

•the journal

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

March 2011
Volume #11
Issue #3



And He [Jesus] said to them, "Whose image and inscription is this?" They said to Him, "Caesar's." And He said to them, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." When they had heard these words, they marveled, and left Him and went their way.

—Matthew 20–22

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Upcoming Student Conference Schedule

CO Session 01 May 15 – May 27
CO Session 02 May 29 – June 10
CO Session 03 June 12 – June 24
CO Session 04 June 26 – July 08
TN Session July 10 – July 22
CO Session 05 July 17 – July 29
CO Session 06 July 31 – August 12
WI Session August 07 – August 20
CO Session 07 August 14 – August 26
CO Session 08 August 28 – September 09

At the Summit, we're already getting ready for this summer's student worldview conferences—8 sessions here in Colorado, 1 in Tennessee, and 1 in Wisconsin. As you know, our goal in these 2-week camps is to anchor Christian young people in their Christian faith and expose them to other worldviews vying for their hearts and minds.

We want young Christians to know what is transpiring in the world, and we think the easiest way to accomplish this is to help them grow in their understanding of the “evangelical” worldviews that are seeking converts and followers. We concentrate on six—Christianity, Islam, Secular Humanism, Marxism, New Age, and Postmodernism. We help students see that nearly every headline in the news relates to one of these worldviews.

Each of these worldviews, including Christianity, teaches theology, philosophy, ethics, biology, psychology, sociology, economics, law, politics, and history through its own set of lenses. We want this generation of young people to see the pitfalls of learning “truth” using the wrong pair of glasses.

Let me illustrate this with a couple of examples. Ann Coulter says she received a good education—12 years in public schools, 4 years at Cornell University, and 3 years at University of Michigan Law School. Yet she never learned how Karl Marx's ideas about politics were affected by Charles Darwin's ideas about evolution and vice versa. How did this relationship negatively impact the next generation? What worldviews were at work in this dynamic?

A second example of worldviews in collision comes from a recent article by Dennis Prager, “The One Thing You Won't See on TV at the State of the Union.” American citizens, whose taxes pay for the whole event, won't see “chiseled in the marble wall behind the speaker and vice president, in giant letters, the words ‘In God We Trust.’”

Prager says he knows the words are there only because he saw them when he attended an earlier speech to a joint session of Congress by President Obama on health care. He wondered why media cameras never pulled back to provide a wide-angle

view of the president delivering his speech, which he says would be more journalistically routine and certainly provide the television audience with a more interesting view.

Prager theorizes an answer: “A generation of Americans has been raised to regard any mention of God outside the home or church as a violation of the deepest principles of our country. To the men and women of the left-leaning news media, in particular, ‘In God We Trust’ is an anachronism at best, an impediment to moral progress at worst. The existence of those giant chiseled words so disturbs the media that, consciously or not, they do not want Americans to see them....

“We have been led to believe that America is supposed to be a secular [read secular humanist] country. But that was never the case. We were founded to be a God-centered, God-based country with a nondenominational government. And that is what those chiseled words affirm.”

We would do well to remind ourselves and others what former President Reagan tried to tell us: “If we ever forget that we are One Nation Under God, then we will be a Nation gone under.” He also noted, “American needs God more than God needs America.”

Because of my experience at Summit I have been able to speak more confidently and knowledgeably in my college courses. I also have decided to become an educator. I can't wait to teach students with as much passion and commitment as Dr. Noebel has. He is truly a visionary and I hope I am able to take the experience he shared with me and impact it to generations to come. Thank you, Dr. Noebel and Summit staff. You changed my life!

—Cassandra V.

On another note, let me applaud Lila Rose, founder and president of Live Action, a youth-led pro-life organization dedicated to educating and mobilizing “local and national audiences to demand accountability from the abortion industry and human rights for the pre-born.” Lila, a former Summit student, is back in the national news for once again

exposing Planned Parenthood's sexual abuse and sex trafficking cover-up. A new video released by Live Action shows a Planned Parenthood clinic manager instructing “a man and a woman posing as sex traffickers how to secure secret abortions” and other services for their female underage sex slaves. America and the world need more young people like Lila Rose!

Help us educate this next generation and help us locate those young people who should be part of one of our two-week sessions this summer.



BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

At that time the disciples came to Jesus, saying, “Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?”

Then Jesus called a little child to Him, set him in the midst of them, and said, “Assuredly, I say to you, unless you are converted and become as little children, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven.

“Therefore whoever humbles himself as this little child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Whoever receives one little child like this in My name receives Me.

“But whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to sin, it would be better for him if a millstone were hung around his neck, and he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

—Matthew 18:1–6 (NKJV)

All possible knowledge, then, depends on the validity of reasoning. If the feeling of certainty which we express by words like *must be* and *therefore* and *since* is a real perception of how things outside our own minds really “must” be, well and good. But if this certainty is merely a feeling *in* our own minds and not a genuine insight into realities beyond them—if it merely represents the way our minds happen to work—then we can have no knowledge. Unless human reasoning is valid no science can be true.

