

Monday, May 31, 2010

## **FORT McHENRY- A MUST SEE!**

An absolute must see is Fort McHenry in Baltimore, MD. Watching the short movie in the Visitor's Center which depicted the decisive Battle there in the War of 1812 (during which our Capital in DC was burned down) was instructive and inspiring. Hearing the Naval Academy's Men's Chorus sing the National Anthem while viewing the flag flying over the fort, as it was seen on the day of the Battle, was very emotional and patriotic experience. Going into the Fort we were treated to a very dramatic recital and explanation of our National Anthem by a Park Ranger, as he unfolded a replica of the massive star spangled banner seen by the British enemy ships in the harbor after their attack. The flag was spread on the parade ground (it is huge) and then many of us from the crowd present refolded it together. (A smaller flag was flown during the battle itself. The much larger one was raised to send the message to the British that we were still there, undefeated, after their bombardment of the Fort through the night.) In the post below are all the words of the Anthem. What we hear at sports events is only the first stanza, which is really a question asked. The answer to it comes in the next 3 stanzas, which we never hear. The last stanza is especially important.

Posted by Cal in Current Events at 11:45

## **ALL THE WORDS OF OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM**

Oh, say can you see, by the dawn's early light, What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming? Whose broad stripes and bright stars, through the perilous fight, O'er the ramparts we watched, were so gallantly streaming? And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air, Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there. O say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave? On the shore, dimly seen through the mists of the deep, Where the foe's haughty host in dread silence reposes, What is that which the breeze, o'er the towering steep, As it fitfully blows, half conceals, half discloses? Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam, In full glory reflected now shines on the stream: 'Tis the star-spangled banner! O long may it wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave. And where is that band [the British] who so vauntingly swore That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion A home and a country should leave us no more? Their blood has wiped out their foul footsteps' pollution. No refuge could save the hireling and slave From the terror of flight, or the gloom of the grave: And the star-spangled banner in triumph doth wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave. Oh! thus be it ever, when freemen shall stand Between their loved homes and the war's desolation! Blest with victory and peace, may the heaven-rescued land Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation. Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, And this be our motto: "In God is our trust." And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave! (emphasis added)

Posted by Cal in Current Events at 11:38

Friday, May 14. 2010

### **OVER 1845 ENTRIES AND HOLDING**

Dear faithful Readers,

There are over 1845 entries on this Blog, posted over more than 5 years. I hope you will browse and enjoy some of them.

God bless

Cal

Posted by Cal in Personal Journal at 09:32

Wednesday, May 12, 2010

## **WHAT DOES NEO-CALVINISM MEAN?**

Retired from the Pastorate, I am now a lay-theologian in the Reformed, Covenant and Neo-Calvinist Tradition. The Principles of Neo-Calvinism are outlined below. I am convinced that they are Scriptural. Historically, "Neo Calvinism" or Neo Kuyperianism has origins in Holland (hence "Dutch Treat"). Much of what I write comes from this Perspective as I understand it. (Others understand Neo-Calvinism differently, and many Calvinists have problems with it, but this is a fair consensus of what its Principles are.)**ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES OF NEO-CALVINISM**  
Creation, Fall and Redemption

The Gospel Story begins in Genesis. God's Creation is good. It has been radically corrupted by the Fall. Redemption includes restoration of that Creation in Christ  
Rejection of Dualism.

Dualism is common in much Christian thinking. The most notable dualism is between Nature and Grace. Neo-Calvinists maintain that Grace restores Nature (and that the Church, as Salt and Light, is the instrument God uses to transform Culture.

Jesus is Lord over all of Creation.

Jesus' Lordship extends through every area and aspect of life-it is not restricted to the sphere of church or of personal piety.

All of life is to be Redeemed.

The work of Jesus on the cross was intended to defeat Evil in all areas of life. The resurrection of Jesus is meant to lead to the renewal of all life, beginning with the Church Cultural Mandate

Genesis 1:26-28 is the mandate from God to Humanity to care for and cultivate all of Creation, including Culture and Civilization, to God's glory  
The Role of Law.

Law is more than the Decalogue. It is the Torah (Five Books of Moses) and begins with the creation ordinances (Norms) established by God as His will for the living of life in all Spheres  
Sphere sovereignty.

The Spheres are God-given Institutions: Marriage, Family, Church, Civic Community (by extension) and Civil Government. Each of these Institutions has boundaries that mark off its sphere of responsibility and influence. All are responsible to God. In relation to each other, they are autonomous (sovereign), but cooperative. The sovereignty of each must be recognized and respected by the others.

