



Examples of Anti-Christian Bias in American Society: Articles by Cynthia Tucker, Ann Coulter, & Cal Thomas; Review: The Silent Witness of Shear-jashub

If pastors who do submit to a biblically mandated system of teaching the Bible to their congregations cannot be silenced in the church then the freedom of their parishioners to repeat the principles he has taught them must be attempted. A good example of this is the recent case of Army General William G. Boykin.

General Boykin has spoken over the years in what are described by the mainline media as "conservative Christian churches" in which he has described the War on Terror in terms that have caused some to speculate he has listened to the *Clanking Chains* series. Not likely. The Word of God when accurately taught would lead any believer to draw the same conclusions and Gen. Boykin. Let's note a few quotes by the general in an article by:

Tucker, Cynthia. "Boykin's Bizarre Beliefs Give Aid and Comfort to the Enemy." *Yahoo! News*, 24 Oct. 2003:

Is this how the Bush White House hopes to win hearts and minds in the Islamic world? By supporting a small-minded general with a schoolboy's view that his God can beat up their God?

The Bush administration's hatchet men (and women) have been quick to browbeat critics of the reckless invasion of Iraq -- questioning their patriotism and even accusing them of treason. But there has been no reprimand of Lt. Gen. William "Jerry" Boykin, a high-ranking Pentagon official who has **ridiculed Islam as "Satan"** and dismissed Muslims as **idol worshippers**.

Instead, defense chief Donald Rumsfeld has initiated a low-profile "internal investigation" of Boykin's speeches, while praising the general's "outstanding" military record. But there seems little to investigate. Boykin's comments are on the record (and first reported by military affairs analyst William Arkin, writing in the Los Angeles Times).

If anyone has given aid and comfort to the enemy, Boykin has. During the past several months, the general -- who is deputy undersecretary of defense for intelligence and charged with finding high-profile targets, such as Osama bin Laden -- has appeared in conservative Christian pulpits around the country, often in uniform, to declare the war on terror a "spiritual battle." His **foolish, bigoted remarks** will be repeated ad nauseam on Arab TV and used to buttress the view of Islamic extremists, who insist the United States has launched a latter-day crusade against Islam. If you listen to Boykin, perhaps we have.

Last January, speaking of the search for Somali warlord Osman Atto, Boykin told a congregation that Atto had appeared on CNN to taunt American soldiers, declaring that "Allah" would protect him. (Atto was later captured.)

"Well, you know what?" Boykin continued. "I knew that my God was bigger than his. I knew that my God was a real God and his was an idol."

On other occasions, Boykin has described the war on terror as a "spiritual battle. **Satan wants to destroy this nation**, he wants to destroy us as a nation, and he wants to destroy us as a Christian army."

There are other equally troubling facets of Boykin's beliefs. They are clearly at odds with his commander in chief, who has gone out of his way to **discourage the view that the war on terror is a clash between Islam and Christianity**. The president has invited Muslim imams to the White House; he has **criticized ultraconservative Christian ministers who have dismissed Islam as dangerous and violent**; he has made pointed **distinctions between mainstream Islam and the extremists who preach jihad**.

Boykin's remarks contradict -- and perhaps overwhelm -- that message. Indeed, for a high-ranking military officer, **his beliefs are surprisingly benighted**.



"It is not a matter of worshipping different gods," said Dr. Richard C. Martin, Emory University professor of Islamic studies. "The Arabs who are Christians use the word 'Allah' for God. We start out with the notion **we are not talking about three different religions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) with three different gods.**"

Boykin can hardly hide behind his right to free speech; the oath of military service constricts that right considerably. Besides, the Bush administration has had no trouble ousting other high-ranking officials who contradicted its public message. President Bush should promptly demote Boykin and lose him in the anonymous Pentagon bureaucracy, where his **ignorance** will do less harm.

Ann Coulter was able to evaluate the commentary on Gen. Boykin's remarks and came to a very striking conclusion:

Coulter, Ann. "Bush Official Caught in Church Dagnet." *anncoulter.com*, 22 Oct. 2003: <http://www.anncoulter.com/columns/2003/102203p.htm>

IN AN EMERGING scandal, NBC News has produced tapes proving beyond deniability that the new deputy undersecretary of defense for intelligence is ... a Christian. Lt. Gen. William G. "Jerry" Boykin has been captured on a series of grainy tapes, attesting to his faith at churches and prayer breakfasts. Having driven the Judeo-Christian value system out of the public square, the classrooms, and the Alabama Supreme Court, liberals now want to drive it out of church.

Ann with tongue in cheek makes the conspicuous point: no one may express Christian doctrine who has anything whatsoever to do with the government and especially inside a church and most assuredly not in a military uniform. The new morality is well on its way to making the very mention of doctrinal concepts a crime worthy of dismissal from public service.