It follows that no account of the universe can be true unless that account leaves it possible for our thinking to be a real insight. A theory which explained everything else in the whole universe but which made it impossible to believe that our thinking was valid, would be utterly out of court. For that theory would itself have been reached by thinking, and if thinking is not valid that theory would, of course, be itself demolished. It would have destroyed its own credentials. It would be an argument which proved that no argument was sound—a proof that there are no such things as proofs—which is nonsense.

—C.S. Lewis, *Miracles*

CAPITALISM

Everywhere we turn these days, it seems, leftists are undermining and attacking capitalism on moral grounds. Their criticisms are directed not at merely certain corrupt corporations or individuals who abuse the system, but at the system itself.

Sadly, few conservatives, even conservative Christians, are willing or prepared to defend capitalism’s virtues. Rather than tout it in terms of liberty, they sheepishly apologize for its allegedly inherent greed.

It’s a testament to the power of propaganda and the appeal of emotion over reason that a system that has produced the greatest prosperity in world history is castigated on moral grounds, while those systems that have proliferated abject

misery, poverty, tyranny, and subjugation are hailed as morally superior.

Granted, most leftists don’t openly confess their hostility to capitalism, but they come close, especially in their endless waging of class warfare.

Surely you’ve heard Obama say, preposterously, “A free market was never meant to be a free license to take whatever you can get, however you can get it.” No one actually supports this straw man argument. American capitalism has always been subject to the rule of law. Even the fiercest free market proponents don’t defend the license to steal or economic anarchy.

Hidden in Obama’s statement (and more apparent in some of his other statements) are unmistakable implications that those who thrive in our system are immoral and don’t deserve it and that the less successful have been cheated out of their just desserts. This doubtlessly proceeds from his leftist view of the relationship between government and the people.

The left doesn’t seem to comprehend the indispensability of private property to liberty or the necessity of liberty to achieve prosperity. To them, it is not individuals operating in a climate of liberty who produce prosperity. Government produces (or magnanimously permits) the creation of wealth and is the most appropriate vehicle for distributing that wealth and delivering the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

America’s gross national product first belongs to the government, and only that portion the government allows you, in its beneficence, to keep after taxes is your money. But even then, it is not wholly your money, for you are not free to transfer it by gift (lifetime or death) to whomever you’d like without penalty. And the interest you earn on it will also be taxed.

Leftists pay lip service to America’s founding ideal of equality of opportunity but honor instead the un-American idea of equality of outcomes.

They fully intend to use the power of government to rectify America’s inequitable distribution of resources. Don’t forget that at one time, at the hands of the left, the top income tax rate was higher than 90 percent or that it was 70 percent before the Reagan cuts.

Indeed, it’s ironic that leftists depict conservatives as hyperbolic and extreme for sometimes using the terms “socialist” and “Marxist” to describe Obama. They don’t offer a substantive defense against the claim, but use the same argument they offer against all charges about Obama’s radical behavior, namely that an elected American president couldn’t possibly be a radical or a socialist and certainly couldn’t be a Marxist. That’s the stuff of spy novels.

Never mind Obama’s actual background, his associations, his statements, his radical appointments, and his unprecedented policies. Those who describe him in terms that accurately capture his extremism and divisiveness are the ones written off as extremists or divisive.

This irony is compounded by the fact that it is leftists who are guilty of hyperbole—even paranoia—in their attack on conservatives, their patriotism, and their free market ad-

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

vocacy. Consider the bizarre rant of Obama's spiritual adviser, Jim Wallis, in trashing America's "conservative media" to a group of Britons.

Wallis said: "We now are controlled by the right-wing media, Fox News and all the rest, and this is the media that has an ideological point of view that America is best and the rest of you don't even count, that the rich are our salvation.... When I say the 1 percent of the country has more wealth than the bottom 90 percent, they say that's a good thing.... You just keep feeding the rich and the poor with their little tin cups hoping the rich are good tippers; that's a good thing for the economy."

Talk about the stuff of fiction. Conservatives don't believe foreign countries "don't count." Nor do they believe that the rich are anyone's salvation or that they are glorified benefactors of the economically less fortunate.

—David Limbaugh, Townhall.com, Dec 14, 2010

Politics

The contrast between what Illinois Democrats did last week and what Republicans have done in Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, Virginia, and New Jersey, could not be clearer.

In Illinois, Democratic legislators and a Democratic governor pushed through a massive 67 percent personal income tax hike (and a 46 percent boost in corporate taxes), claiming an accompanying "cap" would mean no new spending. Sure.

Illinois is caught in a trap of its own making, agreeing with unions (the Democrat base) to pay exorbitant amounts of retirement and health benefits to public employees the state cannot afford. Governors in nearby states are inviting Illinois residents and businesses to move from Illinois. No doubt many will accept those invitations, taking their money and their jobs with them.

California is a failing state, having overpromising public-sector workers at the expense of the private sector. And it's not alone. According to Bloomberg, "More than 80 percent of the nation's 27 million state and local government workers and retirees are covered by public pensions. Yet the median state plan had enough money to pay just 76 percent of its obligations as of Aug 20, 2010." Data compiled by the University of Rochester and Northwestern University found that "six cities—Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Jacksonville, FL, Philadelphia, and St. Paul, MN—will run out of pension money by 2020." States that have had enough have Republican governors who are committed to reducing spending and taxes.

