

Chapter 25

DOES SLANDER MATTER?

Yes, It Assassinates Free Speech

Most Christians are not aware of the extreme dangers they face in the year 2008. Except God grant us a miracle (which would be no problem for God)—and we had better be praying that He does—, a humanist is certain to be our next president. Tom DeLay, majority leader in the House of Representatives from 1995 to 2005, explains why this is so:

"When Bush came to power, the Clintonistas didn't just skip town looking for work," said Mr DeLay, who remains an influential and popular figure with the party's Right-wing faithful. "They stayed in Washington and formed dozens of political groups to push their liberal agenda and built the most impressive political coalition I've ever witnessed.

"This is the network that beat conservatives in 2006, and that was just the warm-up."

He is scathing about the lack of unity and leadership in the conservative movement and holds out little prospects that the Republicans can hold on to the White House, despite the creation of his new grouping.

"The Republican party is in total disarray, it's demoralised and it's trying to find itself," he said.

"None of the leading Republican candidates have really caught on, and if the Republicans don't get their act together soon, it will be too late. In the polls, the party's frontrunner is Undecided. And at the moment, Undecided gets my endorsement.

"By contrast, the Democrats are the most united of any party I've seen in years. Hillary Clinton is clearly favourite to win this election."¹

If a humanist is elected president in 2008, every moral person in the USA will be in danger of going to prison for "hate speech" or for breaking some other humanist designed and enacted law specifically designed to shut up people who oppose humanist religious teachings. What humanists mean by "hate speech" is any "speech" which advocates something humanists "hate." Preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ is hate speech to humanists because Christ taught that only those who believe in Him will go to Heaven. In fact, if you use the Bible in your church at all you are guilty of promoting hate crimes as far as humanists are concerned, because the Bible says, "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them" (Lev. 20:13). What does that verse mean? It means that sodomy is a very major crime and should be punished by death. Let no one misunderstand: it is *not* the responsibility of individuals or churches to execute homosexuals. But civil governments *do* bear this responsibility. This is not what Christians have decided; that is what God decided. In the eyes of humanists this verse makes the Bible a hate book and makes Bible preachers promoters of hate crimes—because, say humanists, quoting that verse encourages people to bash gays. The fact that many gays (sodomites) are actually very violent individuals who themselves bash people is ignored by humanists. Several years ago in Oklahoma City an out of town man accidentally went into a gay bar. When the man refused their sexual advances, two sodomites followed the man back to his hotel and into his hotel room, and beat him so badly that his blood splattered onto the walls and ceiling. A guard at the hotel in frantically phoning 911 to ask for police assistance, called the two sodomites "fags." For this he was publicly rebuked for using "hate speech"! But no rebuke was given to the two sodomites who had almost beaten a man to death. I listened to this live over the radio as it happened.

To the members of the church in Wichita, Kansas which pickets the funerals of fallen soldiers saying their deaths are the judgement of God upon America for allowing homosexuality: most soldiers and their families

¹ Philip Sherwell, "Tom DeLay Targets US Liberals in Media War," *Telegraph.co.Uk*, 2004 November 2007, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/11/04/wdelay104.xml>.

are opposed to homosexuality. So, picketing them is stupid. You may as well picket the funerals of members of your own church. Why picket those who agree with you? That is dumb. In fact, it is dumb to picket anybody's funeral; that is disrespectful, and makes Christianity look bad. You are playing right into the hands of the humanists, who are trying to make Christianity appear to be a hate religion. You are accomplishing the exact opposite of what you intend. Hopefully, people will notice that your church is the only one in the whole USA doing this.

Just to set the record straight, Bible-believing Christians do not hate sodomites, but pray that they find salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ. We invite them into the membership of our churches, requiring only that they meet the qualifications universally required of everyone, which are: (1) that they first repent of their sins (including the sin of sodomy), accepting Jesus Christ as their personal Lord and Savior; and (2) that they then submit themselves to believer's baptism. Some of the members of the church at Corinth had formerly been sodomites, as the Apostle Paul plainly stated in 1 Cor. 6:9-11:

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, **nor abusers of themselves with mankind**², nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. **And such were some of you:** but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

Sodomy is a sin like all other sins. People are born sodomites only in the same sense that people are born rapists, or murderers or robbers. That is, all men are born with a depraved nature, but must control it. It is not hate to say that rape, murder, robbery or sodomy are self-destructive sins. Many sodomites have been freed from the sin and bondage of sodomy by Christ, and now live straight clean lives. To deliver that good news to people enslaved to sodomy is love speech, not hate speech.

Humanists constantly claim to be defenders of free speech. They usually say this when they are defending someone's "right" to use profane and vulgar words, or to produce pornography, or to be disrespectful to conservative government officials, or to defend traitors' rights to promote communism or fascism. But in actions they consistently deny free speech to all who disagree with them. They work to silence their critics in whatever way is necessary.

The Fairness Doctrine

Since regaining control of the House and the Senate in 2006, the humanist Democrat Party has been openly working to restore the deceptively named "Fairness Doctrine." Fox News reports that

Ohio Rep. Dennis Kucinich, who is seeking the Democratic nomination for president in 2008, chairs the House Domestic Policy Subcommittee and plans to revisit the Fairness Doctrine. He said in January that the Fairness Doctrine "derived from the public interest, and that is that there should be an uninhibited marketplace of ideas. That's what the First Amendment is all about."

Rep. Maurice D. Hinchey, D-N.Y., plans to reintroduce his Media Ownership Reform Act (MORA). That bill, introduced in the last Congress, called for the restoration of the Fairness Doctrine and called for broadcast news outlets to investigate issues thoroughly and present their findings in an unbiased way.³

There is nothing fair about the Fairness Doctrine; it is what kept conservatives from having a public voice for decades while Democrats controlled all three branches of the government before Ronald Reagan was president. Why is the Fairness Doctrine not fair?

² The greek word translated "abusers of themselves with mankind" is "arsenokoitai" which Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible defines as, "one who lies with male as with female, sodomite, homosexual."

³ Liza Porteus, "Inhofe Says Boxer, Hillary Clinton Discussed Reining in Conservative Talk Radio Three Years Ago," *FoxNews.Com*, 1926 June 2007, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,285933,00.html>.

*The Fairness Doctrine is Not Fair Because Humanists Control
Almost Every Newspaper and Television News Channel in the USA*

Except for a few exceptions such as the Daily Oklahoman newspaper in Oklahoma City, humanists control every newspaper in the USA. Except for Fox News, humanists control all of the television news networks, and are totally biased in favor of liberalism/humanism. These liberal/humanist news media churn out a daily mega dose of humanist lies and propaganda with no balance whatsoever. The **only place** where conservatives dominate is the in the free market places of talk radio and the Internet. The humanists have multiplied thousands of web sites, but almost no one reads them unless they are doing a search—in which case they really get fed a bill of goods. Instead, most people read the Drudge Report (www.drudgereport.com). Why? Because they trust Matt Drudge to deliver unbiased news, and they know that the liberals/humanists deliver mostly lies and propaganda. “In the spring of 2007, of the 257 news/talk stations owned by the top five commercial station owners, 91 percent of the total weekday talk radio programming was conservative, and only 9 percent was progressive.”⁴ Liberals are ashamed to admit they are liberals, so they call themselves instead “progressives.” A skunk by another name smells the same.

Talk radio is already totally fair. There are no laws that say liberals/humanists cannot start talk radio shows. In fact, they start them all the time, but fail. What prevents humanists from succeeding is their hateful, lying message to which few people want to listen. Liberals/humanists have repeatedly started their own talk shows, but in virtually every case they end up going bankrupt for a lack of listeners. Almost nobody wants to listen to the liberal/humanist glum and doom, hate-and-divide-America message.

To start television news channels takes multiplied millions of dollars, and even if the money is available there are numerous government regulations that make it close to impossible. So the present humanist monopoly of TV news is secure. Do the humanist Democrats plan for the Fairness Doctrine to apply to television stations? Of course not. If television news was made fair, humanists/liberals would immediately lose much of their influence.

*The Fairness Doctrine Is Not Fair Because
It Makes Talk Radio Unprofitable, Thereby Killing It*

The lyingly named Fairness Doctrine was designed to destroy the free market as it applies to talk radio.

The doctrine had two rules that remained in practice until 2000 — the "personal attack" rule and the "political editorial" rule. The "personal attack" stipulated that when a person or small group was subject to a character attack during a broadcast, stations had to notify them within a week, send them transcripts, and give them an opportunity to respond on air. The "political editorial" rule stipulated that when a station broadcast editorials endorsing or opposing candidates for public office, the candidates who were not endorsed must be notified and allowed an opportunity to respond.

These two rules destroy talk radio because they make it unprofitable. Each radio station ends up having to provide free time for response from liberals/humanists to whom virtually no one wants to listen. Therefore, radio stations end up taking a loss. And they are able to withstand only so much loss until they are no longer able to afford talk radio hosts. It is like telling WalMart that they can't sell only products that people want to buy, but must also make available products that almost no one wants. That would destroy WalMart. So, applying the deceptively named Fairness Doctrine to talk radio would destroy talk radio, thus silencing Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Michel Savage, and all other conservative talk show hosts who are exposing the humanist/liberal lies. Liberals/humanists don't want to restore fairness, they want to completely destroy fairness.

⁴ Ibid.

Old-Style, Relentless, Vicious, Low-Tech Slander

In a previous chapter we saw how communists and humanists drove Senator Joseph McCarthy into an early grave, using relentless, vicious slander. Since that time, they have constantly refined this method of attack into a science.

The Character Assassination of Robert Bork

Robert Bork, considered by many the most highly qualified judge in the United States at the time, was nominated to the Supreme Court by President Ronald Reagan on July 1, 1987. Less than an hour later, liberal, humanist, pro-baby-murder, Democrat, Senator Ted Kennedy⁵ began the slander of Robert Bork in a nationally televised speech from the Senate floor, saying,

Robert Bork's America is a land in which women would be forced into back-alley abortions, blacks would sit at segregated lunch counters, rogue police could break down citizens' doors in midnight raids, schoolchildren could not be taught about evolution, writers and artists could be censored at the whim of government.⁶

Immediately humanists nationwide began publish articles attacking Bork as an “extremist”—a man whose ideas were absolutely wicked. TV ads condemned Bork as a dangerous “extremist.” Liberal/humanist news anchors (there were no conservative news anchors then) warned of how Bork would destroy freedom in America. So rapid, and well organized, vicious, and relentless was the slander that President Reagan and conservatives everywhere were stunned. Did the liberal, humanist, Democrats give any facts to prove any of these charges? No, the charges were baseless. But by the time conservatives finally recovered from their shock and began to answer the charges it was too late. Their delay made it look like Bork was actually guilty of the charges, and the Senate voted not to confirm him.

This wicked and horrendous attack against Bork's character was led by two of the American Humanist Associations best known fronts: the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)⁷ and National Organization for Women (NOW).⁸ To this day, humanists continue to slander Robert Bork at every opportunity.

The Character Assassination of Clarence Thomas

Clarence Thomas was nominated to the Supreme Court by President George H.W. Bush on July 2, 1991. Because they suspected that Thomas, a black American, was anti-abortion and against affirmative action and generally conservative in his views, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), NOW, and the ACLU—all Humanist front organizations—immediately put into action a plan to

⁵ This is the same Ted Kennedy who was expelled from Harvard during his sophomore year for cheating on a Spanish test; who, on Friday 18, 1969, while his wife was at home pregnant, attended a wild party composed of 6 married men and 6 single women on Chappaquiddick island, Mass.; who after consuming at least 2 Heineken beers and 6 rum and cokes was driving with an expired driver's license while taking one of those single women somewhere to do something in the dark of that night; who that evening drove his car off a bridge into a channel, then leaving that young woman in the car to drown, fled the scene of the accident, failing to report the accident to the police for 10 hours. “On August 13, based on a tip from a telephone company employee, The Manchester Union Leader reported that Senator Kennedy had charged 17 long distance telephone calls to his credit card during the hours he claimed to be ‘in shock’ after the accident.” “John Farrar, the rescue diver who examined the Chappaquiddick accident scene, was convinced that Mary Jo Kopechne had not only survived the crash, but had also lived for some time by breathing a pocket of trapped air. Farrar did not believe that she had drowned, but instead had died by asphyxiation as the oxygen in the air she was breathing was used up and replaced with carbon dioxide. “She was alive, easily an hour, maybe two,” he said. If that be so, she would have lived if only the accident had been reported. Said George Killen, State Police Detective-Lieutenant, “Senator Kennedy killed that girl the same as if he put a gun to her head and pulled the trigger.” (<http://www.ytedk.com/>)

⁶ “Robert Bork,” *Wikipedia*, 1929 October 2007, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Bork.

⁷ Linda Greenhouse, “A.C.L.U., Reversing Policy, Joins the Opposition to Bork,” *The New York Times*, 2001 September 1987, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9B0DE0DE1E3CF932A3575AC0A961948260>.

⁸ “In Memoriam: Molly Yard—Honoring an Indomitable NOW President and Civil Rights Pioneer,” *NOW.Org*, 1921 September 2005, <http://www.now.org/press/09-05/09-21.html>.

block his confirmation. Promised Florence Kennedy at a NOW conference in New York City, “We’re going to ‘bork’ him.” By this she obviously meant that they were going to slander him to try to prevent his confirmation—and they did. A woman named Anita Hill, a liberal, humanist Democrat who had formerly worked under Thomas’ supervision at the U.S. Department of Education and then followed him to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, accused him of making sexually provocative statements to her at both places of employment. Without checking to see if the accusations were true, someone on the confirmation committee leaked the the allegations to Nina Totenberg who was legal correspondant for National Public Radio. Was she a Republican? No, of course not. She was a liberal, humanist Democrat. She was at the time married to former Democrat senator from Colorado, liberal, humanist Floyd Kirk Haskell.⁹ She immediately—and no doubt gleefully—made the allegations public. Now world-wide attention was drawn to the confirmation hearing as Anita Hill was called to testify. Shamelessly using the most sexually explicit and vulgar language to a world-wide audience she knew included a multitude of children, Hill actually said the words she was merely accusing Thomas of saying—words too vulgar to repeat. And in so doing Hill sexually harressed thousands and thousands of children. And we have absolute proof that she said them, as she said them publicly with full media coverage. But she gave not one shred of proof that Thomas actually said those words of which she was accusing him. Indeed, she admitted she couldn’t prove her allegations, saying, “These incidents took place in his office or mine. They were in the form of private conversations which would not have been overheard by anyone else.”¹⁰ True! Something that was never said would not have been overheard by anyone else! This was character assassination at its dirtiest, with its only purpose being to prevent a conservative from becoming a Supreme Court justice. Most people saw through Hill, and Thomas was confirmed to sit on the Supreme Court. But great damage had been done to Thomas’ reputation. He told the confirmation committee:

I think that this today is a travesty. I think that it is disgusting. I think that this hearing should never occur in America. This is a case in which this sleaze, this dirt was searched for by staffers of members of this committee, was then leaked to the media, and this committee and this body validated it and displayed it at prime time over our entire nation. How would any member on this committee, any person in this room, or any person in this country would like sleaze said about him or her in this fashion? Or this dirt dredged up and this gossip and these lies displayed in this manner, how would any person like it? The Supreme Court is not worth it. No job is worth it. I am not here for that. I am here for my name, my family, my life, and my integrity. I think something is dreadfully wrong with this country when any person, any person in this free country would be subjected to this. This is not a closed room. There was an FBI investigation. This is not an opportunity to talk about difficult matters privately or in a closed environment. This is a circus. It’s a national disgrace. And from my standpoint, as a black American, it is a high-tech lynching for uppity blacks who in any way deign to think for themselves, to do for themselves, to have different ideas, and it is a message that unless you kowtow to an old order, this is what will happen to you. You will be lynched, destroyed, caricatured by a committee of the U.S. Senate rather than hung from a tree.¹¹

Many of these very same liberal, Democrat, humanist congressmen and news reporter character assassins would later defend President Bill Clinton when he was caught in adultery with Monica Lewinsky. Clinton was not just *accused* of dirty talk. He was *actually guilty* of adultery. There was a seaman stained dress to prove it. He was also guilty of lying about it under oath—perjury. Yet humanists defended him as a righteous man, saying that what a person does in private is no one else’s business. Humanists defend criminals as though they can do no wrong, yet attempt to make even the most righteous good that conservatives do look evil. They are masters of deceit, expert character assassins, professional slanderers. To this very day, humanists continue to slander Clarence Thomas at every opportunity. They do this to try to bully him into helping their pro-baby-murder agenda. And they do this to make other people fear to oppose them.

⁹ Floyd Haskell was a member of Common Cause, an anti-war organization. At least three members of Common Cause were also members of the American Civil Liberties Union: Winston Perry Bullard, Milton Robert Carr, and Unitarian Fortney Doug Ross. (<http://politicalgraveyard.com/group/common-cause.html>)

¹⁰ Anita F. Hill, “Testimony of Anita F. Hill, Professor of Law, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK,” *Gpoaccess.Gov*, 1911 October 1991, <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/senate/judiciary/sh102-1084pt4/36-40.pdf>.

¹¹ “Clarence Thomas,” *Wikipedia*, 1930 October 2007, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clarence_Thomas.

New-Style, Relentless, Vicious, High-Tech Slander

As the public school system converts more and more of our children into humanists, the Humanist movement gets stronger and stronger. And the stronger the Humanist movement gets, the more aggressive and vicious they become. We are now in the high technology age, and the Internet has enabled Humanists to become much more highly organized, and to act much faster against their critics. They have put up multiplied thousands of web sites to promote their atheist religion, and to enable them to communicate more easily with each other, and to slander those who expose them. Several of the most effective, and therefore most dangerous, of the new high tech organizations they have started to refute and defeat Christianity are:

Daily Kos and Yearly Kos

Daily Kos (often referred to as DailyKos or DailyKos.com) is a radical humanist web site founded by Markos Moulitsas Zuniga. The British on-line newspaper Telegraph.co.uk lists Zuniga as the 12th most influential liberal in the U.S.A. They describe him as follows:

Founder and chief author of the website Daily Kos, which receives 20 million unique visitors per month. A former US Army artilleryman and consultant for Howard Dean, Moulitsas, 36, described his job as “the sweetest gig in the world”. It is also one of the most influential in US politics – **contributors have included Nancy Pelosi, Ted Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, John Kerry, Harry Reid and Cindy Sheehan.**

Co-author with Jerome Armstrong (Number 62) of *Crashing the Gate: Netroots, Grassroots, and the Rise of People-Powered Politics*, a definitive examination of the internet’s role in transforming politics. ***This year’s Yearly Kos convention attracted all the main Democratic candidates*** and Hillary Clinton got a rough ride. ***Kos’s status as a liberal powerhouse pushing the Democrats towards the Left*** has been underlined by attacks on it from the likes of Fox’s Bill O’Reilly. [Emphasis added.]

The bloggers of DailyKos organize a yearly convention (mentioned in the above quote) where humanists plan out or finalize strategy. While speaking to the Yearly Kos convention in Chicago on August 4, 2007, Senator Hillary Clinton bragged,

We are certainly better prepared and more focused on, you know, taking our arguments, and making them effective, and disseminating them widely, and really putting together a network, uh, in the blogosphere, in a lot of the new progressive infrastructure, ***institutions that I helped to start and support like Media Matters and Center for American Progress.***¹² [Emphasis added.]

These two institutions Hillary “helped to start and support” need to be closely examined and remembered.

Media Matters For America

This organization would be more truthfully named Slander Matters for America. Says the Media Matters web site about itself:

Media Matters for America is a Web-based, not-for-profit, 501(c)(3) progressive research and information center dedicated to comprehensively monitoring, analyzing, and correcting conservative misinformation in the U.S. media.

Launched in May 2004, Media Matters for America put in place, for the first time, the means to systematically monitor a cross section of print, broadcast, cable, radio, and Internet media outlets for conservative misinformation — news or commentary that is not accurate, reliable, or credible and that forwards the conservative agenda — every day, in real time.

Using the website www.mediamatters.org as the principal vehicle for disseminating research and information, Media Matters posts rapid-response items as well as longer research and analytic reports documenting conservative misinformation throughout the media. Additionally, Media Matters works daily to notify activists, journalists, pundits, and the general public about instances of misinformation, providing them with the resources to rebut false claims and to take direct action against offending media institutions.¹³

So, clearly, Media Matters is not a non-partisan organization, but is by its own admission an anti-

¹² Neal Sheppard, “Hillary Clinton Told YearlyKos Convention She Helped Start Media Matters,” *NewsBusters*, 2001 October 2007, <http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/noel-sheppard/2007/10/01/hillary-clinton-told-yearlykos-convention-she-helped-start-media-matt>.

¹³ http://mediamatters.org/about_us/

conservative organization whose purpose is to immediately rebut and discredit anyone who exposes humanists as the liars and traitors that they are, thereby helping Hillary Clinton in her quest to become the next president of the United States. Their purpose is to refute “conservative” information as “misinformation.” Obviously, they do not expose “liberal misinformation” as that would require exposing themselves as liars and deceivers.

But the ultimate goal of Media Matters is not just to discredit but to silence opposing viewpoints. In spite of their loud claims to the contrary, humanists hate freedom of speech, and work relentlessly to stomp it out. Here is another quote from the Media Matters web site:

Contact advertisers. ***If a news outlet has a habit of presenting conservative misinformation, contact companies that financially support or advertise on it and request they withdraw their support.*** Identify the companies whose advertisements appear most often, or visit the news outlet's website to determine who provides financial support.¹⁴

That is a very clear statement of intent. Whatever conservatives say is automatically considered misinformation whether it is true or not. Media Matters wants to cut off all funding so as to silence the critics of their godless religion.

Center for American Progress

Center for American Progress is the Hillary Clinton administration working zealously to undermine conservative critics in preparation to take over the white house. Telegraph.co.uk lists John Podesta, president of Center for American Progress, as the 11th most influential liberal in America. They describe him and Center for American Progress as follows:

Bill Clinton's former chief of staff remains a pivotal player in the Democratic party. Head of the Centre for American Progress, funded by George Soros, A fanatical X-Files aficionado, he has not publicly endorsed Hillary Clinton's presidential bid but ***his think tank is packed with former Clinton staffers itching to return to the White House in a Hillary Clinton administration.***

Battle tested in the trenches of the Clinton-Gingrich wars of the 1990s and a vehement defender of Bill Clinton during the Lewinsky scandal, he is likely to play a major role in any Democratic administration. ***Released a report detailing how Right-wingers dominate talk radio and calling for restrictive legislation*** – making him a target of derision from conservatives. If a Democrat wins, his think tank could enjoy the same influence that AEI and Heritage Foundation enjoyed in the Bush years. [Emphasis added.]

Center for American Progress and many other humanist organizations are funded by George Soros. Telegraph.co.uk lists him as the 15th most influential liberal in the U.S.A., and says,

Soros, 78, has given millions from his \$11 billion fortune to Democratic-supporting organisations, such as MoveOn.org, the Centre for American Progress and America Coming Together, leading the Republican party to claim he has “purchased the Democratic party”. Certain to be a source of controversy – and hard cash exceeding the \$15.5 million he spent last time – once again in the 2008 campaign.

MoveOn.org

Telegraph.co.uk describes MoveOn.org as a “liberal pressure group” that supports “democratic political candidates with tens of millions of dollars in advertising and thousands of hours of telephone canvassing and knocking on doors.” It was founded by millionaire Wes Boyd and his wife Joan Blades. Telegraph.co.uk lists them as the 20th most influential liberals in the U.S.A.

The December 10, 2004 issue of FrontPageMag.com reported that

In a December 9th e-mail signed by “Eli Pariser, Justin Ruben, and the whole MoveOn PAC team,” the Soros front group stated: “In the last year, grassroots contributors like us gave more than \$300 million to the Kerry campaign and the DNC, and proved that the Party doesn't need corporate cash to be competitive. ***Now it's our Party: we bought it, we own it, and we're going to take it back.***”¹⁵ [Emphasis added.]

¹⁴ “What You Can Do,” *MediaMatters.Org*, 1922 August 2007, <http://mediamatters.org/items/200508220010>.

¹⁵ Ben Johnson, “MoveOn: ‘We Bought’ the Democratic Party,” *FrontPageMag.Com*, 1910 December 2004, <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Read.aspx?GUID={89BC7BB2-298F-4B8D-99DF-A9EA273A0559}>.

On September 10, 2007, in an effort to refute what they believed would be a report from General David H. Petraeus, the commander of our troops in Iraq, that the war against terrorism in Iraq was succeeding, MoveOn.org placed a full-page ad in the New York Times calling him "General Betray Us," and accusing him of "cooking the books for the White House." They placed this ad before he delivered his report, thus criticizing his report before they even know what it said. This ad caused a very negative backlash against MoveOn.org from the American public, which the Democrats in congress could not ignore.

On September 20, 2007, Republican Senator John Cornyn III of Texas introduced a resolution to "strongly condemn personal attacks on the honor and integrity of General Petraeus."

The goal was to put Democrats in a corner, forcing them to risk angering anti-war voters OR face potential political fallout for NOT condemning an attack on a respected military leader.

Democrats countered with a proposed resolution of their own, condemning the MoveOn ad, but also those run in the past by conservative groups attacking the patriotism of Democrats, including 2004 Presidential nominee John Kerry.

"They're all disgraceful ads and we ought to treat them the same way," said Sen. Carl Levin, a Democrat from Michigan. "They impugn the honor, integrity and patriotism of real patriots."

The Democrats' resolution failed. The one proposed by Republicans passed 72-25. ***Of the Democrats running for president, sens. Hillary Clinton of New York and Christopher Dodd of Connecticut voted against the resolution.*** Sens. Barack Obama of Illinois and Joseph Biden of Delaware did not vote.¹⁶

The resolution passed with all 49 Republican senators and 22 Democrat senators supporting, and a similar bill passed the House by a vote of 341 to 79. Tim Harper of thestar.com said,

The "General Betray Us" controversy has also peeled back the curtain on MoveOn, which boasts a huge array of firepower for a cyber-organization that has only 17 employees, no central office and is being run by a guy who is still in his 20s... Today, it is run out of New York by Eli Pariser, a 26-year-old precocious child of 1960s activists who moved from anti-globalization rallies to more pragmatic political fundraising and partisan battle.

This is an example of how humanists portray themselves as being far more numerous than they actually are, and far more credible than they possibly could be. Nevertheless,

MoveOn.org is continuing to push the theme of betrayal. It expanded its ad campaign with TV spots targeting President Bush specifically, and other Republican leaders, including presidential candidate Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York.¹⁷

It has one television ad in heavy rotation attacking the Bush "betrayal of trust" with last week's troop reduction announcement and going after Giuliani as "a big fan of George Bush's war" who didn't bother showing up for work as a member of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group created to give Bush a way ahead on the war.¹⁸

Actually, such attacks on President Bush is nothing new for MoveOn.org.

During the 2004 campaign, MoveOn... had to withdraw one ad that compared Bush to Hitler.¹⁹

The backlash to the General Betray Us ad exposed the Democrats as unpatriotic, and dealt them a stinging defeat. For this they wanted revenge badly. Thus, only seven days later, overconfident in their ability to make slander look true, they attempted to get that revenge by destroying Rush Limbaugh.

¹⁶ Don Gonyea, "Anger Over 'Betray Us' Ad Simmers on Hill," *National Public Radio*, 1922 September 2007, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=14623512>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Tim Harper, "Putting the Moves on MoveOn.Org," *Thestar.Com*, 1923 September 2007, <http://www.thestar.com/article/259511>.

¹⁹ Ibid.

Recent Victims of Humanist Slander

America is in the midst of a civil war, and sadly it is no longer just a war of words and ideas. Humanists want their atheist religion to reign over every aspect of life, and are willing to use force if necessary to make it happen. One by one they are taking us down, like mad wolves take down a buffalo.

The Character Assassination of Rush Limbaugh

Humanists especially hate Rush Limbaugh because he is very talented in exposing their lies and hypocrisy, and because he has a very large audience.

On Thursday September 27, 2007, Hillary Clinton's Media Matters for America falsely claimed on its web site that "during the September 26 broadcast of Rush Limbaugh's nationally syndicated radio show, he called service members who advocate U.S. withdrawal from Iraq "phony soldiers."²⁰



Harry "Wave-the-White-Flag" Reid

On Monday October 1, 2007, acting upon the Media Matters report, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) asked all senators to sign an intimidating letter he and other Democrat senators had co-written to Clear Channel Communications CEO Mark Mays demanding that he repudiate Rush Limbaugh for allegedly calling U.S. troops opposed to the war in Iraq "phony soldiers." Said Reid, "I ask my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to join together against this irresponsible, hateful, and unpatriotic attack by calling upon Rush Limbaugh to give our troops the apology they deserve."²¹ Reid issued this accusation from the senate, knowing that slander issued from the senate is immune from prosecution. Forty-one Democrat senators signed the letter, and sent it to Mays. But were the accusations true? No, the context of Limbaugh's reveals that they were just lies. The phony soldiers Rush had referred to were actually phony soldiers—men claiming to be soldiers

when in truth they weren't, but which humanist news reporters had been dishonestly quoting as being actual soldiers. This context was not hard for Limbaugh to prove. As one lady commented concerning Senator Reid:

What an idiot - how did Reid get his job? Limbaugh has had the full audio and transcript of all this on his website since last week - available for anyone to see. None of what Reid says is even remotely close to what was said. Reid is either illiterate or a liar.²²

Limbaugh responded to Senator Reid, "If anybody in this country has been trying to demoralize the troops, it is you, sir, and your members of the Democrat Party. You have waved the white flag of defeat."


When Mays received the letter, he gave it to Limbaugh who promptly put it up for auction on Ebay, promising his 20 million listeners that he would match every dollar of the final bid with a dollar of his own to be given to the Marine Corps-Law Enforcement Foundation to help with its charitable work with the

²⁰ A.J. Walzer, "Limbaugh: Service Members Who Support U.S. Withdrawal Are 'phony Soldiers'," *MEDIA MATTERS for America*, 1927 September 2007, [Http://mediamatters.org/items/200709270010?f=h_top](http://mediamatters.org/items/200709270010?f=h_top).

²¹ Mark Silva, "Senate Leader Demands Apology of Rush Limbaugh," *Baltimoresun.Com*, 2001 October 2007, [Http://weblogs.baltimoresun.com/news/politics/blog/2007/10/senate_leader_demands_apology.html](http://weblogs.baltimoresun.com/news/politics/blog/2007/10/senate_leader_demands_apology.html).

²² Ibid.

children of fallen Marines. Limbaugh also challenged the Democrat senators that signed the letter to match it with a dollar of their own. Amazingly, the top bid for the letter was \$2,100,000.00! Matching with his own funds as promised, Limbaugh sent a 4.2 million dollar check to help the children of fallen marines! Even more amazingly, shortly before bidding ceased, Senator Reid attempted to take credit for raising the money! From the senate floor he said,



Harry "I'm-Gonna-Make-Sure-We-Lose" Reid

More than \$2 million, this is going to really help. And that's, again, an understatement. There's only a little bit of time left. -- so I would ask those that are wanting to do more, that they can go to the Harry Reid, search -- actually go on say "Harry Reid letter," this will come up on eBay. I encourage anyone interested in this with the means to do so to consider bidding on this letter and contributing to this worthwhile cause. I strongly believe that when we can put our differences aside, even Harry Reid and Rush Limbaugh, we should do that and try to accomplish good things for the American people.

Limbaugh responded:

Senator Reid, let me be clear about this one more time -- actually, as many times as it takes. It wasn't your letter that raised this money. It was your abuse of power that is responsible for raising this money. No other letter you have written would be... People wouldn't pay a dime for it, Senator! This one represents an abuse of power: a federal government official, a US senator, getting hold -- after besmirching me and smearing me by name personally from the Senate floor, gets hold -- of the CEO of my syndication partner and asks him to "confer" with me about something Senator Reid thought was said that was improper? Words? First Amendment? Free speech? That, sir, is an abuse of power. That is why your letter is historic, not because you signed it, not because 40 other people signed it, not because you wrote it. It is because of what that letter represents: a full-fledged, undeniable, 100% abuse of power, and that's how this letter will be remembered by historians forever... The 41 Democrats who signed the letter wanted Mark Mays, CEO of Clear Channel, my

syndication partner, to "confer" with me about what I had said. When you run a business that's federally regulated, and the Senate majority leader tells you that he wants you to confer with me, what he means is, "You get him to stop criticizing us! You get him to apologize. You make him." There's an implied "or else," when the Senate majority leader calls a CEO of a broadcast company and says those things. That's the abuse of power. That is the arrogant abuse of power and an attempt to essentially negate what I do, and to render me unable to do it.

Um, put our differences aside? Okay. Where is the apology for calling me "unpatriotic"? Where's the apology for repeating a smear and a bunch of lies from Media Matters for America?²³

In spite of Reid encouraging people to bid on the letter, apparently not one of the Democrats that signed the slanderous letter, including Reid, gave even a cent to the Marine Corps-Law Enforcement Foundation. As usual, Reid's talk was just empty humanist hypocrisy.

The Character Assassination of Our Troops

Is anyone still not convinced that liberal, humanist, Democrat leaders are hypocrites? "I Support the Troops" is the title of an article by A. Whitney Brown²⁴ on the Democrats favorite blog site, the Daily Kos. Here is what the article says:

... what I mean when I say I support our troops is that I actually pay for their food, their ammo, their upkeep, transport, everything. I pay for all of it.

And I do that not only because I'm a patriotic American, although I am, but also because they take 35% out of my check every week and if I don't pay it I will end up in jail.

²³ "Senator Reid: You Win, Rush," *Rushlimbaugh.Com*, 1919 October 2007, [Http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/daily/site_101907/content/01125109.guest.html](http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/daily/site_101907/content/01125109.guest.html).

²⁴ A comment made to this article indicates that AWhitney Brown may be a pen name.

That is what I mean by 'I support our troops'. I mean I am involuntarily, under threat of prison, forced to pay for their support. . . .

So yes, I resent my support for the killing of Iraqis for which I get not even a memento or trophy. But do I still support the individual men and women who have given so much to serve their country?

No. I think they're a bunch of idiots. I also think they're morally retarded. Because they sign a contract that says they will kill whoever you tell me to kill. And that is morally retarded.

Friends, the most important moral decision a man makes in the course of a day is "Who am I going to kill today?"

That's a decision you should agonize over, dream about, rehearse in your mind for hours, not just leave up to some hare-brained President you didn't even vote for.

A man's killing list is a very personal matter. It should be between him and those persistent voices in his head.

So to sum up, I don't like our troops, I don't like what they're doing, I don't like their fat, whining families, and yet, I support them. Thank God I live in a free country. Thank You.²⁵

Just to make sure his position was clear, Brown added in the comment section after his article: "And yes, I'm anti-military." And thank you, Mr. Brown, for explaining to us so clearly what our Democrat senators actually mean when they say they support our troops!

Do liberal, humanist, Democrats believe in free speech or are they working with mad rage to stomp it out? Failing in their attempt to intimidate Mark Mays, Hillary Clinton's Media Matters put up a web page to make it easy for humanists to intimidate the individual radio stations carrying Limbaugh's broadcasts. The web page is titled, "Contact Your Local Rush Limbaugh Radio Station Today," which, after condemning Limbaugh in no uncertain terms, says, "It's time to take action. Use this online directory of Limbaugh's radio affiliates -- contact your local station directly and let them know what you think of his despicable comments."²⁶ A drop down menu then lists links for all the states, which in a few clicks gives the name, title, e-mail address, phone number, and fax number of each station manager they want to be intimidated. Underneath this is a paragraph that says, "When contacting the media, please be polite and professional. Express your specific concerns regarding that particular news report or commentary, and be sure to indicate exactly what you would like the media outlet to do differently in the future."²⁷

And, of course, what possibly can these radio station managers do differently except not run Limbaugh's broadcasts? Humanists hate free speech because their ideas cannot hold up under the light of the truth.

The Character Assassination of Ann Coulter

Doing a Google search on "Ann Coulter" finds 1,570,000 web pages (as of November 1, 2007)! Most of them are on humanist web sites and condemn her. Of these, most are almost identical in content. Could that be because their owners all answer to the same leader? Could it be that just a few people own those multitude of web sites, and use them for propaganda purposes? Very likely. Many of the web pages are just a list of out-of-context quotes from Coulter in a not so subtle attempt to discredit her. Generally these web pages enable readers to leave comments without identifying themselves, and many of those comments attack Coulter using such hateful, and vile language that it is not fit to reprint. After one such web page, a more sane reader commented:

Liberals. When they can't argue with the facts, quickly resort to personal attacks.

If Coulter is so "off the wall", why ARE liberals so afraid of her (and Rush and all the rest)? Why can't they just ignore her like conservatives ignore, uh, what's his name, that guy that used to be on Air America? I guess I've forgotten (see liberals, that's how it's done).²⁸

²⁵ A Whitney Brown, "I Support the Troops," *Daily Kos*, 1923 July 2007, <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2007/7/23/114037/956>.

²⁶ "Contact Your Local Rush Limbaugh Radio Station Today," *Media Matter for America Web Site*, November 2007, http://mediamatters.org/action_center/limbaugh_stations/.

²⁷ http://mediamatters.org/action_center/limbaugh_stations/index?qstate=ok will take you to the Media Matters web page for the Oklahoma radio stations.

²⁸ "Ann Blames Clinton, Carter for 9/11 and Dreams of Denying Women the Vote," *The New York Observer*, 2002 October 2007,

Of course, the fact is that Coulter isn't off the wall. What upsets the liberals/humanists so much is that she is telling the truth about them, and has the guts to call them what they are: TRAITORS. And she has the brains and training to document their treason in very easy to read and entertaining prose. She is a lawyer, and she writes very carefully and precisely, knowing that if she cannot prove what she writes the ACLU will probably have her in court before she receives the first royalty on a book. Her book *TREASON: Liberal Treachery from the Cold War to the War on Terrorism*, quoted in the chapter about the ACLU, should be required reading before a person is allowed to vote. If a person can still vote Democrat after reading and checking out the facts given in *TREASON*, that person is not a true American.

One of Anne's fans pointed out, "The Loony Left has NO sense of humor. Ann loves to get their goat; and it's SOOOO easy."²⁹ All she has to do is point out the facts in a clear and frank manner that exposes how silly, hypocritical, and wicked their arguments are. The Amazon web page for *Treason*, lists a whooping 2030 customer reviews (as of Oct. 31, 2007)! Individual reviewers usually give her either five stars or only one. Her writing is so good that people either love her or hate her. Many reviewers are humanists, who probably haven't even read her book, but simply want to give her book a low rating to discourage people from reading its exposure of them.

Humanists' attempts to silence Coulter have been so many that a book could be written about them. So far, humanists have succeeded in getting her columns dropped from: USA Today, the Arizona Star, The Gazette of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the Augusta Chronicle of Augusta, Georgia, Yes! Weekly of Greensboro, North Carolina, The Times of Shreveport, Louisiana, The Oakland Press of Oakland County, Michigan, The Mountain Press of Sevierville, Tennessee, and the New Era of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Several advertisers have been pressured into pulling their advertisements from her web site: Verizon, Sallie Mae, and Netbank.³⁰

Hillary Clinton's Media Matters for America has started a petition to silence Ann Coulter and other conservatives which are exposing them. Here is what it says:

Hate has no place on the airwaves

Recently, the major television networks have given a platform to conservative hate merchants like Ann Coulter, Glenn Beck, and Melanie Morgan.

Coulter's column is distributed by Universal Press Syndicate, one of the country's largest syndicates. Beck was recently hired by CNN Headline News. Morgan broadcasts from a radio station owned by Disney. And all three -- and countless others like them -- are regularly given guest spots on cable-news networks.

The fact that these right-wing pundits -- who have called for the execution of public officials and others -- are given a platform in the major media is unprecedented.

We, the undersigned, urge the media to stop allowing these hate merchants to spread their venom and abuse. America deserves to hear honest, reasoned debate, not rants from professional hatemongers.

Please sign this petition (with complete contact information) to show that the American public does not endorse the hate speech that these pundits are spewing.

Urge your friends to sign the petition here.

33913 people have already added their names.³¹

Manufactured scandal of the week; humanists manufacture a new scandal just about every week. Any "speech" humanists "hate" is "hate speech" to humanists. So, they brand almost every statement Coulter makes as "hate speech." As they do with all the more influential conservatives, Media Matters for America monitors every word Coulter speaks or writes looking for anything they can take out of context to attempt to discredit her. As of this writing, humanists are accusing Coulter of "hate speech" because, during an

[Http://www.observer.com/2007/coulter-culture](http://www.observer.com/2007/coulter-culture).

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ann_Coulter as of 6 November 2007.

³¹ <http://mediamatters.org/hatefree>

interview on Donny Deutsch's CNBC show, *The Big Idea*, on October 8, 2007, she answered "Yes" to this direct question from Deutsch, who is a Jew: "Christian — so we should be Christian? It would be better if we were all Christian?"

Deutsch, was obviously fishing for something he could use against Coulter, and so asked her one loaded question after another. Finally, he asked a question that produced the answer he wanted: "Let's wipe Israel off the earth. I mean, what, no Jews?" Coulter answered, "No, we think — we just want Jews to be perfected, as they say." Deutsch said that he was offended by this comment, and said Coulter's words were "hateful...anti-Semitic." Coulter responded, "No, no, no, no, no. I don't want you being offended by this... We consider ourselves perfected Christians. For me to say that for you to become a Christian is to become a perfected Christian is not offensive at all."³²

Within two days Media Matter for America had posted a web page³³ to exploit this into a major issue to divide conservative Jews from Conservative Gentiles. On this web page, to really make Christians look bad, they deceptively quote what a Jewish writer says as though it was said by a Christian. Taking their cue from Media Matters, Humanists world wide branded Coulter as anti-Semitic on their web sites.³⁴ Many conservative Jews recognized this as the usual divide-in-order-to-defeat humanist tactic, and publicly stated that Coulter's remarks were not anti-Semitic. However, sadly, many other conservative Jews took the bait.

So now on thousands of humanist and Jewish web sites Coulter is being branded "anti-Semitic," "a pig...so hateful it is beyond the study of man," "a neo-fascist," "a heretic preacher of dual covenant theology," "vomit," "a gnarley headed hoe," "a buffoon," "a demagogue," "a bleached-blond skank with no body fat and a prominent Adam's Apple," "an evil pshyco," "a sick individual, beyond crazed," "a vicious troll," "an unclovcen harlot," "a crazy aunt," "a fraud," and a lot of other bad things too vulgar to reprint.³⁵ One writer said what many others implied, "I hope this woman wakes up one morning and everything she belives [*sic*] is wrong starts to happen to her." And all of that hatred from the very people who are demanding that Coulter be silenced because of "hate speech"!

A few words to conservative Jews. Is it wise to let atheists divide you from Christian friends? You should always be suspicious of the motives of atheists.

Why is it so offensive for Coulter to say that she would like for all Americans to be Christians? People of all religions wish that all people believed exactly like them. That does not necessarily mean that they hate other people. Do you not write articles to convince people to believe like you? Should we Gentiles be offended by that? I mean, do you mean to say we are wrong and need to change our way of thinking? How dare you! You spewer of hate-speech! Those last three sentences are sarcasm, of course. Say whatever you want and it will not offend me, so long as you don't take up a sword to try to force me to believe it, and provided you don't try to keep me from saying what I believe.

Did Coulter pull out a sword and try to decapitate Deutsch? No. Instead she said, "Would you like to come to church with me, Donny?" That does not sound like anti-Semitism to me. Instead that sounds like a genuine accepting of Donny (a Jew) as a person, and a desire to have him become a part of her church. What is wrong with that?

Especially after Coulter explained that *everyone* needs to be perfected, not just Jews, why does that upset you? Do you not believe that Muslims need to be perfected? For instance, what about the Muslims who

³² "Columnist Ann Coulter Shocks Cable TV Show, Declaring 'Jews Need to Be Perfected by Becoming Christians'," *FoxNews.Com*, 1911 October 2007, [Http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,301216,00.html](http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,301216,00.html).

³³ <http://mediamatters.org/items/200710100008>

³⁴ Remember that on the Internet you cannot easily know where the webmaster of a web site is located. He may rent space on a server of a web hosting company in the USA, but he, himself, may be in Russian, or North Korea or anywhere in the world; a person knowledgeable in Internet technology can easily put up a new web site in a foreign country in just a few hours. And one person can maintain many different web sites. So, just because there are many different humanist web sites, does not mean that there are actually that many humanists.

³⁵ I'm not going to document these nasty quotes since there are thousands of such quotes on the internet. Do a search. You do not have time to read them all. Warning: some use words and pornographic pictures that are vulgar beyond comprehension.

have declared war on you and want to wipe you off the face of the earth? Are they perfect? Or do you think they need to be perfected? If you answer that they are perfect, then why do you complain when they blow you up? If you answer that they are not perfect, does that make you a hate monger? What about evangelical Christians like Ann Coulter? Are they perfect? Or do you think they need to be perfected?

Do you think Jews are perfect? Do Jews never sin? If Jews are sinners like everyone else then they are not perfect and need to be perfected.

Here is how the Bible says we can be perfected:

For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

So you can see that Christians believe that people of all nationalities need to be perfected, and can be "perfected for ever" through faith in Christ. Keeping the law cannot perfect us simply because we (us Gentiles along with you Jews) do not keep it. Some of us try to keep it, but all of us fail miserably. We are all sinners, including you. We cannot perfect ourselves. The Bible teaches that only in the Messiah can we (whatever our nationality) be considered perfect, and that because He died for our sins, and His perfect righteousness becomes eternally ours the moment we trust Him as Lord and Savior.

Penina Taylor, a young Jewish lady, wrote an article for Arutz Sheva titled "Thank You, Ann Coulter," in which she thanks Ann Coulter for "getting the Jewish community upset about something that it should be upset about. . . ."

In trying to explain why Jews should be upset, Penina gave a good Bible lesson! She said:

Let me give you a little Bible lesson here. Evangelical Christians who are calling themselves Zionists and who give moral and financial support to Israel do so because they believe with every fiber of their beings that the Christian Bible - what they call the Old and New Testaments - are the word of God. They believe every word of it, literally. That's why they are generally very good, moral people and that is also why they believe, in no uncertain terms, that anyone who does not believe in Jesus will go to Hell. That includes the Jews.³⁶

So, that is why Jews should be upset! Not because Christians believe that "anyone" who does not believe in Jesus will go to Hell, but because "that includes the Jews." She then lists the following verses from the New Testament to prove that the Bible actually does teach this: John 3:17-18 and 36; 5:24; 6:40 and 54-56; 17:3; Acts 13:46; 4:12; 6:23; 2 Thessalonians 1:8-10; 1 John 5:11-12. Read them and you will see that she is correct.³⁷ "Anyone" does indeed mean "anyone."

I am a Christian and unashamedly confess that Miss Taylor has stated exactly what I believe: anyone, including each of my own children and closest friends, who does not place his or her faith in Jesus as the Messiah will go to Hell. ***Now let me ask you a question: since I sincerely believe that, what is love? to just remain silent and let you go to Hell? or to try to persuade you to believe the truth so that you can go to Heaven?*** Please open your eyes and notice that Bible-believing Christians—the only genuine kind—are not trying to decapitate unbelievers, but rather trying to keep them out of Hell by showing them the way to Heaven, by persuasion not force. That is not hate, that is love. If that

³⁶ Penina Taylor, "Thank You, Ann Coulter," *Arutz Sheva*, 1914 October 2007, <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/7475>.

³⁷ One Jewish reader of Miss Taylor's article rebuked her for posting them, as though Jews shouldn't be allowed to see those verses. (YOUR LEADERS FORBID YOU TO READ THOSE VERSES! To them, YOU ARE SO DUMB AND GULLIBLE THAT YOU WILL FOR CERTAIN BE DECEIVED. SO DON'T READ THOSE VERSES! YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED! AND YOU ARE FORBIDDEN TO TALK TO MISSIONARIES TOO. They want to totally control your spiritual life. Not the Torah, but your rabbis' interpretation of it only is what they want you to believe. Also, don't read Isaiah chapter 53 which prophesies that the Messiah would suffer for your sins; you can't understand that passage of Scripture either. You are too dumb. And you don't have the proper education. And Isaiah was probably anti-Semitic too, since he said that Jews actually have sins, implying that Jews also need perfecting.)

is offensive to you, then you are immature and need to grow up. Throw off that pride. People who are not your enemies are your friends. A person doesn't have to agree with you on every point to be your friend; all he has to do to be your friend is have genuine good will toward you.

Another serious question (in answering please be honest with your own self): do you love Christians enough to try to persuade them to believe what you think to be the truth? or do you just hope that Christians go to Hell? Who hates whom? If you are really a loving person, then why aren't you a missionary for your own religion? "...thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I *am* the LORD" (Lev. 19:18 in your Scriptures). Some German Christians knew about the slaughter of Jews during the holocaust, and just remained silent as Jews were marched past them to their deaths, and that was wrong. (Yes! I do believe it was wrong.) Do you then think it is ok for Jews to remain silent as other people march past them into Hell, because religion is a "personal thing." According to who is it a personal thing? That is like saying with Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" (Genesis 4:9). Let me tell you, *that* is the kind of selfish thinking that is offensive. If you truly believe that modern Judaism is the way to Heaven, then show some love and compassion to the lost. It would pay to give serious thought to Luke 10:25-37.

Yet another vital question: is what you believe so lacking in proof that you must forbid free speech in Israel and try to end it in America? The problem seems to be that your religious leaders know that what they teach cannot stand up to being exposed by the light from your own Scriptures. Without freedom of speech you are an enslaved people—chained by darkness. If you knew the truth, it would make you free (John 8:31-59), but when free speech is banned you have no opportunity to know truth. You can't be free without freedom. I love you, and want you to be free. But only you can make the decision to allow the free speech that is necessary for freedom to exist. If you are so insecure in your religious beliefs that you fear they cannot stand up under serious debate, then the reason is probably because down in your heart you sense that your beliefs are wrong. That is the only reason you fear missionaries.

I fully expect that for what I have just written your rabbis will try to persuade you to hate me, just as they have stirred people up to hate Ann Coulter and all evangelical Christians. That is ok. My love and support for Israel is unconditional. I love Israel and the Israeli people because they (you my dear Jewish friends) are my Savior's kinsmen, and because the New Testament which your religious leaders hate teaches me to love the Jews. Isn't that amazing?! Our gospel (good news) is "to the Jew first."

I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the **Jew first**, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. (Romans 1:16)

For the **love of Christ constraineth us**; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and *that* he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we *him* no more. Therefore if any man *be* in Christ, *he is* a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things *are* of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. **Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.** (2 Cor. 5:14-21)

For the **Jews** require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the **Jews** a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both **Jews** and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. (1 Cor. 1:22-24)

Every individual who has so unjustly maligned Ann Coulter owes her an apology.

Hate Crimes

All of the victims of slander discussed so far were to some degree or another harmed by humanist slander. Nevertheless, they remain free to defend their views. Perhaps Robert Bork was hurt the worst, as the slander against him kept him from becoming a Supreme Court justice. Clarence Thomas made it to the Supreme Court, but his character was forever marred in the eyes of those people who believed the slander against him. So far, the communication skills of Rush Limbaugh and Ann Coulter have enabled them to sur-

vive all assaults, and to become champions of conservatives who lack a platform from which to voice their opinions.

But at least twice humanists have instigated criminal investigations against Rush Limbaugh. They wanted to put him in prison over minor infraction of the law that they had tried to make look like major felonies. This should alarm us. Humanist congressmen love to pass laws to force the enactment of their agenda. There are now so many laws that no one can possibly know all of them. Without any doubt, each and every American is breaking some law which he or she does not even realize exists—unjust laws that have been passed for the specific purpose of someday imprisoning people who oppose the atheist humanist religion.

One such law deserving special attention is H.R. 1592, also known as the The Matthew Shepard Act or the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act. Liberal, humanist legislators have been trying unsuccessfully to get this bill passed for 10 years. But since Democrats have regained control of the House and Senate, this bill has now been passed.

On September 27, the Senate passed by voice vote a bill that would expand federal hate crimes coverage to include sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, and disability.

The vote came after a successful vote (60-39) to stop debate and add the amendment to the Department of Defense bill. . . .

The amendment, The Matthew Shepard Act (or the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act), will expand coverage to include gender, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and individuals with disabilities. It also provide grants to state and local communities to combat violent crimes committed by juveniles, train law enforcement officers, or to assist in state and local investigations and prosecutions of bias motivated crimes.³⁸

This bill is the most dangerous threat to religious freedom in America since the establishment of the public school system. Louis Shelton of Traditional Values Coalition correctly summed up the danger:

In 2003, the Canadian House of Commons passed a bill that added “sexual orientation” to the list of groups protected against so-called “hate speech.” Violators can be sentenced to up to five years in prison for uttering words critical of homosexual sodomy.

Homosexual activists are actually monitoring the sermons of Christian pastors to make sure they do not openly criticize homosexuality.

H.R. 1592 is laying the legal framework for this kind of persecution in the U.S. Once homosexuality and cross-dressing become federally-protected minority groups, the full force of the federal law enforcement can be brought down upon anyone who “incites” potential violence against a homosexual. For example, a pastor’s sermon from Romans 1 about homosexuality could be considered an incitement to such violence if some deranged churchgoer then goes out and beats up a homosexual.

If signed into law, H.R. 1592 will usher in the death of religious freedom and speech in this nation. Any critical comments about homosexual sodomy will be considered “hate speech” and outside the bounds of First Amendment protections. It has already happened in Canada and it will happen here if H.R. 1592 and other laws like it are not soundly defeated.³⁹

And Dr. Shelton is not alone in recognizing the danger of this bill.

Many Christian leaders fear that the hate crime bill will inhibit pastors from speaking about homosexuality as a biblical sin and be interpreted in a way that bans even peaceful speech against the lifestyle. As example, leaders have pointed to hate-crime laws in England, Sweden and Canada, where Christians have been prosecuted for breaking these laws.

Furthermore, in the United States, 11 Christians in Pennsylvania were prosecuted under the state’s hate crimes law shortly after “sexual orientation” was added as a victim category several years ago. According to reports, the ten adults and one teenager were singing hymns and carrying signs peacefully at a homosexual celebration in Philadelphia when they were arrested.

“The Hate Crimes Act will be the first step to criminalize our rights as Christians to believe that some behaviors are sinful,” Dr. James C. Dobson, founder and chairman of Focus on the Family, said in a message for a petition to oppose the bill.⁴⁰

³⁸ Tyler Lewis, “Senate Passes Hate Crimes Bill,” *Civilrights.Org*, 1927 September 2007, http://www.civilrights.org/press_room/buzz_clips/civilrightsorg-stories/senate-passes-hate-crimes-bill.html.

³⁹ Louis P. Sheldon, “TVC Chairman Speaks Out On Dangers Of H.R. 1592 To Free Speech/Religion,” *The Traditional Values Coalition*, 1918 April 2007, <http://www.traditionalvalues.org/modules.php?sid=3059>.

⁴⁰ Michelle Vu, “Bush Prepared to Veto ‘Hate Crimes’ Bill,” *The Christian Post*, 2007, 10 March 2007, http://www.christianpost.com/article/20071003/29558_Bush_Prepared_to_Veto_‘Hate_Crimes’_Bill.htm.

Only one man can prevent this bill from becoming law: President George W. Bush.

WASHINGTON – President Bush is ready to veto a contentious hate crimes bill that was attached last week to a massive defense spending bill, said the White House on Tuesday.

The Senate had attached the hate crimes legislation to the high-priority defense spending bill – which includes funding for the Iraq War – in a political maneuver to pressure Bush to pass the amendment.

However, the White House said Bush will not sign the hate crimes bill into law.

“The president has said overwhelmingly that these are two separate issues – that they should not be combined; and the president has reiterated his commitment to vetoing the hate crimes provision,” said White House spokesman Tim Goeglein on Tuesday, according to OneNewsNow.⁴¹

But during 2008 President Bush’s term in office will expire, and he will step down to be replaced by a new president. If the new president is a humanist, this bill will almost certainly become law. So the danger is very, very real. Now is the time to begin preparing for the next election. Begin warning your family members and friends and neighbors now while you still have the chance.

Readers that believe the danger is being exaggerated had perhaps best buckle their seat belts before reading the next chapter.

⁴¹ Ibid.