Posted by Cal in Christian Living at 09:58

## **ACCIDENTAL MISSIONARIES?**

Jon A. Shields has written a helpful review of Ziad Munson's "The Making of Pro-Life Activist". Munson's book has lessons for those of us who pray that many more Christians will become involved in world-wide missions. The review has the spot-on title The Accidental Activists and therein is the major lesson.

"Munson conducted 82 life histories of pro-life activists seeking to learn who becomes a pro-life activist and why? One might suppose that those with strong pro-life sentiments simply join the movement. Yet Munson found that only 13 percent of the activists in his sample were "self starters"—citizens whose strong moral convictions led them to initiate contact with a pro-life organization. In addition, approximately half of the activists in Munson's sample were still ambivalent about abortion or even pro-choice prior to their participation in the pro-life movement. For these activists, pro-life sentiment was a consequence rather than the cause of participation in the right-to-life movement".

See <http://www.booksandculture.com/>

Most pro-life activists got to be that way because of their association with others who are pro-life activists and because of something that happened in their life that got them interested. (e.g.-A man I know became interested in being a fire fighter when he was about 35 when a neighbor's barn burned down.)Munson concludes "activism emerged not because they consciously sought it out to express their beliefs but as an unintended result of their ordinary lives." "Social contacts and networks are more important than preconceived attitudes," Munson shows. "Activism is as much about building community as about mobilizing individuals." That is the way the firefighter's life-long activism was sustained. Could these conclusions be the key to turning ordinary, pew warming Christians into pro-missions activists?

**Blog Export: DUTCH TREAT- Cal Fox's Blog, <http://www.calvinfox.com/blog/>**

Posted by Cal in Christian Living at 03:46

Tuesday, May 11. 2010

## **ON NOT TRANSFORMING CULTURE**

There is an interesting review by Andy Crouch of James D. Hunter's book, "To Change the World".  
<http://www.booksandculture.com/>

Hunter, he writes, does not believe we should (or can) change the world. Nor should we be 'redeeming the culture,' 'advancing the kingdom,' 'building the kingdom,' 'transforming the world,' 'reclaiming the culture,' [or] 'reforming the culture.' According to Hunter, the strategies Christians have pursued are, by themselves, woefully incapable of changing the world. The premise is that once the hearts and minds of ordinary people are properly revived and informed, the culture will change. "This account," Hunter says flatly, "is almost wholly mistaken." "It is mistaken", Crouch summarizes, "because of its individualism: it ignores the central role of institutions in transmitting culture. It is mistaken because it is not just institutions that matter, but institutions at the cultural "center" rather than the "periphery". It is mistaken, perhaps most of all, in its egalitarian assumption that the hearts and minds of ordinary people matter—in fact, cultural change is almost always driven by change among a small élite who occupy powerful positions in those culturally central institutions".

There are books such as "Under the Influence, How Christianity Transformed Civilization" by Alvin Schmidt, which document evidence to the contrary. There is some truth in what Dr Hunter says and important lessons for Christians activists to learn from that truth.

I agree that changing culture as such is not a mandate for Christians. That is not our mission, never has been. We are called to be faithful as God's Covenant People, living for His glory in all and what ever we do in the culture around us. We are to live according to His Law. When we do this, our lives shall be a witness to the world.

God in the person of His Son, Jesus Christ, is acting in the world. That is what He does. It is not our mandate or mission to build or advance God's work or Kingdom. He is doing that. By definition, the Kingdom is His, not ours. But when we are obedient to Him in our lives, He will use us, as His instruments or agents, to achieve His Purposes wherever we are. That will have an impact on people and institutions and in that way the culture (s) of the world around us will be changed.

That which God formed and Sin deformed, Christ will reform.

Posted by Cal in Christian Living at 16:27

Friday, May 7, 2010

## **MR OBAMA'S RECENT SPEECH ABOUT GOVERNMENT**

Mr Obama's recent speech at the University of Michigan about Government did not explain what the form of Government is that we have as a Nation. He called it a Democracy. It is not. "The Government is us", he said. That sounds nice, but it is not true. (If it were a Democracy, all citizens would vote on all issues. Many very small towns are democracies.) It could be said that we have a representational form of Democracy (a Republic) in which citizens elect people to represent them and do the voting for them. Mr Obama also did not distinguish between the Government and the Administration in control of the Government. Many who do not have a problem with the former, have a major problem with the latter. In practice, many non-elected people have great authority in a Republic and make decisions in the governance of the Nation. Actually, the Government of the United States is more than a simple Republic. It is a Federal Republic. A federal system of government is one that divides the powers of government between the national (federal) government and state and local governments. The Constitution limits the Federal Government (likewise, State Constitutions do the same). Under federalism, each level of civil government has sovereignty in some areas and shares powers in other areas. For example: both the federal and state governments have the power to tax. Only the federal government can declare war. That there are acknowledged limits to all civil governments is important to keep in mind, because Scripture also places limits on Civil Government. The following material is excerpts from Biblical Principles to Guide our Political Action. The entire Article can be found on my website, [HERE](#)

"There are three basic creational communities or "spheres" and a fourth derived from them. This is neo-calvinist social theory and I am convinced it is Biblical. Each of these four spheres has specific functions and norms or boundaries. They are permanent inter-relational communities or spheres, even though the forms they take and the actual members at any specific time and place may vary. Each Sphere has its own inner working or system, with members fulfilling various functions or roles." "Biblical commands apply to marriage, family, property, work, money, care of the poor, care of animals and the environment, criminal justice and civil government. The faith that saves is the faith that obeys the Law of God in all such matters. The Civil Government that is good enforces these universal Laws. It is to pass and enforce legislation and laws based on the Law of God, but specific to our Society." "Each Creational social system has its own authority (known as "sphere sovereignty" to neo-Calvinists), but none of them are absolute or autonomous. They cooperate and must not interfere with each other's responsibilities. That especially applies to Civil Government. It is not to usurp or curtail the responsibilities of the other Spheres." "The State has no business to interfere with the responsibility of all able people to work and be self-supporting or to care for those who refuse to do so. This Doctrine of Sphere Sovereignty gives the responsibility for welfare and the care of the sick, the widowed and orphaned, the unemployed and the homeless to the Family and Faith Community (Church) and to the local civic community. The State has no business to interfere with or usurp these God-given responsibilities nor to take money (taxes) from citizens for programs that do. Biblical Christians oppose the concept and common practices of what is commonly known as the "Welfare State" and they are very suspicious of all entitlement programs and oppose the popular entitlement mentality." "The voluntary Civic Associations are not to forego their independence and look to the civil government for support. These groups, whether for business or the arts, are extensions of the Family and Church. The State has no right to interfere with them in any way. In practice, this Doctrine leads to a rejection of many "tax breaks", as well as much government funding and most subsidies. In our Society, it means advocating for privatization (or at least, the localization) of just about everything." "The only legitimate, God-given responsibility for Civil Government is enactment of Law (laws in harmony with the principles of Biblical Law), Law enforcement, Courts and a legal system guaranteeing due process- all to maintain peace and to protect citizens (and the Nation) from injustice, physical harm and danger from any quarter. The latter includes maintaining and using Armed Forces. Taxing the people for this is not theft. It is the obligation of citizens to pay for such services."

Posted by Cal in Bible Topics at 18:33

Thursday, May 6, 2010

## **TEACHER APPRECIATION**

Earlier in the year, I checked out a website about one of the latest attempts to use computers in public schools. It was said to be the beginning of a revolution in public education. HERE Yesterday's Boston Globe carries an article about an even more radical concept. Our State has given its approval for the first at-home, all computerized grade school. It could have 600 students K-8 but will have no building. HERE There was also another article a few months ago about a high school in this State that has no library- all materials there are now digitalized, no printed books. There have been a number of articles about this trend. What they all have in common is replacement of Teachers and interaction between Teachers, authors and other students. (And this in the age when "social networking" is all the rage- well, virtual social networking) My concern here is with the importance of Teachers. It is after all, National Teacher Appreciation Week. Booting up the PC and booting out the live teacher and class room is a terrible idea!

<http://www.teacher-appreciation.info/Teacher-Appreciation-Week-2010/>We were talking about this with some friends yesterday. The wife seemed to remember a lot of boring Teachers who put her to sleep. Yes. there are many of those pedestrian kind around. (I confess skipping a number of classes). But I remember fondly and gratefully the other kind. The ones who were knowledgeable, personable, skilled and did a great job of making the material interesting, even exciting and who helped to inculcate in me a life time appetite for learning and knowledge. I appreciate them! There was Mrs Gray in Third Grade and then my Latin and German and Ancient History Teachers in High School, as well as my Geometry Teacher. One of my HS English Teachers was always interesting. I enjoyed my History, English and Philosophy teachers in college. And in Graduate School, there was Dr James Strauss who taught Theology (and who held court in a local pizza restaurant) who was brilliant (and very entertaining). We all hung on every word he delivered, never missing a class. Beside delivering the lesson content well, all these Teachers had passion. These teachers all loved their subjects and they loved teaching their subjects and they all really wanted their students to share their knowledge and passion. A digital "class" absolutely can not be a satisfactory substitute for experiencing such teachers and their electric classrooms! There were tests, but the goal of teaching was not to pass National or State requirements. The goal was liberal arts education in both head and heart. There were no computers, but there was genuine education going on. Thank God for gifted Teachers! Nothing can replace them and they are needed more than ever.

Posted by Cal in Social Issues at 08:19

Tuesday, May 4, 2010

## **DO HUMANS FACE DYING LIKE CHIMPANZEES DO?**

Here is an interesting but very misleading article- content

"Although we tried hard to avoid anthropomorphism when describing the chimpanzees' behavior, it was difficult not to see some striking parallels between how they reacted to the dying individual and how humans react when faced with the peaceful death of a close relative or companion," James Anderson, a psychologist at the University of Stirling in Scotland and lead author of the Pansy study, said in an e-mail. "It is often stated that humans are unique in being aware of death, but our observations . . . indicate that this position is open to question." The study of the mothers hanging on to their dead babies suggests that "a period of continued contact after the death of an infant may be important for a mother chimpanzee to adjust psychologically to her loss." Sounds pretty human."

Animals certainly do share similarities with Humans. We are animals, but animals are not humans or persons. They are not created in the Image of God, they are not His Children. They do not and can not have a personal, spiritual relationship with God and when they die they do not go to Heaven to love, serve and enjoy the Lord for Eternity. That is not what they enter into when they die. Death has a totally different meaning for animals than it has for people, especially Christians! Let us discern and maintain the difference.

This article does not contradict what I have written, but lends support to people who do.

Posted by Cal in Theological Issues at 11:26

Monday, May 3, 2010

## **PRESIDENT OBAMA PROCLAIMS DAY OF PRAYER FOR NATION**

There are two groups that have problems with this for different reasons. Atheist Groups and Bloggers denounced the annual National Day of Prayer because they do not believe in prayer and certainly not a Government endorsed Day of prayer. A Federal Court Judge has agreed and says the Government endorsement is unconstitutional. Religious Leaders generally endorse the Day, as they all believe in Prayer and the need to pray for our Nation. But the Day is meant to be Interfaith and Ecumenical and so Muslim Leaders (and others) oppose the inclusion of Franklin Graham, co-chairman of the Event, because of his strong, negative criticisms of Islam, the Religion. "The Council on American-Islamic Relations ...has called on congressional sponsors of the National Day of Prayer event on Capitol Hill to rescind Graham's invitation to speak at the May 6 gathering"

"The Military Religious Freedom Foundation, on behalf of Muslim military personnel and defense department staff, had demanded in a letter to Defense Secretary Robert Gates that Graham be disinvited from speaking at the Pentagon prayer event." (Actually it was the Chaplains Office that invited Mr Graham to participate at the Pentagon). For all of their disagreements, America's founders found ways to pray together, and virtually all of them believed that the nation's civic leaders should encourage prayer. We would do well to spend this year's National Day of Prayer following Washington's admonition to beseech God to "pardon our national and other transgressions" and to give thanks to "that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be." Read the History of the National day of Prayer extending back to the Founding

article It is a sad commentary on our Nation, founded as a Christian Nation (yes, it was) when members of another Religion, antithetical to Christianity, and Citizens who deny the very existence of God Himself, can bring enough social pressure to curtail our National Observance of Prayer to our God and threaten to actually make it illegal through the Courts. Here is Franklin Graham's response to the controversy. <http://www.wsocvtv.com/news/23193597/detail.html>

Posted by Cal in Current Events at 19:32

## **WHAT THE BIBLE REALLY SAYS ABOUT "IMMIGRANTS"**

Biblical Light on the subject of Foreigners in Israel- it is not what you have heard

Many Christians (and others) favor five arguments to support an open door immigration policy, and particularly a Federal Government Policy that will facilitate welcoming "undocumented workers" or illegal immigrants into full inclusion in American life with all of its rights and privileges. These arguments are "Hospitality", "Humanity", "Image of God", "we are all immigrants" and especially the argument using what the Bible teaches about Aliens in Israel. This post is specifically about these five arguments. The claim is that they are Biblical or Christian. They are not. (Comments that go beyond this topic into other areas such as NAFTA and Free Trade are not appropriate here.)

"Hospitality" is commanded 3 times in the NT. The word (philoxenos) literally means "love of strangers" but is used to mean "being generous to guests". In debate about the treatment of illegal immigrants, some use the command to practice hospitality as a Biblical and Christian reason to welcome illegal immigrants into the United States That is an unwarranted stretch of the 3 texts about hospitality. The word does not mean granting the legal privileges that citizens of a Nation have to those who enter that Nation illegally. It simple commands treating guests in out homes generously. Many signs protesting Arizona's new immigration law have words on them that say simply, "We are human". They are rightly concerned about the possible use of "racial profiling" and "racism" in pursuit of enforcing the new Law. (As I understand the new law it does not call for or require such behavior.) Of course, illegal aliens are human and must be treated as humans, i.e. humanely. This does not mean they must not be deported if found in Arizona. It would mean, in that case, that they must be treated humanely while being deported. To say the latter contradicts the former is arbitrary and not valid. Being "human" does not excuse anyone from from being responsible for their behavior. All law-breakers are human beings. They should all be treated with respect as human beings, but that does not mean that all law breakers should be allowed to get away with breaking laws because they are human. In fact, one of the most important characteristics of being "human" is the ability to make choices and to be responsible for the consequences of those choices, including the illegal ones. The normal human being has an innate sense of morality and knows right from wrong. To treat people as "human" includes respecting exactly that about them and treating them accordingly. Another version of some muddle-headed thinking or poor argument is the use of the doctrine that everyone is created equal in the Image of God in defense of illegal immigrants. It has the same weakness as the argument about being human and

is just as irrelevant in the defense of law-breakers. Still another popular argument is also fallacious in the same way: it persistently equates "immigrant" with "illegal immigrant". Almost every article writer and commentator seems to make this mistake. These are not the same! It is often repeated that America is a land of immigrants- we all are immigrants or children of immigrants. No one contests that, but that is not what the current debate is about. The problem and debate before us now is about those people who have been entering the US illegally (jumping the line as it were, ahead of those standing in the line for years, obeying the Rules that they might become legal immigrants). That is especially egregious because current [and incorrect] interpretation of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution provides full citizenship with all its legal rights to the babies of the illegal immigrants jumping the line upon the birth of those babies within the borders crossed illegally! See George Will's argument [HERE](#) What does the Bible say about aliens in Israel? This is not what many think! Probably the major argument in favor of open borders and full inclusion of "illegal aliens" into American life with all rights and privileges of Citizens is based on the Bible and what it allegedly says about "aliens", "sojourners" and "strangers" in Israel. Yes, the Bible has texts like these- Exo 22:21 "You shall not wrong a sojourner [a temporary inhabitant, a newcomer lacking inherited rights or foreigners in Israel] or oppress him, for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt. Lev 19:34 "You shall treat the stranger who sojourns with you as the native among you, and you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God. An OT Professor from Denver Seminary [evangelical Baptist] has this to say in an article published on the Seminary website, "This concern for the sojourner in their midst was grounded in Israel's past. It had been born as a nation of despised foreigners, workers in an oppressive system in Egypt. God, though, had redeemed them in the Exodus, and that experience as immigrants was to mark them as a people for all time. Because they had come from immigrant stock, they were to be compassionate to the foreigners, who moved into their land. They were never to forget their immigrant history. That history defined them, and their treatment of the outsider was a measure of their faith in God (Lev. 19:34). God had designed Israel's laws to shine as an example to other peoples (Deut. 4:5-8), and the provisions for the sojourner were part of this exemplary legislation." Well, yes, but this is a superficial and very selective use of Bible texts that overlooks important distinctions. There were actually, four groups of "aliens". More specifically, there are four general words designating four groups of people. Each word or name had nuances that changed over time, but the following conclusions are reasonable. (a good source on this subject is the article, "Sojourners", in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, 1988 revised edition) Looking closer, the group of non-Jews who were fully accepted in Israel were the "Gerim", who voluntarily assimilated fully in all things Jewish. For all practical purposes they converted to Judaism and became members of the People of God (the LXX Greek equivalent for Gerim is "Proselytes"). They were accepted as Jews with all the rights and responsibilities of the Hebrew People, thus fulfilling the Biblical admonitions to treat Gerim properly (Deut 29:10f) This group of "Aliens" (-our word. In the Bible texts Gerim is translated as "Sojourners") submitted to the Laws of Israel in all matters, the males became circumcised, they observed Passover and all the other Feasts and Festivals and offered sacrifices in the Temple. (Lev 16:29, 17:8, Numbers 9:14, Exodus 12:47-49 etc.) There were periods in their later history when natural born Israelites treated the Gerim as second-class citizens. But Ezekiel prophesied the day when that would end and the Nation would experience peace and unity of all its citizens (47:22) This prophecy will be fulfilled in the Church. There was another Hebrew word, Tosab, used 14 times. It was interchangeable with Ger (Gerim, pl) But there were two other outside groups of aliens. The Nokri were "strangers", foreigners, living in Israel. They did not assimilate and were considered a threat to the Nation (Neh 9:2, Ezek 44:7-9, Zeph 1:8, Mal 2:11, Isa 2:6, etc) And there were the Zarim. These people living in Israel were considered foreigners, outsiders and truly "aliens" in every way. They did not belong and were seen as "illegitimate" outsiders. They were seen as dangerous to the country, enemies. Israel was warned against these Nokri and Zarim and they were not treated the same as the Gerim. (Joel 3:7, Prov 5:10, Psalm 54:3, etc) Texts about these last two groups must be included when people go to the Bible for guidance in how to treat illegal aliens in America, (See Prov. 5:10; Psalm 54:3; Ezek 7:21, 11:9; 16:32; Isa 1:7, 29:5; Hosea 7:9; Jer 5:19, 30:8, 51:51, etc) And we must remember all the warnings against intermarriage with members of these groups, e.g.- Ezra 9-10. In addition, there was the constant effort to eradicate non-Jews from the promised land when the Tribes of Isarel entered it. In this case, those people were (debatably) the original "citizens" and the Hebrew tribes were (debatably) the foreign invaders. But the point is that the Bible (God) discriminates between peoples according to their potential blessing or trouble for the Nation. Those that did not fully adopt the ways of Israel (especially its Religion and Laws), were not given a warm welcome by the natural Citizens and treated as equals with full rights and privileges of those citizens. After the Exile and during the period between the Testaments, Israelite feelings (their prejudice and hate against the Nokri and the Zarim hardened. Thus began the divide of Humanity between Jews and Gentiles. The heart of the Gospel as Paul preached it was that this division was to disappear through the work of Christ and by unity found in Him of both Jew and Gentile (Eph 2:19ff, Gal 3:28, Rom 3:19ff) How can all this teaching be applied to the problem of Illegal Immigrants in America? At the very least, it means that Scripture can not support a Federal Government "open door" Immigration Policy. It also means the Hospitality, We are Human, We are all made in the Image of God and we are all Immigrants Arguments do not support an Open Door Policy either. It should be obvious what the Bible teaching does support. There are two realities that must be faced. For all the high principles rhetoric, the real underlying issue here is money and jobs. That includes the demand by American businesses and private employers for certain kinds of workers. legal or not. The other reality is that there are 10-15 million plus illegal immigrants already here and they can not be ignored and no one can or will deport them all. At the very least, there must be a policy enacted and action taken that closes the border now to prevent any more people from entering the Country illegally while we

## Blog Export: DUTCH TREAT- Cal Fox's Blog, <http://www.calvinfox.com/blog/>

figure out a humane and equitable way of caring for those who are here. Correcting the current interpretation of the 14th Amendment regarding birth rights will also remove a major incentive for many adults who come here to take advantage of that loophole. A report entitled 5 Myths about Immigration that is helpful to solving the debate can be found here, [HERE](#)

Posted by Cal in Bible Topics at 00:04

Saturday, May 1, 2010

## **STRAIGHT TALK ABOUT ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION**

This is a big weekend for demonstrations provoked by Arizona's new law trying to deal with a major problem that it has with Hispanics coming into that State illegally. The problem is not with immigration or immigrants as such. George Will again offers a good analysis of what is happening and of the inflammatory and untrue rhetoric of many of the protesters. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/30/AR2010043001667.html?wpisrc=nl\\_cuzhead](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/30/AR2010043001667.html?wpisrc=nl_cuzhead)

Posted by Cal in Social Issues at 11:27