In his State of the State address last week, Indiana Republican Mitch Daniels, properly took credit for policies that have placed his state among the financially strongest in the nation: lowest property taxes in the country and matching spending to income by eliminating "nice to do" programs, focusing instead on "must do" ones.

Daniels noted, "Elsewhere state government payrolls

have grown, but here, we have the nation's fewest state employees per capita, fewer than we did in 1978." He said that during the current recession "at least 35 states raised taxes, but Indiana cut them. Since 2004, the other 49 states added to their debt by 40 percent; we paid ours down by 40 percent." Other states went into the red, he said, but in Indiana "our savings account remains strong, and our credit AAA."

Daniels spoke of "protecting the taxpayer" and added, "...whatever course others may choose, here in Indiana we live within our means, we put the private sector ahead of government, the taxpayer ahead of everyone, and we will stay in the black, whatever it takes."

Unless you're a retired state employee in Illinois, you are probably on your feet shouting, "Yes! This is what I've been waiting to hear!"

President Obama and too many other politicians emphasize "public service" as if government work is superior to a vibrant private sector that creates jobs, goods, and services people want. Governor Daniels has the right priority: people and jobs first, government second. If Daniels hasn't decided to run for president, he should. This is a platform that has not only worked in Indiana but, if adopted by the federal government (and other states), would work nationally.

Many Democrats who voted for the Illinois tax increases were lame ducks who will pay no political price for their cowardly vote. Besides, it wasn't their money. That's why it's so easy to spend.

If politicians in other financially troubled states won't follow Indiana's example, people can move to states with lower taxes. But no one can escape the federal government.

Short of term limits or regular turnovers in Congress until they "get it," a more radical approach may be necessary. Suppose there was a groundswell of taxpayers who announced they will no longer pay for government and, in fact, will start reducing payments to government if politicians won't significantly cut spending? That would get their attention.

There aren't enough prisons to house thousands, perhaps millions, of taxpayers who cry "enough" and demand that Washington live within its means. It's time to starve the beast. If Dracula doesn't get blood, he dies. If Washington can't suck more money out of us and must stop borrowing, it will be forced to cutback, like so many have done in this recession.

Anyone ready to lead this second American Revolution?

—Cal Thomas, Townhall.com, Jan 18, 2011

A growing number of Republicans are breaking with the party's traditional stance to publicly state their support for same-sex marriage, a shift strategists say stems as much from demographics as from the renewed focus on economics and the "tea party" movement.

A solid majority of adults younger than 30—about six in 10—support the right of gay and lesbian couples to le-

gally wed, according to a *Washington Post* poll in February.

But even many older Americans and self-identified social conservatives have changed their view on an issue that just six years ago galvanized voters in support of President George W. Bush's reelection.

Gay Republican activists credit the shift to the heightened attention within the GOP base to jobs and the economy, and by a desire among strategists to expand the party's appeal.

"Our nation is at a crossroads, and conservatives are trying to rally together to turn back the Obama-Pelosi-Reid agenda," said Chris Barron, chairman of GOProud, a gay Republican group. "That's why we've seen people like Glenn Beck saying, 'Look, same-sex marriage isn't hurting anybody.' Because he sees a need to create a broad-based conservative movement."

Beck, a tea party favorite, recently told fellow Fox talk show host Bill O'Reilly that gay marriage was not "a threat to the country" and that marriage is a religious, not a governmental, issue.

A number of prominent Republicans have been more outspoken, stating that they support same-sex marriage rights. They include Meghan McCain, daughter of Sen. John McCain (AR); "The View" commentator Elizabeth Hasselbeck; former first lady Laura Bush and former vice president Dick Cheney.

Ted Olson, solicitor general under Bush, was part of the legal team that successfully challenged Proposition 8, California's voter-approved ban on same-sex marriage. And this week, former Republican operative Ken Mehlman disclosed that he is gay and that he will be raising money to support Olson's effort.

Also at play is the rise of the libertarian-leaning tea party movement. Many of the movement's leaders have said they oppose government intervention on marriage issues, while others say their concerns about taxation and the size of government supercede concerns over social issues.

"I come from a pretty strict upbringing in that I was raised Catholic," said Dawn Wildman, a coordinator for the California Tea Party Patriots, who said she personally opposes gay marriage. "But I have this strong belief in individualism. Not to mention that we don't have the luxury to think of the social issues right now."

One striking example of the tea party's ambivalence about social issues played out this summer in a House primary race in South Florida, where many tea party activists rallied around Donna Milo, a transgender Republican candidate who was seeking to challenge Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D). Milo came in third in the Aug. 24 primary.

Opposition to same-sex marriage has by no means disappeared in either party. President Obama has said he opposes the right of gay couples to marry, although he backs civil unions. Religiously inclined conservative groups such as the Family Research Council and Focus on the Family, whose political agenda has long overlapped with the GOP's, have

continued to push back on the gains made by pro-gay marriage groups in recent years.

—Sandhya Somashekhar,
The Washington Post, Jan 9, 2011

On the same January day that John Boehner took the oath of office to become the next House speaker, the pro-abortion group NARAL Pro-Choice America asked its supporters to take their own oath.

