



Christian Identity Ministries

A member of the
Congregations of Israel

PO Box 146, CARDWELL, QLD, 4849, Australia

Ph: 07-4066 0146 (International 61-7 instead of 07) www.christianidentityministries.com - hr_cim@bigpond.com

"Blessed be the LORD God of *Israel*; For He hath visited and redeemed *His* people, And hath raised up an horn of salvation for *us* in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began; That *we* should be saved from *our* enemies and from the hand of all that hate *us*; to perform the mercy promised to *our* fathers and to remember his holy covenant; The oath which he sware to *our* father Abraham, That he would grant unto *us*, that *we* being delivered out of the hand of *our* enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of *our* lives." Luke 1:68-75; the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavian people are *ISRAEL!*

#324

Covenant Messenger

May AD2013

(a publication of N.Q. Fellowship of God's Covenant People)

THE CASE FOR EARLY MARRIAGE

by Mark Regnerus

(amid our purity pledges and attempts to make chastity hip, we forgot to teach young Christians how to tie the knot)

[mature reading matter!]

Virginity pledges, Chastity balls, Courtship, Side hugs, Guarding your heart. Evangelical discourse on sex is more conservative than I've ever seen it. Parents and pastors and youth group leaders told us not to do it before we got married. Why? Because the Bible says so. Yet that simple message didn't go very far in shaping our sexual decision-making.

So they kicked it up a notch and staked a battle over virginity, with pledges of abstinence and accountability structures to maintain the power of the imperative to not do what many of us felt like doing. Some of us failed, but we could become "born again virgins." Virginity mattered. But sex can be had in other ways, and many of us got creative.

Then they told us that oral sex was still sex. It could spread disease, and it would make you feel bad. "Sex will be so much better if you wait until your wedding night," they urged. If we could hold out, they said, it would be worth it. The sheer glory of consummation would knock our socks off.

Such is the prevailing discourse of abstinence culture in contemporary American evangelicalism. It might sound like I devalue abstinence. I don't. The problem is that not all abstainers end up happy or go on to the great sex lives they were promised. Nor do all indulgers become miserable or marital train wrecks. More simply, however, I have found that few evangelicals accomplish what their pastors and parents wanted them to.

Indeed, over 90 percent of American adults experience sexual intercourse before marrying. The percentage of evangelicals who do so is not much lower. In a nationally representative study of young adults, just under 80 percent of unmarried, church-going, conservative Protestants who are currently dating someone are having sex of some sort. I'm certainly not suggesting that they cannot abstain. I'm suggesting that in the domain of sex, most of them don't and won't [dating is not a good practice to follow].

What to do? Intensify the abstinence message even more? No. It won't work. The message must change, because our preoccupation with sex has unwittingly turned our attention away from the damage that Americans — including evangelicals — are doing to the institution of

marriage by discouraging it and delaying it.

LATE HAVE I LOVED YOU

If you think it's difficult to be pro-life in a pro-choice world, or to be a disciple of Jesus in a sea of skeptics, try advocating for young marriage. Almost no one empathizes, even among the faithful. The nearly universal hostile reaction to my April 23, 2009, op-ed on early marriage in *The Washington Post* suggests that to esteem marriage in the public sphere today is to speak a foreign language: you invoke annoyance, confusion, or both.

But after years of studying the sexual behaviour and family decision-making of young people, I've come to the conclusion that Christians have made much ado about sex but are becoming slow and lax about marriage—that is more significant, enduring witness to Jesus' sacrificial love for his bride. People are taking flight from marriage. We are marrying later, if at all, and having fewer children.

Demographers call it the second demographic transition. In societies like ours that exhibit lengthy economic prosperity, men and women alike begin to lose motivation to marry and have children, and thus avoid one or both.

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Case for Early Marriage,	1
No King But Caesar,	5
The Bigger the Family, The Better,	6
Want Happy Children? Do This,	8
For Whom the Bells Toll,	9
It Is Dangerous to be Right, When Government is, .	10
Should You Vaccinate Your Children,	11
The Law of Dominance,	12

The views and opinions expressed in the articles herein or herewith are those of the authors and not necessarily those of CIM. They are written by fallible men. You must ask Jesus to guide your studies!

CIM reserves the right to edit submitted or reprinted material in line with CIM editorial policy. CIM does the utmost to ensure that the spirit of articles remains intact at all times.

Pragmatically, however, the institution of marriage remains a foundational good for individuals and communities. It is by far the optimal context for child-rearing. Married people accumulate more wealth than people who are single or cohabiting. Marriage consolidates expenses—like food, child care, electricity, and gas—and over the life course drastically reduces the odds of becoming indigent or dependent on the state.

It is, however, an institution under extreme duress in America. In the past 35 years, the number of independent female households has grown by 65 percent, while the share of independent male households has skyrocketed, leaping 120 percent. As a result, fewer than half of all households today are made up of married couples.

Another indicator of our shifting sentiment about the institution is the median age at first marriage, which has risen from 21 for women and 23 for men in 1970 to where it stands today: 26 for women and 28 for men, the highest figures since the Census Bureau started collecting data about it. That's five additional, long years of peak sexual interest and fertility. (And remember, those numbers are medians: for every man marrying at 22, there's one marrying for the first time at 34).

Evangelicals tend to marry slightly earlier than other people, but not by much. Many of them plan to marry in their mid-20s. Yet waiting for sex until then feels far too long to most of them. I am suggesting that when people wait until their mid-to-late 20s to marry, it is unreasonable to expect them to refrain from sex. It is battling our Creator's reproductive designs. The data don't lie. Our sexual behaviour patterns—the kind I documented in 2007 in *Forbidden Fruit*—give us away. Very few wait long for sex. Meanwhile, women's fertility is more or less fixed, yet people are increasingly ignoring it during their 20s, only to beg and pray to reclaim it in their 30s and 40s.

WHERE ARE ALL THE CHRISTIAN MEN?

Unfortunately, evangelicals have another demographic concern: The ratio of devoutly Christian young women to men is far from even. Among evangelical church-goers, there are about three single women for every two single men. This is the elephant in the corner of almost every congregation—a shortage of young Christian men.

Try counting singles in your congregation next Sunday. Evangelicals make much of avoiding being unequally yoked, but the fact that there are far more spiritually mature women out there than men makes this bit of advice difficult to swallow. No congregational program or men's retreat in the Rocky Mountains will solve this. If she decides to marry, one in three women has no choice but to marry down in terms of Christian maturity. Many of the hopeful ones wait, watching their late 20s and early 30s arrive with no husband. When the persistent longing turns to deep disappointment, some decide that they didn't really want to marry after all.

Given this unfavourable ratio, and the plain fact that men are, on average, ready for sex earlier in relationships than women are, many young Christian women are being left with a dilemma: either commence a sexual relationship with a decent, marriage-minded man before she would prefer to—almost certainly before marriage—or risk the real possibility that, in holding out for a godly, chaste, uncommon man, she will wait a lot longer than she would like. Plenty will wait so long as to put their fertility in jeopardy.

By that time, the pool of available men is hardly the cream of the crop—and rarely chaste. I know, I know: God has someone in mind for them [although Regnerus seems to discount that very easily, and is almost saying marry the first one that comes along—hardly godly advice, CIM], and it's just a matter of time before they meet. God does work miracles. But the fact remains that there just aren't as many serious Christian young men as there are women, and the men know it. [but then we have also encountered the opposite, that the young men couldn't find serious Christian young women, CIM]

Men get the idea that they can indeed find the ideal woman if they are patient enough. Life expectancies nearing 80 years prompt many to dabble with relationships in their 20s rather than commit to a life of “the same thing” for such a long time. Men have few compelling reasons to mature quickly. Marriage seems an unnecessary risk to many of them, even Christians. Sex seldom requires such a steep commitment [obviously that is the case because they are not hanging out with Godly women. Associating with Godly women who said NO! to sex would solve that problem, CIM].

As a result, many men postpone growing up. Even their workplace performance is suffering: earnings for 25-34-year-old-men have fallen by 20 percent since 1971, even after accounting for inflation. No wonder young women marry men who are on average at least two years older than they. Unfortunately, a key developmental institution for men—marriage—is the very thing being postponed, thus perpetuating their adolescence (well into mid-life).

CHANGING IDEALS

Still, the data from nearly every survey suggest that young people want to get married — Eventually. That makes sense. Our Creator clearly intended for male and female to be knit together in covenantal relationship. An increasing number of men and women, however, aren't marrying. They want to. But it's not happening [and when it does, they end in divorce at the same rate as the rest of the world out there, CIM]. And yet in surveying this scene, many Christians continue to perceive a *sexual* crisis, not a *marital* one. We buy, read, and pass along books about battling our sexual urges, when in fact we are battling them far longer than we were meant to. How did we misdiagnose this?

The answer is pretty straightforward: While our sexual ideals have remained biblical and thus rooted in marriage, our ideas about marriage have changed significantly. For all the heated talk and contested referendums about defending marriage against attempts to legally redefine it, the church has already ceded plenty of intellectual ground in its marriage-mindedness. Christian practical ethics about marriage—not the ones expounded on in books, but the ones we actually exhibit—have become a nebulous hodgepodge of pragmatic norms and romantic imperatives, few of which resemble anything biblical.

Unfortunately, many Christians *cannot tell the difference*. Much about evangelical marital ethics is at bottom therapeutic: since we are pro-family, we are sure that a happy marriage is a central source of human contentment, and that romantic love is the key to gauge of its health. While our marriage covenants are strengthened by romance, the latter has no particular loyalty to the former.

Our personal feelings may lead us out of a marriage as quickly as they lead us into one. As a result, many of us

New Video:

HITLER'S WAR

(No connection to David Irving's book of the same name)

Some suppressed history, Austria, Sudeten-Germans.

The problem of German refugees from Poland in Danzig and Koningsberg and in Germany, which created a very bad feeling between Germany and Poland, who was supported by France and England. 97 min. - You Tube.

DVD#CI-902 sug don \$7.00



think about marriage much like those outside the church—as a capstone that completes the life of the autonomous self. We claim to be better promise keepers, but our vision of what marriage means is not all that unique. When did all this change?

The shift has gone largely unnoticed over the past half-century. As we finally climb toward multi-generational economic success, we advise our children to finish their education, to launch their careers, and to become financially independent, since dependence is weakness. “Don’t rush into a relationship,” we caution them. “Hold out for a spouse who displays real godliness.” “First loves aren’t likely the best fit.” “You have plenty of time!” we now remind them. “Don’t bank on a mate.” Even those who successfully married young now find themselves dispensing such parental wisdom with little forethought [I married young - I was 23 and my wife was 19, but we would never encourage anyone putting off getting married if a suitable spouse was available, CIM]

As a result, many young adults sense that putting oneself in the trust of another person so soon may be foolish and risky. Many choose to wait out the risk—sometimes for years—to see how a relationship will fare before committing. [that’s why it’s important to involve in a family environment, with parents and siblings, which will be far more beneficial at assessing a future spouse than just being alone together, CIM] Consequently, the focus of 20-somethings has become less about building mature relationships and fulfilling responsibilities, and more about enjoying oneself, travelling and trying on identities and relationships. After all the fun, it will be time to settle down and get serious.

Most young people no longer think of marriage as a formative institution, but rather as the institution they enter once they think they are fully formed. Increasing numbers of young evangelicals think likewise, and, by integrating these ideas with the timeless imperative to abstain from sex before marriage, we’ve created a new optimal life formula for our children: Marriage is glorious, and a big deal. But it must wait, and with it, sex. Which is seldom as patient.

OBJECTIONS TO YOUNG MARRIAGE

Now let’s have a dose of that pragmatic reasoning, because there are some good reasons to avoid marrying young. Indeed, studies continue to show that early marriage is the *number one predictor of divorce*. So why on earth would I want to consider such a disastrous idea that flies in the face of the evidence? Two reasons:

First: what is deemed “early marriage” by researchers is commonly misunderstood. The most competent evaluations of early marriage and divorce note that the association between early age-at-marriage and divorce occurs largely among those who marry as teenagers (before age 20). Although probably all of us know successful examples of such marriages, I still don’t think teen marriage is wise. But the data suggests that marriages that commence in the early 20s are not as risky—especially for women—as conventional wisdom claims.

Second: the age at which a person marries never causes divorce. Rather, a young age-at-marriage is an indicator of an underlying proclivity for marital problems, the kind most Christian couples learn to avoid or solve without parting. Family scholars agree that there are several roots to the

link between age-at-marriage and divorce. I consider five of them here, together with some practical ways that parents, friends, and the church can work to turn such weaknesses into strengths.

(1). **Economic Insecurity:** Marrying young can spell poverty, at least temporarily. Yet the mentality that we need to shield young adults from the usual struggles of life by encouraging them to delay marriage until they are financially secure usually rests on an unrealistic standard of living. Good marriages grow through struggles, including economic ones. My wife and I are still fiscal conservatives because of our early days of austerity.

Nevertheless, the economic domain remains an area which many parents are often able, but frequently unwilling, to assist their children. Many well-meaning parents use their resources as a threat, implying that if their children marry before the age at which their parents socially approve, they are on their own. No more car insurance, no help with tuition, no more rent.

This doesn’t sound very compassionate toward marriage—or toward family members. This is, however a two-way street: many young adults consider it immature or humiliating to rely on others for financial or even social support. They would rather deal with sexual guilt—if they

sense any at all—than consider marrying before they think they are ready. This cultural predilection toward punishing rather than blessing marriage must go, and congregations and churchgoers can help by dropping their own punitive positions toward family members, as well as by identifying deserving young couples who could use a little extra help once in a while. Christians are great about supporting their missionaries (which is often misplaced), but in this matter, we can be missionaries to the marriages in our midst.

(2). **Immaturity:** Even if economic security is not a concern, immaturity and naïveté often characterize young marriages. While unlearning self-centredness and acquiring a sacrificial side aren’t easy

at any age, naïveté may actually benefit youth, since preferences and habits ingrained over years of single life often are not set aside easily. Let’s face it: Young adults are inexperienced, but they are not intrinsically incompetent at marriage. So they need, of course, the frank guidance of parents, mentors and Christian couples.

Women, however, do tend to exhibit greater maturity earlier than men. As a result, it shouldn’t surprise us when a young woman falls in love with someone three, five, even ten years her senior. Indeed, two of the finest marriages I’ve recently witnessed exhibit nearly a dozen years’ difference between husband and wife. While there are unwise ages to marry, there is no right age for which we must make our children wait. Indeed, age integration is one of the unique hallmarks of the institutional church, tacitly contesting the strict age-separation patterns that have long characterized schools and universities.

One common way that immaturity reveals itself is when parents or children make marriage into another form of social competition or sibling rivalry. Modern adolescence and young adulthood read like one contest after another: the race to win in sports, to get good grades, to attend a prestigious college, to attract the best-looking person, to secure that coveted job. Where does it end? Not with marriage. Even college students who wish to marry

New Video:

ISLAM:

What the West Needs to Know.

This video reveals the continuity of violence in the Islam faith. Islam tradition and law and theology dictates violence towards unbelievers and their goal is to establish rule of Allah over the whole earth. The Muslim community is obliged to uphold and apply that which was practiced by their prophet Mohamed who was their revered model of Islamic behaviour.

DVD#CI-909 @ sug don \$7.00



are painfully (or proudly) aware of the “ring by spring” competition. Marriage becomes equated with beautiful, successful people. Weddings become expensive displays of personal and family status. Clergy often get caught in the middle of this, and feel powerless to contest it. My father, a minister, told me that he’d rather “bury people than marry people.”

Such is the pressure cooker of modern weddings. *None* of this is good. Marriage is too important and too serious to be treated as yet another game to play, with winners and losers. It’s a covenant of mutual submission and sacrificial love, not a contest of prestige, social norms, and saving face. A trend toward more modest weddings would be a great start.

(3). **A Poor Match:** Marrying early can mean a short search process, which elevates the odds of a poorer match. In the age of online dating personality algorithms and matches (see “*Restless, Reformed, and Single*,” page 28, see www.christianitytoday.com), people have become well acquainted with the cultural notion that getting the right fit in a marital partner is extremely important. Chemistry is the new watchword as we meld marriage with science. Should opposites attract? Or should we look for common interests?

There is no right answer to such questions, because successful marriages are less about the right personalities than about the right practices, like persistent communication and conflict resolution, along with the ability to handle the cyclical nature of so much about marriage, and a bedrock commitment to its sacred unity. Indeed, marriage research confirms that couples who view their marriages as sacred covenants are far better off than those who don’t.

Toward this end, pastors, premarital counselors, and Christian friends must be free to speak frankly into the lives of those seeking their counsel about marriage. While it may be nice to find an optimal match in marriage, it cannot hold a candle to sharing a mental and spiritual commitment to the enduring covenant between God, man, and woman. It just can’t. People change. Chemistry wanes. Covenants don’t.

(4) **Marrying for Sex:** One by-product of the abstinence culture is that some marry early simply for the promise of long-awaited, guilt-free sex. After all, Paul told us that it’s better to marry than to burn with passion (1 Cor. 7). And today we certainly bear a striking resemblance to Corinth, whose church was confused about what to do with marriage. Its people were delaying marriage, just like we are. Yet in our culture of shallow marriages and easy divorce, marrying simply for the lure of sex is not what Paul had in mind. He reminded the Corinthians—and us—of the only two callings for believers in this matter; a season or lifetime of singleness, or marriage. In other words, our freedom to serve as singles or our submission as married people is never intended to be about *us*. It’s about God. While I certainly understand the biological urge to mate, we need to remind young adults that values like generosity, courage, dependability, compassion, and godliness live on far longer than do high testosterone and estrogen levels. Simply put, family and friends ought to do their best to help young couples discern whether there is more to their love than sexual desire.

(5). **Unrealistic Expectations:** Today’s young adults show tremendous optimism about their own personal futures, leading many to sense they are entitled to a great marriage that will commence according to plan, on their

timetable. Unfortunately, marital life often ends up looking different from what they had anticipated. Marriage is a remarkable institution in many ways, but it cannot bear all of the unrealistic expectations that we moderns have heaped upon it.

So enough of the honeymoon banter: insiders know that a good marriage is hard work, and that its challenges often begin immediately. The abstinence industry perpetuates a blissful myth; too much is made of the explosively rewarding marital sex life awaiting abstainers. The fact is that God makes no promises of great sex to those who wait (only blessings for obedience). Some experience difficult marriages. Spouses wander. Some are overbearing. Others cannot conceive children.

In reality, spouses *learn* marriage, just like they learn communication, child-rearing, or making love. Unfortunately, education about marriage is now sadly perceived as self-obvious, juvenile, or feminine, the domain of disparaged home economics courses. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In sum, Christians need to get real about marriage: it’s a covenant helpmate thing that suffers from too much idealism and too little realism. Weddings may be beautiful, but marriages *become* beautiful. Personal storytelling and testimonies can work wonders here, since so much about life is learned behaviour. Young adults want to know that it’s possible for two fellow

believers to stay happy together for a lifetime, and they need to hear how generations preceding them did it.

ENDURING GOSPEL WITNESS

Abstinence is not to blame for our marital crisis. But promoting it has come at a cost in a permissive world in which we are increasingly postponing marriage. While I am no fan of the demographic realities I outlined earlier, one thing I will remember is that while sex matters, *marriage matters more*. The importance of Christian marriage as a symbol of God’s covenantal faithfulness to His people—and a witness to the future union of the Body of Christ with his bride—will only grow in significance as the wider Western culture diminishes both the meaning and actual practice of marriage. Marriage itself will become a witness to the gospel.

Romantic relationship formation is what I study. I’ve spoken with hundreds of young adults about not only what they think or hope for, but also what they actually do. Time and again, I’ve listened to Christian undergraduates recount to me how their relationships turned sexual. One thing I never ask them is *why*. I know why. Because sex feels great, it feels connective, it feels deeply human. I never blame them for wanting that. Sex is intended to deepen personal relationships, and desire for it is intended to promote marriage. Such are the impulses of many young Christians in love. In an environment where parents and peers are encouraging them to delay thoughts of marriage, I’m not surprised that their sexuality remains difficult to suppress and the source of considerable angst (especially in a dating environment). We would do well to recognize some of these relationships for what they are: marriages in the making. If a young couple displays maturity, faith, fidelity, a commitment to understanding marriage as a covenant, and a sense of realism about marriage, then it’s our duty—indeed, our pleasure—to help them expedite the part of marriage that involves public recognition and celebration of what God is already knitting together. We ought to

CDs of the Month:

H-328b The Browning of America

H-330a Keeping Your Word

H-330b The Rise of the Jews

H-331a Where There is no Vision

H-331b Hare Speech of the P.C.

H-360a Idioms in the Bible

H-360b Feeding the Beast

all pastor Bob Hallstrom



“rejoice and delight” in them, and praise their love (Song of Solomon 1:4).

[Mark Regnerus, Ph.D., is the author of *Forbidden Fruit: Sex and Religion in the lives of American Teenagers* (Oxford, 2007). He’s an associate professor of sociology at the University of Texas, Austin, where he lives with his wife Deeann, and their three children.]

Courtesy Christianity Today;

www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2009/august/16.22.html?paging=off

NO KING BUT CAESAR

by **Chuck Baldwin**, Apr. 4, 2013, NewsWithViews.com

Is Christ King, Or Is Caesar King? Christian, Make Up Your Mind.

With the Easter message fresh on my mind, I am again reminded of what the Jewish leaders said to Pilate when they tried to coerce him to crucify Jesus. They said, “*We have no king but Caesar.*” Remember, these were the Jewish Pharisees, scribes, elders, priests and high priests. They prided themselves in being scholars of the Torah. They believed themselves to be the sole interpreters of the Mosaic Law. Yet, the very First Commandment of the Decalogue handed down to Moses is, “*thou shalt have no other gods before me.*” But in order to stay in the good graces of the Roman government, they emphatically proclaimed that they recognized no king but Caesar.

Remember, Caesar insisted that everyone recognize him to be, not only king, but God. To be loyal to Rome, one had to acknowledge the deity of Caesar. One could worship any other god that one wanted to, as long as Caesar was acknowledged as Sovereign. Historians famously say that there were as many gods in Rome as people. Rome prided itself in being religiously pluralistic and tolerant. First Century Christians were not persecuted because they worshipped Jesus; they were persecuted because they refused to worship Caesar; they refused to acknowledge the sovereignty of Caesar. It was for this reason that early Christians were fed to the lions and made sport of in the amphitheaters.

In their desire to use the Roman government to advance their own agenda (crucifying Jesus and later His disciples and apostles), the Jewish leaders were quite willing to acknowledge the deity and sovereignty of Caesar—even though doing so was a blatant violation of the First Commandment given by Jehovah to Moses. Is it a little more than interesting that after conducting a secret, illegal trial of Jesus and blaspheming God in declaring Caesar king that they immediately sat down to observe the Passover? No wonder Jesus called them “Hypocrites.”

“What does all of this have to do with modern America?” you ask. Everything!

Anytime a pastor or church uses Romans 13 to teach that Christians should submit to government “no matter what,” they are joining the First Century Jewish leaders in saying, “*We have no king but Caesar.*” Wittingly or unwittingly, they have made a god out of government. And by doing so, they have violated the First Commandment and blasphemed the God they claim to serve. They are like the Jewish leaders who declared unlimited submission to Cae-

sar then sat down to observe the Passover. These modern pastors and church leaders do the same thing: they declare unlimited submission to government and then go through the exercise of conducting a Christian worship service, complete with songs of praise, recitations of scripture, and collecting tithes and offerings. Are they not as guilty of blasphemy and hypocrisy as were the First Century Jewish leaders?

Another statement that leaped out at me as I rehearsed the Easter story last Sunday was spoken by the Lord Jesus. When questioned by Pilate, Jesus said, “*My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.*” (John 18:36, KJV)

How many times have I heard some ‘we-have-no-king-but-Caesar-type preacher’ say that Jesus’ words here mean that Christians have no right to resist or fight against evil government? If government passes a law to register your guns, Christians are bound to register their guns. If government passes a law outlawing your guns, Christians are bound to not resist. If government passes a law prohibiting

praying, Christians are bound to not pray. If government passes a law authorizing the killing of unborn babies (about 4,000 per day), Christians are bound to not interfere. If government passes a law requiring pastors to conduct marriage ceremonies for homosexual couples, pastors are bound to conduct marriage ceremonies for homosexual couples. If the government orders military chaplains to not pray in Jesus’ name, they must not pray in Jesus’ name. If the President declares a “national emergency” and asks people to surrender their firearms, Christians are bound to surrender their firearms. I suppose these same preachers believe that if the President wanted to pass an Executive Order initiating the ancient law of *Prima Noctua* (Right of the First Night), whereby nobles (governing authorities) could sleep with a man’s bride on the night of her wedding, (see the movie *Braveheart*) Christians are bound to submit to that order, too?

Yet, the vast majority of these same Christian leaders who say “don’t resist government” are the first ones to cheer for foreign wars of aggression. They are the loudest and most vocal supporters of military action against governments all over the world. They proudly extol and laud acts of war by our nation’s military. They brag about young men of their churches joining the military and going off to war (and now even women are going to be put in the front lines). And just what is it that military troops do? They commit acts of violence and resistance against foreign governments.

Am I a pacifist? Am I promoting pacifism? Absolutely not! I am a staunch believer in the Natural God-given right of self-defense. I believe men have an inalienable right to resist and fight against evil government—even if it sometimes means using violence—such as when America’s founders fought our country’s War for Independence. I’m merely trying to point out the hypocrisy of these modern-day preachers and Christians who try to justify their own refusal to even peacefully resist evil government at home but who then turn around and blatantly justify violent acts

New CDs:

D-011 Responding to His Grace, Get this Right, Pt 1. *Lawrence Blanchard.*

E-418 Shake and Bake, *Mark Downey*

G-884 Non-Optional Leadership, pt 8, *Ted Weiland*

J-396 The Purpose of Scripture, *John Weaver*

K-621 U.S. Civil War in the Bible, Mystery Babylon, pt 32, *James Bruggeman*

U-180 Ladies’ Symposium on Managing the Logistics of a Large Family, pt 1.

Beale Phillips, Jennie Chancey, etc.

U-181 Ladies’ Symposium, pt 2.

U-182 The Myth of Overpopulation and the Coming Demographic Bomb,

Kevin Swanson



of resistance against (foreign) government overseas.

At least the conscientious pacifist is consistent. A true pacifist would refuse to resist any and all government—regardless of how evil that government is. Of course, this would require that such people refuse to join the military, refuse to become a policeman or sheriff's deputy, and refuse to defend themselves against any act of criminality committed against them or their family. I have known a small handful of such people. And I always encourage them to pray for those of us who are not pacifists—and who believe in defending the liberties of all our people—so that they will have the freedom to practice their pacifism.

And interestingly enough, as the federal government in Washington, DC., becomes more and more oppressive, more and more Christian leaders are preaching the doctrine of non-resistance. And when they do, they almost always justify themselves using Jesus' words referenced above.

However, Jesus' words actually teach the opposite of non-resistance. Notice He said, "Then would my servants FIGHT." That Jesus refused to resist His arrest and crucifixion is not to be construed as Him teaching non-resistance as a duty for Christians of all time.

Remember that Jesus is God's only begotten Son who gave His life a sacrifice for man's sin. No other man, before or since, shares Jesus' nature, character, and mission. There is ONE mediator between God and men: the man Christ Jesus. He was born to die; He came to be crucified. No man took His life from Him: He gave it. None of us can claim such a mission or destiny. None of us!

We Christians might not be "of this world," but we are most certainly "in" it. And Jesus prayed to keep us "in" this world (John 17:15). We go to work in this world; we pay our bills in this world; we lock our doors at night in this world; we instruct our children to avoid certain locations and situations in this world; we sit on juries in this world; our taxes support policemen and sheriff's deputies who arrest criminals and protect society in this world; we join "neighbourhood watch" groups in this world; and we install burglar alarms in this world. Jesus did none of that. He didn't even own a home. Are all of these pious-talking non-resistors going to give up their homes and properties because Jesus didn't own any? Jesus didn't marry either. So, should Christians not marry because Jesus didn't? Again, Jesus' life and mission were unique; no Christian can claim such a duty or purpose.

Furthermore, Jesus plainly instructed His disciples to buy a sword (Luke 22:36). The Roman sword was the most effective and efficient self-defense tool in the world at the time. The Roman sword was the First Century equivalent of the modern-day AR-15 semi-automatic rifle. Realize, too, that when Jesus uttered this command, it was against the law for Hebrews to possess a sword of this type. Yes, Jesus commanded His disciples to break the law of man in order to obey the higher Natural Law of God. So much for the argument that Jesus would endorse Obama's universal background check proposal.

For Franklin Graham and Richard Land—and other evangelical leaders support Barack Obama's attempt to reg-

ister and restrict the arms of the people, is not only blatantly unconstitutional, it is blatantly unscriptural. Here is my column regarding the asinine support of universal background checks by Graham and Land:

<http://chuckbaldwinlive.com/home/archives/5518>

Recall, too, that at the time of His arrest in the garden, Jesus protected Simon Peter's right to keep and bear arms when he literally knocked the soldiers off their feet with the power of His voice, which allowed Simon and the other armed disciple to leave the garden unmolested and fully armed. Yes, Jesus fully protected the disciples' right to keep and bear arms in the Garden of Gethsemane.

Readers should also be aware that my new book, co-authored by my constitutional attorney son, Tim, entitled, "To keep or Not To Keep: Why Christians Should Not Give Up Their Guns," is at the printers now and will be delivered in the next few weeks. To pre-order this very relevant and powerful book, go to:

<http://keepyourarms.com/>

Remember, too, that it was Jesus who violently resisted the money changers in the temple, driving them out with the force of whip and fist. This is hardly an act of non-resistance. And it is the same Jesus who will come again in power and glory subduing His enemies with the violence and force of the sword.

Furthermore, there is absolutely no doubt that Jehovah God approved of, authorized, and directly ordered the use of violent resistance against myriads of oppressors, dictators, and despots of all kinds. To preach the doctrine of non-resistance, one must ignore the entire Old Testament, not to mention a host of New Testament passages — including Hebrews 11.

At some point, every person on earth has to determine in his or her own mind who is king. Is Jesus Christ king, or is Caesar king? This is the spiri-

tual battle that is raging in America's churches today. And, unfortunately, as did the Jewish leaders at the crucifixion of Jesus, many pastors and church leaders are saying, "We have no king but Caesar."

As for me and my house, we cast our lots with America's founders whose battle cry of the Revolutionary War was "**No King but Jesus.**"

Christian, make up your mind.*****

Chuck Baldwin's official Facebook Page:

www.facebook.com/pages/Chuck-Baldwin/226997970644468

Website: ChuckBaldwinLive.com

© 2013 Chuck Baldwin - all rights reserved. Used by permission.

THE BIGGER THE FAMILY THE BETTER says *Cassandra Jardine*

A new report concludes that children growing up in large families are happier and more successful. Told you so, says mother-of-five Cassandra Jardine.

When I tell people that I have five children, they tend to say: "Lucky you." [when we used to tell people that we had fourteen, the response we used to get was, "Don't you have TV?"] Roughly translated, that means: "What a show-off." A generation back, large families were generally attributed to rejection of contraception; nowadays, they are considered to be a public declaration of a huge income,

Old Historic Videos:

MARK LANE on

THE MERMELSTEIN TRIAL

(Mel Mermelstein vs. the Institute for Historical Review) Attorney Mark Lane talks about this trial.

DCD#CI-180 @ sug don \$17

-----*

THE CHRISTIAN ISRAEL STORY disk 3.

A Very Great Valley

As Birds Flying

The Jamestown Story

Survival Island

Voice of the Australian Flag

DVD#CI-179 @ sug don \$20



limitless energy and a selfish disregard for the future of the planet, to boot.

None of the above is true in my case, but I'm always rather feeble in putting the case for large families any more coherently than to say that I enjoy having lots of children, however expensive and tiring they can be.

Each throw of the genetic dice is a new adventure, a fascinating individual, another sometimes tiresome, usually loveable bundle of strengths and weaknesses. I didn't plan to have so many; I just couldn't bear to stop.

The point about big families is that they are more than the sum of their parts—they are a microcosm of society in which the members battle for attention and the best seat in the car.

The squabbles are endless, and often intense, but at the end of the day (literally) everyone has to get on with one another, because they have to share the television remote control. As such, I've always believed that large families are not just a selfish pleasure but beneficial for the country, even the world—but, until now, I've been short of ammunition for arguing my case.

I'm grateful, therefore, to Sky News presenter Colin Brazier, who has spent the past five years assembling evidence that supports the idea that larger families are A Good Thing. "We are so often told about the disadvantages of large families that we have lost sight of the hidden advantages," he says.

His mission began one day at the start of the Iraq war when, while embedded with the United army, he heard a radio report claiming that the cost of bringing up a child had risen to £180,000 (A\$265,806)

At the time he didn't have the five children that he has now, but he was already aware that it was bunkum to suggest that it costs as much as the price of a family house to raise each child. By sharing bedrooms, baths and toys, he could see that each additional child in a large family worked out cheaper to raise than a child in a small family.

Nor did he feel it was fair to calculate that each child adds an additional 750 tons of carbon dioxide to the environment. "What about economics of scale?" he thought.

"A four-person household uses half as much electricity, per capita, as a home for one. The people who are messing up the planet are the single people living alone in swanky apartments. Someone needs to rebut these nonsensical stories."

Since then he has not just gathered arguments for the defense, he has gone on the attack. Having condensed his research into an article for the think tank Civitas, he may need to don his flak jacket again, because the anti-natalists who advocate the benefits of a small family may not like what he has to say.

Nor may the government. In France, parents with three or more children are given medals for their procreative valour. In Britain, we are penalised by higher taxes on people carriers and will soon have to pay through the nose for rubbish collection and water use.

Private schools don't offer discounts for bulk buying, while state schools are abandoning sibling policies, so parents can't assume that they won't have to hurtle around to several schools each morning.

The result of such measures, combined with the constant scare stories about the cost of children, is that 90,000

have fallen into a baby gap: they would like to have more children but don't dare because they can't afford a larger house or bigger car.

With the British birthrate currently standing at 1.7 per woman - well below replacement level - Brazier argues that there's no need for such restraint. It doesn't matter if you can't afford a large house. Children who share bedrooms are physically healthier than those who don't, because their immune systems are toughened up by catching minor illnesses from one another in their early years. If they are a bit cramped and have to endure being told they can't always have the new trainers or toy they want, that's good for them.

Having several siblings is also a pointer to future mental health. Scions of large families stand a good chance of making a success of their marriages, because they are used to sharing. There is also safety in numbers from the pressure of ambitious, fussing parents whose tendency to hover like helicopters over their children's heads contributes, according to a recent Unicef survey, to British children being the most miserable in the developed world.

I'm as keen as the next mother for my children to be world-beaters, but with several children to compare I'm more realistic about their talents and don't have either the time or the resources to apply the mental thumbscrews. Mostly, I'm happy to settle for the children being whoever they happen to be, so long as they help with the washing-up.

Chores are an issue in larger families. The very rich can employ armies of cleaners to pick up after their broods, but the rest of us rely on the children to look after themselves. With a little benign neglect they are forced to learn to clean, cook, fix things for themselves and babysit one another. They may grumble, but these are more useful life skills than playing the violin. Not that children from large families underperform educationally, as used to be thought.

The theory was that parents with lots of children stop reading to them and park them in front of the television, but a survey of 22,000 French school-leavers found that academic performance improved with additional siblings so long as one parent was "an educated professional." Knowledge and studious habits trickle down the family.

Younger children get less parental help with their homework, but their older siblings act as teachers and the younger ones learn to work on their own. It would be nice if it were so. Children from large families are also less likely to be members of the awkward squad at school: having had their rough edges worn down by sibling squabbles, they tend to be cooperative in the classroom.

One non-economic, non-ecological reason why parents limit themselves to small families these days is that they like the idea of having the time to be best friends with their mini-me's. In large families, relationships between siblings become more important than those with their parents, who are too busy keeping the show on the road to go on endless one-on-one shopping or football trips.

This, too, brings bonuses: not only do children in large families have more siblings among whom to find soul-mates but there is always someone to give advice or act as whistle-blower if they are doing something dodgy.

Taking the emphasis off the parent/child relationship also means that twenty-somethings from big families are

from Charles A. Weisman:

WHAT ABOUT THE SEEDLINE DOCTRINE? A Biblical Examination and Explanation of the Cain-Satanic Seedline Doctrine.

This doctrine is an issue which confuses and perplexes many. Some flatly deny the doctrine, while others believe it is the clear revelation of Scripture. To properly answer these questions, we will also need to examine the validity of some of the traditional Christian concepts about the events in Eden.

#275 @ sug don \$12.75



less likely to join the growing hordes who live at home, behaving like “kidults” well past the age when they should be taking responsibility for themselves (and getting married). They are also better at being parents themselves — and less likely to need Supernanny’s advice — because they have more experience of seeing how it’s done.

What’s missing in this country, Brazier concludes, is a lobby to uphold the manifold benefits and interests of the large families. If he wants to start one, he can count me in. Why size really matters:

Pros:

- Children from larger families get into fewer fights, and are better at making and keeping friends.
- Through having siblings, children learn empathy, team playing, gratification deferment, time-management and how to resolve disputes.
- Children with several siblings have lower rates of asthma, eczema and hay fever. They make fewer visits to the doctor and have reduced risk of leukaemia, cancer and diabetes.
- Older siblings prevent younger ones being bullied.
- In larger families play is less closely supervised. Children learn to take risks, which will make them better employees and employers.
- Children in large families learn to cook, use the washing machine and to iron.
- In larger families there is more emphasis on thrift.
- Those who grow up with siblings are better at getting on with the opposite sex and have fewer divorces.

Cons:

- Developers are building so few larger homes that a third bedroom can add a fifth to the price of a house, and a fourth bedroom can raise the cost by two thirds.
- Since 1988 the tax and benefits system has left larger families living on average incomes worse off (in the UK).
- Converting a loft or basement means higher (UK) council tax bills.
- Family tickets for many attractions are limited to two children.
- Car tax on larger cars (people movers) may soon be followed by dearer parking.
- Many swimming pools allow an adult to supervise only two children.

© Telegraph Media Group Limited 2013.

WANT HAPPY CHILDREN? DO THIS

By Joel Hilliker

What makes children happy? Stuff. That’s what most parents think, it seems. Xbox 360, Furby, Lil Swanky clothing, M&M’s and licorice ropes, Lego sets — whatever little Madison and Braydon desire.

If Mom and Dad took a break from indulging their kids’ whims and thought about it, they might admit that it’s not working. You don’t have to peek down too many aisles in the toy store to see children who already have everything — and are miserable brats. There must be another way.

Now, science is supplying some evidence to teach us what was once common knowledge: that it actually *is* more blessed to give than to receive.

In their recent study “Giving Leads to Happiness in Young Children,” psychologists at the University of British

Columbia found that *giving* puts smiles on young children more than *getting*. “Before the age of 2, toddlers exhibit greater happiness when giving treats to others than receiving treats themselves,” they wrote. “Further, children are happier after engaging in *costly giving*—forfeiting their own resources—than when giving the same treat at no cost.”

CNN summed up their findings: “These studies confirm some age-old wisdom about happiness. If the goal really is to make our children happy, perhaps what we ought to be doing is not overindulging them, but giving them the opportunity to give.” (Sept.17,2012).

The study’s lead author, Lara Aknin, insists that children receiving pleasure from giving away their goldfish crackers shows the emotional rewards we can *all* enjoy from personal sacrifice. “You can construe that pro-social behaviour broadly to include giving time volunteering, giving money to causes or giving other resources,” she told CNN. “All of these correlate to happiness.”

Other studies have confirmed that this life law doesn’t just apply to kiddos with crackers. For example, research has shown that teens are happier when they’re giving. “Adolescents who identify their primary motive as helping others are three times happier than those who lack such altruistic motivation,” says Christian Carter, a sociologist at the University of California. Teens who are givers are not only happier, but are more excited about life, and more involved at school and in their families. Carter says, “Generous behavior reduces adolescent depression and suicide risk, and several studies have shown that teenagers who volunteer are less likely to fail a subject in school, get pregnant or abuse substances.”

And it doesn’t change when we become adults, as a multitude of research bears out. Whether a person donates money to charity, volunteers time or commits random acts of kindness—like providing directions to a lost traveller or holding the door for someone—reports show he will be happier and suffer less anxiety and depression.

In 2000, the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey found that of 30,000 American households, who who gave money to charity were 43 percent likelier to say they were “very happy” about their lives compared to non-givers. Those who volunteered time were 42 percent likelier to be very happy than those who didn’t.

Ergo, a surefire way to lead your children to a happier life, both now and on into adulthood, is to *teach him to give*. But how?

- Start by setting the example. Give of your time, and be sure your children do too. If you have a neighbour or someone from church who needs help, get your children involved. When you visit someone in need - take your children. If you write a note of encouragement, let them add a hello.

- Help your children to look out for others’ needs. If you know someone is down, ask your children what they think can be done to help. Help them to write a note, bake a treat, place the phone call. Get them in the habit of one “act of giving” a week: a get-well card for someone sick; a thank-you present for the teacher; a friendship note to someone special, etc.

watch TV or movies?

HATE WHITEY

THE CINEMA OF DEFAMATION

Michael A. Hoffman II

I first became aware of the special genre of hate propaganda which dare not speak its name, when I was a child. I was reading Mad Magazine and one of its cartoons depicted greedy white Southerners exhibiting disapproval of Yankee tourists.

The Media Establishment has created a special category of ethnic and religious stereotyping that is exempt from censure. The System’s crusade against “hate propaganda” is rigged. Its intention is not to defend all people against contempt.....

#137 @ sug don \$16.95



- Have your children do yard work for an elderly neighbour; rake leaves, mow the lawn, shovel snow—volunteer work, not for money. (That's not to discourage entrepreneurship—there's a time for that too). Spend time together picking up trash and cleaning up the neighbourhood; then, when your children look across a clean neighbourhood, they can take pleasure in having contributed to it.

- Teach your children to *tithe* and give offerings. Any money they receive in allowances or for chores or their jobs, have them set some aside for God. This is another area where we should set the example. Tithing and giving to God is the blessed way of life. Instill this habit in your children, and the lessons of working hard, saving and contributing to a cause bigger than themselves will help their whole life long!

We all know that money can't buy happiness, but so many of us still make the mistake of trying to purchase it for our children. Wise up and flip the script. Help your children experience all the benefits of the happy way of life—the way of give.

Courtesy The Philadelphia Trumpet, 14400 S. Bryant Ave, Edmond OK 73034.

**A CHRISTIAN ISRAELITE
 VIEW
 FOR WHOM THE
 BELLS TOLL OR
 DID YOU HEAR THE
 TRUMPET CALL?**

By Bob Vermaat

“The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few”
 (Matt. 9:3)

In the Scriptures there are frequent mentions of trumpets or horns. They are most often spoken of as a means of sounding alarm, such as in Ezekiel 7:14 to prepare or get ready for battle, or as in Ezekiel 33:3 to warn the people to prepare themselves in case of danger. In Joel 2:1 we are told to blow the trumpet in Zion to warn the people that the Day of The Lord is at hand.

In Numbers 10 we read that the Lord commanded Moses to make two silver trumpets to be used to call the people to assemble and also to be used to sound the alarm when the camps of the Israelites were getting ready to take up their journey again. Those trumpets were also to be blown when Israel went into battle.

In our modern history this concept was and is still used in our military installations. Reveille is sounded at the beginning of each day and tattoo is sounded at stand-down (day's end). A horn is also blown to advance the troops or cavalry and it was also used to indicate a charge or recall.

In the Bible there are many references to trumpets but little or none in regard to bells, but with the coming of the Christian era and with the building of churches, the bell in many instances became what the trumpet was before. Most, if not all, churches has, and have a tower in which a bell was installed. This bell would peal out warning in times of danger or distress; it was rung in times of joy, such as a wedding, or it was rung when there was a death in the community. Foremost, though, the bells were rung to call the community to worship. This custom is still enjoyed in many rural communities.

A few years back while I was visiting my son in a small town in southern Germany, this fact of bell-ringing was really brought back to me. On a quiet Sunday morning I could hear the bells ringing, not only in the little town

where I was staying, but from half a dozen or so villages throughout the hills of that part of the country. It really did my heart good to see and hear that God still has a place in the hearts of the common people. It is something that we miss in the larger and more sophisticated societies of North America.

Now the foregoing all pertained to all the assembly or nation or city or congregation. But what about individuals when it comes to worship and especially to service? We read in Scripture that God uses different means with which to call individuals to Himself and to some task. God called Abram to leave his father's house and go to some unknown destination. The Bible does not tell us how God called Abram, but it must have been in some special way for Abram to leave the comforts and riches of his paternal home, particularly as Terah, Abram's father, was a high official in Nimrod's Babylonian kingdom (Jasher 7:41). So you see, Abram, later called Abraham by God, left comfort for uncertainty.

God called and talked to Moses through a burning bush (Ex. 3:2-4) and He called Samuel as a young child, while Samuel was asleep (1 Sam. 3:3-10). God sent an angel (messenger) in the form of a man unto Gideon (Judges 6:11-13). In the New Testament an angel tells Philip to go to the desert to teach and baptize an official from Ethiopia in the name of the Lord (Acts 8:26-40). Saul, later called Paul, was brought to heel, so to speak, by a bright light from which the Lord spoke to him (Acts 9:”1-5). Peter was convinced by the Lord by means of a vision of a sheet with

animals, let down from heaven (Acts 10:9-22). So you can see that the Lord uses diverse and subtle ways to make us aware of the fact that He has some special task in store for us.

You may well ask what I am trying to say. Well, simply this, are we listening for and to the Lord's call and command? As for myself, I used to sing as a soloist in different churches by invitation and also at fundraisings for Christian schools. It was a ministry in song and music, but that was quite a while ago. Now, I write these little articles for our magazine (*Thy Kingdom Come*), not because I like to write that much, for I could not even be bothered to write a letter to my folks when they were still alive (I had my wife do that for me). I write not so as to teach you, because I do not think that I am qualified to teach, but I write so that you may study your Bible to verify what I am saying and by so doing that you may get a closer understanding of what the Lord requires from you too.

Just knowing that you are a son of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and therefore heirs of the promise is really not enough (you must also live in obedience to His Law). The Lord has a task for all of us. Whether this task is monumental or small, it is for Him to know. Read Matthew 25:14-30, it is the parable of the talents and let's hope that we compare to the first and second servant, so the Lord will say to us *“well done thou good and faithful servant.”*

Now, I know whatever we do is not going to get us closer to Salvation, for Paul tells us in Eph. 28-9, *“For by grace are ye saved though faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works lest any man should boast.”* But in answer to that we should also read what James has to say in James 2:17, 18, 20 and there we read: *“Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead being alone.”*

**LOAN ONLY VIDEO:
 THE ASSASSINATION OF HUGO
 CHAVEZ**

by investigative reporter Greg Palast who flew to Venezuela to get the inside information on the man the Bush administration loves to hate: Hugo Chavez. Palast meets with the president they call a mad-man, a dictator and then finds the man who took Chavez hostage.

Also contains: “Oiled and Despoiled,” & “Florida Con Salsa”

DVD#CI-910 @ sug LOAN ONLY don \$7



Yea, a man may say, thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead.

And so, let me close with the words of our Lord Jesus as recorded in Matt. 9:37-38. *“The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into the harvest.”*

Courtesy Thy Kingdom Come, PO Box 1478, Ferndale WA 98248

‘IT IS DANGEROUS TO BE RIGHT WHEN THE GOVERNMENT IS WRONG!’

By Don Boys, Ph.D.

Few statements by bible hater Voltaire are worth repeating but this one is worthwhile: **“It is dangerous to be right when the government is wrong!”** People have lost their jobs, been fined, and placed in prison because they dared to tell the truth about their government. There is a big difference in your country and the ruling party. However, principled people have no choice but to tell the truth and accept the consequences.

It is the responsibility of all thinking, honest people to stand against those who want to do them harm or imprison them! Or simply to steal some of their freedom “for their own sake” of course. I am not blaming Obama and his czars for seeking to rule since that is what wicked men have always tried to do to lazy, listless, and languid people. I am blaming those who so quickly submitted to his rule with very little or no protest. There are still Christians who defend voting for Obama!

I resist, I reject, and I refuse to keep quiet. I will not whimper my objections lying in a fetal position in a semi-dark bedroom but will scream them, almost incoherently, from a mountain top or more precisely from my computer, radio and television, church pulpit, magazines, and street corner if necessary. Obviously, I’m a little appalled, agitated, and angry.

George Orwell said, “In times of universal deceit, telling the truth will be a revolutionary act.” George was right! America has been stolen from us by the public school system, the media, Hollywood lowlifes, academia, and Liberal politicians. Because lies have been told so often, for so long, and in such enormity, our enemy is perceived as correct and exemplary while common, calm, and cautious people are thought to be corrupt and extremists!

It is shocking that so many people think it is wrong to speak out against their government when that is exactly what all patriots should be doing. It is not disloyal to criticize your president. An informed, indignant, and impatient patriot must always be ready to defend his country against its government. Theodore Roosevelt said, “That we are to stand by the president, right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public.” That’s one Roosevelt who was right.

My government is wrong and I am right about welfare. How can any thinking person defend, let alone promote, taking money from the rich and giving it to the poor? However, Obama, socialistic Democrats, and RINOs make that argument without shame or apology. Obama seems to think he is the Sheriff of Nottingham one day and Robin Hood

the next day. Of course, the Sheriff was a tyrant and Robin was a thief. Obama is more like the winsome “Thief of Baghdad,” who somehow conjured, cheated, and cajoled enough people to elect him President of the United States. Maybe we will all wake up, rub our eyes, stretch, then realize that it has all been a bad dream or, more appropriately, a bone-chilling nightmare!

If government continues to take from Peter to give to Paul, it can always expect Paul to be its supporter. My name is “Peter” and I want Obama’s hand out of my back pocket.

We have lived so long with the butchering of innocent babies that even Christians are insensitive to the slaughter. Yet “normal” people defend that sinful act as if it is noble, if not nice. The sin/crime is compounded by forcing taxpayers to fund the killings! Obama even voted against a bill to protect the life of aborted babies that somehow managed to live. Moreover, his wife lobbied for a partial birth abortion bill! Pharaoh of Egypt waited until after the babies were born to butcher them!

We are told that perversion is now legal, even respectable. You can call perversion (sodomy) by any name you want but it is still abnormal, aberrant, and abominable. You can put lipstick, rouge and eye shadow on a dirty hog, but it is still a dirty hog—and sane, honest people can see what it is. By declaring that it is a dirty, fat, gross hog, does not mean we hate the hog. No, we simply see before us a dirty, fat, gross hog and calling it something else changes nothing. It only makes the “hogs are beautiful” crowd look silly, blind, or dishonest. Maybe all three!

Now we are told that homosexuals not only have a right to sleep together but we must respect and appreciate, their “many contributions” to society (such as AIDS?). Of course, they demand the “right” to get married (don’t expect a wedding gift from me) adopt children, join our churches (without repentance), teach our children and be accepted as normal people. No, not as long as Christian people exist, but then that could change also with the lack of commitment of modern Christians. (New Zealand has now “legalized” sodomite ‘marriage’[77 to 44]).

If Obama has the power to make you believe in absurdities such as welfare, abortion, and sodomy, he has the power to justify and force you to believe and agree to anything. However, Christians don’t permit government to decide what is right; that is God’s decision as expressed in the scriptures.

We must never confuse principled disagreement with government policies, people, and programs with pernicious disloyalty to your country. The first should be promoted and the second prosecuted. Whatever the result, I will decide, not anyone else, what is right for me and if the government is wrong, I will tell them they are—whatever the result.

(Dr. Don Boys is a former member of the Indiana House of Reps, author of 14 books, frequent guest on television and radio talk shows, and wrote columns for *USA Today* for 8 years. © 2012, Don Boys, Ph.D.)

Courtesy Midnight Messenger, PO Box 294 Colton OR 97017

SHOULD YOU VACCINATE YOUR CHILDREN?



by Ty Bollinger

My name is Ty Bollinger, I am a homeschool dad, devoted husband, and committed Christian. In my last article, I attempted to debunk some of the typical “myths” about home education. In this article, however, I am going to head back to the “health” arena and address the “hot” topic of vaccines. Much of this article was excerpted from my book, *Cancer—Step Outside the Box*.

SHOULD YOU VACCINATE YOUR CHILDREN?

For many parents (especially homeschool parents), this is a tough question, in light of all the misinformation about the benefits and risks of vaccines. Many modern health “authorities” credit vaccines for declines in disease and assure us that vaccines are safe and effective. Pediatricians quickly tell us that it is unwise and a health risk to have unvaccinated children. Sadly, nothing could be further from the truth. The truth of the matter is that vaccines have been a hoax from their very inception. Some have referred to Edward Jenner known as the “father of vaccines”) and Louis Pasteur (known as the “father of the germ theory of disease”) as the “Barnum & Bailey” of medicine.

Vaccines are the key to the entire “Well Baby” program, which introduces our children to the US “health care” system. Truth be told, vaccines are the “bread and butter” of the entire pediatrics profession. I know that having the audacity to question vaccines is tantamount to blasphemy. However, I can assure you that I would not challenge the efficacy and safety of something as revered as vaccines unless I were certain, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that I am accurate when I state that vaccines are **not safe** (unless you change the definition of “safe” to include death, numerous diseases, and brain damage).

Contrary to popular belief, the scientific community is **not** 100% behind mandated vaccination laws in the US. Thus you have a consensus of thought rather than solid scientific evidence supporting vaccine mandates ... which, for a lack of a better term, translates into “junk science.” Real scientists and real science tell us that artificial immunity (*aka* vaccination) is “an emperor with no clothes on.” As far as real science is concerned, there is **no evidence** that you should vaccinate yourself or your children, *ever, for any reason*. According to Dr. Len Horowitz, “the greatest lie ever told is that vaccines are safe and effective.”

But don’t take Dr. Horowitz’s word for it—check out the statistics for yourself. From 1990 to March 2008, the US Government recorded 238,755 vaccine related injuries and deaths, according to the Vaccine Adverse Effect Reporting System (VAERS) database. Since the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) estimates that 90% of vaccine reactions go unrecorded, we can extrapolate that during the past 18 years, there have actually been almost 2.4 million vaccine related injuries and deaths! But that’s not surprising, considering the toxic ingredients in most vaccines. Oftentimes described as “toxic cocktails,” vaccines contain live and dead animal viruses that have been cultured in monkey kidney tissue, cow tissue, goat tissue, pig tissue, and even aborted human fetuses. Vaccines contain any combination of the following: thimerosal (a mercury derivative), aluminium, formaldehyde (carcinogenic embalming

fluid), phenol, ethylene glycol (antifreeze), live viruses, bacteria, and acetone, among other things.

HOW TOXIC ARE VACCINES?

Since August of 2006, Jock Doubleday (Director of the California 501(c)3 non-profit corporation Natural Woman, Natural Man, Inc) has been offering \$75,000 to the first medical doctor or pharmaceutical company CEO who publicly drinks a mixture of standard vaccine additives ingredients in the same amount as a six-year-old child is recommended to receive under the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines. If the vaccines were as safe as we are led to believe, then one would think that there would be a line of doctors and CEOs outside Mr. Doubleday’s office the next day right? Well, guess what . . . almost six years have passed and *not one* physician or CEO has taken Mr. Doubleday up on his offer! Hmmm ... sounds to me like no one is willing to “put their money where their mouth is.” (or in this case, put their mouth where Doubleday’s money is!)

What if I were to take some mercury, formaldehyde, aluminium, antifreeze, and live viruses cultured in dead animal tissue, then mix them together with some peanut butter and spread it on a piece of bread for my children to eat for a snack? Would you think I was a good parent? What if I were to state, “This will keep them from getting sick”? Would you question my sanity? The odds are that I would be arrested for *child abuse*. However when doctors inject our children with the same ingredients (less the peanut butter) and tell us, “This will keep them from getting sick,” most of us don’t even give it a second thought.

What if you call your family physician and tell him that you are going to inject your baby with mercury, aluminium, and formaldehyde, and that you are wondering what the “safe dosage” was for these ingredients? Well, right after he calls Child Protective Services, he will probably call the police! You see, *there is no safe dosage* because these are all potentially carcinogenic substances, but mercury derivatives, aluminium, and formaldehyde are ingredients in most vaccinations. How is it possible that they are safe? Supposedly, the answer depends on who is injecting them. If you or I inject our child with mercury or formaldehyde, we are going to jail, but if a pharmaceutical company and a doctor inject the same toxic poisons, then they are perfectly safe. What’s wrong with this picture? Unfortunately, most people follow the masses, believe what they’re told, don’t ask questions, and place blind faith in their doctors.

WHAT ABOUT AUTISM?

In the 1970s, only one child in 10,000 was autistic. In the 1990s, there was a “stepped-up vaccine schedule” where the amount of thimerosal was drastically increased in most childhood vaccines, including the MMR and DPT. Now, in the year 2008, autism affects 1 in 67 children! It is a well-established fact that exposure to mercury can cause immune, sensory, neurological, motor, and behavioural dysfunctions—all similar to traits defining, or associated with, autism. My cousin’s second boy is autistic and he first showed autistic behaviour less than 24 hours after receiving the MMR vaccine. The evidence linking vaccines to autism

New Video:

HEAR THE SILENCE

The Story Of Dr. Andrew Wakefield

This video tells the story of the British gastroenterologist, whose 1998 research published in The Lancet, suggested there may be a link between the MMR vaccine, chronic bowel disease and autism, since the article’s publication, it has remained one of the most controversial studies on the topic of vaccine safety. It provides a moving portrayal of the Dr’s research and a mother’s journey in trying to find out the truth about what caused her child’s autism. 97 min.

DVD#CI-908 @ sug don \$7.00

Apparently this film was aired on Israeli TV channel (that’s why you see the Hebrew subtitles). Some anonymous viewer taped it and published it on YouTube.



is overwhelming. Interestingly, in March of 2008, the US Government conceded that childhood vaccines were responsible for the autism in 9-year-old Hannah Poling. This unprecedented concession was in response to one of three test cases that allege thimerosal caused autism in children. There are currently 4,900 autism cases pending in Federal "Vaccine Court."

I know we are all brought up to blindly trust our doctors, but the fact is that they no longer deserve that kind of blind trust. Physicians take an oath to "First, do no harm," but today, what gets injected into your child is being decided not by physicians but by multinational pharmaceutical companies which have a financial incentive to sell as many vaccines as possible. Only by keeping people in the dark can they continue their absurd profiteering from the vaccine industry. We assume that because vaccines are mandated by US law that the government is verifying to their safety and effectiveness. We assume that vaccines must be safe because our doctor says so. *Nothing could be further from the truth!*

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

In Phillipians 4:6, we are commanded to "*be careful (anxious) for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.*" Sadly, rather than making our requests known to God, many Christians have replaced their faith in Him with a misplaced faith in modern medicine and doctors. Growing up, I remember hearing my Grandma Helen say, "Jesus said it ... I believe it." I wonder how many Christians believe that "my doctor said it ... I believe it"? Two verses later in Phillipians 4:8 we read, "*Finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, what-soever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.*"

What is *honest, just, pure, and lovely* about allowing the injection of toxic heavy metals, embalming fluid, and viruses cultured in aborted fetal tissue into the bodies (and eventually bloodstreams) of our precious children? How can Christians be "pro-life" when it comes to aborticide, yet find nothing wrong with injecting our children with the DNA of aborted fetuses under the guise of "public health"? How can this be pure and lovely in the sight of the LORD? There are over 400 references to "the blood" in the Bible. Throughout His Word, the LORD refers to the sanctity of the blood and the importance of keeping it pure [just this week there was a case in Australia, where a 17-year-old who refused a blood transfusion, was ordered by a judge to have the transfusion, the order only being applicable for only 10 months, as he then turned 18. CIM]. I can't help but believe that the sovereign LORD of Heaven looks upon the vile practice of vaccinations with sadness in His heart.

CONCLUSION

In closing, I want to make it clear that vaccines are mandated but they are **not** mandatory! Besides certain laws that apply only to (US) government medical specialists, THERE IS NO LAW that enforces the mandatory use of any vaccine in the US. Waiver forms for the personal or

religious exemptions are freely available. Enforced medical treatment is an assault and a violation of the 14th amendment.

However, some lawmakers seem determined to ignore the Constitution and to make some vaccinations (usually the most profitable ones) mandatory. Take for instance, New York Assembly Bill 10942, recently introduced at the request of Richard Daines, the commissioner of the New York State Department of Health. This pending bill calls for changes to the law in order to change all "recommended" vaccinations by the CDC to "mandatory" vaccinations for all children, *including infants and toddlers!* The bill would also permit the administration of vaccines for sexually transmitted infections to minors *without parental consent.* This bill has been dubbed the "worst vaccine bill ever" by one activist group. Only time will tell if our liberties are tossed aside and our children are subjected to mandatory government sanctioned poisoning.

With every child on the planet a potential "required recipient" of multiple vaccines, and with every health care system and government a potential buyer, it is little wonder that billions of dollars are spent nurturing the vaccine industry. Without public outcry, we will see more and more new vaccines required of us and our children. *And while profits are readily calculable, the real human costs are being ignored.* Dr. James R. Shannon, former director of the National Institute of Health reported in December 2003 that "the only safe vaccine is the one that is never used."

In the December 1994 *Medical Post*, Canadian author of the best-seller *Medical Mafia*, Dr. Guylaine Lanctot, MD stated "The medical authorities keep lying. Vaccination has been a disaster on the immune system. It actually causes a lot of illnesses. We are actually changing our genetic code through vaccinations ten years from now we will know that the biggest crime

against humanity was vaccines."

Well, it is now 2008, almost fourteen years since Dr. Lanctot made this statement, and I will let you decide if she was correct

I would like to leave you with two verses from Holy Scripture. In Hosea 4:6 and 14 we read, "*My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge ... therefore the people that doth not understand shall fall.*" I'm afraid that this verse hits the nail on the head when it comes to vaccines. But, thanks be to God that through Jesus the Christ we have His Holy Spirit to help us and teach us along the Way ... one day at a time ... by His grace ... God bless you all, until next time.

*

Concerning the preceding article, I must give you the following FDA mandated warning and disclaimer: I am not a doctor. The article above is for educational purposes only. It is not intended as a substitute for the diagnosis, treatment, or advice of a qualified licensed medical professional. The facts presented in this article are offered as information only, not medical advice, and in no way should anyone infer that I am practicing medicine. My statements regarding alternative treatments for cancer have not been evaluated by the FDA. The publisher provides this content for informational/educational purposes only.

Ty Bollinger is the author of Cancer: Step Outside the Box which has been called, "the most eye-opening



book of 2007!" To order this fascinating book, visit:

www.CancerTruth.net

Courtesy: Home School Digest, Box 374 Covert MI 49043

THE LAW OF DOMINANCE

by Charles A. Weisman

Most see an invisible force that seems to be the cause of many of the political, social and economic problems we face today. The fact is many of these problems are the result of cursed people among us, and how their curses affect things under a concept known as the Law of Dominance.

All things that exist or that occur do so in one of four realms—physical, legal, mental, or spiritual. The Law of Dominance states that whenever two dissimilar things are brought together, the nature or characteristics of the one that is of a more negative, baser, or lower order will predominate.

Thus, that which is impure dominates over that which is pure when they are brought together. That is, the impure characteristic dominates over the pure characteristic. So when we put a few drops of poison in a glass of pure water, the characteristics of the poison dominates, not the characteristics of the pure water even though 99% of the liquid was pure water. Likewise, that which is immoral dominates over that which is moral. Disorder prevails over order, and falsehood prevails over truth when they are put together. That which is ungodly dominates over that which is godly when the two are mixed with one another.

By the Law of Dominance then, the natural trend is for things to gravitate towards the lower level or order because the crude, negative, debased, impure or evil characteristics are dominant. But those things which are good, pure, godly, and true will either take on the nature of these dominant characteristics, or be expelled. They in effect recede from operation or view. They are thus called "recessive" characteristics. The concept of recessive and dominant characteristics in the area of genetics was revealed by Gregor Mendel (1822-84), in his experiments with plants. Most can readily recognize the operation of the Law of Dominance upon the genetic traits of human races.

"It must be borne in mind that the specializations which characterize the higher races are of relatively recent development, are highly unstable and when mixed with generalized or primitive characteristics, tend to disappear. Whether we like to admit it or not, the result of the mixture of two races, in the long run, gives us a race reverting to the more ancient, generalized and lower type. The cross between a white man and an Indian is an Indian; the cross between a white man and a negro is a negro; the cross between a white man and a Hindu is a Hindu; and the cross between any of the three European races and a Jew is a Jew.

"In crossing the blond (light) and brunette (dark elements) of a population, the more deeply rooted and ancient dark traits are prepotent or dominant. This is a matter of everyday observation, and the working of this law of nature is not influenced or affected by democratic institutions or by religious beliefs" (The Passing of the Great Race by Madison Grant, 1916).

Genetically, the white race is the most recessive in its nature and when mixed with other races, the genetic characteristics of the other races dominate. The dominant char-

acteristics cause the whole to be brought down to its lower, debased level. (Perhaps this is why it takes 10 generations with some and 3 generations with others of breeding back into the white race before they are allowed back into "the congregation of the Lord.")

That is the way the Law of Dominance works, always causing things to go to the lowest order of the two types put together. It is a fundamental law of nature, and operates in the spiritual, legal and mental realms, as it does in the physical. For instance, Scripture states:

"Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Cor. 15:33).

This reveals the working of the law of dominance in the mental realm. An exposure to evil ways causes good habits and manners to be corrupted, not the reverse. Most can see the workings of this concept in the physical realm but not the spiritual realm, though the effects are often seen.

The effects of the curses upon the Jews causes all things that the Jews are connected with to be degraded and brought down to the nature of their curses:

"It is true that beneath all the network of trivializing influences in literature, art, politics, economics, fashion and sport, is Jewish influence controlled by Jewish groups. Their Orientalism has served as a subtle poison to dry up

the sound serum of Anglo-Saxon morality on which this country thrived in its formative years. Is it necessary to specify? In every movement toward a lower standard, a looser relationship, especially toward the overthrow of the old Christian safeguards, do not Jewish names predominate?" (The International Jew, Henry Ford, Dearborn Publishing Co, vol.4, 1922).

Where we find a trend of degeneracy or degradation of Christian standards, Jewish names often predominate because their curse predominates. The characteristics of the Jews brings everything down to their level. [That's why it's important for people to not slacken off, and set the

example to pray before and after meals, and read the Bible to the family every day - as part of an orderly and organised meal time. It is too easy to slacken off and then the next generation will be at a bigger disadvantage, instead of trying to right some of the previous wrongs. CIM]

The nature of curses on persons and their effects under the Law of Dominance also helps to explain some of the enigmas and paradoxes associated with Jews today. For instance, the issue of the migrations and intermixture of the cursed Judeans leaves us with a perplexing question: If these people were scattered in so many different lands, and had mixed with so many different people, how could they have retained their identity with Judea and the religion of the Pharisees? Any other people who became that scattered and racially mixed would have lost all connection to their original culture, religion, heritage and homeland. But the Jews today, a people who possess a small portion of the cursed Judean blood, still have an identity with those original people in Judea. This can only be explained by the nature of blessings and curses, and their role under the Law of Dominance.

In the spiritual realm, a curse is a dominant characteristic, and a blessing is recessive in nature. Thus when a person cursed intermarries with other people, the curse prevails in the offspring. An example of this is with Esau, who intermarried with Hittites, Ishmaelites, and Horites,

must reading:

JEWISH IDENTITY

Charles A. Weisman

Modern history and theology tells us that the Jews are an ancient people who have been around for 4,000 years. But this is not an accurate statement, for neither the Jews nor their name existed 4,000 years ago, or even at the time of Jesus Christ. It shows that the common Christian doctrines regarding the "Jews" and the "Gentiles" are false.

#130 @ sug don \$12.95



and the offspring inherited the curse and rejection of God that was upon Esau.

... This is why Rebekah was distressed at the possibility of her son Jacob taking a Canaanite wife. She knew that if he did, the blessings of Abraham she inherited would not continue on in the resulting offspring. Jacob was thus sent by his parents to his own kindred to take a wife (Genesis 27:46, 28:1-5)....

The characteristic of a curse or rejection by God is often irreversible and permanent. It falls upon every generation from the original person or race cursed, as with Canaan and Esau. The dominant effect of these characteristics will not be lost by intermarrying with other races or those who are blessed by God. It will not fade away with time or after so many generations. Now it can be understood why God wanted the Israelites to kill every last man, woman and child of the Canaanites. The dominant characteristics of these cursed people would have adversely affected the Israelites physically and spiritually.

The concept of the Law of Dominance leads us to a critical key in understanding the enigma of Jewish identity. All of the characteristics of the cursed Judeans, such as their Phariseism, unfruitfulness, perverted culture, anti-Christ tendencies, and their rejection by God, are all dominant characteristics. They prevail in succeeding generations no matter with whom they might intermarry. Their offspring would always have these characteristics and would cause them to retain an identity with the Judean Israelites that were cursed.

It thus is understandable why those who are known as "Jews" are identified with the *Bible* and the old land of Israel. Some of their ancestors did come from Judea and were Israelites, or rather cursed Judeans. Consequently they have retained an identity or connection with these Judeans and follow their religion and fruitless ways. Throughout the centuries to the present day there has always been a people identified with Judea and the Pharisaical religion of the Judeans at the time of Christ. It is the curse that binds the Jews together, and maintains their unity and their identity. While ethnologically the Jews are not a race but hybrids due to the curse (or curses) the Jews are in a sense a race. They are a group of people that share a common characteristic which continues unchanged from generation to generation - - that being the curse of God.

We can never know for sure all the groups or races which have intermixed with the cursed and rejected people of the *Bible*, or the degree of intermixture that has occurred. but since the spiritual aspect is related to the racial aspect of a people, the curse identifies all persons and races that have the cursed Judean, Edomite or Canaanite blood in them. The modern Jews are probably mostly of Turko-Mongolian, Tartar, Khazar stock, with a smaller portion of cursed Judean, Edomite or Canaanite blood . . . One who has the cursed blood would be inclined to be anti-Christian, or go to the old Temple site to wail at the wall (of Herod's temple. The principle was stated by Jesus:

"By their fruits you shall know them" (Mat. 7:16,20)

Both Judaism and Christianity are spiritually guided lifestyles. This means that a people in general will not be led or compelled to follow either one of these religions unless God has placed a spiritual disposition within them that would motivate them to do so. God put His Spirit in His Israel people and His Laws in their hearts and mind. Thus it is only white European people in general that have been the light bearers of Christianity, the promoters of the Bible, and the producers of godly acts and deeds for 2,000 years. No other race of people have done so, since God has not spiritually motivated them to do so. Likewise, God has put a cursed spiritual disposition into certain people in the Bible, and it is only those who have this spiritual trait,

within them, such as the Jews, who are compelled to be ungodly and anti-Christian.

If a people retained an identity with Judea, which today is a "Jewish identity," it is because they are of the cursed lineage of those Judeans God cursed. There are several types of Jews in the world that have this identity" Sephardic, Ashkenazi, Karaite, Arabic, Asiatic, Falasha, Caucasian, etc. Each are from different lands with a different admixture of indigenous stock, but each having some degree of cursed blood within them [want a blood transfusion from one of these?? CIM]

**

[this is taken from Charles Weisman's book titled: *Jewish Identity*.] www.seek-info.com

Courtesy, Hear Ye! Hear Ye!, General PO Lead Hill AR 72644.

OUR READERS SAY:

Hi Hank: Many thanks for the recent Messenger - a top quality and informative read as always. I was most pleased to see something from Richard Hoskins again - it has always been one of my favourites in the mailout. *Tasmania*.

Hello, I am returning the loan only video I received from you. Thank you for making this service available. I always look forward to the next Messenger. *Queensland*.

(Note: The "LOAN ONLY" discs are NOT available to overseas readers, and are for "within Australia" ONLY)

IF ONLY YOU'D HAVE CARED

I could have seen the sunshine,
I could have seen the spring.
I could have watched the robins fly,
I could have heard them sing.
I could have smelled the flowers, I could have felt the snow.
The things you take for granted, are things I'll never know.

You could have heard my laughter,
you could have dried my tears.
You could have watched me playing,
and growing through the years.
You could have shown me rainbows,
God painted in the sky.
You could have held me in your arms,
instead you made me die.

I might have been your daughter,
I might have been your son.
I might have learned to crawl, and stand,
and walk, and even run.
I might have felt you hug me, as your milk began to fill me.
I might have called you 'Momma,'
but instead you chose to kill me.

They say "Have an abortion, it is your legal right."
They say I'm not a person, I can't put up a fight.
They say that I'm not born yet, I haven't drawn a breath.
My heart beats in my mother's womb,
as they sentence me to death.

If only you'd have loved me, like only mother's do.
If only you'd have given me,
what your mother gave to you.
The gift of life, the gift of love,
with me you could have shared.
I could have seen the sunshine,
If only you'd have cared!
© Thelen Paul. *Watervliet MI*.

Hope this is starting to catch up a little now. God bless you and keep you safe in these dangerous times,

Hendrik (Hank) Roelofs

14