The fallacy of this approach is made shockingly clear by columnist Cal Thomas in an op-ed piece written by him in May of this year:

Thomas, Cal. "America Faces Dangers from within." *Conservative Chronicle*, 28 May 2003, 23:

Government officials warn that America remains in danger from Al Qaeda and other terrorist operatives who wish to destroy us. This is not a one-front war, because we also face dangers from within our democratic institutions.

Suppose our enemies have invaded the United States through immigration for the express purpose of organizing themselves politically? Suppose they present themselves as benign and seek to register voters, becoming politically active in order to elect their people to office and change U.S. policy in the Middle East? What if their intentions are the eventual destruction of this nation through its democratic processes and the imposition of a theocratic state? Would that be enough to get our attention?

In at least 16 states, Muslim groups, by their own admission, are organizing voter-registration drives and political consciousness-raising events for this express purpose. One of the advantages the United States has had over its enemies is that that they openly state their goals. One of the advantages our enemies have over the United States is that too many Americans don't take them seriously. We prefer the short-term comfort that denial brings. We fear being labeled "bigots" more than we fear the intentions of those who hate us, and so we are reluctant to speak ill of another person's faith, unless it is the majority faith.

Last Saturday (May 17), the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) opened its newest office in Columbia, S.C., a Southern city with strong Christian roots. The stated purpose of organizers was to discuss "the obligation of Muslims to participate in public affairs, (the Council's) achievements, and future goals of the organization."



Among those "future goals," according to a (Council) press release, is the elimination of references to "Judeo-Christian" when describing the heritage of the United States. Instead, (the Council) and other Muslim groups prefer "Judeo-Christian-Islamic" or "Abrahamic." (The Council) wants this new phrase used "in all venues where we normally talk about Judeo-Christian values, starting with the media, academia, statements by politicians, and comments made in churches, synagogues and other places." Notice the absence of the word "mosques" in this statement. Muslim groups want Jews and Christians to tolerate them, but there is not a similar call for mosques to include Jewish and Christian beliefs.

You do not have to believe in conspiracies or be a bigot to realize something important is happening with this statement and in these political meetings. As Daniel Pipes, director of the Middle East Forum, wrote last month in *Jewish World Review*: "(The Council is) on the wrong side in the war on terrorism," consistently defending militant Islamic groups and dictators, while "denouncing" terrorist acts. Pipes refers to a story reported in the San Ramon Valley (Calif.) Herald about (Council) Chairman Omar M. Ahmad, who told a crowd of California Muslims in July, 1998, "Islam isn't in America to be equal to any other faith, but to become dominant. The Koran ... should be the highest authority in America and Islam the only accepted religion on Earth."

In Canada, census figures released last week show that for the first time Muslims now outnumber Jews. The Canadian Muslim population increased 128.9 percent in the decade beginning in 1991, making Islam the fastest-growing faith in Canada. Muslims now make up 2 percent of the Canadian population, while Jews have declined from 1.2 to 1.1 percent, according to census data.

You don't have to be paranoid to fear where this can lead in Canada and in the United States—where immigration and births are dramatically increasing the Muslim population. Vote-hungry politicians might easily bow to the political objectives of Muslim voters, many of whom have agendas outside this country and, in fact, outside this world. When Muslims gain political power, the historical and contemporary record is not encouraging for people who hold democratic values and are of the "Judeo-Christian" persuasion.

If politicians succumb to pressure from Muslim activist groups and equate Islam with the religious and political heritage of this country, we will know that an important beachhead has been attained by our enemies. From their behavior in other parts of the world, one can safely predict they will use this beachhead to advance their cause.

No client nation can survive the expunging of divine viewpoint from the nation's inventory of ideas. No client nation can endure the inversion of thought brought about by the doctrines of idolaters and heathen. To do so is to invite demise, disaster, and ultimate destruction.

The only way that order can be restored is a return to the absolute principles provided by divine revelation in Scripture. In the interim, while disorder gains momentum, it is the mature believer of the nation's Christian population that provides the glue which holds society together. They have the confidence of knowing that regardless of the historical outcome of political failures, military conflicts, and social upheavals the Pivot will survive, for as there will always be a remnant in Israel there will also always be a remnant in the Church Age.

This brings us back to our study of paragraph:

F. The Silent Witness of Shear-jashab:

[NOTE: The following notes are taken from lessons MD02-204 through -208 and pages 786 through 803.]

