



# Christian View of the News



Volume 32 Number 4

Norman Pyle, Editor

April 2007

## THE LOST TOMB OF JESUS

*The Lost Tomb of Jesus*, a new documentary aired March 4, claims to reveal not simply the tomb where Jesus lay for three days, but the box where, according to the filmmakers, His bones lay for nearly 2,000 years in Jerusalem. The box, called an "ossuary," contains a faint inscription: "Jesus, son of Joseph." The ossuaries allegedly found nearby are inscribed with other common Jewish names from the first century. "Mary," "Mariamene e Mara," "Matia" (Matthew) and "Jose" (Joseph). The documentary's producers believe this is Jesus' family -- including Mary Magdalene, whom, they suggest, Jesus may have married.

Director James Cameron, who directed the world's most financially successful movie ever (*Titanic*) claims that his documentary "doesn't really attempt to deal with theological matters," but rather "the historical, forensic evidence."

But Christian doctrine is rooted in history: "If Christ be not raised. . . we are of all men most miserable." So Christian scholars have dismissed the Discovery Channel show. As well-known evangelical scholar Darrel Bock pointed out, the Bible teaches "a physical resurrection as I Corinthians 15. . . makes clear."

Even liberal academics are dismissing *The Lost Tomb of Jesus*. "This is exploiting the whole trend that caught on with *The Da Vinci Code*," says Lawrence Stager, archaeology of Israel professor at Harvard. "There are so many biblically illiterate people around the world that they don't know what is real judicious assessment and what is what some of us in the field call 'fantastic archaeology.'" - *New York Times*, 2/27/07 in *What In the World*, Vol. 42, #5

### IF JESUS CHRIST DID NOT RISE FROM THE DEAD AS THE NEW TESTAMENT SAYS:

1. He was a fraud or a lunatic.
2. The Disciples were frauds or had hallucinations.
3. Pentecost, with the preaching of the resurrection, is unexplainable.
4. The conversion of Saul and its result is due to his being a fraud, or deceived by hallucinations.

A fraud does not die on a cross for sinners. A lunatic does not preach the Sermon on the Mount.

An hallucination does not change 3,000 stubborn Jews from Moses to Jesus as their final authority, and the 7th day to the 1st day as their day of worship.

A fraud doesn't live the life and die the death of the Apostle Paul. A lunatic does not write most of the New Testament.

Subjective, sentimental religion that says "I can't prove anything, but I just take it all by faith," is preparing for a colossal sellout.

Only those whose faith is rooted in the facts of the Bible will stand when that Day comes. - The Pyle File.

### THE MATURING OF THE RIGHT

Conservative Evangelical Christian voters have come a long way in a short time. From their nearly unanimous condemnation of Bill Clinton for his extramarital affairs, a growing number of these "pro-family" voters appear ready to accept several Republican presidential candidates who do not share their ideal of marriage and faith.

Among those seriously under consideration by these church-going folks is former New York Mayor Rudy Guiliani, who has been married three times and who had an affair with the woman now his wife when he was married to wife number two. The second wife, Donna Hanover, once recorded a political commercial for Guiliani, touting his virtues as a husband. She called him "honest and very kind" and "this is the kind of man I wanted to be the father of my children" and "Rudy is such a great Dad." It's on YouTube. In recent days we've learned from his son Andrew that he and his father are estranged, but that they're working on it. Andrew says he got his values from his mother.

Another of the thrice married is former House Speaker Newt Gingrich who, last week, trod the Damascus Road to Colorado Springs. On the syndicated radio program of psychologist James Dobson, Gingrich confessed that he had an extramarital affair with the woman to whom he is now married while he was married to his second wife. Gingrich acknowledged not living up to his own standards, or God's.

A third Republican presidential candidate is Sen. John McCain, who has been married twice. He is disliked by many social conservatives more for his support of "campaign finance reform," which they regard as an attempt to limit their speech, his work on immigration with Ted Kennedy and past remarks that some evangelical leaders are "agents of intolerance."

Mitt Romney has the right social conservative views, fairly recently bringing them into conformity with their own, but to some conservative evangelicals he has the "wrong" religion. Romney, a Mormom, is the poster boy for family values: one wife, handsome children, and no apparent personal skeletons in his closet, but some, not all, evangelicals can't get over the Mormom belief that Jesus once visited America. They also reject the "Book of Mormom," which they believe tells "another gospel."

**What's Inside . . .**  
**Barack Obama**  
**Campus Dangers**  
**Young Earth**  
**Immigration**  
**Keep & Bear Arms**  
**Current Slavery**  
**Hate Crimes**

That substantial numbers of conservative evangelical voters are even considering these candidates as presidential prospects is a sign of their political maturation and of their more pragmatic view of what can be expected from politics and politicians. It is also evidence that many of them are awakening to at least two other realities - (1) they are not electing a church deacon; and (2) government has limited power to rebuild a crumbling social construct.

The Census Bureau recently noted that only 23.7 percent of the U.S. population fit the '50s stereotype of heterosexual married couples with children. Even in the "golden age" of the '50s, the figure was just under 50 percent. Until this election cycle, most social conservatives supported candidates and policies based on the married with children "ideal" family model. It may be the ideal, but it is no longer widely practiced, including by many conservative evangelicals. Researchers have found many conservative Christians live in states where divorce rates are highest. These states overwhelmingly oppose same-sex marriage. Too bad they don't do a better job supporting opposite-sex marriage in which they claim to believe.

No politician can "fix" broken heterosexual marriages. If they could, some of those mentioned above would have fixed their own. The crumbling "traditional" family is the result of many social and cultural factors. The solution, like the fault, lies neither with government or with politicians.

While "character issues" can overlap with other concerns when considering for whom to vote, conservative evangelicals are beginning to see them as less important than who can meet the multiple challenges faced by the nation. Put it this way: If you are about to have major surgery and your only choice was a church-going doctor with a high mortality rate, or an agnostic with a high success record, which would it be? I'd choose the agnostic.

Conservative evangelicals have grown up. But they still can't stand Hillary Clinton, though she's only been married once and is a Methodist. Jimmy Carter, also once married, only lusted in his heart. It makes one nostalgic for the "good old day." - Cal Thomas, *townhall.com*, 3/13/07

## LIBBY: WHOSE FALL GUY?

The whole Scooter Libby case, from start to finish, has been based on the left's depraved obsession with substantiating the lie that President Bush and Vice President Cheney lied us into war.

Though I won't presume to substitute myself as a juror and will never downplay the actual commission of perjury, I have serious doubts that Mr. Libby lied -- as opposed to having an imperfect memory over matters not that critically important -- because he had no motive to lie. He had no motive because the administration had nothing to hide concerning its decision to attack Iraq and particularly the yellow cake uranium flap, despite the left's endless cacophony to the contrary.

The relevant facts in this unfortunate saga are not that complicated. Most Democrats, because of overwhelming public support for the war, were politically compelled to support the Iraq war resolution. But when the war became less popular and the Democrats' antiwar base demanded accountability for the Democrats' heresy, they manufactured the fiction that the administration lied about WMD.

Enter Joseph Wilson, who was willing to put some teeth into their false claims. Wilson corroborated the Democrats' claim that Bush lied in his 2003 State of the Union address in saying, "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." (Note that the Brits still stand by their statement.)

Wilson feigned outrage, saying he had investigated the claim

himself in Niger and determined it was baseless. But the Senate Intelligence Committee and the British Butler Report both concluded that Wilson's findings did more to substantiate, than debunk, the Saddam-Niger connection. The Senate Intelligence committee also found that Wilson lied in saying he had discredited certain forged documents, since those very documents weren't discovered until eight months after his trip to Niger. Finally, the Committee contradicted Wilson's claim that Cheney, rather than his wife, recommended him for the trip.

Since the administration had not lied about Iraqi WMD -- as opposed to having properly relied on the best intelligence available to it (and Democrats) -- it had nothing to cover up, but it did have the right -- and duty -- to protect its reputation, especially since the Democrats' false characterizations were damaging America's image in the world, something they profess to exalt above all else.

If Cheney instructed Libby to disclose that Valerie Plame was Wilson's spouse, his motive wasn't to punish Wilson by exposing his wife's highly disputed covert status. It was to impeach Wilson's credibility.

But none of this mattered to Democrats, because it didn't fit their template that "Bush lied, people died."

From the beginning, Democrats have been trying to make this case into something they knew it was not; a smoking gun against the administration. At the outset of the prosecution, Sen. Harry Reid shamelessly said, "The Libby indictment provides a window into what this is really about: how the administration manufactured and manipulated intelligence in order to sell the war in Iraq and attempted to destroy those who dared to challenge its actions. As a result of its improper conduct, a cloud now hangs over this administration." (Reid and others said virtually the same thing after the verdict.)

Special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald also pushed the Democrats' conspiratorial lunacy, as evidenced by his bizarre and outrageously inflammatory statement to a D.C. jury in closing argument, "There is a cloud over the vice president." Sound familiar?

How could Fitzgerald possibly say that in good conscience, knowing and having known from the very beginning of the case, that Richard Armitage, not Libby, was the leaker and Armitage was no friend of the administration and even less supportive of the Iraq war?

Predictably, the liberal media has also made its best efforts to turn this trial into Bush's Watergate. Early on they were praying for and predicting that Rove would be indicted. And despite the unconscionably belated revelation that Libby was not the leaker, MSNBC reporter David Shuster struck with the Democrat template, asking Libby, after the verdict, "Are you willing to go to jail to protect Vice President Cheney?"

Protect him from what? How many times can we repeat that Libby was neither charged nor convicted of leaking -- because he didn't do it? No matter. They just continue to push the theme that "the wrong guy was convicted."

Scooter Libby is the wrong guy, all right, but there is no right guy, because there was no administration misconduct here. Libby is also the fall guy, but not for Cheney, Rove or Bush. He's the left's sacrificial lamb, an expendable human being whose criminalization is necessary to perpetuate their abominable and politically self-serving myth that Bush, Cheney and Rove lied us into war. - David Limbaugh, *townhall.com*, 3/9/07.

## BARACK OBAMA: PRICELESS POLITICS

Senator Barack Obama recently said, "Let's allow our unions and their organizers to lift up this country's middle class again."

Ironically, he said it at a time when Detroit automakers have

been laying off unionized workers by the tens of thousands, while Toyota has been hiring tens of thousands of non-union American automobile workers.

Labor unions, like the government, can change prices -- in this case, the price of labor -- but without changing the underlying reality that prices convey.

Neither unions nor minimum wage laws change the productivity of workers. All they can do is forbid the employer from paying less than what the government or the unions want the employer to pay.

When that is more than the labor in question produces, some workers who are perfectly capable become "unemployable" only because of wages set above the level of their productivity.

In the short run -- which is what matters to politicians and to union leaders, who both get elected in the short run -- workers who are already on the payroll may get a windfall gain before the market adjusts.

But, sooner or later, the chickens come home to roost. They have been coming home to roost big time in the automobile industry, where hundreds of thousands of jobs have been lost over the years. (*Makes you wonder if this doesn't apply to the airlines too.* - N.P.)

It is not that people don't want automobiles. Toyota is selling plenty of cars made in its American factories with non-union labor.

Some claim that it is automation, rather than union wages and benefits, that is responsible for declining employment among the Detroit auto workers.

But why are automobile companies buying expensive automated machinery, except that labor has been made expensive enough to make that their next best option?

Senator Obama is being hailed as the newest and freshest face on the American political scene. But he is advocating some of the oldest fallacies, just as if it was the 1960s again, or as if he has learned nothing and forgotten nothing since then.

He thinks higher teacher pay is the answer to the abysmal failures of our education system, which is already far more expensive than the education provided in countries whose students have for decades consistently outperformed ours on international tests.

*(Notice this: "Who, on average, is better paid -- public school teachers or architects? How about teachers or economists? You might be surprised to learn that public school teachers are better paid than these and many other professionals. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, public school teachers earned \$34.06 per hour in 2005, 36 percent more than the hourly wages of the average white-collar worker. . . .*

*"In the popular imagination, however, public school teachers are underpaid. 'Salaries are too low. We all know that,' noted First Lady Laura Bush, expressing the consensus view. 'We need to figure out a way to pay teachers more.' . . .*

*"Higher teacher pay seems to have no effect on raising student achievement. Metropolitan areas with higher teacher pay do not graduate a higher percentage of their students than areas with lower teacher pay.*

*"In fact, the urban areas with the highest teacher pay are famous for their abysmal outcomes. Metro Detroit leads the nation, paying its public school teachers on average, \$47.28 per hour. . . In metro New York, public school teachers make \$45.79 per hour. . . And in Los Angeles teachers earn \$44.03 per hour, 23 percent higher than other professionals in the area." - Jay P. Greene and Marcus A. Winters in *Opinion Journal*, from *Washington Times Weekly*, 2/19/07)*

Senator Obama is for making college "affordable," as if he has never considered that government subsidies push up tuition, just as

government subsidies push up agricultural prices, the price of medical care and other prices . . .

He is also for "alternative fuels," without the slightest thought about the prices of those fuels or the implications of those prices. All this is the old liberal agenda from years past, old wine in new bottles, a new face with old ideas that have been tried and failed repeatedly over the past generation.

Senator Obama is not unique among politicians who want to control prices, as if that is controlling the underlying reality behind the prices.

There is much current political interest in so-called "predatory tending" -- the charging of high interest rates for loans to poor people or to people with low credit ratings.

Nothing will be easier politically than passing laws to limit interest rates or make it harder for lenders to recover their money -- and nothing will cause credit to dry up faster to low-income people, forcing some of them to have to turn to illegal loan sharks, who have their own methods of collecting.

The underlying reality that politicians do not want to face is that here, too, prices convey a reality that is not subject to political control. That reality is that it is far riskier to lend to some people than to others.

That is why the price of a loan -- the interest rate -- is far higher to some people than to others. Far from making extra profits on riskier loans, many lenders have lost millions of dollars on such loans and some have gone bankrupt. (*Notice housing and mortgage lending markets.* - N.P.)

But politics is not about facts. It is about what politicians can get people to believe. - Thomas Sowell, *townhall.com*, 2/24/07

*(Next month, I will give you the religious side of Barack Obama. He says he is a Christian, but what kind? He is not a "Bible Christian." His faith is not evangelical, nor orthodox.* - N.P.)

## MANDATORY VACCINATION GOES TOO FAR

As an OB/GYN physician, I welcomed the development of a vaccine against the human papillomavirus, commonly known as HPV. When the Food and Drug Administration approved the Gardasil vaccine in June, it opened the door for millions of young women to be protected against a sexually transmitted disease associated with cervical cancer.

But the Georgia Legislature would be wrong to implement a mandatory vaccination program for our sixth-grade girls. A recently introduced bill, S.B. 155, would do just that, adding Georgia to the growing list of states considering mandatory HPV vaccination programs.

As a father, physician and member of Congress, I firmly believe parents, not politicians, should be making health care decisions for our children.

In Georgia, public school students must be vaccinated against a variety of diseases, from measles and mumps to polio and rubella. These diseases pose communicable health threats; vaccination is mandatory to protect our children from the sneezes and coughs of infected schoolmates.

But HPV is not a communicable disease; it is a sexually transmitted disease, one that is passed not through casual contact, but through sexual behavior. In short, our students aren't at risk of catching HPV by sharing a juice box at lunch or playing tag during recess.

Because of this critical distinction, it is both inappropriate and unprecedented to mandate vaccination for HPV. The Georgia Legislature would do a grave disservice to parents across our state by allowing the government to unnecessarily take a health care decision away

from our families.

To combat this growing trend, I have introduced legislation in the U. S. House of Representatives that would prohibit federal funds from being used to implement mandatory state vaccination programs. I believe this is the best way we can encourage states to leave these important health care decisions to parents and doctors, not legislators and bureaucrats. Under my legislation, states with voluntary programs could still use federal Medicaid, education and health care dollars to ensure girls who want the vaccination can afford it. This delivers control back to the family, where it belongs. - U.S. Rep. Phil Gingrey, *Atlanta Journal/Constitution*, 2/25/07

### CAMPUS LIFE HAZARDOUS TO YOUNG WOMEN

"I'm very politically incorrect, college campus psychiatrist Dr. Miriam Grossman says as she takes aim at a dogma that says, "Latex protects, behaviors are entrenched, disease is unavoidable."

"The message must get out,: Casual sex is a health hazard for young women." Dr. Grossman says in her new book, "Unprotected: A Campus Psychiatrist Reveals How Political Correctness in Her Profession Endangers Every Student," which she wrote under the name "Anonymous, M.D.," for fear of professional reprisals.

A few weeks ago, she identified herself and her employer for the past 10 years, the University of California at Los Angeles, on Laura Schlessinger's "Dr. Laura" radio program. . . .

Dr. Grossman argues that campus life and college health care are dominated by a "doctrine of sex without consequences:" and that certain concepts, such as the idea that getting a sexually transmitted disease (STD) is a rite of passage, cannot be questioned.

"Radical politics pervades my profession and common sense has vanished," she told the Best Friends leaders, who teach character education and sexual abstinence to thousands of young people. Research that doesn't fit with the social agenda is ignored, she said, and as a result:

- Young women aren't taught that, for biological reasons, they are likely to bond emotionally with the men with whom they have sex and this is part of the reason they often feel angry, distressed or depressed after casual sexual activity.

- Teenage girls are not taught that their reproductive systems are more vulnerable to infections than those of older women. This is why telling teens to delay sexual intercourse is "sound medical advice," she says.

- Young women aren't warned that being diagnosed with an STD is often a shocking and traumatic event, and that medical treatments cannot guarantee that their STDs will not continue to cause problems, especially when they are trying to get pregnant or give birth.

- Young women are not encouraged to talk about their abortion experiences even though their crying spells, insomnia and depression may be linked to such an event.

- Young women are not advised by college counselors about planning for motherhood, even if this is among their life goals. . . .

Dr. Grossman's book has been praised by professional colleagues such as Dr. Joe S. McIlhaney, founder of the Medical Institute for Sexual Health. - Cheryl Wetzstein, *WTW*, 2/12/07

### MENTAL HEALTH AND ABORTION

During the thirty-fourth anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, you heard a great deal about the victims of abortion. That phrase -- for obvious reasons -- nearly always referred to the tens of millions of unborn

children who have been killed as the result of *Roe*.

But there is another group of victims whose plight receives much less attention: the women themselves. And the fault for this lack of attention can be laid at the feet of those who claim to be defending their "right to choose."

A recent example of their plight is a study published in the *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. In it, researchers from New Zealand explored possible "linkages between unwanted pregnancy, abortion and long-term mental health" . . . Their goal was to either confirm or disprove previous studies that did find a link between having an abortion and things like "substance abuse, anxiety, hostility, low self-esteem, [and] depression. . . .

After controlling for factors such as socio-economic status and home life, they found "significant differences" between those who had had an abortion and those who had not. There were greater instances of depression, drug use, suicidal thoughts, and total mental health problems. The authors concluded that their results were consistent "with the view that exposure to abortion was associated with increased risks of mental health problems" -- the increases as much as 33 and 42 percent.

The authors were just looking for the facts. They are not partisans in the debate over abortion, but I am. So I will say what they did not: If some behavior or environmental factor increased people's chances of serious health problems by more than a third, there would be outraged calls for regulation, or at the very minimum, they would demand adequate notice and warnings. Any behavior but abortion, that is. As the authors of the study pointed out, theirs is but the most recent in a line of peer-reviewed studies that suggest that having an abortion is bad for a woman's mental health.

Yet, giving that information to pregnant women is seen as an unacceptable infringement on their "right to choose." It is the glaring exception to the overall trend today toward giving people more information -- not less -- about health risks.

Pro-abortionists apparently think that uninformed "choice" is the best kind. That makes their claim to be "pro-woman" ring hollow. All of us ought to want women to know all the risks involved in having an abortion. They should know that there are two victims of what they are considering. - Chuck Colson, *townhall.com*, 1/24/07

### YOUNG EARTH CRUCIAL TO DOCTRINES

In Kurt Wise's office at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary you can find fossils that secular scientists claim are billions of years old and are part of the long process of man's evolution.

But the Harvard-trained paleontology expert is out to show a better explanation for fossils -- and why neither science nor the Bible allow for evolution. That's why Wise, director of the Center for Technology and Science and professor of theology and science at Southern, also has agreed to serve as a consultant for the Creation Museum in Florence, Ky., near Cincinnati.

The museum, scheduled to open in April 2007, will feature 50,000 square feet and more than 250 exhibits countering the errors of evolutionary science and demonstrating the reliability of the first 11 chapters in *Genesis*.

Laid out in a walk-through format, the museum shows how science supports the Bible's accounts of creation, the origin of man and the worldwide flood. The Creation Museum is a project of Answers in *Genesis*, an apologetics organization focused on answering questions about the *Book of Genesis*.

"It's a good balance of philosophy, theology and science with the priority being on Scripture as a starting point," said Wise, who

came to Southern in 2006. "We understand science because we start with the Bible. We understand philosophy because we start with the Bible. It [The museum] is an attempt to weave those together."

One goal of the museum is to combine the expertise and resources of two groups in the creationist movement that too often work separately -- scientists and popular conveyers of creationist concepts, Wise said. He noted that scientists often have nuanced data that they have difficulty communicating with the public while popular creation speakers often give imprecise scientific data in an effort to present a simple message.

The Creation Museum meshes precise science with understandable presentations of data, Wise said, adding that he has consulted with other experts in the fields of biology, geology and astronomy.

"It's not just my personal expertise I'm bringing in, but that of everybody I know," he said.

The material presented in the museum is important for Christians to understand because it shows that biblical inerrantists who take Genesis literally have scientific support, Wise said. He noted that believing the earth was created by God 6,000-7,000 years ago is the most consistent position to take in light of Scripture.

"If you don't believe in a young earth, you really cannot -- and be consistent -- believe in the truth of much of Genesis 1-11," he said. "You have to reject a Babel origin for modern languages. You have to reject a global flood -- it has to be a local flood. You have to reject the longevity of the patriarchs -- they couldn't possibly have lived for 900 years.

"You have to reject that the first city was built by Cain or anything associated with Cain. You have to reject that Adam was the first human. You have to reject the origin of agriculture spoken of in Genesis," Wise added. "You have to reject the description of Eden -- it becomes absurd with rivers on three different continents coming out in one place. You have to reject Genesis chapter 1 -- the order of creation is wrong, not just the days or the length of the days."

Wise acknowledged that the majority of Christians and even the majority of conservative evangelicals believe the world is older than 7,000 years, but he argued many of the foundational doctrines of the Bible -- such as marriage, the literal fall of man, the necessity of a Savior and the end times -- depend on belief in a young earth. - David Roach, *Christian News*, 11/13/06

## COMMON-SENSE ON IMMIGRATION

I finally talked last weekend to someone who made sense on the immigration issue. He's not an INS specialist, a think tank expert, or a know-it-all editorial writer. Instead, he's a San Diego businessman, and one so modest about his thoughts that he was reluctant even to let me use his name.

Bill Tanksley has spent most of his life in Mexico and southern California. He thinks that has enabled him to understand a good bit of the mindset on both sides of the border -- although he readily concedes that some of the issues are so complex that nobody can really identify with every nuance.

Tanksley thinks Mexicans (and by implication, immigrants from other countries as well) need to understand far better than they do what American culture is all about. They need to understand what rule by law entails, and they need to understand that a "melting pot" -- not a "salad bowl" -- sensibility has made the United States what it is.

And Tanksley thinks some Americans need to back off a bit in the harshness with which so many ask the question, "What part of illegal don't you understand?" He thinks Mexicans have been taught for many years -- from both sides of the border -- a pretty lenient view

of the law. When hundreds of employers, including agencies of the U.S. government itself, regularly advertise in Mexico for transient workers, why shouldn't such workers assume the laws don't mean too much?

Tanksley's solution, contradictory as it may sound, is a simultaneous opening and securing of the border.

The border should be opened, he says, by formalizing the invitation to Mexicans to come here to work. Beyond the shadow of a doubt, we need them. Whole industries -- especially those in construction and agriculture -- would collapse without them. So let's welcome such workers in whatever numbers the free market for such labor sustains. A majority of such workers, Tanksley observes, do not want to live in the United States; they want to earn a nest egg to send or take back home, or enough to launch a business back there. So let the traffic flow, he says.

But the border should also be secured. That can't be done, Tanksley stresses, in any physical sense. It's just too big. But it can be done stateside with a consistent and rigorous administration of basic law -- especially in the three areas of transportation, housing, and employment. No driver's licenses for those who are here illegally. No rental housing (and obviously no housing purchases). No jobs. Make it clear to everyone that vehicles will be confiscated, houses will be subject to seizure, and employers subject to arrest when basic identification procedures have been ignored or falsified.

Such an approach, Tanksley argues, will send the consistent message -- not just to Mexicans, but to scofflaw Americans as well -- that the law here means something. It will say clearly that we are a nation with a huge welcome mat, but that anyone stepping onto that mat had better be prepared to live by the rules.

This isn't "amnesty," Tanksley insists. He gets irritated when he hears folks use that term to describe (and deride) any and all efforts to find a middle ground in the immigration debate. Such oversimplification, he says, and the parallel pejorative use of the term *illegal* are not helpful in the whole discussion. Most Mexicans have been taught by their government that it's OK to wink at certain selective skirting of the law -- and they expect the same thing here. Some Americans are aghast at such relativism -- until they're reminded of the abandon with which we ourselves observe speed limits and blue laws.

America does indeed offer the best mix of freedom and law in the whole world, Tanksley stresses. We shouldn't be surprised that others want to enjoy our blessings.

So as we respond, we've got no right to be stingy with what we've been given. Physical walls and fences -- besides the fact that they don't work -- send an altogether wrong message. But watering down requirements for those who would join us, either temporarily or permanently, also says the wrong things. Roll out the welcome mat, Tanksley urges. But beef up and don't let anybody destroy the very thing that makes America so inviting.

I like this common man's common sense. - Joel Belz, *WORLD*, 11/4/06

## GENERAL PACE'S CRIME OF CONVICTION

Our nation's top military officer, a veteran decorated with no less than forty-eight military awards and a very distinguished career, made a startling revelation this week: He has moral conviction. The world gasps, hurls insults, and demands an apology. How dare one of the top leaders of our land have a moral belief and share it when questioned?

But that's exactly what happened this week when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- the first Marine general ever to hold that

position -- General Peter Pace, commented in a wide-ranging interview with the *Chicago Tribune*, "My upbringing is such that I believe that there are certain things, certain types of conduct that are immoral. I believe that military members who sleep with other military members' wives are immoral in their conduct, and that we should not tolerate that."

But then Pace went on to tell the *Tribune*, "I believe that homosexual acts between individuals are immoral and that we should not condone immoral acts."

Well, stop the presses.

Of course, all that the radio, news, and television outlets have focused on since General Pace's comments are his remarks on homosexuality. Never mind that he puts immorality of all kinds on equal footing. General Pace went on to say in the interview, "I do not believe the United States is well served by a policy that says it is OK to be immoral in any way."

While the world should be applauding a man who proposes that one of the most important institutions in our country should have moral integrity, instead we hammer him for having a conviction.

But I believe this goes far beyond the whole question of homosexuals in the military and the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. This cuts to the core of the question of whether anyone in public office is free to speak his deepest religious or moral convictions. The Constitution says there will be no religious test for office, and yet we are applying one. We are basically saying that if you are the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, you are not allowed to express your moral or religious views -- especially on matters of sexual preference and behavior.

This is another sign that we live in an age that no longer believes in objective truth or a moral order. Moral relativism is the rule, and personal preference trumps all. And government is there to ensure that no one place any restraint on the pursuit of our own desires. . . .

Ironic that today, the head of our Joint Chiefs of Staff argues that the military should have consistent policies of moral integrity, and the world demands an apology. Maybe it is time to lock him up: General Pace is guilty.

He has committed the intolerable crime of our day: He has stated his conviction in a value-free society that respects only so-called "tolerance."

As for me, well, General Pace makes me proud that I am a former Marine. - Chuck Colson, *townhall.com*, 3/16/07

## THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

Last week, when a federal appeals court ruled that the District of Columbia's gun ban violates the right to "keep and bear arms," the *New York Times* reported that the judges were "interpreting the Second Amendment broadly." If they had interpreted the amendment in the normal, mainstream way, according to the *Times*, they would have concluded that it imposes no restrictions on gun control because it has nothing to do with individual rights.

This oddly bifurcated view of an enumerated constitutional right helps explain why the gun-control debate in this country is so acrimonious. When one side considers the Second Amendment a nullity and the other side thinks it counts for something, there is no safe middle ground.

If a court takes the position that Americans have a right to free speech, it is not interpreting the First Amendment broadly. If it says they have a right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures, it is not interpreting the Fourth Amendment broadly. So why is the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D. C. Circuit "interpreting the

Second Amendment broadly" when it says Americans have a right to keep and bear arms?

The court did not say Americans have a right to own anti-aircraft missiles or nuclear warheads. It did not even say they have a right to carry guns publicly (although that does seem to be implied by the "bear" part). It said they have a right to keep guns in their own homes for self-protection.

The D. C. law makes that impossible. It bans handguns not registered by 1976, except for those owned by retired police officers; prohibits carrying a handgun, even from one room to another, without a license that cannot be obtained; and requires that all firearms in the home, including rifles and shotguns, be unloaded and either disassembled or disabled with trigger locks.

It is hardly a stretch to view this policy, which effectively proscribes armed self-defense for the vast majority of D.C. residents, as a violation of the right to keep and bear arms. But according to a *Washington Post* editorial, the D.C. Circuit gave "a new and dangerous meaning to the Second Amendment," acceding to an "unconscionable campaign to broadly reinterpret the Constitution so as to give individuals Second Amendment rights."

In fact, as the court's 58-page opinion shows, gun controllers are the ones who have reinterpreted the Second Amendment, finding hidden meaninglessness. They insist that "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms" guaranteed by the Second Amendment, unlike the rights of "the people" mentioned in the First, Fourth, Ninth and 10th amendments, is not a right that belongs to people. But as the D.C. Circuit pointed out, "The Second Amendment would be an inexplicable aberration if it were not read to protect individual rights as well."

The idea that the amendment's prefatory clause, referring to the importance of a "well regulated Militia," obliterates everything that follows is a relatively recent interpretive innovation. It was unknown to the Framers and to the leading legal scholars of the 19th century, all of whom saw the amendment as guaranteeing a pre-existing right to use arms for defense against criminals, invaders and tyrants.

The part about the militia (which included all able-bodied white men of fighting age, each of whom was expected to bring his own weapons) was meant to acknowledge one important function of the right recognized by the Second Amendment, reassuring Antifederalists who worried that the new national government would abolish state militias. It was not meant to transform an individual right into a state prerogative.

"The people's right to arms was auxiliary to the natural right of self-preservation," the D.C. Circuit noted. "That right existed prior to the formation of the new government under the Constitution."

The *Washington Post* called this ruling "radical." I suppose it is, in the sense that it goes to the root of what the Framers wanted to protect. - Jacob Sullum, *townhall.com*, 3/14/07

## SEX SURVEY CONNECTED TO ABORTIONISTS

One of the most popular news stories circulating in recent days is a study by the Guttmacher Institute in New York that says 95 percent of Americans have had premarital sex. But there's more to the story than is being reported.

"It would be more forthright for the Guttmacher Institute to mention in its reports that it is the research arm for Planned Parenthood," Richard Ross, founder of the True Love Waits abstinence movement, told Baptist Press. "Corporate profits and staff salaries at Planned Parenthood depend on abortion services.

"Helping Americans abandon any sense that sex belongs in marriage is essential to boosting the demand for those abortion ser-

vices. Knowing of the tie between Planned Parenthood and Guttmacher could help readers watch for any possible bias creeping into research," Ross said.

Comments from the study's author, Lawrence B. Finer, indicate his motivation may be to suggest that programs promoting abstinence until marriage are not worth American taxpayer dollars. . . .

Ross said that since the year 1993, when True Love Waits became a national movement, teenage sexual behavior, sexually transmitted diseases, abortions and live births before marriage have declined for twelve consecutive years. . . .

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported in 2003 that 47 percent of teenagers had had sex, compared to 54 percent in 1991. And the Heritage Foundation said in 2004 that young women who take a virginity pledge are at least 40 percent less likely to have a child out of wedlock and twelve times more likely to be virgins when they marry, compared to young women who do not make such a pledge.

- *Baptist Press in Sword of the Lord*, 2/9/07

## FORGET SHARPTON, HERE'S REAL SLAVERY

Al Sharpton is apparently subdued by news that his ancestors were owned by ancestors of the late Sen. Strom Thurmond. New York Times columnist Bob Herbert described him as "quiet" and "reflective" -- states of mind that Herbert acknowledges are "unusual" for the reverend. That qualifies as the understatement of the decade.

Sharpton indicates that the news of his ancestry brought the "complete dehumanization" of slavery home to him, and Herbert takes the opportunity to preach that "Slavery, like the past. . . is not dead. It's not even past. It's not something you can wish away."

No, you can't wish it away, but it is possible to dwell on it overmuch, as I believe we do in this country. To judge by what my children are learning in school, you'd think American history was 75 percent slavery and 25 percent everything else (and that 25 percent includes a large dollop of imperialism, racism, sexism and homophobia, leaving little time for Lincoln, Edison, Clay, Holmes, Alcott, Dickinson, Addams, Longfellow or Fulton).

If Sharpton has not really understood slavery until now, then he has a peculiarly feeble imagination. Is it possible to live in 2007 America and not have thought about what life must have been like for black slaves? Is he kidding?" This from a self-described "civil rights leader?"

When Herbert wrote "slavery is not dead," I thought he was going in a different direction. I thought he was going to address the continuing practice of slavery worldwide. He has done so in the past. In fact, if Al Sharpton were a serious man, which he is not, he would be agitating and teaching and focusing on the slavery that continues to torment mostly women and children around the world and even here in the United States.

The U.S. Department of State recently released a report on human trafficking. "As unimaginable as it seems, " begins the report, "slavery and bondage still persist in the early 21st century. Millions of people around the world still suffer in silence in slave-like situations of forced labor and commercial sexual exploitation from which they cannot free themselves. Trafficking in persons is one of the greatest human rights challenges of our time."

Each year, an estimated 600,000-800,000 men, women and children are trafficked against their will across international borders. According to the White House, 14,500-17,500 of these are trafficked into the United States. Some are forced to work in sweatshops and farms, but most are domestic workers and prostitutes. A typical case is that of "Maria," a Guatemalan who was lured to the U.S. by a "coyote"

when she was 12. Once in Florida, she was raped and forced to submit to prostitution. She did not speak the language and was threatened with violence if she attempted to escape.

Poor women from the Philippines stream into Saudi Arabia seeking jobs as domestics. It is not uncommon for their employers to confiscate their passports, force them to work seven days a week, and confiscate all or most of their salaries as compensation for room and board. Some escape. Most do not.

In Burma, and in several countries in Africa, children as young as 11 are kidnapped and forced to become soldiers. The State Department's trafficking report quotes a 13-year-old former soldier from Liberia who told of being drugged. "They gave me pills that made me crazy. When the craziness got in my head, I beat people and made them bleed."

Elsewhere, the exploitation of children for "child sex tourism" is a thriving industry. In Thailand, Cambodia and Costa Rica, as well as other nations, pedophiles traveling from all over the globe are offered their choice of male or female victims from among the poorest classes. The children can be as young as 5.

In 2003, President Bush signed the PROTECT Act, which makes sex tourism by Americans a crime punishable by up to 30 years in prison, which is a start. But thousands upon thousands of children continue to be raped, beaten and abused for years on end, and then thrown away when they reach adulthood.

We don't have to imagine what life is like for these slaves. We can ask them. And the best way to honor the lives of our ancestors who suffered under slavery is to do what we can to free those who are suffering now. - Mona Charen, *townhall.com*, 3/2/07

## FEDERAL "HATE CRIMES" LAW AGAIN

On January 5, Representative Sheila Jackson-Lee of Texas introduced a bill that would create federal guidelines for the sentencing of violent criminals who were "motivated by the actual or perceived race, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender or disability of the victim." It expands the scope of current federal hate-crime law, which extends federal oversight to crimes that prevent the victim from engaging in a federally protected right -- such as voting -- and that are motivated on the basis of race, color, religion or nationality. The new bill expands the definition of a hate crime to include sexual orientation, gender and disability and allows for any violent crime to be considered a hate crime regardless of whether it affects a victim's ability to engage in a federally protected right. According to the bill, Congress has the authority to oversee hate crimes because of its constitutional powers to supervise interstate commerce. "Such violence affects interstate commerce in many ways," the bill states, and "instrumentalities of interstate commerce are used to facilitate the commission of such violence." - *Religion Today*

*Dr. Shelton Smith's Comments: The liberals are up to no good with this. It is a very slippery slope that should be avoided. All crime has an element of hate connected with it. Altogether, all crime should be punished, but speech that disagrees, defames or otherwise denigrates a person or a group cannot be codified as criminal. This whole "hate speech" furor is a smokescreen designed to aid and abet the homosexual's march toward legitimacy. If preachers and churches speak out on homosexuality, are they going to be charged as felons? It is wake up time!* - *Sword of the Lord*, 3/9/07

## CHRISTIANS TARGETED UNDER HATE CRIMES

Two Christians in Australia have been indicted for criticizing Islam, and another, for criticizing Zionism. A filmmaker has been threat-

ened with arrest for using the word "homosexual" rather than "gay." Now a German priest faces jail time for publicly criticizing abortionists, and in Holland, "fornicators" and "adulterers" are protected classes and cannot be criticized.

All [of this] is courtesy of the concept of federal "hate crimes" legislation, which unless defeated soon could be mandatory in the United States, warns a rising chorus of critics.

"All that matters are the delicate feelings of members of federally protected groups," said Michael Marcavage, director of RepentAmerica.com. "Truth is not allowed as evidence in hate crimes trials. . . A homosexual can claim emotional damage from hearing Scripture that describes his lifestyle as an abomination. He can press charges against the pastor or broadcaster who merely reads the Bible in public. The "hater" can be fined thousands of dollars and even imprisoned." - *WorldnetDaily.com* in *Sword of the Lord*, 3/9/07

### FIRST MUSLIM IN CONGRESS

Contrary to pronouncements by pundits and publications alike, freshman Rep. Keith Ellison, Minnesota Democrat, is not the first Muslim elected to Congress.

Writing for the Christian Worldview Network, historian David Barton says that "as is often the case with the mainstream media, they were wrong" about the 43-year-old Democrat, who created a storm of controversy by taking his oath of office on the Koran rather than the Bible.

Rather, the first Muslim to serve in Congress was John Randolph of Virginia, elected off and on from 1799 to 1834. During the time there

"were numerous Muslims living in America," says Mr. Barton, so many that the first Koran was published and sold here in 1806.

"Significantly, Francis Scott Key, author of the 'Star Spangled Banner' befriended Randolph and faithfully shared Christ with him. Randolph eventually converted from Islam to Christianity," Mr. Barton writes.

"Interestingly, during the founding era, like today, there was great concern over the possibility of a Muslim being elected to Congress. That concern was heightened by the fact that at that time, like now, America was involved in a war on terror against Islamic terrorists," the historian notes.

"That war, called the Barbary Powers War, lasted 32 years, involved six year of active overseas warfare against Muslim terrorists, and spanned four U.S. presidencies: those of George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison." - *WTW*, 2/5/07

### WHY ISRAEL IS GIVING UP LAND

The United States, UN, EU, and most of the world have been pressuring Israel ever since 1948 to give back the land she was forced to take in self-defence when attacked by Muslim neighbors determined to annihilate her. Tiny Israel is blamed for the terrorist attacks and wars that Arabs start. She depends upon Europe to buy her produce and upon the world to buy her electronics. If the nations boycotted her products, how could she survive? Although Israel is under God's judgment for centuries of rebellion against Him, she is also under His protection. There can be no other explanation for the fact that she exists today. - *The Berean Call*, 3/07



Christian  
View of the News

**Bible Baptist Church**  
**2780 Mt. Carmel Road**  
**Hampton, GA 30228**  
**Brad Blanton, Pastor**  
**[www.biblebaptistministries.com](http://www.biblebaptistministries.com)**

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

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED