

September 2004



The

# JOURNAL

---

A Summit Ministries Publication

---

Let him who stole steal no longer, but rather let him labor, working with his hands what is good, that he may have something to give him who has need.

Ephesians 4:28

## **From The President's Desk**

There is no doubt that Islam is at war with Western Civilization, a civilization steeped in Christian values, morality, art, etc., but now not so sure it wants anything to do with God, Christ or the Bible. It seems we have abandoned the very foundation stones that made Western Civilization one of the greatest in all human history.

Anyway, in the following article, Dinesh D'Souza takes up one point of the discussion that will be increasingly prominent well into this century—freedom and virtue. His article appeared in The Washington Times, July 4, 2004

“Behind the physical attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon was an intellectual attack—not just on American foreign policy but also on the central principle of American life, the principle of freedom.

“So far, the United States has responded with effective military action against the al Qaeda network, but it has not effectively answered the Islamic critique of America at its deepest level.

“Usually Americans seek to defend their society by appealing to its shared principles. Thus, they say America is a free or a prosperous society, or is diverse and pluralistic, or a place where religious differences are tolerated, or a nation where women have the same rights as

men. The most intelligent Islamic critics admit all this but dismiss it as worthless triviality.

“A leading theoretician of Islamic fundamentalism is Egyptian writer Sayyid Qutb. Qutb is called ‘the brains behind bin Laden.’ Mr. Qutb and other Islamic radicals argue the West is a society based on freedom while the Islamic world is based on virtue.

“In his books, Mr. Qutb says: Look at how badly freedom is often used in the West. Look at the pervasive materialism, the crime rates, the breakdown of the family, the pervasive vulgarity and debasement of the popular culture. Our society may be poor, Mr. Qutb and other Islamic activists say, but we try to carry out God’s will. Mr. Qutb argues Islamic laws are based on divine law, and God’s law is necessarily higher than any human law. The Islamic radicals contend virtue is ultimately a higher principle than freedom.

“We are tempted to dismiss the Islamic critique as based on irrational hatred or envy, but we shouldn’t. Indeed the Islamic critique as exemplified by Mr. Qutb is quite similar to the critique that the classical philosophers, including Plato and Aristotle, made of freedom. The classical thinker would have agreed with Mr. Qutb that virtue, not freedom, is the ultimate goal of a good society. And in saying this, they would be quite right. How, then, can the Islamic argument against America be answered on its own terms?

“Let us concede that, in a free society, freedom often will be used badly. The Islamic critics have a point when they deplore our high crime and illegitimacy rates and the triviality and vulgarity of our popular culture. Freedom, by definition, includes freedom to do good or evil, to act nobly or basely. Thus we should not be surprised there is considerable vice, license and vulgarity in a free society. Given the warp of humanity, freedom simply expresses human flaws and weaknesses.

“But if freedom brings out the worst in people, it also brings out the best. The millions of Americans who live decent, praise-worthy lives deserve our highest admiration because they have opted for the good when the good is not the only option. Even amidst the temptations a rich and free society offers, they have remained on the straight path. Their virtue has special luster because it is freely chosen.

“The free society does not guarantee virtue, any more than it guarantees happiness. But it allows pursuit of both, a pursuit rendered all the more meaningful and profound as success is not guaranteed and must be won through personal striving.

“By contrast, the authoritarian society Islamic fundamentalists advocate undermines the possibility of virtue. If virtue is insufficient in free societies, it is almost nonexistent in Islamic societies because coerced virtues are not virtues at all.

“Consider the woman required to wear a veil. There is no modesty in this, because the

woman is compelled. Compulsion cannot produce virtue, but only produces the outward semblance of virtue.

“Indeed, once the reins of coercion are released, as they were for the terrorists who lived in the United States, the worst impulses of human nature break loose. Sure enough, the deeply religious terrorists spent their last days in gambling dens, bars and strip clubs, sampling the licentious lifestyle they were about to strike out against. In this respect, they were like the Spartans, who—Plutarch tells us—were abstemious in public but privately coveted wealth and luxury. In theocracies such as Iran, the absence of freedom signals the absence of virtue.

“ ‘To make us love our country,’ Edmund Burke once wrote, ‘our country ought to be lovely.’ A reflective patriotism in America is based on understanding that the free society is not simply more prosperous, more varied and more tolerant: It is also morally superior to the Islamic society. The greatness of America is that it gives us the freedom to live both the good life and the life that is good.”

### Month In Review

Q Therefore, putting away lying, let each one of you speak truth with his neighbor, for we are members of one another. Be angry, and do not sin: do not let the sun go down on your wrath, nor give place to the devil. Let him who stole steal no longer, but rather let him labor, working with his hands what is good, that he may have something to give him who has need. Let no corrupt word proceed out of your mouth, but what is good for necessary edification, that it may impart grace to the hearers. And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you were sealed for the day of redemption. Let all bitterness, wrath, anger, clamor, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice. And be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God in Christ forgave you.

“Therefore be imitators of God as dear children. And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us and given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling aroma.

“But fornication and all uncleanness or covetousness, let it not even be named among you, as is fitting for saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor coarse jesting, which are not fitting, but rather giving of thanks. For this you know, that no fornicator, unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, has any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God. Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience. Therefore do not be partakers with them.”

—Ephesians 4:25-5:7

Q If the parents in each generation...knew what really goes on at their son's schools, the history of education would be very different.”

—C.S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*

Q My point is that those who stand outside all judgments of value cannot have any ground for preferring one of their own impulses to another except the emotional strength of that impulse.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*

Q Either we are rational spirits obliged for ever to obey the absolute values of the Tao [moral order], or else we are mere nature to be kneaded and cut into new shapes for the pleasures of masters who must, by hypothesis, have no motive but their own ‘natural’ impulses. Only the Tao provides a common human law of action which can overarch rulers and ruled alike. A dogmatic belief in objective value is necessary to the very idea of a rule which is not tyranny or an obedience which is not slavery.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*

Q But the man-molders of the new age will be armed with the powers of an omniscient state and an irresistible scientific technique: we shall get at last a race of conditioners who really can cut out all posterity in what shape they please...

“The Conditioners, then, are to choose what kind of artificial Tao they will, for their own good reason, produce in the Human race. It is not that they are bad men. They are not men at all. Stepping outside the Tao they have stepped into the void.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*

Q The humanistic system of values has now become the predominant way of thinking in most of the power centers of society. It has outstripped Judeo-Christian precepts in the universities, in the news media, in the entertainment industry, in the judiciary, in the federal bureaucracy, in business, medicine, law, psychology, sociology, in the arts, in many public schools and, to be sure, in the halls of Congress. Indeed, the resources available to secular humanists throughout society are almost unlimited in scope, and they are breaking new ground almost every day.

—James C. Dobson, *Children At Risk*, p. 22

Q Americans are no longer willing to pour more billions into programs that have failed to accomplish their goals. They are also growing weary of supporting a public-education system which bans God, encourages licentiousness, decries Western civilization, indicts American tradition, promotes cultural disharmony, and serves as a breeding ground to indoctrinate new

little liberals.”

—Rush Limbaugh, III, *The Way Things Ought to Be*, p. 302

Q Theirs is an anti-American credo, which abhors American political and governmental institutions and this nation’s capitalistic economy. Their value system is at war with the Judeo-Christian tradition upon which this country was founded and is centered in secular humanism and moral relativism. Theirs is the ‘me generation,’ which seeks immediate gratification, presumably because there is no spiritual tomorrow. Their God is not spiritual or personal. Their God is in every fiber of nature and is impersonal. He is just as much a part of the plant and animal kingdom as He is a part of the human soul; thus, their pantheistic devotion to animals and the environment. Their God did not give them dominion over nature and the animal kingdom, positioning them at the top rung on the hierarchy of creation, as did the Judeo-Christian God who inspired Genesis. As their emphasis is on this world, they cling to the belief that man is morally perfectible and that Utopia on earth is achievable.

“If you look at popular culture and TV shows or go to any major university you will find that the ideals of the 1960s generation are alive and well. They march under different labels now: political correctness, gender politics, peace studies. But they are all based on the same misguided premise held by the ’60s radicals: that Utopia is possible. They think that a centralized governmental authority can bring us Utopia. I say that’s bunk. I think it is Utopian to expect that every citizen will eat equally well on every day of the year. I think it is Utopian to expect that every citizen will be provided health care in whatever amount and to whatever degree he wants every day of the year.

“I think it is Utopian to believe that we can eliminate suffering of all kinds. It is certainly an honorable goal to attempt to reduce hunger, provide health care, and diminish suffering. But it is simply not realistic to expect that every citizen will have what he considers enough good food and fine health care. It’s not even possible to guarantee everyone an adequate supply of those things, because the definition of adequate always changes with rising affluence. The poor in America today are incredibly rich compared with the much higher percentage of poor people at the turn of the century. Why, in America, over half of those classified as poor own a dishwasher, most have a car, and nearly all have a television set. Most have enough to eat, but now we hear complaints about the quality of their food. We hear that too many fast-food joints operate in poor neighborhoods and therefore the poor aren’t getting a nutritious enough diet. You can never wipe out the poor because the standard for being poor keeps rising.

“Equalizing outcomes and ensuring everyone a mediocre minimum was what communism tried to accomplish. That’s what the socialists tried to accomplish. They tried to produce a Utopia and failed miserably.

—Rush Limbaugh, III, *The Way Things Ought to Be*, p. 261, 262

Q Advocates of secular humanism, for example, have been quite clear and explicit as to the crucial importance of promoting their philosophy in the schools, to counter or undermine religious values among the next generation.”

—Thomas Sowell, *Inside American Education*, p. 59

Q German scientists said Friday they had developed a ‘pioneering’ method of extracting stem cells from the human body that could render obsolete the controversial practice of harvesting the cells from embryos.

“Researchers at the Fraunhofer Institute and the University of Luebeck succeeded in extracting cells from human and rat glandular tissue that have similar properties to embryonic stem cells, the institute said in a statement. Researchers said they took cells from a 74-year-old person and a rat that were extremely stable, and easily multiplied them and conserved them by freezing.

“ ‘An easily accessible source for the extraction of highly potent stem cells has been discovered, in almost any vertebrate but also in the human body, regardless of sex and age,’ the institute said.

“Stem cells are master cells in the body that have the capability to transform into new cells or tissue.

“They can be taken from adults and discarded umbilical cords but those from embryos are considered especially valuable as each one has the potential to become any sort of cell or tissue.

“Researches believe they may offer a revolutionary way to repair diseased and damaged body tissues and could be used in the treatment of diseases such as cancer and Parkinson’s.

“But anti-abortion groups and other opponents who believe life begins at conception argue that the harvesting of cells from embryos violates the unborn baby’s human rights.”

—Reuters, Yahoo News, Tech Tuesday, July 2004

Q Pushing the world’s biggest ground-based telescopes to their limits, astronomers have peered deep into cosmic history and spied something they shouldn’t have: grizzled old galaxies in an epoch when only infant swarms of stars were thought to exist.

“The perplexing discovery, reported in Thursday’s issue of the journal *Nature* by two separate teams, could force scientists to scrap dearly held theories about how our Milky Way

and other galaxies came to be.

“ ‘Up until now, we assumed that galaxies were just beginning to form between 8 to 11 billion years ago, but what we found suggests that is not the case,’ said astronomer Karl Glazebrook of Johns Hopkins University, who led one of the research teams.

“Gregory Wirth, an astronomer at the W.M. Keck Observatory in Hawaii, who did not participate in the studies, called the teams’ findings significant.

“ ‘What this is telling us is our picture of how galaxies form is incomplete,’ he said.

“First proposed in 1984, the leading theory of galaxy formation is known as the ‘hierarchical model.’

“It says the menagerie of massive galaxies we have today coalesced from smaller groupings of stars.

“According to theory, this process should have required billions of years.

“That doesn’t jibe, however, with what Glazebrook and his colleagues found using the Gemini North Telescope in Mauna Kea, Hawaii.

“To peer back into time, the astronomers took advantage of the fact that the more distant an object is in space, the older it is because the speed of light is constant.

“When astronomers view a distant star or galaxy, they are seeing it not as it exists today but as it looked millions or billions of years ago, when the light left the object.

“By capturing faint starlight from the fringes of the cosmos, Glazebrook and his team were able to study galaxies as they looked 3 billion to 6 billion years after the big bang, the fiery explosion thought to have given rise to the universe 14 billion years ago.

“What they saw surprised them: Rather than seeing collections of infant or adolescent stars, they found galaxies not unlike those that exist today.”

—The [Colorado Springs] Gazette, July 11, 2004, A 22

Q Dark matter has just become a shade darker. At the APS meeting, physicists from the Minnesota-based Cryogenic Dark Matter Search (CDMS) reported that the first results from the most sensitive dark-matter detector ever built had failed to reveal the invisible particles that theorists believe make up most of the mass in the universe. The finding nails shut the

coffin on a controversial claim to have spotted dark matter, but if the particles continue to be no-shows, that would spell trouble for scientists' understanding of our universe.

“Almost all astrophysicists are certain that dark matter exists. Several lines of evidence suggest that about 85% of the universe's mass is invisible. Stranger still, the observations imply that this mass is not the ordinary matter that makes up stars and planets and people. It must be made of an entirely different type of particle. The leading candidate by far is known as a weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP).

“Despite years of trying, scientists have yet to catch WIMPs. Since 1998, researchers in the Italian Dark Matter (DAMA) experiment have claimed to have seen their faint signature, but nobody else has confirmed DAMA's results—and other experiments seemed to belie them (Science, 7 June 2002, p. 1782).

“CDMS also started hunting WIMPs in 1998, using silicon and germanium detectors to look for dark-matter particles traversing a tunnel at Stanford University in California. If a dark-matter particle bumps into an atom in the detector, it leaves behind some energy, which shows up as a signal. But cosmic rays and stray nuclear particles can give false readings and limit the detectors' sensitivity. So, in 2003, physicists running the second phase of the experiment, CDMS II, buried improved detectors deep in an iron mine in Soudan, Minnesota, where overlying rock and soil screen out most of the stray particles.

“CDMS II is four times more sensitive than any other experiment is, says team member Bernard Sadoulet, a physicist at the University of California, Berkeley. Nevertheless, CDMS II has not spotted a WIMP in 53 days of running. Says Stanford physicist and CDMS II team member Blas Cabrera: ‘If there had been WIMP events in the data set, we're quite convinced we would have seen them.’

“Although the results are disheartening so far, they at least refute the controversial DAMA claim. If the DAMA result were a genuine observation, say Sadoulet, ‘we would have observed something like 150 events.’ At another talk at the meeting, physicist Lawrence Krauss of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, declared that ‘DAMA is dead, as far as I can see.’ But Rita Bernabei, a physicist with the DAMA collaboration, says that the CDMS results are ‘model dependent’ and do not invalidate DAMA's direct measurements of dark matter.

“The CDMS II team plans to increase the instrument's sensitivity in the coming months by adding more detectors. Then, the experiment will run for several more years. If CDMS II hasn't shined spotlight on a dark-matter particle by then, cosmologists will be in a dark mood indeed.”



Q Our ideas about the history of the universe are dominated by big bang theory. But its dominance rests more on funding decisions than on the scientific method, according to Eric Lerner [president of Lawrenceville Plasma Physics] and dozens of other scientists.”

—New Scientist, May 22, 2004, p. 20

Q Big Bang theory relies on a growing number of hypothetical entities—things that we have never observed. Inflation, dark matter, and dark energy are the most prominent. Without them, there would be fatal contradictions between the observations made by astronomers and the predictions of the big bang theory. In no other field of physics would this continual recourse to new hypothetical objects be accepted as a way of bridging the gap between theory and observation. It would, at the least, raise serious questions about the validity of the underlying theory.

“But the big bang theory can’t survive without these fudge factors. Without the hypothetical inflation field, the big bang does not predict the smooth, isotropic cosmic background radiation that is observed, because there would be no way for parts of the universe that are now more than a few degrees away in the sky to come to the same temperature and thus emit the same amount of microwave radiation.

“Without some kind of dark matter, unlike any that we have observed on Earth despite 20 years of experiments, big bang theory makes contradictory predictions for the density of matter in the universe. Inflation requires a density 20 times larger than that implied by big bang nucleosynthesis, the theory’s explanation of the origin of the light elements.

“Without dark energy, the theory predicts that the universe is only about 8 billion years old, which is billions of years younger than the age of many stars in our galaxy.

“What’s more, the big bang theory can boast of no quantitative predictions that have subsequently been validated by observation. The successes claimed by the theory’s supporters consist of its ability to retrospectively fit observations with a steadily increasing array of adjustable parameters, just as the old Earth-centered cosmology of Ptolemy needed layer upon layer of epicycles.

“Yet the big bang is not the only framework available for understanding the history of the universe. Plasma cosmology and the steady-state model both hypothesise an evolving universe without beginning or end. These and other alternative approaches can also explain the basic phenomena of the cosmos, including the abundances of light elements, the generation of large-scale structure, the cosmic background radiation, and how the red shift of faraway galaxies increases with distance. They have even predicted new phenomena that were subsequently observed, something the big bang has failed to do.

“Supporters of the big bang theory may retort that these theories do not explain every cosmological observation. But that is scarcely surprising, as their development has been severely hampered by a complete lack of funding. Indeed, such questions and alternatives cannot even now be freely discussed and examined. An open exchange of ideas is lacking in most mainstream conferences. Whereas Richard Feynman could say that ‘science is the culture of doubt’, in cosmology today doubt and dissent are not tolerated, and young scientists learn to remain silent if they have something negative to say about the standard big bang model. Those who doubt the big bang fear that saying so will cost them their funding.

“Even observations are now interpreted through this biased filter, judged right or wrong depending on whether or not they support the big bang. So discordant data on red shifts, lithium and helium abundances, and galaxy distribution, among other topics, are ignored or ridiculed. This reflects a growing dogmatic mindset that is alien to the spirit of free scientific enquiry.

“Today, virtually all financial and experimental resources in cosmology are devoted to big bang studies. Funding comes from only a few sources, and all the peer-review committees that control them are dominated by supporters of the big bang. As a result, the dominance of the big bang within the field has become self-sustaining, irrespective of the scientific validity of the theory.

“Giving support only to projects within the big bang framework undermines a fundamental element of the scientific method—that constant testing of theory against observation. Such a restriction makes unbiased discussion and research impossible.

“To redress this, we urge those agencies that fund work in cosmology to set aside a significant fraction of their funding for investigations into alternative theories and observational contradictions of the big bang. To avoid bias, the peer review committee that allocates such funds could be composed of astronomers and physicists from outside the field of cosmology.

“Allocating funding to investigations into the big bang’s validity, and its alternatives, would allow the scientific process to determine our most accurate model of the history of the universe.”

—New Scientist, May 22, 2004, p. 20

Q The first surprise from the [Hubble] Deep Field is how many more galaxies there were in the past. ‘We’re all trying to figure out if this is real,’ says Bahcall, ‘or whether they are misinterpreting the image.’ What happened to all these galaxies? Did they fade? Or are the galaxies we see today formed of many pieces—that is, did many primordial galaxies merge to form today’s?

“The second surprise from the Deep Field is that the universe’s lights, contrary to astronomers’ hunch, turned on in one great burst. It was as if every chandelier in a mansion were flicked on simultaneously on a moonless night. Today only about two stars turn on in our Milky Way every year; back then, tens of thousands turned on every year. How could the lights go on practically at once?”

—Newsweek, November 3, 1997, p. 33, 34, 36

Q Genesis one anyone?

Q A University of Toronto professor believes that one of the most sacrosanct rules of 20th century science—that the speed of light has always been the same—is wrong. Ever since Einstein proposed his special theory of relativity in 1905, physicists have accepted as fundamental principle that the speed of light—300 million meters per second—is a constant and that nothing has, or can, travel faster. John Moffat of the physics department disagrees—light once traveled much faster than it does today, he believes.

“Recent theory and observations about the origins of the universe would appear to back up his belief. For instance, theories of the origin of the universe—the ‘Big Bang’—suggests that very early in the universe’s development, it’s edges were farther apart than light, moving at a constant speed, could possibly have traveled in that time. To explain this, scientists have focused on strange, unknown, and as-yet-undiscovered forms of matter that produce gravity that repulses objects.

“Moffat’s theory—that the speed of light at the beginning of time was much faster than it is now—provides an answer to some of these cosmology problems. ‘It is easier for me to question Einstein’s theory that it is to assume there is some kind of strange, exotic matter around me in my kitchen.’ His theory could also help explain astronomers’ discovery last year that the universe’s expansion is accelerating. Moffat’s paper, co-authored with former U of Toronto researcher Michael Clayton, appeared in a recent edition of the journal *Physics Letters*.”

—Contact: Bruce Rolston, University of Toronto 416-978-6974

Q Sen. John Kerry’s flamboyant flip flops—like voting for the war in Iraq and then against the \$87 billion to fund it, courting conservative Sen. John McCain for vice president before turning to liberal Sen. John Edwards and taking both sides on the first Gulf War in separate letters to the same constituent—have garnered substantial attention in recent months. But lost in the turmoil are more subtle, but no less baffling, flip flops on the issue of same-sex ‘marriage.’

“Back in 1996, faced with the prospect of court-imposed same-sex ‘marriage’ in Hawaii, the Senate passed the Defense of Marriage Act, which clarified that no state is required to recognize same-sex ‘marriages’ performed in other states. DOMA passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote of 85-14, and was signed into law by Bill Clinton. Mr. Kerry was one of the 14 senators who voted no, on grounds that it was ‘unnecessary and divisive.’ Back then, he even labeled it fundamentally unconstitutional, on the premise that the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution requires states to recognize marriages performed outside their borders. Mr. Kerry also said that DOMA was ‘fundamentally ugly’ and amounted to ‘legislative gay-bashing,’ and he compared the current marriage laws to a ‘caste system’ akin to bans on interracial marriages decades before.

“But now—after four judges legalized same-sex ‘marriage’ in Massachusetts, and with conservatives pushing the Federal Marriage Amendment—Mr. Kerry supports leaving the issue up to the states. So why, just eight years ago, did he vote against DOMA, which was passed in order to leave same-sex ‘marriage’ up to the states? To Mr. Kerry’s credit, he now acknowledges that he was wrong in calling DOMA fundamentally unconstitutional. But he still brags about voting against it on his Web site. How can this be?

“Mr. Kerry justifies this contradiction by saying that DOMA was ‘unnecessary.’ The fact that marriage has been left up to the states for more than 200 years, Mr. Kerry thinks, is enough to keep same-sex marriages from leaking across state lines. ‘I think, in fact, that no state has to recognize something that is against their public policy,’ Mr. Kerry said during the presidential primaries. DOMA, therefore, was nothing more than a needlessly divisive form of ‘gay-bashing.’ The Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution, which Mr. Kerry invoked eight years earlier, apparently no longer applies.

“Just to add another thread to the web, Mr. Kerry has said all along that he opposes same-sex ‘marriage.’ But until recently, he also opposed a Massachusetts constitutional amendment limiting marriage to the union of a man and a woman. Now, inexplicably, he supports the amendment.

“So, all in all, it appears that Mr. Kerry voted against leaving same-sex ‘marriage’ up to the states before he said that the issue should be left up to the states. He’s said that the Full Faith and Credit Clause applies to marriage before he said that it doesn’t. And he’s declared all along that he opposes same-sex ‘marriage,’ but he also opposed a Massachusetts marriage amendment limiting marriage to the union of a man and a woman. Now, he flip flopped on that as well. It’s a tangled mess. So, where does Mr. Kerry really stand? Everywhere, as usual.”

—The Washington Times, July 19, 2004, p. A18

Q A new animal welfare law in Britain that will offer slugs and snails the same protection as

cats and dogs was condemned as absurd by gardeners yesterday.

“Legislation to be announced by the government this week will give courts the power to impose fines of up to \$37,000 and 12 months in jail on people found guilty of mistreating animals. Anyone under the age of 16 will be banned from owning a pet, and goldfish will no longer be allowed to be given as prizes at fairgrounds.

“The legislation could mean gardeners will be fined for killing insects, worms, caterpillars, slugs and snails, if scientific evidence proves they have suffered pain and distress. Cabinet ministers say the law, which updates existing legislation, is needed to protect animals from abuse. Horticulturalists say the plan is excessive and reject the idea that they could be guilty of cruelty.

Bunny Guinness, the Sunday Telegraph gardening columnist and six-time winner of the gold medal at the Chelsea Flower Show, said gardeners should not be liable to fines for protecting their gardens.

“ ‘Hundreds of slugs and snails are being slaughtered in gardens up and down the country. It would be quite ridiculous to call that cruelty. Almost all gardeners use slug pellets or salt to keep the pests at bay,’ she said.

“John Cushnie, a regular panelist on British Broadcasting Corp. Radio’s ‘Gardeners’ Question Time,’ said some aspects of the legislation were nonsensical. ‘To give worms and slugs protection under the law is ludicrous. If I have an infestation of slugs or snails or cabbage white butterflies then I will get rid of them in whatever way I choose.

“ ‘No one is going to tell me that the things are suffering. If I want to boil them alive, stamp on them or treat them to a slow, drown-out death by poison then I will—and would like to see the government that would try to interfere with a man and his garden.’

“The draft bill, which updates the Protection of Animals Act 1911, will be published next week by Ben Bradshaw, the minister for animal welfare.

“Under the bill, anyone owning a pet, farm or exotic animal would have a statutory duty of care toward it and could have it taken away. They could also be banned from looking after another. Unborn animals will receive the same protection.

“The crackdown follows pressure from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and organizations such as the Kennel Club, but has been criticized for not going far enough. The draft contains no reference to circus animals and fails to ban the docking of dogs’ tails.

“The Countryside Alliance expressed concern that the law would be interpreted for animals used for sport or recreation. Even though the changes are not intended to affect hunting, shooting or fishing, the alliance fears animal rights campaigners could attempt to use them in relation to dogs in hunt kennels, racehorses in stables and pheasants reared for game shoots.

“ ‘The law could be taken too literally. If people can be prosecuted for causing their pets psychological distress, then, in theory, a man could be arrested for having a depressed dog,’ a spokesman said.”

—London Sunday Telegraph, The Washington Times, July 11, 2004, p. A 6

Q Most Americans probably think the Islamic terrorists declared war on the United States Sept. 11, 2001.

“Actually, it started a long time before – right from the birth of the nation.

“In 1784, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and Benjamin Franklin were commissioned by the first Congress to assemble in Paris to see about marketing U.S. products in Europe.

“Jefferson quickly surmised that the biggest challenge facing U.S. merchant ships were those referred to euphemistically as ‘Barbary pirates.’

“They weren’t ‘pirates’ at all, in the traditional sense, Jefferson noticed. They didn’t drink and chase women and they really weren’t out to strike it rich. Instead, their motivation was strictly religious. They bought and sold slaves, to be sure. They looted ships. But they used their booty to buy guns, ships, cannon and ammunition.

“Like those we call ‘terrorists’ today, they saw themselves engaged in jihad and called themselves ‘mujahiddin.’

“Why did these 18th-century terrorists represent such a grave threat to U.S. merchant ships? With independence from Great Britain, the former colonists lost the protection of the greatest navy in the world. The U.S. had no navy – not a single warship.

“Jefferson inquired of his European hosts how they dealt with the problem. He was stunned to find out that France and England both paid tribute to the fiends – who would, in turn, use the money to expand their own armada, buy more weaponry, hijack more commercial ships, enslave more innocent civilians and demand greater ransom.

“This didn’t make sense to Jefferson. He recognized the purchase of peace from the Muslims only worked temporarily. They would always find an excuse to break an agreement, blame the Europeans and demand higher tribute.

“After three months researching the history of militant Islam, he came up with a very different policy to deal with the terrorists. But he didn’t get to implement it until years later.

“As the first secretary of state, Jefferson urged the building of a navy to rescue American hostages held in North Africa and to deter future attacks on U.S. ships. In 1792, he commissioned John Paul Jones to go to Algiers under the guise of diplomatic negotiations, but with the real intent of sizing up a future target of a naval attack.

“Jefferson was ready to retire a year later when what could only be described as ‘America’s first Sept. 11’ happened.

“America was struck with its first mega-terror attack by jihadists. In the fall of 1793, the Algerians seized 11 U.S. merchant ships and enslaved more than 100 Americans.

“When word of the attack reached New York, the stock market crashed. Voyages were canceled in every major port. Seamen were thrown out of work. Ship suppliers went out of business. What Sept. 11 did to the U.S. economy in 2001, the mass shipjacking of 1793 did to the fledgling U.S. economy in that year.

“Accordingly, it took the U.S. Congress only four months to decide to build a fleet of warships.

“But even then, Congress didn’t choose war, as Jefferson prescribed. Instead, while building what would become the U.S. Navy, Congress sent diplomats to reason with the Algerians. The U.S. ended up paying close to \$1 million and giving the pasha of Algiers a new warship, ‘The Crescent,’ to win release of 85 surviving American hostages.

“It wasn’t until 1801, under the presidency of Jefferson, that the U.S. engaged in what became a four-year war against Tripoli. And it wasn’t until 1830, when France occupied Algiers, and later Tunisia and Morocco, that the terrorism on the high seas finally ended.

“France didn’t leave North Africa until 1962 – and it quickly became a major base of terrorism once again.

“What’s the moral of the story? Appeasement never works. Jefferson saw it. Sept. 11 was hardly the beginning. The war in which we fight today is the longest conflict in human history. It’s time to learn from history, not repeat its mistakes.”

—WorldNetDaily, April 27, 2004