

Janet Parshall



Compassionate Christian Soldier

BrotherWatch™ proudly presents this award to

Janet Parshall

*in recognition of being a champion for Christ,
an advocate for life, and a torchbearer of truth,
speaking the truth in love.*

- July 1997

Introduction

No stranger to controversy, Janet Parshall tackles the tough issues of our times, applying timeless principles to contemporary problems in a winsome way.

Host of the award-winning nationally-syndicated *Janet Parshall's America*, Janet addresses the issues and concerns most important to Americans. Janet's guests and topics are wide-ranging, providing food for the body, mind and spirit. Whether a fast-breaking news story, potentially culture-changing legislation, or big picture life issues, Janet Parshall's perspectives prove profitable and persuasive to her audience. Easily expressing eternal truths and pragmatic principles of behavior, Janet is a remarkable story-teller uniquely able to put flesh and blood on those principles, draping them with the clothing of human experience.

Interview

BW: How large is your listening audience?

JP: We have 60 affiliates in eight out of ten major markets, so one could only guess what the total number of listeners is.

BW: What does it mean to “influence and occupy” the culture and how do we “speak the truth in love?”

JP: “To influence and occupy” really can be found in the verse that says we’re to let our light so shine before men that they would see our good works and would honor and glorify our Father in heaven. The mission field to which we’ve been called is the land right between our two feet. It’s not necessarily *foreign* service; it’s right where you are. In *your* Jerusalem, then in your Judea, then your Samaria, and, if the Lord should call, the outermost parts of the world. It’s understanding that our life *doesn't* belong to us and that we are but ambassadors for the King of kings.

And when it says to “speak the truth in love,” what it means is to go like Bunyon’s characters of *Pilgrims’ Progress* to Vanity Fair, to establish our booth, where we do sell Truth with a *capital* T. And we have to know that there are going to be all kinds of merchants selling *all* kinds of ideologies, but the *only* ideology that transforms human beings from the inside out is a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

BW: You speak often of two mutually-exclusive worldviews, one bibliocentric, the other theophobic. What are the basic parameters of these worldviews?

JP: Billy Graham says that our fight is against the world, the flesh and the Devil. A bibliocentric worldview believes *without* exception or apology that there is *one* true living God, the *Lord Jehovah*, and that we can have a personal relationship with Him through His Son, Jesus Christ; that He *desires* to know us and to know us intimately; that the chasm of sin that has been *created* by the sin nature of man has been bridged with the sacrificial act of Calvary.

Theophobia are people who *really* and *truly* – on the *one* hand purport to say “Oh, I *believe* in religious liberties” – would really prefer that *only* religious expressions take place inside the parameters of *your* closet. The minute you bring it outside into the marketplace of ideas, they know that the *power* of our message – while they will never articulate this – the *power* of our message is so *replete* with *truth* that they *fear* what it would do for the hearts of other human beings.

So they want it *sequestered*, they want it *closeted*, so that it doesn't come out in the light of day. Well, I think that's why Scripture refers to the power of our message as *the Light*. And so, theophobia are those people who are *afraid* to have sessions of Congress open in prayer, who don't think the Ten Commandments should be hung in the courtyard, and they don't think that kids should be meeting for Bible classes on public school grounds. And these are *mutually-exclusive positions*.

The *believer* can't hold back their personal faith in Jesus Christ, it just *exudes* out of their *very* existence, and they want to be able to tell the culture about the transforming power of Jesus Christ. Someone who's theophobic doesn't want you to express that at all, at the same time purporting freedom of expression.

BW: Isn't theophobia in our society really a fear of *monotheistic* beliefs?

JP: Absolutely, as evidenced by what I just said – it's that belief in the one true living God.

BW: Do you see countercultural and far left ideas originating primarily from the "People" or from the elite?

JP: I don't subscribe to a magic bullet approach. I don't think all of the nasty people meet in one room and promulgate these ideas and then have their marching orders to go out. I think there's a conspiracy. I think it started after the fall of man in the garden and I think it's been going on ever since, and I think the deceiver of the brethren and the father of lies will use whatever conduit he is able to squash out the message of grace – salvation by grace and not by works – and to keep man from knowing that God desires to have a personal relationship with Him.

What happens is this *old model* of "faith is for the ignorant and the *intellectuals* are the sophisticates in this culture" *continues* to be put out there, that somehow, if you are a person of faith you have put your brains in a box under your shoe, and that being a person who *reasons* and *thinks* and *believes* in the ascertainment of knowledge and wisdom is *antithetical* to being a person of faith, when it's just exactly the opposite. Scripture talks to us about the necessity and the mandate for knowledge and for wisdom and says that those are necessary *precursors* for knowing God in a more intimate way.

BW: As a former educator, what do you consider the greatest problems in public education? The best solutions?

JP: The biggest problem in public education today is an *unbelievably insidious doctrine* that believes the *children belong to the State!* I remember being in a meeting in the state of Wisconsin when a man who headed the state Department of Education said that the children of Wisconsin belong to the state. He said it without *apology* and without *hesitation*.

The *current* manifestation of that *same* ideology is all bound up in this "village mentality" that's predicated on the belief that anybody can nurture your child. Well, when that's the genesis of your worldview, when *my* child walks into *your* classroom, someone who has that village mentality, they believe that they have been *sanctioned* by the *state* to *supplant* whatever value system I have instilled in my child. And so you get this *cultural confrontation*.

In fact, I call the classroom Ground Zero in the culture war, where you've got a child that comes in with an absolutely strictly-adhered-to moral code believing that *God* wrote it in stone for all times' sake versus a teacher who believes that *their* worldview on the distribution of condoms, that homosexuality is a viable alternative lifestyle, *matches* and *raises* your worldview and that because they're licensed by the State they therefore are more eminently qualified to teach your child and that *their* worldview takes predominance.

So that's the biggest problem. And the other thing is that this whole *relativistic*, situational ethics, no belief in Truth with a capital T, works its way into history, works its way into literature, works its way into social studies, works its way into *so many* of the curricula areas where you're supposed to be *examining* Great Ideas, not *distorting* Great Ideas. And so often we get children who walk out with, I think, what is tantamount to an experience of *educational malpractice* where they have been given anything *but* the Truth, but instead they've been given a political diatribe.

I remember going undercover to a state convention of an organization called Educators for Social Responsibility. What a nice sanitized name. Basically they were *radicals*. After listening to the general session – where they berated Ronald Reagan and then conservative Christians – they then broke into workshops. When I went into a workshop I sat down next to a man who said, “I don't know why *you're* here but I know why *I'm* here. I have a particularly *liberal* agenda and I try to get it in *wherever* I can.” And I thought, “Yep, and that's exactly why we've got controversy in the classroom.”

So the problem is we have to get back to the idea that as much as a person feels called into teaching – and I do believe it is a high and important calling – *you* didn't give birth to that child, *you* didn't walk the floor at three o'clock in the morning, *you're* not instilling the values, *you're* not the one who's going to introduce them to the person of Jesus Christ because of the goofiness of our current laws, so as *much* as you care about my child, there is a beginning and an *end* to your relationship with my child. Don't *ever* think you can supplant me as the parent.

BW: The Clinton administration has spearheaded a jihad against tobacco while exercising permissiveness towards marijuana. Would you consider this a concrete example of an *inversion* of values emanating from the White House? A case study in countercultural *schizophrenia*? A wedge to exert greater control over big business?

JP: *Absolutely!* And it's *absolutely disingenuous* to purport on the one hand that you want to make sure that children know that Joe Camel is to be *feared* and that he's not to be *funded*. It's so diametrically *opposite* to his Surgeon General appointee in Jocelyn Elders, where she believed in the *decriminalization* of drugs and felt that if we taught more kids to *masturbate* we wouldn't have such a high rate of teenage pregnancy.

The President *is himself* an *embodiment* of “cultural schizophrenia.” He doesn't *rule* from any *moral code*. He *rules* from whatever the *polls* dictate. And he *himself* has manifested all kinds of *terrible* character choices so he doesn't even have a *moral* compass on how to guide the country in what is a clearly delineated sense of right and wrong. More importantly, I *really* challenge the government who purports to be *dogmatic* on smoking and yet will not spend the same kind of money to get rock stars and athletes to get on MTV and say “*Don't* have sex before marriage because it could kill you.”

So it happens to be the *cause de jour*, whatever is current hot button bit that will boost him up in the polls. That's the only reason he would get on board. It isn't coming from some deep moral center.

BW: What are your thoughts on this inversion of values in our culture, calling evil good and good evil, and rewarding failure while punishing success?

JP: This is the *current* manifestation of what was the *logical* outcome of saying that all we wanted to do was to purport and *raise* the consciousness on the issue of *rights*, while *denying* at the same time a *heightened* discussion on the *necessity* for personal responsibility. So it's “I want, I want, I want. When I *don't* get it I then become a *victim*,” which has led Charlie Sykes to write his book, *A Nation of Victims*. But not, at the same time talking about responsibility. So this slipping

around and making a *right a preeminent* issue in a person's life while not at the same time saying that you have responsibilities is a *perfect picture*, a *perfect picture* of what it looks like *not* to have a *set of principles* as the guiding force in your life.

What happens in this town, and what we're seeing in the 105th Congress, is men and women who are dictated by *politics* as opposed to *principles*. I also think that calling evil good and good evil is *so* indicative that we are one day closer to the Lord's return. I love the verse in Colossians that challenges us *not* to be taken captive by *vain* philosophies *predicated* on the ideas of *man*. And what we're seeing in this culture are a bunch of vain philosophies where, as long as self is exposed and as long as self can be satisfied, therein lies truth. There is nothing outside of "self," then, according to these people that dictates the existence of truth.

BW: Children have grown up in crime-ridden neighborhoods, been educated in public schools with metal detectors and drive-by shootings, and have seen the advocacy of abortion as birth control. Does this account for the *new* kind of violence of *children* killing other *children* and even killing *babies*?

JP: I remember when I was pregnant with my first child in 1973 as *Roe v. Wade* was being handed down. The proponents of abortion said that they would limit this procedure to the first trimester. I remember the opponents – who were definitely prophets in their day – saying not only will you *not* limit it to the first trimester, you will go to the *second* and the *third*, and you're not stop there. You will move to *infanticide* and you're go to the *infirm* and you'll move toward *euthanasia* for our senior citizens. *Every syllable of their prediction has come true.*

There *is* a classic slippery slope, for a very logical reason. The minute you begin to move the lines and to drop them to wherever you feel comfortable, or where you think your *circumstances* dictate truth as opposed to *truth* telling you how to exist in the *midst* of your circumstances, you have the *natural* – and I do mean that in the theological sense – the *natural* outcome of children killing children, of children thinking that a *baby* is an *encumbrance* to a senior prom. You have the natural experience of a young woman on the east coast going in and delivering the baby, cutting the cord on the garbage can in the stall, and shouting from the stall, "Hey, tell the guys we'll be right out."

If the culture has said – as Molly Yard said to my husband in the course of a deposition, "That's not a baby. That's tantamount to a hangnail" – when that sort of *blatant disregard* for *creation* as *defined* and *shaped* in the image of the *Creator* – what we have is the ultimate picture of the lack of the existence of God and therefore no respect for His creation versus the ultimate transcendent truth for these people which is "circumstances define my truth."

BW: *BrotherWatch* frequently writes about the dangers of *groupthink*. What are your views on the idea that all men or all women think alike, that people of a given race are all the same, that ideas have color?

JP: I have to tell you, this is one of those issues that makes me go back and try to keep the verse that says, "Be angry and sin not." I get *livid* when I am *immediately* put into a voting bloc because I am a *woman*.

It's real interesting. I just did a taping for *To the Contrary* recently and one of the topics was the role of women in the media. They interviewed a woman who had written a book about women in the media and felt that women were getting short-handed in the media. Well, she did something wonderful. She so *self-exploded* it was unbelievable. Napoleon said, "Never interrupt your enemy when she is in the middle of destroying herself." She went on to define that the kinds of women we weren't hearing from in the media were people from NOW and Planned Parenthood. So when it got tossed back to us in our debate I said, "You know, I'm a woman. I'm in the media. And

why do I think *that* woman wouldn't spend *five minutes* trying to ensure *my* platform to espouse *my* worldview?"

I said, "What we have here is a *classic* case of smoke and mirrors where people use *sex* or *gender* as an *excuse* to try to promulgate a particular political worldview. It is *not* about sex. It is *100%* about *politics*."

And this is where I get really angry in particular at the Republican Party, who, rather than *leading* have been *following* the Clinton administration, and have decided that they will *rule*, not based on *principles* but on *polls*. And they *think* they have what they call a "gender gap."

So shortly after the reelection when Susan Molanari left to get involved with a CBS Saturday News program and Jennifer Dunn took her place within the party leadership, they were so happy and declared with great bravado, "Look, we are the party where we now are putting women in leadership, thereby closing the gender gap." Well with all due respect my friends on the political Republican side, you don't have a *gender* gap. You have a *philosophy* gap. You have so stepped away from the guiding principles of the party you're willing to *sell* your *soul* and you don't understand what the price tag for that sellout is.

So women do not vote the same. Men don't vote the same. Blacks don't vote the same. Hispanics don't vote the same. The message these politicians have to get is ultimately it is about *principle* and *principle* is no respecter of color, or race or ethnic background. And *until* the Republicans get that right, and if they *don't* get that right, this will be the *shortest* tenure of leadership that we'll *ever* see.

BW: On your show you often address "religious apartheid" and the "privatization of religion" in America. What would you like to tell our readers?

JP: Here's a concern that I have and maybe it's because I have been very, very fortunate to be married to an attorney who has been litigating these cases for close to 25 years. Unlike the Barry Lynns of the world who think that *all* the problems out there dealing with the *free* expression of religion can be corrected by *simply* sending a letter to the appropriate party *or* signing on to a series of guidelines as suggested by the President, they are *dead wrong*. They are people who *don't* go into a courtroom and don't understand the *unbelievable* hostility that is out there against – not *religion*, but, in *particular* – the *Christian* faith.

Case after case after case where, for example, a man is fired from the Peace Corps, a current case my husband has. He gets an outstanding rating from the government, government records clearly say this. But he says two things as a physician who oversaw four countries in Africa. Number One – stop having sex, Peace Corps volunteers, with the people in the countries that you go to serve. The government's own records tell us that *90%* of the people who work in the government – *90%* – have sex with the people in the countries they go to serve. So he said, "Stop it." And the second thing he said is, "I'm not going to talk to you about *condoms*. I'm going to talk to you about *abstinence*." And a week after he made those statements he got fired.

I can tell you about the police officer in North Carolina who dared to share his faith with someone in uniform and the Police Chief said "Don't you *ever* talk about *God* *again* as long as you have that uniform on." Case after case after case that tell me that those guidelines aren't worth the paper that they're written on and sending letters doesn't mean anything.

There is a *well-financed*, *very* collective effort by a lot of people in this country to make sure that *Christian* expression in the marketplace of ideas is *snuffed* out at *any* and *every* cost.

One of the reasons that I'm glad there is so much increased conversation in this country about worldwide Christian persecution is that I'm hoping and praying that my brothers and sisters in the

body will begin to first of all not be so *myopic* – that they'll *expand* their prayer list to include other countries, because Scripture tells us that when one part of the body hurts we all hurt. *Those* brothers and sisters need to be *prayed* for and we *really* need to be lifting their burdens up. But second of all, if you begin to be sensitized to the *persecution* in another country my prayer is you'll be more sensitized to the *discrimination* – that's where we are right now, we're moving to persecution – but the discrimination that we have in this country right now.

But as long as you don't feel – and that's the problem with Christians, we are by and large very sheepish, like our Father says – unless we feel the hot air of the wolf on the back of our necks we tend to be the *most apathetic sleepers* in the world. I think that's why Paul gives us the admonition on multiple occasions to *awake*. When you're *asleep* you are *food* for the lion. When you are *awake* you're a *watchman* on the wall. So that somnambulistic state *kills* our effective witness and our spiritual life and I want people to be *quicken*ed to the fact that all across America there are people whose Christian expression in the marketplace is being *challenged*, is being *aborted*, is being *snuffed* out. If you don't understand how there is this pattern out there, when they come to *your* front door someone is going to say to you, "How come *you* weren't involved in preventing this?"

BW: The Left consistently shows contempt for patriotism and disparagingly calls their opponents *nativists*. Peter Brimelow coined the term *alienist* to describe Americans who appreciate all other cultures above their own. Did this arise from the dichotomy between traditionalists and counterculturalists in the Sixties?

JP: I got *nauseous* – let me give you a pop culture response to that one – when the President approached a sea of microphones and was asked what he thought about the movie *Air Force One*. "Oh," he replied in overt simplicity, "Air Force One doesn't have an escape hatch like Harrison Ford had. And, number two, I really can't stand nationalism." Well, in one fell swoop that man again took a *wonderful* word – a word that brings tears to *my* eyes and a lump in *my* throat when I see Old Glory wave – and he *repudiated* it and *vilified* it as though a strong belief in the *wonderfulness* and the *sovereignty* of our country is some kind of a *heinous* national crime.

Obviously the Sixties were very much a *catalyst* for this *anti-America* sentiment, as evidenced by discord on campuses all across America while we were involved in Vietnam. But it's grown, and we've become more of an international community, with the Euro-dollar and our ever-increasing involvement with the United Nations. We tend to forget that America *was* and always *is*, by God's design meant to be a *leader*, and if we stop viewing ourselves as the country that *sets* the standard, that *sets* the example, that *leads* by principle, then I don't know what makes us unique.

We were the American Experiment predicated on *profound reliance upon God*. When we abandon that I think what we've done is we've created the stage for, I think, the end times. Eschatology is not my strong suit. I don't dwell on that. I'm prepared to go home *today* if He called me. I'm prepared to go home in *fifty years* should He allow. But I do believe that when America continues to step away from what we know to be that reliance upon our *Creator* that we are setting the stage to step away from *leading* and turning into *followers*.

BW: What do you make of the failed coup against Newt Gingrich and why is the GOP always looking to the *Left* instead of the *Right*?

JP: Let me answer the second part of the question first. There truly is a split right down the middle of the [Republican] Party. There are those who lead by *politics* and those who lead by *principles*. You've got the Steve Largents, and the Jim Talents, and the J.C. Watts who are *men of God*, who *believe* that they were *called* to this town on a *mission* just as surely as somebody from Navigators who is serving in Zimbabwe. They believe that God has *called* them here like Joseph

of old to serve in Pharaoh's court and they *view* it as a ministry. So every decision they make is *predicated* on *principle* and what will allow the continuance of the spread of the gospel, what will continue to protect the family, the most precious institution of the heart of God.

And then you've got others whose attitude is, "I don't care what it costs me. I'm willing to sell my soul," and that can be wrapped up in people like William Weld, who are willing to sell out to *anybody* at *any* cost just as long as *their* particular political career gets advanced.

That takes us to the first part of your question which is the person of Newt Gingrich. Newt does *not* have a *moral center*, and as a result his *professorial* approach is fine when he's behind closed doors in a caucus room but he cannot connect with the American people because we're not sitting at a 400-level class at Auburn University. We are living *real* lives with *real* needs and want the government to get *out* of our lives and cut us loose so that we can take care of our families ourselves.

That attempted coup – and I don't think that's the last we see of that, by the way. It's August recess. My guess is that there's a whole lot of conversations behind closed doors. It was the way of the *conservatives* saying to the *liberals* – I'm not even calling them "moderates" – to the liberals, "You are trying to kidnap and co-opt our party. And unfortunately Newt Gingrich is not siding with us. There is no gray. You are sided, *de facto*, on the liberal side of this camp."

So it really is an in-party fighting structure. When I, for example, go over to NET and co-host a show two nights a week and we throw open the phones, *caller* after *caller* after *caller* says, "I'm never voting *Republican* again," or "I'm never *voting* again," or "I can't believe how this party has abandoned its principles."

I'll give you a perfect example. Now we've got the Speaker pushing for statehood for Puerto Rico. *Now?* This is an important issue for you? And the spokesperson for the Speaker said, "Well it's part of the Republican platform." Well, here's a news flash Newt, so is the Human Rights Amendment. I don't see you pushing for *that* one. So what in the world are you involved in something as *liberal* as statehood for Puerto Rico right now when families are falling apart and have not gotten the sort of tax relief that *you* promised them during the course of the 104th?

So it's a party that has no sense of itself. It has *no* moral center. Those that *do* are *systematically* being made the *illegitimate* members of the party. Maybe it's because they haven't stepped outside of the Beltway, but I think they have no idea the trouble they're in. This is the *quintessential* application of the verse, "He that troubleth his own house inherits the wind." They are in for a *whirlwind* of dissatisfaction among their constituents.

BW: Much has been made of the Religious *Right's* growing influence in the public square. Would you comment on the Religious *Left*?

JP: The interesting thing about the Religious *Left* is they seem to be oh so content flying, if I may use their own verbiage, under radar. They are *more* powerful, *more* financed, *more* well connected and have *greater* friends in *higher* places than the so-called Religious Right can ever *hope* to have. They represent *everything*. In fact, I find them more problematic than anyone else because they put on the garb – like the *Pharisees* of old – of *religionists* while not purporting *anything* that's *Bible*-based.

And yet the National Council of Churches and a lot of these social justice groups co-opt Scripture, pick-and-choose passages out of Scripture when it's convenient, to theologically and theoretically justify their position. And they are the Pharisees of old, and they are extremely problematic.

And I'll give you a *personal* issue that I have with them. When the *New York Times* in 1996 during the month of December put a full-page ad saying they were calling for a *shared* Jerusalem and said that they represented the *Christian churches of America*, I found that to be *anathema*. First of all, that is so anti-scriptural it's unbelievable. And second of all I am thrilled that the real church in America then put in a countervailing ad as well as invited Benjamin Netanyahu to come to Washington, D.C., and conservative Christians and Jews together told the Prime Minister unapologetically that we wanted a *united* Jerusalem, that there was no such thing as Arab-East Jerusalem, that Benjamin Netanyahu was not violating the Oslo Accord by building in Har Homa, and that those people who *said* they represented the churches in America didn't represent *any* of us.

So, again, I find them to be more problematic. *They're* the ones invited to the White House. *They're* the ones who purport to say to the lawmakers that they represent the Christians in this country. So, here's what I've discovered as a Christian who believes strongly that our mandate *is* to influence this culture. *We* tend to fight a war on two sides. *One*, those whose worldview is *absolutely* antithetical to one that's Bible-based. And those, theoretically, in our community who *wear* the nomenclature of Christians without having a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. So ours is a *two-fronted* fight.

BW: What are your views on Ronald Reagan?

JP: Ronald Reagan will always be very much a man who represents the American *hero* to me. He's a man who lived not by *politics* but he lived by *principle*. He's a man who wasn't afraid to do what was *right* even when it wasn't *popular*. And he was a man who without hesitation let us know that it was *principle, principle, principle* over politics.

BW: What do you consider the "defining moment" of your generation?

JP: I have to say the days in which we find ourselves because we're either going to define ourselves as people who believe in absolute truth or we're gonna define ourselves as *moral relativists*. I think that what the Clinton crisis has done is it's had each and every one of us do a *personal inventory*. I thank God for that. Now when we wake up in the morning we ask ourselves whether there *is* absolute truth, whether we *live* by it, *subscribe* to it, *or* whether we think that truth comes in all shapes and sizes, what's good for you is not necessarily good for me, and vice versa, and, after all, everybody's doing it, if it feels good, do it, let it all hang out, and ah oh, *déjà vu* all over again – it's the Sixties come home to roost.

So I have to tell you that while I thought that was sort of a *hiccup* on the cultural horizon back in the Sixties – and I was there in the midst of all of that tumult. In fact, I was at the University of Wisconsin when they blew up the math building and the T.A. was killed. I mean, I was there on the front lines with this acting up and I thought "Wait a minute. I'm still not gonna throw off what my Mom and Dad taught me because it's been *protective* up to this point. Why would I replace it with *another* morality that's been *unproven* and I don't know if it'll offer me the same protection as I go along the road of life as the one my Mom and Dad gave me, which is *absolute eternal truth*."

So, where we find ourselves now is, the Baby Boomers, the Hippies have given up the bell bottoms, they've got the three-piece Brooks Brothers suits on instead, but it's the *same* philosophy, the *same* ideology, that either is *God-centered* or is *self-centered*, and I'm afraid that what the Clinton scandals have asked us to do is to ask ourselves who we will serve. But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.

BW: Some people have pointed out that in order to *create* a utopia, counterculturalists have to *destroy* America in the process.

JP: *Save* the village by *burning* it – *exactly!* And I don't think that that's the way to go. I still believe *in* the country, in the village if you will, but I believe it's *redeemable*. But the reason that we've *had* this *wonderful, successful* 222-year-old experiment is because up to this point at least we have *held fast* to a certain set of *values* that – regardless of our *background* or where we *came* from, our ethnicity or even our religious background – there were some universally-identified values to which we as a *country collectively subscribed*.

We're not *there* anymore. We're all these little divinities who make it up themselves and now we not only *cannot* universally *recognize* them, we *cannot define* them, and we have an even harder time in *implementing* them. And therein lies the challenge. If in fact, to borrow from the President and the First Lady, it takes a village – and, I think more preferably it takes a family – but even if you were to take *their* viewpoint and say it takes a village, and only way you keep from having mayhem and chaos and anarchy in your village is by saying collectively, “This is how we live.” Out there it's called the rule of law. You can't *touch* it, you can't *feel* it, you can't *smell* it, and yet it offers us a *hedge* that basically says, “Left to our own devices we'll *destroy* ourselves.”

But the rule of law *hedges* us and *protects* us and says, “If you don't have an internal moral compass that will help you do the right thing then the long arm of the law is there to remind you.” So, I have to tell you truthfully I would not want to be alive at any other point in history. This is a *magnificent* moment where we get to say to ourselves, “*What* do I believe? *Why* do I believe it? What am I willing to *live* for? What am I willing to *die* for?” It doesn't get any better than that.

BW: What event or experience has most shaped your life?

JP: That's *tough*, I have to tell you that my philosophy is that I'm always in God's classroom and recess is only called when He calls me home. There have been so many. First of all, marrying the man that I know is God's choice for my life – my high school sweetheart. I wouldn't be who I am without him. He's a mentor, a tutor, a playmate, a friend, a lover, a confidant, everything that we could possibly want. Second, he believes in those same eternal values. So our marriage is held together with super glue. So no matter what happens we're held fast because we're hanging on to the One who gave His life for us.

I'm certainly a different person having been blessed with Sarah, Rebecca, Samuel and Joseph. It's one thing to *talk* the pro-life movement, it's another to have *wiped* four noses, and taught four babies to tie their shoes and to pray and to be a good healthy family member. So that's extremely significant.

There's been *tragedy* in our lives as well, and as much as no one signs up for the tragedy part of life, I am a different person coming out of the other side of that Refiner's fire because what it taught me to do was to hang on to the hand of the One who is faithful and will never abandon me.

So, I'm hesitant to say *a* defining moment because being just clay on the Potter's wheel I think I'm still in the process of being defined. While some of the lessons are not fun, they conform me and transform me into the image of His Son, which is what I want.

BW: What is Bill Clinton's legacy for the Democratic Party? for Feminism? for America?

JP: Where there is no vision the people perish. I think that he's figured out that he's given a lot of political favors to a lot of special interest groups, and he *has*, for the time being. And I do believe that for a *short* period of time he will have followers who will think, “He was *good* for us because he *carried* forth the standard for *our* agenda.”

But the legacy for Bill Clinton will be the fact that he *troubled* America's household, and he who troubleth his own house inherits the wind. I have to tell you in my heart of hearts that I really believe we have not yet begun to see what the fallout of this is going to be. First of all, I think the rule of law and American jurisprudence has just been turned upside down on its head. With a daughter who's about to graduate as a lawyer and a husband who's a lawyer, we talk about the rule of law a lot. Will there be any significance to the *oath* any more? George Washington talked about the significance of the religious underpinning of an oath. Do we *value* those? Because when we step into a courtroom everything is predicated on telling the *truth*. If *that* doesn't matter any more it's all a *charade* – those are *kangaroo* courts we have now, not *real* courts.

The other thing too, is, I think that when we have young people – grade-schoolers who are molesting girls in the bathroom and their defense is, “Well, the President is doing it” – we have handed down morality; values are caught, not taught. May God have mercy on our soul. What have we *tossed* their way? When we have a teenager in the Bronx who says you can go to *law* school and he went to *lie* school, I'm thinking, “our babies aren't missing *any* of this.”

So in the midst of this, while he leaves his legacy – and he'll *never* be able to take away, by the way, the branding of having been impeached, even if they decide to cancel everything and say it doesn't count any more, he was acquitted so he's off Scot free – history will always record *what* he did, *where* he did it, and that he *lied* about it, and that will never be removed. I think what moms and dads have to do is – if the Senate doesn't do their job correctly and remove this man from office, which needs to be done – then moms and dads have then got to repair the breach – the one *he* talked about in his State of the Union Address – the breach now is all across the country. It's *broken*. There's a *split* from stem to stern in the ship of state.

I think what we have to do as moms and dads is say, “OK, there's damage here. Now, how do we go back and repair it?” What we do is we *teach* them that there's a way that seems right unto man but the end therein is death. We *teach* them so that, as it says in the book of Deuteronomy, they hang our teaching around their necks so that when they rise up and they go to bed at night they remember there is a right and a wrong way to behave, given to us by the One who loved us enough to give us those parameters for protection. We've got our work cut out for us.

BW: Is there anything in your heart that you want to talk about now?

JP: I think the biggest issue that really sort of precedes, as an overlayment, as an underpinning for every other issue, is whether or not *truth* can be made *known* and whether or not it is *absolute* or whether or not it happens to be *relativistic*, and the answer to that resides with the One who said, “I am the Way, the Truth and the Light.” *My* burden is that, in these days of *real* cultural confusion, that people would come to know the One who set the captive free. That was *me* – *burdened* with a load of sin – until I found out who Christ Jesus was and saw His absolute truth as not making me walk five steps behind my man, not forcing me to stay in the home, not telling me all the “I can'ts” if I follow Him – but teaching me that I have life and I have it abundantly by having a personal relationship with Him. That is *the* issue. Everything else is mashed potatoes.

BW: What is the *relationship* between faith and courage as illustrated in your book, *Tough Faith*.

JP: Well, I have to tell you that I think the two are *inextricably connected*. When you have *faith* – a faith that endures, a faith that continues regardless of your circumstances – one of the natural outcomes is *courage*. Courage is the ability to face difficult circumstances and to persevere. Paul, from the walls of a prison, said that he could “count it all joy,” and if you simply looked at his *circumstances* you would have thought “But from a mortal's perspective there's nothing hopeful or joyful about where you are.” He *had* courage because he *knew* where his hope *came* from and he was prepared to give a *reason* for that hope at *any* time in *any* season.

We wrote about *Tough Faith*, about a faith that endures, by sort of laying out the *topography*, if you will, of America at the close of the 20th century and anticipating the sorts of hills and valleys we see this country having to climb and fall down into in the days to come. The only way we're going to be able to do that successfully is by having a faith that endures.

BW: Your book looks at the many ways people worship things *other* than the Creator. Please encapsulate the worship of these *false* gods and its *effect* on American life as we know it.

JP: I think as we rapidly approach this new millennium, what we're going to see is a heightened discussion in our culture about spiritualism. I believe that with all of my heart and I think one of the indicators of that – it's a very *clear* cultural indicator – has to be Hollywood and the movies. When you see movies like *The Sixth Sense* having Number One box office receivables for weeks and weeks and weeks, you have to ask yourself "Why?"

You start by going back and looking at the premise of the film. It's about what happens when you – *their* words – "cross over." In other words, when you die. Do we *wander* the earth aimlessly trying to figure out what went wrong? Do we try to complete a *task* that we didn't have an opportunity to complete before we died? Do *spirits* sit on the edge of our beds in the evening and visit with us as though they were still in human form?

I think that what these movies remind all of us is that residing within the heart of every man is still the profound ancient question, "Is God real? How do I know Him personally? And how may I have a personal relationship with Him?"

Man basically *fears* death. The Scriptures point that out to us. "Then by man came death. The wages of sin is death." So there's a natural *fear* that we have of death and I think Hollywood tries to offer a kind of resolution. What we'll see in man's attempt to answer that question, if they're not going to offer Christ – who is the *ultimate* answer to that question because He *conquered* death – then what people will try to do is to offer *substitute* messiahs, *substitute* theologies, *substitute* religions, *substitute* spiritualism, to try to fill that *gap* which still resides in their hearts.

So, when you see, for example, Deepak Chopra, who makes regular appearances on PBS, talk about having *Christ-consciousness*, to the *fuzzy-thinking* Christian we might say, "Oh, well good, see, all we're saying is give peace a chance, we're all one, there's no difference between ideas, all ideas have equal value and worth, and after all, he's talking about Christ so he *must* be a Christian."

What we need to do in these latter days is to ask our heavenly Father to give us *discernment*, to use the *ears* on our heart as well as the *ears* on our head. We're going to see bizarre amalgamations of *all* kinds of religions and ultimately we will see the world divided as it has been since the beginning into two camps: those who *know* and *follow* Jesus Christ, the *true* Messiah, the One who said, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Light," or, the other camp will be those who follow other and false messiahs.

BW: What are the root causes of the *escalation* of violence in America in 1999, how has the *nature* of this violence changed, and how should we *address* this phenomenon?

JP: Well, I believe that the heart is *reprobate* above all things. The book of Jeremiah tells us that. So there will *always* be *violence* in our world because, until Jesus comes, there will always be *sin* in our world. But we've seen some interesting manifestations of violence in 1999 and perhaps one of the most *horrific* manifestations of that is violence in our local schools, and, most recently now, violence in our church, though it used to be considered safe harbors where we could send our children, but no longer. Things have changed dramatically.

I think that there are several reasons for this, not the *least* of which is we started back in 1973 to make a public declaration on life. We said it is *open* season on pre-born children and we would give the government the rights to help facilitate that warfare. When you pick up the line of absolute truth, when you *believe* the answer to the test that God gave us when He said, “I put before you this day life and death” – and then He helped us out by giving us the answer to the test, “Choose *life*,” He said – when we make the wrong choice, there are *consequences* for that choice. So we are seeing violence where we completely disregard life *in* the womb. We, in many cases now sadly are disregarding life recently *exited* from the womb. We devalue life if it’s *infirm* or if it’s *old* or if it’s *inconvenient*. When you have that sort of sangfroid-bearing *barbarism* in your culture, then we shouldn’t be surprised to see violence.

The other cultural manifestation happens to be what I call a kind of *cognitive disconnect* with our kids. I don’t think that they can sit in front of a video game with a handpiece that looks and feels like a gun to the point where it back-jumps after you fire it and think that kids somehow have *made* a connection between their *actions* and the *consequences*.

I recently made a point, and I chose to do it as a cultural observer, of seeing the movie, *The Matrix*. That was particularly problematic to me because basically what it said was that *those* people who are living *real* lives were *really* just *sleeping machines* walking around, that the *problem* was people who *felt* that there were rules and guidelines that they had to live by, and in this film the haphazard blowing away of individuals with no consequences, giving the *young* protagonist in this movie the ability to even *dodge* bullets, *feeds*, I think, into the mindset of the Eric Harris’s and Dylan Klebold’s out there who think that they can *kill* with no real *consequences*.

BW: On your radio show you have discussed many of the *tragedies* which have touched the American psyche. What *positive* results have you discerned in the *midst* of these tragedies?

JP: Oh my. That’s perhaps where I think there is some real hope. If America is paying attention to what I think has to be described as nothing more and nothing less than a divine tutorial, we are being asked today, “Whose are we? Will we live for Him and, if necessary, will we die for Him?” I don’t see it as an accident that so many of the violent shootings that we’ve seen in our culture lately are directed tied back to men, women and students who have made a profession of faith in Christ Jesus. I think what it’s doing is it’s teaching slovenly American Christians to count the cost, something that we’ve been told to do since we were first introduced to the person of Jesus Christ. He told us that in this life that we would have tribulation. None of this should come as a surprise. He said that if we followed Him, in Matthew 24, we were *guaranteed* persecution.

The blessing in the midst of this tragedy is the assurance of the validity of His word, first and foremost, and, second of all, has to be the ever-growing anticipation in the heart of the believer that Jesus is coming again and it may be soon.

The other thing that I find so encouraging is that the lost and the seeking and the hurt in this world – when they see people make an unapologetic faith of who they are in Jesus Christ – it has to challenge them to the marrow of their bone: do *they* know Him and if *they* were to lose their life, by flying a private plane to a wedding on the east coast, or by attending a worship service at a church, or by walking across the street to an office building in Atlanta, would they know where they are going today? God has issued a wakeup call and God willing people will listen to what He has to say.

BW: What are the proper *relationships* between America’s political, cultural and religious institutions and how do we most effectively *engage* those institutions as Christians and as Americans?

JP: This is such a profoundly important question because I truly believe with *all* of my heart and with *all* of my soul that revival has to start first in the heart of the *individual*. But when that happens what we *necessarily* and what we *historically* have seen is revival taking place in *all* factions of culture. We've seen revival in politics, revival in business, revival in economics. There are necessary concentric circles of influence with revival. So that should give us hope to persevere, to not grow weary in well-doing.

Our salvation has not now nor will it ever come from government. Government is made up of fallen people and fallen people will always be in government, therefore, if you follow to the logical conclusion, there will never be a perfect government. But I take very seriously in this country the admonition that we are supposed to "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's."

God has given us this government and in *America* we have government by *representation*. We have a government where, according to the perspective of our Founding Fathers, we are *supposed* to influence those who are elected to office. That is something we have to take seriously.

I am concerned about, again, fuzzy-headed thinking where people think that somehow we don't have to participate because we've not found in our midst the perfect candidate. We are responsible for *our* actions, not someone else's *reaction*. We have to be educated. We have to be prepared. We have to study. We have to think. And then what we have to do is to say, "Out of *these* principles which are non-negotiable, if I can't find a perfect candidate, which one will at least *move* the most forward and in the *right* position?"

Culture is a reflection of politics just like *politics* is a reflection of culture. In these days in which we find ourselves the line of distinction between those two is extremely *blurred*. The problem is we add to this mix now so many "*mainstream*" religions that have added to that blurredness. Religion used to be a standout, a *separator*. It used to be the *caveat* for truth and it used to say, "This is the way you should go." But because religion has now been inundated with political correctness, because politics is now run on politics as opposed to principle (which is how it was run in the past), these separate and distinct entities in our society are no longer separate and distinct.

What an opportunity, then, for the *Christian* to offer that *distinct moral reasoning* and *seasoning* to a culture which has lost a sense of herself!

BW: The three recognized power centers in America are the District of Columbia (politics), New York (media) and Los Angeles (entertainment). How *corrupting* can these power centers be to their respective *spheres* of influence and to those who are *part* of those power centers?

JP: That's a complex question. I am of the belief that in *theory* *media* can be neutral. I am of the belief that *entertainment* can be neutral and I am of the belief that *politics* can be neutral. The problem is that these are entities which only come *alive* when man steps *into* them. And therein lies the *challenge*. If it's a humanistic, self-centered, self-aggrandizing, self-inflating sort of a perspective the ultimate end of that will be *ruin*. If it happens to be speaking to what Francis Schaeffer used to call "higher principles" – getting the *first* things right *first*, seeing their implementation – then I think politics, media, entertainment can be used for good.

I'm one of those people – in fact, I just had the opportunity to spend some time with Jeanette Clift George who played Corrie ten Boom in the wonderful movie, *The Hiding Place*. God gave us the arts. I don't think that Christians should abandon them. I think they should go back and *reoccupy* them. But I think that we as believers should support those who are *in* the arts. I think Anita Shaeffer wrote about this with such eloquence: We've abandoned them and so the arts don't live in a moral vacuum – they've been occupied by those with a different worldview.

I think we go back and we reoccupy. And here's where I think that there's a parallel with the other two. I think Christians should be in media. I think they should go back and reoccupy rather than wave our hand and say it's reprobate and dismissed. The same with politics. We could say, "It's all reprobate, it's all about graft and corruption, and back-scratching and compromise and retreat." My challenge is – and the challenge I think the Lord has given us – is that we don't retreat. We go back and we reoccupy.

BW: Would you agree that all of the *important* things – character, compassion, courage – are matters of the *heart* (not the head)? Why or why not?

JP: Yes and no, and I hate to give a lawyer's response on that, but let me start with the "No" first.

I believe that C.S. Lewis was right when he said that the *will* must necessarily precede the *emotion*. I have to *purpose* first to do something and then I have to ask God to give me the *courage* to be able to *do* it. Sometimes that starts with a head decision.

My problem is that so often if it's a feeling first then I have to step outside my comfort zone and therein lies a *huge* quagmire for the modern Christian. Because we tend to build *truth* based on our feelings. We've *juxtaposed* the way the relationship between experience and truth is supposed to be. *Truth* is supposed to *permeate* our experience rather than let our *experience* *define* the truth. And I think the problem is sometimes truth starts by standing hard on the *facts*. I remember growing up with the word picture that it was *fact* precedes our *faith* which then precedes our *feelings*. But the *engine* on our train was the facts. That is a *head* decision.

But I think that what we have to do in the meantime is understand that the way God designed us is that there is in fact an absolute and complete connection between head and heart. Sometimes I have to say, "Lord, given the head knowledge, give me the heart now to engage the culture. Give me the compassion that's needed to see people whose ideas are hellish as not people who are hellish themselves but people who rather have been caught in the snare of the enemy. Let me have a compassion on the very people I'm trying to influence."

Character means that you've reasoned in your *head* that there is a right and a wrong and you've decided in your *heart* how you will live. *Compassion* says, "I understand logically that God loves all people, that He's no respecter of persons and in my heart I will live out my life in such a way that it's reflective of that compassion." *Courage* says, "There is a plan here. I must choose to go forward." But it affects the heart by saying, "God, give me the boldness to persevere." So the two are absolutely and completely connected.

BW: In Orwell's *1984*, Big Brother created *cultural amnesia* wherein today's spin contradicts yesterday's – *and nobody notices*. How has this phenomenon developed in America and how can it be counteracted?

JP: *That* would be the essence of *why* I do *what* I do. Not only do we have cultural *amnesia*, to pick up on Orwell, but because we have coupled with that situational *ethics*, it makes it oh so convenient *for* cultural amnesia. *If* truth is situational and relativistic then I don't care what I even decided yesterday because being a little divinity – which is really the logical end of being a cultural relativist – I can forget what I said yesterday and start with a whole *new* moral code. The problem is that again has to be the distinctive *hallmark* for us as believers from an unsaved culture. We know that truth is non-negotiable. It is the same yesterday, today and tomorrow. It is uncompromisable. And it transcends, undergirds and wraps itself around every single situation in which we find ourselves.

This phenomena has happened in America because we have seen a moving away from absolute truth into relativism. And I think that there's a real problem in the church on this one. When

George Barna surveyed Christians and Christians overwhelmingly – to the tune of 64% – said that truth is situational, we have a hard time discerning right from wrong and we feed right into the cultural amnesia that Orwell was writing about.

How can it be counteracted? For the believer, *get into the Word of God*. As Dwight L. Moody said, “How can you measure truth unless you lay down the straight stick of truth which is straight and measure all else that is crooked by it.” The bottom line is that as biblically-illiterate people we’re going to be pushed and pulled and swayed and mesmerized, if you will, into a kind of cultural *amnesia*, but much more important than that, not only will it be amnesia it will be a cultural *coma*, which is far more problematic.

Interview Dates: August 4, 1997; January 22, 1999; September 27, 1999.

Personal Comments

When I think of Janet Parshall I think of love. Janet *exudes* love. Janet has a special ability to connect with people *because* of her love for God and her fellow man. Her warmth and compassion are genuine and transparent, coming from her heart.

Janet Parshall is a special person who really *does* “speak the truth in love.” Janet beautifully balances the head and the heart. I have never – not *once* – heard Janet answer a hostile caller in kind. Rather, Janet’s grace and graciousness abound in every situation she encounters.

I have had the personal pleasure of meeting Janet on numerous occasions and have heard her speak in a variety of venues, including a Jews for Jesus Passover Seder, two Titus 2 women’s conferences, a Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), a Family Research Council conference on homosexuality, and, most recently, at a book signing for her book, *Tough Faith*. Janet’s remarks are *always* on the mark, compelling and compassionate, and her interpersonal skills are exemplary. One couldn’t ask for a better spokesperson for a cause or for a better person to be with.

Bio – <http://wabs.wava.com/janet/janet.shtml>

Janet Parshall is the host of a three-hour, nationally syndicated program originating from Washington, DC. "Janet Parshall's America" is one of the only conservative talk shows in America hosted by a woman. Janet Parshall's America is thought provoking, interactive radio that allows listeners to exchange information and learn. Guests include Senators and Representatives; authors and film producers; Catholics, Protestants and Jews; pro-family advocates, historians, public policy experts and national leaders. Guests have included former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, Supreme Court Nominee Robert Bork, and family advocates and advisers Dr. James Dobson, Gary Smalley, and Larry Burkett.

"Janet Parshall's America" was nominated for the National Religious Broadcasters Talk Show of the Year in 1996, 1997, and 1999. It was also nominated for National Religious Broadcasters Best Produced Radio Program of the Year in 1998. In 1998, Janet was elected Board of Directors of the National Religious Broadcasters. In February 2001, Janet was elected to the executive board of the National Religious Broadcasters. Janet was nominated for the 1994-95 American Women in Radio and Television Commendation Award and was chosen in 1995, 1996, 1998, and 1999 by the Achievement in Radio (AIR) awards as a finalist for best talk show host, in Washington, DC. The program was also nominated by the AIR awards as Best Afternoon Drive Show in 1998 and 1999. Janet's interview with screenwriter and major motion picture producer Randall Wallace was nominated for Best Long Form Entertainment Interview in 1998, and her coverage of the Columbine High School tragedy was nominated for Best Long

Form News Interview in 1999. Janet was profiled as one of the top 100 talkers of 1998, 1999 and 2000 in *Talkers* magazine, the official publication of the National Association of Radio Talk Show Hosts.