In launching their new website standuptoboehner.org, Nancy Keenan, the group's president, urged Americans to sign a pledge to support abortion. Keenan argued that the new speaker must learn "that his anti-choice agenda is out of step with our country's values and priorities."

Some are calling Boehner, who has said there is "no cause more noble than the defense of human life," the most pro-life speaker since the Supreme Court's 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade* legalized abortion.

But he is not alone on Capitol Hill. Last November a majority of Americans chose life as one of the country's values: The conservative surge brings as many as 246 pro-life lawmakers to the House. The new pro-life majority includes a net gain of about 45 seats for the movement. The number of women in the House who are now pro-life increased by 70 percent while the number of pro-abortion women in the House declined by 16 percent.

Unified by a sense of urgency in the aftermath of last year's healthcare debate, conservatives sent to Congress what Douglas Johnson of the National Right to Life Committee calls the biggest pro-life increase in the House during a single election. "We'll see if that translates into pro-life legislation," Johnson added.

The top priority for pro-life groups is a bill scrubbing every bit of abortion funding out of the federal government. Reps. Chris Smith, R-NJ, and Dan Lipinski, D-IL, are expected to introduce legislation establishing a permanent, government-wide prohibition on taxpayer funding of abortion. The blanket ban would prevent pro-life legislators from having to fight each year to insert abortion limits in numerous annual spending bills.

Meanwhile, Rep. Mike Pence, R-IN, has introduced legislation that would prevent tax dollars from being sent to abortion providers under the federal government program, called Title X, created to provide family planning for the needy. This is part of a larger effort to defund Planned Parenthood in much the same way the government defunded the controversial community organization ACORN last year. In 2008-2009, Planned Parenthood received more than \$363 million in government grants while performing 324,800 abortions.

"We are really focused on being on the offensive because we can be on the offensive," says Johanna Dasteel, senior congressional liaison with the American Life League.

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

“It feels really good.”

—Edward Lee Pitts, *World*, Jan 29, 2011, p.5

Sen. Charles Grassley, R-IA, concluded his three-year probe into the financial affairs of six televangelists without handing down any penalties—even though only two ministries fully cooperated with the investigation. Instead, Grassley’s report recommends that the Internal Revenue Service form an advisory committee to make sure religious organizations don’t abuse their tax-exempt status. Additionally, the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability (ECFA) will create a national commission to lead an independent review of religious organizations.

Donor advocates and ministry watchdogs were disappointed by the announcement. Rod Pitzer, of MinistryWatch.com, said Grassley’s conclusions were “far less than we could have hoped for.” Pitzer criticized Grassley for naming the ECFA to lead commission, calling it a “copout” that will end up protecting large organizations at the expense of grassroots donors. Michael Batts, an ECFA board member, will chair the commission. In a statement he said that “self-regulation and accountability” as “a model has worked very well for more than 30 years.” But none of the so-called “Grassley Six” televangelists were members when the investigation began. Joyce Meyer Ministries has since joined.

—Ibid, p. 8

ETHICS

The tendency to trust in man rather than God is everywhere apparent. Look at this *Wall Street Journal* headline from 2009: “A Baby, Please. Blond, Freckles—Hold the Colic. Laboratory techniques that screen for diseases in embryos are now being offered to create designer children.” Or this headline from last month: “Assembling the Global Baby. With an international network of surrogate mothers and egg and sperm donors, a new industry is emerging to produce children on the cheap.”

Trusting in man, we end up with chilling language such as this from last month’s article: “Mike Aki and his husband, a Massachusetts couple...planned on having two children. But their two surrogate mothers in India each became pregnant with twins. At 12 weeks into the pregnancies, Mr. Aki and his husband decided to abort two of the fetuses, one from each woman. It was a very painful call to make, Mr. Aki says. ‘You start thinking to yourself, Oh, my god, am I killing this child?’ He didn’t think of his decision as an abortion, but as a ‘reduction.’”

Trusting in man’s judgment, defenders of abortion still

say it is needed, although most no longer happily equate abortion with liberation. The Japanese anticipated us here: a high abortion rate, but places to mourn the dead unborn, with aborting mothers putting out bottles of milk and baby toys. Is that the best we can do?

Trusting in man’s rationality, one of last year’s new books on abortion, *The Fetal Position: A Rational Approach to the Abortion Issue*, by Chris Meyers (Prometheus), audaciously claims to take “neither a pro-life nor a pro-choice stance.” Meyers instead asserts that he is assessing both sides “from a position that is as unbiased as possible,” yet his position is inherently biased because he shows no belief in God. Unsurprisingly, Meyers ends up arguing that “a virtuous person would see abortion as something unfortunate,” but it should still be legal.

Trust in man, and we end up with both designer babies and abortions. Has any other civilization made life both so expensive and so cheap, so desired and so denigrated? Subjectivity rules. Jesus weeps.

—Marvin Olasky, *World*, Jan 29, 2011, p. 80

One has to wonder if Reuters reporter Julie Steenhuysen will soon be joining the millions of other Americans relegated to Obama’s swelling unemployment lines. She evidently didn’t get the media memo last week and violated the goose-stepping Left’s Orwellian requirement that we all adhere to obtuse notions of political correctness.

Having contracted a rare case of journalistic objectivity, Ms. Steenhuysen penned a story that dared to detail a recent Centers for Disease Control and Prevention study on homosexuality.

The study exposed the jaw-dropping fact that one-in-five “gay” and “bisexual” men in American cities have been infected with HIV/AIDS. Needless to say, this scandalous revelation completely blows out of the water the Left’s morally relative, propagandist line that homosexuality is “normal, natural, and good.”

To believers, it’s never surprising when modern science serves to validate the transcendent truths found in Scripture (not that God’s truth needs validating). James 1:15 warns: “Then when lust has conceived, it brings forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, brings forth death.”

Indeed, it seems the common moniker “homosexual lifestyle” has it exactly backwards. As opponents of the extremist “gay” lobby have long illustrated, homosexuality falls dead center within our nation’s burgeoning culture of death.

First, take that feminist rite of passage: abortion. Due to a national lack of sexual self-governance, in 2010 we find that—post-Roe v. Wade—50 million of God’s precious children have been slaughtered at Satan’s altar of euphemistic “choice.”

Moreover, millions of self-styled “gay” men have—as a

direct result of homosexual conduct—died from AIDS, syphilis, hepatitis, and all other forms of homosexually transmitted disease.

Romans 1:26-27, which Obama once comically called an “obscure passage in Romans,” addresses the homosexual deathstyle: “Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.”

It’s tragic when people yield to disordered sexual temptations that can literally kill them spiritually, emotionally, and physically. Nobody with any compassion enjoys watching others “[receive] in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.” But a corollary to free will is living—or dying—with the choices we’ve made.

—Matt Barber, “The Gay Deathstyle”, *Whistleblower*, Nov 2010, p. 24

Canada is now embroiled in a legal challenge that will test its polygamy laws—and it just may become the first Western nation to legalize the practice.

Canada’s long descent from a Christian to a secular nation serves as a harbinger of things to come for the U.S., should it continue to follow in its northern neighbor’s example.

The case of polygamist leaders Winston Blackmore and James Oler—with ties to Utah-based Warren Jeffs, the head of the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (a renegade sect of the Mormon Church)—is now before the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

The Canadian government has repeatedly tried to prosecute Blackmore, 52, and Oler, 44, leaders of rival polygamist communities in Bountiful, British Columbia. The latest attempt, however, was thrown out on technical grounds.

Now the tables are turned, and the polygamy ban itself is on trial. Blackmore and Oler are challenging the ban. Claiming that polygamy is “mandated by their faith,” the leaders say the practice is legal under Canada’s religious protections section in its bill of rights. A polyandrous woman—one who has many husbands—who is a member of the Canadian Polyamory Advocacy Association, has also joined the lawsuit. Polyamorists believe in more than one intimate relationship at a time, with members of either sex, as long as there is consent from all those involved.

The trial, which commenced in November, was still underway at press time.

Pro-family organizations say this case puts them in a difficult position. On one hand, they support the freedom of religion. On the other, they recognize the harm caused to society by polygamy. Nevertheless, their predictions have proven correct: Same-sex marriage laws have served to un-

dermine traditional marriage.

Although polygamy and same-sex marriage are inherently different, advocates are using similar arguments to achieve acceptance. Blair Suffredine, Blackmore’s defense attorney, argued that if Canada permits same-sex marriage, it must allow polygamy.

“If (homosexuals) can marry,” Suffredine opined, “what is the reason that public policy says one person can’t marry more than one person?”

The Canadian Polyamory Advocacy Association is calling its battle to legalize polygamy the “new gay” movement.

—*Citizen* magazine, Feb 2011, p. 24

In just five short years since legalizing same-sex marriage in 2005, many of the predictions made by family and marriage advocates are coming true: When you continue to expand the definition of words—or, in this case, institutions such as marriage—they lose all meaning.

As in the U.S., Canadian proponents of same-sex marriage scoffed at the claims that redefining marriage would undermine the institution and open the door to cultural confusion. And, like in the U.S., a study was commissioned by proponents, hoping to quell the opposition. Rather than proving that same-sex marriage will not lead to polygamy, a Canadian study found a strong correlation between the two. The authors of the study called for a repeal of Canada’s polygamy ban, by using an American-esque argument: If consenting adults are already living in polygamous relationships, why make their arrangements illegal?

Canadian Mark Steyn, a conservative commentator now residing in the States, predicted back in 2004 that his country was in the fast lane to legalizing polygamy. “Gay marriage, they assure(d) us, is the merest amendment to traditional marriage,” Steyn recalled, “and once we’ve done that we’ll pull up the drawbridge.”

In his column for *McLean’s*, an online Canadian magazine, Steyn criticized the Canada government for its hypocrisy trying to stop polygamy, yet supporting the practice by allowing polygamous men to receive welfare payments for each of their wives.

—*Ibid*, p. 26

Last week, following the murder of six people and the attempted murder of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords in Arizona, the American people were given a vivid display of the single most important tactic of the left: libeling opponents.

Most Americans have been naively and blissfully un-

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

Summit Curricula

Because we are called to think like Christ.

Are your loved ones developing a Christian understanding of the world? Help ground them in the faith with Summit's worldview curricula for Christian schools, home schools, and Sunday schools.

Building on the Rock: Grades 1-6

Lightbearers: Grade 8

Understanding the Times: Grade 12

Worldviews in Focus: Sunday School

www.summit.org/curricula | 866.786.6483



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

aware of this aspect of the left's arsenal against the right. But now, just as more Americans than ever before understand the left's limitless appetite for political power in an ever-expanding state, more Americans than ever before understand that a key to the left's success is defaming the right.

I do not recall any major American daily attacking another major American daily the way the *Wall Street Journal* attacked *The New York Times* last week under the heading "*The New York Times* has crossed a moral line." I do not recall Pulitzer-Prize winning *Washington Post* columnist Charles Krauthammer ever expressing contempt toward a colleague the way he did against *The New York Times* columnist Paul Krugman last week. Krauthammer ended his *Washington Post* column "Massacre, then libel" with this sentence: "The origins of Loughner's delusions are clear: mental illness. What are the origins of Krugman's?"

People are awakening to the seminal fact of left-wing success: The only way the left can succeed in America is by libeling the right. Only 20 percent of Americans label themselves liberal, let alone left. How, then, do Leftists get elected? And why don't more Americans call themselves conservative when, in fact, so many share conservatives' values?

The answer to both questions is that through its dominance of the news media, entertainment media, and educational institutions, the left has been able to successfully demonize the right for at least half a century.

The left rarely convinces Americans to adopt its views. What it does is create a fear of the right that influences many Americans to align themselves with the left.

For example, most Americans want to retain the man-woman definition of marriage. Even most voters in liberal Californians want to. The left has not been able to convince even Californians to redefine marriage to include members of the same sex. So what the left did was to declare as "haters" all those who wanted California to retain the definition of marriage as between a man and a woman. Proposition 8 became "Prop. Hate."

But the Left's modus operandi was never as apparent as it was this past week when it took a tragic mass killing of innocents by a violent mentally ill individual and transformed it—within hours—into an attack on the decency of the Right: specifically Sarah Palin, the tea party, Fox News, and talk radio.

The same left, led by *The New York Times*, that warned against making any quick assumptions that Islam had played any role in Maj. Nidal Hasan's murder of 13 people and wounding of 30 others at Fort Hood, immediately declared that the Arizona murders were largely a result of a "climate of hate" induced by Palin and other conservatives.

It wasn't true. They knew it wasn't true. And, yes, it was a libel.

But when you control all the major news media, Hollywood, much of the rest of the culture, and most of the high schools and colleges, how are most people supposed to re-

alize that it is not a valid description of the right?

What makes last week different is this: The left, for the first time, does not have the same monopoly over mass information, and the Republican Party is no longer emasculated. There is talk radio, there is the Internet, there is Fox News, and there is a vigorous conservative Republican Party. So, when the left unleashed its libel against the right, claiming that it was responsible for a "climate of hate" that produced Jared Loughner, to its shock, America did not lie down and believe it. Many millions did, as usual. But for those with eyes to see, it was a false accusation, and for many, for the first time, it provided a clear view into how the left operates.

As it becomes ever more obvious that Loughner's crimes had nothing—absolutely nothing—to do with conservatives, the left will do three things: change the subject by criticizing Palin's use of the term "blood libel," (a term whose use by Palin was honorably defended by Professor Alan Dershowitz, a prominent Jewish liberal); deny it ever really blamed the right for the Loughner's crimes (hoping, with good reason, that Americans have a short memory); and continue to blame the right for creating the "climate of hate" that the left itself has created.

That is why it is important for conservatives and honorable liberals not to allow Americans to forget what the left did last week. It is the key to giving conservatives the good name they deserve. And it is the key to giving the left the name it deserves.

—Dennis Prager, Townhall.com, Jan 18, 2011

Mikey Weinstein, founder of the Military Religious Freedom Foundation, wants Lt. Gen. Mike Gould removed as superintendent of the U.S. Air Force Academy because he will host retired Marine 1st Lt. Clebe McClary to speak at a February prayer luncheon.

McClary, a legendary war hero, was critically wounded during his 19th reconnaissance mission in Vietnam. For selfless bravery, the president awarded McClary the Silver Star and the Bronze Star. He has three Purple Hearts. As one of the most sought-after motivational speakers in the country, he has addressed more than 7,500 audiences—some in auditoriums of 10,000 or more. Only retired Gen. Colin Powell, who had a scheduling conflict, was higher on Gould's invitation list.

McClary offends Weinstein, along with the American Civil Liberties Union, because he is Christian. Weinstein complains that Billy Graham respects him. He doesn't like that this retired Marine, living with permanent combat disabilities, calls himself a member of the "Lord's Army."

For McClary's religious beliefs, Weinstein and the ACLU want him effectively censored by punishing the person who invited him. They want prior restraint of a speech. They want to trample on academic freedom. They want Gen. Gould's

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

head because he would dare invite a speaker who loves Jesus.

—Wayne Laugesen, *The Colorado Springs Gazette*,
Jan 24, 2011, p. A11

SCIENCE

Born to a poor family in eastern France, Louis Pasteur grew up to become the explorer and cartographer of microscopic realms. He secured a place in the history of medicine as the chief architect of germ theory, as one of the pioneers of vaccination, as an advocate for antisepsis in hospitals, and as the creator of the process to prevent spoiling in beverage that bears his name, pasteurization. Along the way, he disproved the theory of spontaneous generation, the spurious belief, dating from the Greeks, that living matter can arise from inanimate matter.

Pasteur devoted himself to studying how diseases are caused and transmitted and can be stopped from spreading. In the 1860s he conducted a series of experiments on sealed containers of beverages, confirming that the bacteria that infected them came from spores found in airborne yeast. These experiments ruled out spontaneous generation, even as they helped confirm germ theory. Realizing that microorganisms were responsible for the spoiling of milk, beer, and wine, in 1864 he invented a heating process now called pasteurization, to reduce their numbers. When an accident in his laboratory exposed chickens to bird cholera and made them immune to the disease, he developed a vaccine to do the same. Another of his vaccines was the first to prove effective against rabies. Yes, it was happenstance that led to his cholera breakthroughs, but Pasteur had an answer for that. “Chance favors only the prepared mind,” he declared.

—“100 Events that Changed the World”,
Time magazine special, p. 80

There’s no denying that Stephen Hawking is intellectually bold as well as physically heroic. And in his latest book, the renowned physicist mounts an audacious challenge to the traditional religious belief in the divine creation of the universe.

According to Hawking, the laws of physics, not the will of God, provide the real explanation as to how life on Earth came into being. The Big Bang, he argues, was the inevitable consequence of these laws “because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing.”

Unfortunately, while Hawking’s argument is being hailed as controversial and ground-breaking, it is hardly new.

For years, other scientists have made similar claims, maintaining that the awesome, sophisticated creativity of the world around us can be interpreted solely by reference to physical laws such as gravity.

It is a simplistic approach, yet in our secular age it is one that seems to have resonance with a sceptical public.

But, as both a scientist and a Christian, I would say that

Hawking’s claim is misguided. He asks us to choose between God and the laws of physics, as if they were necessarily in mutual conflict.

But contrary to what Hawking claims, physical laws can never provide a complete explanation of the universe. Laws themselves do not create anything, they are merely a description of what happens under certain conditions.

What Hawking appears to have done is to confuse law with agency. His call on us to choose between God and physics is a bit like someone demanding that we choose between aeronautical engineer Sir Frank Whittle and the laws of physics to explain the jet engine.

That is a confusion of category. The laws of physics can explain how the jet engine works, but someone had to build the thing, put in the fuel, and start it up. The jet could not have been created without the laws of physics on their own—but the task of development and creation needed the genius of Whittle as its agent.

Similarly, the laws of physics could never have actually built the universe. Some agency must have been involved.

To use a simple analogy, Isaac Newton’s laws of motion in themselves never sent a snooker ball racing across the green baize. That can only be done by people using a snooker cue and the actions of their own arms.

Hawking’s argument appears to me even more illogical when he says the existence of gravity means the creation of the universe was inevitable. But how did gravity exist in the first place? Who put it there? And what was the creative force behind its birth?

Similarly, when Hawking argues, in support of his theory of spontaneous creation, that it was only necessary for ‘the blue touch paper’ to be lit to ‘set the universe going’, the question must be: where did this blue touch paper come from? And who lit it, if not God?

Much of the rationale behind Hawking’s argument lies in the idea that there is a deep-seated conflict between science and religion. But this is not a discord I recognize.

For me, as a Christian believer, the beauty of the scientific laws only reinforces my faith in an intelligent, divine creative force at work. The more I understand science, the more I believe in God because of my wonder at the breadth, sophistication, and integrity of his creation.

The very reason science flourished so vigorously in the 16th and 17th centuries was precisely because of the belief that the laws of nature which were then being discovered and defined reflected the influence of a divine law-giver.

One of the fundamental themes of Christianity is that the universe was built according to a rational, intelligent design. Far from being at odds with science, the Christian faith actually makes perfect scientific sense.

Some years ago, the scientist Joseph Needham made an epic study of technological development in China. He wanted to find out why China, for all its early gifts of innovation, had fallen so far behind Europe in the advancement of science.

He reluctantly came to the conclusion that European science had been spurred on by the widespread belief in a rational creative force, known as God, which made all scientific laws comprehensible.

Despite this, Hawking, like so many other critics of religion, wants us to believe we are nothing but a random collection of molecules, the end product of a mindless process.

This, if true, would undermine the very rationality we need to study science. If the brain were really the result of an unguided process, then there is no reason to believe in its capacity to tell us the truth.

We live in an information age. When we see a few letters of the alphabet spelling our name in the sand, our immediate response is to recognise the work of an intelligent agent. How much more likely, then, is an intelligent creator behind the human DNA, the colossal biological database that contains no fewer than 3.5 billion “letters”?

—John Lennox, *Daily Mail*, Sep 16, 2010

ECONOMICS

In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the central planning was done by the State Planning Committee of “experts,” called Gosplan. In the U.S. monetary system, Gosplan is the Federal Reserve.

The mortal enemy of the Federal Reserve has always been gold. The yellow metal cannot be created on a printing press, so the U.S. Gosplan cannot counterfeit it.

In 1971, the last vestiges of the gold standard were removed, and Washington led the world into a completely fiat monetary system. The U.S. Gosplan was now able to counterfeit without any restraints at all.

This monetary socialism has worked about as well as any other kind of socialism. That is, it has put a lot more power into the hands of experts, who have wrecked the lives of millions.

For more than three years, Americans have been trying to cope with Gosplan’s most spectacular creation. My label for it is the Great Monetary Calamity, and I am sure it has many years left to run.

Two thousand eleven is the 40th anniversary of the world going off the gold standard, which had worked well for thousands of years.

On August 15, 1971, Nixon announced wage and price controls, a rise in import taxes, and the severing of the dollar’s link to gold. This was dubbed the Nixon Shock. The socialist legal system gave him the power to do this to us, and there was little resistance because the socialist schools had taught us that the experts knew what was best for us.

The dollar became a “fiat” (created out of nothing) currency, and this led to a four-decade unmitigated catastrophe in which no one has known the value of his or her money.

Officials print dollars and dump them wherever they think necessary, and the rest of us are stuck trying to cope with the resulting distortions.

In August 2007, we entered the blow-off stage of this experiment. The experts had directed billions of fiat dollars into subprime mortgages, creating the real estate bubble, and the bubble had begun to deflate. At first the Fed stayed tight, refusing to expand the money supply further.

This resolve to protect the value of the dollar lasted only a few days. On August 17, 2007, the Fed’s experts began to loosen, signaling a full-blown return to a sacrifice-the-dollar policy.

On October 15, 2010, Fed chief Bernanke announced that sacrifice-the-dollar had not been as effective as (socialist) Fed experts had hoped, and more sacrificing was necessary.

On November 3, 2010, a further QE—QE2—of \$600 billion was announced.

Only four days later, World Bank President Robert Zoellick dropped a bombshell.

Zoellick suggested that the dollar and other fiat currencies be re-tied to gold.

Also, on September 15th, former Fed chief Alan Greenspan said, “Fiat money has no place to go but gold.” This might be a tipping point.

To the Keynesians, who teach most economics courses in the colleges and try to stage-manage the economy and investment markets, Zoellick’s and Greenspan’s suggestions are heresy. A return to gold would curtail the power of Keynesian experts to manipulate our way of life by inflating the money supply.

By making the gold suggestion openly, Zoellick and Greenspan have given permission for the world to consider an alternative to Keynesianism. It is now okay for journalists and others to talk openly about a return to gold, which Keynes had famously stigmatized as a “barbarous relic.”

Suddenly, we anti-Keynesians have gone from being crackpots to vanguards.

—Richard J. Maybury, *Early Warning Report*, Jan 2011, p. 6, 7

HISTORY

“Recently the Boy Scouts of America distanced itself from the Girl Scouts and entered into an agreement with American Heritage Girls to provide mutual support to one another.

“The mission of Boy Scouts has always been to prepare young men to make ethical and moral choices over their lifetimes by instilling in them the values of the Scout Oath and Scout Law. Okay, but where are the Girl Scouts in this picture and who are American Heritage Girls?”

“American Heritage Girls was founded to offer faith-based leadership and character development programs to girls age five to eighteen. Its mission is to “build women of

integrity through service to God, family, community, and country.” The small all-girl unit within the American Heritage Girls troop structure provides a nurturing environment for learning and building positive relationships, character development, and spiritual enrichment.”

“At this point you may be thinking this is what Girl Scouts have been doing. Well, the Girl Scout’s Executive Director, Marty Evans, has boasted, “We’re not your mother’s Girl Scout troop.” How true! Let’s take a closer look at why this is the case.

“It is quite obvious that Boy Scouts are now considered a controversial group because they won’t allow homosexual troop leaders. You may also be thinking that the Girl Scouts aren’t controversial. These cute little girls who sell you cookies are all sugar and spice and everything nice? Well, not if the current generation of Girl Scout leaders has anything to say about it. For they hope to make these little girls the “shock troops” of an ongoing feminist revolution.”

“Let’s look back on the history of Girl Scouts, for change has been slowing coming on for years. In 1972, they dropped loyalty to their country from their oath in favor of “I will do my best to be honest and fair.” In 1975 the first Catholic Archdiocese cut off all support for the Girl Scouts because of their sex-ed program.

“During 1993, the Girl Scouts made “God” optional in the Girl Scout promise. “On my honor, I will try to serve God and my country, to help all people at all times, and to live by the Girl Scout law.” But the Scout manual notes that the word “God” can be interpreted in a number of ways depending on one’s spiritual beliefs. “When reciting the Girl Scout Promise, it is okay to replace the word God with whatever word your spiritual beliefs dictate.” Note that Boy Scouts have been sued over keeping God’s name obligatory in their oath. ...”

—Howard Phillips, *Issues and Strategy Bulletin*,
Dec 31, 2010, p. 6

