



Christian View of the News



Volume 31 Number 5

Norman Pyle, Editor

May 2006

IMMIGRATION ISSUES

America doesn't really have an immigration problem. Or, to be more accurate, it has several distinct immigration problems. The first and most prominent is immigration from Mexico. Many pro-immigration advocates say that Mexicans are no different than other immigrants, and that what critics of Mexican immigration -- legal and illegal -- say about Latinos is what they said about Germans, Poles, Italians, the Irish and the Jews in the past.

Obviously, there's some truth to this. Many of the complaints do sound similar. But that doesn't mean the arguments have the same weight. The arguments against interracial marriage sound very similar to the arguments against gay marriage, but that doesn't mean a black woman marrying a white man is the same thing as a man marrying another man.

Similarly, people may have complained about the ability of legal immigrants from Italy to assimilate, or fretted that these Italian immigrants were taking jobs from Americans, but that doesn't mean illegal Mexican immigrants in the early 21st century are indistinguishable from legal Italian ones a century ago. The fact is that America has never shared an enormous border with Italy. Large chunks of U.S. soil never belonged to Italy or Ireland. You can be as romantic as you like about the glory and honor of America's noble tradition of accepting the "wretched refuse" of the world; it won't change this very basic fact.

Our border with Mexico allows for levels of illegal immigration that have no historical precedent. In 1970, there were fewer than 800,000 Mexicans in America, according to the Center for Immigration Studies. In 1980, there were 2.2 million. In 1990, the number reached 4.3 million -- a spike of 37 percent in half a decade. Today, roughly a third of all undocumented immigrants in America are Mexican, and they make up a disproportionate share of low-wage immigrants.

The Mexican government aids and abets illegal immigration in myriad ways, including giving prospective entrants to the U.S. a how-to guide for how to slip across the border, telling them not to wear heavy clothes, to drink plenty of water, and to keep your professional smuggler-guide in sight at all times. There's much less in the booklet about how to fill out the right forms and pass the naturalization exam.

The Mexican government is being perfectly rational. Mexico depends on the billions of dollars its fellow countrymen send back home, (Remittances to Mexico hit an estimated \$20 billion last year, **making American cash the second-largest source of Mexican income, behind oil**, tax payments by illegal immigrants from Mexico to local, state and federal governments exceeded the \$20 billion mark. - Tony Snow) and it benefits -- or hopes to -- from the political clout Mexican-Americans have in our political system.

This isn't an anti-Mexican observation. It is, in fact, merely an observation, and an irrefutable one. But it flies in the face of a lot of

idealistic abstraction. - Jonah Goldberg, *townhall.com*, 3/29/06

PRACTICAL IMMIGRATION REFORM

America, the only developed nation that shares a long -- 2,000-mile -- border with a Third World nation, could seal that border. East Germany showed how: walls, barbed wire, machine gun-toting border guards in towers, mine fields, large irritable dogs. And we have modern technologies that East Germany never had -- sophisticated sensors, unmanned surveillance drones, etc.

It is a melancholy fact that many of these may have to be employed along the U.S.-Mexican border. The alternatives are dangerous and disagreeable conditions for Americans residing near the border, and vigilantism. It is, however, important that Americans feel melancholy about taking such measures to frustrate immigration that usually is an entrepreneurial act -- taking risks to get to America to do work most Americans spurn. As debate about immigration policy boils, augmented **border control must not be the entire agenda**, lest other thorny problems be ignored, and lest America turn a scowling face to the south and, to some extent, to many immigrants already here.

But control belongs at the top of the agenda, for four reasons. **First**, control of borders is an essential attribute of sovereignty. **Second**, current conditions along the border mock the rule of law. **Third**, large rallies by immigrants, many of them here illegally, protesting more stringent control of immigration reveal that many immigrants have, alas, assimilated: They have acquired the entitlement mentality spawned by America's welfare state, asserting an entitlement to exemption from the laws of the society they invited themselves into. **Fourth**, giving Americans a sense that borders are controlled is a prerequisite for calm consideration of what policy that control should serve.

Of the estimated at least 11 million illegal immigrants -- a cohort larger than the combined population of 12 states -- 60 percent have been here at least five years. Most have roots in their communities. Their children born here are U.S. citizens. **We are not going to take the draconian police measures necessary to deport 11 million people.** They would fill 200,000 buses in a caravan stretching bumper-to-bumper from San Diego to Alaska -- where, by the way, 26,000 Latinos live. And there are no plausible incentives to get the 11 million to board the buses.

Facts, a conser-

What's Inside . . .
Employment Rate
Denominational Items
Correcting Lies
Attacking Christianity
An Energy Revolution
Retired Summer Soldiers
Mainstream Media

vative (John Adams) said, are stubborn things, and regarding immigration, true conservatives take their bearings from facts such as those in the preceding paragraph. **Conservatives should want, as the president proposes, a...program to supply what the U.S. economy demands -- immigrant labor for entry-level jobs. Conservatives should favor a policy of encouraging unlimited immigration by educated persons with math, engineering, technology or science skills that America's education system is not sufficiently supplying.**

And conservatives should favor reducing illegality by putting illegal immigrants on a path. . . to citizenship by paying fines and back taxes and learning English. Faux conservatives absurdly call this price tag on legal status "amnesty." Actually, it would prevent the emergence of a sullen, simmering subculture of the permanently marginalized, akin to the Arab ghettos in France. The House-passed bill, making it a felony to be in the country illegally, would make 11 million people permanently ineligible for legal status. To what end?

Within a decade, the New York and Washington metropolitan regions will join the Miami, Houston, Los Angeles and San Francisco regions in having majorities made up of minorities, partly because immigrants have higher birth rates than whites. Since 2000, births, not immigration, were the largest source of America's Latino populations.

Urban immigrant communities, with their support networks, are magnets for immigrants. Good. **Investor's Business Daily reports** a new study demonstrating that "over the past 30 years rising immigration led to higher wages for U.S.-born workers. Cities that served as migrant magnets did better than others. Why? Hiring one worker creates wealth with which to hire more workers." - George Will, *townhall.com*, 3/30/06

Despite partisans' seething passions on the issue, most of us feel baffled and torn. Immigration isn't a single issue, but a bundle that encompasses everything from border security, to welfare reform, to the necessity of supplying enough workers to keep the economy growing.

Immigration has always been a mixed blessing. It infuses the nation with industrious and idealistic new Americans, and burdens it with scoundrels, slackers and intriguers.

*So don't count on any reform's working for long, if at all. The immigration issue will stalk us -- and frustrate us -- as long as we remain vibrant enough to attract the globe's big thinkers, and free enough to welcome those who want to add greater luster to the American dream. - From "Overrated", by Tony Snow, *townhall.com*, 4/7/06*

THE LOW JOBLESS RATE

The latest jobless rate -- 4.7 percent -- is at a five-year low.

Yet, despite this and other good economic news, the Left is frantic to repeal the Bush administration's tax cuts. In fact, even if every single economic indicator were better than at any time in American history, the Left would still want to repeal the tax cuts.

The reason is that the essence of the Left is ever bigger government for the purpose of controlling ever more of the economic and social life of society. That America is so much more economically efficient than the major socialist countries of Europe, such as France and Germany, is of no concern to Democrats and others on the Left.

Even a child would readily understand that the more of their money citizens are allowed to keep, the more money they will spend and the more workers they will hire. But liberals want high taxes not in order to improve the economy, but in order to expand government and reduce economic inequality. Therefore, the obvious economic benefits of lower taxes do not much interest liberals.

The socialist economies of the major European countries are failing -- the French and German economies are stalled, and the entire socialist system is unsustainable -- but this, too, has no impact on the Left in America. The future they want for America has actually been tried in fellow Western democracies and is failing. To invert the famous statement of Westerners who praised communism, "We have seen the future and it doesn't work." One wonders if ever before in history such a large number of people had such a clear view of the consequences of their policies, and despite the failure of those policies, continued to devote their lives to enacting them.

And the Left thinks religious Americans are irrational.

That is why the language of liberal condemnation of tax cuts is that they are "tax cuts for the rich" rather than that they are "bad for the economy." It is resentment of the wealthier -- and most productive -- sector of America that animates liberal opposition to tax cuts, not concern about unemployment.

But the unemployment data not only challenges the Left. The record low jobless rate also challenges a widely held belief of many on the right -- that illegal immigrants have been taking jobs away from Americans.

There are excellent reasons to be concerned about the vast number of illegal immigrants in our society. But their taking jobs from Americans is not one of them. If we have historically low unemployment rates while at least 11 million illegal immigrants are here, how many jobs have these people really taken away from Americans? What would our unemployment rate be if we had no illegal workers here? One percent? And wouldn't our inflation rate be higher without millions of people working at such low wages helping to keep consumer prices low?

It must be emphasized that while just about everyone on the left is opposed to what they describe as "tax cuts for the rich," many on the right do not argue that illegal immigrants have taken jobs away from Americans. But an energetic segment of the Right does.

And they do so despite what the conservative Washington Times reports: "The economy appears to have achieved what analysts call 'full employment' -- a state where nearly every worker who wants a job can get one fairly easily."

How, then, does the whole Left and a significant part of the Right argue things that just aren't so -- that tax cuts are bad for the nation and that illegal immigrants have taken millions of jobs from Americans?

The answer is that passion often trumps reason. The Left is passionate about inequality and ever larger government. And the Right is passionate about America remaining American.

I share the Right's passion and agree with the conservative voices that argue for (1) building a fence to prevent millions more from illegally entering America, (2) creating a national ID card, (3) making English the official language of the United States (thereby ending, for example, ballots being printed in myriad languages), and (4) ensuring that American schools Americanize foreigners rather than celebrate multiculturalism (if all cultures were equally wonderful, millions of Mexicans wouldn't be leaving theirs to live in ours).

But those of us who are very worried about the demise of American national unity, identity and security need to argue about those things, not about illegal immigrants taking millions of jobs from Americans.

And those on the left need to cheer the unemployment data. But they can't do that until they love the low unemployment figures even more than they hate George Bush and his tax cuts. - Dennis Prager, *townhall.com*, 4/12/06

BEST JOB MARKET IN 5 YEARS FOR GRADS

U. S. college graduates are facing the best job market since 2001, with business, computer, engineering, education and health care grads in highest demand, a report by an employment consulting firm showed on Monday.

"We are approaching full employment and some employers are already dreaming up perks to attract the best talent," said John Challenger, chief executive of Challenger, Gray & Christmas.

In its annual outlook of entry-level jobs, Challenger, Gray & Christmas said strong job growth and falling unemployment makes this spring the hottest job market for America's 1.4 million college graduates since the dot-com collapse in 2001. - By Terri at *GOPUSA Forum*, from *Reuters*, 3/21/06

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE VOTE SOON

The date for a vote on the Marriage Protection Amendment (MPA) by the U.S. Senate has been scheduled for the week of June 5, and AFA is asking supporters to let their senators know where they stand.

The MPA would amend the U.S. Constitution to ensure that marriage remains only between one man and one woman.

"It is time for Christians to get involved in this fight, or sometime soon, somewhere in our nation, some activist federal judge will make same-sex marriage legal," said AFA Chairman Don Wildmon. "You can bet that those pushing for homosexual marriage are taking a few moments to contact their senators."

"Ask your friends and family to also get involved. Ask members of our Sunday School class and church to send an e-mail," he said. "The time for silence and apathy on yet another critical cultural issue is over. - *AFA Journal*, 4/06

HIGHLAND PARK ROCKS

The October 29 issue of the *Chattanooga Times Free Press* featured a picture of Tennessee Temple University students worshipping to contemporary rock music during a Wednesday evening service. The accompanying article said: "Beneath the 90-year-old stained glass at St. Andrews Center, rock music blares as worshippers in jeans and T-shirts fill the sanctuary. The weekly Wednesday night church service has all the markings of traditional worship -- music, preaching and praying. But the choir and organ have been replaced with drums and an electric guitar. 'Each generation has different styles of music, and what churches have to realize is that we've got to meet those younger generations' needs,' said Dr. Danny Lovett, who preaches at the service and is president of Tennessee Temple University." Where does the Bible say God's people should use the world's style of music? To the contrary, we are instructed to have spiritual music (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16), which means music that is set apart unto God from this wicked world. While it is a sad thing for older graduates of this school to observe, it is not surprising to see Tennessee Temple and Highland Park Baptist Church take such a dramatic turn to a worldly philosophy. Lovett recently came to Temple from Jerry Falwell's Liberty Baptist University, and it is New Evangelical to the core. . . . Biblical separation is rapidly fading from the agenda of a large body of former fundamental Baptists who are moving in the popular contemporary direction.

METHODIST BISHOPS SUPPORT GAY MEMBERSHIP

The bishops of the United Methodist Church have issued a statement declaring that homosexuality is no barrier to church membership. The Council of Bishops said that "while pastors have the respon-

sibility to discern readiness for membership, homosexuality is not a barrier" ("United Methodist Bishops Affirm Church Membership Open to All," United Methodist Church News Service, Nov. 3). The bishops' sorry and heretical decision was unanimous, thus exposing the deep apostasy of this denomination. When we look into the Scriptures, we find that while the Gospel is for everyone, church membership is only for those who have been born again through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, those whose lives have been converted to holy living by the power of the indwelling Spirit.

CATHOLIC CARDINALS ACCEPT EVOLUTION

During a news conference on a Vatican project to reconcile science and religion, Catholic Cardinal Gianfranco Basti affirmed Pope John Paul II's 1996 statement that evolution is "more than just a hypothesis." He said, "A hypothesis asks whether something is true or false. [Evolution] is more than a hypothesis because there is proof" ("Vatican: Faithful Should Listen to Science," AP, Nov. 3). Basti is the director of the Vatican's Science, Theology and Ontological Quest (STOQ). Cardinal Paul Poupard concurred and warned against a fundamentalist approach to Scriptures. Not only has the Roman Catholic Church today not renounced its ancient heresies such as papal supremacy, priestcraft, sacramentalism, and sainthood, it has added to those many contemporary heresies such as evolution and modernistic documentary theories of Scripture.

GA. BAPTISTS END MERCER SUPPORT

The Georgia Baptist Convention (GBC) voted last week to end its 175-year-old relationship with Mercer University. This was in response to the school's activities in relation to homosexuality. It was discovered in October that a Gay-Lesbian-Bisexual-Transgender organization exists at Mercer and is supported by students and teachers, including some in the theological department. Heretofore the school has received financial grants from the GBC to the tune of \$3 million per year. Mercer University has been a hotbed of theological poison for at least 50 years.

LESBIAN CRITICIZES FEMININE DRESS

Lesbian author Virginia Mollenkott, in her book *Omnigender: A Trans-religious Approach*, describes her aversion to wearing dresses "I feel myself to be female all right, but masculine at the same time, so that dresses and skirts feel rather ridiculous -- and this despite the fact that as a child I was not allowed to wear overalls, shorts, or pants. [She grew up in a fundamentalist home.] . . . One of the greatest benefits of coming out publicly as lesbian was that I could go through my closets and give away all my dresses and skirts. . . ." This lesbian's admission that dresses are feminine reminds us that clothing is a form of language. We make social statements by our clothing choices. In Western society, pants have long been associated with masculinity and dresses with femininity. That was based on the biblical injunction that women and men are not to dress the same. Only in recent decades has this barrier been breached, and those at the forefront of the unisex fashion industry are in open and admitted rebellion against the Bible.

The above five articles are from *O Timothy* magazine by David Cloud, in the December 2005 issue.

BUSH'S JUSTIFIABLE DISCLOSURE

People suffer all sorts of indignation, but few things are more difficult to take than being falsely accused of misconduct. It is difficult to defend yourself both because it is hard to prove a negative and, if

you defend yourself strenuously, you risk appearing guilty for protesting too much.

Do you remember Bill Clinton's vicious savaging of special prosecutor Ken Starr and how his goon squad twisted every negative revelation against Clinton into a sin of Starr's? They distorted the Starr Report from a meticulously documented record of a president's perjury and obstruction of justice into a pornographic novel penned by a voyeuristic Ken Starr.

But painting the prudish Starr as a pervert wasn't the worst thing they did. While publicly smearing him they also initiated no fewer than seven formal complaints (or appeals) against him in the six weeks following Clinton's denial of sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky. Most of those complaints were based on false charges that Starr had criminally leaked secret grand jury information.

Though Starr would eventually be exonerated on all counts, he would never fully dispel the taint on his previously stellar reputation. About the best he could do to counter the nonstop Clinton slander machine was to point out that his accusers had launched an "avalanche of lies" against him.

Surely one of the most difficult experiences Starr had to endure was to be publicly accused of these leaks -- by the very people most likely responsible for them -- during the nationally televised impeachment hearings. Though the court had already cleared Starr of the charges, he was prevented from shouting that out to the world in his own defense because the order clearing him was under seal. Adding insult to injury, his accusers were privy to that order yet persisted with their claims.

Now, fast forward to the present, and put yourself in the shoes of President Bush, who has been falsely accused of infinitely worse sins, the worst being that he lied about Iraqi WMD to lead us into war against Iraq. Just like the Clinton attack dogs, those responsible for leveling the charges against Bush were the ones who were lying -- and for the same basic reason: to divert attention from their own missteps.

All of this brings us to the latest trumped-up outrage against the beleaguered President Bush -- that he leaked classified information involving sensitive national security information. But once again, the charge is false. Yes, Bush apparently authorized the public disclosure of certain information, but he first declassified it -- meaning, by definition, it was impossible for him to have illegally leaked it. Plus, he had every justification, and some would argue a duty, to publicize it -- because the public should know the truth about these claims, especially since its support for the war is affected by the "Bush lied" ruse.

You know the basics. President Bush was accused by the liberal' then latest darling, Joe Wilson, of manipulating intelligence to hype the Iraqi WMD threat. Specifically, Wilson claimed Bush lied in his State of the Union address in asserting the British had learned Iraq was trying to purchase yellow cake uranium from Africa. This supposedly outraged Wilson, who had traveled to Niger for the CIA, investigated the charge and reported that it was groundless.

But Mr. Wilson -- like Clinton's lawyers -- was the one guilty of the distortions in several particulars. According to the British Butler Report and the bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee, Wilson's findings did not debunk the Saddam-Niger connection, and, if anything, substantiated it. The Senate Intelligence Committee, let's not forget, also caught Wilson in the bald-faced lie that he had discredited certain forged documents that were not even discovered until eight months after his trip.

Just as the left distorted Patrick Fitzgerald's indictment of Scooter

Libby as proof that he intentionally "outed" a covert CIA operative (Valerie Plame), which he did not (Fitzgerald did not indict Libby on the "underlying" charge), they are now saying the same thing about Bush.

But Fitzgerald himself, according to the Washington Post, which published a refreshing editorial defending Bush on these leak charges, stated that Bush did not authorize the leak of Plame's identity.

Libby's motive in identifying Plame was to refute another Wilson tall tale: that Vice President Cheney had arranged for his trip to Niger, when it was Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, who had recommended him for the mission.

Unlike Ken Starr, President Bush had the authority to declassify secret information that would not just clear him of false charges but help set the record straight concerning matters involving our national security.

The constant "avalanche of lies" against Bush has damaged the national interest. President Bush was justified in doing what he could to repair that damage. - David Limbaugh, *townhall.com*, 4/12/06

ACLU IS WHAT THE FOUNDER WANTED

A conservative author and editor says the ACLU is clearly engaged in trying to remove every hint of Judeo-Christian values in America. The philosophies of the legal group's founder, he says, suggest why that is the case.

David Kupelian is managing editor of WorldNetDaily.com and author of the recently published book *The Marketing of Evil: How Radicals, Elitists, and Pseudo-Experts Sell Us Corruption Disguised as Freedom*. The American Civil Liberties Union, says Kupelian, falls into the category of groups discussed in his book because of its founder.

"The ACLU was founded by Roger Baldwin, who was a card-carrying communist," Kupelian states. "This is not me, some right-winger saying, 'Oh, he's a commie' -- I'm saying he was a communist, he said he was a communist, he belonged to the Communist Party, and he wanted to further the cause of communism."

...[A]ccording to Alan Sears of the Alliance Defense Fund, Baldwin -- 15 years after founding the ACLU -- wrote: "I am for socialism, disarmament and, ultimately, for the abolishing of the State itself...I seek the social ownership of property, the abolition of the propertied class and sole control of those who produce wealth. Communism is the goal"

The WorldNetDaily managing editor says that heritage explains the motivation behind the ACLU's attacks on Christianity -- and its tactic of forcing U.S. taxpayers to foot the bill. "They are engaged in trying to eliminate every vestige of Judeo-Christian expression in public places in America. It's frightening -- and they are using our tax dollars to do this," he says. "They use the laws of the land to get American taxpayers to spend their hard-earned money, actually financing their own destruction."

For example, says Kupelian, taxpayers had to shell out nearly half a million dollars to the ACLU when it won a case that forced former Alabama chief justice Roy Moore to remove a publicly displayed Ten Commandments monument in Montgomery. - *The Sword of the Lord*, 12/30/05

THE GOSPEL OF UNBELIEF

It happens twice a year, at Christmas and Easter. The newsweeklies sometimes carry cover stories. The newspapers print items calling the reasons for these seasons into question.

This Easter is no exception, but the intensity level seems to have

increased. This year's first attack came from St. Paul Minnesota where local officials decided to ban the **Easter Bunny** from City Hall. They said it might offend some non-Christians, as if the Easter Bunny has anything to do with Easter's real significance. Apparently it escaped the notice of the city council that the Easter Bunny might offend Christians, because, like **Santa Claus**, it is a counterfeit. If they want to be consistent, perhaps the council should change the name of the city from St. Paul to, say, Paul Bunyan.

Newspapers also carried a story about a Florida State University scientist who speculated that **Jesus didn't really walk on water**; he walked on ice. The scientist theorized there must have been an unusual cold snap 2,000 years ago that froze the Sea of Galilee. This begs the question how Jesus was able to pull off such a stunt when Peter also walked on water, before his lack of faith sank him.

The New York Times piled on by trumpeting the discovery of a fossil in Arctic Canada as a "**missing link**," which it editorialized "puts the lie to creationist beliefs."Not exactly.

Next was a story on the "**Gospel of Judas**," a work written between 130 and 170 C.E., long after the events it purports to describe. In this document, Jesus is revealed as having urged Judas to betray him. That a number of Judas' contemporaries said otherwise in Scripture matters not to skeptics.

Adding to the gospel of unbelief is the movie version of the best-selling novel, "**The Da Vinci Code**," which, if it is faithful to the book, will mix a few historical facts with a great deal of fiction. The book claims Jesus married Mary Magdalene and fathered children. The film is scheduled for release next month. Like the book, the movie will have as much to do with fact as Oliver Stone's film on the Kennedy assassination.

What is responsible for this flood of skepticism, heresy and outright denial of the biblical record? Why is there not a similar cultural onslaught against other faiths? Only the suicidal would treat Islam in this way. The skeptics sound like those disclaimers for certain drugs sold on TV: Side effects may include vomiting, hair loss, bleeding, dizziness and disorientation. The side effects of believing in Jesus may include loss of friends, disrespect by the academic and journalistic communities and damage to one's career, not to mention a complete change in the life to which one has become comfortably accustomed.

The question inherent in all of these challenges to the original story and original cast is this: How could anything like the resurrection be true? The question is not asked with the intention of getting an answer. It is rhetorical, hostile and unbelieving.

So, how does one know it is true? First, not a single witness of that first Easter morning subsequently denied what he (or she) observed. Human nature tells us that when those who publicly stated Jesus rose from the grave were threatened with death unless they recanted, at least one, and probably more, would have said it never happened, if it didn't occur. They would have wanted to live. Not one recanted. All of the Apostles died martyrs deaths, except John, who died in exile.

The second reason is also logical. What kind of loving father would direct his lost children through a bad neighborhood, if he wanted them to get home safely? If no human father would be so cruel, why would God, after giving up His Son to die for humanity, create a flawed road map so they would get lost in their search for Him?

Christians who believe the Bible's account of Easter believe it because they also believe God's spirit guarded human hands, from making errors in recording these events. Skeptics have no such guide. They should be humbled that God is far wiser than the wisest man. (I Corinthians 1:25-27)

Before accepting what heretics and unbelievers say, consideration should be given to what is contained in the guidebook. - Ca Thomas, *townhall.com*, 4/12/06

AN ENERGY REVOLUTION

The world economy is currently running on a resource that is controlled by our enemies. This threatens to leave us prostrate. It must change -- and the good news is that it can change quickly.

Using portions of the hundreds of billions of petrodollars they are annually draining from our economy, Middle Easterners have established training centers for terrorists, paid bounties to the families of suicide bombers, and funded the purchase of weapons and explosives. Oil revenues underwrite new media outlets that propagandize hate fully against the United States and the West. They pay for more than 10,000 radical *madrassahs* set up around the world to indoctrinate young boys with the idea that the way to paradise is to murder Christians, Jews, and Hindus. It was men energized by oil-revenue resources who killed 3,000 American civilians on September 11, 2001, and who have continued to kill large numbers of Westerners in Iraq and elsewhere. We are thus subsidizing acts of war against ourselves.

And we have not yet reached the culmination of the process. Iran and other states are now using petroleum lucre to underwrite the development of nuclear weapons, and insulate themselves from the economic sanctions that could result. Once produced, these nuclear weapons could be used directly or made available to terrorists to attack U.S., European, or Israeli cities and military forces. This is one of the gravest threats to the next generation -- and, again, we are paying for it ourselves with oil revenue.

Our responses to these provocations have been muted and hapless. Why? Because any forceful action on our part against nations like Iran and Saudi Arabia could result in the disruption of oil supplies that the world economy is completely dependent upon. We can't stand up to our enemies because we rely upon them for the fuel that is our own lifeblood.

And the situation is even worse below the surface. In addition to financial terror directly and indirectly, oil exporters are using their wealth to corrupt our political system. Important Washington, D.C. law firms and lobbying organizations have been put on the payroll of Arab nations to blunt any attempts at retaliation for their promotion of terrorism. Arab investors have made enormous buys in media organizations that could allow them to influence U.S. public opinion.

All this, however, is mere prologue. China and India are rapidly industrializing, and within a decade or two the number of cars in the world will double or triple. If the world remains on the oil standard the income streams of many noxious oil exporters will soar. We will be impoverished to the same degree they are enriched. The vast sums transferred will not only finance global jihad and dangerous weapons development in the Middle East, but also increase potential for manipulation of the U.S. and Western economies. At currently projected rates of consumption, by the year 2020, over 90 percent of the world's remaining petroleum reserves will be in the Middle East, controlled by people whose religion obligates them to subjugate us.

In light of these realities, current U.S. energy policy is a scandal. There is no reason the United States should remain helpless, allowing itself to be looted by people who are using the proceeds to undermine us. A much higher degree of energy independence is possible, ever apparent, yet victory is not being pursued. - Dr. Robert Zubrin, president of aerospace engineering and research firm Pioneer Astronautics *The American Enterprise*, 3/06 (I will complete this article in the next month's CVN. - N.P.)

BUSH WAS RIGHT ABOUT IRAQ & URANIUM

In a surprising editorial, the *Washington Post* deviated from the conventional anti-Bush media position on two counts. It said President Bush was right to declassify parts of a National Intelligence Estimate to make clear why he thought Saddam Hussein was seeking nuclear weapons. And the editorial said ex-ambassador Joseph Wilson was wrong to think he had debunked Bush on the nuclear charge because Wilson's statements after visiting Niger actually "supported the conclusion that Iraq had sought uranium."

In the orthodox narrative line, Wilson is the truth-teller and Bush is the liar. But Wilson was not speaking truthfully when he said his wife, Valerie Plame, had nothing to do with the CIA sending him to Niger. And it obviously wasn't true, as Wilson claimed, that he had found nothing to support Bush's charge about Niger when he (Wilson) had been told that the Iraqis were poking around in that uranium-rich nation.

Testifying before the Senate intelligence committee, Wilson said that the former prime minister of Niger told him he had been asked to meet with Iraqis to talk about "expanding commercial relations" between the two countries. Everybody knew what that meant; Niger has nothing much to trade other than uranium.

Christopher Hitchens made the latter point last week in a muscular column subtitled "Sorry, everyone, but Iraq did go uranium shopping in Niger." The "Sorry, everyone" phrase indicates the strength of the reigning orthodoxy -- that Bush simply lied when he uttered the famous 16 words in his 2003 State of the Union speech: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa."

Hitchens made these points: Saddam Hussein had already acquired a large amount of uranium from Niger once before in 1981, so he knew where to go. Amid suspicions that Saddam was trying to revive his nuclear program, Iraqis made a 1999 visit to Niger. The head member of the visiting Iraqi team was Saddam's senior public envoy for nuclear matters. Hmmm.

Defenders of orthodoxy have a fair point to make here. They say that the alert French, who were in total control of Nigerian uranium, would never have allowed it. Maybe, but the alert French turned out to be the payoff-oriented French on a very large scale in the oil-for-bribes scandal.

Hitchens made another point. The forged documents claiming an Iraq-Niger connection were so crude that they could never have fooled the CIA or British intelligence for very long. Who would do this, and do it so badly? Nobody knows. But if the forgeries were meant to distract from other evidence that Bush was right, then they certainly worked. Look around in American journalism, and you will find great certitude that the forgeries destroyed Bush's claim.

That certitude can only be founded on the belief that Tony Blair, the U.S. Senate intelligence committee and the special investigative team of Parliament were all liars when they said there was substantial non-forged evidence backing Bush's claim. The investigative team was headed by the highly regarded Lord Butler, who served as a Cabinet minister under five prime ministers. It concluded that Bush's 16 words about Iraq's uranium shopping were "well-founded."

Actually, there is one other way to discount the Butler report: Either muffle or don't mention it in your news columns. The *New York Times* opted for muffling. A database search finds no mention of "well-founded" in the Times reporting, and only one barely scrutable paragraph about uranium in the Butler report, way down in the 11th paragraph of a story buried well inside the paper.

For you collectors of embarrassing journalism, here is paragraph

11: "It (the report) also defended British officials in the case of an apparently erroneous British report on Iraq's nuclear ambitions that made its way into President Bush's State of the Union speech last year claiming that Iraq had sought to purchase uranium in Niger. The Butler report confirmed that Iraqi officials had visited Niger in 1999, and the British government had several different sources insisting that the purpose was to buy uranium. But it added, "the evidence was not conclusive that Iraq had actually purchased, as opposed to having sought, uranium, and the British government did not claim this."

Note the Times' careful denial of something nobody had claimed -- that Iraq had recently bought, not sought, uranium in Africa.

In truth, Bush handled the issue badly. He dithered, couldn't find the words to explain himself, and weirdly withdrew the 16 words when the pressure came. And it is surely arguable that the uranium-in-Africa charge was too flimsy for the weight Bush gave it in his speech.

