

•the journal

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

June 2011
Volume #11
Issue #6



Student Worldview Conference
CO, Session 01, 2011

Who can find a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies.

—Proverbs 31:10 (NKJV)

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Matthew Mittelberg, an August 2010 session eight graduate of Summit Ministries and a homeschool senior, is currently ranked number one in the nation in Lincoln-Douglas debate (a standing he has held for almost the entire season in the national STOA debate league), as well as number one in Persuasive Speech for his speech against abortion. He was the undefeated Lincoln-Douglas debate champion at the largest ever homeschool speech and debate tournament—the 2011 Concordia Challenge in Irvine, California—and was also the winner of the 2011 San Diego Classic. In addition, he placed first in two consecutive 2011 tournaments in Persuasive Speech and will be competing in both debate and speech at Nationals in San Diego in early June.

Matthew has also been an academic tutor, acted in many dramas, played basketball on a championship team, and has been a violinist since the age of three. He's known for his love of life, positive attitude, and a wide circle of fantastic friends. He has a strong relationship with God and loves to defend the truth of Christianity—a love that he says was strongly reinforced last summer at Summit. And when he's not doing research or debate you'll probably find Matthew doing his other favorite thing—leaping through the air to catch a long pass in an epic game of Ultimate Frisbee!



If you are a longtime friend of Summit Ministries, you know what we have been saying about the “religion” of Secular Humanism—it’s as “religious” as Christianity! And you know that we have been explaining this to Summit students for years. This comparison has been obvious to us for a number of reasons, including this well-known statement from *Humanism: A New Religion* (1930) by Charles Francis Potter: “Education is thus a most powerful ally of humanism, and every American school is a school of humanism. What can a theistic Sunday school meeting for an hour once a week and teaching only a fraction of the children do to stem the tide of the five-day program of humanistic teaching?” Potter was one of the original 34 signatories of the first *Humanist Manifesto* in 1933.

And now the mother of all truth—*The New York Times*—is making this

comparison clear to its readers. A recent headline announces “Atheists Seek Chaplain Role in the Military” (April 26, 2011).

The article, by James Dao, includes the following explanation: “In the military, there are more than 3,000 chaplains who minister to the spiritual and emotional needs of active duty troops, regardless of their faiths. The vast majority are Christians, a few are Jews or Muslims, one is a Buddhist. A Hindu, possibly even a Wiccan, may join their ranks soon.

“But an atheist?”

“Strange as it sounds, groups representing atheists and secular humanists are pushing for the appointment of one of their own to the chaplaincy, hoping to give voice to what they say is a large—and largely underground—population of non-believers in the military.

“Joining the chaplain corps is part of a broader campaign by atheists to win official acceptance in the military. Such recognition would make it easier for them to raise money and meet on military bases. It would help ensure that chaplains, religious or atheist, would distribute their literature, advertise their events, and advocate for them with commanders.

“Jason Torpy, a former Army captain who is president of the Military Association of Atheists and Freethinkers, said humanist chaplains would do everything religious chaplains do, including counsel troops and help them follow their faiths. But just as a Protestant chaplain would not preside over a Catholic service, a humanist might not lead a religious ceremony, though he might help organize it.

“‘Humanism fills the same role for atheists that Christianity does for Christians and Judaism does for Jews,’ Mr. Torpy said in an interview. ‘It answers questions of ultimate concern; it directs our values.’

“Mr. Torpy has asked to meet the chiefs of chaplains for each of the armed forces, which have their own corps, to discuss his proposal. The chiefs have yet to comment.”

What Summit has maintained for years is now verified by the secular press—atheistic Secular Humanists want an equal place at the table alongside Christians as chaplains in the US military.

If you’re interested in further reading on this topic, Summit’s book *Clergy in the Classroom: The Religion of Secular Humanism* (1995) makes an irrefutable case that Secular Humanism is indeed a religion (and has been since John Dewey wrote *A Common Faith*). *The New York Times* has now provided the latest evidence!

Relevance? Christians should be emboldened to demand equal time and emphasis for their worldview in America’s public schools. The atheistic worldview and religion of Secular Humanism should not remain as the unquestioned dominant view underpinning all of public education.



BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

Who can find a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies. The heart of her husband safely trusts her; so he will have no lack of gain. She does him good and not evil all the days of her life.

She seeks wool and flax, and willingly works with her hands. She is like the merchant ships, she brings her food from afar. She also rises while it is yet night, and provides food for her household, and a portion for her maidservants.

She considers a field and buys it; from her profits she plants a vineyard. She girds herself with strength, and strengthens her arms. She perceives that her merchandise is good, and her lamp does not go out by night. She stretches out her hands to the distaff, and her hand holds the spindle.

She extends her hand to the poor, yes, she reaches out her hands to the needy. She is not afraid of snow for her household, for all her household is clothed with scarlet. She makes tapestry for herself; her clothing is fine linen and purple.