Jennings, F. C. *Studies in Isaiah*. (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Publishers, n.d.), 422-25:



Rabshakeh takes his stand at “The conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller’s field.” Three representatives of King Hezekiah come out of the city to meet him. Haughtily, as a conqueror, he addresses them, wondering at the temerity that dare refuse anything to “the great king.” What can have given Hezekiah so vain a confidence? It must, Rabshakeh thinks, consist in one of three things, all equally baseless. First, and the most probable, he hopes for help from Egypt. Egypt, that reed that splinters with the least weight put upon it, and pierces the hand that expected its aid! (pp. 422-23)

But possibly—for it is a common report that Hezekiah is a religious fanatic—he may say that he is trusting in Jehovah, his God. How can that be possible? For whose high places has Hezekiah removed but those dedicated to that very Jehovah, insisting on so strict a conformity to his own narrow-minded bigotry, that people must only worship just what, where, and as *he* thinks right!

Or is it barely possible that he still retains some remnant of dependence on his own army. Rabshakeh will let him have 2,000 horses if he can mount them with riders. He cannot do it. How then can he resist the youngest subaltern in the Assyrian forces?

Rabshakeh has covered the field well. Hezekiah’s hopes must be either on the world (Egypt), or on Jehovah, or on his own resources; the spheres of soul [human viewpoint driven by fear], spirit [blind faith in a mythological “god”], and body [reliance on military power alone to deliver].

The second [reference to the “sprit” or Hezekiah’s faith in Jehovah to deliver] shows how utterly incapable an unregenerate man is to discern the motives that govern him who is led of the Spirit.

Has there been any change in man’s heart today? Not one whit. Speak of God, or religion in any of its externals, and you will be approved. Speak of Jesus, tell of the virtue of His blood as alone able to cleanse from all sin, and it requires no divinely inspired prophet to tell what will happen; you will at once be condemned as a fanatic. (p. 423)

Rabshakeh’s speech cuts deep, and the three plenipotentiaries fear the effect of it on the people who are listening to the colloquy as they sit on the walls, and they beg that Rabshakeh will speak in Aramaic, with which they, as educated men, were familiar, while it had not as yet become (as it did later) the vernacular of the people. (p. 424)

The Assyrian, first insulting in the coarsest way the Committee, steps nearer, raises his voice, and addresses directly the very people, thus: “Do not be deceived by Hezekiah—I will not call him king, there is but one worthy of the title, and that The Great King, the King of Assyria—he can not deliver you, nor can your Jehovah. Let me give you some advice: make terms with me, and then you will be at ease till I transfer you to another land of equal fertility and beauty to your own, so that you shall suffer nothing. But on no account let Hezekiah deceive you with such vain hope as that Jehovah will deliver you. That is an old story due to superstition; let history speak, let experience be heard. Where are all the gods who have opposed our march?—Hamath, Arpah, Sepharvaim?

Nearer and nearer as we approached they fell one after another. These gods all failed to protect their votaries; and now look at your sister state to the north, Samaria! Of how much avail was Jehovah there? Shall He then deliver *you* out of my hand?” (p. 425)

- 1) Thus the Rabshakeh concludes his address by which he sought to propagandize the diplomats, the people of Judah, and ultimately Hezekiah into surrender.
- 2) But according to Isaiah 36:21 the people “were silent and answered him not a word; for the king’s commandment was, ‘Do not answer him.’”
- 3) The Rabshakeh’s speech was laced with propaganda as we have noted. But we have also noted the site of his discourse as the “conduit of the upper pool on the highway on the fuller’s field.”
- 4) The Rabshakeh chose this location because he wanted to remind the people that during the reign of Ahaz, Isaiah selected this very site to deliver his prophecy that the Assyrians would invade Judah.



- 5) He thought he had done his research well and that by positioning himself in this spot the people would discern the clear implication that Isaiah's prophecy had come true.
- 6) But Isaiah never prophesied the fall of Judah, only the fact that she would be invaded. There were other implications regarding the location of Isaiah's speech that the Rabshakeh, being an unbeliever, was incapable of knowing.
- 7) And it is this disadvantage that caused his selection of the "conduit of the upper pool" as the place for his speech to result in a confirmation of Hezekiah's commandment, "Do not answer him."
- 8) Only those who had a spiritual inventory could possibly pick up on the subtlety but the citizens of Judah did. The Rabshakeh sought a propaganda advantage by choosing the conduit as the site for his address.
- 9) But by doing so he converted an assumed advantage into a distinct disadvantage. Isaiah did indeed deliver his prophecy of the Assyrian invasion on the conduit, but he also sent with it a coded message that provided the solution to the problem about which he prophesied.
- 10) It is this coded message that takes our study of the Assyrian invasion of client nation Judah and segues us to Lucifer's primary objective for the attack—the severance of the line of Christ.
- 11) This coded message will also instruct us into how divine omniscience and omnipotence are able to anticipate Lucifer's every move and trump it before it occurs.