But as columnist Robert Novak once argued, the burgeoning "Bush lied" mantra was heavily dependent on the uranium claim. So the liar label was most firmly attached on an issue Bush was right about. Go figure. - John Leo, *townhall.com*, 4/17/06

OUT OF THE MAINSTREAM

The third anniversary of the invasion of Iraq brought out the usual suspects to critique the war and the president. The "MSM" -- mainstream media -- also came under criticism for reporting only the violence in Iraq and never the progress being made there. They seem intent on predicting civil war rather than relaying the facts as to how the country is still holding together.

Public distrust of MSM coverage of Iraq has three sources.

First, as then CNN senior news executive Eason Jordan admitted in a *New York Times* column published in April 2003, his network was complicit in the cover-up of Saddam's barbarism. CNN was not alone in refusing to expose the cruel despot and his mad sons -- and the MSM have still not thoroughly detailed the nightmare that U.S. intervention ended.

This unreported past leads to the **second** criticism: the lack of context for bad news reports from Iraq, the MSM rarely report on peaceful and prospering Kurdistan and the largely stable south. Dogs that don't bite don't get stories, and Americans thus don't get the picture.

It is the **third** criticism that deepens dislike into contempt. Most serious observers understand Iraq as one front in a wider war. We know Musab al-Zarqawi traveled between Afghanistan and Baghdad before the invasion of Iraq, and now details of Saddam's support for terrorism across the globe are coming to light. But the MSM began moaning about defeat and quagmire when a sandstorm temporarily stopped the March to Baghdad three years ago, and have kept it up even as Iraq has met deadlines and three times overwhelmingly voted for freedom.

The terrorists know their only hope of victory is to demoralize the American public and force a premature withdrawal of American troops from Iraq. They play the MSM like a banjo, but many Americans know this and deeply resent it.

On the third anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, the people of Iraq are on the path to reform and stability. The MSM, sadly, are not. - Hugh Hewitt, *WORLD*, 4/1/06

RETIRED SUMMER SOLDIERS

What is one to make of the six retired generals who, in recent days, have called not only for the resignation of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, but have questioned whether U.S. troops should

remain in Iraq much longer? Only that it will further embolden America's enemies who are betting that the United States is weak, morally corrupt and lacks the stomach for protracted conflict.

It is apparently less newsworthy that other retired generals, including **Richard B. Myers**, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. **Tommy Franks**, former commander of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, are supporting Rumsfeld.

Appearing on Al Arabiya television, Rumsfeld said, "Out of thousands and thousands of admirals and generals, if every time two or three people disagreed, we changed the secretary of defense of the United States, it would be like a merry-go-round around here."

On Fox News Channel, Rumsfeld said, ". . . it's a test of wills. If they can't win a battle, where can they win? The only place they can win is the capitals of Western countries. And with trying to persuade the American people and other western nations, free people, 'look,, it isn't worth the cost, it isn't worth the time, it isn't worth the money.' And to get them to toss in the towel and say it's not worth the effort. Well, it is worth the effort because terrorists are against free people for behaving as free people."

Anyone doubting Rumsfeld should consider the testimony of **Zacarias Moussaoui**. During the death penalty phase of his trial for involvement in the 9/11 attacks, Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert A. Spencer asked Moussaoui if he thought the United States is destined to fall. He coldly replied, "I know it. I know it."

"You wake up every day to destroy the United States, don't you" asked Spencer.

"To the best of my ability," Moussaoui responded.

Moussaoui said it was "my pleasure" to accept a suicide mission from Osama bin Laden. He mocked relatives of those who died on 9/11, saying he wishes more had been killed. He called those relatives who shed tears during their testimony "weak."

Moussaoui isn't retreating or calling for the resignation of Osama bin Laden or any other leader in the terrorist war on America and the West.

Neither is Iran retreating or in doubt about its nuclear weapons program. **Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad** openly defies and ridicules the West and the United Nations, as they ponder meaningless resolutions and call for equally meaningless diplomacy against a religious nut case who thinks he has been commissioned by his false god to usher in Armageddon. One can be sure no Iranian general - active or retired - will be questioning Ahmadinejad's politics or theology, if he wants to be around for the "last battle."

The growing expressions of negativity in America about the war may be having the effect on public opinion desired by our enemies. A USA Today/Gallup Poll found nearly half of those surveyed said the United States "should mind its own business internationally and let other countries get along as best they can on their own."

That might have worked in another era before terrorism and intercontinental missiles. Today, it is unrealistic. As President Bush has repeatedly stated, if we don't defeat them over there, they will come after us over here. That means 9/11 will not have been a unique event.

In an April 14 editorial, *The Wall Street Journal* correctly noted: "The further we move away from 9/11 without another domestic attack, the more tempting it is to believe that awful day was an aberration, to think that we can return to normalcy if we merely leave Iraq and the other Middle Eastern regimes to their own purposes. But the forces of radical Islam aren't going to leave us alone merely because we decide that resisting them is too hard."

This isn't about one secretary of defense or six generals who

don't like his policies. This is about winning the most dangerous and important war America has ever fought. By going public with their criticisms in the midst of the war, those generals are making victory more difficult. They are encouraging the enemy to fight on, believing we will ultimately surrender. There can be no good that will come from the comments of the former leaders of our volunteer soldiers, at least no good for what they once called "our side." - Cal Thomas, *townhall.com*, 4/18/06

PREACHING ON GLOBAL WARMING?

Do you ever get the feeling that some pastors and priests just aren't happy with their jobs -- that they have become bored with the business of saving souls, and seek more tangible distractions? How else to explain the misuse of Holy Scripture to justify ventures in the realms of social activism by church leaders? Every person in the United States has the right to spout off their views about any topic they like. Trouble arises, however, when churches and clergy in their official capacities start staking out political positions on topics straying far from Scripture. Indeed, the environment has become a fashionable favorite. Liberal church leaders have been using their positions to rail against so-called manmade global warming for some time, and now this collection of evangelicals has joined the chorus.

Pastor Rick Warren was one of the 86 who signed the "Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action." So, where does activism on global warming fit in? These evangelicals cite assorted, vague passages from Scripture, arguing that these somehow support a particular environmental policy agenda. Not only is all of this atrocious theology, but it also happens to be bad economics and questionable, at best, climate science. The declaration ignores that while many in the scientific community acknowledges some inconsistent, uneven, and slight warming, there is widespread disagreement over possible causes.

Nonetheless, these Christian leaders assert: "Millions of people could die in this century because of climate change, most of them our poorest global neighbors." Such a statement is grossly irresponsible.

In the end, statements like this one on global warming from church leaders do the most damage by undercutting the church's moral authority. After all, if pastors offer worthless declarations on environmental policy, then how many people wonder about their authority to speak on abortion, marriage, or even on saving souls? [TBC: *Anyone remember Y2K?*] - *The Berean Call*, 3/06

HOMOSEXUAL ACTOR PLAYS MISSIONARY

January marked the 50th Anniversary of the martyrdom of five missionaries in Ecuador, South America. When Ed McCully, Jim Elliot, Peter Fleming, Nate Saint, and Roger Youderian were killed by the natives, they were trying to reach with the gospel, this shocked the religious world. I still remember the chilling effect that it had upon Christians which resulted in many young people surrendering to go to the mission field.

Now a movie has been made purporting to tell their story. This movie is called the "End of the Spear," and the actor chosen to play the role of Nate Saint, one of the martyred missionaries, was Chad Allen, a homosexual activist. This is the ultimate insult to the memory of these people who gave their lives to try to reach the lost. . . .

Baptist Press, Jan. 20, 2006 carried an article by R. Albert Mohler Jr., President of Southern Seminary, and he had this to say:

"The actor chosen to play both Nate and Steve Saint in the movie is Chad Allen, an actor well known to American television viewers for his roles in *St. Elsewhere*, *Our House*, and *Dr. Quinn: Medicine Woman*. But Chad Allen is also known for something else - his very public

homosexual activism. As a matter of fact, he has been on the cover of *The Advocate*, the leading homosexual news magazine, at least three times. He also staged Terence McNally's play, *Corpus Christi*, which portrays Christ as a homosexual involved in a homoerotic dynamic with his disciples."

R. Albert Mohler Jr., appeared on Larry King Live with Chad Allen. According to Mohler, the testimony of Chad Allen is as follows:

"I have a deep relationship with [the] god of my understanding. It's very powerful, and it's taken its own shape and form. And I am very much at peace in the knowledge that in my heart god created this beautiful expression of my love," he told the CNN audience.

Here's how Mr. Allen described his process of moral decision making:

"These days I judge all of my actions by my relationship with [the] god of my understanding. It is a deep-founded, faith-based belief in god based upon the work that I've done growing up as a Catholic boy and then reaching out to Buddhism philosophy, to Hindu philosophy, to Native American beliefs and finally as I got through my course with addiction and alcoholism and finding a higher power that worked for me."

My Opinion about Christian Movies

I am referring to movies made in Hollywood, or made with Hollywood actors. Christians should avoid them like the plague.

1. They always distort the facts of Christianity as found in the Bible.
2. This is a blatant attempt to lure Christians into the theaters so

that they get used to going to the movies.

3. Many Christians have been taught to avoid the movie theater, and if they can be lured in for a religious movie, they may become paying customers in the future.

4. Hollywood and Hollywood actors are not out to exalt Christ and the Bible in a godly manner.

5. It violates the 10 commandments when they portray Jesus Christ (Exodus 20:1-4).

6. A large part of the Hollywood movie industry is populated by adulterers, fornicators, homosexuals who are un-American radicals and who are doing their best to break down the morals of our civilization.

7. Why should Christians patronize and make these people rich?.

.. **My advice is to stay away from such un-Christian perversions of the truth and get your facts from the Bible.** - By E. L. Bynum, *Plains Baptist Challenger*, 3/06

The Bible Broadcasting Network (BBN) out of Charlotte, N.C. is my favorite on radio while traveling around. They have recently dropped David Jeremiah's programs due to his choice of music. They said in their letter to listeners, explaining this decision, that they believe that "Contemporary Christian Music" should better be referred to as "Contemporary Religious Rock" music.

I agree and congratulate them on making this difficult decision. - N. P.

Thanks to all who have helped us with gifts this year in putting out CVN. - N.P.



Christian
View of the News

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

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

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED