

•the journal

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

October 2011
Volume #11
Issue #10



TN Educator Conference

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

How Summit Responds to Its Conspiracy-Addled Leftist Attackers

When asked for a list of admired intellectuals, one of this year's Republican presidential candidates said, "Dr. David Noebel." Almost immediately far-left bloggers hysterically denounced Doc—and others who speak of "Christian worldview"—as hateful, power-hungry racists who are responsible for, among other things, the attacks of Norwegian terrorist Anders Behring Breivik.

The mainstream media breathlessly repeated these absurd charges, proving once again that it has absolutely no idea what true Christianity is all about.

How Should We Respond Under Attack?

We are not intimidated by these attacks. We will continue persuading young adults that the Christian worldview is intelligent, reasonable and true. At the same time, we're trying to be good ambassadors for Christ (2 Corinthians 5:20). The Greek word for "ambassador" is *presbeuos*, which means "to be older." Simply put, Christians are to bring maturity to an immature culture. Immature people may hatefully spew lies, but mature people respond in gracious boldness because they represent Christ, not themselves.

If you find yourself under fire, here's a Q & A to help you articulate the truth winsomely:

Question #1: What does Summit mean by a Christian Worldview?

A Christian worldview simply means the answers Christians historically accept to questions about God, human beings, and God's relationship to human beings. A Christian worldview teaches that humans have dignity because they bear God's image, and that the good life is the pursuit of wisdom, fellowship, servanthood, and stewardship. This is why Christians have often led in opposing the world's greatest evils, including slavery, poverty, and Communism, and in promoting economic and religious freedom.

Critics need to understand that no one is worldview-neutral. Everyone—even atheists—has a worldview because everyone makes assumptions about the cause, nature and purpose of the universe. Critics ask us to defend our worldview, but can they defend theirs?

Question #2: Does Summit teach students to take over the world?

At Summit we don't share the leftist's obsession with raw power. We just tutor students to be good citizens who promote good policy because they embrace the Good Book. We teach that political, re-

ligious and economic freedom are cultural goods worth pursuing, that the Constitution is a good idea, and that fascism, Communism and socialism are bad ideas. We critique people who say that truth is relative, or that the family is an archaic institution that should be done away with.

Question #3: What about those who think Christians should be passive?

Several recent Christian books, most of them coming from the left, have suggested that Christians leave politics and social issues behind and focus on praying, giving their money to the poor, and loving their neighbors. This is a red herring: Christians already do these things. Research shows that Christians are actually more generous with their time and money, more compassionate, and better neighbors. They have more stable marriages and cause a lot less trouble.

At Summit we think Christians should be active citizens. We can't 'mind our own business,' because political and social structures affect individuals and therefore society at large. For example, personal sexual brokenness destroys the family, and broken families can lead to poverty and violence. We must speak up for sound public policy—and also the hope of personal redemption.

Question #4: What about Dr. Noebel's anti-Communist stance?

It's no secret that Doc Noebel has been a lifelong opponent of Communism. Reporters and bloggers treat this fact derisively, calling Doc (among other things) an 'anti-Communist propagandist.' The facts are clear: 150 million people were killed during the 20th century at the hands of Communist governments, and we're proud that Doc stood up against this unspeakable evil. What a tremendous example for us to follow!

It's Time to Stand Up

As Ronald Reagan said so many years ago, we live in a time of choosing. Let's not cower in the face of attack. Instead, let us be effective ambassadors of Christ who speak the truth in love to our friends, neighbors, and colleagues.

Doc is passing the baton this month and entering a well-earned retirement. He and I talk weekly so I'll be keeping you up-to-date on what he's reading and thinking about. Meanwhile, our mission going forward is simple: teach the truth and reach more youth. This summer, we worked with 1,700 students—the most we've ever had—and watched as they moved from aimlessly aping the culture to fearlessly speaking the truth. Thank you for your prayers and support!



BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY

[As an atheist] my argument against God was that the universe seemed so cruel and unjust. But how had I got this idea of just and unjust? A man does not call a line crooked unless he has some idea of a straight line.

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

Without God and the future life? How will man be after that? It means everything is permitted now.

—Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*

Religion and the Cult of Tolerance (Main Street, August 16) by William McGurn is timely in that volunteers from Gideons International have been informed that they can no longer give Bibles at the local military induction center to the men and women entering the armed services. Apparently the government thinks the Gideons volunteers are now at risk. The Gideons have been giving out Bibles to the armed services for more than half a century without incident. I have done this myself for about 20 years.

There are hundreds, if not thousands, of wonderful stories of how these Bibles have given comfort to our young men and women. Now our government is prohibiting the Gideons from this worthy service. What a shame!

—William B. Fry, *The Wall Street Journal*,
Aug 24, 2011, p. A12

Campus Crusade for Christ has changed its name to Cru. The ministry Bill and Vonette Bright founded in 1951 said its former name presented obstacles to the group's mission because the word campus does not represent all of its ministries and the word crusade now carries negative associations. "Our surveys show that, in the US, 20 percent of the people willing to consider the gospel are less interested in talking with us after they hear the name," the Cru website states. "We are changing the name for the sake of more effective ministry." Coral Ridge Ministries, the ministry D. James Kennedy founded in 1974, also announced it has changed its name to Truth in Action Ministries to reflect the organization's mission of "not just educating people on social issues and biblical worldview, but motivating and activating them to make a difference for the Kingdom."

—*WORLD Magazine*, Aug 27, 2011, p. 12

While a Gallup poll earlier this summer showed that nine in ten Americans still believe in God, a survey by the Barna Group released last week found that only 43% of Americans believe the devil to be a "living entity," as opposed to a symbol of evil.

Among the educated elite today, talking publicly about one's belief in the devil and his influence on the culture and the world would be social suicide. The same was no less true in 1947, when Oxford don C.S. Lewis addressed this subject in an interview with *Time* magazine.

"Lewis (like T. S. Eliot, W. H. Auden, et al.) is one of a growing band of heretics among modern intellectuals: an intellectual who believes in God," *Time* reported. "It is not a mild and vague belief, for he accepts 'all the articles of the Christian faith'—which means that he also believes in sin and in the Devil."

The *Time* article went on to note: "Since 1941, when Lewis published a witty collection of infernal correspondence called *The Screwtape Letters*, this middle-aged (49) bachelor professor who lives a mildly humdrum life ('I like monotony') has sold something over a million copies of his 15 books. He has made 29 radio broadcasts on religious subjects, each to an average of 600,000 listeners."

C.S. Lewis's *The Screwtape Letters* first appeared in the *Guardian* from May 2, 1941, to Nov. 28, 1941, before being published as a book in 1942. It became an immediate best-seller and has remained popular; 20th Century Fox hopes to make a movie based on "Screwtape" in the next few years.

Over the years, *The Screwtape Letters* has captured the imagination of a wide spectrum of admirers from Monty Python's John Cleese (who narrated a famous audio version) to Focus on the Family (which recently published a dramatic audio version of their own).

The collection of letters follows the correspondence of Uncle Screwtape ("Undersecretary for the Infernal Lowerarchy") to his nephew Wormwood—an inexperienced devil who has been assigned a "patient" to tempt on Earth. "The Enemy" in the story is not the devil, whom Screwtape affectionately calls "Our Father Below," but God. "Our Father's House" is not heaven, but hell. Thus, everything Screwtape portrays as good is actually evil, and vice versa.

Set at the start of World War II, an unnamed young Englishman serves as Wormwood's patient and the focus of the devil's schemes. As commentator Mark Edward DeForrest wrote, "It is the story of a simple life of faith, concerned with the commonplace difficulties of being a disciple of Jesus Christ in a world filled with small but spiritually deadly dangers."

When asked about "his belief in the Devil," Lewis addressed the question in a thought-provoking way in his preface to a revised edition of *Screwtape* in 1960: "Now, if by 'the Devil' you mean a power opposite to God and, like God, self-existent from all eternity, the answer is certainly No."

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

That is, Lewis did not believe in the false theology and caricatures of the devil that have developed over the centuries—whether through art, literature, or even today's sports mascots (think Duke and Arizona State).

As Lewis explained, "There is no uncreated being except God. God has no opposite. . . . The proper question is whether I believe in devils. I do. That is to say, I believe in angels, and I believe that some of these, by the abuse of their free will, have become enemies to God. . . . Satan, the leader or dictator of devils, is the opposite, not of God, but of Michael."

In his original preface written from Magdalen College at Oxford on July 5, 1941, Lewis warned of what he called "the two equal and opposite errors into which our race can fall about the devils." One error "is to disbelieve in their existence. The other is to believe and to feel an excessive and unhealthy interest in them." Lewis concluded that the devils "are equally pleased by both errors, and hail a materialist or a magician with the same delight."

Lewis noted the failures born from mankind's fallen nature. But he believed in the power of Jesus Christ to overcome sin, death, and Satan, and the optimism of faith and hope.

The Screwtape Letters concludes by echoing the words of the First Epistle of John, as the patient dies in a bombing raid and goes to heaven—seeing not only angels but Christ himself. For as St. John declared, "I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God so that you may know that you have eternal life. . . . The one who was born of God keeps him safe, and the evil one cannot harm him."

—John A. Murray, *The Wall Street Journal*, Aug 5, 2011, p. A11

ORIGINS

"Biochemical systems are exceedingly complex, so much so that the chance of their being formed through random shuffling is . . . insensibly different from zero."

There must be "...an intelligence, which designed the biochemical and gave rise to the origin of carbonaceous life."

—Sir Fred Hoyle, *Evolution from Space*

Now we see how the astronomical evidence leads to a biblical view of the origin of the world. . . . The chain of events leading to man commence suddenly and sharply at a definite moment in time, in a flash of light and energy.

—Robert Jastrow, *God and the Astronomers*

"That there are what I or anyone would call supernatural forces at work is now, I think, a scientifically proven fact."

—Robert Jastrow, *Christianity Today*, Aug 6, 1983, p. 15

MULTICULTURALISM

During the 1970s, I was a primary school teacher in inner London and fully subscribed to the prevailing philosophy of "multiculturalism." I believed then that children from immigrant families would perform better scholastically if their own culture were promoted in the classroom, making them feel proud rather than ashamed of their parents' background. But I gradually became aware of the disastrous consequences for our society of what has become an ideology. Education ought to have played an important part in the assimilation of the children of immigrants into the mainstream British culture. But something has gone drastically wrong. Assimilation is no longer considered a respectable social policy. Multiculturalism and bilingualism have been the fashion for thirty years. The notion that one could actively encourage integrated individuals subscribing to a minimum of common core values is now condemned as chauvinism, racism, cultural imperialism, or even cultural genocide.

But multiculturalism is based on some fundamental misconceptions. First, there is the erroneous and sentimental belief that all cultures, deep down, have the same values, or, if these values are different, that they are all equally worthy of respect. Multiculturalism, being the product of relativism, is incapable of criticizing cultures, of making cross-cultural judgments; it emphasizes differences but fails to teach immigrants allegiance to common values or even to the country that has received them with such generosity. Furthermore, the truth is that not all cultures have the same values, and not all values are worthy of respect. There is nothing sacrosanct about customs or cultural traditions; they can change under criticism. After all, the secularist values of the West are not much more than two hundred years old.

Respect for other cultures, for other values than our own, is a hallmark of a civilized attitude. But if these other values are destructive of our own cherished values, are we not justified in fighting them by intellectual means—that is, by reason and argument and criticism—and by legal means—by making sure the laws and constitution of the country are respected by all? While religious beliefs are to be tolerated, religious practices and institutions must not automatically or necessarily be accorded the same freedom if they conflict with the law or constitution of the wider state.

—Ibn Warraq, *Academic Questions*, Spring 2011, p. 15–16

Historically, democracy and constitutional liberalism, or liberal democracy, have followed different paths, and contrary to one's expectations liberalism has *preceded* democracy. Greece gave us democracy, Rome gave us the notion of limited government and the rule of law, but it was the rise of the Christian church that was the source of liberty in the West, since it was the first major institution in history that

was independent of temporal authority and willing to challenge it, as Fareed Zakaria points out in his book, *The Future of Freedom*. Jumping ahead to the nineteenth century, I should like to add, as noted earlier, while biblical criticism led to the abandonment of a literal reading of the Bible, it was also Christian religious tolerance and religious pluralism that eventually led to tolerance and pluralism *tout court*. As the British historian of Christianity Owen Chadwick put it, “Christian conscience was the force which began to make Europe ‘secular’; that is, to allow many religions or no religion in a state, and repudiate any kind of pressure upon the man who rejected the accepted and inherited axioms of society. My conscience is my own.”

—*Ibid*, p. 21

SOCIOLOGY

Reality-TV star Kody Brown and his “sister wives” may not intend to be an example of the “slippery slope” in the homosexual-marriage debate, but their new lawsuit against Utah’s anti-polygamy laws bolsters the argument that legalizing marriage for same-sex couples could open the door to recognition of other kinds of marriages.

Utah’s anti-polygamy laws have caused “personal injuries” to the Brown family and trample on “the right of consenting adults to create a family environment of their choosing,” Mr. Turley and Mr. Alba argued in their July 13 complaint at US District Court in Utah.

The lawsuit, which names Utah Gov. Gary R. Herbert and other state officials as defendants, seeks relief for the Brown family, and, “by extension, thousands of unorthodox or non-traditional families in Utah.”

The Brown lawsuit does not mention the 1996 Defense of Marriage Act, which defines marriage, for federal purposes, as only the union of one man and one woman, thus denying federal benefits to same-sex couples. But at a recent Senate hearing on the merits of DOMA, two witnesses mentioned polygamy as a reason to retain the 1996 law.

Same-sex marriage advocates say that “a union between two men or two women is equal to that of one man and one woman,” Rep. Steve King, Iowa Republican, told the July 20 hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. “But these are the same arguments that could be used to promote marriage between fathers and daughters, mothers and sons, or even polygamous relationships,” Mr. King said.

The legal arguments for homosexual marriage “clearly threaten to pave the way for polygamous and other polyamorous unions,” testified Edward Whelan, president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center. If the male-female aspect of marriage can be “dismissed,” Mr. Whelan added, “surely the distinction between a marriage of two persons and a marriage of three or more is all the more arbitrary and irrational.”

Advocates for same-sex marriage typically dismiss the “slippery slope” argument.

The Human Rights Campaign, the nation’s largest homosexual-rights advocacy organization, says same-sex marriage will not lead to polygamy or a “free for all” for marriage benefits. “Granting same-sex couples the right to marry would in no way change the number of people who could enter into a marriage (or eliminate restrictions on the age or familial relationships of those who may marry),” the HRC says.

At the July 20 Senate committee hearing, the polygamy issue was not addressed by same-sex-marriage supporters. Instead, members of Congress and dozens of witnesses who called for a repeal of DOMA focused almost entirely on the law’s adverse impacts on same-sex couples.

Still, the “slippery slope” argument is not going away. In a recent blog, Catholic Archbishop Timothy Dolan said New York’s new homosexual-marriage law, which went into effect July 24, is only the “latest dilution of the authentic understanding of marriage.”

A likely next step, the archbishop warned, “will be another redefinition to justify multiple partners and infidelity.”

In the Brown lawsuit, Mr. Turley and Mr. Alba said the Brown family, members of the Apostolic United Brethren faith, has committed no crime except to live together, “motivated by their sincere religious beliefs and love for one another.”

States cannot “criminalize consensual intimate relationships, including homosexual relationships, between unmarried adults,” the lawyers wrote, citing the 2003 US Supreme Court decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*.

And yet Utah has a law that forbids a legally married person from “purport[ing] to marry another person or cohabit[ing] with another person,” the lawyers wrote.

With this and other anti-polygamy laws, Utah “criminalizes not just polygamous marriages, but also an array of plural intimate relationships and associations of consenting adults,” Mr. Turley and Mr. Alba wrote.

The Brown family’s “basic liberties and equal protection” are being violated, they added, asking the court to “preliminarily and permanently” block enforcement of Utah’s laws that ban and criminalize polygamy.

—Cheryl Wetzstein, *The Washington Times*, Aug 1, 2011, p. 17

ECONOMICS

Imagine a family that earns \$50,000 a year but is spending more than \$88,000 and has a credit card balance of \$330,000. The discussions around the kitchen table are likely to be a little tense.

Proportionally, that’s where Washington’s finances are today, and that’s why the national discussion is a little tense, too.

Even these figures belie the magnitude of the fiscal crisis. Shutting down the entire federal government and firing every employee is no longer enough to balance the budget.

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

Mandatory spending—mainly entitlements—consumes more than the government takes in.

And that’s the biggest budget challenge because an entire generation of Americans has made retirement plans based on those promises.

For example, an average couple earning \$89,000 and retiring in 2011 will have paid \$110,000 into Medicare and will consume \$350,000.

Is anyone really surprised the system is collapsing?

—Tom McClintock, *The Washington Times*,
Aug 1, 2011, p. 32

“The real lesson from Europe,” wrote Paul Krugman in January 2010, “is actually the opposite of what conservatives claim: Europe is an economic success, and that success shows that social democracy works.” Here are some postcards from the social democracy that works.

- In Britain, 239 patients died of malnutrition in the country’s public hospitals in 2007, according to a charity called Age U.K. And at any given time, a quarter-million Britons have been made to wait 18 weeks or longer for medical treatment. This follows a decade in which funding for the National Health Service doubled.

- In France, the incidence of violent crimes rose by nearly 15% between 2002 and 2008, according to statistics provided by Eurostat. In Italy, violent crime was up 38%. In the EU as a whole, the rate rose by 6% despite declines in robbery and murder.

- As of June 2011, Eurostat reports that the unemployment rate in the euro zone was 9.9%. For the under-25s, it was 20.3%. In Spain, youth unemployment stands at 45.7%, which tops even the Greek rate of 38.5%. Then there’s this remarkable detail: Among Europeans aged 18-34, no fewer than 46%—51 million people in all—live with their parents.

- In 2009, 37.4% of European children were born outside of marriage. That’s more than twice the 1990 rate of 17.4%. The number of children per woman for the EU is 1.56, catastrophically below the replacement rate of 2.1. Roughly half of all Europeans belong in the “dependency” category on account of their youth or old age. Just 64% of the working-age population actually works.

I could go on in this vein for pages, but you get the point. Europe is not a happy place and hasn’t been for nearly a generation. It’s about to get much worse.

—Bret Stephens, *The Wall Street Journal*,
Aug 16, 2011, p. A11

HISTORY

John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State in the administration of President James Monroe, offered a toast to his native America on July 4, 1821. The Republic was yet young, just 45 years after declaring its independence of Great Britain. The glories of its destiny were mainly to come. But the glories foreseen by Adams, the son of America’s second President and destined to be its sixth, were not triumphs of conquest, but rather the majesty of a nation leading truly by the force of example instead of the example of force.

For America, said Adams, with the same voice by which it spoke itself into existence, similarly held forth to other lands the “hand of honest friendship, of equal freedom, of generous reciprocity. She has uniformly spoken among them, though often to heedless and often to disdainful ears, the language of equal liberty, of equal justice, and of equal rights. She has in the lapse of nearly half a century, without a single exception, respected the independence of other nations while asserting and maintaining our own.”

Alas, respecting the independence of other nations has not been the hallmark of American foreign policy in the post-World War II era, and even less so in the 20 years since the demise of the Soviet Union. As for our own independence, we have been surrendering it, piece by piece, to the United Nations, to the World Bank, to the International Monetary Fund, and to myriad other international organizations we have created to perpetuate our dependence on foreign rulers, foreign alliances, and foreign capital to keep our nation going. We have all but made of America a debtors’ prison, enslaving future generations with a level of debt that will force them to choose between lives of crushing poverty or national bankruptcy and a stain on the honor of the United States of America that will last for decades, perhaps centuries, possibly forever. Were they honest, the “progressives” in American political life would admit they regard national sovereignty as an antiquated concept. Their allegiance is to their capital, and the capital to which they pledge allegiance is not Washington, D.C., or any of our state capitals, but the capital of accumulated wealth that will become greater as the economies of nations go under. There will, in the end, be one flag, one nation, and one currency. And one set of rulers over all. This was not the kind of republic John Quincy Adams saluted on July 4, 1821.

Nor would Adams be taken in by the claims of the United States as world liberator, set out upon the lands and seas of the world to dethrone tyrants, capture flags, and set the captives free. “Wherever the standard of freedom and Independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will her heart, her benedictions and her prayers be,” Adams said. Prayers are not to be dismissed nor neglected in this age of “enlightenment.” More things are wrought by prayer, Tennyson said, than the world has dreamed of.

“But,” Adams continued in tribute to his blessed America, “she goes not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy.”

In other words, America has not as her mission to bring “regime change” to lands other than her own — not even in lands where the people are captive to unspeakable tyrants. For America, said Adams, “is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will commend the general cause by the countenance of her voice and benignant sympathy of her example.” Long before Americans were compelled to don blue helmets and sent to fight under the banner of the United Nations, the America of John Quincy Adams knew that “by once enlisting under banners other than her own, were they even banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standard of freedom.” Sound familiar?

How often in the past half-century has America, fighting under standards other than her own, been drawn into foreign wars “beyond the power of extrication,” as Adams warned? “The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force,” Adams foresaw. “She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit.”

The vision John Quincy Adams articulated in 1821 is still the right road map for America. Her “glory is not dominion, but liberty. Her march is the march of the mind. She has a spear and a shield; but the motto upon her shield is Freedom, Independence, and Peace. This has been her Declaration: this has been, as far as her necessary intercourse with the rest of mankind would permit, her practice.”

The siren song beckons America toward the broad road that leads to the graveyard of empires. We would do well to heed voices of the past that urge us to follow the paths of our forebears. Concerning the lure of empire, there is a simple and faithful warning:

Don’t go there!

—Jack Kenny, *The New American*, July 4, 2011, p. 44

Earlier this summer, the chief rabbi for Great Britain warned about a new intolerance being imposed in the name of tolerance.

“I share a real concern that the attempt to impose the current prevailing template of equality and discrimination on religious organizations is an erosion of religious liberty,” Lord Sacks told a House of Commons committee in June. “We are beginning to move back to where we came in in the 17th century—a whole lot of people on the Mayflower leaving to find religious freedom elsewhere.”

Though not as pronounced on this side of the Atlantic, we can see the same trend that so worries Lord Sacks. Here too the imposition comes in the guise of nondiscrimination

laws and codes. Here too, the result is the same: Faith organizations are told whom they must employ and what they must assent to, or face being shoved off the public square.

The latest example is a case called *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*, which the Supreme Court has just agreed to hear. It stems out of a dispute involving a teacher who was replaced at a very small school when she became ill and absent from work. When the teacher threatened to take her complaint to the EEOC, she was sacked.

School leaders say that taking disputes outside the community violates church teaching. Their argument didn’t fly at the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Now the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, a sort of American Civil Liberties Union for people of faith, has taken up the cause.

“The Becket Fund is involved in this case because it’s not just about one little Lutheran school in suburban Detroit,” says Fund attorney Eric Rassbach. “It’s about the ability of people of all faiths to work out their relationship with God and one another without the government looking over their shoulder.”

Indeed. That helps explain why the many briefs filed in support of *Hosanna-Tabor* include one jointly authored by the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, the Catholic bishops, the presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormons).

At the core of their concern is just this: the politically correct rewriting of the First Amendment. Post-1791, what made America’s religious freedom truly radical was not simply that it allowed people to worship (or not to worship) as they saw fit. The radical part was the guarantee it gave to corporate freedoms: to hold property together, to own newspapers, to run schools, to open hospitals, and clinics, etc.

That understanding is now up for grabs. Last week, Kentucky Gov. Steve Beshear said approval for a local merger that would create a new Catholic hospital system will depend on maintaining a “public mission”—by which he means the performance of procedures, such as sterilization, at odds with church teaching.

In San Francisco, opponents of circumcision recently attempted to outlaw it via state ballot. The California State University system has been found within its legal rights to deem a Christian fraternity and sorority unfit for recognition. Meanwhile, the National Labor Relations Board declared that two Catholic colleges are not, in fact, Catholic.

These are not cases of people trying to impose their beliefs on the rest of us. Instead they involve the question whether faith communities are free to live their own beliefs in their

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

know **what** you believe. know **why** you believe it.
learn how to **discern** truth. learn how to **defend** it.



student conferences
equipping Christians to defend the faith

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

own institutions. Somehow the more “tolerant” we become, the more difficult that becomes.

In the debates over same-sex marriage, for example, the question is often asked of opponents: What can it possibly mean to you if two people of the same sex have their commitment to each other recognized as marriage? We’re now finding out. To give but one example, in Washington, D.C., it means that Catholic Charities no longer qualifies to do adoptions and foster care because it will not place children with or extend health benefits to gay couples.

So much for live and let live.

The radical uniqueness of what our Founding Fathers bequeathed us becomes more vivid when you set it against contrasting nations. In China, for example, you will find any number of churches holding worship services on Sunday. It would, however, be a huge mistake to think that China has anything close to freedom of religion.

To the contrary, governments such as China’s fully appreciate that opening the public square to organized faith groups has consequences for government control. After Tiananmen, Chinese officials told one another: Look what happened in Poland.

During a 1785 debate in the Virginia legislature over state subsidies for Christian teachers, the future author of the First Amendment, James Madison, opposed that measure as state coercion. His alternative was giving all religions free exercise, which he said would add a “lustre to our country.” When it comes to how we treat religion, 21st-century America is, of course, nowhere near China. The question is how far we’ve moved from Madison.

—William McGurn, *The Wall Street Journal*,
Aug 16, 2011, p. A11

Until this month, John Candide had taught religion at Calvin College, affiliated with the Christian Reformed Church, for 25 years. But his “fall from grace,” as the website InsideHigherEd put it, came after he “wrote about challenges science poses to a literal reading of the gospels.” For that offense, he has agreed to leave his tenured teaching job.

As Mr. Candide explains, he recently became troubled by conflicts between science and literal readings of gospel accounts of Jesus’ resurrection: “The more I read, the more I talked with biologists, the more it became clear to me: science tells us that when people die, they stay dead.” He adds that he continues to believe in the importance of the Bible.

In their joint statement, Mr. Candide and Calvin College said that they agreed to part ways because of tensions raised by his scholarship and a desire not to create “harm and distraction.” Despite this peaceful resolution, his departure raises questions about freedom of scholarship at the college.

Or not—I invented John Candide. The actual story at InsideHigherEd, from which I have borrowed liberally above, was a bit different. The alleged offense involved challenges posed by science to a literal reading of Genesis, not of Jesus’ resurrection. And the professor in question is named John Schneider.

As he wrote in an academic journal earlier this year, Mr. Schneider has concluded that human ancestry can’t be traced to a single couple, the Adam and Eve of the Genesis account. Moreover, he believes—on the basis of science, he says—that the very notion of a fall from a primal state of beatitude must be false.

Let’s compare the fictitious case of Prof. Candide with the real Prof. Schneider. Clearly the gospel accounts of Jesus’ resurrection are at odds with what science tells us about the everyday workings of the world. Faced with this conflict, some Christians have reverted to damage control, saying that of course Jesus didn’t rise from the dead—that’s just silly. What would happen to our credibility if we kept insisting on that? No, the real meaning of the resurrection story is that Jesus lives on in the hearts of all those who follow his example. And so on.

The vast majority of Christians—including those who teach at Calvin College—continue to believe otherwise. Yes, they say, Jesus triumphed over sin and death. But they don’t suppose that Jesus’ resurrection renders the scientific understanding of the world irrelevant. On the contrary: It’s precisely in contrast to the ordinary that the resurrection stands out.

In short, if our imaginary Prof. Candide decided one day that he could no longer affirm the reality of the resurrection, it would seem unremarkable that he and the college should part.

But what about Prof. Schneider? There is a salient difference between Genesis and the gospels. For all their disagreement over the details, orthodox Christians broadly agree about how to read the gospels. But there is no such consensus about how to read Genesis. The range of sharply differing views was outlined in the cover story of the June 2011 issue of *Christianity Today*, “The Search for the Historical Adam.”

What is at stake in these disputes is not a choice between following biblical authority on the one hand or science on the other, as the matter is often misleadingly framed. Rather, we see rival theological commitments, rival understandings of how to read Genesis.

Undergirding Young Earth Creationism—the belief that the Earth was created only a few thousand years ago—is an unswerving commitment to a certain way of reading scripture, not a disdain for science. A different approach (for example, John Walton’s *The Lost World of Genesis One*) seeks to recover the ancient worldview implicit in the Genesis account of creation, a perspective from which the measurable age of the Earth, however vast, is not relevant. Critical to debates over “the historical Adam” are theological motifs such as Christ as “the second Adam.” These lose their meaning, many evangelicals argue, if Genesis isn’t read literally.

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

But an alarm should sound whenever the word “literal” is used in this context, whether as a badge of pride (“I just believe in reading the Bible literally”) or as a hint that low-browed fundamentalists are lurking nearby. No one—no one—reads the Bible literally. But some readers are more attentive, more faithful, more imaginative and more persuasive than others.

—John Wilson, *The Wall Street Journal*,
Aug 19, 2011, p. A11

EDUCATION

A national scandal hit the news when Georgia Governor Nathan Deal released a 413-page report describing how hundreds of Atlanta public school teachers and principals had been cheating during the past ten years on standardized tests in order to falsely report that their schools were doing a good job and the kids were improving. A total of 178 teachers and principals (38 were principals), 82 of whom have already confessed, had fraudulently raised test scores so their schools would meet test targets set by the district and thereby qualify for federal funds.

The truth came out after a 10-month inquiry by 60 investigators conducting 2,100 interviews. The investigation showed that principals and teachers in 56 schools had been cheating since 2001 by various methods, such as erasing wrong answers on tests and inserting correct answers.

The high scores of Atlanta schoolchildren had enabled Superintendent Beverly L. Hall to collect \$600,000 in performance bonuses over 10 years to supplement her \$400,000 annual salary. Two national organizations honored her with the title of Superintendent of the Year.

According to the report, Dr. Hall and her top staff “created a culture of fear, intimidation, and retaliation,” concealed by “a conspiracy of silence and deniability,” that allowed “cheating—at all levels—to go unchecked for years.” Those who dared to report concerns about cheating “were held in contempt and punished,” sometimes by termination.

Dr. Hall’s message was: Get the scores up by any means necessary, so teachers and principals were afraid of falling under her rhetorical lash and being sanctioned for failing to achieve “required results.” Her own words were: “No exceptions and no excuses.”

Somehow, the Atlanta scandal didn’t make it onto the agenda of the annual convention of the National Education Association (NEA), held in Chicago over the Fourth of July weekend. The representatives of the 3.2 million NEA members were too busy passing their usual long list of anti-parent, pro-homosexual, pro-feminist, and leftwing resolutions.

The NEA adopted Standing Rule Amendment 1 to order all future NEA materials to replace references to K-12 with Pre-K-12. That’s a clear message that the NEA sees its future in lining up more union members by expanding the role of public schools to get three- and four-year-old children.

Resolution B-1 repeats the demand the NEA has made for several years for “early childhood education programs in the public schools for children from birth through age eight,” in addition to “compulsory attendance” in Kindergarten. This resolution also insists that Pre-K programs have “diversity-based curricula” and “bias-free screening devices.”

It must have been difficult for the Resolutions Committee to add any new pro-homosexual resolutions to the twenty passed last year, but they did. The NEA voted to “publish Articles to celebrate the contributions of GLBT (gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, transgender) teachers and GLBT friends of education.”

Feminist resolutions passed by the NEA include endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion, family planning clinics in public schools, hiring on the basis of “comparable worth” instead of “market value,” and the use of so-called non-sexist language.

The NEA adopted Resolution B-16 to urge Hispanics to be involved in “lobbying efforts for federal programs.” Among those political goals, of course, is support of “passage of the Dream Act that provides a pathway for undocumented college students to obtain a Green Card and eventual citizenship,” endorsed in New Business Item 11.

Among the other political resolutions adopted by the NEA Convention were endorsements of single-payer (government) health care, reparations for descendants of slaves, statehood for the District of Columbia, compliance with unratified United Nations treaties, opposition to English as our official language, opposition to a moment of silence in schools, and strict regulation of guns. NEA Resolution H-1 urges members “to become politically involved” in the NEA’s political action committees, and we all know that means electing Democratic candidates.

The NEA did pass a few resolutions about education, but none about doing a better job of teaching children to read. The NEA supports public school courses in multiculturalism, global education, environmental education, bilingual education, AIDS education, and self-esteem, but opposes voucher plans, tuition tax credits, parental-option plans, and homeschooling.

The most exciting event during the NEA Convention was the presentation of the Friend of Education Award to the “Wisconsin 14,” the state legislators who fled their state rather than vote for legislation that would slightly modify collective bargaining rights for state employees. The legislators hid out in Illinois for three weeks.

Going on record as the first union to endorse Barack Obama for a second term, NEA Delegates voted overwhelmingly to support him in the 2012 presidential election, a year earlier than the NEA usually makes its endorsements. No surprise there.

—Phyllis Schlafly, *Human Events*, Aug 1, 2011, p. 18

In July, California Gov. Jerry Brown signed a first-of-its-kind bill mandating the teaching of a subject about which he thinks Golden State public school students remain unacceptably unenlightened.

There has been a seemingly endless stream of reports cataloging the decline of American public education. So you could imagine a new law mandating more emphasis on core curriculum subjects of science, math, history, English or even—given the childhood obesity epidemic—physical education.

But the latest addition to the California public school curriculum will not help our children learn how to write a complete sentence, locate their home state on a map, or even run a mile.

Instead, it aspires to sensitize students, as early as kindergarten, to the travails of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) Americans. The FAIR Education Act requires the inclusion of the contributions of “sexual minorities” in California public school history lessons and textbooks.

As this new law suggests, homosexual rights advocates have convinced many Americans that they are large in number but short on influence. The opposite is true. In fact, LGBT Americans have become one of the most conspicuous, strident, and disproportionately influential groups in American life.

Opinion polls indicate how successful homosexual rights activists have been at convincing Americans that they are more numerous than they are. A recent Gallup poll found that the average American adult estimates that about 1 in 4 Americans is homosexual. This was a slight increase from 2002, when Gallup found that the average American estimated that 22 percent of the country was homosexual.

These numbers greatly overestimate the LGBT share of the American population. As Gallup notes, demographer Gary Gates last month released a paper on the topic and estimated that 3.5 percent of American adults identify as homosexual or bisexual.

The 2000 US census found that homosexual couples constitute less than 1 percent of American households. The Family Research Report states that no more than 3 percent of men and 2 percent of women are homosexual or bisexual.

Even the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force puts the homosexual population at only 3 percent to 8 percent for both men and women.

We live in a time when even some social conservatives feel obliged to preface their opposition to “gay rights” legislation with the defensive phrase, “Some of my best friends are gay.”

But a 2009 Gallup poll found that just 58 percent of Americans actually know an open gay or lesbian, (a relative, co-worker, or friend), a percentage virtually unchanged from a decade earlier.

It's easy to understand why Americans wildly overestimate the size of the LGBT community. Far from being forced

to remain in the closet, homosexuals are cheered for “coming out”—and given special attention when they do.

Not so long ago, every homosexual rights milestone—the first openly gay TV character, professional athlete, political candidate, etc.—made headlines.

Homosexuals now are fully entrenched in the worlds of entertainment, higher education, and politics. Homosexuals have their own TV networks, magazines, and dating websites. ArchieComics just announced that Kevin Keller, its first openly gay character, will start his own monthly series in February. Homosexual are highly visible on television, making up 3.9 percent of scripted network television's regular characters, according to the most recent report by the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD).

At least 115 American colleges and universities have LGBT campus centers. There are more than 40 certificate and degree-granting programs in “queer studies.” At least five institutions offer undergraduate degrees on the subject.

In 2009, Harvard University became the first school of higher learning to establish an endowed chair in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender studies.

The Gay & Lesbian Victory Fund estimates that more than 100 openly homosexual candidates were elected to office nationwide in 2010, an increase of one-third from 2008 and nearly threefold the number of a decade earlier.

Remarking on the anticipated impact of the new California law, Carolyn Laub, director of the Gay-Straight Alliance Network in California, said, “Suddenly students [will] see [gays are] part of a broader community, and they have a much better understanding of that community in the context of the rest of the world. It has absolutely nothing to do with sex; it's about entire communities that are left out.”

Ms. Laub is wrong on all counts. The new law perpetuates the myth that a group defined strictly by the sexuality of its members continues to be unjustly “left out” from the broader community.

An honest societal debate about homosexual rights is hampered by inflated numbers and inaccurate perceptions. These perceptions are a result of the public relations accomplishments of a small, well-funded, highly educated minority that has seized upon the language of the civil rights movement to achieve power and position.

In looking at California's new educational guidelines, one wonders if it is too late to aspire to the goal of Martin Luther King, who longed for a world in which his children would be judged by the content of their character and not by any other factors.

—Gary Bauer, *The Washington Times*, Aug 8, 2011, p. 34

Christian students, warned about anti-Christian thought in areas like sociology or psychology, suffer from the illu-

A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

sion that majoring in economics or finance is “safe.” Not so, and the work of one of the giants of economics, John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946), is a case in point.

Keynes’ milieu was that of the “Cambridge Apostles,” a once-Christian debate society that changed under Keynes’ leadership: “We were, in the strict sense of the term,” he wrote, “immoralists.” Richard Deacon’s history, *The Cambridge Apostles*, shows how the fruit of this immorality was what “apostles” called “the higher sodomy.” Homosexuality was, in their view, a higher way of life than traditional heterosexual pairings, because it added sexual affection to the already allegedly superior intellectual friendship of men.

Keynes endorsed the atheistic views of fellow “apostle” G.E. Moore, who, having presented the con argument when the society debated whether to allow God as a member, led the chant “God, out! God, out!” Keynes said that the chief benefit of Moore’s atheism was that “we entirely repudiated a personal liability on us to obey general rules. We claimed the right to judge every individual case on its merits, and the wisdom to do so successfully. This was a very important part of our faith, violently and aggressively held, and for the outer world it was our most obvious and dangerous characteristic. We repudiated entirely customary morals, conventions, and traditional wisdom.”

Part of the traditional wisdom that the Keynes circle repudiated was classical economics, which emphasized work and savings in an environment of economic freedom and sound money. Labeling classical economics “Puritanism,” Keynes argued that people saved too much and that government through inflationary policies could push consumption, which would create more jobs. Thrifty people would therefore see their purchasing power reduced, and a powerful government could directly increase the amount of spending through public works.

We shouldn’t make too much of this, since the economic flaws of Keynesianism are not directly related to the sexual interests of his “apostles,” but his sense of wanting to do away with the ethics of the real apostles was.

—Jerry Bowyer, *World* magazine, Aug 27, 2011, p. 59

ETHICS

In mid-September 2008, I stumbled on the likelihood that [communist] Bill Ayers served as the primary craftsman of Obama’s acclaimed 1995 memoir, *Dreams from My Father*. By mid-October 2008, I was sure that he had. “This was a charge,” David Remnick would write of my accusation, “that if ever proved true, or believed to be true among enough voters, could have been the end of the candidacy.”

My thesis involves no eyewitnesses or radar data or ballistics tests. I was not asking anyone to buy it sight unseen but to kick the tires and take it for a test drive. Yet even so simple a literary review proved a task too daunting. The Fifth

Estate either ignored or blindly attacked, not just me but anyone who dared defend me.

Rush Limbaugh, for instance, cited my work approvingly in October 2008. “This may not have been Limbaugh’s most racist insinuation of the campaign,” said Remnick, before adding that our collective “libel about Obama’s memoir...had a particularly ugly pedigree.”

On at least a half dozen occasions, Donald Trump advanced my thesis in 2011. In retaliation, Remnick savaged this “jackass” in the pages of the magazine he edits, the *New Yorker*. He concluded that this and other “fantasies” were designed “to arouse a fear of the Other, of an African-American man with a white American mother and a black Kenyan father.”

When Andrew Breitbart merely tweeted that he found my thesis “compelling” both Martin Bashir on MSNBC and Bill Maher on HBO denounced him as a racist for so doing, though neither has read my book, *Deconstructing Obama*, or ever talked to me.

Fearing the abuse of the anti-journalists, the “respectable” conservative media, those with a serious and sober presence in New York and/or Washington, have become cautious to the point of cowardly. To date, not a single one of them has so much as commented on my book, let alone reviewed it.

—Jack Cashill, *Whistleblower*, July 2011, p. 6