Her husband is known in the gates, when he sits among the elders of the land. She makes linen garments and sells them, and supplies sashes for the merchants.

Strength and honor are her clothing; she shall rejoice in time to come. She opens her mouth with wisdom, and on her tongue is the law of kindness. She watches over the ways of her household, and does not eat the bread of idleness.

Her children rise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praises her: "Many daughters have done well, but you excel them all."

Charm is deceitful and beauty is passing, but a woman who fears the LORD, she shall be praised. Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates.

—Proverbs 31:10–31 (NKJV)

SOCIOLOGY

For a look at the exact opposite of Proverbs' virtuous woman, read carefully Suzanne Venker and Phyllis Schlafly's *The Flipside of Feminism: What Conservative Women Know—and Men Can't Say* (published by WND Books, March 2011).

Why has this feminist icon continued to cover up her years as a party activist?

What is it with progressives? Why do they feel the need to lie so relentlessly about who they are? Recently Rigoberta Menchu's autobiography was exposed as a complete hoax. Now it's Betty Friedan's turn to be revealed as a feminist fibber.

In a new book, *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique*, Smith College professor Daniel Horowitz (no relation) establishes beyond doubt that the woman who has always presented herself as a typical suburban housewife until she began work on her groundbreaking book was in fact nothing of the kind. In fact, under her maiden name, Betty Goldstein,

she was a political activist and professional propagandist for the Communist left for a quarter of a century before the publication of *The Feminist Mystique* launched the modern women's movement.

Professor Horowitz documents that Friedan was from her college days, and until her mid-30s, a Stalinist Marxist, the political intimate of the leaders of America's Cold War fifth column and for a time even the lover of a young Communist physicist working on atomic bomb projects in Berkeley's radiation lab with J. Robert Oppenheimer. Her famous description of America's suburban family household as "a comfortable concentration camp" in *The Feminine Mystique* therefore had more to do with her Marxist hatred for America than with any of her actual experience as a housewife or mother. (Her husband, Carl, also a leftist, once complained that his wife "was in the world during the marriage," had a full-time maid, and "seldom was a wife and a mother.").

—David Horowitz, Salon: Right On!, Jan 8, 1999

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

—C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

ECONOMICS

Keynesians ceaselessly claim that huge deficits are not just necessary to reboot the economy, they are essentially harmless. And the bond market's acceptance of 2009's unprecedented deficit of \$1.4 trillion seems to justify their complacency. Indeed, since the Federal Reserve is committed to maintaining a zero interest rate policy, then the consequences of borrowing trillions and trillions seem modest.

But the "new normal" of trillion-dollar deficits does pose potentially interesting questions: Will this vast issuance of new debt ever exceed demand? What happens if buyers of all this low-yield debt become scarce?

The usual response is that global and domestic investors can never get enough of US Treasury bonds because they are

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

liquid—that is, easy to buy and sell—and are safe, backed by the full faith and credit of the US government.

But Treasury debt, like all other bonds, has two funny characteristics the Keynesians either dismiss or ignore: the government has to pay interest on that debt, and the bond market, not the Fed, sets the interest rates on Treasury bonds.

In actuality, the Fed has only a few levers to pull in controlling interest rates. It sets the Federal Funds Target Rate for interbank lending and recently it has taken to buying mortgages and Treasury bonds directly to keep those rates low. But the ultimate arbiter of Treasury yields is the global bond market, not the Federal Reserve.

If buyers don't snap up bonds with low yields, then the yield has to rise to the point that buyers are enticed to step in. If buyers become scarce, then the interest rate rises, and the federal government has to pay more interest.

Why do we care? For the same reason that the Keynesians suddenly fall silent when the topic of interest rates comes up: rising rates on trillions of dollars of debt would obligate the government to pay a lot more interest than it currently does. That would squeeze spending on other programs and raise interest rates throughout the economy, rippling into mortgages, corporate bonds, credit cards, and other consumer lending.

The Keynesians also never mention what happens to real estate and the stock and bond markets when rates rise: like all interest-sensitive markets, they tank. Real estate tanks because mortgage rates and prices are on a see-saw: when rates rise, prices must drop to maintain the same monthly "nut" (mortgage payment). Stocks tank because investors prefer the safety of high-yielding bonds to risky low-yield stocks. The market for existing long-term bonds also tanks because the market value of a bond is inverse to the yield: when rates fall, long-term bonds at high yields rise in value, and when rates rise, then long-term bonds with low yields plummet. If you can get 8 percent on a new bond today, who wants a bond paying 4 percent for ten years? Answer: nobody, unless the price of the bond falls by half, effectively boosting its yield to 8 percent.

So, That Which Cannot Be Spoken among Keynesians is this: borrowing insanely large amounts of money at low yields boosts the odds that buyers will eventually hesitate, which will then drive rates higher, with dire consequences to the asset classes noted above.

—Charles Hugh Smith, *The American Conservative*, June 2010, p. 32

Two years ago, George Soros said he wanted to reorganize the entire global economic system. In two short weeks, he is going to start—and no one seems to have noticed.

On Apr. 8, a group he's funded with \$50 million is holding a major economic conference and Soros's goal for such an event is to "establish new international rules" and "reform the currency system." It's all according to a plan laid out in a Nov.

4, 2009, Soros op-ed calling for "a grand bargain that rearranges the entire financial order."

The event is bringing together "more than 200 academic, business, and government policy thought leaders" to repeat the famed 1944 Bretton Woods gathering that helped create the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Soros wants a new "multilateral system," or an economic system where America isn't so dominant.

More than two-thirds of the slated speakers have direct ties to Soros. The billionaire who thinks "the main enemy of the open society, I believe, is no longer the communist but the capitalist threat" is taking no chances.

Thus far, this global gathering has generated less publicity than a spelling bee. And that's with at least four journalists on the speakers list, including a managing editor for the *Financial Times* and editors for both Reuters and *The Times*. Given Soros's warnings of what might happen without an agreement, this should be a big deal. But it's not.

What is a big deal is that Soros is doing exactly what he wanted to do. His 2009 commentary pushed for "a new Bretton Woods conference, like the one that established the post-WWII international financial architecture." And he had already set the wheels in motion.

Just a week before that op-ed was published, Soros had founded the New York City-based Institute for New Economic Thinking (INET), the group hosting the conference set at the Mount Washington Resort, the very same hotel that hosted the first gathering. The most recent INET conference was held at Central European University, in Budapest. CEU received \$206 million from Soros in 2005 and has \$880 million in its endowment now, according to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

This, too, is a gathering of Soros supporters. INET is bringing together prominent people like former UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown, former Fed Chairman Paul Volcker and Soros, to produce "a lot of high-quality, breakthrough thinking."

While INET claims more than 200 will attend, only 79 speakers are listed on its site—and it already looks like a Soros convention. Twenty-two are on Soros-funded INET's board and three more are INET grantees. Nineteen are listed as contributors for another Soros operation—Project Syndicate, which calls itself "the world's pre-eminent source of original op-ed commentaries" reaching "456 leading newspapers in 150 countries." It's financed by Soros's Open Society Institute. That's just the beginning.

The speakers include:

- Volcker, who is chairman of President Obama's Economic Advisory Board. He wrote the forward for Soros's best-known book, *The Alchemy of Finance*, and praised Soros as "an enormously successful speculator" who wrote "with insight and passion" about the problems of globalization.

- Economist Jeffrey Sachs, director of The Earth Institute and longtime recipient of Soros charity cash. Sachs received \$50 million from Soros for the UN Millennium Project, which he also directs. Sachs is world-renown for his liberal economics. In 2009, for example, he complained about low US taxes, saying the “US will have to raise taxes in order to pay for new spending initiatives, especially in the areas of sustainable energy, climate change, education, and relief for the poor.”
- Soros friend Joseph E. Stiglitz, a former senior vice president and chief economist for the World Bank and Nobel Prize winner in Economics. Stiglitz shares similar views to Soros and has criticized free-market economists whom he calls “free market fundamentalists.” Naturally, he’s on the INET board and is a contributor to Project Syndicate.
- INET Executive Director Rob Johnson, a former managing director at Soros Fund Management, who is on the Board of Directors for the Soros-funded Economic Policy Institute. Johnson has complained that government intervention in the fiscal crisis hasn’t been enough and wanted “restructuring,” including asking “for letters of resignation from the top executives of all the major banks.”

Have no doubt about it: This is a Soros event from top to bottom. Even Soros admits his ties to INET are a problem, saying, “There is a conflict there which I fully recognize.” He claims he stays out of operations. That’s impossible. The whole event is his operation.

INET isn’t subtle about its aims for the conference. Johnson interviewed fellow INET board member Robert Skidelsky about “The Need for a New Bretton Woods” in a recent video. The introductory slide to the video is subtitled: “How currency issues and tension between the US and China are renewing calls for a global financial overhaul.” Skidelsky called for a new agreement and said in the video that the conflict between the United States and China was “at the center of any monetary deal that may be struck, that needs to be struck.”

Soros described in the 2009 op-ed that US-China conflict is “another stark choice between two fundamentally different forms of organization: international capitalism and state capitalism.” He concluded that “a new multilateral system based on sounder principles must be invented.” As he explained it in 2010, “We need a global sheriff.”

In the 2000 version of his book *Open Society: Reforming Global Capitalism*, Soros wrote how the Bretton Woods institutions “failed spectacularly” during the economic crisis of the late 1990s. When he called for a new Bretton Woods in 2009, he wanted it to “reconstitute the International Monetary Fund,” and while he’s at it, restructure the United Nations, too, boosting China and other countries at our expense.

“Reorganizing the world order will need to extend beyond the financial system and involve the United Nations, especially membership of the Security Council,” he wrote. “That process needs to be initiated by the US, but China and other developing countries ought to participate as equals.”

Soros emphasized that point, that this needs to be a global solution, making America one among many. “The rising powers must be present at the creation of this new system in order to ensure that they will be active supporters.”

And that’s exactly the kind of event INET is delivering, with the event website emphasizing “today’s reconstruction must engage the larger European Union, as well as the emerging economies of Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia.” China figures prominently, including a senior economist for the World Bank in Beijing, the director of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, the chief adviser for the China Banking Regulatory Commission and the Director of the Center on US-China Relations.

This is all easy to do when you have the reach of George Soros who funds more than 1,200 organizations. Except, any one of those 1,200 would shout such an event from the highest mountain. Groups like MoveOn.org or the Center for American Progress didn’t make their names being quiet. The same holds true globally, where Soros has given more than \$7 billion to Open Society Foundations—including many media-savvy organizations just a phone call away. Why hasn’t the Soros network spread the word?

Especially since Soros warns, all this needs to happen because “the alternative is frightening.” The Bush-hating billionaire says America is scary “because a declining superpower losing both political and economic dominance but still preserving military supremacy is a dangerous mix.”

The Soros empire is silent about this new Bretton Woods conference because it isn’t just designed to change global economic rules. It is also designed to put America in its place—part of a multilateral world the way Soros wants it. He wrote that the US “could lead a cooperative effort to involve both the developed and the developing world, thereby reestablishing American leadership in an acceptable form.”

That’s what this conference is all about—changing the global economy and the United States to make them “acceptable” to George Soros.

—Dan Gainor, Fox News.com, Mar. 23, 2011



A dominant theme of President Obama’s budget speech last Wednesday was that our fiscal problems would vanish if only the wealthiest Americans were asked “to pay a little more.” Since he’s asking, imagine that instead of proposing to raise the top income tax rate well north of 40%, the President decided to go all the way to 100%.

Let’s stipulate that this is a thought experiment, because Democrats don’t need any more ideas. But it’s still a useful ex-

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

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

periment because it exposes the fiscal futility of raising rates on the top 2%, or even the top 5% or 10%, of taxpayers to close the deficit. The mathematical reality is that in the absence of entitlement reform on the Paul Ryan model, Washington will need to soak the middle class—because that’s where the big money is.

Consider the Internal Revenue Service’s income tax statistics for 2008, the latest year for which data are available. The top 1% of taxpayers—those with salaries, dividends and capital gains roughly above about \$380,000—paid 38% of taxes. But assume that tax policy confiscated all the taxable income of all the “millionaires and billionaires” Mr. Obama singled out. That yields merely about \$938 billion, which is sand on the beach amid the \$4 trillion White House budget, a \$1.65 trillion deficit, and spending at 25% as a share of the economy, a post-World War II record.

Say we take it up to the top 10%, or everyone with income over \$114,000, including joint filers. That’s five times Mr. Obama’s 2% promise. The IRS data are broken down at \$100,000, yet taxing all income above that level throws up only \$3.4 trillion. And remember, the top 10% already pay 69% of all total income taxes, while the top 5% pay more than all of the other 95%.

We recognize that 2008 was a bad year for the economy and thus for tax receipts, as payments by the rich fell along with their income. So let’s perform the same exercise in 2005, a boom year and among the best ever for federal revenue. (Ahem, 2005 comes after the Bush tax cuts that Mr. Obama holds responsible for all the world’s problems.)

In 2005 the top 5% earned over \$145,000. If you took all the income of people over \$200,000, it would yield about \$1.89 trillion, enough revenue to cover the 2012 bill for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—but not the same bill in 2016, as the costs of those entitlements are expected to grow rapidly. The rich, in short, aren’t nearly rich enough to finance Mr. Obama’s entitlement state ambitions—even before his health-care plan kicks in.

So who else is there to tax? Well, in 2008, there was about \$5.65 trillion in total taxable income from all individual taxpayers, and most of that came from middle income earners, and that is where Democrats are inevitably headed for the same reason that Willie Sutton robbed banks.

—*Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 18, 2011, p. A14

ISLAM

The very notion of a Muslim America might seem preposterous, downright laughable, but there are people and forces identifiably working towards that end. “Islamism” is the term that describes the growing global movement of Muslims for

whom the supremacy of their faith justifies every kind of deception and violence.

Islamism as we experience it today began in Egypt between the world wars, with the movement known as the Muslim Brotherhood. Over the years, the Brothers have been phenomenally successful, establishing themselves in one form or another in at least 60 countries. In 1991, the Brotherhood’s top leader in America wrote a memorandum for the Brothers to make them understand their present purposes—and, in so doing, provided the title of this book. They were engaged, he explained, on “a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and ‘sabotaging’ its miserable house by their hands and the hands of believers so that it is eliminated and God’s religion is made victorious over all other religions.” Had he known that the FBI would obtain this document, he might have been more guarded. Yet today’s foremost spokesman for the Muslim Brotherhood, Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, boasts in much the same manner: “We will conquer Europe, we will conquer America, not through the sword but through *dawa* [the Arabic for proselytizing, or outreach].”

People in public positions—George W. Bush, for instance, Tony Blair, and pretty well all other European politicians—like to maintain that Islam is a religion of peace, and consequently it has become politically correct, indeed mandatory, to say that Islamism is a deformity, nothing whatever to do with the faith. Andrew C. McCarthy has the independence of mind and the courage to put forth the opposite point of view, that Islamism is the practical derivative of Islam itself. The doctrines of the faith and the savagery of Muslims are directly related or, as McCarthy defines it, they form a “nexus.” Plentiful incitements to violence and war against non-Muslims are to be found in the Koran to substantiate the point. ...

One representative and very exposed leftist is Barack Obama, and McCarthy builds much of his case about today’s fellow-traveling with Islamism around him. He identifies him with “a Leftism of the most insidious kind: secular and uncompromising in its rejection of bourgeois values, but feverishly spiritual in its zeal to tear down the existing order.” Such was indeed the aim of those once exercising intellectual influence on Obama—for instance, Saul Alinsky, the community organizer who politicized him; the Communist-party member Frank Marshall Davis, at whose feet he sat; and the race-obsessed and anti-American Jeremiah Wright, in whose Chicago church Obama worshipped for some 20 years.

His accusations against Obama as president are comprehensive. Obama is suffocating freedom, encouraging voluntary apartheid; and he and his Islamist allies consider capitalist democracy an abject failure. His speech in Cairo in the summer of 2009 was to mark a new beginning in the relationship of the United States to the Muslim world. That speech was co-hosted by Al-Azhar University, at which the Blind Sheikh and Sheikh Qaradawi had studied, and selected members of the Muslim Brotherhood were in the audience. They may have been as sur-

prised as everyone else to hear in that speech that Islam had always been a part of America's history.

All around him McCarthy sees evidence of appeasement and surrender in response to the example set at the top. The Department of Homeland Security is a monstrosity, more harmful than helpful to national security. Muslim officials and imams deliberately provoke the public with Islamist behavior but then demand, and receive, groveling apologies from those whom they have offended. An Orwellian order comes that language has to be controlled, and terms like "jihad" and "Islamofascism" purged. The expression "War on Terror" is now bowdlerized to "Overseas Contingency Operation against Man-Caused Disasters," and officials have to keep a straight face when they utter this complete travesty of reality. Maj. Stephen Coughlin, an expert in Islamic jurisprudence, was ousted from the Pentagon—at the behest of someone of Egyptian origins and dubious credentials—for a scholarly brief he had written. The incident when Obama bowed low to the Islamist bigot-in-chief, the king of Saudi Arabia, seems to McCarthy the perfect symbol of national abasement and a promise of worse to come.

Everyone must hope that Muslims will assimilate wherever they have immigrated, and that the Grand Jihad will fade away as fantasies do. In that event, this polemic will seem a curiosity, a state-of-the-nation pessimism at a time when things were in flux and Obama's contribution still in the balance. But should the opposite occur, and the Grand Jihad make further inroads, then this will prove to have been a furious and prescient warning.

—David Pryce Jones, *National Review*,
June 21, 2010, p. 41–42

The Muslim Brotherhood, with the complicity of the Obama administration, has infiltrated the US government at the highest levels and is influencing American policy that leaves the world's Christians in grave danger, warns internationally known evangelist Franklin Graham.

"The Muslim Brotherhood is very strong and active here in our country," Graham tells *Newsmax*. "We have these people advising our military and State Department. We've brought in Muslims to tell us how to make policy toward Muslim countries.

"It's like a farmer asking a fox, 'How do I protect my hen house?'"

That same Muslim Brotherhood is fomenting much of the rebellion and the deteriorating social order roiling the Middle East, forcing millions of Christians to flee for their lives, says Graham, son of beloved evangelist Dr. Billy Graham, and founder of The Samaritan's Purse international charity.

"Under [Egypt's Hosni] Mubarek and [Jordan's] King Hussein and other moderate leaders, Christians had been protected," Graham says. Eleven million Christians live in Egypt and I fear for them, because if the Muslim Brotherhood comes to

power, you're going to see a great exodus of Christians. Same thing in Tunisia and Lebanon. I fear for the church because the Muslim Brotherhood is going to be a very terrible thing."

A new report from the Roman Catholic aid agency Aid to the Church in Need supports Graham's contention that the persecution of Christians worldwide has worsened exponentially in the past few years.

According to the report, Christians face increased suffering in 22 countries around the world, with Iraq, Egypt, Lebanon, Pakistan, and Nigeria being among the worst countries to be a Christian in today.

The persecution has gotten markedly worse over the past two years according to the organization.

"The proportion of countries with a worsening track record of anti-Christian violence and intimidation would be higher were it not for the fact that in many cases the situation could scarcely have been worse in the first place" the report's authors wrote.

More than 75 percent of religious persecution in the world is currently being carried out against Christians, the report concludes.

The Vatican formed a special committee late last year to address the flight of Christians and the rise of militant Islam in the Middle East. In his New Year's message, Pope Benedict XVI said Christians suffer more than any other religious group because of their faith.

Asked if President Barack Obama was doing enough to protect Christians at home and abroad, Graham says, "No. If anything it's the opposite."

"Muslims are protected more in this country than Christians," he says. "The president has made many statements but he doesn't back them up. We have to do more to protect the Christians in the Muslim world. Their lives are in danger."

In recent weeks, Obama administration officials have stepped up the defense of their inclusive stance toward Muslims in their ranks. Deputy national security advisor Denis McDonough said last week that President Obama is actually trying to prevent terrorism by "dispelling the myths that have developed over the years, including misperceptions about our fellow Americans who are Muslim."

"When it comes to preventing violent extremism and terrorism in the United States, Muslim Americans are not part of the problem, you're part of the solution," McDonough said at an interfaith forum in Sterling, VA.

Graham, however says what Obama is really doing is "giving Islam a pass" rather than speaking openly about the "horrific" treatment women and minorities receive.

"We certainly love the Muslim people," Graham said in an earlier interview with *Newsmax*. "But that is not the faith of this country. And that is not the religion that built this nation.

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

The people of the Christian faith and the Jewish faith are the ones who built America, and it is not Islam.”

—Chris Consalves, Kathleen Walter,
Newsmax, Mar 18, 2011

Influential leftist and Muslim groups in America want to make sure that you remain ignorant and complacent about the real extent and magnitude of the Islamic jihad threat. Therefore, they brand any honest examination of how jihadists use Islamic texts and teachings to justify violence and Islamic supremacism as “bigoted and hateful.” The absurdities this leads to were made clear during the New York State Senate’s homeland security committee hearings last week on the Islamic terror threat facing New York, when the proceedings quickly devolved into yet another circus of political correctness and claims of victim status for Muslims—with little, if any, light shed on the terror threat facing New York and the country as a whole.

Reprising his own failed hearings about the jihad threat, US Rep. Peter King (R.-NY) testified that “99%” of Muslims in this country are “outstanding Americans” who abhor terrorism. King, in other words, said nothing about the comprehensive Muslim Brotherhood initiatives that I wrote about in my 2008 book *Stealth Jihad*, which documents the multifaceted nonviolent campaign to assert the primacy of elements of Islamic law and custom over American law and custom. Yet so many Americans have now awakened to this campaign that at least 14 states are considering initiatives to ban Islamic law (sharia).

King did say that “the fact is, the enemy, or those being recruited by Al-Qaeda, live within the Muslim community, and that’s the reality we have to face.” True, and necessary to be said. However, King stopped short of saying not only that Al-Qaeda lives within the Muslim community, but makes recruits among peaceful Muslims by claiming for itself the mantle of true and pure Islam, quoting copiously from the Koran and invoking the example of Muhammad. The implications of that are apparently too hard even for someone as committed to protecting our nation from jihadis as King obviously is.

But maybe I am being too tough on King. After all, he is working in a difficult field. How difficult was epitomized by Adem Carroll of the New York State Interfaith Network for Immigration Reform, who complained about the New York State Senate’s hearings. by explaining: “None of us are condemning the hearings’ stated purpose. ... But hate speech and defamation can and do perpetuate a cycle of violence.”

The hearings, in other words, were “hate speech and defamation,” apparently because they featured speakers such as the ex-Muslim human rights activist Nonie Darwish. Yet Carroll’s claim that he didn’t condemn the hearings’ stated purpose rang hollow. In reality, *everyone* who dares to speak the truth about the jihad against the US is targeted as “biased against Islam” and too extreme for polite company. There is no terrorism

hearing anywhere that would look at Islamic jihad in a realistic way that would be acceptable to blinked multiculturalists like Adem Carroll.

The fireworks began in earnest when Darwish testified, speaking about the education in hate that Muslim children receive in the Middle East. “The education of Arab children is to make killing of certain groups of people not only good. It’s holy. It becomes holy in our culture.”

That was too much for Brooklyn Sen. Eric Adams, who presented a Koran and thundered that Darwish was “bringing hate and poison” into the proceedings. Adams, an extremely serviceable useful idiot, was using the familiar Islamic supremacist tactic of accusing those who report on the hate and poison of jihadists of spreading that hate and poison. He did not, and could not, refute what Darwish said about the education of Arab children, so he decided instead to shoot the messenger.

And as for a critic of Islam bringing hate and poison into the hearing, which Adams countered by waving around the Koran as a talisman, one wonders if he ever bothered to open that book even once. Adams is worried about hate and poison? How about this for starters: the Koran tells Muslims not to take Jews and Christians as their friends (5:51), that Jews will be “strongest in enmity” to the Muslims (5:82), that Jews and Christians are under Allah’s curse (9:30), and that Muslims must wage war against them and subjugate them (9:29).

But in Adams’ world, the hate is all Nonie Darwish’s fault. It was just the latest indication of the willful blindness of the PC crowd, and the fix we’re in as a result.

—Robert Spencer, *Human Events*, Apr 18, 2011, p. 23

ENTERTAINMENT

Christian conservatives often decry the silencing of faith by major network television.

But Sunday night on CBS’ hit reality TV series “Undercover Boss,” people of faith had their breath taken away by what they witnessed, sparking a Facebook and Twitter avalanche of support and praise.

On Facebook, Kini Se remarked, “Loved the episode of ‘Undercover Boss’ last night. It is the BEST one yet. It is great to see you praising the Lord on national television. The entire time, I had tears running down my face. It was real, it was true and inspirational. God bless you and your family.”

Chris Connor on Twitter wrote, “Loving that Undercover Boss has a positive Christian perspective features tonight—about time we have a good depiction in the media.”

The show featured Baja Fresh CEO David Kim, a Korean immigrant who has gained a reputation as an “empire builder” within the food and restaurant franchise world, praying with his children, praying alone in a church, even praying with one of his employees—a scene surely to cause ire among anti-faith in the workplace progressives. But the serial entrepreneur, who is also the CEO of La Salsa and Sweet Factory, is not bashful about his faith or passion for America.

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

“America is about freedom!” Kim told *Human Events*. “As Christians, we shouldn’t be afraid to share the hope within us. It’s what our country’s Founding Fathers believed in. So why hide the love inside our hearts?”

—Jason Mattera, *Human Events*, Apr 18, 2011, p. 7

Back in 1993, a Cuban dissident boarded a plane in Havana disguised as a Spanish tourist, with a wig and a fake passport, and flew to Spain to escape the tyranny in Cuba.

But Alina Fernandez-Revuelta isn’t just another Cuban dissident—she is Fidel Castro’s daughter.

Now she lives in Miami and is dedicated to one crusade: Educating Americans about the injustices of the Cuban regime. And she is about to see her life unfold on the big screen in “Castro’s Daughter,” a film based on a screenplay by Oscar-winner Bobby Moresco (“Crash”) and Pulitzer Prize-winner Nilo Cruz.

Fernandez-Revuelta, 55, lives alone in a house near Miami’s Little Havana, and works part-time as a medical researcher at a local hospital. But her main focus is on her hour-long weeknight radio show, “Simply Alina” in English, which features her commentary, news about Cuba, and guests from across the Cuban-American community.

She also delivers anti-Castro speeches at universities and other institutions.

“It’s my duty, maybe part of the obligation I have because of who I am,” she told Fox News Latino.

She also said living in the Cuban exile capital of the world “has been the hardest experience in my life because it’s living with the victims of your own family, your own flesh and blood.”

Mauricio Claver-Carone, chairman of the US Cuba Democracy PAC, said, “The impact she’s had has been tremendous in terms of educating the American public about the reality and injustice of the Cuban regime—but it’s difficult for her because it’s still her father.”

Fernandez-Revuelta does not speak by phone with her mother, Natalia Revuelta, who had an affair with Fidel Castro three years before he came to power in 1959 and still lives in Cuba.

“My family caused so much damage to people walking around here [in Miami] every day,” she said. “It’s taken me several years to get over those guilty feelings.”

—Newsmax.com, Apr 17, 2011

Politics

Wisconsin State Rep. Michelle Litjens, 38, a freshman Republican, delivered the assembly’s opening prayer the day the chamber passed Gov. Scott Walker’s original budget bill at the end of February. Democratic legislators shouted her down, she said. After the assembly passed the bill, a Democratic legislator, Gordon Hintz, said to her, “You’re [expletive] dead.” He apologized for the threat after the press reported it. Litjens said

she understood that he was exhausted—they had been in session 61 hours straight as Democrats offered 84 amendments to slow the bill’s passage—but he had “no excuse.” Police provided protection to some Republican lawmakers as they left the chamber after the vote, while Democrats threw papers in the air in frustration.

Litjens was in her office nearly two weeks later on March 9 when the Senate removed the fiscal elements of the budget bill and passed the bill that curtailed collective bargaining for certain public sector unions, without long-absent Democratic senators. The move enraged protestors. The Capitol police came over the intercom urging legislators to leave the building as quickly as possible, but Litjens needed to finish up some work, and disregarded the warning several times until she heard a swelling roar as protestors entered the Capitol.

The police officers told her they didn’t have enough manpower to protect her, so a kind Democrat passed her an AFL-CIO button—a fist shaped like the state of Wisconsin—which she pinned on so she could pass through the crowd. On the ground she noticed protestors from Organizing for America, President Obama’s campaign organization that opposed the budget bill and the collective bargaining measure. “He didn’t teach his people much civility,” Litjens said. As she told me this story, after ordering a bowl of cottage cheese with wheat toast, she pulled out the button the Democrat gave her. Now she keeps it in her purse.

The state Capitol is quieter but the fierce protests have enthused Democrats, who are working now to ensure Walker reaps the whirlwind. And not just Walker: The Wisconsin backlash is sending signals to the new crop of Republican governors that are attempting measures similar to Walker’s.

—Emily Belz, *World* magazine, Apr 23, 2011, p. 52

History

Well, it’s official. America’s National Day of Prayer is indeed constitutional.

Last week, the Seventh US Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago ruled unanimously that the National Day of Prayer—established by Congress in 1952 and in 1988 set as the first Thursday in May—does not constitute a violation of the separation of church and state.

The ruling deemed powerless a lawsuit brought by a group of atheists and agnostics called the Freedom From Religion Foundation . . . and overturned a ruling last April by federal judge Barbara Crabb that the National Day of Prayer was unconstitutional.

By law, the president must proclaim a national day of prayer every year—and despite Crabb’s ruling President Obama, in his 2010 National Day of Prayer proclamation last year, said: “In prayer, we have expressed gratitude and humility, sought guidance and forgiveness, and received inspiration and assistance, both in good times and in bad.” Obama called on Americans to

“pray, or otherwise give thanks, in accordance with their own faiths and consciences, for our many freedoms and blessings.”

Now, this year, Americans will again await the president’s proclamation and more forward in powerful, unified prayer for the nation—and your Prayer Team will be there to help lead the way!

—The Presidential Prayer Team, Apr 19, 2011

HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE MILITARY

Four branches of the military have begun sending training material to 2.2 million active and reserve troops as a prelude to opening the ranks to gays, with instructions on, for example, what to do if an officer sees two male Marines kissing in a shopping mall.

Key themes are that sexual orientation will no longer be a bar to service, that all service members must respect each other, and that the partners of gay troops will not receive the benefits of heterosexual spouses.

“We are going to make [gay ban] repeal training expeditiously,” said Maj. Joel Harper, an Air Force spokesman at the Pentagon. “It’s great training.”

The briefings first target commanders, who will have to enforce the new law and deal with disputes, and then the entire force. The slides, vignettes, and talking points by the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are similar.

The vignette about seeing two male Marines kissing is part of a list of scenarios to help instructors prepare commanders for incidents likely to arise.

“Situation,” it begins. “You are the Executive Officer of your unit. While shopping at the local mall over the weekend, you observe two junior male Marines in appropriate civilian attire assigned to your unit kissing and hugging in the food court.

“Issue: Standards of Conduct. Is this within standards of personal and professional conduct?”

The answer to Marines: “If the observed behavior crosses acceptable boundaries as defined in the standards of conduct for your unit and the Marine Corps, then an appropriate correction should be made. Your assessment should be made without regard to sexual orientation.”

The vignettes’ talking point states that commanders cannot rule a bar off limits simply because it caters to gays. Nor can commanders bar an off-duty homosexual from marching in civilian clothes in a gay-pride parade.

—Rowan Scarborough, *The Washington Times*, Mar 23, 2011

- knowing when to come in out of the rain;
- why the early bird gets the worm;
- life isn’t always fair;
- and maybe it was my fault.

Common Sense lived by simple, sound financial policies (don’t spend more than you earn) and reliable parenting strategies (adults, not children, are in charge).

His health began to deteriorate rapidly when well intentioned but overbearing regulations were set in place. Reports of a six-year old boy charged with sexual harassment for kissing a classmate; teens suspended from school for using mouthwash after lunch; and a teacher fired for reprimanding an unruly student, only worsened his condition.

Common Sense lost ground when parents attacked teachers for doing the job they themselves failed to do in disciplining their unruly children.

It declined even further when schools were required to get parental consent to administer sun lotion or an aspirin to a student, but could not inform parents when a student became pregnant and wanted to have an abortion.

Common Sense lost the will to live as the churches became businesses, and criminals received better treatment than their victims.

Common Sense took a beating when you couldn’t defend yourself from a burglar in your own home and the burglar can sue you for assault.

Common Sense finally gave up the will to live after a woman failed to realize that a steaming cup of coffee was hot. She spilled a little in her lap, and was promptly awarded a huge settlement.

Common Sense was preceded in death by his parents, Truth and Trust; his wife, Discretion; his daughter, Responsibility, and his son, Reason.

He is survived by his 4 stepbrothers;

I know my Rights

I want It Now

Someone Else is to blame

I’m a Victim.

—Anne Whitfield, *The London Times*, December 4, 2007

COMMON SENSE

Today we mourn the passing of a beloved old friend, Common Sense, who has been with us for many years. No one knows for sure how old he was since his birth records were long ago lost in bureaucratic red tape. He will be remembered as having cultivated such valuable lessons as: