

- » pg. 2 From the President's Desk
- » pg. 5 Doc's recent reading on marijuana legalization
- » pg. 7 All in the Family

- » The latest announcements and news
- » Find us on Facebook
- » Check our Twitter feed: @summitmn

Summit on the Cusp of Tripled Capacity

“My people are destroyed from lack of knowledge.” —Hosea 4:6

Today, a battle is raging for the soul of America.

Far from mere alarmist hyperbole, critical observers and analysts share a growing consensus that a decades-long worldview war is now entering a critical stage. While a litany of social, economic, political, and spiritual woes could fill volumes, a mere handful of reminders suffices to demonstrate that we may be facing a tipping point. As the greatest nation in history sinks further under a multitrillion dollar mountain of debt, thought inconceivable just a decade ago, our national leaders appear paralyzed by a lack of courage, competence, or both.

On the social front, an array of statistics testifies to our moral decline. Millions of babies continue to be aborted. Forty percent of children are born out of wedlock. Venereal disease is epidemic. And the divorce rate has dropped only because a proportionately fewer number of people are marrying — marriage now being deemed an “obsolete” institution.

In churches, biblical illiteracy has reached alarming proportions, while ever-increasing numbers of young Christians are abandoning their faith.

On college and university campuses, the reign of relativism and totalitarian tolerance continues its corrosive march across entire academic disciplines, while our leading business schools spawn growing legions of technologically sophisticated barbarians.

Clearly, the alarm has sounded. The clock is ticking. Yet most of the Christian church continues to snore undisturbed in a potentially lethal slumber.

Careening Toward a Precipice

“Like men with sore eyes: They find the



light painful, while the darkness, which permits them to see nothing, is restful and agreeable.” —Dio Chrysostom, AD 40-120, 11th Discourse

As evidence mounts on multiple fronts that our nation is careening toward a precipice, there are nevertheless reasons to be hopeful.

First, we believe that we have not yet reached a point of no return. A vital window of opportunity still remains open. In fact, if even a modest portion of 38 million self-professed evangelicals would simply awaken from their slumbers and stand resolutely for righteousness and a biblical worldview — in their homes, their churches, and at the voting booth — it would be a “game changer.”

Second, through the work of Summit and related ministries, growing numbers of knowledgeable and resolute change agents are championing a biblical worldview in strategic centers of influence across the country. In over 50 years, Summit alone has trained 30,000 students, and more than 100,000 lives have been

impacted by Summit's worldview curriculum.

As we contemplate the need to awaken the sleeping giant of the evangelical church, it is clear that merely “more of the same” would be a prescription for certain failure. The rising tide of hostile worldviews will simply not be turned by timid steps, nor will inconsequential incrementalism be adequate to meet the growing threats to our faith, family, and freedoms.

What is needed instead is bold and courageous leadership by those who have soberly grasped the consequences of the failure to turn this rising tide. In truth, our situation is not entirely unlike that facing England in the 1930s. Debilitated by defeatism and pacifism in the wake of World War I, vast swaths of the nation supported appeasement and concession to the increasingly belligerent threats from Hitler. Some even dared speak of surrender.

Yet on June 18, 1940, as France fell and Britain stood alone, Prime Minister Winston Churchill addressed his nation:

“Upon this battle depends the survival
See **tripled capacity** page 3

from the president's desk

a word from dr. jeff myers



This is the biggest news in the history of Summit Ministries.

Two years from now, with your help, Summit will be transformed from a life-changing summer program into a year-round nerve center through which not only students but also pastors, teachers, and other influencers will be equipped to stand for truth in every aspect of culture.

Not everyone is happy about this. The enemies of a Christian worldview are expecting us to retreat any day. Imagine their howls of rage when they learn that within 24 months Summit is going to be influencing *millions* of young people, not just thousands.

This is not a pipe dream. *Two-thirds of the project is already complete.* My family and I are contributing sacrificially to close the gap. I am asking you to join me.

Here's the abridged version: The Summit hotel is a summer-only facility. Ever since the building was built in 1891, it's been shut up tight during the winter months. But with the help of architect Jack Paulson (see *Spotlight*), whose great-grandfather *built* the hotel, we have been quietly preparing it to be a year-round destination that is attractive, comfortable, safe, and handicap-accessible.

Opening Summit during the winter literally triples our ministry's capacity:

- **Envision hundreds more students:** School breaks in the fall, Christmas, and spring become training times to prepare students to stand strong for a time such as this.

- **Imagine advanced programs:**

Summit grads get a "Vitamin B12" shot through training and mentoring as they lead courageously in politics, business, science, and more.

- **Picture strategic events for pastors and Christian educators:** Trained leaders return home to share biblical truth with tens of thousands of people we've never met.

And this is only the beginning. We're also opening our doors to apologetics, biblical worldview, and discipleship programs whose partnership geomet-

“Two years from now, with your help, Summit will be transformed from a life-changing summer program into a year-round nerve center.”

rically increases the kingdom momentum we see God building. It's a game-changer.

Most people do not grasp the desperation of our times. Far too many hide their heads in the sand, hoping the bombardment will cease. That's not our approach. We picture the noisy opponents of biblical truth with their binoculars out, scanning the horizon for a white flag. What they're going to see instead, with your generous help, is wave after wave of reinforcements.

Years ago, I found myself captivated as Summit Founder David Noebel

shared the multiplying effect a year-round Summit program would have. *This dream is coming true right now.* With a total bill of \$3.9M, it's our biggest stretch ever. But look at what God has already done:

- **Phase one:** a state of the art sprinkler system, fire exits, beautiful new stair tower, and dozens of appearance upgrades.

- o **Status:** \$1.1M raised. Project complete.

- **Phase two:** beefing up the hotel structurally, installing a new elevator, beautifying the interior, and preparing handicap-accessible rooms.

- o **Status:** \$600,000 raised. Fundraising complete — work begins this month and will be completed in May 2015.

Phase three is finalizing the winterization. It retrofits the hotel with upgraded electric, a HVAC system, new windows, and insulation. Planning and engineering are complete. As soon as we raise \$2.2M, we will hit the ignition.

In the coming months, I will be in touch to share details. Please open your heart to these communications. Ask God how you can play a lively role in preparing for a whole new season of influence for Summit.

Our Summit family can do this. Indeed, we're more than halfway there. It will be our legacy to accomplish this great thing for the sake of our children and our children's children, for God's glory, and for this country we love.

tripled capacity

continued from page 1

of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. ... Hitler knows that he will have to break us on this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free, and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, the whole world, including the United States, including all we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age, made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves for our duties, and so bear ourselves that if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say: "This was their finest hour."

Ideas have consequences.

Choices matter.

"Do not think that because you are alone in the king's house you alone of all the Jews will escape. For if you remain silent at this time, relief and deliverance for the Jews will arise from another place, but you and your father's family will perish. And who knows but that you have come to royal position for such a time as this?" Esther 4:13, 14

Echoing a noble sounding but confused piety, many Christians today have failed to engage in a battle that threatens our future because they believe the outcome is "all up to God." A careful reading of the passage above should disabuse them of such notions. As with Esther, choices matter. If we remain silent at this time, relief and deliverance may arise from another place and another time, but many will perish in the interim. As with England in its hour of greatest peril, our challenge is formidable, but it is not complex. Success resides not in cracking some

indecipherable code but in simply acting courageously on the clear choices before us.

First, rather than cultural appeasers and accommodators, we need leaders in the tradition of Winston Churchill who recognize that while losing this war would have unthinkable consequences, this could also be our finest hour.

Second, we must understand that resolve, while necessary, is not in itself sufficient. Just as America's industrial strength played a critical role in turning the tide of World War II, so will worldview resources play a critical role in the outcome of this battle. We must move quickly and strategically to double, then double again, our capacity to stem the tide of secular humanism engulfing our country.

“By dramatically increasing Summit's capacity and swelling the ranks of able and articulate Christian worldview defenders on multiple fronts, we can more effectively awaken, galvanize, and engage Christians now on the sidelines of this conflict.”

Third, by dramatically increasing Summit's capacity and swelling the ranks of able and articulate Chris-

tian worldview defenders on multiple fronts, we can more effectively awaken, galvanize, and engage Christians now on the sidelines of this conflict.

We have no illusions about the magnitude of the challenge facing us. We recognize and lament that as it relates to the criticality of worldviews in determining the course of civilization, many Christians have been in the dark so long they don't even realize that the lights are out. Yet history confirms that great awakenings are indeed possible. And that the course of world events is shaped profoundly by the choices we make.

The Request

"You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we will sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness. If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done." —President Ronald Reagan

The history of great movements reveals that long before masses of people were mobilized, a pivotal role was always played by a select few. Whether it was Martin Luther in launching the Reformation ... William Wilberforce in abolishing the slave trade ... or Winston Churchill in galvanizing the will of Great Britain to defy the onslaught of Nazism, the simple yet powerful truth is that leadership matters.

Since its inception in 1962, through the vision and determination of Dr. David Noebel, a vital nucleus of friends has played a key leadership role in Summit Ministries. A relatively small group of friends, willing to share their God-given blessings, has consistently made a difference in making possible the far-

See **tripled capacity** page 4

reaching impact of this vital ministry.

You are reading this right now because you have demonstrated your Christian convictions and concern for our nation through your generosity. Your partnership with Summit has underscored that you, too, understand that ideas have consequences; that our choices matter. In light of the pivotal role your commitment and generosity can play in transforming Summit's capacity to impact entire generations, we prayerfully submit for your consideration an investment that will touch thousands of lives for years to come.

Enlarge the place of your tent, stretch your tent curtains wide, do not hold back; lengthen your cords, strengthen your stakes.

—Isaiah 54:2

To meet the growing need for worldview training throughout the church, Summit is seeking to “lengthen the cords and strengthen the stakes” of its ministry. A first critical step entails the renovation of Summit's antique hotel in Manitou Springs, Colo., that has served as a training ground for tens of thousands of Christian students.

Here, students have learned to effectively articulate and defend a biblical worldview in the midst of a culture increasingly hostile to Christian perspectives and values. Here, students have found Christ waiting, calling them to surrender their lives to Him alone. It is also here, once renovated, that Summit plans to host a wide variety of adult conferences as well as strategic gatherings of influential thought leaders. Our goal is to mobilize and focus efforts and resources — intellectual, human, financial — at critical points in the battle for our nation's future.

To accommodate a dramatic increase in its training initiatives, Summit must winterize its facility for year-round use

— thus *tripling* current capacity. Functioning increasingly as a “War College” in the battle for the heart and mind of American society, the planned renovation of the campus will represent a major step forward in Summit's ability to mobilize and equip Christians to be agents of transformation in centers of influence at home and around the world.

Beyond tripling our current capacity, completing the renovation of the facility will quicken the pace of subsequent strategic initiatives outlined in Summit's strategic plan, like reaching out to churches and Christian schools across America.

Over the next five years, our target is focused and potent: to encourage, strengthen, and mobilize Christian leaders so that they can bring their skills and knowledge to bear on the culture. Summit believes we can help others see that together ... WE CAN DO THIS! We reject the idea that young people are not capable of bringing about transformation. We have seen throughout history, and recently with Summit students, that even one passionate believer can turn the tide.

As Eric Metaxas details in his New York Times best-selling book *Bonhoeffer*, a young Dietrich Bonhoeffer received his doctorate in theology at age 21 but was unable to be officially ordained until age 25. To continue growing in the meantime, he accepted a summer pastoral internship in Barcelona, Spain. In one of his sermons he said, “God wants to see human beings, not ghosts who shun the world. ... In the whole of world history, there is always only one really significant hour — the present ... if you want to find eternity, you must serve the times.”

Bonhoeffer, who would later give his life trying to bring down Hitler's government, was only 24 years of age at

the time. Throughout history, God regularly gives astounding vision to young people. In fact, Acts 2:17 says, “In the last days, God says, I will pour out my Spirit on all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your young men will see visions, your old men will dream dreams.”

Dare we to dream the dream that God will, through the intentional mentoring and cultivating of a biblical worldview in the rising generation, inspire vision in young adults that will have a profound impact on the world? This would truly be a joy to the world. As the great Isaac Watts hymn by that name says, “He comes to make His blessings flow far as the curse is found.”

In order to facilitate this mentoring quickly and effectively, we are strategically reaching out to churches across the country with the *Cultivate Project*. This program systematically trains church staff and lay leaders to mentor the rising generation. There are more than 300,000 churches in America — reaching millions of young adults. These churches act as a delivery system to inoculate young adults against lies that spread like viruses and destroy their futures.

To finish the renovation project and triple its capacity to teach and mentor young people, Summit needs \$2.2 million to complete the final phase of construction. This last push will winterize the facility, redesign and upgrade the wiring and plumbing, and configure many of the bathrooms so that they are private baths and adequate for guests of all ages. This winterization process will exponentially increase the capacity of the hotel for student trainings, adult conferences, and strategic gatherings.

If you have questions or would like to contribute to this historic project, please call Summit at 866.786.6483.

Editor's Note: Our President Emeritus, Dr. David Noebel, helps us with research by sending 20-30 pages of clippings of each month's news. To see the complete list of Doc's clippings, go to www.summit.org/resources/the-journal/, open the PDF, and scroll to page 9, or call us at 866.786.6483.

Marijuana Legalization

The legalization of marijuana has acquired an aura of inevitability. But is there really no choice? Must Americans resign ourselves to the social acceptability, legal entrenchment, and widespread availability (including to our kids) of marijuana?

We are convinced this headlong rush into disaster can be stopped — if, that is, political leaders can be found who have the nerve to take on the conventional wisdom.

Currently, marijuana is legal in Colorado, and Washington state will soon debut its pot shops. Pew Research finds that pot is now legal in some form or decriminalized in 24 states. *Reason* reports that, in 2014 alone — either through ballot initiatives or legislation — 13 states could legalize marijuana, another 16 could permit medicinal marijuana, and 5 could decriminalize possession.

The shift in public opinion has been dramatic. In the early and mid-2000s, support for legalizing marijuana across Republicans, Democrats, and independents hovered between 30 and 36 percent. In October 2013, Gallup reported for the first time that a clear majority of Americans (58 percent) supported marijuana legalization. Even 35 percent of Republicans are now on board.

No doubt some Democrats support the loosening of marijuana laws in order to court a group they view as their voters. The strongest supporters of marijuana legalization are young males age 18-29. They lean towards the Democratic party, and Democrats realize that marijuana ballot initiatives could help drum up support

for Democrats running in 2014, especially in Florida.

Indeed, a recent *Wall Street Journal*/NBC poll found that young adults are more interested in states legalizing marijuana than in other major news stories such as Obamacare, the crisis in Ukraine, and same-sex marriage. The same poll found that Americans believe sugar to be more harmful than marijuana. When asked to name the most harmful of four substances, 49 percent of respondents placed tobacco first, and another 24 percent placed alcohol first. Sugar followed with 15 percent, while only 8 percent thought marijuana the most harmful.

We have reached a dangerous and absurd moment when there is unprecedented support for the legalization of a substance that is demonstrably harmful to the health and safety of individuals, as well as to the fabric of our nation. No country in the history of the world has persevered in the legalization of drugs. None. We may learn the hard way why.

The great political scientist James Q. Wilson staunchly opposed the legalization of drugs. He explained that “drug use is wrong because it is immoral, and it is immoral because it enslaves the mind and destroys the soul.” No society should want unhealthy substances destroying the minds, bodies, character, and potential of its citizens.

As Wilson put it, “The central prob-

“No country in the world has persevered in the legalization of drugs. None. We may learn the hard way why.”

lem with legalizing drugs is that it will increase drug consumption.” Experience shows that when previously controlled substances become permissible, they are

more widely used. So the question becomes: Do we want more stoned Americans? Do we want the damage from legal marijuana to approach the damage done by legal alcohol?

Alaska tried this experiment. In 1982, it legalized the possession of marijuana in small amounts. But by 1990, less than a decade later, the people of the state passed a ballot initiative to recriminalize pot, primarily because marijuana use among Alaskan teens had jumped to twice the national average.

Even in states that have allowed only medicinal marijuana, use among young people has risen. Christian Thurstone is one of the leading child psychiatrists in Colorado and head of the teen rehab center Adolescent STEP: Substance Abuse Treatment Education & Prevention Program in Denver. He has chronicled firsthand the increase in marijuana use among adolescents since Colorado legalized medicinal marijuana in 2009.

As one would expect, today's marijuana laws in Colorado prohibit use by children. But this prohibition — as with alcohol and cigarettes — has proven ineffectual in a state where pot is now available in vending machines. Marijuana producers and sellers know what Big Alcohol and Tobacco know: Hook users early, and you have customers for life; hook them to heavy use, and the profits flow.

In their book *Marijuana Legalization: What Everyone Needs to Know*, Jonathan Calukins, Mark Kleiman, Angela Hawken, and Beau Kilmer* report, “Marijuana use is highest among 18-25 year olds; their past-year rate (31 percent) is three times the U.S. average.”

Hence the pot-tarts and marijuana-infused sodas, brownies, cookies, and pasta sauces that already line the shelves of Colorado's pot shops. Billboards advertising marijuana dot Denver freeways and feature cartoon characters; they're obviously aimed at young people.

The authors also found that “more-



than-weekly users account for more than 90 percent of marijuana demand.” In other words, legalization enables an industry that thrives on maximizing addiction.

Furthermore, the medical science is clear: Marijuana use has deleterious effects on health and behavior, especially among the young.

Marijuana today is far more potent than it was in the 1960s and '70s. This is not your parents' or grandparents' pot. “Over just the past 15 years, potency levels measured in U.S. seizures have more than doubled,” *Marijuana Legalization* reports. The University of Mississippi Potency Monitoring Project found that the average potency of all cannabis seized by state and federal law enforcement increased from 3.4 percent in 1993 to about 8.8 percent in 2008. By most estimates, the average potency today is 13 or 14 percent.

The more potent the drug the more dangerous its effects. Marijuana has already been linked to two deaths in Colorado: a 19-year-old college student who jumped to his death from a Denver hotel room after eating six times the recommended amount of a pot cookie, and a man who allegedly shot and killed his wife after eating marijuana candy and hallucinating.

It seems that the American Medical Association was right when it came out with a long report opposing legalization in 2013. Among its most damning findings was: “Heavy cannabis use in adolescence causes persistent impairments in neuro-cognitive performance and IQ, and use is associated with increased rates of anxiety, mood, and psychotic thought disorders.”

And now even casual pot smoking has been linked to harmful brain abnormalities. An important new study by researchers at Northwestern University to be published in the *Journal of Neuroscience* found that young adults who smoked pot only once or twice a week still showed significant abnormalities in the part of the brain that deals with memory and motivation.

And the consequences of marijuana use are not restricted to individual users. Over the last 10 years, fatal car accidents involving people who were stoned have tripled,

according to a report in the *American Journal of Epidemiology*.

Marijuana, of course, is a gateway drug. Even the authors of *Marijuana Legalization* admit that “kids who use marijuana — particularly those who start marijuana use at a young age — are statistically much more likely to go on to use other drugs than their peers who do not use marijuana.”

Rather than address these problems, many supporters of marijuana change the terms of debate. But the claims that if we legalize pot we can reap economic benefits from taxation and regulation, right wrongs in the criminal justice system, and undercut the criminal cartels are mostly false.

It doesn't seem to be the case that legalization will produce a financial windfall. Early revenue estimates from Colorado's own legislative economists have already been revised downward. In any case, a few more dollars for state governments to spend pale beside the societal costs of wasted lives, incapacitated employees, doped-up students, and stoned parents neglecting life and family responsibilities.

Neither is it true that legalizing pot will rid us of the big crime syndicates. When asked how much drug-related crime, violence, and corruption marijuana legalization would eliminate, the authors of *Marijuana Legalization* admit, “Not much.” To date, police in Colorado report that the black market is alive and well. With taxes on legal pot running 25 percent, cartels can provide cheaper, untaxed weed, and consumers will buy it.

Finally, proponents of legalization claim that pot smokers (particularly young black males) are crowding our prisons. This couldn't be further from the truth. The U.S. criminal justice system is the single largest referral source for drug treatment programs. What's more, those serving time for marijuana possession alone account for less than 1 percent of the state and federal prison population, and most of these prisoners are drug dealers who pleaded guilty to possession in exchange for a lesser sentence.

The allegations of racial injustice are untrue as well. While studies of arrest data show that African Americans are 2.5 times more likely to be arrested (not incarcerated) for marijuana possession than whites, the disparity comes from purchasing behavior, not racist enforcement. A comprehensive RAND study demonstrated that African-American marijuana users were “nearly twice as likely to buy outdoors, three times more likely to buy from a stranger, and significantly more likely to buy away from their homes.” All these factors greatly increase their risk of arrest.

In any case, these ancillary issues should not be allowed to sidetrack the larger question. We are at a crucial time in our nation's history, engaged in a once-in-a-lifetime debate over a national health-care system and still struggling to improve schools whose graduates are behind their peers in many industrialized nations. On top of all this, do we really need more pot-heads? Do we need a dumber country?

Jerry Brown, the Democratic governor of California, was recently asked about legalizing pot in his state, and he put it this way: “How many people can get stoned and still have a great state or a great nation?” Last week, a leading Republican finally joined him.

“I am not going to be the governor who is going to tell our children and our young adults that marijuana use is OK, because it's not,” said New Jersey governor Chris Christie on his monthly radio show. “You want to elect somebody else who's willing to legalize marijuana and expose our children to that gateway drug and the effects it has on their brain? You'll have to live with yourself if you do that, but it's not going to be this governor who does it.”

This is exactly the message our leaders need to be sending.

*The original version of this article mischaracterized the positions of these authors on legalization.

— Christopher Beach, William Bennett

The Weekly Standard

May 5, 2014, Vol. 19, No. 32

All in the Family: Architect Comes Home to Help Summit

By Krystan Clupny

In 1891, The Grandview opened as a luxurious hotel in Manitou Springs, Colo. Built by Dutch immigrant William Paulson, the hotel remained in the family until the 1950s. In 1962, Summit Founder Dr. David Noebel purchased the hotel and began Summit's program to engage students in learning biblical worldview.

“When young people come here, do they get born again?” the architect asked as he surveyed the property.

Jack Paulson came to Summit after a series of interviews with contractors who all suggested him as the right architect to help Summit embark on the historic renovation of the Summit hotel. Dr. Noebel had envisioned a year-round program that would help Christians of all ages develop a robust biblical worldview. In 2012, Summit President Dr. Jeff Myers and the Summit board of directors agreed the time was right to begin working toward that vision.

When Dr. Myers called Paulson, an amazing connection with Summit was revealed. Paulson shared that, in fact, his

“I have no doubt that God brought Jack to us. We'd never find a more committed person to see this through.”

— Dr. Jeff Myers



Jack Paulson and his wife, Cheri

great grandfather was William Paulson — the original owner of the hotel. His family had owned the building for nearly 50 years before Dr. Noebel took possession in 1962.

Dr. Myers wasn't certain if Paulson would approve of his answer to the question about students getting born again, but he prepared for whatever was to come: “Yes Jack, sometimes they do.”

“That's fantastic!” Paulson responded.

Stepping foot on the Summit property was like taking a ride in a time machine, says Paulson. “At first it was a little overwhelming walking through the front door. Nothing had changed since I left.” (Paulson lived on-site until he was about 10 years old.)

It's no coincidence that Paulson connected with Summit, according to Dr. Myers.

“I have no doubt that God brought Jack to us,” Dr. Myers said. “We'd never find a more committed person to see this through. The fact that Jack's great

grandfather built this hotel is nothing less than evidence that God's fingerprints are all over this. I believe God had this special family build and steward this building especially for Summit all along. It's all part of God's design!”

Now, after 54 years of Summit students learning to live biblically at the Summit hotel, another generation of Paulsons is again shaping the building's future.

Having Paulson on the team is a true asset, says Summit's project manager, Adam Hinkle.

“It has been a joy to work with Jack as he remembers running through the halls of this hotel as a kid back when his parents owned it,” Hinkle says. “Jack's connections locally make him the ideal partner for this project. He's masterfully helped us determine how to fit our needs for the building with the modern code requirements. He's been very patient with us, and I'm truly grateful for him!”

Managing the complexities of the fire and building code has been a real challenge. Summit's team has guarded the historic nature of the building like it's gold. Paulson has orchestrated meeting after meeting to facilitate discussion on the part of the Historic Preservation Society, the Regional Building Department, and the Manitou Springs Planning Department.

“It's gratifying to me because of what Summit does,” Paulson said. “We think it's a great program and ministry; you are helping kids stay in line with their faith.”



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

INSIDE: Update on Summit's renovation project to triple capacity



Do you believe in Summit?

Help us TRIPLE our capacity through a year-round facility.

Give today:
Online at www.summit.org
By phone at **866.786.6483**
By mail at **PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, CO 80829**

The Journal is the monthly publication of American Christian College (dba Summit Ministries), a nonprofit, educational, religious corporation operating under the laws of the states of Oklahoma and Colorado.

PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, Colorado 80829 | Phone: 866.786.6483 | URL: www.summit.org | Email: aaronz@summit.org

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 6

Family

The disintegration of the two-parent family is the greatest long-term threat to American prosperity and cultural health. Nearly half of all births in the Millennial Generation (18- to 33-year-olds) occur outside of marriage; the national average is 41 percent. Children raised by single mothers fail in school and commit crime at much higher rates than children raised by both parents. These children's social skills — needed to become productive, self-sufficient adults — are weaker on average. Single-parent households are far more likely to be poor and dependent on government assistance. But more consequential than the risks to individual children is the cultural pathology of regarding fathers as an optional appendage for child-rearing. A society that fails to teach its young males that they are unambiguously responsible for their offspring will have a hard time inculcating other fundamental duties.

Unfortunately, family breakdown isn't amenable to public-policy solutions, since it results from something more profound than misguided tax structure or welfare rules. Though many factors are at play, the biggest culprit is feminism's devaluing of males and the conceit that "strong women" can do it all. Reversing the trend of fatherlessness will require public figures, from President Obama on down, to violate feminist taboos and start speaking at every opportunity about the essential contributions that fathers make to the formation of their children. Family decline will be stemmed only when it is widely understood that care provided by both biological parents is the most powerful social and economic advantage that any

child can enjoy.

— Heather MacDonald
The Wall Street Journal
July 8, 2014

Intelligent Design

Drive across the Black Hills of South Dakota and you'll come across a rock formation that bears the unmistakable mark of intelligent design. The formation is Mount Rushmore, the towering likeness of four U.S. presidents carved in stone. Now drive to Arizona and turn north from I-40 west of Flagstaff, and you'll come across another rock formation, the Grand Canyon. As remarkable as the canyon is, there's no reason to think a sculptor or engineer built it.

Not all rock formations are so obviously designed and not designed as Mount Rushmore and the Grand Canyon. Take, for instance, the Old Man of the mountain, a stone formation in the White Mountains of New Hampshire that resembles a human face. Nineteenth-century American novelist Nathaniel Hawthorne described it as a "Great Stone face" that looked as if "an enormous giant, or a Titan, had sculpted his own likeness on the precipice." When viewed from just the right angle from just the right distance, it looks designed. But it isn't. Natural forces acting blindly and without intelligence or foresight just happened to produce it, much as natural forces sometimes sculpt a cloud to look like a rabbit, a whale, or some other animal.

Here we have three kinds of rock formations. Mount Rushmore looks designed, and is. The Grand Canyon doesn't look designed, and isn't. And the Old Man of the Mountain looks designed, but isn't. Of course, there's one

other possibility: A rock formation that doesn't look designed, but is. Finding such objects is the job of archeologists. Crude arrowheads and weathered burial mounds can look like natural objects to the untrained eye, but a good archeologist spots the evidence of design that others miss.

These four rock formations represent four main groups: designed and appears designed, not designed but appears designed, designed but appears undesignated, not designed and appears undesignated.

We use rock formation to illustrate these four categories, but the categories cover everything anyone has ever seen. On the one hand, things can appear to be either designed or not designed. On the other hand, a particular thing either was designed by someone (or some team), or it wasn't.

— William Dembski, Jonathan Witt
Intelligent Design Uncensored
p. 43,45

Court Cases

Contrary to what you may have read in less enlightened corners of the Internet, the Supreme Court did not deny access to contraception to anyone. Rather, it ruled today that if the owners of a closely held company have religious objections to providing contraceptives or abortifacients in their insurance policies, the Obama administration cannot force them to do it.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) trumps the administration's regulations. The act says that religious objectors must be exempt from a government policy that imposes a substantial burden on their beliefs if the government has a less burdensome way

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 9

of advancing a compelling interest. Five justices of the Court ruled that closely held companies can be religious objectors protected by the law, and that the government can indeed make contraception more affordable without coercing these companies.

Just as notable is what the Supreme Court's ruling did not do. Women who work for the plaintiff, Hobby Lobby, remain able to use their employer-provided insurance coverage to finance the most popular forms of contraception. They remain free to use their wages to finance the ones Hobby Lobby will not cover. They remain free to find other jobs, too, if they want employer-provided insurance coverage that includes the abortifacients to which Hobby Lobby objects. Congress remains free to enact a new law that requires employers to cover abortifacients and contraceptives and explicitly rules out any RFRA exemptions. It remains free, for that matter, to repeal RFRA altogether.

The ruling does not even make it clear whether the Little Sisters of the Poor will, in the end, remain free from the requirement that they authorize another party to provide contraceptive coverage. That question will be answered in a different case. The Court's ruling today, in short, is an extremely limited one. It does not even restore the full scope of freedom employers had in these matters as recently as 2012. Nobody then, you may recall, was agitated over the fact that throughout the entire course of American history up to that point, their supposed "rights" to free contraceptive coverage from employers had been continuously violated.

It can be safely predicted that any change in birth rates and rates of con-

traceptive use based on this ruling will be undetectable. All that has changed is that employers are a little freer to refuse to engage in conduct they consider religiously objectionable. That this increase in freedom makes some people so very upset tells us more about them than about the Court's ruling.

—The Editors
National Review
June 30, 2014

The IRS settled a lawsuit by the National Organization for Marriage, admitting that it leaked confidential information about it to a left-wing group. The agency says that the leak was the result of the isolated actions of a single employee, one who was acting in error but not out of malice. In isolation, that might — barely — be credible, but consider the agency's recent history: the targeting of conservative organizations for extraordinary harassment and intimidation; lies about the scope of the targeting, its timeline, its extent, and the involvement of senior IRS officials in Washington; its agents openly campaigning for Barack Obama on agency time; the convenient destruction of evidence related to the investigation of these misdeeds; the planted questions at staged press conferences; the willful misleading of Congress. We can see how that employee might not have thought he was doing anything untoward.

—*National Review*
July 21, 2014, p. 8, 10

Gender

For an hour or two, a fair number of conservative commentators were convinced that Christin Scarlett Milloy's essay in Slate "Don't Let the Doctor Do

This to Your Newborn" was a parody, and an oafish one at that. What Milloy objects to is having the attending physician announce: "It's a boy!" or "It's a girl!" Milloy, a transsexual, is peddling the fantasy that sex is a social construct rather than a biological reality and that when a doctor takes note at birth of the baby's sex, the newborn is "instantly and brutally reduced from such infinite potentials down to one concrete set of expectations and stereotypes." This is, in a word, madness. (A riposte to *National Review's* Kevin D. Williamson on the matter of transsexualism began: "As a woman with a penis ...") Milloy went so far as to argue that treating boys as boys and girls as girls constitutes "psychological abuse." Given the radical and invasive medical procedures to which transsexuals routinely subject themselves, there can be little doubt that their sense of sexual misidentification is sincerely felt. But it is far from clear that the correct response to that sensation is its encouragement in individuals; the idea that an entire child-rearing ethic should be constructed upon it is perverse and intellectually indefensible. To take reality into account is not bigotry.

—*National Review*
July 21, 2014, p. 12

Feminism

Feminism is in control of America's colleges and universities, where its principles at least are held as dogmas unquestioned and unopposed. Yet in what should be a paradise with those principles at work, women speak of a "rape culture" that sounds like the patriarchal hell we thought we'd left behind. One woman at Harvard (my

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 10

place of work), an apparent victim of sexual assault, writing anonymously but very publicly in an open letter to the student newspaper that gained everyone's attention, felt obliged to call herself "hopeless, powerless, betrayed and worthless." In reaction, the university, already on alert, has sprung into action and created several new committees to consider what to do. The federal government is at hand to help provide what it describes as "significant guidance" to universities in this sort of situation, in which a single act of sexual assault can engender a "hostile environment."

Sexual assault does not sound like a minor offense, but though it may be a crime, it does not have to be one in the current understanding. The young woman does not appear to have been raped, as defined by the criminal code, nor were the police ever involved. Rather, she was apparently pressured into having sex while under the influence of alcohol. She was the victim of a fellow student, a man who took advantage of her. The "rape culture" in colleges does not produce rape typically but rather instances like this of women cajoled into something they did not feel they consented to, either at the moment or later. Apparently the requirement of consent to having sex does not provide women the protection they thought it would. Apparently it does not stop predatory males but quite to the contrary gives them greater opportunity than they had under patriarchy, when women had less freedom but more protection.

To look at the principles of feminism will help to understand the situation. Two of them are most relevant:

that there is no essential difference between men and women, and the corollary that men and women are not real beings but arbitrary "social constructions" containing nothing "natural" or permanent. The purpose of the first is to declare that men and women are the same, so as to give women, formerly the "second sex" (the title of Simone de Beauvoir's famous founding book of contemporary feminism), an independence equal to that of men. Then the second has the function of guiding the construction of a society in which women's independence will be secured. The two are maintained without proof and to the exclusion of doubt, and are not subjected to debate. If someone wants to call them "radical feminism," as opposed to moderate feminism that merely wants to improve the status of women, I do not object as long as it is clear that these two principles are the ground of today's feminism.

The trouble is that the two do not work in concert. If "woman" is defined by society, by social construction, then women are dependent on society and not independent. They are defined not by their voices but by their voices being heard, not by their accomplishments but by being recognized for their accomplishments, not by their own intent but by their environment, hostile or friendly. One may see then what has happened to feminism. In answer to the eternal complaint of women that men do not listen to them, feminism had the ambition for the first time in the history of man to compel him to listen. The unintended result is that women are defined by their listeners, by their desire to imitate men, not by themselves. The feminist desire for independence is

defeated by the feminist principle of social construction that was designed and adopted to achieve it.

Social construction is whatever society does. The idea sounds independent and liberating because it suggests that society can do anything it wants. Society can make a feminine woman, as under patriarchy — the sort of woman that the American founder of feminism Betty Friedan deflated in her famous book *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) — or it can make the gender-neutral woman the feminists have tried to produce. This would be a woman no longer confined by male definition but capable all around, especially in matters formerly reserved for men. So which is better?

The problem with the idea of social construction is that society, on its own, has no notion of what is suitable to construct. Both the feminine woman and the feminist woman are socially constructed, and equally so. Actually, when one says social construction, the meaning is political construction: Who rules society in order to make its conventions, the patriarchal males or the feminists? But then we still have to know which ruler is more suitable for women — and let's not forget men and children.

If we take the anonymous Harvard woman student as exemplary, her example shows that the feminist model of sexual independence is not suitable for women, and perhaps not for men either. The feminist model of sexual independence wants women to be equal to men; it is therefore taken from the independent male whose main feature is the ability to walk away from sex afterward. This borrowed model is actually the predatory male from whom the

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 11

Harvard woman suffered, and whom feminism imitates and paradoxically glorifies. He is adventurous in sex, but this is because he is not too impressed by his adventures. He walks away after “good sex” just as after bad sex, neither captivated by the first nor much dismayed by the second. Cool! The premise of independent sex is that sex is no big deal. And this is precisely what the Harvard woman found to be unsuitable and untrue to herself.

Here is what she said in her open letter: “I do not care about my future anymore, because I do not know who I am or what I care about or whether I will still be alive in a few years.” Quite a commentary, isn’t it, on the social construction accomplished by the feminist, gender-neutral rulers of Harvard? And, as we shall see, those of the Obama administration.

One could understand feminism generally as an attack on woman as she was under “patriarchy” (that concept is a social construction of feminism). The feminine mystique was her ideal; in regard to sex, it consisted of women’s modesty and in the double standard of sexual conduct that comes with it, which treated women’s misbehavior as more serious than men’s. Instead of trying to establish a single standard by bringing men up to the higher standard of women, as with earlier feminism, today’s feminism decided to demand that women be entitled to sink to the level of men. It bought into the sexual revolution of the late ‘60s and required that women be rewarded with the privileges of male conquest rather than, say, continue serving as camp followers of rock bands. The result has been the turn for the worse that we see in the complaint of

the Harvard student. What was there in feminine modesty that the feminists left behind?

In return for women’s holding to a higher standard of sexual behavior, feminine modesty gave them protection while they considered whether they wanted to consent. It gave them time: Not so fast! Not the first date! I’m not ready for that! It gave them the pleasure of being courted along with the advantage of looking before you leap. To win over a woman, men had to strive to express their finer feelings, if they had any. Women could judge their character and choose accordingly. In sum, women had the right of choice, if I may borrow that slogan. All this and more was social construction, to be sure, but on the basis of the bent toward modesty that was held to be in the nature of women. That inclination, it was thought, cooperated with the aggressive drive in the nature of men that could be beneficially constructed into the male duty to take the initiative. There was no guarantee of perfection in this arrangement, but at least each sex would have a legitimate expectation of possible success in seeking marital happiness. They could live together, have children, and take care of them.

Without feminine modesty, however, women must imitate men, and in matters of sex, the most predatory men, as we have seen. The consequence is the hook-up culture now prevalent on college campuses, and off-campus too (even more, it is said). The purpose of hooking up is to replace the human complexity of courtship with “good sex,” a kind of animal simplicity, eliminating all the preliminaries to sex as well as the aftermath. “Good sex,” by the

way, is in good part a social construction of the alliance between feminists and male predators that we see today. It narrows and distorts the human potentiality for something nobler and more satisfying than the bare minimum.

The hook-up culture denounced by conservatives is the very same rape culture denounced by feminists. Who wants it? Most college women do not; they ignore hook-ups and lament the loss of dating. Many men will not turn down the offer of an available woman, but what they really want is a girlfriend. The predatory males are a small minority among men who are the main beneficiaries of the feminist norm. It’s not the fault of men that women want to join them in excess rather than calm them down, for men too are victims of the rape culture. Nor is it the fault of women. Women are so far from wanting hook-ups that they must drink themselves into drunken consent — in order to overcome their natural modesty, one might suggest. Not having a sociable drink but getting blind drunk is today’s preliminary to sex. Beautifully romantic, isn’t it? The anonymous Harvard woman by getting drunk was unfortunately helping to pressure herself into consenting to a very bad experience. But she is right that the pressure comes with the encouragement of the culture. And the culture comes from the dogmas of feminism that made this mess for women and men too.

One more feature of the mess should not be omitted, the worsening of it by our federal government. Colleges today are under pressure not only from feminist students but also from the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the Department of Education. A recent letter from

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 12

that office, one of a series, was sent to 55 colleges, addressed to “Dear Colleague” and containing what it called “significant guidance.” Anyone who thinks that the idea of a “nanny state” is an exaggeration should read this letter. The official author, who is the assistant secretary for the OCR, purports to be the colleague of the leaders of America’s universities but treats them as if they were children being instructed with a catechism. The form of the letter is Q-and-A, the questions innocent and submissive, the answers authoritative — usually you “must,” occasionally you “may.”

The purpose behind the letter is to create an area between the law’s commands and the law’s permissions that is “significantly guided” by the government, in which the government commands but leaves the responsibility of enforcement to the universities commanded. The universities have been required to set up (and of course pay for) a “Title IX coordinator” with the duty of preventing a “hostile environment” caused by sexual assault, which may or may not be a crime prosecuted by state and local authorities. The latter police the crime, and the universities are responsible, and open to penalties, for preventing the culture of crime. Harvard responded last year by appointing as its coordinator a woman lawyer formerly employed at the OCR. It has now answered last month’s letter by hastening to hire more staff for her office. Without the slightest sign of pushback, the university volunteers to aid in the ridiculous accusation against itself. The OCR’s ridiculous accusation (and this summary does not do justice to its many absurdities) is for having failed to

establish a culture of sexual adventure that never results in misadventure.

In its vocabulary, the OCR fully adopts the feminist notion of gender neutrality so that the sex of the “complainant” or the “perpetrator” is never identified. Thus the obvious difference between the sexes in regard to sexual assault is never stated, the problem never described. Are most men really potential rapists as the term “rape culture” suggests, or are some of them merely taking what is offered? Are women so colossally imprudent as to desire to get into bed with such creatures? Does a gender-neutral environment exist that will please both sexes equally? Are both sexes not independent in different ways as well as dependent on each other? Will there be an end to feminist nonsense aided by government intrusion and university compliance?

These are easy questions, but they call for the independence of mind necessary to answer the hard question that comes next: How can we recover some sense of feminine modesty and male restraint?

— Harvey Mansfield
The Weekly Standard
June 30, 2014, Vol. 19, No. 40

Homosexuality

Less than 3 percent of the U.S. population identify themselves as gay, lesbian, or bisexual, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported Tuesday in the first large-scale government survey measuring Americans’ sexual orientation.

The National Health Interview Survey, which is the government’s premier tool for annually assessing Americans’ health and behaviors, found that 1.6

percent of adults self-identify as gay or lesbian, and 0.7 percent consider themselves bisexual.

The overwhelming majority of adults, 96.6 percent, labeled themselves as straight in the 2013 survey. An additional 1.1 percent declined to answer, responded “I don’t know the answer,” or said they were “something else.”

The figures offered a slightly smaller assessment of the size of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population than other surveys, which have pegged the overall proportion at closer to 3.5 or 4 percent. In particular, the estimate for bisexuals was lower than in some other surveys.

The inclusion of the sexual-orientation question in an influential survey used to guide government funding and research decisions was viewed as a major victory for the gay community, which has struggled with a dearth of data about its special health needs.

“This is a major step forward in trying to remedy some of these gaps in our understanding of the role sexual orientation and gender identity play in people’s health and in their lives,” said Gary J. Gates, a demographer at the Williams Institute, a research center at the University of California at Los Angeles that studies the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) population.

Begun in 1957, the federal health interview survey comprises a wide range of questions on topics including medical care, vaccinations, and tobacco use. The data is collected for the CDC by the Census Bureau, which conducts interviews with thousands of Americans across the country. It is highly regarded because of its large sample size — it comprised 33,557 adults between the ages of 18 and 64 for the most recent survey — and because of its methods,

which include face-to-face interviews and some follow-up telephone queries.

A few other federal surveys ask about sexual orientation but are not large enough to provide data that can be generalized to the country as a whole, government health officials have said.

The information released by the CDC on Tuesday offers an initial analysis through the lens of sexual orientation on measures critical to public health, such as smoking, drinking, and health insurance status.

It did not find a broad pattern suggesting that one group was less healthy overall than any other group, said Brian W. Ward, the researcher for the report. Echoing other studies, it found that, compared with straight people, gays were more likely to smoke and to have consumed five or more drinks in one day at least once in the past year. Straight women were more likely to consider themselves in excellent or very good health than women who identified as lesbian.

But gays were more likely to have received a flu shot than straight people, and gay men were less likely to be overweight than straight men.

In some cases, the more notable disparities were experienced by bisexuals. People who identify as being attracted to both sexes are more likely to have experienced psychological distress in the past 30 days than straight people, the survey showed.

— Sandhya Somashekhar
Washingtonpost.com
July 15, 2014

Sex Education

Pro-life organization Live Action has introduced another investigative video exposing Planned Parenthood's dis-

turbing practice of advising young girls about dangerous sex activities such as bondage/discipline and sadomasochistic sex (BDSM).

In the video, counselors offer suggestions to the undercover investigators, in graphic detail, of a spectrum of sadistic sexual behaviors, including "whipping," "tying up," and "asphyxiation."

As the video shows, a gruesome crime involving asphyxiation was recently in the media. In January, police discovered 16-year-old Jessica Burlew with the corpse of 43-year-old Jason Ash, whom Burlew had strangled to death and mutilated with razor blades in the midst of "a sex game."

Live Action observes that Planned Parenthood is an ObamaCare grant recipient.

"Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains is already bragging about receiving ObamaCare grants specifically for sex education," said Lila Rose, Live Action's president, in a press release. "Here's an abortion corporation, which gets 45 percent of its budget from the taxpayers, telling 15- and 16-year-olds not only to have sex, but also to choke each other in the process. Police should be busting down its door."

At its Planned Parenthood Exposed site, Live Action lists a number of disturbing marketing practices and counsel from Planned Parenthood staff, including the "resource" website Go Ask Alice! which is sponsored by Columbia University. The site answers questions about sexual practices such as bondage and discipline and sadomasochistic role-playing, as well as others such as playing with feces.

A site for Planned Parenthood of Hudson Peconic also contains information

about a seminar for educators called "50 Shades of Safe," which seeks to explain "how a BDSM relationship is successfully navigated between sexual partners."

"The Planned Parenthood-approved advice of 'do whatever you want, but just use a safe word' glorifies kids acting out rape scenarios," Rose said. "It's extremely dangerous counseling: They're undermining and invalidating the crucially important rule of *no means no*."

In the video, one Planned Parenthood counselor tells Live Action's investigator that a young girl's use of words like "stop" when she is uncomfortable "can get mixed up," resulting in the male partner wondering, "Does she really mean 'stop,' or does she mean, you know, whatever?"

The other counselor agrees, saying, "Usually, a lot of people will say 'stop' even though it feels good, so that's usually not something that is used."

Live Action is calling on Colorado residents to contact their local officials, including school administrators.

"Parents need to get on the phone right now," Rose said, "and ask their principals and superintendents, 'Do you have a relationship with Planned Parenthood? Are you OK with this sort of behavior being pushed on my children?' This won't stop until people take action locally for their kids."

— Susan Berry
Breitbart.com
July 15, 2014

Education

"My son recently graduated from Seattle University, a Jesuit institution. Talking to my brother, he pronounced himself a believer in 'communism' (after which he turned and said, 'Sorry Dad'). I wasn't surprised; Jesuit educa-

tion manages to preserve a certain kind of political radicalism by combining it with Christian moralism and spiritual idealism."

Editor's Note: A few suggestions for Dr. Reno: a) Have son spend six months in some of Cuba's prison camps; b) Have son read Humberto Fontova's *The Longest Romance*; c) Have son read Stéphane Courtois' work *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (published by Harvard University Press); d) Have son read Fred C. Schwarz's *You Can Still Trust the Communists (to Be Communists)*; e) Have son reconsider his Jesuit brainwashing and wash his mind with truth presented in the above works and perhaps comprehend how the Pilgrims finally decided that God is smarter than Plato. Although his womanizing will distract from his work, *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* is worth reading.

Unfortunately, if the son is as brilliant as his father and he strikes off to propagate his version of communism, one can almost hear the firing squads, the murdering of unarmed settlers, hacking policemen to death, and killing schoolmasters, etc. These were the consequences of Rousseau, Marx, Sartre, Faron, and other "intellectuals."

— R.R. Reno
First Things

August/September 2014, p.6, 7

When her grandmother dropped Anaiya Holman at Ben Chavis' farm the second week in June, the young girl was not happy. School had let out for the summer the day before, and the soon to be sixth grader did not want to be stuck in a classroom learning math

until July. She screamed and cried and kicked Mr. Chavis, who was unfazed, according to other students. Anaiya had softened up by the following week. "I want to be a vet," she told me. And when Friday afternoon came around, she asked Mr. Chavis if she could stay for the weekend.

This is the fourth year that Mr. Chavis, a member of the Lumbee Indian tribe, has invited children from Robeson County in grades five to nine to learn math for three weeks at his 200-acre cattle farm in a barn converted into five air-conditioned classrooms. Most of the 50 or so children are also Lumbees — the county is 40 percent Indian — though he also has a few who identify as black or Hispanic.

Robeson County is North Carolina's poorest — close to half the children live in families below the poverty line, most in households headed by single mothers. Those children are the lucky ones. Several students at math camp are living in group homes, and their parents are often incarcerated or too strung out on drugs to care, says Mr. Chavis.

Amazingly, the Lumbee Indians are actually better off than most tribes. According to federally collected data, Native Americans have the highest rate of poverty, alcoholism, and gang involvement of any racial group in the country. Suicide is the leading cause of death among Native American boys ages 10-14. At a time when the rest of the country thinks about American Indians mainly for offending team nicknames, Mr. Chavis is addressing their real problems.

While a few families pay the \$300 tuition at math camp, most pay nothing. Mr. Chavis either pays the teachers out of his own pocket or helps them out with paying for college, and other camp expenses are on his dime. Some of the mothers offer to cook dinner for the teachers in exchange for their children's attendance. The math teachers include two graduates of the American Indian Public Charter School in Oakland, Calif., where Mr. Chavis was the principal; he also served as executive director of three American Indian schools until 2012.

One young woman, a Mexican immigrant, is now studying to be a civil engineer at Sacramento State, and the other, who grew up in a home where bullets from rival gangs whizzed through her yard, is studying marine biology at the University of Hawaii. The students seem to adore their teachers.

If Mr. Chavis provided only a disciplined, safe environment every day, it would be a public service. But this camp is so much more. From 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, the children learn math interspersed with some reading, physical education, and lunch. Each gets 120 hours of instruction during the three weeks, equivalent to what they would get in a year at a typical public school.

The public schools nearby seem hopelessly inadequate. In 2012, only 11 percent of high-school juniors in Robeson County met the state's standards for passing the math portion of the ACT text (which is similar to the SAT). Students and parents told me that even if students received D's and F's on their

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 15

report cards, they were sent to the next grade. One fifth-grade student I saw was stumped by problems like 11-6=?

On Mr. Chavis' farm, students don't switch classrooms during the day; the rooms all have restrooms and water fountains. Teachers drill math concepts over and over. They use flashcards, ask children to do problems on the dry-erase boards and to compete with one another to get answers right.

The closest thing these classrooms have to technology is an electric pencil sharpener. Students are given about two hours of homework each night. Detention (which can involve anything from washing windows and emptying the garbage to shoveling manure) is given for infractions such as tardiness, talking back to teachers, or failing to turn in homework.

The method, as old-fashioned as it sounds, works. In 2001, Mr. Chavis took over the failing American Indian Public Charter School. His strict standards and no-nonsense attitude earned him the ire of many school administrators but also the respect of low-income neighborhood parents. During Mr. Chavis' tenure as principal, the charter became one of the highest-performing schools in California.

For two years, it has been No. 1 on the Washington Post's ranking of high schools in America, with 100 percent of its students passing at least one advanced placement test. More than three-quarters of its students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch, but all of its students are accepted to college. Mr. Chavis helps some of them pay tuition.

Ben Chavis grew up in Robeson County, the only one of six siblings to have finished high school. He earned a track scholarship to Oklahoma City College, earned a doctorate at the University of Arizona, and went on to make a small fortune in California real estate. He remembers being in high school running down the street where his farm is now and dreaming of being wealthy enough to own a house here. He recently bought his parents that home for \$30,000.

Perhaps the biggest sign of Mr. Chavis' confidence in his teaching method is that his own three children attend the charter school in Oakland and math camp in Lumberton. "I want them to know they're not better than these people here. They just have more opportunities," he says.

In the fall of 2016, Mr. Chavis plans to open a charter school on the farm. He shows me another barn and explains how it could easily be converted to a school building: "I design these things for the future." It's hard to argue with that.

— Naomi Schaeffer Riley
The Wall Street Journal
July 18, 2014

Energy

In a bid to give alternative energy sources a boost, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has quietly granted a California wind energy farm a permit to kill a limited number of endangered bald and golden eagles that get sliced up in its giant turbines. But last week's free pass is sparking anger from wildlife advocates and from free market advocates who ask why they don't qualify for the same dis-

pensation.

The American Bird Conservancy filed a lawsuit last week against the six-month-old federal rule expanding permits for killing bald and golden eagles from a maximum of five to 30 years, charging the Interior Department with "multiple violations of federal law."

Conservancy spokesman Bob Johns said the organization is on board with green energy but the Obama administration has gone too far with incentives for the wind industry. The incentives include optional guidelines on environmental rules and production tax credits.

"We know we need renewables, and that's fine. We're not saying shut them down, we're just saying, 'Hey, enough's enough, bring them into the same ballpark that everyone else is in,'" said Mr. Johns. "Give them regulations, tell them where they need to site these things, where they shouldn't site them. Don't give them a set of, 'Gee, it would be nice if you did this, but if you don't, it's OK.'"

Last week, the Fish and Wildlife Service ruffled feathers by issuing what officials called a first-of-its-kind permit that allows a 50-turbine Northern California wind farm to kill up to five golden eagles over five years. In exchange, the developer agreed to retrofit 133 utility poles to reduce eagle deaths by electrocution.

"We can't solve the problem of eagle mortality at wind farms overnight," Fish and Wildlife Service Director Daniel Ashe said in a statement. "But this common-sense solution merits the support of all who advocate for the long-term conservation of eagles."

"This is not a program to kill eagles," John Anderson, director of siting policy

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 16

at the American Wind Energy Association, told The Associated Press late last year. "This permit program is about conservation."

Among those stunned by the agency's move were residents of King Cove, Alaska. Interior Secretary Sally Jewell ruled in December that those in the remote fishing village could not build an 11-mile gravel road to a nearby airport because it would affect eelgrass that serves as a way-stop meal for migratory birds.

"We'd have much less impact on the birds with our road than these wind farms have on the eagles," said Della Trumble, a spokeswoman for the King Cove Corp. and the Agdaagux tribe. "It's another slap in the face. It doesn't make sense."

The administration's preferential treatment is designed to help boost the wind energy industry as part of a strategy to reduce fossil fuel use, which President Obama has described as a necessary step in combating climate change.

"The changes in this permitting program will help the renewable energy industry and others develop projects that can operate in the longer term while ensuring bald and golden eagles continue to thrive for future generations," Ms. Jewell said in a December statement.

But free market advocates argue that the Obama administration is playing favorites by letting the wind industry bypass regulations that hold back other energy providers. The Bureau of Land Management decided last week to cordon off 400,000 acres from energy development in Utah and Colorado in anticipation of a listing to preserve the numbers of the Gunnison sage-grouse.

Michael Sandoval, an energy analyst with the Independence Institute in Denver, said there is inevitably enormous outrage when sea gulls or ducks are coated with oil after a spill, but much less concern over wind turbines that chop eagles in half or cause bats to explode.

"Preferred energy policy favoring wind produces double standards. Think of the rancor if oil and gas companies were allowed such a government dispensation," said Mr. Sandoval. "Thirty years represents not only the theoretical life cycle of the turbines themselves, but an eternity in public policy. No other industry is allowed 'takings' permits that last an entire generation."

The Interior Department's decision to extend by sixfold the permit period prompted Mr. Sandoval to create a video game, "Greed Energy Kills," which depicts cartoon birds and bats trying to avoid turbines.

Wind farms typically feature clusters of turbines that can rise as high as a 30-story building, with whirling rotors that can reach more than 150 mph at the tips of the blades. Eagles scanning the ground below for a meal often do not see the danger until it is too late.

The conservancy lawsuit cites the 1940 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, which provides fines and jail time for those who kill eagles on purpose or by accident. The law even prohibits possession of eagle feathers, talons, and beaks.

In 2009, the Fish and Wildlife Service added a provision to the 1940 law allowing permits for eagle kills when they are incidental to an otherwise legal activity, such as construction or transportation

projects.

Since the 1980s, wind turbines have killed an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 eagles, but the industry has paid only one fine, Mr. Johns said.

"If you or I get caught with an eagle feather, we've got some serious explaining to do. We're going to pay a hefty fine," said Mr. Johns. "There's no exception noted in the law for the wind industry. The notion that somehow they're entitled when the law doesn't provide for it is ridiculous.

— Valerie Richardson
The Washington Times
Wednesday, July 2, 2014

Economics

America doesn't need big new economic ideas to get going again. We need to address the hundreds of little common-sense economic problems that everyone agrees need to be fixed. Achieving that goal requires the revival of an old political idea: limited government and the rule of law.

Our tax code is a mess. The budget is a mess. Immigration is a mess. Energy policy is a mess. Much law is a mess. The schools are awful. Boondoggles abound. We still pay farmers not to grow crops. Social programs make work unproductive for many. ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank are monstrous messes. These are self-inflicted wounds, not external problems.

Why are we so stuck? To blame "gridlock," "partisanship," or "obstructionism" for political immobility is as pointless as blaming "greed" for economic problems.

Washington is stuck because that

serves its interests. Long laws and vague regulations amount to arbitrary power. The administration uses this power to buy off allies and to silence opponents. Big businesses, public-employee unions, and the well-connected get subsidies and protection, in return for political support. And silence: No insurance company will speak out against ObamaCare or the Department of Health and Human Services. No bank will speak out against Dodd-Frank or the Securities and Exchange Commission. Agencies from the Environmental Protection Agency to the Internal Revenue Service wait in the wings to punish the unwary.

This is crony capitalism, far worse than bureaucratic socialism in many ways, and far more effective for generating money and political power. But it suffocates innovation and competition, the wellsprings of growth.

Not just our robust economy, but 250 years of hard-won liberty are at stake. Yes, courts, media, and a few brave politicians can fight it. But in the end, only an outraged electorate will bring change — and growth.

— John H. Cochrane
Wall Street Journal
July 7, 2014

To achieve America's economic comeback, we need to end the era of crony capitalism where out-of-control, bloated government and big businesses join forces at the expense of main-street entrepreneurs.

As Washington continues to expand overly complex and expensive tax codes and regulations, written by an alliance of corporate lawyers and government

bureaucrats, the victims are the small-business owners who are the country's backbone. As a result of these regulations-on-steroids, innovation, business creation, and job growth are being stifled.

Who is looking out for innovative newcomers as well as the neighborhood dry cleaners, the corner taqueria, the coffee shop, and the lawn-care company? Not Washington. Government bureaucracies like complexity because it keeps them busy and funded. Americans can see that too much government actually causes the problems that big new programs are meant to solve. Wall Street bailouts, the housing crisis, and the tragedy of ObamaCare are just a few examples of overbearing government.

More small businesses are failing and fewer are starting than at any time in the past four decades. This trend must be reversed. Until it is, our economy will not produce the jobs we need, nor will we be ready to lead.

It is time for a great American comeback. We will know we have succeeded when a single mother raising her two kids can easily open a new business in her neighborhood without having to worry about burdensome and costly regulations.

— Carly Fiorina
The Wall Street Journal
July 8, 2014

In 1966, the eminent management sage Peter Drucker wrote about government regulation in *The Effective Executive* that "at a guess, at least half the bureaus and agencies" in government "regulate what no longer needs regulation." He

added: "There is a serious need for a new principle of effective administration under which every act, every agency, and every program of government is conceived as temporary and as expiring automatically after a fixed number of years — maybe 10 — unless specifically prolonged by new legislation following careful outside study."

When Drucker wrote, the U.S. was by far the leading force in world capitalism, and most regulatory bodies were relatively new. Today the U.S. is falling far behind Asian leaders in capitalist vitality. Not only is the U.S. less free than Hong Kong, it is less capitalistic by many measures than China, allegedly a communist country. China now boasts government revenues of just 17 percent of GDP, compared with U.S. revenues of 26 percent of GDP.

The key problem is the same one that Drucker identified in 1966 — a glut of regulations and programs that no longer serve their purposes but which constitute a nearly insuperable barrier for creative new enterprise. Twenty years ago, initial public offerings in crucial technology domains exceeded mergers and acquisitions by a factor of 20. Today there are eight mergers and acquisitions for every IPO. Large companies that can deal with the mazes of government rules increase their dominance by purchasing potential rivals.

Most efforts focus on making regulations more efficient. But efficient performance of futile or obstructive functions makes the problems worse. What we need is what Peter Drucker recommended: expiration dates for regulations.

— Heather Mac Donald
The Wall Street Journal
July 8, 2014

Biology

Scientists have identified the largest flying bird ever found — an ungainly glider with a wingspan of 21 feet or more that likely soared above ancient seas 25 million years ago.

Until now, though, it was a bird that few experts believed could get off the ground. By the conventional formulas of flight, the extinct sea bird — twice the size of an albatross, the largest flying bird today — was just too heavy to fly on its long, fragile wings.

But a new computer analysis reported Monday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences shows that the bird apparently could ride efficiently on rising air currents, staying aloft for a week or more at a stretch.

The bird's fossil remains were found in South Carolina in 1983, unearthed by construction workers digging the foundation for a new terminal at Charleston International Airport. It was formally named *Pelagornis sandersi* in honor of Albert Sanders, then curator of the Charleston Museum, where the specimen has been kept.

It is the only one of its kind discovered so far, but fossils of its close relatives have been found world-wide.

"You have to conclude that this animal was capable of flapping its wings and taking off, even though it is much heavier than the theoretical maximum weight of a flapping flying bird," said Luis Chiappe, an expert on flight evolution at the Los Angeles County Natural History

Museum, who wasn't involved in the project. "Our modern perspective on the diversity of flight is rather narrow," he said. "These were very unique birds."

Indeed, if the new flight analysis is correct, the bird could fly faster than an Olympic sprinter can run, traveling at speeds up to 50 feet per second.

The animal's hollow wing bones were barely a millimeter thick and at least 20 feet long in all — so fragile that experts who examined it after it was found doubted the wings could generate the lift normally needed to get off the ground. Scientists estimate the bird weighed between 48 and 88 pounds.

"This was a pretty impressive creature," said avian paleontologist Daniel T. Ksepka at the Bruce Museum in Greenwich, Conn., who conducted the analysis of the bird's biomechanics. "Science had made a rule about flight, and life found a way around it."

To probe its flight properties, Dr. Ksepka conducted 24 different computer simulations that tested various estimates of flight muscle energy, flapping styles, body mass, and the ratio of wing length to breadth. He concluded that the bird was a surprisingly well-designed glider that could soar at least as well as an albatross and fly more efficiently than a modern condor.

The bird's beak was lined with needle-like teeth made of projecting spurs of bone rather than enamel that may have served as spears to pierce and hold wriggling fish snatched from the waves.

"There is no doubt that this is the largest wingspan we have ever seen in a bird," Dr. Ksepka said. "It is one of the

weirdest things we have ever seen, nothing like anything alive today."

The simulations didn't reveal just how such a large creature could land safely. "When you are coming back down, it would be a little dangerous for this bird because the bones are so thin," he said.

— Robert Lee Hotz
July 7, 2014

Darwinism

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized [England, France, Germany] races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace the savage races [e.g., Negro] throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes, as Professor Schaafhausen has remarked, will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his allies will then be even wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.

— *The Descent of Man*
Charles Darwin
Chapter 6

Hitler believed that humans were animals to which the genetic laws learned from livestock breeding can, and should, be applied. Instead of permitting natural forces and chance to control evolution, the government must control evolution in order to advance the human race. The first step to achieve its goal was to isolate the 'inferior races' to prevent them from contaminating the 'Aryan' gene pool. Inferior races included not only Jews but also Slavs (mostly Russians, Poles,

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 19

Czechoslovakians, and Ukrainians).

— *Hitler and the Nazi Darwinian Worldview*
Jerry Bergman
P. 44

The German Fuhrer, Adolf Hitler, and the Nazi movement as a whole had strong support from almost the entire German scientific and academic community. ... Their support extended to his eugenics policies, including extermination of the Jews and others whom the racial hygiene 'experts' judged as racially inferior.

— Ibid., p. 127

In short, Nazism was based on Charles Darwin's doctrine of the survival of the fittest ... which Herbert Spencer argued that those better adapted to the conditions of life prevailed not only in nature but in human society as well. Thus, from Darwin's doctrine, the Nazi racists concluded that the strong and victorious were also in the right.

— Ibid., p. 105

If Darwinism is the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, eugenics is the doctrine of the survival of the nastiest.

— G.K. Chesterton

Nazism is applied evolutionary biology.

— Anonymous

Nashville, a fine 1975 film directed by Robert Altman, features a song about a marriage maintained "for the sake of the children." That song runs through my head when I hear church-connected evolutionists claiming that kids taught Darwin was wrong will abandon Christianity.

You can see the *Nashville* lyrics at lyrics.net/lyric/3560410, and you can listen to my reworking, performed by WORLD interns Ryan Hill and Emily Scheie, by going to YouTube and typing in "Can't Give Up Darwin." The song is now what a theistic evolutionist might sing:

Unpack your bags and try not to cry./I can't give up Darwin — there's three reasons why./There's Jimmy, and Kathy, and sweet Lorelei:/For the sake of the children, we must say goodbye.

'Cos Jimmy has fear that he'd blow his career./His bio term paper is something to see./And Kathy's 18 now, a sorority queen now,/And I will protect what her major will be. So unpack your bags. ...

Sure I love Scripture, I'm not just a hipster,/But I've got to stay with what now has such cred./Laurie's just walkin', she just started talkin',/Evolution's the first word that she ever said! So unpack your bags. ...

Will some college students turn from the Bible if professors push Darwin and their pastors push back? Yes, some will, especially if they believe that science demands faith in evolution. But science does not — see, for example, the Center for Science and Culture website at discovery.org/csc. Furthermore, science is not the only source of knowledge about the world: God created science, and the Bible teaches us about God.

Or does it? We might think chapter 2 of Genesis teaches that "God formed the man of dust from the ground," and Eve from Adam — but if they were the

product of evolution, then early Genesis becomes a myth, and everyone who assumed the history to be true (including Jesus and Paul) were naive. Original sin becomes a theoretical construct rather than harsh reality, so why do we desperately need Christ?

If for the sake of the children we can't give up Darwin, and if by doing so the kids don't turn their backs on the Bible, they have a Bible with lots of pages torn out and its overarching theme — creation, fall, and redemption — slashed. If we jettison Genesis, Jesus who made miracles will eventually go too. Jimmy, Kathy, and sweet Lorelei may go to church a bit longer, but they'll eventually find a more amusing club.

What's the alternative? Theistic evolutionists say we must bend or die, but when we bend on something so basic, where do we stop? Is our chief task to glorify our Creator or to be glorified by other creatures? When Darwin trumps the Bible, what are we worshipping?

This spring I reported on a tempest at Bryan College. The administration and board of trustees did not want professors to profess theistic evolution. Many faculty members thought administrators and trustees acted high-handedly, even deceptively, by clarifying the Genesis-affirming statement of faith to stipulate that God specially created Adam and Eve, "and not from previous life-forms." I don't know the nuances of the procedural questions but I do know what happens when colleges slip-slide away from the biblical position on what man is and what God does. (See "Soaping the slippery slope," WORLD, Aug. 25, 2012.)

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 20

Since the theological issue is so central, I emphasized it rather than the organizational one, and some twitter feeds swelled with complaints. I enjoyed one tweet that semi-defended me: "Olasky wants to do good and has often reported well. With certain hobby horses." Hmm: Two out of three, not bad. But it got me to consider two hobby horses over the years: WORLD's defense of the Bible during translation controversies, and WORLD's emphasis on creation rather than evolution. They have in common a belief that the Bible is God's Word, so we are wrong to smooth off what to some are rough edges.

Therefore, we should sing to theistic evolutionists: "Pack up your bags and try not to cry./The Bible trumps Darwin, there's three reasons why./The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost too,/For the sake of the children, we must teach what's true."

— Marvin Olasky
Fighting Fatalism
July 12, 2014

Drugs/Marijuana Legalization

Raul Castro is Fidel's right-hand man for all the clandestine operations, and Fidel viewed the drugs [marijuana, heroine, cocaine] as "a very important weapon against the United States, because drugs demoralize people and undermine society."

The drugs were destined for the United States. Our youth would not be harmed, but rather the youth of the United States, the youth of our enemies. Therefore, the drugs were used as a political weapon because in that way we

were delivering a blow to our principal enemy ... the drug trafficking produced a very good economic benefit which we needed for our [Communist] revolution. Again, in a few words, we wanted to provide food for our people with the suffering and death of the United States.

[Editor's Note: Dr. Douglass' book published in 1990 is now coming to pass exactly as he outlined. The basic strategy to "dope" the West and especially the United States was "set forth in 1961 or 1962 by Soviet General Kalashnik and reinforced by Mikhail Suslov, chief ideologist of the Communist Cuba! (See esp. chap. 8 "Cuba and The Rise Of Narco-Terrorism.)"]

— Joseph D. Douglass, Jr.
Red Cocaine: The Drugging of America
p. 101-102

The More open-minded teen attitudes toward marijuana have no doubt been encouraged by the push toward legalization. Twenty-one states, plus the District of Columbia, now permit marijuana for medicinal purposes. Washington and Colorado already allow recreational use."

— Daniel James Devine
World Magazine
May 31, 2014, p.62

Book Review

ALVIN YORK: A NEW BIOGRAPHY OF THE HERO OF THE ARGONNE

By Colonel Douglas V. Mastriano

Those of us of a certain generation first became aware of the World War I hero via the 1941 movie *Sergeant York* starring Gary Cooper in the title role, for which he won an Academy Award. Even at age 7, sitting in a movie house in

East Texas, I realized that Alvin York was a special human, both as a warrior who shot up a German machine gun nest and captured 132 prisoners, and as a decent man with devout religious beliefs.

In subsequent years, York was nipped by skeptics ranging from jealous colleagues-in-arms who had never liked the taciturn Tennessee country boy, to persons who scoffed at the audacity of a born-again Christian crediting God for bringing him through fierce combat unharmed.

Now, Col. Douglas V. Mastriano, a U.S. Army veteran of Afghanistan and Iraq, restores York to his rightful place in military history. His book is also a valuable depiction of how a created-on-the-fly Army entered battle during the war, a welcome addition to the flood of anniversary books gushing from publishers these days.

York was an unlikely hero. The third of 11 children born to a farm family in northern Tennessee, York learned marksmanship from his father, a renowned hunter, wielding both muzzle-loading rifles and pistols with pinpoint accuracy. He worked in the fields from age six, attending school only sporadically.

Although the York family was deeply religious, the "blind tiger" drinking joints in the area lured the young man astray. In a ghost-written "autobiography," York would remember, "I am a-telling you, Sodom and Gomorrah might have been bigger places, but they weren't any worse. Knife-fights and shooting were common, gambling and drinking were commoner, and lots of careless girls jes used to sorter drift in." However, at the

a look at our world

from the desk of dr. david noebel, continued from page 21

age of 27, counseled by his mother, and fearing a slide into perdition, York returned to religion, a friend walking him to the altar “to re-enter the fold of God.” He affiliated with “a church where the congregation took seriously what the Bible said about Christian living” — the Church of Christ in Christian Union.

Thus, York faced a dilemma when he received a draft notice in April 1917, when America entered the war. He was torn between conflicting biblical admonitions: “Thou shalt not kill,” and “Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s.” As he said, “I wanted to follow both. But I couldn’t.” He filed no less than four appeals for exemption with the local draft board. All were rejected, and York went to France with the 328th Regiment.

All the while, he still entertained doubts about the morality of killing someone, even in war. He found counseling from a superior officer, also a devout Christian, who tried to help him resolve what he saw as an important moral issue.

All doubts vanished in October 1918, when his unit engaged in a fierce fire-fight with a superior German force on the edge of the Argonne Forrest. Cpl. Murray Savage, York’s closest friend, was caught by a machine burst that literally “shot him to pieces. His body and clothes were spread across the meadow in a heap of bloody shreds.” Any misgivings York had about fighting vanished. Along with seven other survivors, he set out to destroy the offending machine gun nest.

York found a position that gave him a clear line of fire. With the deadly preci-

sion he learned as a boy, he began picking off Germans — 19 of whom fell dead. York repeatedly yelled that they should surrender lest he kill more.

When they refused, and charged, York took out his pistol and “picked off the advancing foes from back to front. The logic behind this was that if the lead Germans fell, the trailing Germans would seek cover and be all the more difficult to kill” — something York learned from hunting turkeys. The Germans gave up, and York marched 132 prisoners off the battlefield. His commanding general marveled, “Well, York, I hear you have captured the whole (expletive) German army!”

Fame quickly followed. Other soldiers swore affidavits affirming York’s bravery, and he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, soon upgraded to the Medal of Honor. York was convinced that divine intervention saved his life: “I am a witness to the fact that God did help me out of that hard battle, for the bushes were shot off all around me and I never got a scratch.”

Back in the United States, movie and endorsement offers flooded York, totaling some \$250,000 (at least \$3,320,00 in today’s dollars). He rejected them, saying, “My life is not for sale, and I don’t allow Uncle Sam’s uniform for sale.”

York returned to Tennessee, married, and devoted the rest of his life to raising money to support a church school and other religious activities. His renown, of course, helped, but he kept little money for himself (dying broke). He decided to break his silence on the eve of World War II, hoping that a movie on his own actions would jar America out of isola-

tionist lethargy. It did.

Col. Mastriano thoroughly routs York’s detractors, documenting that he never claimed full credit for winning the encounter, and indeed praised the support of comrades. To resolve a dispute over the exact location of the fight, Col. Mastriano looked beyond flawed U.S. Army maps and found more accurate renditions in German military archives. He found artifacts enabling him to reconstruct the battle site. This is splendid military history that tells the story of a splendid hero.

— Joseph C. Goulden
Special to *The Washington Times*
Monday, May 19, 2014