



Christian View of the News



Volume 31 Number 9

Norman Pyle, Editor

September 2006

WORLD WAR III?

A few weeks ago I was reading **Psalm 83** as part of my yearly excursion through the Bible. I had never before marked this Psalm, nor noticed anything of particular significance. This time, it exploded off the page like the Israeli bombs and Hezbollah rockets in Lebanon.

This psalm was probably written about 900 years before the birth of Christ, 1600 years before the founding of Islam, and 3,000 years ago.

Yet the psalm seems so up-to-date as to be more than an accident. It describes the enemies of Jehovah as those who hate Him. And that they counseled together to cut off Israel from being a nation and to eliminate its name from remembrance.

(Last year, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that Israel should be "wiped off the map" and he repeated the same thing last week.)

This 10-nation confederacy named in Psalm 83:6-8 is made up in large part of apostate kin of Israel; those descended from the incest of Lot, from Abraham's Egyptian wife, from Ishmael and Esau, who were not in the lineage of faith. Also from Canaanite nations never defeated by Israel as God commanded. Philistines who were the Jews' ancient enemies and Tyre and Phoenicia and Byblos of modern Lebanon and Syria.

It is believed by some that this psalm may have been written in the days of Jehoshaphat, a good king of Judah, who was attacked by the Amorites, Moabites and Edomites (Esau). These powerful nations conspired to attack their hated enemy, Israel (Judah). Jehovah answered Jehoshaphat's prayer and told them to take defensive positions, but they would not have to fight because it was God's battle, not theirs.

They sang and praised God for the victory that He would give and He set an ambush for the three pagan armies and wiped them out. II Chronicles 20 records this exciting victory in answer to prayer.

It is interesting to note that the Valley of Jehoshaphat is connected with Armageddon in Joel, chapters 2 and 3. (Speaking of Armageddon, read the last three chapters of Zechariah, paying special attention to 12:10; 13:1; 14:3 and Romans 11:6.)

I am not prophesying anything, but simply saying that what we are seeing in Israel and the Middle East today has been going on for over 3,000 years and our redemption is closer now than it has ever been. - N.P.

UNDERSTAND THE TEMPER OF THE TIMES

In chronicling the number of armed warriors who joined David at Hebron, there is this exquisite line: "These men had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do." - I Chronicles 12:32 (KJV)

For roughly 4,000 years there has been "unrest" and war in the

Middle East. It possibly began when the ancient Israelites drove out the Canaanites, Hittites, Hivites, Perizzites, Girgashites, Amorites and Jebusites. Modern Israel is attempting to drive out Hezbollah-ites, Hamas-ites, Islamic Jihad-ites and the rest.

Nothing has changed, except Israel may be in greater peril today than at any time in its modern history. That is because Israel, often under pressure from its "ally" the United States, has bought into the fiction that says giving Israel's declared enemies the land they demand will cause those enemies to suddenly beat their swords into ploughshares and study war no more. The more Israel gives, the more her enemies feel emboldened to take away. It's called appeasement and it never works.

When Israel pulled out of Gaza, I predicted terrorists would move in and begin firing rockets into Israeli towns. It doesn't take someone with the vision of a biblical prophet to forecast the obvious. The rockets hitting Israel from Lebanon are coming from territory previously occupied by the Israel Defense Forces, which the IDF had entered in response to earlier shelling. Too many, whether in Europe, the worthless U.N., or the U.S. State Department - even many Israelis - do not understand the temper of the times.

Israel's enemies are all of the same piece by whatever name they call themselves. There are no "moderates," at least none who have the power to make peace. The idea of a "two-state solution" with a Palestinian state living alongside Israel was always a pipe dream concocted by secular Westerners. They accept a false doctrine that says the enemies of Israel (and America) can be placated by people they regard as "infidels."

Hezbollah runs a television station in Lebanon. A visit to the Middle East Media Research Institute's Website (Memritv.org) found a number of interesting clips. Hezbollah Secretary General Hassan Nasrallah says, "We prefer death and martyrdom over American guarantees." Nasrallah survived an Israeli air strike on his headquarters in Southern Lebanon. He declared "all-out-war" against Israel. There's a film for children that speaks of Jews turning into apes and pigs. Lebanese students at a Hezbollah TV symposium say, "we should fight the Jews and burn them like Hitler. Israel should be wiped off the map."

The head of "Radio Islam" in Sweden said on Hezbollah TV, "The Muslims' war is with the Jews." In Europe, Islamic influence is growing due to the spinelessness of government leaders.

There is another

What's Inside . . .

- Labor Day**
- Education**
- Hollywood**
- Pacifists**
- Stem Cell Veto**
- Democrats & War**
- Media Threat**

danger and that is the fantasy that elections will produce leaders within Islamic fanaticism who will be committed to real democracy, pluralism and tolerance. Last Friday, New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman wrote: "What we are seeing in Iraq, the Palestinian territories and Lebanon is an effort by Islamist parties to use elections to pursue their long-term aim of Islamizing the Arab-Muslim world. This is not a conflict about Palestinian or Lebanese prisoners in Israel. This is a power struggle within Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq over who will call the shots in their newly elected 'democratic' governments and whether they will be real democracies."

It's not only about "Islamizing" the Arab-Muslim world, but the entire world.

The turmoil in the Middle East will not stay in the Middle East. **This is a world war and the first shots have already been fired in Europe and America.** - Cal Thomas, *townhall.com*, 7/18/06

BRITISH THWART TERRORIST PLOT

LONDON - British police said Thursday, Aug. 10, they thwarted a terrorist plot, possibly just days away, to blow up U.S.-bound jetliners over the Atlantic and kill thousands. Chilling accounts leaked by investigators described a plan on the scale of Sept. 11 that would use liquid explosives concealed as everyday carry-on items and common electronic devices to bring down 10 planes in a nearly simultaneous strike.

The bombs were to be assembled on the aircraft apparently using a liquid explosive - most likely peroxide - and detonated by such devices as a disposable camera or a music player, two American law enforcement officials told The Associated Press. The officials spoke on condition of anonymity because Britain asked that no information be released.

A federal law enforcement official in Washington said that at least one martyrdom tape was found during ongoing raids, across England on Thursday. Such a tape, as well as the scheme to strike a range of targets at roughly the same time, is an earmark of al-Qaida.

British authorities arrested 24 people based partly on intelligence from Pakistan, where authorities detained up to three others several days earlier. More arrests were expected, the official said. The suspects were believed to be mainly British Muslims, at least some of Pakistani ancestry.

The official said some suspects were cruising the Internet looking for flights to the United States for several different days in recent weeks. He said some had gone to Pakistan recently.

American investigators praised Britain for preventing a catastrophe. "If this plot had actually occurred, the world would have stood still," Mark Mershon, assistant director of the FBI, told the AP in New York. . . .

The raids in Britain on Thursday followed a months-long investigation, but U.S. intelligence officials said authorities moved quickly after learning the plotters hoped to stage a practice run within two days, with the actual attack expected just days after that.

The test run was designed to see whether the plotters would be able to smuggle the needed materials aboard the planes, the officials said, speaking on condition of anonymity. Security experts warned it was possible attackers could hide their bomb ingredients in containers for talcum powder or medicine bottles and then assemble the weapon once behind a locked restroom door.

U.S. counterterrorism officials said United, American, and Continental airlines bound for New York, Washington and California were targeted by the terrorists. Los Angeles Mayor Antonion Villaraigosa said the individuals plotted to detonate liquid explosive devices on as

many as 10 aircraft bound for the United States.

"This nation is at war with Islamic fascists who will use any means to destroy those of us who love freedom, to hurt our nation," President Bush declared.

The plane bombings could have come just ahead of the fifth anniversary of the Sept. 11 attacks carried out by al-Qaida. The terror group's leader Osama bin Laden and his No. 2, Ayman al-Zawahri, are believed hiding along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border and have repeatedly issued tapes threatening new attacks.

"In terms of scale, it was probably designed to be...a new Sept. 11," said Jean-Charles Brisard, a French private investigator who works with lawyers of many Sept. 11 victims, "it involved the same tools, the same transportation tools and devices."

The close call also shifted attention once more to Britain's Islamic community just over a year after the London transit attacks. Three Britons of Pakistani descent and a Jamaican convert to Islam carried out those deadly bombings with a peroxide-based explosive that trained operatives can make using ordinary ingredients such as hair bleach.

In Pakistan, an intelligence official said the arrest of an Islamic militant near that border several weeks ago played a role in "unearthing the plot." The official, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said some suspects arrested in Britain were linked to al-Qaida. However, authorities stopped short of accusing al-Qaida directly for the plot. - *Earthlink*, 8/10/06

ISLAMISTS: WHAT THEY WANT

"What do they want?" It's a query we hear a lot these days. By "they," of course, the questioner means the suicide bombers, the masked men in the videotape decapitating a hostage, the goose-stepping, black-clad legions parading with AK-47s. "They" call themselves Hamas, al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, the Muslim Brotherhood, Jamaat-Islamiyah, the Mahdi Army or any of a dozen other names for violent terror groups operating with impunity around the world.

Five years ago next month, "they" were al Qaeda -- thrust onto center stage aboard four aircraft, turned into deadly missiles. This past spring, "they" were Hamas terrorists, firing lethal Qassam rockets from Gaza into neighborhoods in southern Israel. This week, it's Hezbollah -- the Iranian-armed and directed movement in Lebanon that ignited the current round of violence in the Middle East.

Some of the "theys" are Sunni Muslim. Others are Shia. In most of the world they are theological adversaries -- with a long sanguinary history of fratricide far bloodier than anything experienced in the Christian schism between Catholics and Protestants. In nearly every case, "they" have foundations in a local grievance, recruit followers by emphasizing perceived wrongs and have charismatic leaders who promote "martyrdom" as a means of making things right.

Regardless of origin -- Sunni or Shia -- "they" share critical common ground. They all despise Judeo-Christian values, institutions and individuals and are committed to "ridding" Islamic lands of Western "occupation." They are all "non-state" entities -- claiming independence of any government -- but rely on support from radical Islamic entities awash in petro-dollars. All carry out attacks with ruthless brutality without regard for their victims. All regard Israel and America as abominations, share the aim of "liberating" Jerusalem and envision a caliphate that extends from Casablanca in the west to Indonesia in the east. That is "what they want."

Unfortunately, in this era of shallow "sound-bite" journalism and drive-by "action" coverage, these objectives -- routinely specified in the writings, speeches and sermons of radical Islamic political leaders

and clerics -- are widely ignored by the masters of our mainstream media or dismissed as the ranting of fanatics with few followers. The consequence is a woefully uninformed public -- and an electorate so ignorant of reality that western political leaders can promote simplistic solutions like this week's calls for an immediate cease-fire, intensive diplomacy and the introduction of an international peacekeeping force leading to a negotiated end to the strife.

This theme, repeated in today's newspapers, magazines, newscasts and political stump speeches, is a minor variation on the kind of thinking that succeeded so brilliantly with Adolf Hitler. He too had written and spoken widely of his aspirations for global domination and ethnic cleansing. Yet, even after he had re-armed and commenced fulfilling his twisted dreams of "purification" and expansion, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain was able to proclaim "peace for our time," after returning from Munich in September 1938. Less than a year later, the Fuhrer plunged the world into a global conflagration. The willful ignorance of weak-willed democratic leaders bent on appeasing evil did not spare their populations then -- nor will it today.

Those leading the call for the Israelis to cease their aggression in Lebanon and start immediate talks leading to a broader Middle East peace -- all part of the lexicon today -- need a healthy dose of reality. There is no "Middle East Peace" to keep.

Here at home, Sen. Richard "Dick" Durbin, D-Ill., Rep. Dennis Kucinich, D-Ohio, and others in the "cut and run from Iraq" crowd in the U.S. Congress, are urging that the United States "reign Israel in" -- force them to "stop the shooting" by cutting off deliveries of fuel, ordnance and spare parts for the U.S.-made weapons and equipment used by the Israel Defense Forces. They claim that doing so will make it possible for the immediate introduction of a U.N.-sponsored peacekeeping force.

Though this course of action would indeed bring about a short-term cessation of hostilities, it is nonsense. U.N. "peacekeepers" have failed miserably at keeping peace, or preventing radical Islamic terrorists from recruiting, training or firing rockets into Israel from U.N.-run refugee camps. Though a strong, well-armed, competently-led multi-national intervention force is going to be essential in Lebanon, deploying such a corps is going to take weeks, not days.

In Washington, London, Paris, Rome and moderate Islamic capitals, there is a desperate need to see the crisis in Lebanon for what it is -- the latest battle in the global war on Islamo-Nazi terror. Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah-- the Iranian-puppet who heads Hezbollah -- has ambitions to become the dominant political force in Lebanon and establish Beirut as another capital in a Shia-dominated caliphate -- but ultimately, he dances to Tehran's tune.

Stopping the Israelis from destroying Hezbollah's military capability will, in the short term, significantly endanger the troops in a multi-national intervention force. The destruction of the U.S. Marine and French paratrooper barracks in Beirut in October 1983 should have taught us that much. Worse, if Hezbollah -- and their Iranian Pasdaran allies -- are allowed to retain their arms and bases in the Biq'a Valley, it will lead to far greater bloodshed for the Israelis, Lebanese and Americans in the future if Iran succeeds in acquiring nuclear weapons. - Oliver North, *townhall.com*, 8/4/06

THE AXIS OF EVIL

Terrorism: Connections between **Iraq, Iran, and North Korea** only grow.

Hezbollah's missile attacks on Israel have made clear the relationship between Hezbollah and Iran's mullahs. Those who studied Lebanon prior to the Hezbollah provocation of mid-July understood

the relationship between Tehran and Nasrallah's jihadists, but large parts of world opinion were ignorant of the Iranian proxy operating in Beirut and throughout south Lebanon.

Now when Israel's Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni declares that "Hezbollah is the long arm of Iran," no one disputes her - and clarity regarding Hezbollah should lead to clarity as to Iran, and by extension, the stakes in Iraq.

From 9/11 forward, America has faced a three-front war against al-Qaeda terror (Sunni extremism), Iranian terror and ambitions (Shia extremism), and rogue dictatorships with the capacity for great evil (Saddam's Iraq and North Korea).

Each of these threats was and remains distinct, but each was capable of coordination with the other. All but Saddam continue to support one another, if only because the forces required to confront them draw upon America's strength.

Now at last, America may begin to understand deeply the ambitions of Iran's mullahs, and to grasp why the letters from Iran's President Ahmadinejad to President Bush, Chancellor Merkel, and President Chirac are not the ravings of a nutter, but the expressions of fatalism of a fanatic.

Hezbollah is deeply entrenched and abundantly armed. Iran made it so.

The massacres in Baghdad are not al-Qaeda alone, but Iranian-orchestrated in part to sow more chaos and instability.

The representatives of the mullahs are said to have been in North Korea for the launching of the missiles that outraged the world.

The battles in Lebanon are just another particularly dramatic battle in a world war that only weeks ago saw another bloody attack in Mumbai, India.

Even as the Senate Democratic leader, Harry Reid, urged again that America cut and run from Iraq, Hezbollah has driven home the lesson that the war waits for no country. It cannot be avoided by retreat, no matter how alluring a dream that might present. - Hugh Hewitt, *WORLD*, 8/5/06

CAN A MUSLIM BE A GOOD AMERICAN?

Written by Dr. A. Shorosh, a former Muslim who converted to Christianity.

- Theologically, No, Because his allegiance is to Allah, the moon god of Arabia.
- Scripturally, No, Because his allegiance is to the five pillars of Islam and the Quran.
- Geographically, No, Because his allegiance is to Mecca, to which he turns in prayer five times a day.
- Socially, No, Because his allegiance to Islam forbids him to make friends with Christians or Jews.
- Politically, No, Because he must submit to the mullah (spiritual leaders), who teach annihilation of Israel and destruction of America, the great Satan.
- Domestically, No, Because he is instructed to marry four women and beat and scourge his wife when she disobeys him.
- Intellectually, No, Because he cannot accept the American Constitution since it is based on Biblical principles, and he believes the Bible to be corrupt.
- Philosophically, No, Because Islam, Muhammad, and the Quran do not allow freedom of religion and expression. Democracy and Islam cannot co-exist. Every Muslim government is either dictatorial or autocratic.

• Spiritually, No, Because when we declare "one nation under God," The Christian's God is loving and kind, while Allah is NEVER referred to as our heavenly father, nor is he ever called love in the Quran. - *Plains Baptist Challenger*, 4/06

LABOR DAY: MEN NOT AT WORK

This article from Monday's edition of *The New York Times* is a sign of deep cultural distress -- of men without any sense of shame for not working. In "Men Not Working, And Not Wanting Just Any Job," reporters Louis Uchitelle and David Leonhardt tell an amazing story.

Alan Beggerow has stopped looking for work. Laid off as a steelworker at 48, he taught math for a while at a community college. But when that ended, he could not find a job that, in his view, was neither demeaning nor underpaid.

So instead of heading to work, Mr. Beggerow, now 53, fills his days with diversions: playing the piano, reading histories and biographies, writing unpublished Western potboilers in the Louis L'Amour style -- all activities once relegated to spare time. He often stays up late and sleeps until 11 a.m.

"I have come to realize that my free time is worth a lot to me," he said. To make ends meet, he has tapped the equity in his home through a \$30,000 second mortgage, and he is drawing down the family's savings, at the rate of \$7,500 a year. About \$60,000 is left. His wife's income helps them scrape by. "If things really get tight," Mr. Beggerow said, "I might have to take a low-wage job, but I don't want to do that."

Millions of men like Mr. Beggerow -- men in the prime of their lives, between 30 and 55 -- have dropped out of regular work. They are turning down jobs they think beneath them or are unable to find work for which they are qualified, even as an expanding economy offers opportunity to work.

The very fact that *The New York Times* finds this phenomenon to be of front-page interest tells us something. Such complacency -- matched to an idea that many jobs are just beneath consideration -- flies in the face of our cultural work ethic, such as it is.

For the Christian, of course, the issue is far deeper. We understand that men were made for work, and that a man's responsibility is to care and provide for his wife and family.

As the Apostle Paul wrote to Timothy: *"But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."*

Thus, the Christian worldview sees work as a man's assignment -- and as a Gospel issue. One who fails in this responsibility by complacency and sloth does injury to the Gospel and the cause of Christ.

Manhood and masculinity are in crisis, but those at the center of the crisis seem rather unconcerned. Or, at least not concerned to the point that they would take a job they consider beneath them. - *AlbertMohler.com*, 8/4/06 See Proverbs 19:15

EVOLUTIONISTS AFRAID OF THE STUDENTS

Given the public bluster of the evolutionary establishment, one would think that these scientists and teachers of science would be up to any challenge to their cherished evolutionary orthodoxy. If they are so certain that their theory is correct and their worldview is superior, why are they so afraid to have the issues debated before the public?

Now, it appears that these teachers are even afraid of their students. *The Los Angeles Times* offers a report that, taken seriously, makes science teachers appear to be intimidated by a group of querulous adolescents.

Two decades of political and legal maneuvering on evolution

has spilled over into public schools, and biology teachers are struggling to respond. Loyal to the accounts they've learned in church, students are taking it upon themselves to wedge creationism into the classroom, sometimes with snide comments but also with sophisticated questions -- and a fervent faith. As sophomore Daniel Read put it: "I'm going to say as much about God as I can in school, even if the teachers can't." Such challenges have become so disruptive that some teachers dread the annual unit on evolution -- or skip it altogether. In response, the American Assn. for the Advancement of Science is distributing a 24-page guide to teaching the scientific principles behind evolution, starting in kindergarten. The group also has issued talking points for teachers flustered by demands to present "both sides."

Ah, yes. Those pesky teenagers just won't buy into the theory that they, and all their peers, are accidents produced by purely natural causes.

*About half of all Americans dismiss as preposterous the scientific consensus that life on Earth evolved from a common ancestor over millions of years. Some hold to a literal reading of Genesis: God created the universe about 6,000 years ago. Others accept an ancient cosmos but take the variety, complexity and beauty of Earth's creatures as proof that life was crafted by an intelligent designer. Religious accounts of life's origins have generally been kept out of the science classroom, sometimes by court order. But polls show a majority of Americans are unhappy with the evolution-only approach. - *AlbertMohler.com*, 4/3/06*

CHAOS ON AMERICA'S COLLEGE CAMPUSES

What can explain the chaos on America's elite college campuses? The undeniable fact is that education is in big trouble. Americans now lack any common conception of education in terms of its content or its process. The elite academic institutions of the nation have been taken hostage to the postmodern worldview and the educational system seems trapped in a web of confusion and politics. There is little hope for a secular recovery. The major institutions of higher education are now almost entirely captive to radical perspectives and the secular ideologies that compete for primacy on each campus. Though stalwart conservative professors continue to fight the good fight in these schools, they are outnumbered and outgunned.

This is a good time to remember that the Christian church has been the central patron of education in Western civilization. It was the church that developed the schools, established the medieval universities, and founded most of the great colleges and universities of this nation. The loss of so many great institutions should serve as a warning and an example -- it will happen to any school that severs its commitments to Christian faith.

Far too many Christians neglect to pay attention to what is distinctively Christian about Christian education. In Romans 12:2, Paul wrote, "And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God." That powerful sentence represents the very heart of Christian education. Rather than conforming to the prevailing worldview of the secular culture, Christian education is to be transformative -- demonstrating the power of God's truth in human lives.

A true Christian education is like a light shining in the darkness. In a day when the prevailing secular culture is not even certain that truth exists, Christian education is established in the name and to the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" . . .

While secular worldviews attract the attention of so many in the

academy, an authentically Christian education must take root among God's people. Christians must learn once again to be thinking disciples, constantly at work learning God's truth for God's glory. - Albert Mohler.com, 4/5/06

TV PROMOTES SIN AMONG CHILDREN

A study published earlier this year found that "movies, television, music and magazines are fueling promiscuity in children aged 12-15" ("TV Promotes Promiscuity," Lifesite, March 23). Scientists associated with the University of North Carolina studied the effect of the media on more than 1,000 children and young teens. The study reported "that the majority of the 264 media sources examined found sexually-charged situations were almost always between unmarried couples and usually portrayed sex as risk-free." It called the media a "**Sexual Super Peer**" with an influence "at least equal to religion or the relationship between the child and parents." There should be no surprise in this study for Bible believers. I have never known of parents who regretted discarding the television or at least setting the strictest controls on it. - David Cloud, *Christian News*, 7/17/06

HOLLYWOOD WILL NOT POLICE ITSELF

On June 15, President Bush held a signing ceremony at the White House for the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act, a new law increasing the maximum fine for indecent TV programming tenfold, from \$32,500 to \$325,000 per violation.

The president knows the problem. The current maximum "is meaningless. It's relatively painless for them when they violate decency standards. And so the Congress decided to join the administration and do something about it. . . The Congress got serious."

It may have taken three years too many, but when Congress finally acted, it did so in an overwhelmingly bi-partisan fashion seldom seen in Washington anymore. The House bill passed by a 397 to 35 margin. The Senate version sailed through unanimously.

And why not? The public, in red and blue states alike, is fed up with the raw sexual sewage and graphic violence being poured onto the airwaves they own. A December Associated Press poll found 66 percent of those surveyed said there was too much sex on TV, and 68 percent said there was too much violence. Other polls have pegged public disgust in the 80- and 90-percent levels.

In that sense, it was a no-brainer vote, but this is Washington, D.C., where nothing is simple, and ultimately, it also took real courage. Credit should flow to the Congress and the president for risking offending a very powerful lobby in the broadcasters, who not only broadcast filthy entertainment, but also broadcast the news, which helps people decide who to elect to the Congress and the presidency. - Brent Bozell, *Conservative Chronicle*, 6/16/06

PACIFISTS VERSUS PEACE

One of the many failings of our educational system is that it sends out into the world people who cannot tell rhetoric from reality. They have learned no systematic way to analyze ideas, derive their implications and test those implications against hard facts.

"Peace" movements are among those who take advantage of this widespread inability to see beyond rhetoric to realities. Few people even seem interested in the actual track record of so-called "peace" movements -- that is, whether such movements actually produce peace or war.

Take the Middle East. People are calling for a cease-fire in the interests of peace. But there have been more cease-fires in the Middle East than anywhere else. If cease-fires actually promoted peace, the

Middle East would be the most peaceful region on the face of the earth instead of the most violent.

Was World War II ended by cease-fires or by annihilating much of Germany and Japan? Make no mistake about it, innocent civilians died in the process. Indeed, American prisoners of war died when we bombed Germany. . . .

There was a time when it would have been suicidal to threaten, much less attack, a nation with much stronger military power because one of the dangers to the attacker would be the prospect of being annihilated.

"World opinion," the U.N. and "peace movements" have eliminated that deterrent. An aggressor today knows that if his aggression fails, he will still be protected from the full retaliatory power and fury of those he attacked because there will be hand-wringers demanding a cease fire, negotiations and concessions.

That has been a formula for never-ending attacks on Israel in the Middle East. The disastrous track record of that approach extends to other times and places -- but who looks at track records?

The most catastrophic result of "peace" movements was World War II. While Hitler was arming Germany to the teeth, "peace" movements in Britain were advocating that their own country disarm "as an example to others."

British Labor Party Members of Parliament voted consistently against military spending and British college students publicly pledged never to fight for their country. If "peace" movements brought peace, there would never have been World War II.

Not only did that war lead to tens of millions of deaths, it came dangerously close to a crushing victory for the Nazis in Europe and the Japanese empire in Asia. And we now know that the United States was on Hitler's timetable after that

.For the first two years of that war, the Western democracies lost virtually every battle, all over the world, because pre-war "peace" movements had left them with inadequate military equipment and much of it obsolete. The Nazis and the Japanese knew that. That is why they launched the war.

"Peace" movements don't bring peace, but war. - Thomas Sowell, *townhall.com*, 7/21/06

ECONOMIC SUNSHINE

We interrupt your usually depressing news to bring you some developments that will give Americans cause to be optimistic about our economy.

I know this runs against the grain of the fearmongering we have been hearing from Wall Street and the whiners and complainers in Washington, but several things happened two weeks ago that suggest this country is definitely moving in the right direction.

The government reports tax revenues are significantly higher than anticipated, cutting the budget deficit much more deeply than forecast. Unemployment has fallen to a low 4.6 percent after 34 consecutive months of continued job growth. The economy was growing at a blistering 5.6 percent rate in the first quarter, and the U.S. Treasury reports total worker compensation (including wages and benefits) grew 7.4 percent after inflation during the current expansion.

Unsurprisingly, the Gallup Poll also reported two weeks ago that President Bush's job approval rating, in the low 30s for months, has risen to 40 percent. That's still way below his peak of previous years, but a sign he is turning his presidency around in his second term. - Donald Lambro, *Washington Times Weekly*, 7/24/06 (Things are often not as bad as they seem. God is good. We should continue to pray for our President. - N.P.)

THE BUSH VETO

Yesterday President Bush vetoed a bill that, had it become law, would have deeply eroded respect for human life. It was a courageous act because there was enormous pressure on him to agree to fund more embryo-destructive research.

After vetoing this bill, the president signed one for funding research into methods of creating pluripotent stem cells -- the kind that can be turned into many types of body tissue without creating or killing human embryos.

Not surprisingly, there was an outpouring of vitriol directed not only against the president but also against conservative Christians. A full-page ad in the *New York Times*, funded by a liberal front group called DefConAmerica, screamed, "The religious right is imposing its will on all Americans. . . That loud noise you hear is the wall between church and state crumbling."

Wait a minute. Aren't Christians allowed to have a voice in politics like everybody else, or has the First Amendment been repealed?

Other critics claim Bush is anti-science. The bill he vetoed was about funding, not banning research -- billions in taxpayer money for something private companies refuse to support. Why? Because the prospects of it leading to any cures are very poor. As President Reagan said when he outlawed stem-cell research: If private companies won't put up their money, why should the taxpayers? Good question.

Another argument we hear is that embryonic stem-cell researchers only want to use so-called "spare" embryos left over from *in vitro* fertilization. False: Many researchers really want to engage in so-called "therapeutic cloning" -- the cloning of huge numbers of embryos in the attempt to find cures for diseases, to which the bill the president vetoed would have opened the door.

Another false claim is that we ought to proceed with this research because everybody else is doing it. That would be news in Canada, Norway, Switzerland, and Australia, where cloning research is illegal. Both Germany and France have embraced the same position President Bush has.

The supporters of embryo-destructive research want to cross a great moral divide. They are seeking not only to destroy human life made in God's image but also to manufacture life made in man's image. Tragically, we are losing this fight, however, because too few people understand the issues. - Chuck Colson, *townhall.com*, 7/20/06

AL GORE'S GLOBAL 'TRUTH'

"Scientists have an independent obligation to respect and present the truth as they see it,' Al Gore sensibly asserts in his film 'An Inconvenient Truth.' With that outlook in mind, what do world climate experts actually think about the science of his movie?

"Professor Bob Carter of the Marine Geophysical Laboratory at James Cook University in Australia gives . . . a surprising assessment: 'Gore's circumstantial arguments are so weak that they are pathetic. It is simply incredible that they and his film are commanding public attention.'

"But surely Carter is merely part of what most people regard as a tiny cadre of 'climate change skeptics' who disagree with the 'vast majority of scientists,' Gore cites?

"No; Carter is one of hundreds of highly qualified . . . climate experts who contest the hypothesis that human emissions . . . are causing significant global climate change. "Climate experts ' is the operative term here. Why? Because what Gore's 'majority of scientists' think is immaterial when only a very small fraction of them actually work in the climate field." - Tom Harris in the *Canada Free Press*, 6/15 quoted in *WTW*, 6/26-7/2/06

CHRISTIAN PRISON PROGRAM OUTLAWED

Evidently it matters not that a well-known and highly successful prison ministry believes one of its premier programs is constitutional and well within the guidelines of the First Amendment, or that statistics bear out the effectiveness of the program. A federal judge has ruled the program is unconstitutional -- and now the program that equips prisoners to reenter society successfully is in jeopardy.

A federal judge has ruled that an Iowa prison program that involves inmates immersing themselves in evangelical Christianity is unconstitutional and must be shut down. Associated Press reports that Judge Robert Pratt, in a ruling expected to have national implications, said Prison Fellowship's InnerChange Freedom Initiative amounts to a government establishment of religion.

Pratt ruled that the Iowa Department of Corrections must close the program within 60 days and that \$1.5 million in contract payments must be returned to state officials, but he suspended those orders while an appeal is pending.

Prison Fellowship, which sponsors similar programs in Texas, Minnesota, Kansas and Arkansas, argued that the Iowa program is voluntary and has secular benefits. The ministry claims the program has produced "dramatic results" in the lives of hardened criminals and has been effective in stopping what it describes as "the revolving door of crime." - *Religion Today*

Editor's Comments: This case could very well determine whether or not Christians will have access to the USA's prison system which now houses in excess of 2.2 million inmates.

The AUCS, headed by former ACLU lawyer and clergyman Barry Lynn, is doing all it can do to get Christian influence out of the public arena. Their distorted view of the First Amendment serves as their rally cry in a full-court press to stifle the voice of Christians in the nation's life and business. - *Sword of the Lord*, 7/14/06

WAR CRIMES

Politics: Democrats cannot bring themselves to condemn terror.

"I don't take sides for or against Hezbollah; I don't take sides for or against Israel." Those are the words of Michigan Democratic Congressman John Dingell, spoken on Detroit television and now available via You Tube to the entire world. They are so outlandishly void of moral content that you have to listen repeatedly to grasp that Dingell really is saying he's not against the terrorist organization that killed 241 U.S. soldiers and Marines in 1983, and which for the past three weeks has been launching rockets at the civilian population of Israel. The use of indiscriminate weapons is a war crime, recognized as such by international law. But one of the most senior Democrats in Congress cannot bring himself to declare himself against Hezbollah.

Not only will Dingell not be shunned by his caucus, if the Nancy Pelosi-John Murtha Democrats triumph in the fall and gain back their majority in the House, Dingell will be the chair of the powerful Energy and Commerce Committee.

Though Dingell's outrageous moral equivalence and his party's silence about it shocks, it should not surprise. On the last day of July the congressional Democratic leadership declared that it stands united for retreat from Iraq beginning immediately. "Their action puts party leaders on the same page," *The Washington Post* reported, "and it helps clarify the Nov. 7 election as a choice between a party seeking a timeline for withdrawing troops from an unpopular war and a party resisting any such timetable."

And those are the moderate Democrats. The Iraq War Powers Repeal Act of 2006, introduced by Lynn Woolsey (D-Calif.) July 25,

has 22 co-sponsors. "It's become very clear that we're not in war," Woolsey asserted. "We're occupying Iraq and the president never came to us and asked us for permission."

Some Democrats can't brand terrorists as terrorists. Some Democrats don't believe we are in a war. Most Democrats at a minimum want to cut and run from a conflict over the future security of this country against the same jihadists who have struck again and again around the globe. - Hugh Hewitt, *WORLD*, 8/12/06 (**This November we will decide whether to trust our security to "Cut and Run" Democrats or "Fight to the Finish" Republicans. - N.P.**)

MEDIA: THE REAL THREAT TO AMERICA

Sometimes you have to just wonder if these liberal geniuses at the *New York Times* and elsewhere have the slightest scintilla of common sense, let alone good-will. At a time when the global conspiracy of Islamic terrorists to wage war against the civilized world is on display for all to see in Israel, the *New York Times* chooses, once again, to downplay -- if not dismiss -- that threat and instead, demonize President Bush.

For several years the Democratic leadership and the mainstream media have been depicting President Bush as a power-hungry executive who "tramples on" the Constitution. But the *New York Times*, in its July 16 editorial, wrote, "It is only now, nearly five years after Sept. 11, that the full picture of the Bush administration's response to the terror attacks is becoming clear. Much of it, we can see now, had far less to do with fighting Osama bin Laden than with expanding presidential power."

Maybe Charlie Sheen has become a shadow member of the editorial board. Sheen, you will recall, recently demonstrated he had his father's penchant for radical left-lunacy when he hinted that a U.S. government conspiracy was behind the 9/11 attacks. Twenty Muslim hijackers just couldn't have pulled off the attacks absent collusion with the government.

Well, go ahead and write Sheen off as a fringe leftist kook if you choose, but when the leading liberal editorial page of the nation is saying things just as maliciously preposterous, it's hard to describe far-left kooks as "fringe" anymore.

To say that Bush has been aggressive in the war on terror as a means to gaining more power for himself and not to defeat the terrorist threat is shockingly paranoid. And there's more. The *Times* cites a piece by Jane Mayer in the *New Yorker* describing how this grandiose Bush scheme to usurp power from the other two branches of government "grew out of Vice President Dick Cheney's long and deeply held conviction that the real lesson of Watergate and the later Iran-contra debacle was that the president needed more power and that Congress and the courts should get out of the way. To a disturbing degree, the horror of 9/11 became an excuse to take up this cause behind the shield of Americans' deep insecurity."

Folks, if this doesn't give you insight into leftist thinking today and the obstacles we face among our own people in the war on terror, perhaps nothing will. While you're trying to figure out whether it was the sinister Cheney or the hapless Bush who hatched this scheme to ratchet-up executive power, you might ponder what motive either has to expand the presidency, since Bush will be out in two years and Cheney has no presidential aspirations. As a gift to Hillary, perhaps?

The *Times'* Bush/Cheney paranoia is only exceeded by its misapprehension of the nature of the terrorist threat. What it really appears exercised about -- beyond its sheer hatred for George Bush -- is that we are treating terrorists as the enemy instead of criminal defendants who are entitled to the full spectrum of constitutional rights.

The *Times* is furious that President Bush eavesdrops on these people without a warrant, tracks their finances and maintains the Geneva Conventions don't apply to them.

The editors wrote, "Undoing the Geneva Conventions would further endanger the life of every member of the American military who might ever be taken captive in the future." Excuse me, but how could anyone who understands the terrorist mindset believe that by showing kindness to terrorists they'll pose less of a danger to American soldiers captured in the future? Terrorists don't negotiate, and they don't abide by rules or "conventions;" they torture and slaughter human beings for sport.

And our refusal to extend the Geneva Conventions to those not covered by them now and who themselves don't honor them will certainly not cause any civilized enemies we may encounter in the future to mistreat our troops. Of course, the idea that we're going to have civilized enemies in the foreseeable future is pure fantasy.

The *Times* wants Congress to condemn President Bush for his "excesses," including his treatment of Gitmo detainees. It sees his refusal to extend the Geneva Conventions to the terrorists as part of his executive arrogance rather than a good faith, reasonable, and much more commonsensical view of the Conventions than that of the majority of the Supreme Court.

That's because it regards Bush, not Osama bin Laden and his armies, as the real threat to America. And that tells you all you need to know about the *Times*. - David Limbaugh, *Conservative Chronicle*, 7/26/06

DA VINCI FILM FUNDED BY MUSLIM MONEY

The chairman of the Christian Film and Television Commission says *The Da Vinci Code* is an anti-Christian and anti-Semitic film that was financed by a British Muslim. Ted Baehr says Mohammed Yusef's Invicta Capital put up most of the estimated \$200 million it cost to make the film version of Dan Brown's novel. Baehr told reporters at a Washington news conference, "I think it's a very serious problem when people start funding movies and books to attack somebody else's religious faith." He said the financial backing for *The Da Vinci Code* reveals "a terrible double standard" by Muslims, who erupt in violent protests when they believe their own faith is being attacked. - Agape Press

Editor's Comments: So now we get an even clearer view of the *Da Vinci* thing! Muslim money funded this major attack on the Christian faith! - *Sword of the Lord*, 8/11/06

HEALTHY, WEALTHY, AND WISE

A quiet revolution in aging has occurred in this country over the last half-century, raising the quality of life for American seniors in almost every way imaginable. Seniors today are healthier, wealthier, and wiser than any previous generation could have envisioned.

Among the study's findings:

- The median net worth of Americans over 65 was \$108,885 in 2000. Even excluding home equity, the typical senior had a much higher net worth than the typical American under 45 had. In 1950, 35 percent of seniors lived in poverty; in 2003, only 10 percent did.

- Median household income for seniors almost doubled between 1967 and 2003, growing in inflation-adjusted dollars from \$12,882 to \$23,787.

- Only about a quarter of seniors rated their overall health as fair or poor in 2000, and the percentage of seniors who chose one of those two descriptions for their health steadily dropped during the

1990s.

■ Life expectancy rose from 68.2 years in 1950 to 76.9 in 2003, with further increases predicted.

■ Seventy-two percent of seniors had a high-school diploma in 2003, compared to 17 percent in 1950. Seventeen percent of seniors in 2003 had a bachelor's degree, while only 3 percent of their counterparts in 1950 had one.

■ Nineteen percent of male seniors were in the work force in 2003, compared to 46 percent in 1950 (although the study didn't measure rates of voluntarism among seniors, an unfortunate omission.)

The political debate in this country has not caught up with these facts, but it needs to catch up soon. The population of seniors will likely more than double between 2000 and 2030, and the costs of the entitlement programs that serve them will explode. "The aging of our society will have profound consequences for our future, and in fact it is not a very distant future," noted Louis Kincannon, director of the Census Bureau.

Unless young families start having a lot more children very quickly, the only true long-term way to keep Medicare and Social Security from swamping future workers is to increase the eligibility ages for those programs, especially Medicare. Polls, however, show that to be the single most unpopular reform option on the table.

As the Census study chronicled, society has been very good to seniors. The most important economic issue facing the United States is whether the relatively well-off senior population of the near future is prepared to be good to society in return. - Tim Lamer, *WORLD*, 4/1

CONFIRM BOLTON

For a year, John Bolton has served ably as ambassador to the United Nations, bringing common sense to a badly dysfunctional organization at a time of significant upheaval in world affairs. He needs, and deserves, Senate confirmation status to continue his invaluable work. The confirmation process began anew last week when the Senate opened hearings on Mr. Bolton's renomination, the completion of which should prompt a speedy confirmation vote. . . .

Mr. Bolton has advocated much-needed management reforms in the wake of the oil-for-food scandal; he has rightly shunned the new Human Rights Council as a tool of human-rights abusers, like Cuba and Libya, while simultaneously calling attention to genuine human-rights crises, like Darfur -- over which he sharply criticized U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan in February; and he remains a lonely advocate for Israel in a forum famously hostile to the U.S. ally. . . .

Even anti-Bush Democrats should realize that they're playing with fire if they undermine a standing U.N. ambassador as he handles Hezbollah, Iran and North Korea. - Editorial from *Washington Times Weekly*, 7/31/06

I need to purchase a new computer for CVN to replace the antiquated one we have used for many years to retrieve information and to prepare the paper for mailing. I hate to mention this, but if everyone who receives this and is able, would send \$10.00 once a year to our church to cover costs, I would never have to mention it again. Thanks to those who faithfully do this or more. - N.P.



Christian
View of the News

Bible Baptist Church
2780 Mt. Carmel Road
Hampton, GA 30228
Brad Blanton, Pastor
www.biblebaptistministries.com

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

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED