



Christian View of the News



Volume 35 Number 8

Norman Pyle, Editor

August 2010

THE LEFT'S MORAL BANKRUPTCY

Did you hear the one about the Left's plan to counter the tea-party movement?

It's no joke.

"In an effort to replicate the tea party's success, 170 liberal and civil-rights groups are forming a coalition that they hope will match the movement's political energy and influence," explained a Washington Post report. "They promise to 'counter the tea-party narrative' and help the progressive movement find its voice again after 18 months of floundering."

The effort is curiously dubbed "One Nation." Historically, of course, when that two-word phrase has been used in America, it is usually followed by another two-word phrase – "under God." But with groups such as La Raza, the NAACP, the AFL-CIO and the SEIU joining the party, it is unlikely the deity will be invoked by any within this coalition.

You might ask: What's their beef?

They've got Barack Obama in the White House. They have Nancy Pelosi as speaker of the House. They have Harry Reid as Senate majority leader. They seem to have Elena Kagan on her way to the Supreme Court.

The answer, of course, is they see it all slipping away beginning this November. The tide has turned against their causes. Something very predictable happened on the way to their workers' paradise – an awakening in the American spirit that is saying: We will slouch toward Gomorrah no longer!

That spirit is illustrated by the tea-party movement – the biggest and most potent grass-roots political development in generations. People who never before marched on Washington, carried a protest sign or rallied at a town-hall meeting have done just that – by the millions. They have no familiar household names among their leaders. They have no billionaires bankrolling them. They represent no special interests. They get no friendly coverage from the press. They demand nothing for themselves from government except their freedom and to be molested no longer. And this is what has the super-organized, well-funded, government-subsidized, media-backed Left in a tizzy.

Understandably so.

As I write in my new book, "The Tea Party Manifesto," this movement represents what might well be America's last chance for a return to liberty and self-government. If it fails, so does the uniquely American dream of constitutionally limited federal power, the protection of God-breathed inalienable rights, equal justice, the rule of law, the will of the people and national sovereignty.

So, you might ask, what does this new opposition movement demand? What will be the rallying cry of its planned march on Washington Oct. 2?

More government spending on job creation.

Yes, that makes sense. That plan is working so well. It has worked to perfection with the biggest stimulus spending programs in the history of the world. Obviously all we need to do is more of the same!

Of course, no rational human being involved in this movement actually believes that more government spending is going to solve the problem of unemployment. The smarter and more devious elements of this movement know that more spending will only make joblessness even worse. However, they also understand that it will create more unsustainable dependency on government, which will inevitably lead to chaos and the collapse of the nation and ideals they detest.

With Washington already facing insurmountable, inter-generational debt, what else could be on the minds of those within this movement who have any rational understanding of economics? They want to push America off the cliff.

Is there any other explanation?

They don't want jobs. They want to complete the revolution. And they want to complete it, if at all possible, before the new Congress sweeps in following the tea-party electoral victory Nov. 2.

This rogue, reckless movement of fundamentally anti-American ambitions bears careful watching. - Joseph Farah, *WorldNetDaily*, 7/11/10

THE DEPARTMENT OF INJUSTICE

The Justice Department filed suit against the state of Arizona Tuesday over its recently passed immigration law, saying the law "interferes with the federal government's balanced administration of the immigration laws" and, therefore, has crossed a "constitutional line." And believe us, no one knows more about crossing constitutional lines than the Obama administration.

In fact, the administration's real reason for suing may be patent infringement on constitutional line-crossing.

Truly, the lawsuit could allege copyright infringement, because all Arizona did was copy federal law. We don't know if Attorney General Eric Holder has actually read the 18-page law yet, but, as we've said before, it merely makes it a state crime for people to be in Arizona if they're in the United States illegally. If the police have an otherwise lawful encounter with someone, and if they have "reasonable suspicion" that the person is in the U.S. ille-

What's Inside . . .
Afghanistan
Big Labor Payback
Economic Nonsense
Law & Marriage
Fruit of Obamacare
Financial Disaster

gally, the police are required to ask for documentation of immigration status. An Arizona driver's license is sufficient.

The law is not, as the DoJ alleges, an attempt "to set immigration policy at the state level." It is an effort to enforce federal laws that are not being enforced. If there's a legitimate criticism, it's that police resources are scarce enough without this added burden. But that's not Arizona's fault.

The bottom line is that the administration is seeking to do two things: preserve (or even expand) the power of the executive branch in immigration law and policy and win over an important and growing constituency group for generations to come.

It's the second point that brings us to another Justice Department action — that of dropping a slam-dunk case against the New Black Panther Party (another valuable constituent group for the Democrats) for intimidating voters on Election Day 2008 in Philadelphia. We don't know how much clearer the evidence can be than having the Panthers [caught on video](#) wearing paramilitary garb, wielding billy clubs and shouting racial threats at potential white voters in front of a polling place. Indeed, Bartle Bull was an eyewitness. He's also a former civil rights attorney and publisher of the ultra-liberal Village Voice. He called it "the most blatant form of voter intimidation I've ever seen."

Initially, the administration pursued the case, which was brought during the final days of the Bush Administration, winning a default judgment in federal court in April 2009 after the Panther members failed to appear in court. A month later, however, Justice moved to dismiss charges in exchange for one Panther member's pledge not to carry a "deadly weapon" to a Philadelphia polling place and only until 2012. Not surprisingly, mainstream media coverage of this gross miscarriage of justice has been virtually non-existent.

The problem is race-based and it is endemic. J. Christian Adams, an ex-Justice official who resigned over the department's handling of the case, testified Tuesday before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that the DoJ instructed attorneys in the civil rights division to ignore cases involving black defendants and white victims. Furthermore, he alleged that Deputy Assistant Attorney General Julie Fernandez declared that she would not enforce Section 8 of the "Motor Voter" law, which requires states periodically to purge voter rolls of felons, the deceased and those who have moved. According to Adams, Fernandez said, "We're not interested in those kind of cases. What do they have to do with helping increase minority access and turnout? We want to increase access to the ballot, not limit it."

Perhaps stating the obvious, Adams said the dismissal of the Panthers' case "raises serious questions about the department's enforcement neutrality in upcoming midterm elections and the subsequent 2012 presidential election." It's not just neutrality that's a problem, though. "The salient thing about J. Christian Adams's accusation," writes Richard Fernandez of PajamasMedia, "is that, if true, it constitutes a pure exercise in the abuse of power [by the administration]. The other wrongs it represents — the perversion of the electoral process, the violation of civil rights — are secondary. The most serious allegation in the whole affair is that certain officials countenanced a crime because they wanted to."

The Panther case and the Arizona suit make plain that the Department of Justice is engaging in the Saul Alinsky "Rules for Radicals" method of governance: Give blatant favors to allies and crush opponents with brute force.

On a lighter note, perhaps the solution would be to combine problems. Instead of leaving them to obstruct voters at the polls, the feds could station Black Panthers with billy clubs at the border. - Mark Alexander, *Patriot Post*, 7/9/10

TAKE ACTION, RECLAIM AMERICA

I talk for a living. But talk is not enough. We now know what Obama meant when he vowed to "transform" America. It's time to act.

At first, I gave Obama the benefit of the doubt. Even though I was less than enthusiastic to do so, I voted for McCain in 2008. But I cheered the election of a black man, hoping for a president who could truly "bring us together." How's that working out? Not well. Not well at all.

"Race" just seems to be a card to be played. Rev. Jeremiah Wright-style hate got incorporated into the government. It's "payback time."

The white Cambridge police officer acted "stupidly" in detaining professor Henry Louis Gates as he was trying to break into his own house. Charges of voter intimidation at a Philadelphia polling place by a club-wielding New Black Panther — a clear violation of the Voting Rights Act — were dismissed. A California manslaughter conviction of a white transit officer in the killing of a black man was insufficient. The Department of "Justice" announced a double-jeopardy prosecution for "civil-rights" violations.

The black (as the half white Obama described himself in the census) president has acted with all the thin-skinned self-consciousness of an affirmative-action hire.

Traditional liberal, race-based divisiveness played out at the border, too.

Even as they acknowledged that they had not even read S.B. 1070, the Arizona state law that required local law enforcement officers to detain suspected illegal aliens for federal officers, Obama officials denounced the law as "racist," "discriminatory" and "unconstitutional."

Brushing aside other states' laws (California, Rhode Island, Missouri) that require the same actions by local law enforcement, Obama decided to make an example of Arizona, a state he could never turn "blue."

Sen. Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., reported that Obama told him he would not secure the border because then "you all (Republicans) would not support comprehensive immigration reform." In other words, Obama holds national security hostage to his political agenda of amnesty for illegals — otherwise known as "undocumented Democrats."

In a remarkable pleading in U.S. District Court in Phoenix, Obama lawyers asserted that the feds had fully pre-empted the area of immigration law and, even if the president determined *not* to enforce that law, no state could enforce it. This from a president who had sworn on the Bible to "faithfully execute the laws" of the United States. "Equal justice under law"? Gone — just like that.

Sometimes I think I am permanently blue in the face talking about this president

I'm tired of talking about the William Ayers clone "czars" appointed by Obama to drive radical policies deep into federal agencies for labor, defense, the environment, energy and education.

I'm tired of talking about the executive orders and extra legal commands from an elected "chief magistrate" who acts like a dictator — replacing the CEO of a private company, impoverishing corporate bond holders and enriching political allies in corporate takeovers that mirror Hugo Chavez's finest hour. "Rule of law"? Gone — just like that.

I'm tired of revealing the lies of Obamacare. Contrary to Obama's repeated assurances, you won't be able to "keep your doctor" or your insurance. Medical costs will go up, not down. "Death panels" will be called some Orwellian acronym (in the U.K. they're called NICE), but will function just as Sarah Palin predicted. You will get the medical care as dictated by the government.

I'm tired of talking about the bailouts, the tsunami of debt, the "too big to fail" fat cats, the endless pork, the blatant Chicago-style

corruption. . . .

Obama spoke last week in Las Vegas at a fundraiser for sleazy Harry Reid. Again I could take no more.

Obama extolled the virtue of his “good friend” Harry Reid – the same Harry Reid who, as Senate majority leader, gathered the lobbyists to craft the “stimulus” bill and “Obamacare” behind closed doors and then jammed through these trillion-dollar monstrosities without hearings, without real debate, indeed without most senators knowing what was in the thousands of pages they were voting on.

For “equal time” and for “fairness,” I asked Reid’s Republican challenger, Sharron Angle, to come on my show.

At the glittering fundraising dinner, Obama had ridiculed Angle for telling the truth about the Bernie Madoff style scheme we know as “Social Security.” He had scoffed at her calls to abolish the federal Energy and Education Departments – even though the Energy Department has never created any energy and the federal Education Department serves the interests only of the iron-fisted teachers’ union while it presides over the downward spiral of public education.

Sharron Angle is the voice of parents everywhere (she was an elected local school-board member) yearning for quality education for their kids and getting only indoctrination. Angle served in the Nevada Legislature – and was routinely denounced by fellow legislators because she would not “go along to get along.” She opposed tax increases, even when proposed by Republicans.

Angle (parent and grandparent) is the original “Mama Grizzly.” Her limited government, low tax, freedom platform is exactly the antidote to the arrogant narcissism of our “know it all” president and his lapdog, Harry Reid.

Again, I urged listeners to contribute to Angle’s campaign at SharronAngle.com. Despite the presidential slanders and Reid’s fat war chest, Angle leads in the polls. With your help, she can win.

I’m enjoying this. All the frustration, all the helplessness is evaporating as I determine to go beyond talk and take action. The “We the People” enthusiasm of my audience for this new commitment to action is infectious.

My show is now one permanent tea party – a national audience forging a national campaign that will “remember in November” to “vote them out.” - Roger Hedgecock, *WorldNetDaily*, 7/11/10

A TROJAN HORSE IN THE GOP CAMP

A political activist and pro-family leader says a radical homosexual group is trying to infiltrate the Republican Party in order to render it less effective in standing up for policies like the ban on homosexuals from military service.

On July 13, U.S. District Judge Virginia Phillips will hear the lawsuit brought by homosexuals who call themselves the Log Cabin Republicans as they challenge Clinton’s longstanding policy of “don’t ask, don’t tell,” which bars homosexuals from openly serving in the military. Congress is already working on the legislation to repeal the actual 1993 law that declares homosexuality is incompatible with military service.

Robert Knight, a senior writer for *Coral Ridge Ministries*, warns that the Log Cabin group is like a Trojan horse.

“It’s important to understand that the Log Cabin Republicans aren’t really a Republican group; they’re a group of homosexual activists who are inside the Republican party, trying to neutralize the party on the issue of homosexual activism,” he explains. “It’s sort of a voluntary disarmament that they’re advising the Republicans to undertake.

He thinks it is clear that lifting the ban on homosexual service

would be extremely detrimental to America’s armed forces.

“This would destroy the volunteer military as we know it, because 25 percent of people in the military have said they’ll either resign or they wouldn’t re-enlist,” Knight reports. “It would hurt recruitment because the military draws from traditional populations that have very traditional values. It would hurt unit cohesion.”

The pro-family leader concludes that repealing the 1993 law would be a major step in transforming traditional morality into a form of bigotry actionable under the law. - *OneNewsNow.com*, 7/12/10

CLIMATE-GATE 'A SHAMEFUL SHAM'

A leading skeptic of global warming is discrediting an investigation that he says has largely vindicated the scientists involved in the “ClimateGate” scandal.

“[It’s] a shameful sham of a report,” says *Climate Depot* executive editor Marc Morano. “This is the global-warming establishment exonerating the global-warming establishment.”

The report centered on the leak of hundreds of e-mails from the University of East Anglia’s Climatic Research Unit. The inquiry, led by former U.K. civil servant Muir Russell, cleared climate scientists of accusations that they exaggerated the threat of climate change. Morano says that result was predictable.

“This [investigation] was put together by the very university that was called into question that had the Climatic Research Unit -- the heart of the ClimateGate scientists,” he explains. “And they’re actually in the report urging for a campaign to win the hearts and minds and restore confidence in global-warming science. The entire report is essentially premised on the idea that we have to clear their reputation.”

Morano adds that he is shocked Phil Jones has been reinstated as the director of the Climatic Research Unit at the University. “This would be akin to putting Bernie Madoff back in charge of financial institutions,” he reacts.

According to Morano, global-warming alarmists will never have credibility with people like Phil Jones in power. - *OneNewsNow.com*, 7/12/10

AFGHANISTAN: THE ANATOMY OF DEFEAT

The Afghan War may be the first one we lose primarily because our civilian leadership did not understand the effect of its public words on our government, our allies and our enemy. Throughout the summer and fall of 2009, as experts were getting more pessimistic about success in Afghanistan, President Obama began having second thoughts. He was conflicted between his campaign statement that Afghanistan was the good and necessary war and his supporters’ concerns that America not get bogged down in another unwinnable Vietnam.

Finally, he announced his decision in his December 2009 speech at West Point, where he stated: “(A)s commander in chief, I have determined that it is in our vital national interest to send an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan. After 18 months, our troops will begin to come home. These are the resources that we need to seize the initiative, while building the Afghan capacity that can allow for a responsible transition of our forces out of Afghanistan.

“... (T)aken together, these additional American and international troops will allow us to accelerate handing over responsibility to Afghan forces, and allow us to begin the transfer of our forces out of Afghanistan in July of 2011. Just as we have done in Iraq, we will execute this transition responsibly, taking into account conditions on the ground. We will continue to advise and assist Afghanistan’s security forces to ensure that they can succeed over the long haul. But it will be clear to the Afghan government — and, more importantly, to

the Afghan people — that they will ultimately be responsible for their own country.”

So was born a conceptual confusion that is leading us to defeat in that war. As I and many others observed a few weeks after the speech.

“The confusions as to intentions, strategies and exit-timing started immediately after the president’s Dec. 1 speech, and have gotten dangerously worse in the ensuing month. Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Adm. Mike Mullen and the top generals all said we were there to win and the July 2011 exit date was conditional on whether enough had been accomplished by then. White House spokesman Robert Gibbs, adviser David Axelrod, Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel, Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. and the president all indicated July 2011 was real, and senior White House sources said ‘winning’ was not an objective ... Saturday’s Washington Post ... laid bare the shockingly different understandings of the Afghan mission held by the White House and the Pentagon ... A senior Democratic staff member in Congress told The Post: ‘Is the surge a way of helping us leave more quickly, or is the timeline a way to help win support for the surge? Which is the strategy and which is the head fake? Nobody knows.’ A senior officer is quoted in the article saying they ‘don’t know if this is all over in 18 months, or whether this is just a progress report that leads to minor changes.’”

In the ensuing two-thirds of a year, Mr. Obama and his senior aides proceeded to publicly characterize President Karzai and his brother as irredeemably corrupt and incompetent. Then, when Mr. Karzai started negotiating with the Taliban, he was invited to the White House for a heavy dose of warm words and good photo ops. The war continued to go worse and worse; Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal (and his aides) inexcusably whined to the press about the incompetence of the president and his top aides, was justifiably fired for it and was replaced by Gen. David H. Petraeus.

CBS, meanwhile, reported: “The Obama administration is giving different explanations of its July 2011 deadline for the start of an Afghanistan troop withdrawal, assuring foreign officials that it applies only to the 30,000 to 35,000 additional U.S. troops that President Barack Obama is sending next year (2010), but suggesting to Congress that it covers all U.S. forces.

“The conflicting versions suggest that the administration is trying to reassure U.S. allies in the region and elsewhere that the U.S. won’t cut and run, while telling a concerned American public, Congress and Democratic Party that it has an exit strategy.”

That last CBS observation gets us to the essence of the White House’s strategic communications blunder. The president and his men have confused the effect of “political spin” — when heard as such — on domestic public opinion with its effect when heard as formal pronouncements of state by enemies, allies and institutional forces such as the Pentagon.

The American public has become accustomed to discounting the spin of politicians — even of presidents. The public views political spin the way it does professional wrestling: It’s fun to cheer or boo, but don’t take it seriously.

Unfortunately, what the president and his political operatives meant as a little useful spin for their domestic base was taken as formal policy by foreign players — and they have acted accordingly. Our two allies in the Afghan War — Pakistan and Afghanistan — having heard the “spin” as policy have irrevocably taken the strategic action of discounting America as a reliable force in theater. And, as the president’s strategy relied on gaining and keeping their trust and loy-

alty, his strategy has necessarily collapsed. In the coming months, we should expect many more words of explanation in Washington and many more failures in Afghanistan. *Alea iacta est* (the die is cast).

Even the greatest chef cannot unscramble an egg. Even the president of the United States cannot unspin his words.- Tony Blankley, *Townhall.com*, 7/7/10

PAYBACK TO BIG LABOR

Over the last several months, Big Labor has been trying to find any possible way to push their forced unionization, anti-small business agenda in Washington, DC. And late last week, members of U.S. House added an amendment to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, which would give the federal government new powers to override local decisions about public safety employees. With strong opposition coming from many Members of Congress, the amendment supported by Big Labor’s political benefactors has caught the eye of workers, as well as the small business community. The amendment — the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act (PSEECA) — allows the government to step in and federalize the unionization process for police, firefighters and other emergency response and law enforcement personnel.

Should this receive sufficient support in the Senate and become law, it would place a stranglehold on the finances of cities, counties and state governments. They would be forced to abide by the outcome of these deals negotiated and required by the federal government, which in the past have included significantly higher salaries, augmented bonuses and benefit packages that vastly exceed the norm and are certainly more expensive than what local governments can afford as they face massive budget deficits.

This appears to be an attempt by Big Labor to call in political favors, while damaging state economies in the process. Senator Mike Enzi seems to agree as he stated, “This amendment would hit local municipalities during a time of budgetary crisis for no reason other than to reward big labor unions.”

Passing this amendment as part of the appropriations bill means new, higher and unfunded costs to states around the country that are already struggling. Introducing a new, federally-mandated program will only cause more economic hardship as it places the burden of financing the collective-bargaining agreements reached by national bureaucrats on local municipalities.

As these local governments attempt to balance their budgets, Big Labor sees an opportunity to seize more control of the workforce, which will in turn, line their pockets with increased union dues. But the impact that mandated collective bargaining would place on these communities could be devastating. Budgets that have built-in salaries and expenses for their local firemen and police officers would be subject to national unions’ standards. Ignoring local needs and economies, this could open wide the floodgates of financial burden on states around the country and result in less law enforcement and emergency response personnel threatening the citizenry in the process.

This seems to be nothing more than a political handout to give some form of payback to labor bosses being that Congress has been unable to pass the job-killing Employee ‘Forced’ Choice Act (EFCA).

Under EFCA, the unionization process changes from one of a secret ballot election to a public, card check system opening workers to intimidation and coercion. Additionally, by means of a government arbitrator, EFCA would allow salaries and benefits to be set by a federal bureaucrat — not employees and employers — in mandated contracts that would crush small businesses. Much like the collective-bargaining agreement with cities and states, EFCA would place the

federal government in control over local, small businesses. EFCA is Big Labor's top priority in Congress and since they have not been able to secure its passage, they are now looking to their supporters on Capitol Hill to advance other elements of the union agenda.

For instance, labor radical Craig Becker was placed on the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and we're now seeing troubling activity coming from it. Becker, a former union attorney who received a Presidential recess appointment, is under investigation for violating an ethics pledge he made during his failed confirmation process where both Republicans and Democrats voted down his nomination.

The bottom line is that Big Labor will stop at nothing to get the payback they believe they are owed, and whether the result threatens the budgets of local communities and/or forces small businesses to close, it appears their supporters in the nation's capital don't particularly care.

These sorts of unseemly and objectionable acts by public officials who are entrusted to represent the best interests of their constituents do not go unnoticed and will not be excused by the people who pay the bills and create the jobs throughout the country. - Katie Packer, *Townhall.com*, 7/13/10

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC NONSENSE

Sadly, with President Obama, each day is crazier than the previous one. His latest economic speeches border on the surreal. I just can't quite figure out who he thinks his audience is because so much of what he says doesn't square with reality.

In a speech Friday in Las Vegas, Obama painted quite a rosy portrait of his economic record to date — at least rosy compared with what we've all experienced with our five senses.

Though I don't intend to go all "Joe Wilson" on him ("You lie!"), please let me share with you a few, shall we say, "discrepancies" in his speech, the major theme of which could be summarized as "I inherited the worst economy since the Depression, and I saved us from a new depression because I say I did."

Obama doesn't merely ignore all empirical evidence that flies in the face of his claim; he just tells us, astonishingly, that it is positive evidence. It would be like a thief telling the judge at his sentencing that but for his heist, his victims would have been worse off. Or a student telling a math teacher that three minus two equals four. Consider:

—He twice claimed that he inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression, which is no less absurd than Bill Clinton's claim that he inherited from George H.W. Bush the "worst economy in 50 years." Both men conveniently omitted the high misery index-riddled economy of the worst president in American history before Barack Obama, Jimmy Carter. Carter's interest rates reached 15.27 percent. Inflation soared to 13.5 percent. And unemployment grew to 7.8 percent. Obama also omitted his own record, which is far worse than the one he "inherited." His unemployment figures, by the way, easily outdo Carter's.

—Obama described the George W. Bush years as "a decade of misguided economic policies — a decade of stagnant wages, a decade of declining incomes, a decade of spiraling deficits." The Democratic distortion of the Bush record really gets tiring. Try out these statistics: In 2006, the Bush economy grew at 5.6 percent, representing the 18th straight quarter of economic growth, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. The unemployment rate was 4.7 percent; it later fell to 4.6 percent, which was lower than the average rate of unemployment for any of the preceding four decades. (Barack, please tell us how you are going to spin your 9.7 rate against Dubya's 4.7.) As for

those deficits, Bush promised to cut them in half in five years but did so ahead of time. Bush's deficits had decreased to the low \$200,000s. Even his deficit for fiscal year 2008, after the recession set in, was far lower than Obama's deficits, especially when considering the repayment of most of the TARP monies — repayments, by the way, that Obama tried to prevent and/or co-opt for further wasteful spending. Plus, Obama's refrain that the Bush tax cuts led to deficits is flatly contradicted by the record, which shows that federal tax revenues grew following his tax cuts.

—Obama also had the audacity to suggest that his profligate federal programs are stimulating the private sector, when the uncontroverted evidence is that we've lost millions of jobs since he began his madness. He claims he's created 600,000 private-sector jobs but fails to tell you he's lost some 3 million, so the net loss exceeds 2.5 million. He also fails to mention that the only real growth we've seen during his reign has been in the public sector — hardly a surprise but completely incongruous with his other speech themes about private-sector entrepreneurship

—That's right; with a straight face, he told Las Vegans that "the greatest generator of jobs in America is our private sector. It's not government." Though that's generally true, it's not been true under his watch, and it's not what he truly believes, as if I need to tell you that. Oh, sure, he said, "The private sector, not government, is, was and always will be the source of America's economic success." But that was before his boast a few minutes later about how his magnanimously bestowed federal grants were jump-starting a new green economy, implying he'd manufactured the magic economic bullet. Green jobs — give me a break. If he wants to talk green, let him explain away The Heritage Foundation's projection that his "green" cap-and-tax scheme will cause "average annual unemployment to increase by 1.14 million people" from 2011 to 2035.

Obama's major contributions to the economy are astronomical debt acceleration, obscene unemployment, recession bordering on depression, and business and consumer uncertainty across the board. And this is before Obamacare and his other major tax hikes have even gone into effect. It's time for him to start being honest, first with himself and then with the American people. - David Limbaugh, *Townhall.com*, 7/13/10

LAW AND MARRIAGE

A federal judge in Boston has ruled that the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) passed by Congress (427 members voted in favor) and signed into law by President Clinton in 1996 cannot take precedence over a Massachusetts law allowing same-sex marriage. The ruling again raises serious questions about the origin and purpose of law. But before we get to that larger question, the "logic" of Judge Joseph L. Tauro's ruling should first be examined.

Judge Tauro's decision flies in the face of what the federal government has claimed and is claiming in at least two other significant cases. In 1973, the Supreme Court struck down all state laws restricting a woman's right to have an abortion. In its lawsuit against Arizona's new immigration law, the Department of Justice claims federal law (which the feds are not enforcing) trumps state law.

So let's see: state laws are fine when they promote the interests of the ruling liberal and cultural elites, but they are to be ignored, or overturned, when they do not promote the objectives of the ruling liberal and cultural elites. Is that it? How can the federal government have it both ways?

A *New York Times* editorial says of DOMA "There is no rational basis for discriminating against same-sex couples." Really? Has the

newspaper forgotten the federal government's "discrimination" against Utah when it forbade the territory from entering the Union until it outlawed polygamy? In 1878, the Supreme Court declared in *Reynolds v. United States* that polygamy was not protected by the Constitution. If the federal government could reject polygamy then as a means of promoting the general welfare, why can't it block attempts to redefine marriage now? If marriage is re-defined by courts, what is to stop anyone from declaring a "right" to any relationship they wish to enter and demanding "equal protection" under the Constitution?

Now to the larger question of law, which is also being re-defined. During her confirmation hearings, Elena Kagan said she loved the law. Too bad no one asked her which law she loves and what is law's purpose? Law is meant to conform humans to a standard that preserves the cultural and moral order. The purpose of government is to "secure" unalienable pre-existing rights about which Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence (a document Kagan dismissed as irrelevant to the Constitution, though it is the Constitution's moral and philosophical foundation). Government is not supposed to create new rights like national health care, or same-sex marriage.

The *Times* editorial dismisses the overwhelming approval for DOMA as a "wedge issue" during an election year. In fact, it reflected the principled position not only of a vast majority of members of Congress, but also the position of the public, which has almost universally rejected attempts to legalize same-sex marriage. In 2004, 11 states had ballot measures preserving marriage as between opposite sex couples. All passed. In 2008, three states had gay marriage ballot initiatives. Two passed. In California, a measure to overturn the State Supreme Court's earlier 4-3 decision upholding the constitutionality of a legislative ban on same-sex marriage was approved by 400,000 votes, or 52 percent of those voting.

Marriage re-definers demand acceptance for their position that morality, as well as right and wrong, are to be determined by polls. If polls show the public disapproving of behavior the elites favor, the elites ignore majority opinion and seek to shove it down our throats anyway, because, you see, only they can be right. The rest of us have the equivalent standing of 1950s segregationists. Anyone arguing for tradition is branded a bigot, a label that is supposed to end all discussion, while the labeled one is exhausted trying to prove a negative.

Judge Tauro's ruling will likely be overturned on appeal, but that won't stop the marriage re-definers. In a morally exhausted society, they just might succeed. Polygamists were 130 years before their time. -Cal Thomas, *Townhall.com*, 7/13/10

THE BITTER FRUIT OF OBAMACARE

Get ready for your life to change. The so-called benefits of ObamaCare don't start until 2014, but the tax increases, mis-allocated resources and federal regulations start now.

Speaker Nancy Pelosi famously said the night of ObamaCare's passage, "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it." The emerging picture is frightening

ObamaCare dramatically alters the already-overregulated health insurance market. The federal government will now manage your health care decisions. The law creates a maze of mandates, federal directives, price controls, tax increases and subsidies.

We all begin paying ObamaCare taxes this year. The law includes at last count at least 19 new taxes. As Americans begin to reap the personal financial burden of ObamaCare, the movement to repeal it is mounting.

Individuals must pay an annual penalty of \$695, or up to 2.5

percent of their annual income, if they don't purchase an approved health insurance plan. Penalties on families include an annual penalty of \$347 per child, up to \$2,250 per family, if parents don't purchase an approved policy. . . .

Investors get whacked hard. ObamaCare imposes a 3.8 percent tax on investment income for individuals making \$200,000 or more and on families making \$250,000 or more. The investment tax is not indexed for inflation, so as time passes more people will be expected to pay. Seniors on fixed incomes and pensioners with IRAs and 401(k) plans will be hit hard. . . .

Medicare taxes are climbing up, too. The bill requires single people earning \$200,000 or more and couples earning \$250,000 or more to pay an additional 0.9 percent in Medicare taxes.

Thinking about downsizing or buying a new home? There are new taxes on home sales tacked on the bill. ObamaCare imposes a 3.8 percent tax on home sales and other real estate transactions. Almost every homeowner qualifies as "rich" for one day, the day they sell their house.

Taxes on medical devices will also be going up to 2.9 percent under ObamaCare. . . .

ObamaCare empowers the IRS for enforcement. The IRS is hiring 16,500 new enforcement officials. The IRS will confiscate tax refunds, place liens on property and seek jail time if healthcare penalties and taxes are not paid.

But don't despair. As of July 14, 130 members of Congress have signed a discharge petition that will force Nancy Pelosi to hold a straight up-or-down vote on HR 4972, a bill, proposed by Congressman Steve King, that repeals ObamaCare.

In plain language, that means that the repeal of ObamaCare is actually within our grasp. Congressman King is upbeat, saying: "I am optimistic that we will be able to attract the 218 signatures we will need to force a vote on repealing ObamaCare. ... Signatures on the discharge petition have come more quickly than I had expected." - FLOYD & Mary Beth Brown, *Townhall.com*, 7/16/10

FINANCIAL DISASTER

Anytime Congress passes a 2,300-page law that creates more than 500 new regulations and sets up a new, complicated bureaucracy, we should be nervous. And the major financial overhaul that has cleared the final hurdles in the Senate proves the rule. The legislation — the brainchild of Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn., and Rep. Barney Frank, D-Mass. — is the biggest overhaul of the nation's financial industry since the 1930s. Its Democratic supporters claim it was necessary to prevent another economic meltdown like the one we suffered in 2008 (This "meltdown" was primarily created by Dodd and Frank and they are going to rescue us? No doubt. - N.P.).

But no one knows whether it will do any such thing. Even Dodd acknowledged this week, "(Americans) don't ask for perfection. They know we have not solved every problem and that we are not going to bring back their homes and their jobs; but they expect us to respond to the situation that brought us to the brink of financial disaster. This is our best effort to do so."

The bill goes far beyond attempting to regulate the risky derivatives market that led to the credit crisis in the fall of 2008, however. The bill literally touches every American who hopes to buy anything on credit in the future, dictates new capital standards for banks and other institutions, paves the way for new rules for selecting corporate boards of directors, and gives the government broad new powers to seize financial firms.

Like most Democratic solutions, this one rests on bigger gov-

ernment with greater powers to inject itself directly into the economy. Instead of allowing the free market to work — which entails risk of failure — the government will now try to foresee all possible dangers and attempt to prevent them.

A new Federal Insurance Office will monitor the insurance industry to try to prevent “systemically important” insurers — like the 2008 version of AIG — from going under. A new Financial Stability Council will assess risks of large financial institutions and could even break up firms it deems too risky. A new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau in the Federal Reserve will make new rules for large banks, credit unions and other consumer lending companies — except for car dealerships, which managed to get themselves excluded through their political clout.

But the unintended consequences may well be tightening credit for consumers and businesses. In its attempt to protect individuals (and businesses) from the consequences of their own bad decisions, Big Government will now try to foresee all possible risks and mitigate them. How noble. And how naively Utopian. . . .

Dodd claims, “The American public expects nothing less of us than to fashion proposals that will minimize great risks to them.” But what about the risk of government overreach?

The Obama administration and Democrats in Congress have already revamped the American health system. Now they intend to overhaul the U.S. financial system. Yet few of the people in charge of this massive government intrusion have any experience in the industries they think they know best how to run.

A government that can't even pay its own bills and must borrow against the future earnings of people not yet born seems a bad choice to oversee the financial well-being of the nation. - Linda Chavez, *Townhall.com*, 7/17/10

OBAMA-PELOSI LAME DUCK STRATEGY

Democratic House members are so worried about the fall elections they're leaving Washington on July 30, a full week earlier than normal—and they won't return until mid-September. Members gulped when National Journal's Charlie Cook, the Beltway's leading political handicapper, predicted last month “the House is gone,” meaning a GOP takeover. He thinks Democrats will hold the Senate, but with a significantly reduced majority.

The rush to recess gives Democrats little time to pass any major laws. That's why there have been signs in recent weeks that party leaders are planning an ambitious, lame-duck session to muscle through bills in December they don't want to defend before November. Retiring or defeated members of Congress would then be able to vote for sweeping legislation without any fear of voter retaliation. . . .

In the House, Arizona Rep. Raul Grijalva, co-chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, told reporters last month that for bills like “card check”—the measure to curb secret-ballot union elections—the lame duck would be the last chance, quite honestly, for the foreseeable future.”

Iowa Sen. Tom Harkin, chair of the Senate committee overseeing labor issues, told the Bill Press radio show in June that “to those who think [card check] is dead, I say think again.” He told Mr. Press “we're still trying to maneuver” a way to pass some parts of the bill before the next Congress is sworn in.

Other lame-duck possibilities? Senate ratification of the New Start nuclear treaty, a federally mandated universal voter registration system to override state laws, and a budget resolution to lock in increased agency spending.

Then there is pork. A Senate aide told me that “some of the

biggest porkers on both sides of the aisle are leaving office this year, and a lame-duck session would be their last hurrah for spending.” Likely suspects include key members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Congress's “favor factory,” such as Pennsylvania Democrat Arlen Specter and Utah Republican Bob Bennett.

Conservative groups such as FreedomWorks are alarmed at the potential damage, and they are demanding that everyone in Congress pledge not to take up substantive legislation in a post-election session. “Members of Congress are supposed to represent their constituents, not override them like sore losers in a lame-duck session,” Rep. Tom Price, head of the Republican Study Committee, told me.

It's been almost 30 years since anything remotely contentious was handled in a lame-duck session, but that doesn't faze Democrats who have jammed through ObamaCare and are determined to bring the financial system under greater federal control. - John Fund, *The Wall Street Journal*, 7/9/10

TEA PARTY ACCUSED BY NAACP

A number of Tea Party organizations are rejecting a resolution by the NAACP that the Tea Party movement contains “racist elements.”

During its national convention in Kansas City this week, the National Organization for the Advancement of Colored People denounced the national network of Tea Party activists, issuing a resolution condemning “racist elements” in that movement and calling on the movement's leaders to repudiate bigotry.

But even before the NAACP issued its resolution, the St. Louis Tea Party issued a resolution of its own, condemning the NAACP for even considering a resolution accusing the Tea Parties of racism. Jim Hoft is a spokesman for the St. Louis group.

“What we said in our resolution was that we condemn the racism of the NAACP,” he explains. “And we condemn their tactics of trying to accuse us of some incidents that we believe did not happen — and trying to group all the millions of Tea Parties activists across the country as racists.”

Hoft agrees with Jordan Sekulow of the American Center for Law and Justice, who says the NAACP is an irrelevant racist organization that is impeding the progress of black Americans. - Chad Groening, *OneNewsNow.com*, 7/15/10

CHRISTIAN CONVERT OBTAINS ASYLUM

A U.S. immigration judge in San Diego has agreed to grant asylum to the son of a Hamas founder who spied for Israel and converted to Christianity.

The deportation hearing Wednesday for 32-year-old Mosab Hassan Yousef lasted only 15 minutes. The judge ruled that Yousef can stay in the U.S. after he passes a routine background check.

The government denied his request for asylum in February 2009, ruling that he posed a terrorist threat. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security dropped its objections to asylum, but the government's attorney Kerri Calcador gave no explanation for the change of heart.

Faith McDonnell is director of religious liberty at the Institute on Religion & Democracy, which was one of the first organizations to go to bat for Yousef. McDonnell believes the government realized it would be bad PR to deport Yousef. . . . - Chad Groening, *OneNewsNow.com*, 6/30/10

OBAMA EXPLOITING OIL SPILL

The Obama administration is being accused of politicizing the oil spill crisis as the White House has issued another moratorium

against deep-water drilling in the Gulf.

Early next week, a federal appeals court will rule on the attempt to reinstate a six-month standstill on deep-water oil drilling after a federal judge blocked the Obama administration's first bid last month

Ben Lieberman, senior policy analyst for energy and environment at *The Heritage Foundation*, thinks Obama's moratorium politicizes the oil spill crisis. "This attempted moratorium is an opportunity, at least in his view, to exploit the spill and turn it into a real...ban on domestic offshore energy production," Lieberman contends

Critics say the freeze could crush the entire U.S. economy and cause the nation to be more dependent on foreign oil. Chris John, president of the Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, points out that while care needs to be given to environmental concerns, the ban could be crippling to states like Louisiana that are financially dependent on the oil industry.

"Oil and gas [have] got to be a major mix in providing energy for this country, along with alternative sources of fuel, which has to be a part of the portfolio," he comments. "In fact, we are going to need, as someone said, every drop and every DTU [Dry Tree Unit] of energy that we can find to fuel our growing economy."

Obama's moratorium has already forced at least one oil company to stop its work. But Diamond Offshore Drilling is leaving the Gulf of Mexico and is heading to Egypt to continue its work. - Russ Jones, *OneNewsNow.com*, 7/16/10

NEA CELEBRATES 'DRAG QUEEN' TEACHERS

The National Education Association (NEA) continues to alien-

ate more and more of its conservative constituents as the organization showed its liberal leanings at its 2010 national convention.

At this year's meeting in New Orleans, the largest professional organization and labor union in the U.S. recognized a new caucus: the NEA Drag Queen Caucus.

"They already have had the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, [and] Transgender Caucus and apparently felt that the drag queens needed their own caucus," explains Finn Laursen, executive director of Christian Educators Association International (CEAI).

America, I think, needs to respond and to realize what the National Education Association stands for; they're not hiding it. It's appalling to many of our conservative Christian educators who, in their own lives, could not support this kind of thing but find that their dues are being used to support just those kinds of thing," he adds

Laursen also tells OneNewsNow there was a movement this year to see the NEA's pro-abortion stance changed to a more neutral position, but that effort failed. "The organization and its delegates were just unwilling to step back and take no position on abortion," he laments. "They're going to continue their pro-abortion stance." - Bill Bumpas, *OneNewsNow.com*, 7/15/10

I feel like apologizing for all the politics in some of these issues. But frankly, this Administration has stuck its nose in every part of our lives and it appears will destroy the America we love if possible. We must pray and trust God! - N.P.



Christian
View of the News

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

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