

Future NEWS

Volume 9, No. 5

May, 2005

TIME TO TAKE A STAND

“The proclamation of Christ’s coming should now be, as when made by the angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem, good tidings of great joy. Those who really love the Saviour cannot but hail with gladness the announcement founded upon the Word of God, that he in whom their hopes of eternal life are centered, is coming again, not to be insulted, despised, and rejected, as at his first advent, but in power and glory, to redeem his people. It is those who do not love the Saviour, that desire him to remain away; and there can be no more conclusive evidence that the churches have departed from God than the irritation and animosity excited by this Heaven-sent message.

“Those who accepted the Advent doctrine were roused to the necessity of repentance and humiliation before God. Many had long been halting between Christ and the world; ‘now they felt that it was time to take a stand. The things of eternity assumed to them an unwonted reality. Heaven was brought near, and they felt themselves guilty before God. Christians were quickened to new spiritual life. They were made to feel that time was short, that what they had to do for their fellow-men must be done quickly. Earth receded, eternity seemed to open before them, and the soul, with all that pertains to its immortal weal or woe, was felt to eclipse every temporal object.’ The Spirit of God rested upon them, and gave power to their earnest appeals to their brethren, as well as to sinners, to prepare for the day of God. The silent testimony of their daily life was a constant rebuke to formal and unconsecrated church-members. These did not wish to be disturbed in their pursuit of pleasure, their devotion to money-making, and their ambition for worldly honor. Hence the enmity and opposition excited against the Advent faith and those who proclaimed it.” *The Great Controversy*, 340.

Future for America produces and mails out a monthly newsletter and audio presentation in English and Spanish. For information you may contact the following brethren who are affiliated with this work:

Future News

PO Box 7

Bonnerdale, AR 71933

Telephone: 888-278-7744

Circulation Manager—Kathy Pippenger

Author & Speaker—Jeff Pippenger

JeffPippenger@msn.com

Editor--Bronwyn Peck

calica4@hotmail.com

Spanish Department—Al & Lupe Perez

Futuro de America

PO Box 353

Glenwood, AR 71943

Telephone: 870-356-7049

aperez77@alltel.net

Future News—Canada

Phyllis Vallieres

RR 3, 2552 Cooper Road

Madoc, Ontario, K0K 2K0, Canada

Telephone: 613-473-5332

FAX 613-473-5630

phylv@primus.ca

Future for America—Great Britain

Russell & Charmaine Williams

29 Lascelles Close

Leytonstone, London

Telephone: 0044-208-279-6903

judicium1844@aol.com

Future-Is-Now Germany

Pietruska Family & Blaesing Family

Hoehenweg 11

D-74613 Oehringen, Germany

Telephone: 0049-07941-9148-0

FAX 0049-07941-9148-3

architekt@w-blaesing.de

MISSION STATEMENT

The ministry of *Future for America* is to proclaim the final warning message of Revelation 14 as identified within the prophecies of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. The end-time fulfillment of Bible prophecy is no longer future—for it is taking place before our eyes. The historic, prophetic understanding of Seventh-day Adventism is now present truth. We are the final generation. Our emphasis on the prophetic word includes all the counsel of God's Word. To know what lies ahead is useless if we do not possess the experience to stand during these solemn times. Through obedience to God's law, and faith in the promises of God's Word, we are to receive that experience.

Coupled with the prophetic message, *Future for America* emphasizes all aspects of the medical missionary work. The "entering wedge"—medical missionary work—must be practiced by those who are to finish God's work in these final hours.

During this time period, country living becomes more essential with each passing moment. *Future for America* upholds and promotes this end-time truth. God's people must prepare for the coming storm, and that preparation includes the experience of learning how to survive in a simple fashion, away from the great centers of population.

Future for America intends to print and distribute truth-filled literature, while helping in parts of the Lord's vineyard where faithful brethren do not have the means to share prophecy and the present truth messages for Seventh-day Adventism today.

Future for America is a self-supporting 501-C3 non-profit corporation; funded by readers like you. The cost of this newsletter and audio-tape reaching a home is approximately \$3.50.

This publication is sent out free of charge. Your donations are greatly appreciated.

Five Sermons on Righteousness

By Alonzo T. Jones

**Presented at the Ottawa, Kansas Institute
and Campmeeting in May of 1889**

Attended by Ellen G. White

SERMON ONE

Matthew 6:33 “Seek ye first...his righteousness,” is the subject today. We notice first whose righteousness we are to seek. It is God’s. We must seek and find it or we will not be saved. Nothing else will avail. We must know, however, where to seek for it and how, because we often seek for it in the wrong place; for instance, as many do, in the law of God, and through keeping it. We will never find it there. That is not the place to seek for it. This is not saying that the righteousness of God is not there. The commandments are the righteousness of God, but we will never find it there. In Romans 2:17-18, we see that the law is clearly pointed out, through which, if we are instructed, we are called of God. Then they, being the will of God, it would be impossible for the Lord himself to be better than the Ten Commandments require us to be. The Lord’s will must be the expression of what he is himself; hence it is impossible he should be better than his law. To keep his commandments, then, means that we shall be as good as God is, so we read in 1 John 3:7: “He that doeth righteousness, is righteous even as he is righteous.” Now see Psalms 119:138, Deuteronomy 6:35, Isaiah 59:7—the people who do the law of God are righteous, even as God is righteous, then to keep them means that man must be like God in character. Then the righteousness of God is in his law, but it is not revealed to men by the law. Romans 1:16-17, the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel to men, and not in the law. It is in the law, but it is not revealed there to us because we are sinners,

and sin has so darkened our mind that we can not see it there, and therefore our vision has to be enlightened by some other means, which is the gospel, where we must seek for it, Romans 3:21. The righteousness of God is made known without the law. How? By faith in Jesus Christ, through the gospel, and not by the law. Now read again Romans 1:16-17, and this will be clear. To show this further, Romans 10:4. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth. Does not this say the same as the others? We have lost often the real point in this text to use it against those who claim the commandments are abolished, who claim Christ ended the law, and we claiming it means “the purpose of” the law, but the point in this text is that Christ is the purpose of the law “for righteousness” to us, as we can not get it by the law, Romans 8:3. The law was ordained to life, righteousness, holiness, justification, but because of sin it cannot be this to us, so what it cannot do Christ does for us. Then, if we seek it in the wrong place we lose the righteousness of Christ. Now, righteousness must come from the same source as does life; they are inseparable. Romans 8:3. Moses uses the terms here interchangeably, so also Galatians 3:21 showing that righteousness must come to us from the same source as life, and that is Christ. Romans 6:23: this we have always preached, but he said before this the wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life, and so we have always claimed eternal life to be a gift, but we have not claimed the same for righteousness as being a gift through Jesus Christ. Why was it necessary that something was given to have life? Because the wages of sin was death. If a law could give life, it would be by the law. If the law was a secondary form and God could have made another, and better, it would not suffice because if men could not keep an inferior law they could not keep a superior,

consequently no law could give the life. Therefore Christ came to be the purpose of the law to everyone that believeth. Now we want to see what righteousness there is in the law for us, and we will become convinced it is our own, which is the very best we can ever get out of the law. If I take the highest and most comprehensive view of the law I can, and live up to it, is that a satisfying of the law? No, because it is not a high enough view of it, because the mind is all darkened by sin, and man's comprehension is not broad enough to grasp the height and breadth of it, and so does not meet the requirements of the law. It is our own righteousness then, and not God's we see in the law and we see ourselves (the extent of our vision) and not the face of God. Often we think we do right and afterwards see it was not so. If it was God's righteousness at that time, God would be imperfect. It is only in Christ that we can ever see the righteousness of God. But God is the gospel and the gospel is Christ, and so by the law can no man be accounted righteous. We must then have something more than the law to enable us to understand God's righteousness and to comprehend the law. That something "is Christ Jesus in whom is the fullness of the Godhead bodily." I read now Romans 10:13; here we have a people seeking earnestly for righteousness. Where? Their own. Did they find it? No. Romans 9:31-32, being ignorant of Christ's righteousness. They would not believe Christ or Paul, but sought it by the works of the law. Now read verse 30; the Gentiles found it having faith, and not being satisfied with their own righteousness, as did the Pharisees who trusted in themselves that they were righteous. This, too, is where the law will bring us if we try to obtain righteousness through it, but when having faith in Christ, a man sees his sins and longs for the righteousness of God, knowing that it is the goodness, purity and righteousness of

Christ that makes him so, he will become righteous.

Philippians 3:4-9: here was a Pharisee who lived up to the broadest view of the law of God he could obtain and was blameless, yet he gave it all up for Christ. Galatians 2:2; if "righteousness come by the law then Christ is dead in vain," our own righteousness is all then we can get out of the law, and that the righteousness of God can come only by Jesus Christ. What is our own righteousness? Isaiah 64:5. Our righteousness is as filthy rags. We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God. What is sin? When Israel came out of Egypt, they knew not God, remembering only that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had a God, but knew nothing more. To make them understand their condition and what sin was he took one of their own words and applied it to his purpose. He took a word meaning "missed its mark" and used it to express sin. Now we have all sinned and come short—that is what Paul means—we have "missed the mark." Then the more righteousness of the law a man has the worse he is off—the more ragged is he. Now turn to Zechariah 3:1-8. Mrs. White declares this chapter to be a prophecy of this present time. Here we have Joshua standing clothed in his own righteousness and Christ takes it off and clothes him with the righteousness of God. Now Joshua had been doing the best he could, but would he have been saved? No. How often we hear people say "I do the best I can," and believe they will be saved. Joshua was reclothed and was to stand with the angels. If then our righteousness is all taken away and Christ clothes us with God's righteousness, then to walk in his law, we will stand with the angels. So then read Isaiah 54:17, first part. Christ, in all his references in the New Testament, repeats only what God had already spoken. Now Isaiah 61:10, that is the song we are to sing, therefore righteousness is the gift

of God as surely as is life, and if we try to get it in any other way we shall fail. In Romans 5:12-18, we read that as sin came by one, the righteousness of one brought the free gift of life upon men. So also Romans 3:21-26, it was to declare God's righteousness that Christ came. Now taking Romans 5:13-17 we find here a free gift and notice particularly verse 17. Righteousness is the gift of life to everyone who believeth, and Jesus Christ will ever be the purpose of the law to everyone who believeth. It is Christ's obedience that avails and not ours that brings righteousness to us. Well then let us stop trying to do the will of God in our own strength. Stop it all. Put it away from you for ever. Let Christ's obedience do it all for you and gain the strength to pull the bow so that you can hit the mark. Why did the Saviour come as an infant instead of a man? To die on the cross would have met the penalty. Because he lived a child and met all the temptations a child meets and never sinned—so that any child can stand in his place and resist in his strength; and he lived also as a youth, a man full grown, weaving for us a robe of righteousness to cover us (not to cover our filthy garments as that would be a mixture), takes the filthy garment away and puts his own in their place, so that all may have it if they will. Now if the righteousness is the gift of God, and comes by the gospel, then what is the use of the law? There are several, but they may be used wrongfully. The law entered that the offense might abound, Romans 3:19—the law speaks to sinners that all may become guilty before God to show people their guilt. Now verse 20, the law is to reveal sin to us—unrighteousness, not righteousness—Christ reveals the latter, the law the former. The law of God cannot allow a single sin in any degree whatever. If it did and condoned even a single thought that was not perfect it would sink a soul into perdition. The

law is perfect. If it accepts imperfection the Lord must accept it and admit that he is imperfect, because the law is the representation of his character. In the fact that the law demands perfection lies the hope of all mankind, because if it could overlook a sin to a single degree, no one could ever be free from sin, as the law would never make that sin known and it could never be forgiven, by which alone man can be saved. The day is coming when the law will have revealed the last sin and we will stand perfect before him and be saved with an eternal salvation. The perfection of the law of God is that it will show us all our sins, and then a perfect Saviour stands ready to take them all away. When God makes known all our sins it is not to condemn us, but to save us, so it is a token of his love for us, therefore, whenever a sin is made known to you, it is a token of God's love for you because the Saviour stands ready to take it away. That is why God has given us a Saviour and the gospel. He wants us all to believe in him, come to him and be saved. Read Matthew 5:6. Are there not many here who hunger and thirst for righteousness? Do you want to be filled? Look not then at the law, but the cross of Christ. Read Ephesians 3:14-19: rooted and grounded in faith through his love in our heart. Colossians 2:9-10, for we will be complete in Christ. There is a completeness, joy, peace, goodness, righteousness forever.

SERMON TWO

The subject is how to obtain that righteousness of which we read yesterday, the righteousness of God which only will avail. Romans 3:24, justified means accounted righteous. How? Freely. By what means? Grace. What is grace? Favor. Let us ever believe this text, holding fast to it forever. In regard to grace we read Romans 11:6, which means we are justified freely by his grace without works otherwise it is not grace.

Another reference, Ephesians 2:5,8,9. Now turn to Romans 4:4 with Romans 11:4. You see then why if it be our works it is no more of grace. If we have to work to obtain grace, then we bring the Lord in debt to us, and if he does not pay he does us injustice. To pay is not a favor, it is paying a debt. We are accounted righteous freely by his grace and that not of works. I read now Romans 9:1-2. Abraham was the father of all them that believe—the spiritual father. Can we expect to receive more than he did? If he was justified by works, he gloried in himself. Now put Romans 9:2 with 1 Corinthians 1:27-31. The Lord has arranged it that all should glorify him and not themselves because to glorify a sinner, a rebel, would not be proper for a government, allowing them to come back in harmony with it glorifying themselves. All the woes in the world came through Satan attempting to glorify himself. “I will be like the Most High.” To allow a sinner then to glorify himself would force pardon being extended to Satan, also. Now, Christ is made unto us righteousness and sanctification, and we glory in Christ and not ourselves. If we believe on him our faith is counted to us for righteousness. But can the Lord justify the ungodly? Yes, Christ came to justify sinners, so read carefully this verse, Romans 4:5. The first thing then to learn is that we are ungodly and confess it, and God will count him righteous. The Lord cannot justify and save any who cannot see their true condition. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine that need no repentance. The Saviour came not to call righteous but sinners to repentance, then none but sinners will be saved. Now Romans 4:16, “therefore it is of faith.” Why? That it might be by grace, “to the end that it may be sure.”

Faith is the easiest and most natural thing in the world. There is nothing wonderful

about faith, as some think, and say “I try to believe and if I can’t then how can I.” But we can believe God with the same faculties we believe others. Don’t try to believe—quit it—and believe. We either believe or don’t believe—then why not believe? Believe as a child, don’t reason it out. Faith goes in advance of reason, knowledge and all else. At school the teacher pointed out a letter and told us “That is A,” and that is all the evidence we have of it. We believed it; now let us receive the kingdom of heaven as we did when a child the words of your teacher. If we reason on faith we can never believe, because to reason faith is unreasonable because the effort of reason always produces doubt. It begins and ends with a “how.” Because faith is the simplest and easiest thing for all, God put his salvation in the surest place, that we might have it and know that he has it. Now, Romans 5:6-8-10, Christ died for you because you are ungodly, and he died for the ungodly, and you can be counted righteous right now if you will believe it. Christ’s death reconciled the world unto God but it never saved any or ever can. His death met the penalty of the law, but we are saved by Christ’s life. Read Romans 4:25. By his death then we have reconciliation, by his life justification, and by the second coming we have salvation—all these being necessary to complete the plan of salvation. The law of God shows a man to be ungodly—and as by the law is the knowledge of sin which is ungodliness (we will call it now sin). So turn to Proverbs 28:13 (mercy being treating one better than he deserves). Remember, believe this fully; our habit has been to confess our sins and then doubt the forgiveness and carry them all away with us, obtaining no peace because we doubted. “God never appointed us to wrath.” 1 Thessalonians 5:9. He shows the laws to save us from them, the knowledge of them being a token of his love, that there is Jesus

to take them all from us. He calls us to obtain salvation. So do not take the knowledge of your sins as a token of his wrath. "Whoso confesses his sins shall be saved." Romans 4:6-7. Now 1 John 1:9, 5:17, "If we confess our sins he will forgive and cleanse us from all our sins." Believe this fully and go free. How many go to the soul confessing and never believe they are forgiven? To believe part of the word and not all is infidelity. "Man shall live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord." To confess a sin and not believe in its forgiveness is infidelity. Don't wait for feeling—that has nothing to do with faith. How can anyone know how he ought to feel when sins are forgiven? If you trust to feeling you are like a wave of the sea tossed by the winds to and fro. Often revivalists tell mourners how he felt when he was forgiven, and they try to feel as he did and fail, as no two can ever feel just alike and so no one can tell if converted. Faith does not rest on evidence. If it rests on the reasonableness of a thing, it rests on reason and not faith. If it rests on the confidence we have in the person, and that person contradicts himself, then where is faith? If one says, I will do some great thing, and I believe him; if he comes again and says something that uproots all he previously said, what am I to do? Now let me prove this: Abraham was justified by faith and it was counted to him for righteousness. Read the account of it, Genesis 15:5 and onward. Sometime after that Isaac was born and growing up Abraham was told to offer him up, directly against the promise. Where did his faith come in? By believing the promise independent of appearances. That was faith furnishing its own evidence. Abraham believed it until all came right because God had promised it would. Now turn to Romans 4:16-22; Abraham against hope believed in hope, his faith furnishing the hope, confidence and evidence. Never let our feelings, then, have

any control over our faith. Feelings belong to Satan. Relegate them to him. "The just shall live by faith." Brethren, let us live that way. When we believe it puts Christ in place of the sin and when Satan comes to attack us he finds only Christ, and then we have the victory over Satan, not delivering us from temptation, but giving us power to conquer temptation, and gaining the victory so that particular temptation never comes again. We are conquerors there forever. If you want feeling about this, praise the Lord because he ever pardons your sin and because you believe his promise, and there will be feeling enough within you to be satisfactory. Look for God, and he will put a song in your mouth. Now, do you believe my opening text, that we are justified freely. Often we sin and feel so ashamed and bad over it we wait a few days to get a little better before we go to the Lord for forgiveness. We try to make ourselves good first. There is a tendency in every soul to this. That is justification by works the same as fasting or punishing oneself first. This is the root of monkery and all the penances in the Catholic church. Then, if we do not want to be papists, let us quit. We have done no better, but the sin has lost the horror before us, and we are better in our own eyes, and then confess only our surface sin, so the Holy Spirit shows us again the sin that was covered up. Now the only way to get rid of it is to confess it at once, because the Lord shows us a sin just as it is, and right then, so that he can forgive it fully and completely. When we try to catch up our sin by doing better, we are putting on more and more of the filthy rags spoken of by Isaiah, which is our own righteousness. Let us read Revelation 3:11-18. Let us trust the Lord and believe his promises.

*We will continue with these sermons by
Alonzo T. Jones in our June newsletter.*

Current Events

THE DRAGON

US Judge Sets Precedent for United Nations Sovereignty Over America

A US District Court judge ruled in favor of the United Nations over the US Congress this week, setting precedent that, at least in federal courts, the UN is sovereign.

At issue are documents and audiotapes submitted under Congressional subpoena by former UN Oil for Food investigator Robert Parton. The information reportedly demonstrates proof positive that UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's stories are conflicting regarding the world's largest bribery scandal.

US District Judge Ricardo Urbina in Washington issued a temporary restraining order (TRO) after the United Nations filed a petition to block the Parton congressional subpoenas. The ten-day TRO gives both sides, according to the judge, some time to resolve the matter. The ex-FBI agent quit the UN-appointed Independent Inquiry Committee in April, reportedly because he believed it ignored evidence critical of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan.

The UN said that Parton, a former FBI agent, signed a letter of agreement with the Independent Investigative Committee on July 6 to become a "senior investigative counsel" and he began work on August 9. On August 18, Parton signed an agreement with the United Nations that included a clause prohibiting him from communicating with the media or with any government about material that the committee had not made public.

But Parton kept records to protect himself because the investigation's report, in Parton's estimate, was short of the truth. Parton told Fox News, "Although I sought to avoid any public discussion of these issues, I had repeatedly voiced my concerns internally to the IIC and wanted to retain a record of my efforts so that, if it ever became necessary, I could establish that I was not associated with the path the IIC committee chose to take and I could be in a position to defend myself against risks that I knew existed as a result of the IIC committee's actions."

The court order comes in the wake of so-called Independent Investigator Paul Volcker's (who was appointed by and is compensated by the UN) demands for Congress to return the Parton records and to not subpoena any more information or testimony. Volcker said the integrity of the probe into the \$64 billion Oil-for-Food program was at stake and lives may be in jeopardy if details of the investigation are leaked.

Volcker's unverified statement that lives may be at stake, if anything, has double meaning. American lives already have been lost. The US military was committed to a war in Iraq based on false information. Sources often point to the weapons of mass destruction that were never found, although satellite pictures show Russian truck convoys hauling off tons of items across the Syrian border hours before the American attack in March 2003. Given the revelation that the UN Security Council was deeply involved with Saddam Hussein, and subsequent exposure that Russia in particular was doing under the table business with Hussein, the US Congress has every Constitutional right to investigate the Oil for Food program.

The US State Department supports the Congressional inquiry, but is deferring to the court on this latest judicial development. Acting Spokesman Tom Casey said State supports the Volcker work, "but we also believe it's important for the US Congress to be able to have a look at this issue and make sure that it is comfortable with the facts and that it understands what happened...There is some ongoing litigation involved in that and I think I'll just leave it to the courts then to deal with it at this point, rather than trying to describe it for you further."

Bottom line: Court authority seems to be trumping both the Executive Branch and Congressional authority in the Constitutional balance between the three branches of government. Article III of the Constitution gives the power to Congress over the courts. Question is: will the Congress of the United States allow the federal court system to hand US sovereignty over to the United Nations. In this particular instance, it appears the precedent has been set. Taking this concept a

few steps further, the United Nations seems positioned well to stand between the US and its foreign policy objectives, including but not limited to, its longstanding relationship with Israel and the balance of power in the Middle East. *montananews.com*, May 11, 2005.

Germany, Japan, France & Brazil Seek UN Veto Power

For the 60th anniversary of the UN, the world peace keeping organization is seeking to make changes in the Security Council to reflect the modern makeup of global power.

Brazil, Germany, Japan and India are nations seeking permanent membership on the Security Council. Thus far, the existing five permanent members, The United States, Russia, China, England and France have agreed to add new members to the Security Council but do not wish to give the new members the same veto powers that the current members have.

The four countries in question, known as the G-4, have circulated a draft resolution Monday which states, 'The new permanent members should have the same responsibilities and obligations as current permanent members,' the draft says. 'The question of the veto, however, should not be a hindrance to Security Council reform.'

There are two plans presently circulating in the UN Plan A includes the addition of new permanent members of the Security Council while plan B allows only for semi-permanent additions.

Secretary General Kofi Annan has asked the General Assembly to vote on changes to the UN Charter and the makeup of the Security Council by September. It remains to be seen how much influence the G-4 nations will hold in the next incarnation of the United Nations. *elitestv.com*, May 17, 2005.

Time To Declare Our Independence From The United Nations

The United Nations is a mess. It now finds itself buried under scandals. It has Oil for Food scandals. Sex scandals. Power-abuse scandals. Smuggling scandals. Theft scandals. And unpaid traffic tickets. Rob, rape, and pillage seem to be the UN's modus operandi.

Yet why is anyone surprised? The UN considers itself above the law of mere nations. And it answers to no one. There is no vote on UN leaders (other than by the culprits themselves). There is no international referendum on its policies. The UN sets its own standards of conduct and it controls its own judge and jury. These, of course, are the very reasons why many have opposed US membership in the UN. And it's why many have feared the UN gaining any sort of power to gain its own ability to tax, field an army, or create a court system. Possessing these three powers drastically changes the UN from a volunteer membership organization to a global governing body.

Compliant nations simply give the UN a pretense of legitimacy. The United States government plays to the folks at home by talking tough about the need for "UN reform." Yet not once has the Republican-led Administration or the Republican-controlled Congress taken any steps to withhold funds for UN programs. Instead, the US continues to go along with nearly every policy scheme, international conference and peace-keeping mission, paying the majority of the funds, thus supplying huge amounts of tax-payer money to UN coffers so that business as usual goes on down at UN headquarters.

There is one public entity to which the UN at least pretends to react. The court of public opinion. There is a growing awareness, at least in the living rooms of common Americans, that something is very wrong with the UN. The UN's greatest fear is that those Americans might influence our leaders to withdraw from the world body. If that ever happens, then the UN is finished and it knows it.

Articles are surfacing and pundits are pondering, questioning the future of the UN. To sidestep the obvious that the UN has utterly failed in its stated mission to promote world peace, or to even have a hint of influence in making anyone's life better voices are beginning to suggest the word "reform." Reform the UN, make it more "workable." American leaders, looking for a way to get around the growing argument to dump the UN may latch on to such a reform movement. But they should be careful what they wish for because they may not get the kind of reform they are expecting.

The UN is never without a contingency plan for its well-prepared agenda of global governance. A major thorn in the side of those who seek to drive the UN into a position of international power is the Security Council and the veto power of its permanent members. Many say the United States controls the UN with its veto power. Solution: take it away.

One of the twelve points of the Charter for Global Democracy, which surfaced prior to the UN's Millennium Summit in 2000, was a plan to "reform" the UN by doing away with the Security Council and replacing it with an "Assembly of the People." The Assembly would be made up of "people from the world" in the form of non-elected, non-governmental organizations (NGO's). Take note, these are the same NGO's which write the background material for most of the UN treaties like Agenda 21, the Biodiversity Treaty, Rights of the Child, and even the Kyoto Global Warming Treaty. NGOs are special interest groups (almost all leftist) who are seeking to create the UN as a global government. They are the ones pushing for UN tax schemes, standing armies, and the International Criminal Court. While the average citizen focuses on the Security Council and its dramatic, even heroic image, NGOs have become the driving force in setting UN policy.

To them it would be a dream come true for the UN to scrap the Security Council, which still pretends to be a place where nations simply air their differences. They would then be free to install the Assembly of the People through which their drive for UN power could accelerate unabated by pesky US vetoes.

The fact is the UN is not an instrument for guarding the peace. The UN is the source for international unrest and "reform" will not fix it. Most urgently, American leadership must not fall into the trap set by British Prime Minister Tony Blair to allow the UN to take the lead in rebuilding Iraq. Worse, Blair is also attempting to bully the United States into embracing the Kyoto Climate Change Protocol. Such a foolish move would be a disaster to the US economy and would do nothing to cool the planet.

For the past fifty years, as the UN lived off the perception that it provided a forum where nations could air their differences off the battlefield, more wars were fought than

ever before in human history. Instead of removing the threat to peace, the UN has encouraged, even nurtured, regimes that waged violence on their neighbors, and indeed, oppressed and tortured their own people.

The first great challenge to the UN's ability to provide peace was the Korean conflict in 1954. Allowed to operate on its own, the United States would have waged war against this aggressor and eliminated the communist regime and its threat forever. However, because American leadership abided by United Nations diplomatic authority instead of reason, not only was the regime allowed to survive, the conflict was never resolved. Indeed the North Korean communists' greatest ally, Red China, was also allowed to take root and grow. As a result of that UN failure, today, both North Korea and communist China are two of the leading international threats to peace. These are festering sores that the United States will eventually have to deal with, most certainly over UN objections.

Almost the exact scenario was played out in the Vietnam conflict in the 1960's as UN resolutions tied American hands from destroying the communists, allowing another brutal regime to remain in power, again within the axis of China.

Today, fifty years after the inception of the United Nations, the international community is a dangerous place. Instead of peaceful, prosperous, stable trading partners, the world is full of brutal, murdering dictatorships which starve and torture their own people while threatening the security of their neighbors, as once-great powers cower and use diplomatic doublespeak to ignore responsibility. Most of these international thugs have two things in common. 1) Each has a voice and a vote in the United Nations. 2) None would be a threat if they didn't.

The United Nations has come under the control of outlaw nations, petty and tarnished former superpowers and self-ordained special interest groups. Each promotes a socialist agenda that seeks to redistribute the world's wealth into their own coffers as they diminish the power of the United States and enslave the citizens of nations in a dark age of poverty and misery.

That's why terrorist states like Libya and Syria are allowed to serve on the UN's Human Rights Commission as Israel is condemned in resolution after resolution. It's the reason why a prosperous, industrious nation like Taiwan is refused membership in the UN while a murderous thug like Zimbabwe's Robert Mugabe is given a prominent voice at UN conferences.

The United Nations is not "dysfunctional," as some "reformists" have claimed. It is a criminal enterprise in which no moral nation should ever participate, let alone perpetuate.

Many of our elected officials indicate that the United States is bound to some kind of forced membership in the UN, as if it's our legal duty. Congress has resisted Congressman Ron Paul's efforts to pass his "American Sovereignty Restoration Act" (H.R. 1146), which calls for the complete withdraw of the United States from UN membership. Critics say it just isn't reasonable in today's society. They say that the United States would become isolated from the rest of the world. They say that the United States is bound by a treaty to stay in the UN.

But according to legal and Constitution scholar, Herb Titus, the Charter of the United Nations is neither politically nor legally binding upon the United States or the American people. Says Titus, "The Charter of the UN is commonly assumed to be a treaty. It is not." Instead, Titus explains, the UN Charter is a constitution. As such, it is illegitimate, having created a supranational government, deriving its powers not from the consent of the governed (the people of the United States and peoples of other member nations) but from the consent of the peoples' government officials, which have no authority to bind either the American people nor any other nation's to any terms of the Charter of the United Nations.

Titus goes on to explain: "Even if the Charter of the UN were a properly-ratified treaty, it would still be constitutionally illegitimate and void because it transgresses the Constitution of the United States in three major respects: 1) It unconstitutionally delegates to the UN the US Congress' legislative powers to initiate war and the US president's executive power to conduct war; 2) It unconstitutionally

transfers to the United Nations General Assembly the US House of Representatives' exclusive power to originate revenue-raising measures; and 3) It unconstitutionally robs the 50 American states powers reserved to them by the Tenth Amendment of the US Constitution."

Titus declares that H.R.1146 is the only viable solution to the continuing abuses by the United Nations. He says, "The US Congress can remedy its earlier unconstitutional actions of embracing the UN Charter by enacting H.R. 1146."

The world of the UN is like a parallel reality. It is no place for a nation born from the minds of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. How would today's American leaders in Congress react if they were suddenly brought before a tribunal of Founding Fathers and told to justify American participation in such a folly?

Rather than wasting more time and money on hearings and debates over a new UN Ambassador, the Congress would better use its resources to simply ignore the UN and quit. It is past time for the American people to demand action of our elected officials to uphold the US Constitution they have sworn to defend. Just as our Founding Fathers did when confronted with tyranny, it's time that the American people declare their independence from the United Nations. *americandaily.com*, May 9, 2005.

THE BEAST

Holy Warriors

Cardinal Ratzinger handed Bush the presidency by tipping the Catholic vote. Can American democracy survive their shared medieval vision?

President Bush treated his final visit with Pope John Paul II in Vatican City on June 4, 2004, as a campaign stop. After enduring a public rebuke from the pope about the Iraq war, Bush lobbied Vatican officials to help him win the election. "Not all the American bishops are with me," he complained, according to the National Catholic Reporter. He pleaded with the Vatican to pressure the bishops to step up their activism against abortion and gay marriage in the states during the campaign season.

About a week later, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger sent a letter to the US bishops,

pronouncing that those Catholics who were pro-choice on abortion were committing a "grave sin" and must be denied Communion. He pointedly mentioned "the case of a Catholic politician consistently campaigning and voting for permissive abortion and euthanasia laws"—an obvious reference to John Kerry, the Democratic candidate and a Roman Catholic. If such a Catholic politician sought Communion, Ratzinger wrote, priests must be ordered to "refuse to distribute it." Any Catholic who voted for this "Catholic politician," he continued, "would be guilty of formal cooperation in evil and so unworthy to present himself for Holy Communion." During the closing weeks of the campaign, a pastoral letter was read from pulpits in Catholic churches repeating the ominous suggestion of excommunication. Voting for the Democrat was nothing less than consorting with the forces of Satan, collaboration with "evil."

In 2004 Bush increased his margin of Catholic support by 6 points from the 2000 election, rising from 46 to 52 percent. Without this shift, Kerry would have had a popular majority of a million votes. Three states—Ohio, Iowa and New Mexico—moved into Bush's column on the votes of the Catholic "faithful." Even with his atmospheric of terrorism and September 11, Bush required the benediction of the Holy See as his saving grace. The key to his kingdom was turned by Cardinal Ratzinger.

With the College of Cardinals' election of Ratzinger to the papacy, his political alliances with conservative politicians can be expected to deepen and broaden. Under Benedict XVI, the church will assume a consistent reactionary activism it has not had for two centuries. And the new pope's crusade against modernity has already joined forces with the right-wing culture war in the United States, prefigured by his interference in the 2004 election.

Europe is far less susceptible than the United States to the religious wars that Ratzinger will incite. Attendance at church is negligible; church teachings are widely ignored; and the younger generation is least observant of all. But in the United States, the Bush administration and the right wing of the Republican Party are trying to batter down the wall of separation between church and state.

Through court appointments, they wish to enshrine doctrinal views on the family, women, gays, medicine, scientific research and privacy. The Republican attempt to abolish the two-centuries-old filibuster—the so-called nuclear option—is only one coming wrangle in the larger Kulturkampf.

Joseph Ratzinger was born and bred in the cradle of the Kulturkampf, or culture war. Roman Catholic Bavaria was a stronghold against northern Protestantism during the Reformation. In the 19th century the church was a powerful force opposing the unification of Italy and Germany into nation-states, fearing that they would diminish the church's influence in the shambles of duchies and provinces that had followed the breakup of the Holy Roman Empire. The doctrine of papal infallibility in 1870 was promulgated by the church to tighten its grip on Catholic populations against the emerging centralized nations and to sanctify the pope's will against mere secular rulers.

In response, Otto von Bismarck, the German chancellor, launched what he called a Kulturkampf to break the church's hold. He removed the church from the control of schools, expelled the Jesuits, and instituted civil ceremonies for marriage. Bismarck lent support to Catholic dissidents opposed to papal infallibility who were led by German theologian Johann Ignaz von Dollinger. Dollinger and his personal secretary were subsequently excommunicated. His secretary was Georg Ratzinger, great-uncle of the new pope, who became one of the most notable Bavarian intellectuals and politicians of the period. This Ratzinger was a champion against papal absolutism and church centralization, and on behalf of the poor and working class—and was also an anti-Semite.

Joseph Ratzinger's Kulturkampf is claimed by him to be a reaction to the student revolts of 1968. Should Joschka Fischer, a former student radical and now the German foreign minister, have to answer entirely for Ratzinger's Weltanschauung? Pope Benedict's Kulturkampf bears the burden of the church's history and that of his considerable family. He represents the latest incarnation of the long-standing reaction against Bismarck's reforms—beginning with the assertion of the invented tradition of papal infallibility—and, ironically, against the

positions on the church held by his famous uncle. But the roots of his reaction are even more profound.

The new pope's burning passion is to resurrect medieval authority. He equates the Western liberal tradition, that is, the Enlightenment, with Nazism, and denigrates it as "moral relativism." He suppresses all dissent, discussion and debate within the church and concentrates power within the Vatican bureaucracy. His abhorrence of change runs past 1968 (an abhorrence he shares with George W. Bush) to the revolutions of 1848, the "springtime of nations," and 1789, the French Revolution. But, even more momentously, the alignment of the pope's Kulturkampf with the US president's culture war has also set up a conflict with the American Revolution.

For the first time, an American president is politically allied with the Vatican in its doctrinal mission (except, of course, on capital punishment). In the messages and papers of the presidents from George Washington until well into those of the 20th century, there was not a single mention of the pope, except in one minor footnote. Bush's lobbying trip last year to the Vatican reflects an utterly novel turn, and Ratzinger's direct political intervention in American electoral politics ratified it.

The right wing of the Catholic Church is as mobilized as any other part of the religious right. It is seizing control of Catholic universities, exerting influence at other universities, stigmatizing Catholic politicians who fail to adhere to its conservative credo, pressing legislation at the federal and state levels, seeking government funding and sponsorship of the church, and vetting political appointments inside the White House and the administration—imposing in effect a religious test of office. The Bush White House encourages these developments under the cover of moral uplift as it forges a political machine uniting church and state—as was done in premodern Europe.

The American Revolution, the Virginia Statute on Religious Liberty, the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights were fought for explicitly to uproot the traces in American soil of ecclesiastical power in government, which the

Founders to a man regarded with horror, revulsion and foreboding.

The Founders were the ultimate representatives of the Enlightenment. They were not anti-religious, though few if any of them were orthodox or pious. Washington never took Communion and refused to enter the church, while his wife did so. Benjamin Franklin believed that all organized religion was suspect. James Madison thought that established religion did as much harm to religion as it did to free government, twisting the word of God to fit political expediency, thereby throwing religion into the political cauldron. And Thomas Jefferson, allied with his great collaborator Madison, conducted decades of sustained and intense political warfare against the existing and would-be clerisy. His words, engraved on the Jefferson Memorial, are a direct reference to established religion: "I have sworn eternal warfare against all forms of superstition over the minds of men."

But now Republican House Majority Leader Tom DeLay threatens the federal judiciary, saying, "The reason the judiciary has been able to impose a separation of church and state that's nowhere in the Constitution is that Congress didn't stop them." And Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist will participate through a telecast in a rally on April 24 in which he will say that Democrats who refuse to rubber-stamp Bush's judicial nominees and uphold the filibuster are "against people of faith."

But what would Madison say?

This is what Madison wrote in 1785: "What influence in fact have ecclesiastical establishments had on Civil Society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of the Civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty may have found an established Clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just Government instituted to secure & perpetuate it needs them not."

What would John Adams say? This is what he wrote Jefferson in 1815: "The question before the human race is, whether the God of nature shall govern the world by his own laws,

or whether priests and kings shall rule it by fictitious miracles?"

Benjamin Franklin? "The way to see by faith is to shut the eye of reason."

And Jefferson, in "Notes on Virginia," written in 1782: "It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself. Subject opinion to coercion: whom will you make your inquisitors? Fallible men; men governed by bad passions, by private as well as public reasons. And why subject it to coercion? To produce uniformity. But is uniformity of opinion desirable? No more than of face and stature. Introduce the bed of Procrustes then, and as there is danger that the large men may beat the small, make us all of a size, by lopping the former and stretching the latter. Difference of opinion is advantageous in religion. The several sects perform the office of a Censor morum over each other. Is uniformity attainable? Millions of innocent men, women, and children, since the introduction of Christianity, have been burnt, tortured, fined, imprisoned; yet we have not advanced one inch towards uniformity. What has been the effect of coercion? To make one half the world fools and the other half hypocrites. To support roguery and error all over the earth."

The Republican Party was founded in the mid-19th century partly as a party of religious liberty. It supported public common schools, not church schools, and public land-grant universities independent of any denominational affiliation. The Republicans, moreover, were adamant in their opposition to the use of any public funds for any religious purpose, especially involving schools.

A century later, in 1960, there was still such a considerable suspicion of Catholics in government that the Democratic candidate for president, John F. Kennedy, felt compelled to address the issue directly in his famous speech before the Houston Ministerial Association on September 12.

What did Kennedy say? "I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute—where no Catholic prelate would tell the President (should he be Catholic) how to act, and no Protestant minister would tell his parishioners for whom to vote—where no church or church school is granted any public

funds or political preference... I believe in an America that is officially neither Catholic, Protestant nor Jewish—where no public official either requests or accepts instructions on public policy from the Pope, the National Council of Churches or any other ecclesiastical source—where no religious body seeks to impose its will directly or indirectly upon the general populace or the public acts of its officials."

Now Bush is attempting to create what Kennedy warned against. He claims to be conservative, but he seeks a rupture in our system of government. The culture war, which has had many episodes, from the founding of the Moral Majority to the unconstitutional impeachment of President Clinton, is entering a new and far more dangerous phase. In 2004, Bush and Ratzinger used church doctrine to intimidate voters and taint candidates. And through the courts the president is seeking to codify not only conservative ideology but religious doctrine.

When men of God mistake their articles of devotion with political platforms they will inevitably stand exposed in the political arena. When politicians mistake themselves for men of God, their religion, however sincere, will inevitably be seen as contrivance.

As both president and pope invoke heavenly authority to impose their notions of tradition, they have set themselves on a collision course with the American political tradition. In the name of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, democracy without end. Amen. *truthout.org*, April 21, 2005.

Is 'Dominus Iesus' A Shadow Over the New Papacy?

The Ratzinger document reversed ecumenical gains, implying that Catholicism has little to learn from other churches and faiths.

Dominus Iesus, the Catholic Church's declaration about Christianity and non-Catholics issued by then-Cardinal Ratzinger as head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on September 5, 2000, sparked a major controversy in ecumenical Christian circles and serious concern within the wider interreligious dialogue. Asserting that the fullness of truth is found in the Catholic Church alone, Dominus Iesus indicated that Protestant churches

"suffer from defects," and that salvation for non-Christians was mysteriously tied to the Catholic Church. Cardinal Edward Cassidy, former head of the Council for Interreligious Dialogue, then-Archbishop Walter Kasper, head of the Council for Promoting Christian Unity, and Archbishop Michael Fitzgerald, head of the Council for Interreligious Dialogue, took strong steps to curb its negative impact.

I was at a meeting at the World Council of Churches in Geneva on the weekend after it appeared. The General Secretary of the WCC expressed his anger over the document as a breach of the trust that had been created between Protestants and Catholics after the Second Vatican Council in the early 1960s. The Reformed Church in Switzerland summoned the Catholic bishop in Geneva to an emergency meeting to discuss the implications of the document. Cardinal Kasper subsequently indicated that he had attempted to dissuade Cardinal Ratzinger from issuing the declaration.

The tone and content of *Dominus Iesus* was present in a much shorter address given by Ratzinger more than a decade earlier. In that address, Ratzinger laid out his perspective that the Catholic Church is the only one in which the fullness of the gospel can be found. About a week later, Cardinal Johannes Willebrands, then head of the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity, addressed the same question. Without mentioning Ratzinger or his statement by name, Willebrands conveyed that the Ratzinger interpretation of the Catholic-Protestant/Orthodox relationship did not represent the true spirit of Vatican II.

In both his original statement and subsequently in *Dominus Iesus*, Ratzinger basically reduced the other Christian churches to a peripheral status. Willebrands insisted this was not the prevailing view of the post-Vatican II Roman Catholic Church. The real breakthrough at Vatican II was the Catholic Church's recognition that the other churches were in fact integral to a full understanding of Christianity. This was clearly the understanding expressed by Protestant observers at the Council, such as the liberal Methodist theologian Shubert Ogden, in their commentaries on Vatican II.

To be sure, Vatican II did not say all Christian churches were on a totally equal plane with the Catholic Church. But it did insist that there was no fully adequate understanding of the church that excluded them.

By implication, Vatican II argued that Catholicism had something to learn from the other churches' expression of the gospel vision. *Dominus Iesus*, on the other hand, leaves the distinct impression that the Catholic Church has nothing really important to gain from dialogue with the other churches. Some of them, particularly those with a sacramental tradition, may reflect some of the vision that exists within Catholic Christianity. But Catholicism has nothing of essential importance to gain from them.

Dominus Iesus also argues that those who do not accept the Catholic vision of faith stand in considerable danger in terms of ultimate salvation. Vatican II spoke of other Christian communions as "sister churches," implying that they were in fact vehicles of human salvation as well. Admittedly, this question was not totally resolved at Vatican II. But the ecumenical dialogues it generated have moved the Catholic Church positively in this regard. *Dominus Iesus* reversed this course.

Dominus Iesus strikes one as written by a person who only works at the abstract theological level. But the beauty of interfaith and interreligious encounter has been the depth of personal spirituality that participants have uncovered in each other through conversation and other forms of faith sharing. The monks from the Catholic and Buddhist/Hindu tradition who have spent a month or so together in each other's monasteries simply are unable to speak only the language of *Dominus Iesus*. They have found authentic soul friends although they may not have achieved adequate theological language to express fully this new understanding.

On the interreligious front, Pope Benedict XVI has in the past caused considerable apprehension by his remarks regarding Islam, especially his claim that if Turkey joined the European Union it would be the beginning of the demise of Christian Europe, and his grossly inappropriate comments regarding Buddhism, which Cardinal Arinze, as president of the

Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, had to struggle to overcome.

Dominus Iesus also raised questions about Catholic-Jewish relations. Cardinal Cassidy and Archbishop Kasper took immediate steps to plant the idea that the document did not apply to Jews. They had some success in this regard, and Ratzinger appeared to go along with this. His subsequent writings on the Jews, which contain a favorable tone, as well as his endorsement of the 2001 Pontifical Biblical Commission document on the Jews and their Scriptures in the New Testament, did take much of the sting out of Dominus Iesus in terms of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. But questions still remain that only an explicit exception for Jews could finally overcome.

So Benedict XVI comes to the papacy with a definite shadow over him regarding interfaith and interreligious relations. In his homily to the cardinals after his election, he gave the impression of wanting to reach out to other religions. But the ultimate proof of his sincerity will depend on 1) who he appoints to the two critical curial offices concerned with ecumenical and interreligious dialogue; 2) what he says and does on possible visits to Geneva, Canterbury, or Constantinople; and 3) how he receives leaders of other faith traditions who may visit the Vatican.

In other words, the proof will come only with concrete actions. We can all hope and pray that his previous track record on ecumenical and interreligious relations will be overcome, and the shadow over him because of Dominus Iesus and other similar statements will vanish. Let us hope the Holy Spirit will grant him the grace necessary to make this step forward. *axisoflogic.com*, April 25, 2005.

Pope wants to expand diplomatic relations

South Arabia and China among countries with no ties with Vatican

Pope Benedict XVI reached out on Thursday to countries that don't have diplomatic relations with the Vatican, inviting them to establish ties with the Holy See.

Benedict didn't name specific countries, saying only that he appreciated messages that came from some of them following the death

of Pope John Paul II. China, Saudi Arabia and Vietnam are among the countries that don't have relations with the Vatican.

Benedict made the comments in a speech to diplomats accredited to the Holy See, his first since being elected pope on April 19. He delivered his speech in French—the language of diplomacy—to representatives of the 174 countries with which the Vatican has relations in a ceremony inside the Sala Regia of the Apostolic Palace.

"I'm thinking also about the nations with which the Holy See still hasn't entered into diplomatic relations," Benedict told the ambassadors, many in formal dress with sashes and medals on their chests.

He said he appreciated the fact that some of these countries sent messages to the Vatican following the death of John Paul and after his election.

"I want to express my gratitude and address a deferential greeting to the civil authorities of these countries, expressing the wish to see them soon represented at the Apostolic See," he said. *The Associated Press*, May 12, 2005.

THE FALSE PROPHET

Pastor's downfall highlights Protestant identity crisis

When the Reverend Alan Meenan took over as senior pastor at the nationally prominent Hollywood First Presbyterian Church, it had been losing members for 20 years.

Now, hundreds of new worshippers are flocking to an alternative service staged by the church at a nearby nightclub that offers live rock music and a casual atmosphere that doesn't frown on flip-flops and nose piercings.

The service, called Contemporary Urban Experience, has bolstered membership at one of the most storied Presbyterian congregations in the country. But it has also created a deep rift between old and new members that threatens to tear the conservative church apart.

Responding to several complaints about Meenan, regional church officials, in a rare step, took control of operations at Hollywood First last week and put Meenan and his executive pastor on paid administrative leave to restore the peace.

The turmoil within the 2,700-member congregation reflects what experts call the “worship war,” an identity crisis that has beset many mainline Protestant denominations as they struggle to survive in a culture that puts less importance on the traditions of organized religion.

Membership among Presbyterian churches has declined by as many as 40,000 people a year since the mid-1960s, said Jerry Van Marter, news director at Presbyterian Church USA.

Similar declines have been seen in nearly all mainline Protestant denominations, as clashes have developed not only over worship style but such issues as the ordination of women and the role of gays and lesbians in the church.

The situation has been especially painful at Hollywood First, where the congregation helped launch evangelists Billy Graham and Lloyd Ogilvie, who’s now US Senate chaplain. It was home to Bill Bright, founder of Campus Crusade for Christ, and Henrietta Mears, author of the popular Sunday school curriculum Gospel Light.

“Hollywood Presbyterian is the elite,” said congregant Teena Smith, who until recently attended a nondenominational megachurch in Atlanta. “People against Meenan say... ‘That’s great, move to alternative. But not in our backyard.’”

The rift over worship is something that William McKinney, president of the Pacific School of Religion at University of California, Berkeley, has seen before.

“You try to identify the kernel of the gospel—and that, you don’t mess with. But your presentation needs to be sensitive to cultural change,” he said. “This is a question that mainline folk wrestle with: Has the sacredness of the organ been elevated to a point where Jesus gets lost?”

At Hollywood First, the trouble began when Meenan launched the Contemporary Urban Experience, or CUE, services more than two years ago. The weekly Sunday service has attracted some 350 twenty- and thirty-somethings, some with tattoos and piercings. Many work in the entertainment industry.

“I could go into any coffee shop in Los Angeles and go up to any artsy, crazy guy

and feel totally comfortable inviting him to this service,” said J.C. Cornwell, 34, a church member who volunteers to produce CUE each week.

Some traditionalists have embraced the new service as a way to save their beloved church. For others, however, it represents a threat to the faith and a fall from grace.

“I would be very sad if it became demographically oriented or age-oriented, where there would come a day when the sanctuary was abandoned and all worship moved down to the warehouse,” said Sparky Jamison, a 20-year member of Hollywood First and a church elder. “I come from a tradition of loving to sing and perform classical music.”

The building tension over worship style exploded this spring when members discovered an \$856,000 budget shortfall that Meenan had not disclosed. The pastor hasn’t been accused of fraud—simply poor management.

The Presbytery of the Pacific, a regional governing body for the denomination’s churches in Southern California and Hawaii, received more than 100 letters and calls from disgruntled members. They complained about Meenan’s dictatorial management style, his disregard for Presbyterian tradition and his decision to put money into overseas missionary trips and youth outreach while criticizing the cost of the traditional services.

On May 3, some 500 parishioners attended a five-hour meeting during which dozens of people both for and against Meenan addressed the presbytery, which ultimately voted to take control of Hollywood First.

Meenan acknowledged he hadn’t been a perfect pastor but blamed dissension on traditional members who were unwilling to embrace his new direction. He said the church gained 728 new members under his eight-year leadership, including 350 at the alternative service and between 300 and 500 who attend the weekly Bible study.

“There are those who sense a loss of involvement in their church and target me as a result,” Meenan said. “Change is essential to our future and change is working for good in Hollywood.” *signonsandiego.com*, May 13, 2005.

“I saw that it was impossible to have the affections and interests engrossed in worldly cares, to be increasing earthly possessions, and yet be in a waiting, watching position, as our Saviour has commanded. Said the angel: ‘They can secure but one world. In order to acquire the heavenly treasure, they must sacrifice the earthly. They cannot have both worlds.’ I saw how necessary a continuance of faithfulness in watching was in order to escape the delusive snares of Satan. He leads those who should be waiting and watching, to take an advance step toward the world; they have no intention of going further, but that one step removed them that much further from Jesus, and made it easier to take the next; and thus step after step is taken toward the world, until all the difference between them and the world is a profession, a name only. They have lost their peculiar, holy character, and there is nothing except their profession to distinguish them from the lovers of the world around them.” *Testimonies*, volume 2, 193.

Evangelical Strategy Statement Gains Approval

Almost 90 evangelical leaders have given their approval to a document that calls conservative Christians to go beyond their usual issues, like abortion and homosexual rights, and involve themselves in such matters as poverty, justice and human rights. Titled *For the Health of the Nation: An Evangelical Call to Civic Responsibility*, the tome was crafted under the auspices of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). The project was commissioned by the NAE at its 2001 convention, and nearly two dozen leading scholars drafted the document. The NAE says it represents 30 million people in 45,000 churches and 52 denominations in the US. The American Family Association is examining the document, but Chairman Don Wildmon said the ministry was already in agreement with the general sentiments of *For the Health of the Nation*. “Evangelical Christians in America face a historic opportunity. We make up fully one

quarter of all voters in the most powerful nation in history,” the document states. “Never before has God given American evangelicals such an awesome opportunity to shape public policy in ways that could contribute to the well-being of the entire world. Disengagement is not an option.” *For the Health of the Nation* lays out seven principles it says should guide Christian political engagement. The full text is available on the National Association of Evangelicals website. (<http://www.nae.net>) *crosswalk.com*, May 17, 2005.

Civil and Religious Liberty

This article appeared as part of *The Washington Times* website commentary section. Secular society appears to be blind concerning the rapidly growing image of the beast.

Why Theocracy Can’t Happen Here

Recently, Bob Edgar, general secretary of the National Council of Churches and former Pennsylvania Democratic congressman, warned a conference of People for the American Way and 500 other secular liberals the religious right was hell-bent on imposing a “theocracy” on America.

Another speaker, Joan Bokaer, founder of Theocracy Watch, said the US was “not yet a theocracy.” Earlier, Howard Dean, Democratic National Committee chairman, lamented: “Are we going to live in a theocracy where the highest powers tell us what to do?” He did not define “highest powers.”

The American Civil Liberties Union and other secular left voices keep warning us that if Protestant evangelicals got their way, America would become a theocratic state. Nonsense. Their dire prediction is as plausible as another giant meteorite crashing into Earth like the one killed the dinosaurs 65 million years ago.

The democratic West has long rejected theocracy, once known as Caesaropapism, a state in which Caesar and the pope are one. Two thousand years ago in a Roman outpost when the issue of conflicting loyalties was raised, Jesus of Nazareth said: “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and to God the things that are God’s” —an eloquent

forecast of the American Founders' "separation of church and state."

The current film "Kingdom of Heaven" dramatically portrays the arrogance and bloodshed of zealous Christian medieval crusaders who attempted to impose their rule over Jerusalem, then held by Muslims.

Today, no serious Christian or Jewish leader in America advocates a theocratic state. They recognize welding political and ecclesiastical power would corrupt both religion and politics and lead to tyranny, chaos, or both.

America's Founders were committed to a democratic and pluralistic state where every citizen is free to believe as he wishes. Whether Calvinists or Unitarians, they held liberty was a gift from the Creator or Nature's God. "The God who gave us life," said Thomas Jefferson, "gave us liberty at the same time." As long as we are faithful to the Founders' dream, America will not become a theocracy.

Further, Article I of the Constitution rejects the "establishment of religion" and any act of Congress "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion. All citizens are free to worship in churches, synagogues or mosques and to educate their children as they see fit as long as they don't violate the law.

Early on, the Congress authorized the words "In God We Trust" on our coins and currency. We have government chaplains in the Congress and the armed forces. The Lincoln Memorial, Library of Congress and Supreme Court display numerous religious images and quotations. And the Pledge of Alliance, recited in public schools, carry the words, "one nation under God," that reflect the spirit of the Mayflower Compact of 1620 that began with: "In the name of God, amen."

These time-honored manifestation of religion in American life have not curtailed freedom of belief or conscience, nor pointed to a theocracy. Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, agnostic and atheist citizens have equal rights and opportunities.

Some Americans erect symbols of their "faith" in the public square, but others seek to banish the Ten Commandments, Christian creches and the Menorah from public spaces. If secular humanism became the established

"religion" perhaps the only thing liberals would have to fear is liberalism itself.

Modest government grants to "faith based" social service agencies, such as the Salvation Army, are hardly breaches of the separation of church and state. After all, since the republic's beginning, church property has been tax-exempt.

In addition to the Founders' safeguards against a theocracy, that dire outcome is made virtually impossible by America's religious and cultural diversity and the fact no religious leader wants his "church" or any other religion to run the government. When citizens of any faith support the phrase "under God" in the Pledge or insist the Bible be taught as literature in public schools they do not call for theocratic government.

On the other hand, when some Evangelicals insist "evolution" should not be taught in public schools and "creationism" should, they attempt to stifle diversity and debate. Some literalists believe Earth was created 6,000 years ago, but they should not insist public schools teach only their views. They can freely teach their beliefs in their churches and religious schools.

On reflection, religious citizens and secular humanists may not be that far apart. They all are beneficiaries of the Judeo-Christian moral tradition. Many secularists drink from wells they did not dig and are refreshed by water they are reluctant to acknowledge. *washingtontimes.com*, May 16, 2005.

Why Theocracy Can Happen Here

"And he had two horns like a lamb.' The lamblike horns indicate youth, innocence, and gentleness, fitly representing the character of the United States when presented to the prophet as 'coming up' in 1798. Among the Christian exiles who first fled to America and sought an asylum from royal oppression and priestly intolerance were many who determined to establish a government upon the broad foundation of civil and religious liberty. Their views found place in the Declaration of Independence, which sets forth the great truth that 'all men are created equal' and endowed with the inalienable right to 'life, liberty, and the

pursuit of happiness.’ And the Constitution guarantees to the people the right of self-government, providing that representatives elected by the popular vote shall enact and administer the laws. Freedom of religious faith was also granted, every man being permitted to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Republicanism and Protestantism became the fundamental principles of the nation. These principles are the secret of its power and prosperity. The oppressed and downtrodden throughout Christendom have turned to this land with interest and hope. Millions have sought its shores, and the United States has risen to a place among the most powerful nations of the earth.

“But the beast with lamblike horns ‘spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed; ...saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.’ Revelation 13:11-14.

“The lamblike horns and dragon voice of the symbol point to a striking contradiction between the professions and the practice of the nation thus represented. The ‘speaking’ of the nation is the action of its legislative and judicial authorities. By such action it will give the lie to those liberal and peaceful principles which it has put forth as the foundation of its policy. The prediction that it will speak ‘as a dragon’ and exercise ‘all the power of the first beast’ plainly foretells a development of the spirit of intolerance and persecution that was manifested by the nations represented by the dragon and the leopardlike beast. And the statement that the beast with two horns ‘causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast’ indicates that the authority of this nation is to be exercised in enforcing some observance which

shall be an act of homage to the papacy.

“Such action would be directly contrary to the principles of this government, to the genius of its free institutions, to the direct and solemn avowals of the Declaration of Independence, and to the Constitution. The founders of the nation wisely sought to guard against the employment of secular power on the part of the church, with its inevitable result—intolerance and persecution. The Constitution provides that ‘Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,’ and that ‘no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States.’ Only in flagrant violation of these safeguards to the nation’s liberty, can any religious observance be enforced by civil authority. But the inconsistency of such action is no greater than is represented in the symbol. It is the beast with lamblike horns—in profession pure, gentle, and harmless—that speaks as a dragon.

“Saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast.’ Here is clearly presented a form of government in which the legislative power rests with the people, a most striking evidence that the United States is the nation denoted in the prophecy.

“But what is the ‘image to the beast’? and how is it to be formed? The image is made by the two-horned beast, and is an image to the beast. It is also called an image of the beast. Then to learn what the image is like and how it is to be formed we must study the characteristics of the beast itself—the papacy.” *The Great Controversy*, 443.

ACLU Says Federally Funded Abstinence Show Touts Religion

The American Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts sued the Bush administration yesterday on charges of crossing the line between church and state by pumping \$1 million into a nationwide teen sex abstinence program laden with Christianity.

Launched by a preacher, the “Silver Ring Thing” uses high-tech club-style music and comedy to sell “premarital purity” to teens who pay \$15 to don a silver ring inscribed with a Bible verse admonishing them to “keep clear of all sexual sin.”

“The federal government should not underwrite the religious indoctrination of Massachusetts students,” said local ACLU executive director Carol Rose. “The ‘Silver Ring Thing’ is nothing more than a vehicle for converting young people to Christianity.”

The ACLU contends “Silver Ring Thing’s” signature three-hour events, including one slated for Boston in October, culminate in an old-fashioned altar call where members are asked to pledge their lives to Jesus.

The founder and president of the Silver Ring Thing, Denny Pattyn, had no immediate comment yesterday.

The lawsuit cites Pattyn’s comments during a recent BBC documentary called “American Virgins” when he said the end of the world is “approaching very quickly and I believe Christ will come back.”

The suit now before US District Court Judge Joseph L. Tauro in Boston claims the government has funded the Silver Ring Thing with \$1 million since 2003 and accuses the Bush administration of failing to monitor or audit the grants properly.

The ALCU says Silver Ring Thing shares an IRS nonprofit number with the John Guest Evangelistic Team out of Sewickley, Pa., which runs crusades and religious radio broadcasts worldwide. *bostonherald.com*, May 17, 2005.

Radical Islam

Why Islam Was Enraged By Newsweek

“Oops, sorry. It looks like we were wrong.” Thus Newsweek apologizes for its story in last week’s issue that American intelligence interrogators in Guantanamo desecrated the Koran in front of Muslim prisoners and flushed it down the toilet—an error that has to date cost the lives of 16 people killed in the anti-American riots that the story set off in various parts of the Islamic world.

One wonders why a supposedly responsible magazine like Newsweek didn’t manifest a tad less credulity toward a report indicating that American intelligence is run not only by anti-Muslim barbarians, but also by total imbeciles. Who else would think that the way to get a terror suspect to be more cooperative is by treating his holy scriptures as excrement? The strong tendency in today’s world to believe that America is in the hands of cretins has, apparently, its supporters in the American media, too.

But one also wonders about something else. Suppose for a moment that the shoe had been on the other foot—that is, that Newsweek had run a story about intelligence interrogators in a Muslim country desecrating the New Testament or the Hebrew Bible in a facility holding Christian or Jewish prisoners. What would have been the reaction?

There would have been angry protests, of course. Perhaps even a few noisy rallies at churches or synagogues. But riots? 16 deaths? It’s hard to imagine.

Do Muslims really revere the Koran so much more than Christians and Jews do the Bible? It would seem so. They certainly act as if they do. Think of the Salman Rushdie affair. For years this Muslim-born novelist was threatened with death all over the Muslim world for parodying certain episodes in the Koran. A Christian or Jewish novelist who did the same with the Bible would get yawned at.

Indeed, that Muslims do take their religion more seriously is, sociologically speaking, the case. The percentage of observant Muslims in any Islamic country is considerably higher than that of observant Christians in the West or observant Jews in Israel.

One might also point out that inhabitants of Muslim countries tend in general to resort to violence in social situations more often than do Jews or Christians (think of honor killings, for example), so that their doing so in support of their religious beliefs is part of a larger pattern of behavior.

And yet any psychologist would say that, nevertheless, when it comes to the Koran there is a clear measure of overreacting—and that we usually overreact not when we are strongly convinced of something but when, on the

contrary, we are deeply afraid that our convictions may be wrong.

Is it possible that deep down the Muslim world fears that, compared to the Jewish and Christian Bibles, the Koran is simply not a very well-written, nor a very interesting, nor a very enlightening book?

Because—although it's highly politically incorrect to say so—it isn't. It is, almost unremittingly from beginning to end, a distressingly turgid and bombastic document.

Granted, one can say the same, or worse, about parts of the Old and New Testaments. If Jewish Scripture were confined to the ritual laws and genealogies of the Pentateuch, the gory conquistadorial accounts in Joshua, the trite maxims of Proverbs, and the dry-as-dust historical synopses of Chronicles, there wouldn't be a great deal to say for it, either. Nor would there be for the New Testament if all we had of it were the perfunctory epistles of Philemon and Jude and the lurid eschatological fantasies of Revelations.

These two books, however, are not single works but anthologies. They speak not with one but with numerous voices in various styles of prose and poetry, and many of these voices, some narrating stories containing a large number of unforgettable characters, are intellectually brilliant, wonderfully observant, genuinely soul-searching, deeply anguished, poignantly quivering with human experience—the voices of literary and religious genius. One doesn't have to believe in the God-giveness or divine inspiration of the Bible to see the greatness in many of its pages. In fact, it is often the nonbeliever reading it with a skeptical mind who can most appreciate its beauty and profundity.

One cannot say the same of the Koran. Although it is half the length of the "Old" Testament and far longer than the New, the only voice and character in it are Muhammad's. For the Muslim believer, this voice may be the height of sublimity. Yet for anyone else, it is drearily pompous, self-satisfied, and repetitive. It has only one register, that of declamatory rhetoric, and not many emotions, of which anger against anyone doubting its truth is perhaps the most dominant.

One can speculate at length about what it means for a culture or society to adopt such a book at its holy writ and make it the ultimate standard by which all other intellectual and literary endeavor is judged. It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that Islam at its best—and unfortunately, what we often see of it today is its worst—is not so much a response to the inspiration of the Koran as a magnificent overcoming of the Koran's limitations.

Consciously, of course, no Muslim thinks about it this way. But would Muslims be quite so defensive about the Koran if they didn't in some place fear that this was so? Would they be quite so adamant about banning from their own societies the slightest debate about the Koran's contents or provenance, so that Koranic studies in the Islamic world today are roughly where Bible studies were in Europe in the 14th century? That, too, is hard to imagine. There's a lot more insecurity here than meets the eye. *nysun.com*, May 17, 2005.

The West Must Support Islamic Moderates to Fight Jihadist Terrorism

Counter-terror expert Boaz Ganor warns that Islamic terrorism is a deadly threat to Islamic moderates as well as the West, and outlines measures to reduce its influence. How seriously should we take Islamic terrorism? And how can it be combated? For security expert Boaz Ganor the answer to the first question is very seriously. The answer to the second is a little more complicated but essentially requires weighing terrorists' level of motivation contrasted to their operational capability and going beyond military responses alone to offer educational and social services to the Islamic poor that have been left to the jihadists for decades.

Ganor has plenty of experience in his subject. He is a member of Israel's National Committee for Homeland Security Technologies and founder of the International Policy Institute for Counter-Terrorism in Herzlia, Israel. He spoke about his new book *The Counter Terrorism Puzzle: A Guide for Decision Makers* at the UCLA Faculty Center April 28. His visit to the campus was sponsored by the UCLA International Institute's Israel Studies Program.

Boaz Ganor began by cautioning his audience to distinguish between goals and

methods. Almost all terrorist groups advocate political goals shared by others. It is the methods by which they pursue the goals that makes them terrorists. Ganor also sought to cut through the common argument that terrorism is a word used to define the violent actions of one's enemies while the same actions by one's friends are called something else. For him, terrorism by definition is "the deliberate use of violence against civilians to achieve political ends." Ganor affirmed that by his definition, insurgent attacks on American soldiers in Iraq or on Israeli soldiers by Palestinian militants are not terrorism, although they are part of a military conflict.

RELIGIOUS TERRORISTS ARE THE BIGGEST DANGER IN THE WORLD

"I believe that international terrorism, mainly global jihadist terrorism, is maybe the biggest danger opposed to the safety of the world ever," Boaz Ganor declared. If this sounded like hyperbole, Ganor advanced a series of reasons for his belief. "The characteristics of the threat, what it is that makes them so dangerous are, first, the global reach. We are talking about a network that is actually spread all over the world. In the Arab and the Muslim countries, in the Western societies."

The second characteristic of the threat "is that these guys are experienced terrorists. They know exactly what they are doing. They were trained for ten years, most of them, in the trenches of Afghanistan, fighting the second superpower in the world, the USSR. They are the veterans."

The third characteristic of the threat "is that these guys are motivated by the most dangerous and extreme ideology. There have been different kinds of groups all over the world that have used terrorism in modern times. They have been motivated by different grievances: national and racial differences, economic and social grievances, communism, anarchism. I want to argue that when you are motivated by religious grievances, when you are motivated by what you believe is a divine command, God is sending you on your mission, you are much more dangerous than any other kind of terrorist organization."

NOT A CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS

Ganor rejected the idea that the world is engaged in a clash of civilizations. "I see this as a war. But not as a war between Islam against the rest of the world. I see this as a war between Islamic radicalism and the rest of the world. It's very important to differentiate between the two because I believe that what we see here is a war of a small, almost marginal, part of the Muslim world against the rest of the world, which includes the vast majority of the Muslims themselves, who are not Islamic radicals."

Boaz Ganor supported this assertion by pointing to the large number of terrorist attacks within Muslim states. "A few days ago, in Egypt. A few months ago, again in Egypt, in Taba. And then a few weeks before that there was a huge attack in Amman, Jordan. And there were attacks in Indonesia, in Saudi Arabia, in Morocco, and in Ankara and Istanbul in Turkey. Most cases were in Islamic states, in Muslim states. So if you would ask me who is the biggest enemy of Al Qaeda and the global jihad, I would tell you that in my view the biggest enemy is not the United States or Israel or any other Western country. The biggest enemy of Al Qaeda and the global jihad in my view is a state like Turkey. Because Turkey represents the situation of holding the stick from both ends, being a Muslim country and practicing Islam and living under the conditions of the Western societies and being modern. That is the ultimate threat to the global jihadists and the Islamic radicals."

BIN LADEN'S THREE-STAGE STRATEGY

Al Qaeda, Ganor said, "has a sophisticated strategy to carry out its goals of spreading its version of Islam all over the world. Bin Laden is not a fool. He knows he cannot conquer the world." Ganor outlined what he felt was Bin Laden's three-stage strategy.

First, he wants "to shake the stability of the Muslim states of Central Asia and the Middle East." These are states that are majority Muslim countries. "You have an active local radical Islamic movement. And what Bin Laden would like to do is to create the circumstances that will make it possible for this Islamic radical movement to gain control in their homeland. That is the whole purpose of the global jihad."

Not that they will directly revolt against the Muslim countries but that they will make the circumstances and shake the stability of these countries in order that other, local, Islamic radical movements can gain control there."

The second stage, Ganor continued, would be to weaken the surrounding states: Turkey; the former Islamic republics of the USSR; the western side of China, the Xinjiang area; Indonesia, Malaysia, and the north of Africa.

The third and final stage would be "direct and indirect confrontation with rest of the world and the Western societies."

If this is true, why did Bin Laden attack the United States on 9/11? "Didn't the United States belong to the third stage, not to the first one?" Ganor proposed that it was "because they identified the United States as the main obstacle to achieve the first stage." In support of this view Ganor cited the demands that Al Qaeda and Bin Laden posed to the American government immediately after 9/11. "They mentioned this in video cassettes and public statements. There were two concrete demands for the American people. One was to take your troops out of any Muslim soil. Two was, don't spend your taxpayers' money on what they called corrupted Arab regimes and Israel."

If the American people "were to behave the way the Spanish people did behave after they were attacked," the result, Ganor said, would be a US policy of isolationism. "This would shake the stability of the states of the first stage, of Central Asia and the Middle East. What would Egypt do without the American monetary support? What would Israel do without it? What would Jordan do without it? What would Kuwait do without the American military presence there? They would not be able to give their people the basic services they are used to. The people would be very angry about that, and they would revolt. That was the plan."

SUICIDE ATTACKS AND NONCONVENTIONAL TERRORISM

Another characteristic of the threat, Ganor said, is the use of the tactic of suicide bombing. "A suicide attack is like a small bomb. The suicide attacker is no more than a platform to carry the explosives. But this platform can think, and therefore this platform can decide exactly where and when to explode in order to commit the maximum damage." In Israel, he pointed out, there have been thousands of attacks in the last five years. "The number of suicide attacks is less than half of one percent of all the incidents. The number killed by suicide attacks is more than fifty percent of the deaths."

The danger posed by any terrorist group, Ganor said, should be measured on two axes: how high their motivation is, and how good their operational capability. Suicide bombers are obviously acting on the highest possible motivation. The groups employing this tactic, he added, have also been seeking or experimenting with chemical weapons and possibly considering still more grim alternatives.

In the case of the jihadist movement, Ganor said, "these guys, I would say bluntly, would not be reluctant, and will use, nonconventional terrorism whenever they would be able to do so. And when I say nonconventional I refer to chemical, biological, radiological, or, god forbid, nuclear."

Ganor cited an interview with Osama Bin Laden by ABC in 1998. "He was asked, 'Would you ever use nonconventional ingredients in your attacks?' The answer was 'Yes. I would regard it as a sin not to use every means that I would have in my hands in order to defend the Muslims from the infidels.'" Ganor also noted an interview his Institute for Counter Terrorism conducted with an active religious jihadist. The jihadist was asked "Would it be right to use nonconventional terrorism knowing that a lot of Muslims would be hurt as an outcome of this?" The answer was yes. Why? "Because we are fighting a defensive war. We defend the Muslims from the infidels."

When the American troops captured the training bases of Al Qaeda in Afghanistan after 9/11, Ganor said, "they found video cassettes that showed that the activists were using chemical poison gas on dogs. So at least the chemical capability was there back then. In the last four years we have had several nonconventional attacks that were operational in Europe and in Jordan." He cited two possible uses of ricin gas, in France and in Britain, and an attempt to launch a cyanide attack in Amman, Jordan, a few months ago.

IS THE JIHADIST STRUGGLE A DEFENSIVE WAR?

Here Boaz Ganor took up the characterization of jihadism as a defensive war. "Actually people buy this propaganda from Bin Laden and Al Qaeda. You can hear in Europe, and also in the United States, 'Well, they are defending themselves. They defend themselves against American militarism, against military presence of the Americans in the Arab and Muslim countries. They defend themselves against American colonialism, against globalization,' and so on and so forth. I would argue, yes, they defend themselves. It is a defensive war. But it is not defense against American troops, or American militarism. It's a defense against Coca Cola, against McDonald's, against the Internet, against anything that has to do with modernity, which the United States represents in the best way. Because these guys know that the biggest enemy of Islamic radicalism is modernity. The biggest enemy of Islamic radicalism is the Western way of life. And therefore they would like to see to it that [the West] won't be able to educate or change the minds of the Muslim masses by being exposed to modernity and the Western way of life. The world is much more complicated than just calling your troops back home."

MORE DANGEROUS THAN THE SOVIET UNION WAS?

Even given this summary of the dangers of jihadism, how can Ganor argue that this movement is more dangerous than the Soviet Union during the cold war? "In the cold war you had two superpowers with hundreds of nuclear warheads facing each other. Surely this was more dangerous than global jihad militias?" The jihadists are the greater danger, he said, "because these guys have a different kind of rational decision-making process." The USSR and the United States, he said, shared enough common assumptions that they could negotiate; or even threaten each other, but keep communication channels open. In contrast, Ganor said, there is no channel of communication or shared goals that permits negotiation between the jihadists and Western secular society.

HOW CAN JIHADIST TERROR BE COMBATED?

The most essential requirement of effective protection against radical Islamicists, Boaz Ganor said, is good intelligence. "It is needed to have accurate, up-to-date, good, intimate intelligence in order to fulfill all other missions of counter-terrorist activity."

Given good intelligence, Ganor then distinguished between two types of terrorist organization: a skeletal organization and a popular organization. "A skeletal organization would be like the Red Brigades, Bader Meinhoff, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. In a skeletal organization you have a nucleus group of activists, a shell that can hold a few activists, several dozens, a hundred, a bit more. But if you capture or kill all of them you end the problem with this organization. So I don't jump to the conclusion that there is no way to solve the problem of terrorism just by using punitive measures."

Ganor contrasted this with confronting a large popular organization such as Hamas, Hizbullah, or Al Qaeda. "Then I would say it is impossible to deal with them only through operational offensive military activity."

There are two factors analysts should weigh in judging the potential impact of a terrorist group and what tactics to use to combat it, Ganor said. These are motivation and operational capability. The strength of a terrorist organization is the sum of these two elements. As long as motivation has not reached a certain high level, political or religious disagreement will not erupt in terrorist activity. Once motivation reaches a critical point, the members of the group seek out capability: arms, explosives, etc.

WHEN TO EXPECT A BOOMERANG EFFECT

"What can we expect from an effective counter-terrorist operation against a terrorist group?" Ganor asked rhetorically. "There will be a decrease in the operational capability of the terrorists so hopefully they will be unable to launch an attack. But I would argue that this would be a short-term influence." As long as the motivation is there, he said, the operational capability will be rebuilt. In fact, "the motivation will be raised immediately after the offensive campaign; that's the boomerang effect."

Ganor said that in his interviews with high Israeli security officials that he found them divided on whether there really is a boomerang effect. He commented:

"The boomerang effect actually exists. I can give you some examples. The first one in 1992. Israel killed the head of Hizbullah, Abbas El Mousawi. As a clear retaliation effect a month after that, Hizbullah launched a suicide attack against the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, killing many Israelis there. That was a clear retaliation, which was not launched before. The capability was there all the time. They could use it if they wanted to, but only after a rise in motivation by killing the head of their organization they retaliated in a way they were reluctant to do beforehand."

The following year, Israel launched air strikes against a Hizbullah training base in the Beqaa Valley in Lebanon in which 100 trainees were killed. In July 1994, "Hizbullah launched the second suicide attack in Buenos Aires, against the Jewish Community House. Clear retaliation."

Another example, Ganor said, was Israel's killing of "The Engineer," Yehiya Ayash, in 1995. "The Engineer was the one person responsible for importing into Israel the suicide attack, and it caused so many casualties in Israel. Less than a month later we had four suicide attacks in a row in one week, which had never happened before. This was a clear retaliation attack."

While some Israeli officials agreed with Ganor that retaliation attacks are part of the terrorist pattern of operation, some others denied it, holding simply that terrorists will attack whenever they find an opening because that is what they do. These officials replied, "When they launch an attack they will say, 'This happened because you attacked me' a week ago or a month ago. This is propaganda. This is psychological warfare."

This group also offered examples, where there had been no retaliatory attacks. "In 1995 somebody—I'm saying somebody because Israel didn't take responsibility so I don't take responsibility for that—killed the head of Islamic Jihad in Malta, Fathi Shqaqi. But Islamic Jihad put the responsibility on Israel and they said that they were going to retaliate against Israel. Nothing happened. Why, this school says? Because they couldn't. Not that they didn't want to; they couldn't." Another example Ganor offered was the killing of Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, the head of Hamas, by Israel in a March 2004 air strike. "And a few weeks after, another head of Hamas, the successor of Yassin, Rantisi. And Hamas was furious. The Palestinians were furious...Nothing happened. Why? Because they couldn't." These Israeli officials concluded that there is no such thing as a boomerang attack.

"Who is right?" Boaz Ganor asked. Both, he replied. For a counter-terror planner, the key, in his view, is to weigh both the level of motivation and effective capability of a terrorist group before taking action. "Prior to launching an offensive activity I can tell you that we can predict whether there will be a retaliation attack or not."

MOTIVATION AND CAPABILITY: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HAMAS AND HIZBULLAH

In the last two years, Ganor said, "we have had a huge decline in the number of terrorist incidents in Israel. Both the Palestinian terrorist organizations and the Shiite terrorist organization [Hizbullah] launched much less successful terrorist activities against Israel. Now, I would argue that although the outcome was the same, the reasons why we saw this decline are totally different."

For the Palestinian armed groups such as Hamas, he said, the limiting factor in the last two years has been weak operational capability, not their motivation. "Their motivation is as high as could be, more than ever." Israel has succeeded, he said, in restricting these groups' offensive capability through military strikes combined with defensive measures, particularly the construction of the fence separating the West Bank from Israel. He presented a graph showing that while attacks on Israel have mounted steadily since 2000, that casualties peaked in 2002 and declined sharply after that. The great majority of terrorist attacks since then have been failures. "We believe that 85% of the attacks are being thwarted."

Hizbullah in Lebanon "also doesn't launch terrorist attacks against Israel," Ganor said, "but the limiting factor for Hizbullah is motivation." Hizbullah's capability "is enormous." Hizbullah "has thousands of Katyusha rockets that today cover half of Israel from Tel Aviv to the south and north. Hizbullah has organizations and cells that are ready to launch attacks in the West Bank and Gaza. Hizbullah has some sleeper cells within Israel among the Israeli Arabs."

If Hizbullah does not launch daily attacks on Israel, Ganor stated, "it is only for one reason. It doesn't want to." The main restraint on Hizbullah, in his opinion, is pressure from Iran and Syria as well as from the American administration. For Iran and Syria, which have sponsored Hizbullah, "it is not in their interests to see retaliation in the region right now. Syria has a problem with Lebanon. Iran has a problem because right now they have a nuclear capability. None of them would like to be responsible for a deterioration in the region. Therefore they prevent Hizbullah from launching its capability against Israel. So we see how the limiting factor is a different one."

THE ULTIMATE SOLUTION FOR TERRORISM

The ultimate way to curb terrorist activity, Boaz Ganor proposed, is a combination of military repression with a long-term program to change the minds of potential terrorist supporters. First, he said, is repeated frequent offensive activities against the terrorist groups. "But if you do that successfully you should bear in mind that this just buys you time to build a new motivation. Sometimes, unfortunately, we tend to forget that and we are satisfied with the operational success that we have and we say everything is okay. But we turn a blind eye to the real problem."

Ganor judged that both Israel and the United States have had considerable successes in striking blows at the operational capability of terrorist groups, but the two countries "are huge failures in dealing with the motivation of the masses that support these terrorists. Both of them don't do even the first steps that are needed." He cited as an example a recent Israeli operation against tunnels Palestinian militants were digging between the Gaza Strip and Egypt to smuggle weapons and explosives into the Gaza Strip.

"When Israel sent its armed convoy to demolish several Palestinian buildings, because it was an operational need—the buildings were being used as camouflage to build these tunnels to smuggle weapons—Israel was criticized from all over the world for doing that, demolishing civilian houses. What I am saying is that when you have an operational need like that, you have to bear in mind what will be the consequences of your operational activity on the minds of the masses and the motivation of the community."

Ganor did not propose to abandon such operations because they stir up opposition and criticism. But, he added, "I would recommend that when you send this convoy, see to it that at the end of the convoy, after the tanks and the armored cars, you have two Brinks armored cars full of money." After the buildings are demolished, "if you find a tunnel under the building, you should send the residents of this building to hell. But if you didn't find a tunnel there, you should compensate the residents of the building three times more, four times more, than the worth of the damage that you caused them. It will not make them Zionists, but it can ameliorate the hatred. It can show the masses that you didn't do it to punish them or to take revenge or to create hatred. It will show a different way of dealing with this phenomenon."

THE JIHADIST SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

More broadly, Ganor said, the opponents of jihadist terrorism should imitate the educational and welfare institutions that have been a mainstay of the public appeal of the Islamic radical organizations since the late 1970s. "You take a village in Sudan or Egypt, you have a guy there who has three or four wives and fifteen or twenty kids. This is common, not unusual. There is no way in the world that this guy can meet the basic needs of his kids. And I don't refer even to a good education but to one hot meal a day." The governments of the region, he said, are too preoccupied with other problems to offer services to these kinds of overstretched families.

"The local Islamic radical movement opens a mosque in this village. And in the mosque they open a madrasa, a school. And also a welfare center. And they give all these services free of charge. Now this person who has these fifteen kids, he's not an Islamic radical. He's not an activist. He sends his kids there because he gets everything free of charge. And then, after a whole generation, what you see is masses who have been indoctrinated for years with Islamic radicalism. That is what has happened over the last twenty-five years."

Ganor urged the governments of predominantly Muslim nations to found their own educational and welfare institutions. He added that they should not expect quick results. It would take a full generation to have a noticeable effect, just as the jihadist infrastructure had taken.

However, he cautioned the United States and Western nations to leave education in the hands of moderate Muslim institutions and not try to run schools of their own. "There is no way that the United States or Western society can educate Muslims. Only Muslims can educate Muslims. And the nonradical Muslims have to understand that they have to fight. They have to fight this phenomenon, not because the United States and the Western society wants them to. Why? Because they are being regarded as no less infidels than the Americans or the Israelis. Actually they are being regarded as both infidels and traitors by the Islamic radicals. They cannot stand back and believe that it is not their war and that it is a wave that will pass away."

Ganor called on the Muslim states to outlaw the educational and welfare activities of the Islamic radicals and replace them with comparable institutions of the Muslim mainstream. This would require, he said, substantial financial support from the West. Ganor advocated a new Marshall Plan to offer help to the Islamic moderates. They need resources "to be able to close these services that the Islamic radical movements give to the masses and to open different services that do the same thing but without this indoctrination."

THE DEMOCRATIC DILEMMA

Boris Ganor closed by touching on an issue that has come to the fore in the United States as well as the Middle East since 9/11: what balance can be struck between the needs of security and the protection of or struggle to achieve democracy and civil and human rights. "We have to acknowledge that there is a contradiction between the two" poles.

"The government in a democratic society, when they face terrorism, they are being pressured by their own people to use the most extreme measures in order to defend the masses." Any government that fails to respond with stern measures after a severe terrorist attack occurs, he said, "is committing political suicide." But if such a government uses every repressive measure at its disposal, "they lose their legitimacy to govern. That is exactly playing into the hands of the terrorists."

The solution, he said, is a careful balance between the extremes. "The American way, and forgive me for saying that I think it was a bad way...[has been] jumping from one end to the other end in a very short time. The Americans jumped from guarding very extreme liberal democratic values into the most extreme effective measures of counter-terrorism in one day after 9/11. We see Guantanamo, we see interrogations, we see Abu Ghraib, we see the Patriot law, and so forth."

Ganor contrasted this sudden policy shift to the approach taken by Israel. "Israel had, unfortunately, the experience of dealing with terrorism from day one." In Israel, Ganor commented, the Supreme Court has been intimately involved in reviewing and moderating military and government policies toward terrorist activity. The judges, he said, "were smart enough to give the tools to the security agencies, to the intelligence agencies, to fight terrorism effectively. But they still guarded liberal democratic values and they cut the edge of these measures to find the golden bridge between them." It is only now, he concluded, that the US courts are beginning to weigh in on some of the more extreme measures taken by the Bush administration in its campaign against terrorist groups. *international.ucla.edu.*, May 15, 2005.

And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren.

Genesis 16:11, 12