

•the journal

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

September 2011
Volume #11
Issue #9



The rich rules over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender.
—Proverbs 22:7 NKJV

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

The *New York Times* was quick to label Norwegian mass murderer Anders Behring Breivik “a Christian extremist” (July 24, 2011). Other headlines called him “a rightwing fundamentalist Christian,” making it apparent that the leftwing press would use this recent horror to prove that Christians are just another brand of jihadist.

Of course, true Christians knew immediately that Breivik could not be a Christian if he senselessly murdered scores of human beings. Jesus responded to the Jews who wanted to kill Him while claiming God was their Father by saying, “If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and now am here. . . . You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father’s desire. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him” (John 8:42–44).

It turns out Breivik is closer to being a pagan, atheistic, secularist Darwinianist whose philosophy and agenda are more compatible with the *New York Times* than with biblical Christianity. Ann Coulter notes that Breivik favorably quotes the *New York Times*, but never the Bible!

John G. West of Discovery Institute has read Breivik’s 1,518-page manifesto entitled “A European Declaration of Independence” and discovered the following: a) “[Breivik] may not even believe in God”; b) Machiavelli’s *The Prince* is one of his favorite books; c) “He is best described as a virulent mixture of scientific fundamentalism and Social Darwinism”; d) “He wants a secular European state”; e) “Biological science is the ultimate savior of society”; f) “Advances in biology will make possible a vigorous new form of Social Darwinism that will save the Nordic race through positive eugenics”; and g) “Eugenics and evolutionary biology” are the solution.

Jerry Newcombe, senior producer and host of “The Coral Ridge Hour,” not only married a Norwegian, but was married in Norway. In an excellent article entitled “The Norwegian Murderer Was Not a ‘Christian’—But a ‘Blond Beast of Prey’” he writes, “The mainstream media has called [Breivik] a ‘fundamentalist Christian.’ But his own 1500-page manifesto doesn’t line up with that (nor do his actions line up with any element of Christian teaching). He’s a Darwinist, not a creationist, perhaps an Odin-worshiper, but not a Christ-worshiper. He claims he opposes the spread of Islam in Europe, and to prove his point he shoots a bunch of European children (future, potential leaders of the Norwegian Labor Party).”

Newcombe’s brother-in-law, Dr. Arne Fjeldstad (former editor with *Aftenposten*), summarized Breivik’s manifesto by stating, “The 1500+ page manifesto tells of a young man with fantasies of knights and crusades [defending] what he considers the true European culture. Mr. Breivik also belongs to the Free Masons (first grade) and describes himself as a Justiciar Knight in his new movement, which he claims is international—and which borrows from old Norse religion.”

Ann Coulter, after reading Breivik’s manifesto, says “he does not mean ‘Christian’ as most Americans understand the term.” She points out Breivik’s claim that “being a Christian does not necessarily constitute that you are required to have a personal relationship with God or Jesus.” Coulter concludes that in Breivik’s thinking, anyone who is not a Muslim is a Christian by default. Breivik encourages “Christian agnostics” and “Christian atheists” to join him in his new rendition

of the Knights Templar.

Rush Limbaugh pegged him immediately—“he’s a neo-Nazi.”

Ideas rule the world, and ideas have consequences. Lord Acton observed that the ideas of Marx, Darwin, Freud, and Nietzsche at the end of the nineteenth century, if put into practice, would have terrible consequences in the twentieth century. And indeed, the twentieth century under Nazism, Fascism, Communism, and Secular Humanism witnessed the slaughter of more men, women, and children than had all previous centuries combined.

Anders Behring Breivik embraced and put into practice these same ideas, and the July 2011 violent massacre of scores of Norwegians was the horrible consequence. Neither his thoughts nor his actions are compatible with biblical Christianity. Jesus clearly teaches that His true followers are recognized not by their claims, but by their fruit (Matthew 7:15–23).



We just finished two awesome weeks in Tennessee with 300 students and 33 staff! There was definitely never a dull moment and we were thrilled with the stories we heard about how these students were impacted.

One particularly exciting story was told via e-mail just a few days ago. A prominent church in Iowa is a huge supporter of Summit and sends 10 to 20 of their youth to Summit every summer. Their youth pastor e-mailed the below story:

Something happened this morning that I need to tell you about. I accidentally let my Summit kids loose on my congregation and revival practically broke out.

It was our Sr. High Sunday where we are in charge of the whole service. Four Summit Tennessee guys shared the sermon time for which they chose to do a worldview summary and it pretty much ended up to be a 30 minute Summit commercial.

We also wanted to share just a few comments from students and staff after their time at the TN Summit:

"Summit gives you the tools you need to flourish in your faith."

"If you come to Summit and do not get anything out of it or enjoy it...something is wrong with you. It is a life-changing experience!"

"I'm not a Christian, but I still think it's a good program."

"I had extremely high expectations for Summit, but my expectations were exceeded!"

And a few words from our TN staff:

"This was one of the best decisions I've ever made [working for Summit]."

"Best community. Best leaders. Best summer."



BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

My brethren, do not hold the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with partiality. For if there should come into your assembly a man with gold rings, in fine apparel, and there should also come in a poor man in filthy clothes, and you pay attention to the one wearing the fine clothes and say to him, "You sit here in a good place," and say to the poor man, "You stand there," or, "Sit here at my footstool," have you not shown partiality among yourselves,

and become judges with evil thoughts? Listen, my beloved brethren: Has God not chosen the poor of this world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to those who love Him? But you have dishonored the poor man. Do not the rich oppress you and drag you into the courts? Do they not blaspheme that noble name by which you are called? If you really fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," you do well; but if you show partiality, you commit sin, and are convicted by the law as transgressors.

—James 2:1–9 (NKJV)

[One looking at] Christian activities which are, in a sense, directed toward this present world... would find that this religion had, as a mere matter of historical fact, been the agent which preserved such secular civilization as survived the fall of the Roman Empire; that to it Europe owes the salvation, in those perilous ages, of civilized agriculture, architecture, laws, and literacy itself. He would find this same religion has always been healing the sick and caring for the poor; that it has, more than any other, blessed marriage; and that arts and philosophy tend to flourish in its neighborhood.

—C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

SOCIALISM/COMMUNISM

The late Peter Lord Bauer, perhaps the world's pre-eminent development economist, said, "Foreign aid is a process by which the poor in rich countries subsidize the rich in poor countries."

—Bob Adelman, *The New American*, July 18, 2011, p. 18

In the United States, the working classes are Democrats, the middle classes are Republicans, the upper classes are Communists.

—Whittaker Chambers, *Witness*, p. 616

Communism is socialism with an international focus and totalitarian methods.

—Thomas A Sowell, *Intellectuals and Society*, p. 91

We won't have true "social justice" until everyone is equal in everybody's home.

—Rev. Al Sharpton, May 2, 2010

There were more self-declared communists on the Harvard faculty than there were Republicans.

—Ted Cruz, *World*, November 7, 2009

The Point with John Stonestreet

Christianity or Secularism?

Andrew Sullivan is confused. Blogging for Newsweek, Sullivan suggested that real Christianity has been replaced by “Christianism”. He thinks real Christianity is “libertarian” where people “give away much of their property to the poor, forget about the sex lives of their neighbors, pray more than politics, and forgive more than judge.”

Of course we should pray and forgive and give, and shame on us if we don’t. However Sullivan thinks Christians should only do those things, and otherwise should remove themselves from the public square. He thinks Christians should work with individuals but not confront political or social structures. But that’s foolish: structures affect individuals. For example, personal sexual brokenness destroys the family, and the breakdown of the family is the major cause of poverty in the United States. The personal affects the public.

As Alan Jacobs responded to Sullivan, if he’s right, Martin Luther King Jr. was wrong. King engaged politics to confront social evils. In fact, Dietrich Bonhoeffer and many other Christian heroes understood the need to engage the public square from Christian convictions.

In short, Sullivan is confused. Christianity is personal, but its claims aren’t private. For the-PointRadio.org, I’m John Stonestreet.

The Point is a daily radio commentary on world-view and cultural issues that can be found on Christian radio stations nationwide, or online at www.thepointradio.org or www.summit.org.



I would think that if you understood what communism was, you would hope, you would pray on your knees, that we would someday become communists.

—Jane Fonda, *Biography for Jane Fonda*

We’ve got to establish a socialist economic structure that will limit private profit-oriented businesses.

—Jane Fonda, *Dallas Morning News*, December 11, 1971

The faith to which [Barack] Obama actually clings is neo-communism. It is 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, under the banner of its all-purpose rally cry: “social justice.”

—Andrew C. McCarthy, *The Grand Jihad*, p. 12

ECONOMICS

“We were bound to wind up with the system we have, in which the rich, in the name of the poor, avail themselves of the assets of the middle class.”

—Christopher Caldwell, *The Weekly Standard*, July 25, 2011, p. 32

The intentions of Democrats are only the best. They want all of the old to have lavish retirements, all of the young to have scholarships, verse-penning cowboys to have festivals funded by government, and everyone to have access to all the best health care, at no cost to himself. In the face of a huge wave of debt swamping all western nations, this is the core of their argument: They want a fair society, and their critics do not; they want to help, and their opponents like to see people suffer; they want a world filled with love and caring, and their opponents want one of callous indifference, in which the helpless must fend for themselves. (“We must reject both extremes, those who say we shouldn’t help the old and the sick and those who say that we should,” quips the *New Yorker*’s Hendrik Hertzberg.) But in fact, everyone thinks that we “should” do this; the problem, in the face of the debt crisis, is finding a way that we can. It is about the “can” part that the left is now in denial: daintily picking its way through canaries six deep on the floor of the coal mine, and conflating a “good” with a “right.”

—Noeme Emery, *The Weekly Standard*, July 25, 2011, p. 23

What gold brings to the monetary table is discipline. If individuals suspect that money is being issued in excess of levels warranted by legitimate economic needs and growth prospects, they can exchange their currency holdings for gold at a pre-established, fixed rate. Gold convertibility ensures that the money supply expands or contracts based on the collective assessment of market participants—as opposed to the less-than-omniscient hunches of central bankers. Gold provides a self-correcting mechanism for irrational exuberance; as credit begins to flow too freely, as equity values or commodity prices appear frothy, the astute observer at the margin cashes out in gold. Monetary central planning gives way to the aggregate wisdom of the free market.

A gold standard brakes runaway government spending. It allows individuals to defeat governments that dilute the value of money. A gold standard provides citizens with “a form of protection against spendthrift governments,” as the economist Ludwig von Mises put it. “If, under the gold standard, a government is asked to spend money for something new, the minister of finance can say: ‘And where do I get the money? Tell me, first, how I will find the money for this additional expenditure.’”

Under a gold standard, money regains its primary purpose as a vital tool of free markets instead of serving as a corrupted instrument of government policy. Genuine economic growth—as opposed to the money illusion of artificial wealth reflected in bloated equities or housing prices—is no longer sacrificed to monetary policy encumbered by the fiscal failures of government.

—Judy Shelton, *The Weekly Standard*, August 6, 2011, p. 23–24

If we’re talking about the solvency of the country—its financial status—I couldn’t do better than to recommend an article by Boston University Professor Laurence Kotlikoff. He wrote “Is the United States Bankrupt?” in the 2006 *Bulletin of the Federal Reserve Bank of Saint Louis*. Professor Kotlikoff did a mathematical analysis of what he called the fiscal gap, which is the difference between anticipated revenues and anticipated expenditures of the federal government. He came to the conclusion at that time (2006) that the gap was \$65.9 trillion, not counting various contingent liabilities of the government.

It’s important to recognize that Professor Kotlikoff is an established economist whose work appears in what many would call “the mainstream media.” He’s not someone who could be readily discounted as an extremist, a kook, or some other nasty name designed to discredit his opinion. A few months ago, in his blog, he revised those 2006 figures from information supplied by a variety of sources and he now claims that the fiscal gap—the shortfall between the govern-

ment’s revenues and expenditures—has reached over \$200 trillion. So it’s tripled in less than 5 years! It’s gone from being politically impossible to deal with in 2006 to a much larger figure today. And, of course, Professor Kotlikoff is not the only economist or market analyst who is making extremely pessimistic predictions about this country’s financial future.

—Edwim Vieira, *The New American*, May 9, 2011, p. 23

CUBA

A group of US women leaders met with Cuban President Raul Castro’s daughter Monday for an exchange on topics including gender, reproductive health and gay rights.

The delegation, which arrived in Havana on Sunday, includes Democratic political strategist Donna Brazile and former US Rep. Jane Harman, a California Democrat who resigned in February and now heads the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

“I believe that Cuba is our immediate neighbor and it is time to liberalize US policy toward Cuba,” Harman said.

“It is very exciting to hear about some of the social changes going on in your country,” she added, apparently referring to a host of economic reforms initiated by Raul Castro to try to boost Cuba’s flagging economy.

The changes, which were approved by a Communist Party congress in April, have yet to be enacted into law but would loosen the government’s tight control over economic matters and allow some free-market activity.

The US group talked with Mariela Castro, head of the island’s National Sexual Education Center and a champion for gay rights. They were shown a report on Cuba’s recent campaign against homophobia, though reporters were not allowed to remain for the presentation.

Castro, the niece of former President Fidel Castro, said such encounters can help improve US-Cuban relations, which have been in a deep freeze for decades.

“This strikes me as the healthiest thing there is,” she said. “We want there to be transparent relations that respect our sovereignty and are not manipulative or based on conditions.”

“I believe there is a great affinity between our people, that we have a great desire to transform the world and that we can work together to achieve it,” Castro added.

The visit was organized by the Center for Democracy in the Americas, which studies US policy toward countries in the region and opposes Washington’s decades-old trade embargo on Cuba. The delegation will be in Cuba through Thursday.

“Our hope is that we will learn from the Cuban women and that maybe we have something to offer in exchange,” said Sarah Stephens, the group’s executive director. “We look forward to many more meetings with women in the government, women in the religious community, ordinary women on the street.”

—Peter Orsi, *The San Francisco Examiner*, June 11, 2011

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

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

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, April 17, 2011

SOCIOLOGY

Last month, the Connecticut General Assembly passed a bill prohibiting discrimination based on “gender identity or expression” by all purveyors of “public accommodation.” The bill's effects are far-reaching, invading even restrooms. And its definitions are lousy: A person can prove his “gender-related identity” via methods as solid as medical history

or as flimsy as “consistent and uniform assertion” of such an identity. In other words, a man who professes to be a woman can enter a women's bathroom, no questions asked. Liberalism marches on.

—*National Review*, July 4, 2011, p. 10

The road from Stonewall, June 1969, to Stonewall, June 2011, was a trajectory of greater social acceptance of difference and nonconformity,” writes [conservative] *National Review's* deputy managing editor on the magazine's website, describing the scene the night New York approved homosexual “marriage” at the famous gay bar where the riot that started the homosexual rights movement began. Mike Potemra points out how normal everyone is, including the “sweet young couple”—two men, one “a gorgeous platinum-blond in a stunning 1950s *Seven Year Itch*-style dress”—being interviewed by the Associated Press.

The story doesn't say much, but the general idea is that the change is no big deal. In a follow-up post, just as vaguely written, he suggested that the nature of marriage is a mystery.

A couple of months ago, the magazine's managing editor, Jason Steorts, argued more overtly against the “traditionalist” understanding of marriage as between a man and a woman. He insisted that it be abandoned in favor of a “revisionist” view based on the state's interest in increasing “maximal experiential union” and therefore in approving homosexual unions.

This is not, we would have thought, a conservative position.

—*First Things*, August/ September 2011, p. 68

163,000,000 is a big number. It's more, for example, than the entire female population of the United States. It's also the number of girls in Asia who have been aborted over the last three decades. The result is a dangerously imbalanced population. Normally, about 105 boys are born for every 100 girls. The ratio in India is 112 to 100, in China 121 to 100, with some Chinese cities reaching 150 to 100. Thanks to them, the whole *world's* ratio is 107 to 100, which doesn't happen naturally.

In *Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys Over Girls, and the Consequences of a World Full of Men*, Mara Hvistendahl quantifies the disastrous effects for girls—and for civilization—of the combination of ultrasound and abortion in countries where boys are more highly valued (or less expensive) than girls. As Jonathan Last noted in his review of *Unnatural Selection*, “Ms. Hvistendahl identifies a ban on abortion—and not the killing of tens of millions of unborn girls—as the ‘worst nightmare’ of feminism.”

Even so, she has produced “one of the most consequential books ever written in the campaign against abortion.” Her book is aimed, though she did not aim it, “like a heat-seeking missile, against the entire intellectual framework of ‘choice.’ For if ‘choice’ is the moral imperative guiding abortion, then there is no way to take a stand against ‘gendercide.’ Aborting a baby because she is a girl is no different from aborting a baby because she has Down syndrome or because the mother’s ‘mental health’ requires it. Choice is choice.”

—*First Things*, August/September 2011, p. 69

Maria Hvistendahl struck a nerve recently when she released her new book, *Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys Over Girls, and the Consequences of a World Full of Men*. *New York Times* columnist Ross Douthat then struck Ms. Hvistendahl’s nerve, when he gently chided her for the contortions she must make to sustain her unequivocal commitment to “choice” while asking us to share her indignation at what those choices have wrought.

“The anti-abortion side has it easier,” he wrote. “We can say outright what’s implied on every page of *Unnatural Selection*, even if the author can’t quite bring herself around. The tragedy of the world’s 160 million missing girls isn’t that they’re ‘missing.’ The tragedy is that they’re dead.”

Since those words appeared, the author and the *Times* columnist have had at each other, respectively, on Salon and the Times blog. At bottom they disagree on the nature of the crime. Ms. Hvistendahl reserves her outrage for the sexism of sex-selective abortion and the consequences for women already here. She excoriates Mr. Douthat for thinking the tragedy might also have something to do with the millions of girls whose lives were snuffed out.

It’s comforting to think that outside some Asian-American communities that show a preference for boy babies, this debate has little to do with us. The truth, however, is that an unquestionable right to abortion has led to similar questionable numbers right here at home.

Let’s begin with the 90% of fetuses diagnosed with Down syndrome that end up being aborted. Or enlightened New York City—where three African-American babies are aborted for every two live births. You can bet, moreover, that if ever we do indeed identify a “gay gene” or a genetic sequence that raises the odds of homosexuality, we’ll see disproportionate abortions here as well.

There is another similarity between these disparities and the gender disparity that has engaged Ms. Hvistendahl’s attention: They are mostly uncoerced. Today a Down syndrome child has a better chance than at any time in history of living a rich and rewarding life—yet less of a chance of being born. Nor are there Klansmen driving African-American women to

Planned Parenthood clinics, however much the KKK might appreciate the outcome.

Polite society, alas, shuns any discussion of the disconcerting realities. Only a few months ago in New York, a pro-life group put up a billboard of a beautiful black girl under the tag line, “The most dangerous place for an African-American is in the womb.” Within weeks it had been taken down, not because people were upset by the 60% African American abortion rate but because raising the question in progressive New York is apparently beyond the pale.

—William McGurn, *The Wall Street Journal*, July 5, 2011, p. A1

The new Hungarian constitution has taken heat both for what it includes (reference to Hungary’s Christian past) and what it doesn’t (explicit mention of homosexuals as a protected group). Others have criticized the constitution simply because it was written mostly on iPads. We like it. Here are a few striking passages that explain the wringing hands at the European Parliament:

From the first paragraph, part of a section called the “National Avowal of Faith” (you can hear the gasps of horror already): “At the dawn of a new millennium, we members of the Hungarian nation declare the following, with a bond of duty to all Hungarians: We are proud that one thousand years ago our king, Saint Stephen, based the Hungarian State on solid foundations, and made our country a part of Christian Europe.”

From the same section: “We acknowledge the role Christianity has played in preserving our nation. We respect all our country’s religious traditions. We solemnly promise to preserve the intellectual and spiritual unity of our nation, torn apart by the storms of the past century.” (You can hear the sounds of strong drink being poured.)

It gets better. Article K of the section titled “Fundamentals” promises that “(1) Hungary shall protect the institution of marriage, understood to be the conjugal union of a man and woman based on their voluntary decision; Hungary shall also protect the institution of the family, which it recognizes as the basis for survival of the nation. (2) Hungary shall promote the commitment to have and raise children.” (Here grown men faint.)

And finally, the constitution declares in its section on “Freedoms and Responsibilities”: “Human dignity shall be inviolable. Everyone shall have the right to life and human dignity: the life of the fetus shall be protected from the moment of conception.”

—*First Things*, August/September 2011 p. 70

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



further your education.
foster your intellect.
inspire your imagination.
impact your world.

summit oxford
developing the mind for Christ and culture

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

ENERGY

Now that the Obama Administration has decided that Americans should get their energy from windmills, we suppose that the US navy will soon be returning to sails to power its ships. After all, those terrible nuclear reactors that now derive the ships might meet with an accident—and imagine the world wide catastrophe should one of the ships be damaged in combat.

Sailing ships will probably be OK because the US does not engage in wars anymore. Obama informed the Congress on June 14, 2011, that he does not need congressional approval to bomb Libya because this is not a war.

We and our allies have pummeled Libya with hundreds of cruise missiles fired at it with multiple drone aircraft, made several thousand bombing runs with jet aircraft, and are now blasting it with helicopter gun ships—without, we are told, so much as harming a hair on the head of a single one of those civilians we say we are there to protect. So, of course, it is not a war.

From the point of view of a Third World nation of 5 million people that is being hit by thousands of bombs by the United States, Britain, France, and a few other participants, this may look like a war, but Obama assures us that it is not.

The new sailing ships will surely use “sustainable technology” and will not cost the tax payers a cent. The navy can just apply to the government for one of those sustainable-energy wind grants.

“The Wind Subsidy Bubble,” *The Wall Street Journal*, December 20, 2010, p A22, reports that the December tax deal extended, for another year, the \$3 billion grant program for renewable energy projects. So far, our representatives in Congress have spent more than \$30 billion of our money for “clean energy” from the 2009 stimulus bill alone. This is a small part of the total subsidy.

Wind energy companies get huge subsidies to pay for the windmills in the first place and then further subsidies under laws that require Americans to pay higher prices for electrical energy that comes from windmills. Further, the other energy industries are required to provide idle capacity in order to help the windmills along when the wind is not blowing. Still, the wind industry is in difficulties and complains that, without increased tax money, it will fail.

The public, without reference to numbers, sees windmills spread across the landscape (remember when we were concerned about billboards) and thinks this is an important source of energy.

It is claimed that wind now accounts for 1.1% of US energy and solar about 0.1%, for a total of 1.2%. Even this may be high. Wind and solar outputs are often overrated, and there is no subtraction for the extra cost of generating this electricity. With all costs considered, wind and solar are a net economic loss.

The largest US solar installation ever built, opened in Florida in 2010, produces about \$3 million worth of elec-

tricity each year and cost \$150 million to build. So, we can look forward to net electricity from this plant in about 50 years, providing it can be maintained at zero cost and is still operating at that time. Of course, we should not be so mean as to deny Congress its hobbies. When one is healthy, there are lots of interesting things to buy. Since, however, the US is flat broke, with more than \$50 trillion in current and future liabilities, billions of dollars worth of windmills seems like an imprudent way to spend the small amount of money that Congress can still borrow.

Wind energy is subsidized by unsuspecting Americans in so many ways that it is difficult to estimate its real cost. The market, however, gives some guidance. I doubt that you can find anyone in the US who has paid for, with his own money, a windmill to generate and sell electricity at ordinary prices in order to make a profit even in these times of \$100 oil.

Some of the costs of wind are still unknown, such as maintenance. In a typical wind farm as seen from highways, most of the older and smaller windmills are no longer turning, and a significant number of the new ones are stationary, too. Aside from intermittently blowing wind, this equipment is likely to be frequently down for maintenance.

If the American people want to know where their jobs have gone and how their country has been decapitalized, tax-funded advertisements in the form of windmills and solar arrays are all around them.

Instead of getting out of the way and letting private enterprise in a free market with private money (not tax money) compete on a level playing field to build the energy-producing industries that Americans need—industries that would then provide energy at the lowest cost and highest convenience and safety, Americans have elected career politicians who have taxed and regulated the energy industries so severely that they have gone elsewhere.

Like so many of our other industries, our energy industries within the United States have been stifled by taxation and regulation—burdens placed upon them by the Congress. Until those burdens are removed, these industries will never be able to provide the energy we need. The idea that those industries can be replaced by new technologies, selected and paid for with borrowed money by the likes of Barrack Obama and Pete DeFazio is ludicrous.

Don Quixote foolishly tilted at windmills. The people suppressing the industries of the United States are not foolish. They know exactly what they are doing. Their goal (from our corrupt Congressman to the thousands like him in Washington) is personal money and power. This power is not available to them under the US Constitution. So, they have ignored that document.

The tools of our opponents are fear and greed, the most powerful negative human characteristics that can be used to manipulate human beings. The American people, however, are better than this. As they see, more and more, the effects of the devastation that the statists have wrought, their

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

peaceful rebellion will increase until our Congress is populated primarily by honest, principled people.

The end of the time for those who keep American exceptionalism in bondage has come. Soon, they will be gone with the wind.

—*Access To Energy*, January 2011

HISTORY

As the overreaching US empire comes apart at home and abroad—and as Americans, in numbers that will steadily increase until our Constitutional Republic is restored, gradually wake up to the fact that we have agreed to live under a Constitution—not under democracy, a historic return to the principles of our Founding Fathers is taking place. Our first Presidents offered advice:

“Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force; like fire, a troublesome servant and a fearful master. Never for a moment should it be left to irresponsible action.” —George Washington, first US President.

“Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide.” —John Adams, second US President

“The central bank is an institution of the most deadly hostility existing against the Principles and form of our Constitution. I am an Enemy to all banks discounting bills or notes for anything but Coin [gold and silver coins]. If the American people allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the People of all their Property until their Children will wake up homeless on the continent their Fathers conquered.” —Thomas Jefferson, third US President.

—*Access To Energy*, February 2011

New American Socialism began with the policies of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In 1933, FDR seized all the privately held gold in the US and began creating the massive government programs necessary to implement socialism. To give you some idea of how much the federal government grew during FDR’s reign, remember federal spending made up 3% of GDP in 1930—a level that had been fairly consistent for most of America’s history. Almost immediately after his election, he tripled federal spending to more than 10% of GDP. And by the time he died in office, federal spending reached 44% of GDP—an all-time high.

As everyone should know by now, the promises of socialism aren’t affordable. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is inefficient and kills Peter’s incentives. The result is usually economic stagnation, depression, and eventually a crisis that frees people from the government’s confiscatory repression.

Because America was the only large economy standing after War World II, it took much longer than usual for the problems of socialism to appear in our economy. Also, the government scaled back many of FDR’s policies during the post-war boom. In winning the war, we also won a generation of economic spoils.

All this changed in the 1960s. Lyndon Johnson had delusions of government-led grandeur. His ideas of a “Great Society” and “Model Cities,” along with an expensive foreign war (Vietnam), were a recipe for massive new debts and an increasing role for government in all aspects of American life.

These policies led to an acute funding problem in 1971 because the debts of socialism couldn’t be financed with gold-backed money. It was far too expensive. And so we began a new kind of socialism...the New American Socialism.

What happened in 1971? The size of America’s government deficits forced us to abandon gold. After World War II, the US dollar became the world’s reserve currency. In exchange for placing the dollar at the center of the world’s economy, we made a solemn promise to always exchange the US dollar for gold at \$35 an ounce. Nixon broke that promise, calling our creditors “global speculators” and telling them to go pound sand.

This move away from gold severed the fundamental tie between our economy and our money. Without the link to gold, bank reserves could be created by fiat. And they were. This led to a huge expansion of our money supply and our debts.

The power to use this debt and to control the creation of new money is the most powerful factor in our economy. The government can now create unlimited amounts of credit to control the US economy. This bestows favored status on certain companies—notably banks. This lies at the core of our economy’s structure. It is how fiat money privatizes the benefits of New American Socialism.

Most Americans simply don’t understand our historic tie to gold made it impossible for the banking system to grow beyond clear boundaries. Gold limited the amount of currency in circulation, which, in turn, restricted how much money banks could lend. Under the gold standard, the maximum total debt-to-GDP ratio was limited to around 150%. But as soon as we broke the tie to gold, our total debt-to-GDP ratio began to grow. *It’s now close to 400%.*

Without the tie to gold, the amount of economic mischief our government could engineer became practically limitless. No social goal was too absurd...no war too expensive...and no government insurance scheme too patently self-serving not to finance.

Today, New American Socialism has spread like a cancer throughout our country, afflicting industry after industry. Like a cancer, once it infects an industry, it metastasizes from company to company in that sector. Suddenly, businesses cannot function without massive government aid. These corporate wards of the State weigh down the rest of our econ-

omy...making us weaker and less competitive and dragging us further into debt.

Keep in mind, this New American Socialism I'm talking about isn't called socialism at all. It goes by many names. It's been called "compassionate conservatism." It's been called "joint public-private enterprise." It's been called "government insurance."

I've been studying it for many years—finding it in one company after another. I've actually preferred having it in many of the stocks I've recommended over the years because it tends to be good for investors. That's the most insidious thing about New American Socialism: It's a form of socialism that leaves the profit motive in place.

That's why the New American Socialism has grown decade after decade. That's why it continues to be heavily promoted by almost every mainstream media outlet and both political parties. It leads to a kind of corruption I believe will be impossible to stop without a full-scale economic collapse.

—Porter Stansberry, *Stansberry's Investment Advisory*, June 16, 2011

History is nothing if not ironic. In 1999, Franklin Delano Raines—named for the former US president—became the CEO of Fannie Mae, the government mortgage bank. This FDR would blow up the housing bubble and set the stage for a massive monetary crisis.

Raines grew up in politics. He first wrote reports for President Nixon. Then, he worked in the Carter administration. After that, he went to Wall Street and worked as an investment banker for 11 years at Lazard. Then, it was back to D.C. to work for Bill Clinton, who rewarded him with the top job at Fannie Mae. He was hailed as the first black man to head a Fortune 500 company. Within five years, he'd resign in shame...but not before setting the stage for the largest housing bubble in history.

Most of the crimes Raines committed while at Fannie Mae were paltry, petty graft. He demanded illegal accounting changes that inflated the company's earnings. As a result, he received huge amounts of fraudulent compensation—around \$20 million per year. When his crimes were discovered, he resigned. Later, he agreed to a \$3 million settlement with the government, which was paid by Fannie's insurance company. He also gave up \$1.8 million in stock and options (which were later worth nothing in any case.) If you rob a bank, you go to jail. But if you steal \$50 million-\$100 million from the government's mortgage bank, you keep it all. That's New American Socialism.

Raines was disgraced by his own enormous greed and lack of character. But those crimes are merely an afterthought to the real damage he brought to our economy.

Raines was instrumental in building Fannie's mortgage portfolio to gargantuan proportions. And he was responsible for the company's move into subprime loans.

Rather than lend money to homeowners, Fannie's strategy was to buy mortgages from banks, which allowed banks to lend to more homeowners. Fannie Mae also guaranteed mortgage loans across the industry, which allowed more private capital to become available. The theory was this made housing more affordable. It didn't. It only allowed banks to make risk-free loans, which led to vastly higher home prices, bigger banking profits, and huge profits for Fannie Mae at least temporarily. The downside was the whole system was a charade...a giant con job. Fannie never had the capital required to guarantee the loans it bought and insured. When the bubble inevitably popped, the US taxpayers ended up footing the \$500 billion bill.

How could this have happened? How could the largest mortgage bank in the world be run this way? Thanks to its close connection to the government, Fannie Mae didn't have to submit annual reports to the SEC. It didn't have to meet the same capital guidelines that applied to all of the other banks in the country. It could borrow almost as much as it wanted. It could take almost any amount of risk it decided to take.

—Porter Stansberry, *Ibid*.

SCIENCE

Earlier this year, a team in England confirmed the existence of soft skin tissue, known as keratin, in fossilized lizard skin from the USA's Green River Formation. Innovative molecule mapping technology shows that keratin molecules from the fossilized lizard match the keratin protein in modern lizard skin.

Using similar cutting-edge techniques, a team in Sweden showed that another kind of protein known as collagen, has survived in the fossilized bone of a large ocean reptile, known as a mosasaur.

These investigations have satisfactorily demonstrated that biological molecules can survive within fossils.

The challenge for the researchers is that Green River Formation, known for its well-preserved fossil population, is commonly dated at 40 million years or older and that the rock layers where the mosasaur was found are dated at 70 million years. (Fossils are dated according to the presumed age of the rock in which they are found.) Since the researchers believe these fossils are 50 to 70 million years old, they need to explain how fragile biological molecules can survive so long.

The scientists studying the Green River fossil propose a solution. First, they point out the absence of byproducts from aerobic bacteria (bacteria that require oxygen to live). This shows that the fossil was buried rapidly, sealing it off from any oxygen. Then they suggest that trace metals in the original skin bonded to minerals in the rock and held the biological molecules in place. Even if true, these ideas do not

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

explain how protein molecules could remain intact for millions of years.

The Green River researchers hope their work will “provide insight into the biochemistry of extinct organisms.” But the Green River lizard’s keratin matched modern lizard keratin. This finding suggests that neither the biochemistry nor the lizard has evolved.

A rapidly buried lizard skin in which biomolecules have survived should not surprise scientists who accept the Bible’s account of earth’s history. Like the secular researchers they are hopeful that the examination of preserved soft tissues such as these will improve our understanding of the fossilization process.

—Dr. Tommy Mitchell, *Answers*, July-September 2011, p. 3

POLITICS

President Obama famously played to grandma’s Social Security fears this week, saying in an interview about the debt-ceiling talks that “I cannot guarantee that those checks go out on August 3 if we haven’t resolved this issue because there may simply not be the money in the coffers to do it.”

To which a friend of ours replied, whatever happened to the trust fund?

That’s the fund that, according to our politicians, is holding all those Social Security taxes that workers pay. Why can’t Congress or Mr. Obama dip into that \$2.6 trillion cash hoard to pay benefits until this debt-limit business gets sorted out? After all, as White House budget director Jack Lew put it in a February *USA Today* op-ed, “Social Security benefits are entirely self-financing.”

Not quite. As everyone in Washington knows, the trust fund contains not cash but IOUs. Payroll taxes don’t go to some vault in Fort Knox, and they certainly aren’t invested. When Social Security runs a surplus, Congress spends the money immediately on something else and then the government claims it owes a debt to itself. Where the money will come from to pay these IOUs is anybody’s guess—though Mr. Obama is hoping it will be higher taxes.

Trust fund balances only exist in “a bookkeeping sense,” as Bill Clinton’s budget director put it in 1999. “They do not consist of real economic assets that can be drawn down in the future to fund benefits. Instead, they are claims on the Treasury that, when redeemed, will have to be financed by raising taxes, borrowing from the public, or reducing benefits or other expenditures. The existence of large trust fund balances, therefore, does not, by itself, have any impact on the Government’s ability to pay benefits.”

The author of that concession to fiscal reality was none other than the same Jack Lew. Mr. Obama’s contribution is his admission, however inadvertent, that the government has spent so much that even its own accounting and political fictions are collapsing.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, July 16/17, 2011 p. A12

GLOBAL WARMING

It used to be that the hot-button issue of global warming was divided along philosophical lines: liberals on one side, conservatives on the other. But these days it’s not just conservatives who decry the theory that mankind is making the earth warmer. There are also doubters among the people paid to follow our climate every day—American weather forecasters.

They are increasingly taking issue with liberal climatologists who have convinced many in the international scientific community that global warming is a man-made menace, caused largely by the United States and our combustion-generated CO₂.

In the recent study by George Mason University and the University of Texas at Austin, climatologists were shocked to discover that only about half of TV weathercasters believe that global warming is occurring at all, and less than a third believe that human activities are causing global warming. In fact, 29 percent agree that the entire global warming issue is a “scam.”

James Spann, an Emmy-winning meteorologist, is typical. “I don’t buy into catastrophic doomsday scenario that global warming people are promoting,” says Spann, a TV weatherman for 32 years and a forecaster for the ABC affiliate in Birmingham, Ala. “I don’t know of a single TV meteorologist who believe the man-made global warming hype.”

John Coleman, of KUSI-TV San Diego, a former weatherman for *Good Morning America* and founder of The Weather Channel who tells *Newsmax*: “The study didn’t surprise me. Global warming has become the religion of the greens. It’s all part of an effort to bring about national policy based on science which is, to my mind, dead wrong.”

At stake are the beliefs and votes of the American people and up to \$5 billion in annual US funding research grants into global warming. Meanwhile, climatologists face their own “inconvenient truth” that the public’s worries about global warming are waning fast.

—Clayton B. Reid, *Newsmax*, July 2011, p. 18

DARWINISM

We should make time for one big reason: If Darwin was right the Bible is wrong, and we are foolish to follow it. But evolutionary thought that ignores God also has other effects of which we may be unaware. (Ask a fish about water and he’s likely to reply, “What’s water?”—if he’s sufficiently evolved to be a talking fish.) The theological objections to macroevolution are literally crucial because they tell us whether the Cross was necessary, but some secondary issues are also worth pondering.

Politics. Woodrow Wilson started federal government expansion in 1912 by opposing the “Newtonian” view that

the government should have an unchanging constitutional foundation, somewhat like “the law of gravitation.” He argued that government should be “accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. . . . Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice.” Wilson was the president who started the modern pattern of disregarding the Constitution, and in the 2012 election we will either start a second century of governmental expansion or yell, “Stop!”

Economics. Evolutionary thinking influenced not only Social Darwinists but socialists like H.G. Wells who thought it was time to advance beyond competitive enterprise. (Karl Marx in *Das Kapital* called Darwin’s theory “epoch making” and told Friedrich Engels that *On the Origin of Species* “contains the basis in natural history for our view.”) Many books and articles have linked Darwin’s thought to Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung, and Hitler: Darwin is obviously not responsible for the atrocities committed in his name, but evolutionary theory plus his musings about superior and inferior races provided a logical justification for anti-Semites and racists.

Sex. The mid-20th century’s most influential academic was probably Alfred Kinsey, whose high-school classmates half-jokingly called him the “Second Darwin.” Kinsey’s 1948 and 1953 books on sexuality contended that adultery is normal and homosexual experiences not uncommon, for “the mammalian backgrounds of human behavior [made it] difficult to explain why each and every individual is not involved in every type of sexual history.”

(Later, researchers found that Kinsey’s stats were cooked, but in the meantime the American Law Institute’s *Model Penal Code*, published in 1955, had a major effect in eliminating or reducing penalties for sex crimes: “Virtually a Kinsey document,” one biographer called the Code. More recently, John West’s *Darwin Day in America* cites textbook claims that casual sex is an evolutionary adaptation that gives “obvious reproductive advantages”—and we should not raise our standards because “we cannot escape our animal origins.”)

Abortion. Evolution proponents contributed mightily to its legalization, and in a way more direct than the general teaching that human life has no intrinsic value. Robert Williams, president of the Association of American Physicians, said in 1969 that “the fetus has not been shown to be nearer to the human being than is the unborn ape.” He talked of “the recapitulation of phylogeny by ontogeny”—the mistaken theory that an unborn child’s development mimics purported evolutionary progress. The most influential pro-abortion legal expert during the 1960s, Cyril Means, argued that babies are sub-human—and the Supreme Court’s 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision played off his mean-hearted briefs.

Infanticide. I debated Princeton’s Peter Singer in 2004 and had several conversations with him about his defense of infanticide. That year he said, “All we are doing is catching up with Darwin. He showed in the 19th century that we are

simply animals. Humans had imagined we were a separate part of Creation, that there was some magical line between Us and Them. Darwin’s theory undermined the foundations of that entire Western way of thinking about the place of our species in the universe.”

We could run through many more areas. Daniel Dennett in *Darwin’s Dangerous Idea* hit it right: Darwin created a “universal acid” that eats through any “meaning coming from on high.”

—Marvin Olasky, *World* magazine, July 2, 2011, p. 96