governing the behavior of California citizens. Two examples: San Francisco just banned McDonald Happy Meals because they come with a toy and therefore entice children to eat fattening food; and the Democratic legislature has made it illegal for a California employer—even in a retail operation—to ask a male employee who comes to work wearing a dress to wear men's clothing while at work.

And to render the Titanic analogy even more accurate, Californians voted to retain a law that was described by George Will as one "that preposterously aims to cool the

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

Student Worldview Conferences

Ideas come at you from every direction. Few know how to make sense of the world. Few know how to think Christianly. Few know what they believe and fewer still why they believe it.

Our two-week conferences feature over 70 hours of instruction in worldview analysis, Christian apologetics, and leadership from a world-class faculty.

Equip yourself.
Learn to equip others.

www.summit.org/student | 866.786.6483

Manitou Springs, CO

May 15 – May 27
May 29 – June 10
June 12 – June 24
June 26 – July 08
July 17 – July 29
July 31 – August 12
August 14 – August 26
August 28 – Sept 09

Bryan College, TN

July 10 – July 22

Green Lake, WI

August 07 – August 20



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

planet by requiring a 30 percent reduction of carbon emissions by 2020.”

That law will ensure that California taxes energy use more than any other state. That, in turn, is guaranteed to increase unemployment and the cost of living in the state—one more reason businesses and productive individuals are leaving, but rarely moving into, California.

Environmental true believers have free reign in California. They have convinced a majority of the state’s voters to believe the increasingly absurd notion that human carbon dioxide emission is heating up the planet to temperatures so high that humanity and the earth will suffer cataclysmic consequences.

To return to our Titanic metaphor, the great difference between that ill-fated ship’s crew and California’s crew (its voters and the California Democratic Party) is that the Titanic’s crew did everything possible to avoid hitting the iceberg; California’s crew did everything possible to hit it. Perhaps they believe global warming will melt it before they get there.

—Dennis Prager, *Townhall.com*, November 12, 2010

On election eve, a large and prominent delegation from the National Council of Churches (NCC) visited with President Obama in the White House implicitly offering support. The visitation eerily recalled a similar 1995 NCC visit to President Clinton to “pray” that he be “strong for the task” of resisting the then new Newt Gingrich-led Republican Congress. Only this time, the Religious Left seemingly could not wait until AFTER the election and preemptively wanted to express their solidarity before the impending Republican electoral advance.

Whatever the intent, the NCC White House visitation likely had no influence on how its primarily Mainline Protestant constituency voted. A Pew poll showed white Mainline Protestants favoring Republicans by a 54-36 margin as of late October. CNN’s exit poll showed that Protestants overall favored Republicans 59-38 percent.

According to a NCC account of the latest White House Religious Left summit, the church prelates thanked Obama for Obamacare and lamented that “political campaign rhetoric” had descended into “fear-mongering and divisiveness.” By implication, the NCC concerns were aimed not at the President or his party but rather his critics. “Without regard to the election the following day, our faithful witness is needed now more than ever,” explained NCC chief the Rev. Michael Kinnamon, as though their November 1 White House meeting were unrelated to the November 2 mid-term referendum on the Obama Administration’s policies. “We cannot stand by while people of goodwill are baselessly attacked for their faith, their political beliefs, or their identity,” Kinnamon intoned. “We have no reason to fear or demonize those who are different from ourselves. Today, tomorrow, and into this

next Congress, our country needs to come together and reclaim our values of justice and equality.”

The NCC has a long record of injecting itself politically into disputes between Presidents and the Congress. Always, the NCC will side for Big Government against its skeptics, while bemoaning the supposed “fear-mongering” of conservatives. In November 1995, during a budget showdown with the new Republican majority, the NCC helpfully stopped by Bill Clinton’s White House, where they “laid hands” on the man they hailed as “guardian of the nation.” The NCC acclaimed Clinton for ostensibly protecting the “vulnerable, children, families, and the elderly” from Republican budget proposals. Days earlier, the NCC’s board had declared itself “deeply offended” over “appalling” congressional efforts to balance the budget at the expense of “moral vision.”

Undoubtedly, the recent NCC White House visit was just a warm up for similar critiques of another, more recent Republican Congress. Only in 1995, the NCC claimed to speak for 50 million American church members. Now, its claims are down to 40 million or so, as the Religious Left continues to asphyxiate its churches with its spiritually suffocating substitution of Big Government for the Gospel. “As a faith community, we have a moral obligation to speak out for the ‘least of these’ and urge Congress and President Obama to make combating poverty and hunger a top priority,” explained one NCC prelate. But purported concerns about the poor conveniently did not exclude the NCC White House visitors from pressing Obama about “Middle East peace” and lifting sanctions against communist Cuba. They also raised “climate change” and “immigration reform.” The NCC’s preferred brew of Global Warming regulation of course would kill jobs and breed further poverty. And the NCC’s advocacy of amnesty and more liberalized immigration would hurt America’s unemployed and working poor the most. But the Religious Left’s faith in statist ideology always prevails over more pragmatic concerns for the vulnerable.

NCC President Meg Chamberlin explained to reporters afterwards that the NCC wanted to “encourage” President Obama, many of whose “values are shared by the faith community.” Creditably, she at least cited religious liberty for Christians in the Middle East. Kinnamon added that the NCC was at the White House not as a “political coalition” but a “faith based community.” He asserted their meeting the day before the election was purely coincidental. “That’s not the kind of organization we are,” he claimed. But Kinnamon said the NCC is concerned that the “vituperation” of ugly campaign rhetoric shows a lack of “love of neighbor” in America. And he said they were at the White House not as “political colleagues” but as “spiritual leaders” on a “pastoral” mission. Another NCC delegation official reassuringly emphasized: “It’s important to know that this President is attuned to the American people intimately and is very about the well being of the country and its people.” One other prelate,

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

during the Obama meeting, cited scripture against “disorder and wickedness” as they related to the political campaign.

Fifteen years ago, then NCC President United Methodist Bishop Melvin Talbert defended the NCC’s support of Clinton’s policies and opposition to the Republican Congress. “As a welfare state, one thing we have prided ourselves on is working toward the common good of all,” Talbert chimed. “Taxation is a way of doing that,” he explained while blasting tax cut advocates for materialistically wanting “to put more money in your pocket.” This time, the NCC is not yet quite so explicit in its unvarnished statism. With perhaps a little more obfuscation this time, the NCC still seems determined to side with Big Government and paint its critics as enemies of true faith.

—Mark D. Tooley, *Frontpagemagazine.com*, Nov. 11, 2010

TEL AVIV—Two years ago, Ratio Oil Exploration LP, an energy firm here, employed five people and was worth about half a million dollars.

Today it sits at the center of a gas bonanza that has investors, international oil companies, Israeli politicians, and even Hezbollah, Israel’s sworn enemy, clamoring for a piece of the action.

Ratio’s market capitalization now approaches \$1 billion. The rally at Ratio is thanks to the company’s 15% stake in a giant offshore gas field called Leviathan, operated by Houston-based Noble Energy Inc.

On Wednesday, the frenzy got fresh fuel: Noble confirmed its earlier estimates that the field contains 16 trillion cubic feet of gas—making it the world’s biggest deepwater gas find in a decade, with enough reserves to supply Israel’s gas needs for 100 years.

It’s still early days, and getting all that gas out of the seabed may be more difficult than it seems today. But Noble and its partners think the field could hold enough gas to transform Israel, a country precariously dependent on others for energy, into a net-energy exporter.

Such a transformation could potentially alter the geopolitical balance of the Mideast, giving Israel a new economic advantage over its enemies.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 30, 2010, p. 1

COMMUNISM

Infiltration of American legal organizations began in 1922 when the Communist International founded an agency known as MOPR (the Russian initials for “International Class War Prisoners Aid Society”). This became known as the International Red Aid (IRA). An American section was set up in 1925 called the International Labor Defense. In 1936 this ILD helped to organize the *National Lawyers Guild* (NLG), which in 1946 became affiliated with the *International As-*

sociation of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), the world-wide Communist front group for attorneys.

Today the Guild has several thousand members, offices in 50 cities, units in most of the leading law schools, and a major operation in Washington. When the League testifies before Congress, its views are accepted as those of strong civil libertarians.

The major media frequently give NLG members a sounding board without identifying their far left tendencies. For example, on May 28, 1978, at the height of the controversy over the indictment of several FBI agents for their investigation of the Weather Underground terrorists, the *New York Times* ran an article on the Op Ed page by Gerald Lefcourt attacking the FBI. Lefcourt was identified only as “an attorney.” In fact he is a leading member of the Guild and has a long history of radical activities. In the late 60s and 70s he was attorney for the SDS and the Weather Underground, primary subjects of FBI investigations. So he is hardly a neutral commentator on the FBI.

In December 1978, the AP and UP wire services carried stories on a Middle East report of the NLG accusing Israel of violating the rights of Palestinians and using torture. The *Washington Post* and other papers ran these stories, which failed to mention the pro-Communist leanings of the NLG or that the PLO had initiated the NLG visit to the Middle East and paid the delegates’ expenses while there.

Cited several times by HUAC and the Senate Internal Security Committee as a Communist front, the Guild showed its legal clout by mounting a series of hearings and appeals to obtain a dismissal of the listing as a subversive organization on the grounds of “lack of prosecution” by the Government. Nevertheless, it has continued to exhibit unmistakable signs of Communist domination: its continued membership in the IADL, its consistent espousal of communist causes, the large number of identified Communists in its membership, and (a minor but significant point) the singing of “The Internationale” at the conclusion of its 1973 convention in Austin, Texas! And this anthem is not a simple college pep song, as evidenced by the words of its chorus:

Tis the final conflict, let each stand in his place.

The International Soviet shall be the Human Race!

—James L. Tyson, *Target America*, p. 34, 35

The essence of Dr. Fred Schwarz’s message was published in his 1960 book, *You Can Trust the Communists . . . To Be Communists*. When he completed his 50-year mission in the United States and returned to Australia, he bequeathed his organization, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, and its publications to a worthy successor, David Noebel of Summit Ministries. David Noebel has just re-published Dr. Schwarz’s book under the title *You Can Still Trust the Communists . . . To Be Communists*, adding several chapters of

his own to update us on the continued Communist assault on capitalism and Christianity and add a useful bibliography. Communism did not die when the Soviet Empire collapsed. It still exists in Cuba, Venezuela, China, and, unfortunately, on the campuses of many U.S. Colleges and universities.

This book is an excellent primer for anyone who seeks to know how Communists are recruited and molded to become agents for an un-American ideology. It describes Communist techniques for seizing power and setting up fronts and captive organizations. This book would be an excellent vaccine to give to any young person heading off to college.

—Phyllis Schlafly, *Eagle Forum Alert*, Dec. 22, 2010

I recently asked my friend's little girl what she wanted to be when she grows up. She said she wanted to be President some day.

Both of her parents, liberal Democrats, were standing there, so I asked her, "If you were President what would be the first thing you would do?"

She replied, "I'd give food and houses to all the homeless people."

Her parents beamed.

"Wow! What a worthy goal." I told her, "But you don't have to wait until you're President to do that. You can come over to my house and mow the lawn, pull weeds, and sweep my yard, and I'll pay you \$50. Then I'll take you over to the grocery store where the homeless guy hangs out, and you can give him the \$50 to use toward food and a new house."

She thought that over for a few seconds, then she looked me straight in the eye and asked, "Why doesn't the homeless guy come over and do the work, and you can just pay him the \$50?"

I said, "Welcome to the conservative doing of the Republican party."

Her parents still aren't speaking to me.

—Author Unknown

