



# Christian View of the News



Volume 31 Number 6

Norman Pyle, Editor

June 2006

## ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

After the war against global Islamic terrorism, there is no more important issue facing America today than our dependence on foreign oil. This is not an academic debate. Every American family who spent 40-50-60 dollars to fill up their car for an Easter visit to grandma's house already knows this.

Dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security and distorts global diplomacy. Whether it is bandit kidnappers in Nigeria, two-bit Communist dictators like Chavez in Venezuela, or the former student-hostage-taker-turned President of Iran -- it is not in our interest to remain dependent on those who don't share our interests.

Each year we are sending tens of billions of dollars to regimes that are using that money to undermine us in our own hemisphere, to fund the forces of terrorism in radical mosques and suicide bomber schools across the Middle East, and now to build the "Islamic bomb" in Tehran's nuclear plants.

Oil is also the Achilles heel of the American economic miracle. It supplies over 98 percent of our transportation fuel and yet we own a mere 3 percent of known global reserves.

Remaining this addicted to other folk's oil puts our economy at risk to acts of man like terrorism and acts of God like the hurricanes that shut down the Gulf Coast's oil infrastructure last year and still has large parts of it struggling to recover just in time for this year's hurricane season.

And if this were not bad enough, the burning of oil-based fuels contributes to many of the environmental challenges our communities face.

Now I am not taking cheap shots at oil or oil companies. They provide the life-blood of the American economy and will continue to do so throughout this "Second American Century." We need a stable supply of oil and gasoline and should take full and responsible advantage of our own domestic reserves.

And contrary to what you might hear on the evening news, oil companies don't set the price of oil, they "take" the price the market will bear. As long as the growing global demand for more than 83 million barrels per day keeps upward pressure on a global supply of about the same 83 million barrels per day -- the price of oil and therefore gasoline will continue to be high and volatile. And as nearly 2 billion people in China and India trade in their bicycles and mules for the cars and trucks of the developed world, this upward pressure on price will only get worse.

I am also not suggesting that if we would conserve a little more here and there everything will be fine. . . .

But at the end of the day, America cannot drill or carpool our way out of the Middle East. Both of those policies have a place in any solution, but neither is sufficient unless we add new fuel choices for the 21st Century to the mix.

America is blessed with three critical and abundant resources to bring real fuel choices to American consumers:

1. Vast and efficient agricultural lands with a rich heritage of farming.
2. Coal supplies that dwarf the oil supplies of many of our major oil exporters.
3. Most importantly the ingenuity and free market place necessary to make these fuel choices a reality.

America can be growing its own fuel long after Hugo Chavez's Venezuela has drilled its last drop of crude oil.

Fuel choice is about reducing our dependence on foreign oil -- and "on-shoring" our energy future. Investment in the fuel choices of tomorrow like Ethanol made from American corn, and eventually from grass in South Dakota, or pine trees in New Hampshire, or maybe from peanuts in Georgia, all of these choices are about good American jobs.

The fuel choice of tomorrow might also be about diesel fuel made from coal or soy beans or even recycled waste, or it might be Methanol made from coal or agricultural products made in Ohio, Illinois or Montana.

The fuel choice of tomorrow might require the American family to invest the "high technology" of an extension cord -- to run their car on clean electricity that they buy from a power company hundreds of miles away for pennies per mile or even that they capture for free from the sun or the wind.

The fuel choice of tomorrow might be a revolutionary fuel cell that harnesses a hydrogen economy.

All of these fuel choices are a matter of investment far more than invention. They are each within our grasp and they each will "on-shore" and "in-source" America's energy future while providing good jobs for the 21st century. - Jack Kingston, *townhall.com*, 4/26/06

### MORAL EQUIVALENCY OR PRE-EMPTION

In geopolitics, the raising up of an ersatz moral-equivalence induces inaction that invites defeat.

We currently hear these arguments from equivalence:

**Iran** may be developing nuclear weapons, but we abide other South Asian countries possessing them - e.g., India and Pakistan.

**Iran** voices grievances against the

**What's Inside . . .**  
**Mexican Immigration**  
**Global Warming**  
**Islamic Imperialism**  
**Internet Pornography**  
**Domestic Spying?**  
**Christian Weddings**  
**The Aging Brain**

West, but given the West's miserable record in the Middle East, many of those grievances are justified.

**Iran** says it intends to rub Israel off the map, but Israel is the fundamental cause of the Middle Eastern conflict.

So let us accept Iranian nuclearization and work through diplomacy to settle whatever grievances Iran may have.

As in few other periods before, events of the past 10 days have conspired to draw a picture of the future for an inactive, irresponsible West in a morally equivalent hour.

On April 12, jurors weighing the fate of Zacarias Moussaoui heard segments from the flight recorder of United Flight 93. On 9/11, jihadists hijacked the plane and intended to fly it into the Capitol. As passengers stormed the cockpit, the jihadists turned the plane upside down and at 560 mph augured it into the Pennsylvania countryside. The recorder discloses sounds of heroism, anguish, desperation, grisly murderers at work, lives expiring and - to the end - macabre testimonies to the greatness of Allah.

Gripping, even overwhelming, as that testimony from the dead may have been, Moussaoui himself overmatched it. He said he was supposed to hijack a plane on 9/11 and fly it into the White House. . .

Enter, on April 11, Mahmoud Ahmad-nejad, president of Iran. In Mashad (meaning "place of martyrdom") - to Shiites, Iran's holiest place because it is the site of the 9th Century poisoning of Iman Reza - Ahmad-nejad announced Iran has developed bomb-grade uranium. With now a cascade of 164 centrifuges for uranium enrichment, Iran intends to link 54,000 centrifuges - 3,000 by year's end.

A 1979 photograph almost certainly depicts Ahmad-nejad as one of the Iranian "students" who held 52 Americans hostage in the U.S. Embassy in Tehran, ultimately for 444 days. He learned then America would do nothing in response to outrageous action. He knows now the U.S. and the West are unlikely to take out his nuclear program in its early stages. So call this Ahmad-nejad's Hostage Crisis II as he prepares for Heaven knows what while holding America and the West hostage to precisely the moral equivalence that induces inaction.

And what does Ahmad-nejad have in mind? He evidently regards himself as sent to Earth to salvage Islam - to pave the way for the reappearance of the 12th Imam, the Shiites' version of the Messiah. Iran long has funded Hezbollah, the jihadist terror group in Lebanon now in possession of an estimated 14,000 missiles for firing at Israel; Iran has moved Revolutionary Guards into positions reinforcing Hezbollah along the Lebanese border with Israel.

Iran is in the business of something more than pistachios and Persian rugs. It also is funding the Hamas jihadists recently voted into power by the Palestinians. And for what it's worth, let this datum not be lost; biblical prophecy holds that Armageddon - which Osama, Ahmad-nejad, Moussaoui and the 9/11 hijackers, et al, seem so intently to want - will be fought in northern Israel's Valley of Megido.

From the Flight 93 cockpit recorder, Moussaoui, and Ahmad-nejad we have testimony of the most chilling, compelling sort. Evil defined. And the case for our moral equivalence is a fatuous non-starter. Three years of diplomacy by the Bush administration - preceded by two decades of it - have brought us to this profoundly troubling moment. The question at hand: Pre-emption against Iran, or inaction - and an incinerated future for us all? - Ross Mackenzie, *townhall.com*, 4/20/06

## POPE SAYS NON-BELIEVERS CAN BE SAVED

In his general audience on November 30, Pope Benedict XVI

said that whoever "seeks peace and the good of the community with a pure conscience and keeps alive the desire for the transcendent," will be saved if "they have a spark of desire for the unknown, for the greatest, for the transcendent, for a genuine redemption." This, of course, is pure heretical nonsense. The Lord Jesus Christ taught that men are condemned already because they are born estranged from God because of sin and that the only way to heaven is to be born again through faith in Him (John 3). The apostles taught the same thing. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). - David Cloud, *O Timothy*, 1/06

## WORSHIP WITH WARREN ANY WAY YOU WANT

Saddleback Church in southern California, where Rick Warren is senior pastor, features nine different "worship venues." There is a worship style to suit every worldly taste. The Overdrive venue is "for those who like guitar-driven rock band worship in a concert-like setting that you can FEEL." The Ohana venue comes "complete with hula and island-style music," and on the first Saturday of every month you can take hula lessons during the potluck following the service. The Country venue features line dancing. I didn't make this up, folks. It is right from Saddleback's web site. - *Christian News*, 1/2/06

## HOW MEXICO TREATS ITS IMMIGRANTS

The Congress has received lots of free advice lately from Mexican government officials and illegal aliens waving Mexico's flag in mass demonstrations coast-to-coast. Most of it takes the form of bitter complaints about our actual or prospective treatment of immigrants from that country who have gotten into this one illegally -- or who aspire to do so.

If you think these critics are mad about U.S. immigration policy now, imagine how upset they would be if we adopted an approach far more radical than the bill they rail against that was adopted last year by the House of Representatives -- namely, the way Mexico treats illegal aliens.

In fact, as a just-published paper by the Center for Security Policy's J. Michael Waller points out, under a constitution first adopted in 1917 and subsequently amended, Mexico deals harshly not only with illegal immigrants. It treats even legal immigrants, naturalized citizens and foreign investors in ways that would, by the standards of those who carp about U.S. immigration policy, have to be called "racist" and "xenophobic."

For example, according to an official translation published by the Organization of American States, the Mexican constitution includes the following restrictions.

- Pursuant to Article 33, "Foreigners may not in any way participate in the political affairs of the country." This ban applies, among other things, to participation in demonstrations and the expression of opinions in public about domestic politics like those much in evidence in Los Angeles, New York and elsewhere in recent days. . . .

- Jobs for which Mexican citizenship is considered "indispensable" include, pursuant to Article 32, bans on foreigners, immigrants and even naturalized citizens of Mexico serving as military officers, Mexican-flagged ship and airline crew, and chiefs of seaports and airports.

In accordance with Article 130, immigrants -- even legal ones - may not become members of the clergy, either. . . .

- Foreigners, to say nothing of illegal immigrants, are denied fundamental property rights. For example, Article 27 states, "Only

Mexicans by birth or naturalization and Mexican companies have the right to acquire ownership of lands, waters and their appurtenances, or to obtain concessions for the exploitation of mines or of waters."

- Article 11 guarantees federal protection against "undesirable aliens resident in the country." What is more, private individuals are authorized to make citizen's arrests. Article 16 states, "In cases of flagrante delicto, any person may arrest the offender and his accomplices, turning them over without delay to the nearest authorities." In other words, Mexico grants its citizens the right to arrest illegal aliens and hand them over to police for prosecution. . . Imagine the Minute-men exercising such a right.

- The Mexican constitution states that foreigners -- not just illegal immigrants -- may be expelled for any reason and without due process. . . .

As the immigration debate in the Senate moved into a decisive phase last week, legislators who believe America's southern border must be secured, the nation's existing immigration laws enforced and illegal aliens not rewarded with permanent residency and a direct path to citizenship were being sharply criticized, and, in some cases, defamed as bigots and xenophobes. Yet, even their maximalist positions generally pale in comparison with the treatment authorized by the Mexican constitution.

So the next time such legislators -- and the majority of Americans for whom they speak -- are assaulted by Mexican officials, undocumented aliens waving Mexican flags in mass demonstration here in the United States, clergy and self-described humanitarians, businessmen and other advocates of illegal immigration, ask them this: Would they favor having the U.S. impose the same restrictions on immigrants -- legal and illegal -- that Mexico imposes on their counterparts there? - Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., *Washington Times, Weekly*, 4/10-16/06

## MEXICANS: FLEEING CORRUPTION

"John Gibson asked me the other day on Fox TV why hordes of Mexicans flee their homeland and enter the U.S. illegally. My answer: the cancer of corruption that afflicts every level of Mexican society and restricts even the smallest forms of economic opportunity for the poorest Mexicans.

"I said that Mexico has everything to make it a prosperous First World country. They have minerals, they have agriculture, oil, tourism -- everything they need to rank high among First World countries. All that stands in their way is corruption.

"Mexico is a corrupt nation with a corrupt government from top to bottom, and until the U.S. and President Bush stand up and point a finger -- as my dad did at the evil empire -- and say you have to eliminate corruption if you want to keep your people home, the corruption will continue and so will the flow of illegal aliens fleeing it.

"They need to be told that the reason people are fleeing their country is the corruption that saps the very lifeblood of the Mexican economy, making it impossible for the poor to find jobs at wages that allow them to support their families or pay the ever-present mordida - 'the bite,' as they call bribes. Like the refugees who fled from behind the Iron Curtain to find freedom, they flee Mexico to find a living wage and escape the bondage of official bribery that condemns them to poverty." - Michael Reagan, *WTW*, 5/1-7/06

## COMBATING "WARMING" STILL DEBATABLE

So, "the debate is over." *Time* magazine says so. Last week's cover story exhorted readers to "Be Worried. Be Very Worried," and

ABC News concurred in several stories. So did Montana's governor, speaking on ABC. And there was polling about global warming, gathered by *Time* and ABC in collaboration.

Eighty-five percent of Americans say warming is probably happening and 62 percent say it threatens them personally. The National Academy of Sciences says the rise in the earth's surface temperature has been about one degree Fahrenheit in the last century. Did 85 percent of Americans notice? Of course not. They got their anxiety from journalism calculated to produce it. Never mind that one degree might be the margin of error when measuring the planet's temperature. To take a person's temperature, you put a thermometer in an orifice, or under an arm. Taking the temperature of our churning planet, with its tectonic plates sliding around over a molten core, involves limited precision.

Why have Americans been dilatory about becoming as worried - as very worried -- as *Time* and ABC think proper? An article on ABC's Web site wonders ominously, "Was Confusion Over Global Warming a Con Job?" It suggests there has been a misinformation campaign implying that scientists might not be unanimous, a campaign by -- how did you guess? -- big oil. And the coal industry. But speaking of coal. . .

Recently, Montana Gov. Brian Schweitzer flew with ABC's George Stephanopoulos over Glacier National Park's receding glaciers. But Schweitzer offered hope: Everyone, buy Montana coal. New technologies can, he said, burn it while removing carbon causes of global warming.

Stephanopoulos noted that such technologies are at least four years away and "all the scientists" say something must be done "right now." Schweitzer, quickly recovering from hopefulness and returning to the "be worried, be very worried" message said, "It's even more critical than that" because China and India are going to "put more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere with conventional coal-fired generators than all of the rest of the planet has during the last 150 years."

That is one reason why the Clinton administration never submitted the Kyoto accord on global warming for Senate ratification. In 1997, the Senate voted 95-0 that the accord would disproportionately burden America while being too permissive toward major polluters that are America's trade competitors.

While worrying about Montana's receding glaciers, Schweitzer, who is 50, should also worry about the fact that when he was 20 he was told to be worried, very worried, about global cooling:

- Science magazine (Dec. 10, 1976) warned of "extensive Northern Hemisphere glaciation."

- Science Digest (February 1973) reported that "the world's climatologists are agreed" that we must "prepare for the next ice age."

- The Christian Science Monitor ("Warning: Earth's Climate is Changing Faster than Even Experts Expect," Aug. 27, 1974) reported that glaciers "have begun to advance," "growing seasons in England and Scandinavia are getting shorter" and "the North Atlantic is cooling down about as fast as an ocean can cool."

- Newsweek agreed ("The Cooling World," April 28, 1975) that meteorologists "are almost unanimous" that catastrophic famines might result from the global cooling that the New York Times (Sept. 14, 1975) said "may mark the return to another ice age."

- The Times (May 21, 1975) also said "a major cooling of the climate is widely considered inevitable" now that it is "well established" that the Northern Hemisphere's climate "has been getting cooler since about 1950."

In fact, the earth is always experiencing either warming or cool-

ing. But suppose the scientists and their journalistic conduits, who today say they were so spectacularly wrong so recently, are now correct. Suppose the earth is warming and suppose the warming is caused by human activity. Are we sure there will be proportionate benefits from whatever climate change can be purchased at the cost of slowing economic growth and spending trillions? Are we sure the consequences of climate change -- remember, a thick sheet of ice once covered the Middle West -- must be bad? Or has the science-journalism complex decided that debate about these questions, too, is "over?"

About the mystery that vexes ABC -- Why have Americans been slow to get in lock step concerning global warming? -- perhaps the "problem" is not big oil or big coal, both of which have discovered there is big money to be made from tax breaks and other subsidies justified in the name of combating carbon. Perhaps the problem is big crusading journalism. - George F. Will, *townhall.com*, 4/2/06

### ADVICE PARENTS USED TO GIVE

However the Duke lacrosse rape case turns out, one lesson that absolutely will not be learned is this: You can severely reduce your chances of having a false accusation of rape leveled against you if you don't hire strange women to come to your house and take their clothes off for money.

Also, you can severely reduce your chances of being raped if you do not go to strange men's houses and take your clothes off for money. (Does anyone else detect a common thread here?)

And if you are a girl in Aruba or New York City, among the best ways to avoid being the victim of a horrible crime is to not get drunk in public or go off in a car with men you just met. While we're on the subject of things every 5-year-old should know, I also recommend against dousing yourself in gasoline and striking a match.

Everyone makes mistakes, especially young people, but the outpouring of support for the victims and their families is obscuring what ought to be a flashing neon warning for potential future victims.

Whenever a gun is used in a crime, there are never-ending news stories about how dangerous guns are. But these girls go out alone, late at night, drink 'til drunk, and there's nary a peep about the dangers of drunk women on their own in public. It's their "right."

Yes, of course, no one "deserves" to die for a mistake. Or to be raped or falsely accused of rape for a mistake. I have always been unabashedly anti-murder, anti-rape and anti-false accusation -- and I don't care who knows about it!

But these statements would roll off the tongue more easily in a world that so much as tacitly acknowledged that all these messy turns of fate followed behavior that your mother could have told you was tacky.

Not very long ago, all the precursor behavior in these cases would have been recognized as vulgar -- whether or not anyone ended up dead, raped or falsely accused of rape. But in a nation of people in constant terror of being perceived as "judgmental," I'm not sure most people do recognize that anymore.

It shouldn't be necessary to point out that girls shouldn't be bar-hopping alone or take their clothes off in front of strangers, and that young men shouldn't be hiring strippers. But we live in a world of Bill Clinton, Paris Hilton, Howard Stern, Julia Roberts in "Pretty Woman," Democratic fund-raisers at the Playboy Mansion and tax deductions for entertaining clients at strip clubs.

This is an age in which the expression "girls gone wild" is becoming a redundancy. So even as the bodies pile up, I don't think the message about integrity is getting through.

The liberal charge of "hypocrisy" has so permeated the public

consciousness that no one is willing to condemn any behavior anymore, no matter how seedy. The unstated rule is: If you've done it, you can't ever criticize it -- a standard that would seem to repudiate the good works of the Rev. Franklin Graham, Malcolm X, Whittaker Chambers and St. Paul, among others.

Every woman who has had an abortion feels compelled to defend abortion for all women; every man who's ever been at a party with strippers thinks he has to defend all men who watch strippers; and every Democrat who voted for Bill Clinton feels the need to defend duplicity, adultery, lying about adultery, sexual harassment, rape, perjury, obstruction of justice, kicking the can of global Islamo-fascism down the road for eight years and so on.

This is crazy. (I can say that because I've never been diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder. Although I did test positive for "Olympic fever" once.)

In no area except morality would a sane person believe he can't criticize something stupid because he's done it. How about: If you've ever forgotten to fill up your car and run out of gas, you must forevermore defend a person's right to ignore the gas gauge. Or if you've ever forgotten to wear a coat in cold weather and caught a cold, henceforth, you are obliged to encourage others not to dress appropriately in the winter.

This deep-seated societal fear of being accused of "hypocrisy" applies only to behavior touching on morals.

But we're all rotten sinners, incapable of redemption on our own. The liberal answer to sin is to say: I can never pay this back, so my argument will be I didn't do anything wrong.

The religion of peace's answer is: *I've just beheaded an innocent man -- I'm off to meet Allah!*

I don't know what the Jewish answer is, but I'm sure it's something other than, "therefore, what I did is no longer bad behavior" -- or the Talmud could be a lot shorter.

The Christian answer is: I can never pay this back, but thank God Christ has already paid my debt. - Ann Coulter, *townhall.com*, 4/20/06

### WAR ON ISLAMIC IMPERIALISM

To understand what Americans are fighting, it is necessary to first understand that we are not fighting a "War on Terror." We are no more fighting a "War on Terror" than we fought a "War on Kamikazes" in World War II. Of course we had to stop Kamikaze attacks, the suicide crashing by Japanese pilots of airplanes into American war ships. But we were fighting Japanese fascism and imperialism.

The same holds true today. We are fighting Islamic fascism and imperialism (though surely not all Muslims).

The parallels are almost as extensive as any historic parallels of two different phenomena can be. The fascist Japanese regime aimed to subjugate much of the world, Asia in particular, and it used whatever violence it could think of without any moral constraints. The fascist element within Islam wishes to subjugate the entire world using whatever violence it can think of without any moral constraints.

Of course, there are differences: Imperial Japan was preoccupied with dominating Asia, while imperialist Islam aims to dominate the whole world. And imperial Japan did so as an outgrowth of nationalism, while imperialist Islam does so from an outgrowth of a transnational religious ideology.

Islamic terror is a tactic of an ideology. That ideology can be called "radical Islam," "militant Islam" or "Islamist," but it is rooted in **Islamic imperialism.**

With a background in religious studies and having studied Ara-

bic and Islam, many listeners have called my radio show asking me if I consider Islam to be inherently violent or even evil. From 9-11 to now, I have responded that I do not assess religions; I assess the practitioners of religions. Why? Because it is almost impossible to assess any religion since its own adherents so often differ as to what it is. For example, is Christianity the Christianity of most evangelicals or that of the National Council of Churches? On virtually every important moral issue, they differ. The same holds true for right-and-left-wing groups within Judaism.

Nevertheless, one can say that **from its inception, Islam has been imperialist.** My working **definition of imperialism** is that of University of London professor Efraim Karsh, whose recent book, *Islamic Imperialism* (Yale University Press), is one of the few indispensable books on Islam.

Karsh defines **imperialism as "conquering foreign lands and subjugating their populations." Whenever possible, Muslims from the time of Muhammad have done that.** Now, the Church (Roman, that is. - N.P.) also subjugated peoples to Christianity, and Europe suffered from prolonged religious wars. But as Karsh notes, from its inception, Christianity acknowledged a separation of the religious and the political, rendering to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's.

No such division was allowed for in Islam. That is why the nation-state developed in the Christian world but not in the Muslim world. **The Muslim states of the Middle East**, for example, are creations of Western (secular) imperialism or pre-date Islam (Egypt, for example); and they are **foreign concepts to most Middle Eastern Muslims, who recognize themselves much more as part of the ummah, the Muslim community, than as Iraqis, Jordanians, Syrians, etc.**

Nor is Islamic imperialism only a function of Muslim behavior rather than Muslim theology. Karsh opens his book citing the statements of four Muslim figures.

The **Prophet Muhammad** in his farewell address: "I was ordered to fight all men until they say, 'there is no god but Allah.'"

**Saladin** (great 12th-century founder of the Ayyubid dynasty that included Ayyubid Egypt, Syria, Yemen, Iraq and much of present-day Saudi Arabia): "I shall cross this sea to their islands to pursue them until there remains no one on the face of the earth who does not acknowledge Allah."

**Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini** (father of the Islamic revolution in Iran): "We will export our revolution throughout the world. . . until the calls 'There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the messenger of Allah' are echoed all over the world."

**Osama bin Laden** in November 2001: "I was ordered to fight the people until they say 'there is no god but Allah, and his prophet Muhammad.'"

No one should have a problem with Muslims wanting the whole world Muslim. After all, Christians would like the whole world to come to Christ. **What should matter to all people is the answer to one question: What are you prepared to do to bring the world to your religion? For virtually every living Christian, the answer is through modeling and verbal persuasion** (and Jews never believed the world needs to be Jewish).

But by the most conservative estimates, **10 percent of Muslims are in sympathy with the bin Laden way.** That means at least 100 million people are prepared to murder (and apparently torture) in Allah's name. And given the history of Islamic imperialism and its roots in Muslim theology, hundreds of millions more are probably fellow travelers. Hence the almost unanimous Muslim governments' support for the genocidal Islamic regime in Sudan.

We pray that there arises a strong Muslim group that is guided by the Quranic verse, "There shall be no coercion in matters of faith."

But until such time, we had better understand that **we are not merely fighting a war on terror, but a war against an ideology that wishes us to convert, be subject to Islamic law, or die.** - Dennis Prager, *townhall.com*, 5/9/06

## FATHERS DAY (A PERSONAL NOTE)

One of God's blessings to me has been the privilege of being a father. I have four children, two sons and two daughters.

My wife and our two girls are wonderful mothers. I am so grateful to the Lord for them and the impact they have had on our family and multitudes of others.

But Fathers Day is approaching and I want to give tribute to my two sons for the godly fathers they are.

My oldest is now a grandfather which seems strange for someone as young as I feel. He is a teacher in a Christian college, a Sunday School teacher in his local church, has been a youth pastor and music director and is an outstanding Shakesperian actor. But the thing I believe is most significant in his life is being a father.

My second son is a business man who has generously aided missionaries and ministries through his company. He has served his local church as a deacon, school board member, Sunday School worker, etc.

These two men love God, their wives and children, support their churches and seem to have their priorities in order.

I am presently reading the book, *Humility, True Greatness*, by C. J. Mahaney. In this book, he refers to the book *Good to Great* by Jim Collins, a best seller dealing with leadership. Collins identified two specific character qualities shared by CEO's in good-to-great companies. The first was a strong will to succeed no matter the obstacles. Not a surprise.

The second one was -- These leaders were self-effacing, humble, modest people who were more concerned with drawing attention to those around them than to themselves.

I think this describes my two sons. (They will not appreciate my pointing this out.) But God bless them and all the sons who make their Dads proud on this Fathers Day. - Norman Pyle

## INCREASE IN GAY EXPERIMENTATION

According to a new report from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), more women are experimenting with homosexual activity.

The report was based on data collected in 2002 in the National Survey of Family Growth. It found 11% of women said they had had a sexual experience with another woman. That is compared to 4% of women who said the same thing in a 1992 survey.

Younger women, however, were even more likely to experiment with homosexuality. According to an article in the Washington Post, 14% of women in their late teens and 20s claimed to have had a same-sex experience.

Some experts and more and more young people simply see such experimentation as a rite of passage. "It's very safe in the [college and university] academic community; no one thinks anything of it." Elayne Rapping, a professor of American studies at the University of Buffalo told the Post. . . .

Men appear less willing to experiment with homosexuality, but the percentage has still increased. The CDC report said 6% of men in their teens and 20s said they'd had a same-sex experience in their lifetime. In 1992, 4.9% said they had done so.

However, when it came to self-identifying as homosexual, the percentages of the **U.S. population that appear to be gay or lesbian was as small as in other surveys - only 2-3%**, according to the CDC study. - *AFA Journal*, 1/06 (This is primarily because of the "out of the closet," "in your face" entertainment and news media. - N.P.)

## GROWTH OF INTERNET PORNOGRAPHY

A new book by journalist Pamela Paul documents the rapid growth of pornography through the Internet. Entitled "Pornified: How Pornography is Transforming Our Lives Our Relationships, and Our Families" the book describes how porn has corrupted marriages and even perverted children's ideas of sex and sexuality. Paul is a former senior editor at American Demographics and has written for Time magazine and other publications. This book is an extension of an article that she wrote for Time. When Paul was first asked to write on the subject of pornography, she said: "Like many Americans, I believed pornography was no big deal. My eyes were blown open." Paul describes contemporary American culture as 'pornographic' because porn is now literally everywhere. The users are no longer just fraternity boys and those written off as 'dirty old men.' Now, the users of virtually unrestricted porn include children, teenagers and adults of all ages. The victims include not only those whose lives, marriages, relationships, careers and sexuality are corrupted, but also everyone involved in the vast pornography industry at every stage" ("The culture of pornography," Baptist Press, Dec. 28, 2005). Paul describes the addictive, corruptive nature of pornography, how that it drags the viewer deeper and deeper into moral perversion. We do not recommend that anyone read "Pornified" because even its author admits that it is very graphic (I have only read reviews of the book), but its warning must be heeded. The "foolish woman" which Proverbs so frequently warns about has always stood in "the high places of the city" and called out to "passengers who go right on their ways," wickedly urging them that "stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant" (Prov. 9:13-17). But through the Internet the voice of immorality sounds louder today than ever before. It is imperative that the man of God not forget that "the dead are there; and that her guests are in the depths of hell" (Prov. 9:18). - David Cloud, *Christian News*, 1/16/06

## MONKEY BUSINESS IN THE CLASSROOM

Each year, students who are not convinced by evolution enter college classrooms. These students are often nervous about how their beliefs will affect their grades in natural science courses. Their backgrounds are varied; many who believe in creationism or intelligent design describe themselves as evangelical Christians, but others are Muslim, agnostic, or even atheist. Some think the Biblical explanation of the beginning of life is literally accurate, that life began in the days after an omnipotent god created the Earth. Others think that life began with small organisms and that the evolutionary process that did occur with our development was guided by a deity. Still others think that evolutionary theory lacks the necessary support to make it believable.

...

Though there are few firm statistics, it is clear that not everyone with a university degree hanging on the wall believes in evolution. A CBS News poll released in October 2005 stated that 15 percent of all Americans believe that humans evolved without the guidance of a god; other respondents believe either that humans evolved with God's guidance or that humans were created by God in their present form. The numbers alter only slightly among Americans with at least one college degree, 24 percent of whom believe in evolution. Young Americans are more likely to believe in evolution, possibly a result of a 1987

Supreme Court ruling that forbade public schools from teaching creationism as fact. Even so, large numbers of students on college campuses remain ill at ease with their professors' assertions that the world dates back to the Big Bang, not to the Garden of Eden. - Victoria Bosch, *Newsweek's* magazine for college students, *Current* - AlbertMohler.com, 1/3/06

## FLEEING GOVERNMENT INTRUSION

When blacks move into a neighborhood and whites move out, that is something visible to the naked eye, but there is nothing unique about such "white flight."

The fact that people sort themselves out in many ways is not usually a big problem -- except to those people who cannot feel fulfilled unless they are telling other people what to do. Government programs to unsort people who have sorted themselves out have produced one social disaster after another.

The decades-long attempts to mix black and white children through school busing produced no real educational benefits, but much racial polarization and ill will. The same thing continues to be done in colleges in the name of "diversity" -- and with the same bad results.

Among the most unconscionable attempts to unsort people who have sorted themselves out by behavior are government programs to relocate people into neighborhoods where they could not afford to live without subsidies. Often the people in those neighborhoods have sacrificed for years in order to be able to live where they could raise their children in decent surroundings and not have to live in fear of hoodlums -- only to have the government import the bad neighbors and hoodlums they have tried so hard to escape. - Thomas Sowell, *Wall Street Journal*, by *NewsMax*, 1/06

## BUSH DIDN'T START DOMESTIC SPYING

By criticizing President George W. Bush's wiretapping of overseas telephone calls with al-Qaida suspects, leftist politicians have left the impression that Democrats are too fastidious to ever use such methods to eavesdrop on terrorists.

This impression is wrong.

In 1994, Clinton administration Attorney General Janet Reno launched infiltrators, wiretaps, mail-monitoring, and a wide range of other spying activities in a massive coordinated effort that included the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; the U.S. Marshals Service; and other federal and local law enforcement agencies.

The Clinton surveillance scheme was called VAAPCON or Violence Against Abortion Providers Task Force. According to the U.S. Justice Department, VAAPCON "was charged with determining whether there was a nationwide conspiracy to commit acts of violence against reproductive health-care providers."

The more than 900 targets of all this surveillance included the Christian Coalition, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Women's Coalition for Life, the 600,000-member Concerned Women for America, the National Rifle Association, the American Life League, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and even then-Roman Catholic Cardinal of New York John O'Connor.

What was accomplished? Before VAAPCON's powers began being dispersed to other agencies in 1996, it reported that "the evidence gathered did not support a definitive conclusion as to the existence of a nationwide conspiracy" against abortion providers.

By 1994, the threat of a handful of crazies, bombing abortion clinics was magnitudes smaller than Islamist crazies who had almost toppled a World Trade Center tower -- and against whom President

Clinton didn't even lift a finger. But merely being under surveillance, as the ACLU is fond of saying, casts a chilling shadow of implied guilt or suspicion. . . .

VAAPCON produced hundreds of dossiers on conservative groups and individuals regarded as political enemies by the Clinton White House. - Lowell Ponte, *NewsMax*, 4/06

## A GENERAL IN CHARGE OF THE CIA?

Some of the honorables in Congress are shocked - shocked! - that George W. Bush would nominate a military man to head the Central Intelligence Agency. . . . Wasn't Stansfield Turner, an admiral, head of the CIA back in the Carter administration? Indeed, at last count, 13 of the 19 directors of the agency had served in the military at some time before their appointment. In the agency's early days, it was almost assumed a military man would head it. . . .

This four-star, Michael Hayden, comes out of the Air Force, where he developed an interest in intelligence work, and went on to head the National Security Agency; he hasn't worked at the Pentagon since 1999. It was John McCain, the senator from Arizona, who noted that by now Michael Hayden is more of a spook-in-chief than a military man. But whatever his assignment, he's done a heckuva job at it.

That doesn't mean the usual rock-chunkers in Congress won't do everything they can to derail Gen. Hayden's nomination. His greatest accomplishment may have been to oversee the development of a sophisticated computerized databank that's designed to spot and monitor international calls from al-Qaida suspects overseas to contacts in this country. Naturally, he's been bitterly criticized for it, along with his commander-in-chief.

By authorizing such a program, it's said, George W. Bush has been undermining our liberties rather than protecting them against terrorists who care nothing about our laws except how to take advantage of them. Apparently we are supposed to sit back and let them do just that. . . .

In one of the more widespread misnomers of our time, this operation has been dubbed a "domestic spying" program - even though it is designed to track only international calls to and from the United States. It's also been called illegal, unconstitutional and generally un-American by its critics, none of them very persuasive.

But it was Congress itself, by joint resolution, that empowered the president of the United States "to take action to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States" immediately after September 11th. And the Constitution of the United States is quite explicit about who exercises such powers in the federal government. "The executive Power shall be vested in a president of the United States." (It's hard to beat the Founders when it comes to writing a simple declarative sentence.)

Back in 2002, when the memory of September 11th was still fresh, the appellate court that supervises the operation of FISA (the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act) upheld the president's "inherent constitutional authority to obtain foreign intelligence information." Instead of the president's violating the Constitution by authorizing such wiretaps, the court ruled that to bar him from doing so would "encroach on the president's constitutional power."

This still closely guarded system of tracking calls from terrorists now is said, ominously, to authorize "warrantless searches," which is technically accurate. Just as our troops in Iraq conduct warrantless searches when searching for intelligence about the enemy, and should.

The program Gen. Hayden oversaw is just as important, and useful, in guarding the home front. At least one terrorist plot, a plan to blow up the Brooklyn Bridge, was thwarted by intelligence derived

from the NSA's program, or that's what The New York Times reported when it blew the whistle on this operation.

Conclusion: Instead of being lambasted for his role in developing this program, Gen. Hayden deserves another medal - Paul Greenberg, *townhall.com*, 5/16/06

## MODESTY IN CHRISTIAN WEDDINGS

Todd Murray, worship minister at The Bible Church of Little Rock, concluded a women's conference with these words:

*Ladies, please don't forget to apply these principles of modesty to formal events and weddings. In recent years, I have become increasingly grieved by the immodest dresses of both brides and bridesmaids at the weddings that I officiate. I have observed a number of young ladies in our fellowship who have dressed modestly all their lives appearing on their wedding day in extremely provocative dresses, exposing more of themselves than on any other day of their lives.*

*I assume the best about what is going on in the hearts of these young women. I don't think that they went to the wedding dress shop determined to be provocative. No doubt, they just wanted a dress that would be elegant on this day that they have dreamed of all their lives. When a bride and mother set out on their expedition to find a wedding dress, they are, quite naturally, thinking like. . . women! Unfortunately, there is no one in the shop who is thinking like a man! I'd like to make a radical proposal, girls. Why not take your father with you to the wedding boutique? If that thought is just too much for you (or your Dad!) at least consider taking the dress out on approval and allowing your dad to see it before you make your final purchase.*

*Here are a couple of questions to ask yourself when shopping for a wedding or bridesmaid's dress:*

*Does this dress reflect the fact that a wedding ceremony is a holy service of worship and not a fashion show?*

*Can I picture myself standing in this dress, for an extended period of time, just a few feet from my pastor as he opens the Word of God and leads me in my solemn vows? - AlbertMohler.com, 5/17/06*

## THE AGING BRAIN

"The Surprising Power of the Aging Brain" is the title of an article in the January 16 **Time**.

**Time** says, "Scientists used to think intellectual power peaked at age 40. Now they know better."

"More and more neurologists and psychologists are coming to the conclusion that the brain at midlife -- a period increasingly defined as the years from 35 to 65 and even beyond -- is a much more elastic, much more supple thing than anyone ever realized.

"Far from slowly powering down, the brain as it ages begins bringing new cognitive systems on line and cross-indexing existing ones in ways it never did before. You may not pack so much raw data into memory as you could when you were cramming for college finals, and your short-term memory may not be what it was, but you manage information and parse meanings that were entirely beyond you when you were younger. What's more, your temperament changes to suit those new skills, growing more comfortable with ambiguity and less susceptible to frustration or irritation. Although inflexibility, confusion and even later-life dementia are very real problems, for many people the aging process not only does not batter the brain, it actually makes it better."

"In midlife,' says UCLA neurologist George Bartzokis, 'you're beginning to maximize the ability to use the entirety of the information in your brain on an everyday, ongoing, second-to-second basis. Biologically, that's what wisdom is.'"

"It's that talent for reflective thinking that explains the role older adults have always played in the human culture. It's not for nothing that history's firebrands and ideologues are typically young while its judges and peacemakers and great theologians tend to be older. Not everyone achieves the sharp thought and serene mien that can come with age. But for those who do, the later years can be the best years they have ever had.

*Excerpts from Article:*

- "Sleeping your way to the top" in the January 16 *Time* concludes: "If mental sharpness is your goal, the answer is clear; stop depriving yourself and get a good night's sleep."

- "People who enjoy staying up late often skip breakfast in their groggy morning rush. But research shows it provides the day's most vital brain food."

- "A good diet is certainly not the only way to protect and enhance brain health. Regularly exercising the mind and no smoking are also important. But food choices do count. So eat your vegetables, think about your daily dose of omega-3s, and consider flavoring more of your food with turmeric."

- "Want a Brainier Baby? Loading up on tapes, games and videos may not be a smart move. There are better ways to nurture a young mind."

"According to Dimitri Christakism co-director of the Child Health Institute at the University of Washington. "The more TV babies watch, the more likely they are to have attention problems later in life." (That's your ADD.- N.P.)

"The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends no TV viewing of any kind before age 2."

- In fact, all things being equal, people who engage in a wide variety of physical activities - like walking and biking and dancing and swimming - seem to be better protected against cognitive decline than those who don't." - *Christian News*, 1/16/06

## "THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO OPRAH"

In her substitution of psychology for theology, Oprah has become a high priestess and icon of the psychologization of American society. When she features prominent New Age figures on her television show, she helps to mainstream New Age influences and philosophies among millions of Americans. Her substitution of spirituality for biblical Christianity, her promotion of forgiveness without atonement, and her references to a god "without labels" puts her at the epicenter of a seismic cultural earthquake. At the same time, Oprah cannot be ignored. Marcia Z. Nelson's new book is intended as a celebration of Oprah's significance as a harbinger of a new gospel.

In the end, the importance of this book is grounded in the fact that it draws attention to Oprah's influence and cultural impact. Oprah's newly-packaged positive-thinking spirituality is tailor-made for the empty souls of our postmodern age. She promises meaning without truth, acceptance without judgment, and fulfillment without self-denial. Marcia Z. Nelson is certainly right about one thing -- Oprah Winfrey's "congregation" cannot be ignored. - Dr. Albert Mohler, from his Blog, 1/19/06



Christian  
View of the News

**Bible Baptist Church**  
**2780 Mt. Carmel Road**  
**Hampton, GA 30228**  
**Brad Blanton, Pastor**  
**[www.biblebaptistministries.com](http://www.biblebaptistministries.com)**

NON-PROFIT  
 U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
 Hampton GA 30228  
 Permit # 1

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED