

# Steinlight, Howse – The Anti-Immigrant Theologians

By Dave Leach

[www.TequilaPartyOnline.US](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US)

**Leviticus 19:33-34 when the alien is living in your land, don't mistreat him. ...Treat him as your native born, welcome him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt, I am the Lord your God...**

(The translation of Stephen Steinlight – contact him at [sms@cis.org](mailto:sms@cis.org))

*Summary of this article:* The anti-immigrant movement has found Biblical justification of its severity towards immigrants in Stephen Steinlight, a Jewish, Hebrew-speaking 1970 graduate of Columbia college who interprets Lev 19:33 “when the *temporary visitor* comes to your land....” That interpretation presumably allows mistreatment of people who stay very long. Popular evangelist Brandon Howse joined the cause with a video on his website December 15, 2010.

In support of this redefinition, Steinlight cites Richard Friedman, the author of five books which insist that the five books of Moses were written, not by Moses, but by at least four unknown authors spreading from way before Moses to Hezekiah, centuries after. Steinlight ignores published Hebrew lexicons and Bible commentaries, which point out that the Hebrew word for “alien” is applied by God to Abraham’s stay in Canaan for 100 years, Isaac’s stay for 180 years, and Israel’s stay in Egypt for 430 years. Either God doesn’t think the word can only mean a *temporary* visitor, or God regards 430 years as only temporary. In either case, if Steinlight will agree to stop mistreating immigrants who promise not to stay longer than 430 years, we may have a deal.

Most of Steinlight’s “theology” does not really qualify as Biblical arguments. For example, Steinlight insists God didn’t foresee our problems, God doesn’t have “a legislative affairs office in Washington” (doesn’t care what our government does), Romans 13 commands us to obey Hell, and if millions can’t bear the burdens we lay on them, that proves God wants them to.

My own Bible study of Leviticus 19:33-34 focuses on another word: the Hebrew word yaw-NAW, translated “mistreat” or “oppress”. It proves that Leviticus 19:33 is more accurately translated, “If an immigrant come to live with you, you shall not DEPORT him....”!

*(For my exhaustive study of this word, which analyzes 24 different translations and 19 different Bible commentaries, see [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-Shall-Not-Deport-a-stranger.pdf](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-Shall-Not-Deport-a-stranger.pdf).)*

Claims of Biblical support for anti-immigration are crucial to the movement, which consists largely of Bible believing conservative Christians. These claims are unopposed in conservative media, and poorly opposed elsewhere because immigration activists ignore the Biblical dimension of the issue. These claims need to be publicly opposed, in a way that brings Bible discussion into the news. Not only to set the record straight where God stands, but because Scripture offers a practical, comprehensive model of immigration policy which will solve every real problem, restoring America’s economy, security, and integrity. Immigration reform has floundered for lack of so clear a vision.

**Contents below, of responses to Bible arguments of Steinlight and others:**

	Page
A more detailed version of this article	2
Stephen Steinlight, interviewed by David Barton, with Leach’s response	6
James Edwards Bible study, published by Center for Immigration Studies	13
Tamara Scott Letter (Christian radio interviewer in Des Moines, IA)	36
Brandon Howse video, with Leach’s response	40
Stephen Steinlight, interviewed by Jan Mickelson, with Leach’s response	51
Steinlight’s Jewish Perspective (Review of 2001 article)	57

**Leviticus 19:33-34 when the alien is living in your land, don't mistreat him. ...Treat him as your native born, welcome him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt, I am the Lord your God...**

(The translation chosen by Stephen Steinlight)

(Contact Steinlight at [sms@cis.org](mailto:sms@cis.org))

That is a very annoying verse to the anti-immigration movement, which claims Biblical support for its severity towards those it labels “illegals”.

This claim is crucial to the entire movement's legitimacy, because anti-Immigrants are mostly conservative Republicans – not mere “fiscal conservatives”, but full fledged “moral conservatives”, also called “social conservatives”, powered largely by evangelical Christians, most of whose political issues are “informed” or inspired by the Bible.

Except for this issue.

Therefore it has grieved the movement that liberals, Democrats, Catholics, and many Protestants, such as Mat Staver of Liberty Counsel and Richard Land, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, have come forward with Scriptural opposition to the entire anti-immigrant movement.

Like in the South during the days of slavery, the demand for “affirming” theologians is great.

Today, Stephen Steinlight has stepped forward to answer their call. His arguments have been admired by people ranging from David Barton, the conservative Christian historian who owns the largest private collection of early American documents, to Jan Mickelson, WHO radio talk show host in Des Moines, Iowa. Steinlight's helpfulness to the cause has gotten him on the staff of CIS, Center for Immigration Studies, a leading anti-immigrant organization.

Steinlight's anti-immigrant theology pretty much boils down to the meaning of one word in one verse. He claims the word means something other than Bible lexicons say it means. All the rest of his arguments, and the verses he quotes, are not really relevant to immigration policy but are distractions.

First we will go over some of the evidence Steinlight ignores in redefining “alien”.

After that are summaries of his other arguments.

After this article, are transcripts of talks by Steinlight and Brandon Howse, with my analysis interleaved. Brandon Howse, who hosts “Worldview Weekend” conferences in America's largest evangelical churches and has a national Christian radio show, joined the cause December 15, 2010, with a video on his website.

**The word גֵּר (“alien”, or in the KJV, “stranger”) doesn't mean “temporary” by any human concept of “temporary”!**

The *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (TWOT) is the most detailed of my lexicons. It says “The root [גֵּר (*gûr*)] means to live among people who are not blood relatives”. The derivative גֵּר *gēr* means

“Alien, sojourner, stranger, referring to someone who did not enjoy the rights usually possessed by the resident. The clearest sense of the noun *gēr* is seen when used of Israel in their sojourn in Egypt (Ex 23:9; Gen 15:13). Moses named his son Gershom in memory of his stay in Midian (Ex 18:3), for he had been exiled from both Egypt and Canaan. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob lived as strangers in Canaan (Ex 6:4) meaning that they had no property rights there.”

According to this definition, the word says nothing about length of time. In fact, TWOT proves that if it says anything about length of time at all, it does *not* indicate any kind of “temporary” stay: it points out that “Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob only sojourned in Canaan (Ex 6:4), although Isaac and Jacob were born there.”

**Personal background:** Steinlight is a Jew who wrote in 2001 that he abhors the U.S. turning away Jewish refugees prior to World War 2, which sealed their doom. He wants refugee immigration expanded, but he wants Latino immigration suppressed. He says Latino voters have already cost Jews a couple of seats in Congress, and Jews will probably be less sympathetic to the safety of Jews than whites who know about the German Holocaust. Latinos only know Jews as their rich white taskmasters, Steinlight says.

So, like Pharaoh before him, he calls upon his fellow Jews to rescue the overly racial anti-immigrant movement with wisdom and sophistication, in order to reduce the Latino population in the U.S., before Latinos begin voting with the enemies of Jews.

**Exodus 1:8** Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. **9** And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we: **10** Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land. **11** Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. **12** But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.

Steinlight also wants to limit Latino immigration out of compassion for Latinos. He doesn't want them, with their low skills and education, to have to come here and “fill the bottomless demand for the wretched of the earth to occupy the bowels of the service sector” which will somehow end “the American dream of upward mobility and social integration”. To spare them that, he would force them to continue struggling at \$3 a day.

With the compassion of an abortionist who doesn't want a baby to have to grow up “unwanted”, Steinlight would deprive immigrants of the freedom to decide for themselves which alternatives are in their best interests. But this isn't about Freedom. It's about Compassion.

Steinlight makes a more reasonable case for limiting the immigration of Moslems who openly promote the extermination of Jews, Christians, and Freedom of Speech and Religion. But he spends much more time in his 2001 article, and in his interviews with Barton and Mickelson analyzed in this file, moaning about Latino immigration.

(See <http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back1301.htm>. The final article in this file takes selections from Steinlight's article and analyzes them.)

In other words the same word which Steinlight says means a temporary visitor, God uses to describe:

\* Abraham's “sojourn” in Canaan (Gen 17:8, 23:4, Heb 11:9) of 100 years, (He came to Canaan at 75, Gen 12:4, and died at 175, Gen 25:7):

\* Isaac's “sojourn” in Canaan (Ex 6:4) for all the 180 years of his life (Gen 35:28) from birth to death;

\* Jacob's “sojourn” in Canaan (Ex 6:4) for most of his life, except for his “sojourn” with his father-in-law for 21 years and his “sojourn” in Egypt for his last 17 years.

\* Israel's “sojourn” in Babylon (Ezra 1:4) for 70 years

\* Israel's “sojourn” in Egypt (Genesis 47:4) for 430 years [Ex 12:40, Gal 3:17]! (TWOT says “The Israelites are called sojourners (gērîm) in Egypt (Deut 10:17–19; Ex 22:20); being outsiders at the beginning and virtual slaves at the end of their stay.”)

Now if everyone wants to agree that 430 years is a “temporary stay”, fine. Then I will agree that the word means a “temporary stay”, and I will be grateful that Steinlight actually is OK with any immigrant coming to America who wants to, so long as he does not stay longer than 430 years.

A similar, though much shorter, definition is found in *Dictionary of Biblical Languages With Semantic Domains : Hebrew (Old Testament)*.

**1731** גֵר (gēr): n.masc.; ≡ ...

**alien**, stranger, foreigner, i.e., one who is of a different geographical or cultural group, often with less rights than the reference group (Ge 15:13)

Agreement with this definition is found in the *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. It starts its definition with the word often chosen by translators: “sojourner”, and then

says it can mean either a “temporary dweller” or a “newcomer”, but it generally indicates “no inherited rights”. That definition is followed with verses which we are invited to “compare” (cf.) with that definition. As it turns out, the verses give no context indicating how long they have been “strangers”, or how much longer they will be, and no indication of any lesser rights. In fact, the verses all list rights which “the stranger” shall enjoy equally with the “home born”.

“1. *sojourner*, temporary dweller, new-comer (no inherited rights), *cf.* Ex 12:19 Lv 24:16 Nu 15:30 Jos 8:33.”

Later in the list of Scriptures are a few verses about “Israel in Egypt Gn 15:13 Ex 22:20; 23:9 (all JE) Lv 19:34 (H) Dt 10:19; 23:8”.

These verses of course prove that God applied the word to Israel’s 430 year stay in Egypt.

Since Steinlight ignores all this published evidence of lexicons and commentaries, you may ask, well then where *did* Steinlight come up with evidence for a redefinition?

He says Richard Elliot Friedman agrees with him.

He doesn’t say if Friedman ever put it in writing. Friedman published 5 books, but Steinlight doesn’t say whether Friedman’s opinion that “alien” really means “temporary visitor” was written in any of those books, or in any articles, or was ever published anywhere. Maybe Friedman told Steinlight his theory over coffee one day.

So who is Friedman?

Richard Elliot Friedman has won a lot of awards and honors, and published five books, but all five of his books are devoted to the “Documentary Hypothesis”, the theory that Moses didn’t really write the first five books of the Bible but they were written by at least four different unknown authors and editors who added to the earliest writings.

His most famous book is “Who Wrote the Bible?” (1987). Then “The Hidden Face of God” (1996), “The Hidden Book in the Bible” (1999), “Commentary on the Torah” (April Fool’s Day, 2003), and “The Bible with Sources Revealed” (December, 2003).

The second google result for his name turns up an interesting critique of Friedman’s reasoning by Rabbi Dr. Dovid (sic) Gottlieb, at [http://www.dovidgottlieb.com/comments/Who\\_Wrote\\_The\\_Bible.htm](http://www.dovidgottlieb.com/comments/Who_Wrote_The_Bible.htm)

For a scholar to back up a controversial theory about a Bible word, contradicted by published Bible lexicons and commentaries, by saying “a man says so” but without saying where he said it so we can look it up and see if he really did, and in what context, is on the same journalistic level with “It must be true: I read it on the internet.”

In the transcript notes below, you will see in more detail just how Steinlight presents his redefinition.

My own Bible study of Leviticus 19:33-34 focuses on another word: the Hebrew word yaw-NAW, translated “mistreat” or “oppress”. That word shows up 21 times in the Old Testament. In 14 verses, the context is clearly about some kind of involuntary removal, or displacement. Although most translations do not give this meaning but instead translate the word as meaning only some general unspecified wrong, as in Leviticus 19:33, each of these verses would make more sense if the meaning of “involuntary removal” were given.

In a 15<sup>th</sup> verse, all translations describe displacement, which shows that lexicons are mistaken which omit this meaning as a possible definition.

In the remaining 6 verses, the action alluded to by the word is not given, so we don’t know whether displacement is described.

In other words, Leviticus 19:33 is more accurately translated, “If an immigrant come to live with you, you shall not DEPORT him....”!

For my exhaustive study of this word, which analyzes 24 different translations and 19 different Bible commentaries, see [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-Shall-Not-Deport-a-stranger.pdf](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-Shall-Not-Deport-a-stranger.pdf).

Even if Steinlight were right, that American immigration policy should only avoid mistreating

those whose stay is not “temporary”, we would face the practical problem of knowing how long a particular immigrant is going to stay. Immigrants themselves don’t necessarily know.

Here are summaries of Steinlight’s other arguments, which are not even relevant Biblical arguments, so far as I can determine.

**God didn’t foresee our problems.** Steinlight insists that the Bible’s authors didn’t foresee America’s immigration situation, so Moses’ law is not meant as a model for American law. This is not an argument based on Scripture, but a sentiment that the Bible’s Author was not God, so the Bible has limited relevance to “today”.

**We must obey Hell.** He says we must obey all of our laws, right or wrong, whether inspired by the Bible or Hell, as he thinks is commanded by Romans 13:1-7 and 1 Peter 2:13. Even if this interpretation were correct, it would not be relevant. The issue before Christian voters today, whom they are addressing, is whether “We the People”, who are the ultimate rulers and lawmakers in America, ought to replace dysfunctional laws inspired by Hell with practical, fair laws inspired by God.

**If millions can’t bear the burdens we lay on them, that proves God wants them to.** Steinlight says the Bible would of course limit our welcome to immigrants who immigrate legally. This is circular reasoning: the issue before us is whether our laws violate the Laws of God by not allowing immigrants to come legally whom it is God’s Will for us to welcome. He thinks the failure of millions to obey our Hellish laws by remaining in inconceivable conditions proves our Hellish laws are the Will of God. It is God’s will that they remain in those conditions.

In other words, the issue is whether our laws “oppress” immigrants (the KJV word in Lev 19:33), or in the words of Acts 15:10, “put a yoke on the neck...which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear”. In the words of Luke 11:46, “**Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.**”

# Stephen Steinlight interviewed by David Barton

With Leach's response

(Audio: <http://www.wallbuilderslive.com/archives.asp?d=201004>)

I personally talked to David Barton at one of his book tables after one of his lectures for about a minute. I asked him about my frustration that “moral conservatives” have Biblical inspiration for all their other political positions, but have developed no theology to guide their position on immigration.

He agreed, but said with excitement that he has had talks with a theologian that is filling that void.

Stephen Steinlight.

I looked up that name and his theology with great anticipation, because I had nothing but admiration for Barton's thorough approach to evidence of Christian inspiration in America's history. I have defended him against his critics, which I have not found terribly difficult.

But when I learned what Steinlight stands for, I marveled first that Barton would be satisfied by such bankrupt exegesis, and second that he would have no historical perspective to add.

The policy Barton admires is the opposite of the policy of America's Founders which he so admires. Before 1882, no one ever thought of restricting who could come here legally based on what nation they were from. In fact, there was no federal immigration policy at all at first, restricting who could come legally; states had individual policies. Some states had half-hearted restrictions against criminals, the insane, or the poor that varied from state to state and year to year. A typical restriction against “paupers” was to charge the ship captain \$5 per immigrant, comparable to \$500 today, so that the captain would not bring over passengers who could not reimburse him.

But while some states had restrictions designed to limit immigrants who did not meet their criteria of quality, no state thought of restricting how many could come.

How can Barton be satisfied with an immigration vision so opposite of the vision of America's Founders whom he lives to extol?

I have emailed his website, asking if he has any information on what America's founders did or said about immigration. I am waiting for an answer.

From: Leach

Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2011 9:00 AM

To: [brr@wallbuilders.com](mailto:brr@wallbuilders.com)

Subject: Immigration

Do you have anything about what America's Founders did or said about immigration?

Dave Leach

The following are transcript excerpts, in italics, with my comments interleaved, in blue. The number before each excerpt tells you about how many minutes and seconds into the audio recording you will hear that excerpt. =The interviewer was Rick Green. You can hear the complete audio recording at <http://www.wallbuilderslive.com/archives.asp?d=201004>. In case that is ever moved or removed, I have archived it at [www.TequilaPartyOnline/Steinlight-Barton.mp3](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline/Steinlight-Barton.mp3).

2:30 *The folks who are supporting...illegal immigration...they quote a very famous passage from the book of Leviticus, and they quote it again and again and again. And in fact I was a witness before the immigration subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. I was invited by Congressman Lamar Smith...There were 8 witnesses. Of course the majority [Democrats] got 6. ...Everyone [of the 6] quoted Leviticus. ...This is one of those famous things where you say even the Devil can quote Scripture. ...Leviticus 19:33-34 when the alien is living in your land, don't mistreat him. ...Treat him as*

*your native born, welcome him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt, I am the Lord your God....  
That is not a talking point from God's legislative affairs office in Washington.*

Leach: I classify this as Blasphemy. To say principles which clearly apply to our national policy, don't, because what, God cares nothing about government sins?

"It doesn't say anything about immigration policy." What? How much more clear could God have been?!

I need to start using references about immigrants in the prophets, to make the point that when national laws violate God's laws, God ENFORCES HIS laws!

*"To think that the people who wrote the Hebrew Bible, that those people who were divinely inspired to write that Bible anticipated the debate on immigration in America in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century! I just don't think so!"*

Leach: This reasoning attacks the relevance of ALL God's commands ANYWHERE in the Bible! "That was then. This is now."

Those of us who believe the Bible is the Word of God believe that the principles behind His commandments are timeless, applying in all times and places and circumstances, even though changing circumstances requires some translation from ancient to modern applications.

5:55 *"the word for 'alien' that you find in that text...translates into English as 'sojourner'. That word, by the way, first appears in Genesis. It describes our common father Abraham when he dwelt briefly among the Hittites...King David uses that term to compare the transitory nature of human life with eternity..."*

Leach: Steinlight would save me work and guessing if he would give chapter and verse. Apparently this refers to Genesis 23:4, where Abraham told the Hittites he was a "stranger and a sojourner" among them. Steinlight presumably assumes (1) Abraham had known the Hittites only a short time. But by Sarah's burial, in this chapter, he had lived in Canaan 62 of his 100 years there. And (2) that Abraham meant he was a "stranger and a sojourner" relative only to the Hittites. But Hebrews 11:13 says his meaning was broader: Abraham and other Bible heroes were "strangers and pilgrims on the earth". Meaning, their whole lives. Not "briefly".

Genesis 17:8 defines "the land wherein thou [Abraham] art a stranger" as "all the land of Canaan", not just the Hittite land. *Gen 17:8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.*

David was not talking about "the transitory nature of human life" compared "with eternity" when he called himself a "stranger" in relation to God.

The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (TWOT) explains:

...the Psalmist regards himself as [a stranger] before the Lord (Ps 39:1-13; I Chr 29:15).

Indeed, even after the Conquest Israel is still a sojourner in the land, for the land belongs to the Lord (Lev 25:23).

In Psalm 13, verses 4-6 are about the brevity of human life, v. 8-11 is about God's judgment for the Psalmist's sins, and v. 12-13 concludes "Hear my prayer, O LORD, and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I *am* a stranger with thee, *and* a sojourner, as all my fathers *were*. O spare me, that I may recover strength, before I go hence, and be no more."

Since the Psalmist is not asking to live on the earth forever, but only that he may "recover strength" before his brief life ends, his tears and prayers must concern God's judgment for his sins.

If "stranger" and "sojourner" mean anything related to a brief condition, that will have to be proved by other evidence. Nothing in this Psalm requires such a meaning of these words. The more

natural explanation of why he would feel “out of place” or “out of his league” or “out of his comfort zone” (synonyms of “immigrant”) is that he was a sinner, in the presence of a Holy God.

As the NET renders it:

12 Hear my prayer, O Lord! Listen to my cry for help! Do not ignore my sobbing! For I am dependent on you, like one residing outside his native land; I am at your mercy, just as all my ancestors were.

Solomon not only calls himself, likewise, a “stranger” and “sojourner” before God, but by saying “we”, during a temple dedication attended by much of the nation, he gave all Israel that standing. His context of those labels mentioned nothing about brevity of life; indeed that would not have been accurate, since Israel, and especially its capital, Jerusalem, is the eternal Bride of Christ according to Revelation 21:9-10!

The context of Solomon’s characterization of Israel as “strangers and sojourners” was Solomon’s overwhelming realization that what he was “sacrificing” to God was already God’s.

1Chronicles 29:14 But who *am* I, and what *is* my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? for all things *come* of thee, and of thine own have we given thee.  
15 For we *are* strangers before thee, and sojourners, as *were* all our fathers: our days on the earth *are* as a shadow, and *there is none* abiding.

As the preceding selection from TWOT pointed out, God, also, called Israel “strangers and sojourners with me”, in Leviticus 25:23. God’s context likewise said nothing about brevity of life, but was rather in the sense of limited ownership rights. God said that in the same sense an immigrant has no right to sell land he may be living on but does not own, Israel may freely live on the land but they have no right to sell it. Again, since Israel, or at least Jerusalem, is eternal, God would have been inaccurate had He meant that Israel is “living briefly with me”.

Lev 25:23 The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land *is* mine; for ye *are* strangers and sojourners with me.

6:30 “One of the greatest of all modern Biblical scholars of...the Hebrew Bible is a professor...Richard Elliot Freedman...he translates that...as ‘alien’ or ‘visitor’. So what we’re talking about in the Bible is really the morals and ethics of nomadic societies, where the stranger who lived among you was entitled to be treated with decency, and that passage is also there obviously to express the omnipotence of God and the oneness of humankind. But it is not a statement about immigration. In fact it’s a statement about how you treat temporary residents. And so to say that 10.3 million illegal aliens should remain permanently in America, that doesn’t find any support in Leviticus. And just for the record, it’s not 10.3 million. I wish people would be just a little more honest. The fact is, the ways chain immigration works, that is to say extended family reunification, we’re probably looking at ...66 to 100 million immigrants in the next 20 years.”

Leach: 1. If the USCIS would allow temporary visas to the millions here who just want to work here temporarily anyway, they would go back home, and would never have brought their families here.

2. He quotes Friedman, without giving citation to any published article; and against Friedman is the weight of translations and commentaries which say otherwise. Without Freedman’s exact quotes we do not know if Steinlight even characterizes him fairly.

3. Even Friedman said the word may simply mean “alien”, Steinlight admits. When a word has more than one meaning (almost all words do) we look to the context for the meaning that is appropriate. We find that God applies the word to Isaac, who was an “alien” all of his 180 years, and to Israel in Egypt, which was there 430 years.

4. How do we know, when an immigrant comes, if he wants to stay permanently or temporarily? How did the Hittites know Abraham’s intentions? Not even Abraham knew! Therefore if God means the command to apply ONLY when someone will be here temporarily, we will need to solve the problem of determining when that is the case. But Steinlight has no openness towards those coming temporarily either; he throws all immigrants in a sack marked “permanent” and throws the

whole sack in the trash.

5. Abraham did a bit of wandering, but Moses' laws were given in preparation for the Promised Land, one of whose laws was that farm land could not be permanently sold out of a family's inheritance; it could at most be rented for up to 50 years. Not exactly rules exclusively for "nomadic morays".

6. Is someone who owns his home, starts a family, and founds a business with 318 armed employees, (Gen 14:14), a "temporary resident"? That describes Abraham.

8:25 *There's no word for 'immigrant' in the Hebrew Bible...*

*Do you believe that Scripture assumes, when it says, for instance, in the King James Version, 'If a stranger sojourn', would be in your land, that they are doing so legally?*

*"That's correct. ...in both Hebrew and Christian texts, law is very, very important..."*

Leach: Groan. The issue is whether our laws violate God's Laws. Our law is not "very very important" if it violates God's laws! It is, according to America's founders, "no law at all". Steinlight's logic says God's command to believe in God is only valid if you can do so legally! If the laws of your land outlaw Christianity, 'the law' is so important to God that He requires you to renounce your Christian faith and become a communist, or Buddhist, or whatever 'the law' in your land requires!

9:40 *(Steinlight says immigrants were not exempt from the laws binding on citizens.)*

Leach: Is Steinlight complaining that someone today wants immigrants to be exempt from the laws binding on citizens? Christians are asking precisely what Steinlight says he wants: for immigrants to have to obey only the laws binding on citizens, instead of having also to obey burdens grievous to be born, which Steinlight will not touch with one of his little fingers. Luke 11:46.

10:00-11:00 *(Steinlight's examples of breaking laws are using phony ID's, overstaying visas, etc.)*

Leach: Necessity Defense laws are too narrowly crafted to be useful for immigrants, but their principle is that if considerable harm may be avoided by causing a lesser harm, it is not a public offense. Denial of the God-given unalienable right to liberty is a considerable harm! Especially when the alternative is deadly starvation of family members. Using a phoney ID is a lesser harm! It is not a public offense by the principles of American law as well as by the Laws of God, which also, by the way, condemn the degree of government tracking involved in a government ID! That's right, Big Brother technology is so serious with God that Revelation 14 says everyone who participates will go to Hell! No other sin in the whole Bible carries that judgment! Therefore, whoever monkeys with our Big Brother national tracking database is actually forestalling the judgment of God upon America!

14:30 *(Steinlight says immigrants under Moses' laws could become citizens only by conversion. As if to say, "now if U.S. law forced immigrants to convert to Christianity, then I would be glad to have them come.")*

Leach: But wait. Hispanics are already mostly Catholic. Why doesn't that count? Must they convert to membership in Dr. Steinlight's particular church? Somehow I don't sense if they all did, he would want them!

Exodus 12:49 says there shall be the same law for the stranger, as for the natural born citizen. For the U.S. to require immigrants to convert to one of our religions would first require us to decide which religion, and second would be a requirement not imposed on any citizen, thus violating Exodus 12:49.

Steinlight is not even correct in saying Israel required immigrants to convert. Not even citizens were punished for unbelief. While the First of the Ten Commandments is to worship God, there is no penalty anywhere for violating it. Many of God's commandments are like that: personal, to individuals, as opposed to criminal, enforced by police and courts. The closest to a penalty for not converting, for a citizen or immigrant, is Deuteronomy 13, which gives the death penalty for proselytizing for other gods; but even there the crime is not mere belief, but "serving" them, which means committing crimes by God's criminal standards. For example, through child sacrifice.

The judgment of Phinehas, Numbers 25, and Korah, Numbers 16, were dramatic examples of God's judgment for dramatic unbelief, but these are no examples of God punishing for mere unbelief. In these examples, there was flagrant public unbelief in the very authority of government, which our laws call inciting to rebellion. No one ever had to stand before a crowd and profess to believe particular doctrines, anywhere in the Bible. Freedom of Religion was not invented by America's Founding Fathers. It was merely copied by them from the Pages of God.

The verses leading up to Exodus 12:49 say an immigrant who has not been circumcised can't participate in Passover. No restrictions against being here, or equal protection of the laws, or anything else; just that he can't participate in the passover until he is circumcised. Then verse 49 concludes that the same law shall exist for immigrants as for natural born citizens, who of course are circumcised on the eighth day after they are born, Genesis 17:12. In other words, the correct application of this precedent is that as soon as immigrants meet the same criteria as natural born citizens, they must be given the same rights. When immigrants learn English and have at least the same rudimentary understanding of our freedoms as natural born citizens, they must be given citizenship and allowed to vote.

15:00 Interviewer: *Legal immigration, we're certainly for, but that requires assimilation into our culture, and adopting our culture, right?*

*Steinlight: That hits the nail right on the head.*

Leach: Steinlight apparently, but not explicitly, applies the alleged requirement that Jews convert, then, to a requirement today that immigrants "assimilate". One problem is that no one discusses objective criteria of when an immigrant has "assimilated". If we as a nation had that discussion, we would find that immigrants today "assimilate" about as fast as our own immigrant ancestors did. The first generation struggles with English. The second is fluent in both English and their ancestral language. The third knows only English.

We have objective criteria for immigrants to become citizens. Normally immigrants meet those criteria years, if not decades, before they are allowed to take those tests. Unfortunately our tests focus on the mechanics of our government rather than the principles sustaining our freedom, although I understand mechanics are more objective than principles.

The other problem is that if you have 1,000 people wanting to go to the toilet, and you pass a stupid law that only allows 10 people to get in line before you lock up the toilet for a year, you will create unrestrainable pressure to go to the toilet illegally! Are those breaking the law more at fault than the stupid lawmakers who make breaking the law necessary?

As I point out previously, the Necessity Defense found in American law actually justifies those who break relatively minor laws in order to avoid otherwise imminent serious injury. In most cases, immigrants who come here avoid starvation and exposure to the elements in a nation with no "safety net" for themselves and their families, injuries which are imminent. (Meaning, in ordinary usage and in case law, nearness in time of either the injury itself or the closing of the window of opportunity to prevent it.) In Iowa this principle is found in Code Chapter 704. Section 10 says action taken to prevent serious injury is "not a public offense", meaning "not a violation of law", even if it violates laws which would be enforced in the absence of the emergency.

15:30 (*immigrants came from many nations in the past and*) became Americans because they learned the English language, they adopted our morals and Constitutional principles, and when you do that, fully and with complete freedom of conscience, then you become an American. You are as American as someone who came on the Mayflower. That's the magnificent thing about this country.

Leach: Steinlight forgot to mention the OTHER thing you have to do to be an American in his book: you have to be one of the first 10 people out of every 1,000 in line.

I am a Mayflower descendant. I can trace my genealogy back to Richard Warren, my 12<sup>th</sup> generation ancestor. My children aren't interested in children but my brother's grandchildren are 15<sup>th</sup> generation descendants of the Mayflower passengers, and folks, that is about as far back as Europeans go. And even Native Americans came from Northern China, archeologists say. It may be that Iowa and parts of neighboring states were not even habitable until shortly before the Mayflower; Lewis and Clark reported stories from the natives of a huge lake contained by the Ozark Mountains which drained suddenly about that time.

So what is the difference between a first, or second, or third, or 15<sup>th</sup>, or 20<sup>th</sup> generation immigrant? The main difference that God condemns in Luke 11:46 is that only since 1882 have we added limits on who may come legally; burdens which neither we nor our ancestors were able to bear, which we will not touch with one of our fingers.

*I talk about Mexico not because I have any hostility or bigotry towards those who are Hispanic. But the fact is the numbers are so great. ...The problem is that these folks are not assimilating. Only 17% of this huge demographic is naturalized!*

Leach: It is Steinlight who insists on Numerical Limitations which do not ALLOW the remaining 83% to naturalize, and he is the nation's point man for alleging that these immigration restrictions have the blessing of the Word of God! In so doing, Steinlight is slandering God! Romans 2:24.

16:36 *People are not learning English. Something like 62%. We did two studies with Zogby International. 62% believe the Southwest belongs to Mexico. 69% believe they owe primary loyalty to Mexico.*

17:20 *We must follow the rule of law, constituted authority.* 18:10 *Hardly anyone in America wants amnesty for millions and millions. But we don't want mass deportations. We want, rather, attrition.*

18:50 *We want systematic cooperation between USCIS and local police, not allowing illegals to have drivers licenses, going after employers, border walls. In other words, make life uncomfortable enough that they will want to leave.*

Leach: In other words, Steinlight wants everyone to be in denial. To imagine that what has never worked yet will spontaneously start working.

All of this was supposed to be Steinlight's answer to what a Biblical immigration policy would be.

22:20, (*After Steinlight has left, David Barton joins interviewer Rick Green in a recap. Barton begins by saying "the words of the Bible are very important" which is why he is excited about the interview!*)

23:00 (*Barton says he is impressed to learn there is no word for "immigrant" in the Bible! "Stranger" doesn't count, for him!*)

Leach: “Stranger” appears 211 times in the KJV. It might be translated “outsider”, and its precise meaning varies with context. For example, when it says no “stranger” can carry the temple incense, it means anyone outside the priestly line specifically charged with that duty. When the context is citizens, “stranger” means a non citizen resident, or immigrant.

*“It’s fine to be a sojourner in another land. But you do have to assimilate into the land. The Bible does establish the Rule of Law.”*

Leach: Barton, of all people, should understand the definition of “rule of law”! Of all people! The most popular Christian historian in America, who spends his days reading and quoting America’s Founders, and who owns the world’s largest private collection of early American documents! Of all people, he should know, and he should be ashamed of himself for supporting the most dramatic, egregious attack on America’s Rule of Law since its founding!

“Rule of Law” has nothing to do with out-of-control ultra legalism, which filled the world in which America pioneered the Rule of Law. Ultra legalism is hardly what distinguishes America from the rest of the world! Since time began, men have seized power and passed laws, and hired police and state torturers to brutally enforce them. That is hardly what America’s Founders meant by “Rule of Law”!

The Latin phrase “Rex Lex” summarized the condition of the world’s laws before Rule of Law was pioneered amidst Bible study during the Reformation. It means “The King is the Law.” In other words, the king can make up any law he likes, and everybody has to obey it, except himself.

Our founders turned that rightside up: they declared “Lex Rex”, meaning the Law is King; in other words, whatever the law says, it says to everybody. No exceptions. Not even the lawmakers are exempt.

The very word “law” means laws evenly applied to everybody. To the extent they are not, they are not laws at all but mere raw, unrestrained power.

Are immigration laws applied evenly to everybody? Or are the lawmakers exempt from the burdens they place on others?

The very opposite of Rule of Law bears the judgment of God in Luke 11:46: **Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.**

# A Biblical Perspective on Immigration Policy

*Stephen Steinlight isn't the only "theologian" published by the Center for Immigration Studies. Here's another CIS Bible study about immigration, with Leach's response interleaved in blue.*

By James R. Edwards Jr. September 2009

## Backgrounders and Reports

CIS Fellow James R. Edwards, Jr., PhD, is coauthor of *The Congressional Politics of Immigration Reform*. He contributed a chapter related to this topic to Carol M. Swain's *Debating Immigration*, and his speech at Malone College's Worldview Forum was published in *Vital Speeches of the Day*.

---

The immigration issue often highlights fissures between faithful parishioners and denominational clerics. Many Catholic bishops have called for amnesty for illegal immigrants, and their conference's lobbying arm works continually with open-borders special interests. Catholic and "mainline" Protestant church officials have decried the federal government's enforcement of immigration laws. Some liberal religious leaders re-initiated a "sanctuary" movement to harbor illegal aliens, including in churches. A Southern Baptist official has sided with amnesty proponents as pragmatism, and the National Association of Evangelicals plans to weigh in, likely on the pro "comprehensive immigration reform" side.<sup>1</sup>

Yet such self-described "compassion" among religious elites differs from the perspective of most rank-and-file Christians. The laity generally opposes legalization and supports enforcement of immigration laws.<sup>2</sup> One may ask: How else could Christians approach immigration policy matters?

This *Backgrounder* examines the immigration issue from the perspective of biblical Christianity. Both policy makers and private citizens who are Christians may wish to consider how Scripture might inform their views on immigration. This report intends to aid those faithful readers.

The faith principles of many Americans inform their politics and public policy. And the United States has a long, historical connection with Christian influence, dating to the country's earliest days. Today, the vast majority (about four fifths) of Americans belong to the Christian religion. Some of the most prominent recent examples of faith-influenced politics are freedom of religious expression in public life, abortion, and same-sex marriage.

**On some matters of public policy, the Bible speaks clearly. On other issues, there is less clarity and more room for prudential judgment. The rub comes where there is a lack of scriptural clarity on a particular issue, significant differences between the particular society of Old Testament Israel and the United States, or some other factor.**

Christianity teaches that God, His word, and His precepts are unchanging, but believers may struggle to find the most appropriate guidance from Scripture for handling a very specific public policy issue for their day and age in their nation. This conundrum of finding and applying the right, timeless principles to a modern policy issue in a specific nation challenges both the laity and clerics. This report attempts to shed helpful light, in the best tradition of reasoning from the Scriptures (Acts 17:2).

First, this Backgrounder examines the biblical role of civil government. This includes its weighing justice and mercy, as well as determining which biblical guidance more appropriately applies to individuals and which to society. Second, migration in Scripture is considered. Third, what is the responsibility of immigrants and would-be immigrants? The Backgrounder concludes with the application of biblical principles to 21st century American immigration.

### **Civil Government's Biblical Role**

A central question must be answered before a biblically informed immigration policy may be determined: What role does God intend civil government to fulfill? After all, earthly government will be the mechanism through which public policy is formulated.

Scripture clearly indicates that **God charges civil authorities with preserving order, protecting citizens, and punishing wrongdoers**. A prime passage is Romans 13:1-7:

*Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore whoever resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of the one who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain. For he is the servant of God, an avenger who carries out God's wrath on the wrongdoer. Therefore one must be in subjection, not only to avoid God's wrath but also for the sake of conscience. For because of this you also pay taxes, for the authorities are ministers of God, attending to this very thing. Pay to all what is owed to them: taxes to whom taxes are owed, revenue to whom revenue is owed, respect to whom respect is owed, honor to whom honor is owed.<sup>3</sup>*

Similar teachings, such as I Peter 2:13-17 and Titus 3:1, urge citizens to obey secular authorities, because they hold godly agency, whether the individuals in charge are personally characterized by godliness or not. This conduct of good citizenship is one means of revering God. Earthly governors “bear the sword” on behalf of those under their authority — for instance, preserving law and order, fighting off invaders, and meting out punishment to those who break the law.

Leach: I smell a “straw dog” ahead. “We the people” are the “secular authorities” we are supposed to obey. The issue before Americans is not whether we ought to obey god-defying policies, or whether “we ought to obey God rather than man”, Acts 5:29. The issue before us is, as voters, what immigration policy is Godly?

The authority God delegates to civil government focuses on justice, not mercy (though this is not to say laws should not be tempered by mercy). Biblical teachings of mercy generally apply to individual conduct, not to civil authorities.

Leach: Huh? If indeed the Bible says such a thing somewhere, would you be so kind as to tell us where?

Further, standards of justice are not fully moral if they are not accompanied by judgment and punishment. These two elements (judgment and punishment) are integral, or else justice is not just.

Leach: Hmmm. Still no verses cited in support of this interesting concept. Actually a large proportion of the commandments of Moses, not to mention Jesus or the prophets, list no penalties. Eating pork, for example, though the meat is “unclean”, has no penalty, and doesn't even make the eater “unclean”. And even if it did, most uncleanness is temporary, and its only consequence is that you can't enter the temple. Romans 14 is an example of the care we must take, even in correcting and exhorting one another, to NOT lay burdens or judgments on others to pressure them to agree with us any more than we would attempt to fire an employee of someone else.

But I still don't know where this author is headed. He says laws are immoral if they don't provide for punishment. Even in American law, many laws do not specify penalties or even what legal process must be followed to deal with violations. In such cases courts assume an “implied right of action”, meaning a right to

take action in a civil court, by suing, when you have been hurt by a violation. That is, if you can afford to sue. So I can't think of where to apply this, where this general statement would be true.

In other words, civil government has been delegated authority to use force because government fulfills the role of protector of a specific body politic and the members of that political society. The reason the sword of justice has been delegated to earthly governments is for protection of a defined set of people who live under a government's jurisdiction. It is not power for power's sake, but power to protect and defend a state's own people and resources. Earthly rulers are to guard their own citizens against evil in the world and in the hearts of men.

And God holds rulers accountable for their official conduct (e.g., Deut. 17:14-20). Christians understand this delegation of authority to protectors in the civil realm to be a tangible safeguard against the consequences of the sin nature that inherently resides in every person.<sup>4</sup> Hence, national defense and police powers manifest the central role given to the government. A given government's responsibility under God is to safeguard its citizens.

Leach: As this reasoning proceeds, let's notice whether the author acknowledges that current immigration policy does not protect anybody, but endangers its citizens by maintaining a huge population of people who want nothing more than to serve us with their hard work, but who we pressure to either hide from our laws against them working hard, or leave us and let their families starve to death. This is a huge disenfranchised [no voice in government] population in which the real criminals and terrorists can easily blend. Current policy also endangers us by motivating millions to cross our borders between legal checkpoints because we will not allow them to come legally. If we allowed millions to come legally, only thousands we cross between checkpoints – the real violent criminals – making them much easier to catch.

These points concerning civil government relate to immigration policy in several ways. One is the implication of national sovereignty, which includes the right to determine the grounds for admitting foreigners into the jurisdiction, and on what conditions.

Leach: God has much to say about the conditions under which foreigners should be admitted, just as God has much to say about whom governments may justly execute. Not babies, for example. God does not turn the definitions of right and wrong over to men and then excuse them from judgment for discerning irresponsibly.

It also leads to the deduction that immigration policies should principally benefit citizens, not harm citizens' well-being. Further, its implications include the prerogative of punishment or expulsion of those foreigners who do not abide by the civil laws, including immigration laws, as well as determining the criteria and conditions for foreigners' admission.

Leach: Let's not forget the self interest Americans have in fixing broken laws which, to the extent they are enforced, fire bullets into our feet.

These sorts of prudential judgments may change according to the prevailing situation.

Leach: while the author argues, in effect, "government has legitimate power, therefore all its exercises of power are legitimate", our discussion ought to determine how We The People, the power behind our government, need to change our immigration laws so they won't be such a mess!

**Old Testament Principles.** Even the passages of Scripture most often cited by religious advocates of mass immigration and amnesty plainly do not argue for open borders. Rather, these writings generally reflect "equal justice under law" principles.

Leach: There is no difference. If our immigration laws gave "equal justice under the law", we would not have Numerical Limitations which allow a "line" to literally only 1% of those trying, at great expense through USCIS application fees and lawyers' fees, to get in it. Numerical Limitations ration fundamental liberties like Liberty and Freedom of Speech. Exodus 12:49 and the verses leading up to it explain that once the immigrant meets the criteria that citizens do, they must be given the same rights. Our 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment says anyone who is under the "jurisdiction" of laws (who can be lawfully arrested for violating the laws) must be given the "equal

protection” of those same laws. In other words, you can’t have special laws for some people that are not binding on others. My legal challenge to Numerical Limitations is posted at [www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Deportation-Brief.pdf](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Deportation-Brief.pdf)

Consider Leviticus 19:33-34: “When a stranger sojourns with you in your land, you shall not do him wrong. 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.” Similarly reads Exodus 22:21: “You shall not wrong a sojourner or oppress him, for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt.”

Dr. Stephen Steinlight has noted that the Hebrew term for “sojourn” means temporary stay.<sup>5</sup>

Leach: Interesting that this author quotes Steinlight, rather than consulting any of the dozens of Hebrew lexicons available. It turns out that Steinlight, in his interviews and lectures, in turn quotes another professor as his source, likewise ignoring published lexicons, and he doesn’t even tell us where this professor has ever published his view of the word so we may look it up and verify that is what the professor even actually said.

This is extremely significant because this point is the closest this study comes to an actual Biblical argument, and it turns out the third hand professor’s view is contradicted by published lexicons and commentaries.

For example:

“sojourn, **גָּר** a noun that derives its meaning from the meaning of the verb ‘to live among for an extended time.’ Therefore it is applied to the stay of a people (particularly Israel’s tribes) in a place for **any** length of time, such as Jacob’s tribes in Egypt (Gen. 47:4), [430 years], the man of Judah (Elimelech) in Moab (Ruth 1:1), [until he died], or Jacob and Isaac at Hebron (Gen. 35:27). [Isaac lived 180 years] (Harper’s Bible Dictionary)

**1** to sojourn, abide, dwell in, dwell with, remain, inhabit, be a stranger, be continuing, surely. **1A** (Qal). **1A1** to sojourn, dwell for a time. **1A2** to abide, stay, temporarily dwell. **1B** (Hithpoel). **1B1** to seek hospitality with. **1B2** to assemble oneself. (Enhanced Strong’s Concordance)

Abraham was a “sojourner” in Egypt, Gen 12:10. Uh, he was allowed to work, by the way. Our enlightened laws are more brutal than those of the tyrant Pharaoh! (At least for the first century. of being in Egypt, during which discrimination was so heavy that it was an abomination to the Egyptians to eat with an Israelite. Gen 43:32.) And Exodus 23:9 says don’t oppress the stranger – same word – for you were strangers in Egypt. That was not a very “temporary” stay, in Egypt! That was 430 years!

The traditional, unenhanced Strong’s says “sojourn”, in Hebrew, means to turn aside, in other words, according to context, to turn aside from his land, to come live by you.

But look at the phrase “do him wrong”. The Hebrew word, yaw-NAW, should be translated, in this context, “thou shalt not deport him.” See [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-shall-not-deport-a-stranger.pdf](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-shall-not-deport-a-stranger.pdf)

A related term used in some scriptural translations is “stranger.” One Bible dictionary says, “This word generally denotes a person from a foreign land residing in Palestine. Such persons enjoyed many privileges in common with the Jews, but still were separate from them. The relation of the Jews to strangers was regulated by special laws (Deut. 23:3; 24:14-21; 25:5; 26:10-13).”<sup>6</sup> This Bible dictionary defines “two classes of aliens: 1) those who were temporary visitors, who owned no landed property; and 2) those who held permanent residence without becoming citizens (Lev. 22:10; Ps. 19:12). Both of these classes were to enjoy, under certain conditions, the same rights as other citizens (Lev. 19:33, 34; Deut. 10:19).”<sup>7</sup> Again, those rights amounted to equal standing under the law, or having the benefit of the rule of law. Therefore, it is biblically inaccurate to incorporate, automatically and dogmatically, permanent immigration into every such term.

Leach: So if both categories are to have equal standing under the law with citizens, what IS different about the two categories that the author insists we note?

Let’s look at those “special laws”.

Deut. 23:3; Because the Ammonites and Moabites were so thoroughly committed to Israel’s destruction

that the Ammonites, like modern terrorists, attacked the women, children, and handicapped in the rear; and the Moabites had sent their women to prostitute themselves with Israel's men in order to remove God's protection from Israel, Moses said their descendants couldn't enter the Tabernacle until the 10<sup>th</sup> generation. However, Ruth, a Moabitess, married into the blood line of Jesus Christ in the 4<sup>th</sup> generation.

Deut 24:14-21; These verses do not create "special laws" in the sense of *restrictions* against immigrants that don't apply to citizens, but the opposite: they are special *protections* for immigrants because they are typical targets of discrimination. God says don't take advantage of them through your laws and court rulings, and let private charity be given them.

Deut 25:5 This verse isn't even about immigrants. The word "stranger" means "outsider". The context determines "outside of" what. For example, no "stranger" can carry incense; meaning, no one outside the priestly line specifically charged with that duty may carry incense. Here it means the widow must marry within the family. It is very important to God that family farms remain in the same family. Apparently that will be the case in Heaven.

Deut 26:10-13 Again, these are not restrictions, but special protections. Immigrants and orphans are to receive the same private charity as Levites.

Lev. 22:10 says immigrants can't eat the meat sacrificed to God. (Most of the meat sacrificed to God was actually eaten by men; only the fat and entrails were consumed by the fire.) **But all an immigrant had to do to stop being an immigrant, was to be circumcised!** (I don't know how a woman "converted".) **Then he could enjoy all the rights of citizens!**

In those days of rather public restrooms, a circumcised man among pagans was an abomination to them. Circumcision therefore was a commitment, severing loyalty to any of Israel's enemies, which by the way were about as bloodthirsty towards God's people as Palestinians and other Muslims today (Shiite, more than Sunni).

Ps. 19:12 Apparently this is a typo. Nothing about "strangers" here.

Nor is it reasonable to jump to the conclusions many on the open borders side do about related passages. These activists claim that such passages mandate that a society welcome any and all foreigners presenting themselves. **No such passages state or imply overlooking illegality committed on the part of the alien in his entry.**

Leach: Except that God's laws prohibit human laws against coming here! Yes, of course, God would punish those who commit WHAT WOULD BE CRIMES IF CITIZENS DID THEM! God would not punish those who violate laws which do not apply to citizens, but rather would repeal such corrupt laws!

Nor is there any requirement of unlimited or uncontrolled admittance of those who are members of another nation or society. Assertions like those are, at a minimum, a wrong reading. Such verses actually indicate nothing about the grounds for alien admission to ancient Israel.

Leach: The reason these "verses...indicate nothing about the grounds of admittance to ancient Israel" is that there weren't any! Duh! Find something in the Bible that puts limits on immigration! Uncontrolled admittance, of course not. Cities had walls. Armed robbers could not enter. Unlimited admittance? Show me where God put any limit on how many "strangers" we should treat well! When God says again and again "for ye also were strangers in the land of Egypt", remember that in Egypt, they were just about a majority. So even when Hispanics seem to outnumber us, we are to treat them fairly. This isn't rocket science. Egypt tried to pull a South Africa, with Apartheid. Not smart. Why go out of your way to enrage a majority, or even a significant minority?

In fact, as Steinlight and others have noted, a fair reading of the relevant Old Testament passages makes clear that foreign residents were to comply with Israelite laws, such as Sabbath observance (e.g., Deut. 16:9-15). Furthermore, the law God laid down for Israel allowed legal distinctions to be drawn between native Jews and resident aliens. For instance, Deuteronomy 15 commands the remission of the debts of fellow Israelites every seven years, but "[o]f a foreigner you may exact" his debts (v. 3). A chapter before, Hebrews receive permission to sell or give foreigners "unclean" food (see Deut. 14:21).

Leach: As for "unclean food", since foreigners ate it anyway, why not give it to them? Foreigners weren't FORCED to meet all the requirements which citizens meet. They weren't forced to be circumcised, etc. Until they did, they didn't enjoy the full rights of citizens; for example, Ex 12:49 says the uncircumcised may not participate

in Passover; but once immigrants meet the same standards, they enjoy the same rights. As for lending, foreigners were not subject to Israel's lending laws, any more than China today is subject to our OSHA laws. When the bank of another country wanted to charge interest, Israel's laws against "usury", or interest, claimed no jurisdiction over other countries. Therefore it was fair to let them play by their own rules when it came to them repaying their bills, too.

Another theme stands out in the Bible. God regards borders as meaningful and important (see, for instance, Prov. 22:28 and Prov. 23:10-11). Consider Deuteronomy 32:8: "When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he divided mankind, he fixed the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God." Ezekiel 47:13-23 details the Promised Land's boundaries. Numbers 34:1-15 describes the borders the Lord established for each tribe of Israel. Deuteronomy 19:14 commands against moving a neighboring tribe's boundary stone marking a given tribe of Israel's inheritance in the Promised Land. Another example appears three months after the Israelites left Egypt. The base of Mount Sinai was made off-limits (see Exodus 19:12ff), under penalty of death, until the people had been consecrated. Resident aliens who had children and settled in Israel (largely because of Israel's failure to complete the mandate to remove them) were allowed private property in Israel (Ezek. 47:21-23). However, numerous times Israelites are warned against letting the aliens' pagan practices corrupt God-given moral standards.

**Leach: Of course there are borders. No one today is proposing eliminating borders! The issue, then and now, is for what reasons people may cross them.**

God also employed foreigners as instruments of His justice, with invasion as a curse (just as he used the Israelites to exact justice against the pagans residing in the Promised Land). For example, II Chronicles 36 describes the decline of Judah, the culmination of kingships and continual disobedience by God's people. This sad passage tells of the Chaldean conquest of Israel and the judgment meted by the Babylonian captivity. The curse in Deuteronomy 28:43-44 reads: "The sojourner who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower. He shall lend to you, and you shall not lend to him. He shall be the head, and you shall be the tail." That curse plays out throughout Old Testament history.

**Leach: We are left to aim at implications, for want of a clear point. Are violent armed invading armies then, equated with peaceful unarmed immigrants today who just want to come work for us for little pay? As for the threat of immigrant dominance, what is this the judgment for? Isn't it for violating God's laws? Then, therefore, if we don't want that to happen today, shouldn't we think about obeying God's immigration laws? When we vainly oppress a growing near-majority, it doesn't take any divine miraculous intervention to bring about hostile immigrant dominance! This isn't rocket science!**

In short, the Old Testament teaches fair treatment of resident foreigners, with certain requirements of the aliens related to religious and civil legal standards. It also instructs that aliens were to assimilate to the Hebrew culture. Boundaries are meaningful, as well, and foreign presence among the Hebrews on several occasions was a curse. Few details of immigration procedures, standards, or other policy prescriptions appear. To infer some open-borders or mass-amnesty mandate from what actually appears in Scripture is wrong.

**Leach: NO "details of immigration procedures, standards, or other policy prescriptions appear" in the Bible. That's because there weren't any. Just like in the U.S. before 1882. Sometime, look up the word "amnesty" in a law dictionary, will you? And stop using it to describe "fixing stupid laws". [www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Amnesty.htm](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Amnesty.htm).**

**Justice and Mercy.** Believers have long grasped the instruction of passages such as Micah 6:8: "He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to **do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?**" Some translations use the word "mercy" instead of "kindness." American University **Professor Daniel Driesbach has found Micah 6:8 to rank among the most cited scriptures by America's founding generation.**

Justice and mercy, along with a godly life, are fundamental principles of biblical conduct. Justice and mercy are complementary principles. They informed the thoughts of America's Founders as they fashioned a government for the new nation.

Government's wielding of the sword of justice is well established, biblically, as discussed earlier. Jesus

did not challenge that principle, either toward Rome or other earthly authorities, nor did He question the legitimacy of civil (or religious) government.

Leach: Jesus did clearly say there is a line beyond which human government must not go in intruding on the jurisdiction of God, Mat 22:21. Christian martyrs were slain because they were furious with Christians for holding to that truth.

Romans 13:1 calls for obedience to “*higher* authorities”, plural, which presumes a nation’s laws are consistent with the *highest* authority. When ours are not, Romans 13:1 calls us not only to disobey as individuals, but to correct our laws, as voters. This author does not *specify* otherwise, but treats the subject so vaguely that he *implies* otherwise.

Government’s exercise of mercy is more challenging than its role in ensuring justice. Examples of mercy in public policy exist; for instance, granting a criminal a pardon or parole before he serves out his prison sentence, having proportionality for punishment of a crime (e.g., an eye for an eye, rather than a life for an eye). But most such policies aim in a rifle-shot fashion at individual cases, and often they involve some level of merit. U.S. immigration statutes have provided for suspending deportation in certain exceptional hardship cases. The adverse effects of not carrying out the justice due against guilty individuals are reduced somewhat by these acts’ limited scope and infrequent application.

Leach: True enough, mercy is shown to the most desperate of refugees. But the “boat people” from Vietnam and the turning back of Cubans to torture and death testifies that this mercy is little more than lip service. But it’s like saying our abortion laws are “merciful” because it allows babies to live whose mothers want them! There should be no law allowing ANY babies to be tortured to death! It isn’t “mercy” to exempt a selected few from a cruel, illegitimate law! It is only a brief respite from cruelty!

When considering mercy as public policy, however, an important distinction must be drawn. Not every moral or ethical teaching in the Bible fits cleanly or applies equally to both individuals and societies. This is certainly true with justice and mercy. The case for civil authorities executing justice is much plainer, while their application of mercy in public policies is merely tempering, not predominant. Legislating mercy requires prudence, restraint, and good judgment.

Leach: Any time *any* general principle is applied to a specific situation, “good judgment” is required. Proverbs 26:7, Mat 9:14-17. The problem with the author’s general statement is that it is a general statement. Instead of addressing specifics so we can decide for ourselves whether to despair at the mission of applying God’s principles to the problem before us, he retreats behind a generality that implies that a red flag ought to go up at the suggestion that law treat immigrants fairly.

Oh, that’s the other problem with the author’s statement: calling fairness “mercy”. No one is asking for “mercy” for immigrants, as if they are guilty of something beyond violating our illegal laws which defy the Laws of God. It is *justice* that we demand!

I found a similar dodge at <http://www.worldviewweekend.com/worldview-times/article.php?articleid=6306>

“Addressing a passage from Matthew 25 about caring for ‘the least of these my brothers,’ Smith contended that it ‘advocates individual acts of kindness (but) does not mandate a public policy.’”

(Interesting that anti-immigrants have heard of Matthew 25 but apparently have overlooked that it threatens with Hell those who do not “take in the stranger”. That is a judgment I would rather avoid, either as an individual or as a voter!)

Actually Deuteronomy 26:12 mandates that a portion of the tithe go for food for immigrants. Nevertheless it is true that God’s system relies more on individual charity than government charity. But the problem before us is an immigration policy that makes individual charity towards immigrants illegal! That’s right, you can be prosecuted for helping an “illegal”!

Similarly, Jesus affirmed the place of civil government, the executor of justice. Christ said in Matthew 21:22: “Therefore render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.”

Leach: Today’s Caesar – conservative Christian Bible-believing voters who support God-defying anti-immigration enforced by the latest Mark-of-the-Beast technology – is defying Matthew 25:39-44 about taking in immigrants – but the scariest part is we can’t pass this off on some secular, anti-God government! The power

behind our brutal treatment of immigrants is “evangelical”, “social conservative”, Bible-believing Christians!

And Jesus Christ told the rich young man to sell his belongings and follow Him (an individual act of obedience with merciful effect), yet he never advocated a public policy of extorting or impoverishing the better off. From such facts we may infer certain actions as appropriate by individuals and not by civil government, and vice versa. This principle accords with the idea that not every sin (moral offense) should necessarily be against the civil law in a particular land.<sup>8</sup>

Leach: Agreed. Not every sin should be against the law. Not every act of charity should be enforced by law. But the command “thou shalt not deport him” is a command for governments. It is a moral principle which applies to governments. It is a standard by which governments which do not obey, and all the people under them who tolerated its wickedness, will be judged.

A classic teaching on mercy comes in Luke 6:27-31. In this passage, Jesus says:

*“But I say to you who here, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. To one who strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also, and from one who takes away your cloak do not withhold your tunic either. Give to everyone who begs from you, and from one who takes away your goods do not demand them back. And as you wish that others would do to you, do so to them.”*

The last sentence readers will recognize as the Golden Rule. Christ’s instruction here applies to individuals instead of governments.

Leach: What kind of theology or reasoning is this? Is he saying that a command which applies to individuals, cannot therefore apply to governments? That “thou shalt not murder”, since it applies to individuals, does not apply to governments, so it is OK for governments to murder?!

This “Golden Rule” is deeply embedded in U.S. law as Due Process. “denial of due process rights under the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments” means the same kind of legal procedures, rights, and protections given everyone else in your circumstances was not given you. The Golden Rule, like the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments, says “give unto everybody the same rights you want for yourself”. My “Deportation Brief, [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Deportation-Brief.pdf](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Deportation-Brief.pdf) , makes the legal case that immigration’s “Numerical Limitations”, popularly called “quotas”, violate the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process rights of everyone who is living in the U.S., and who therefore is subject to our laws.

A synonym of “Due Process” is “rule of law”, a phrase which originally meant laws which apply equally to everybody, without placing any burden on anybody from which the lawmakers (voters) are exempt.

Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Luke 11:46 (Also Act 15:10, Mat 23:2-4, Gal 6:13) 2, Is 10:1-2

The reason is the difference between actors and agents. As an agent for members of the body politic, civil government acts on behalf of a larger group of people. Civil authorities have no resources other than what citizens entrust to them. Every obligation civil authorities take on they do in their capacity as public agents, not personally (other than, say, as individual taxpayers themselves).

In other words, these agents (or representatives) are delegated to weigh what obligations the body politic will take on, and their decisions obligate individuals living under their jurisdiction to fulfill them. For instance, policy makers may decide to establish a program to provide for the widows and orphans of fallen military servicemen. This may be regarded as a policy on the mercy side of the equation. However, the government has just obligated individual citizens at large to fund and maintain this program. Thus, the practical consequences of civil government’s “mercy” actually are borne by the citizenry.

Related to this is the familiar passage about treatment of “the least of these my brothers” — the hungry, the naked, the stranger, the prisoner. The passage in Matthew 25:31-46 plainly concerns the eternal reward or punishment of individuals. The judgment here is based on individual acts of kindness, as private persons. It becomes highly problematic to ascribe the specific mercy ministries this passage cites to bodies politic.

Leach: Granted, “I was sick, and in prison, and ye visited me”, were a government to attempt to fulfill it, would raise the question how even to do it. But “I was a stranger, and ye took me not in” leaves no doubt as to

its applicability.

It invites skepticism to conclude that feeding the hungry or welcoming the stranger as a matter of public policy at public cost is implied here.

Leach: The issue here is not whether to accommodate immigrants at public cost. One of the many options for a temporary guest worker program is the condition that immigrants must stay off welfare. Center for Immigration Studies, the publisher of this Bible study, perverts the data on how much immigrants pay in taxes compared with how much they receive in “welfare”, in their August 2004 study. They count public education, and even prison, as “welfare”. But that’s not the worst of it: \$3,000 of the \$6,000 “welfare” cost attributed to the average “illegal” household is the national budget divided by the population, called the cost of “infrastructure”. As if because this “illegal” has come here, that caused the war in Iraq, and those expensive studies on the mating habits of gunga frogs, so illegals ought to pay their fair share! The study also counts citizens born to “illegals” as “illegals” themselves!

When government waste is not called “welfare” and citizens are not called “illegals”, the CIS’ own figures show that instead of the average “illegal” paying \$4,000 in taxes and receiving \$6,000 in benefits, he pays \$4,000 in taxes and receives \$1,000 in benefits! And those “benefits” include public education, jail, and emergency hospital room visits. Only a tiny fraction of that is what anyone would normally call “welfare”, and they receive these benefits only very indirectly.

These figures are, quite frankly, lies. I never had the opportunity to reason with CIS leaders about this, but I had a chance to meet and talk with, and get the email address of, two FAIR leaders who came to Des Moines for Christmas of 2007. Their response was to stop communicating as soon as we get to the interesting details. These lies have the effect of calling God “stupid” for telling us to take in the stranger, and to not “deport” him.

And given that immigration policies pit the interests and well-being of citizens of a body politic against those of people subject to other national jurisdictions, laws that privilege foreigners, wealthy elites, and special interests over the welfare of citizens (particularly average and less fortunate members of society) are, at a minimum, morally obtuse. “The least of these” in this context are those with a claim to particular authorities’ protection, not foreigners or native elites.

Leach: This logic might stand, if its premise were true. If it were true that immigrants cost us, and if it were true that God does not directly command governments to allow peaceful, hard working immigrants to come freely, then it would be logical to conclude that letting them come reduces welfare available for citizens, a goal of which God would disapprove.

Another lie is the notion that they come and take our jobs, leaving us without jobs. That logic would raise the question why 6 billion people aren’t out of work today, since that many have come since Adam, to take away his job! Isn’t it obvious that everyone who comes here and takes a job, also creates a job, since he has to buy our services in order to remain here? Gas, rent, etc.?

Similarly, the notion of neighborliness illustrates the individual (versus societal) obligation. The Good Samaritan parable exemplifies the commandment to love one’s neighbor as one loves oneself. It appears in Luke 10:25-37, where the social outcast in the story Jesus tells acts more as a true neighbor than do more outwardly upstanding characters. It shows one’s investing himself in someone in need, taking mercy, as the example of loving neighbor.

Leach: Today, the very same life saving mercy to an immigrant which Jesus honored as obedience to the Second Greatest Commandment, is prosecuted by the USCIS as aiding and abetting illegals.

***While principles from this example may serve in certain public policy areas***, the model ***largely*** applies to individuals. At the policy level, it would be too easy for the state to demand conduct best exercised voluntarily by individuals, not under compulsion.<sup>9</sup> Such is not mercy, nor is it motivated by love. The same goes for the state erroneously regarding foreigners as “neighbors” and treating them better in certain ways than its own citizens.

Leach: He finally concedes that principles applying to individuals “may serve in certain public policy areas”, which pretty well trashes his previous argument that they cannot. “Largely”? “Too easy”? Once it is clear that the Scripture applies to governments, that fact cannot be canceled by imagining that some proportion of the

principle needs to be limited to individuals!

What danger is there of government treating immigrants BETTER than citizens?! How many citizens do you know who would gladly trade places with an “illegal”?

And while the general principles of mercy Christ mentions here may inform certain public policies, it would be wrong to jump to particular policies as justified (or mandated) here (such as U.S. funding of foreign programs that perversely result in dependency and illegitimacy). For each national government, “the least of these” will be native-born sufferers, the less fortunate of its own nation, those who stand to lose if forced to compete for jobs or education, for example, with people who would immigrate from some other nation (whose own civil authorities are responsible for their welfare). Further, in the United States, federal authorities are constrained by the U.S. Constitution, which limits their authority to certain denominated duties.

Leach: We have a lot of mixed issues here. “...foreign programs that perversely result in dependency...” is an argument about effectiveness. No one is arguing that we should deliberately fund ineffective programs! “...the least of these” will be native-born...”? Was the Good Samaritan native born? This strange idea has no support in compassion, foreign policy, and certainly not in Scripture. We give foreign aid to people “whose own civil authorities are responsible for their welfare”, but whom, we deem are doing it poorly. We find that it is not only good compassion, but good national security, to the extent we do it wisely. “Butter” is cheaper than “guns”. What is this sentence about Constitutional limits? Welfare for either citizens or anyone else has no place in the Constitution, but while we are waiting for our nation to care about that, where does the Constitution prohibit Congress from repairing a stupid immigration policy?

It is important to note another element of justice. God brings reward and punishment to human societies this side of eternity. Corporate entities such as civil societies have no existence except in the here and now. Thus, they temporally experience consequences affecting the whole. Scripture teaches that individuals are ultimately responsible for their personal sin or righteousness, but those personal moral dimensions affect the life of the body politic, as well. An aspect of this principle involves God’s empowering specific civil rulers over particular peoples (e.g., Deut. 32:8 *When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. ; Prov. 8:15-16 By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. 16 By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth. ; Acts 17:26 And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; ).*

Every ruler acts in accordance with God’s sovereignty, knowingly or not, though the reasons for certain political actions may not always be discernable to finite human beings (e.g., Prov. 21:1 *The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will. Pro 28:16 The prince that wanteth understanding is also a great oppressor: but he that hateth covetousness shall prolong his days.; Prov. 29:26 Many seek the ruler's favour; but every man's judgment cometh from the LORD. ).* Those who rule justly achieve a kind of temporal blessing for their body politic (e.g., Prov. 21:15 *It is joy to the just to do judgment: but destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity. ; Prov. 29:4 The king by judgment establisheth the land: but he that receiveth gifts overthroweth it. ; Prov. 29:14 The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his throne shall be established for ever.*). National character matters and has ramifications for a people, and the nation characterized by righteousness pleases God (e.g., Prov. 11:10-11 *When it goeth well with the righteous, the city rejoiceth: and when the wicked perish, there is shouting. 11 By the blessing of the upright the city is exalted: but it is overthrown by the mouth of the wicked. ; Prov. 14:34 Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people. ; Prov. 16:12 It is an abomination to kings to commit wickedness: for the throne is established by righteousness. ).*

The Old Testament constantly illustrates this notion of dealing with corporate reward or judgment. Before the Israelites entered the Promised Land, Moses gathered the people and stated the corporate blessings and curses the nation would receive based on whether the people obeyed God’s commands. Deuteronomy 28 spells out the blessings and curses. Verses 43-44 list among the Lord’s curses the resident alien’s rise above the natives: “The sojourner who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down

lower and lower. He shall lend to you, and you shall not lend to him. He shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.”

Leach: The implied anti-immigrant application is that Latinos are fulfilling this curse. Or maybe it is that “illegals” are fulfilling this curse. Therefore we should, what? Resist God’s judgment? No, we find no acknowledgment in anti-immigrant rhetoric of any sins of ours for which God should judge us. And yet I have seen Deut 28:43-44 quoted often. So what, really, is the implication? Neither in this article nor elsewhere do I find the intended lesson of these verses clearly stated. So we must guess.

Since I don’t see this passage quoted as a call for soul searching, to see what might have angered God, but I only see the verses used to paint Latinos as a curse, I will guess that the message is “Stop welcoming these Least of Jesus’ Brethren! Can’t you see God calls them a curse? Why deliberately welcome a curse?!”

(1) God indeed calls a certain kind of immigration a curse, and yet commands us to “take in” the immigrant, Mat 25:39-44, and commands that we do not “deport” him, Lev 19:33. (See [www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Ye-Shall-Not-Deport-A-Stranger.pdf](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Ye-Shall-Not-Deport-A-Stranger.pdf)) Apparently God distinguishes between one kind of immigration and another.

(2) The Deut 28 “curse” says nothing about increasing *numbers* of immigrants, but only their increasing power over us.

(3) The natural consequence of mistreating a growing population is the nurturing of a growing enemy.

(4) Immigrants who “assimilate” and “naturalize” as citizens, are no longer immigrants. The way to turn any “curse” into a blessing is to allow our “illegals” to become citizens, which they virtually all desperately want to do. At that point, their loyalties are with our nation. When hardly any “sojourners” remain, the danger of becoming subject to “sojourners” is nullified.

(5) Latinos have no resistance to assimilation other than the fear we impose on them of openly speaking and fellowshiping with us. Moslems are different; according to the May 22, 2007 Pew survey, only 43% of Muslims coming here think they should adopt U.S. customs. 26% think they should try to remain distinct. Out of 2.35 million Muslims, 188 thousand said suicide bombings could be justified often, or at least sometimes; another 117,500 thought it could be justified rarely, although it could be justified. Another 211.5 thousand would not answer. 117,500 had a favorable view of Al Queda; another 634,500 would not answer or said they didn’t know.

But there are Godly ways to respond to this threat too.

(a) Impose on Moslems the same laws as for everybody else. No Sharia Law exceptions. Just like God did.

(b) Prosecute imams and others who incite to rebellion and crime, as Deut 13 provides. Notice Deut 13 doesn’t criminalize mere unbelief, but incitement to “serve other gods” whose “service” included crimes such as human sacrifice.

(c) Require a loyalty oath not just to become citizens, but just to come, that renounces loyalty to any government, religion, or sect which calls for the violent overthrow of our Constitution, or our freedoms of speech and religion.

Later on, God brought judgment upon the Hebrew people, corporately, and other nations and kingdoms, corporately, such as through the Babylonian conquest of Israel. Temporal entities cannot be rewarded or punished in the hereafter; that realm is reserved for reward or judgment of individuals. Civil government should therefore heed the lesson that public conduct carries corporately shared consequences.

Leach: I’ve been trying to guess the point of explaining that governments don’t go to heaven or hell. Is it to escape the judgment of Matthew 25, which sends us to Hell when we do not “take in” the “stranger”? It is true that governments don’t go to Heaven or Hell, but the people who influence them do! I fear for the souls of Christians who shout down efforts to “take in” the “stranger” and insist, instead, that we pave the way for the Mark of the Beast by creating and activating national databases and tracking technologies to hunt them all down and deport them!

Getting back to Christ’s pronouncement to Christians in Luke 6, government can only exercise mercy

through its agency. Compassion and mercy, when individuals exercise them, amount to their decision willingly to bear an injustice. It is merciful when a private person turns the other cheek, gives up his tunic, and gives to a beggar. However, the government cannot do any of those things; it only can obligate the members of its society to do so.

Leach: Again, we ask not “compassion” or “mercy”, but justice. This author would deny justice by calling it “mercy” and “compassion”.

A compassionate act, when exercised by an individual, often becomes an injustice when compelled by civil government — the agents who are supposed to be the guardians of justice and protectors of the innocent, “the least of these,” the citizens or subjects of their jurisdiction. Thus, for example, writing into the U.S. Constitution a prohibition against cruel punishment (e.g., torture, which European governments had instituted, such as in the Spanish Inquisition or the English Star Chamber) is an appropriate adaptation of the biblical standards of mercy; freeing thieves and batterers from facing imprisonment, restitution, and accountability to society is inappropriate and not merciful.

Leach: The logic gets a bit jumbled here. Freeing criminals would be no more “compassionate” if done by individuals, than if done by governments.

How might this concept apply in U.S. immigration policy? Take amnesty, for example. Forgiving foreigners for entering the country illegally or staying when their visas expire might be seen as “merciful” or “compassionate,” at least in its effect on the people gaining legal status without having to suffer the consequences the law otherwise would require of them. However, the government, as agent, has acted in such a way that coerces innocent citizens and law-abiding immigrants to suffer the consequences.

Leach: I wish these people would look up the word “amnesty” in a law dictionary and stop using the word to describe fixing a law universally acknowledged as “broken”. Forget “merciful” or “compassionate”. What about “fair”? Woe to us legalistic lawyers who lay upon these immigrants burdens which neither we nor our ancestors (who came before 1882) are willing to touch with one of our fingers! God is not stupid, to say there are no “consequences” to “suffer” from obeying Him! See [www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Amnesty.htm](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Amnesty.htm).

In recent amnesty proposals, 12 million or more illegal aliens would be legalized. These amnestied lawbreakers would tie up the immigration bureaucracy; introduce through chain migration millions of relatives into an already clogged system; qualify for scarce public resources such as Medicaid, welfare, and other public assistance; and the costs of all these things would be borne by American taxpayers. Furthermore, the scale of such “mercy” would do harm to many Americans and communities, and lead to more illegal immigration by the signal such policies would send (and indeed have sent with previous amnesties).

Leach: First, the “lawbreakers” broken “laws” violate the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and the Laws of God, and the very Rule of Law which is defined in contrast to the rule of a king who is exempt from the burdens he lays on others.

Second, what ties up the immigration bureaucracy is Numerical Limitations which only let half a million from all over the world come legally, so the next half million in line are put in the slots for the next year, and the next half million for the year after that, etc. Repeal Numerical Limitations from Hell, replace them with basic criteria that reflect the capacity of citizens (learn English, stay out of jail for what would be crimes if citizens did them, etc), monitor compliance with criteria by simple, objective, machine-gradable tests, and those monstrous lines will go away.

Third, let’s repair the law, not keep it in effect and just allow exceptions for a few lucky ones. We have the equivalent of a 5 mph speed limit on the freeway that makes criminals of good people. Let’s not keep the speed limit at 5 and just forgive last year’s “speeders”. Let’s simply raise the limit, and let people drive normally.

### Migration in the Bible

While movement of people spans the Old Testament from Adam to Abraham to Moses to Ruth, no immigration policy (the terms and conditions for admission or expulsion of aliens) is spelled out. Moreover, Scripture provides no uniform immigration policy mandate intended to apply to every body politic throughout human history.

Leach: "If a foreigner turns aside to you, do not deport him" and "I was a stranger and ye took me not in" are pretty universal. 2 Timothy 3:16-17 says Scripture is "intended to apply to every" situation of every people of every time. It is blasphemy to say "that was then; this is now" to God. What, can you look at today's immigration policy and imagine it has *blessed* America?

Each instance of migration in the Old Testament is different. These movements span hundreds of years and diverse conditions. It would be foolish to assert an immigration policy for the United States based on such passages. The best Christians can do today is to identify the principles that aptly fit their particular society's circumstances.

Leach: The more OT migration was actually different, the more God's model treatment of immigrants, remaining the same through all those differences, is proved intended to apply to a wide enough variety of circumstances to encompass our own.

Most instances of migration in biblical history are particular to the individuals involved. For instance, God ordered Adam and Eve to flee the Garden of Eden or face certain death (Genesis 3:23-24). This forced migration occurred because of their disobedience.

God Himself led certain individuals or households to move to different locations. Each move recorded in Scripture helped fulfill His purpose in biblical history. None appears to have involved illegality. Each segment of the biblical narrative and the people in that historical line have a unique, specific purpose leading toward the coming of the Messiah and the subsequent spread of the Gospel.

Leach: The reason immigrant Bible heroes were not "illegal" was because the primitive pagans of then did not have "laws" which make criminals of honest, hard working people. Nor did America's founders have any such "laws"!

More routine human movement in biblical times was governed by each particular destination. City-states had walls and gates and thereby controlled entry and exit. Much migration was temporary or nomadic. For example, traders, shepherds, and others traversed open spaces. Sojourners would move from location to location, in different city-states and kingdoms, to ply their trades and made a living on the move. Craftsmen would spend periods away from home hiring themselves out. At all times, the local governments or rulers held ultimate control over admission, expulsion, and the terms of stay (see, for example, Nehemiah 13:15-22).

**Neh 13:15** In those days saw I in Judah *some* treading wine presses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all *manner of* burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath day: and I testified *against them* in the day wherein they sold victuals. **16** There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem. **17** Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing *is* this that ye do, and profane the sabbath day? **18** Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the sabbath. **19** And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the sabbath: and *some* of my servants set I at the gates, *that* there should no burden be brought in on the sabbath day. **20** So the merchants and sellers of all kind of ware lodged without Jerusalem once or twice. **21** Then I testified against them, and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the wall? if ye do *so* again, I will lay hands on you. From that time forth came they no *more* on the sabbath. **22** And I commanded the Levites that they should cleanse themselves, and *that* they should come *and* keep the gates, to sanctify the sabbath day. Remember me, O my God, *concerning* this also, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy.

Leach: Interesting. But closing the gate did not keep individuals from entering the "eye of the needle", a small door in the gate through which a man could walk, but donkeys or horses could not, without first unloading their burdens. If we allow all to come through the checkpoints, sign up, have their picture taken, and enroll in a probationary program, only thousands, rather than millions, of bad guys will still be motivated to cross between

check points. They will be much easier to catch.

During the Israelite journey, Moses sought permission for the Hebrew people to travel into Edom. He petitioned the Edomite king (Numbers 20:14-21). The king denied permission; Moses appealed, and the king again denied entry. Edom sent its army out to enforce its borders. While this action by Edom was not “hospitable,” it was legitimate.

Leach: Who is calling it “legitimate”? Certainly not God! God’s judgment was not only military defeat, but instructing Israel not to intermarry with them to the 10<sup>th</sup> generation! Interesting that the author would bring this up, since **it is very much like our immigration policy which brings out armed agents to repel perfectly peaceful hard workers who are perfectly willing to pay their way, as Moses was. Shall God not judge the U.S. for doing the same as Edom did?** How can this author turn this evidence of God’s judgment into evidence that this wickedness is “legitimate”? I don’t get it.

The Canaanite king of Arad (Numbers 21:1-3) launched a preemptive military strike against the Hebrews. That aggression resulted in the Lord’s favoring Israel in a counterstrike, in which the Hebrew army defeated Arad.

Similarly, Moses petitioned the Amorite king, Sihon, to pass through his territory (Numbers 21:21-31). Sihon, too, sent out his army, initiated combat, but lost the battle and consequently his life and his land. Israel stopped short of neighboring Ammon (v. 24) because of its fortified border. Israel similarly won possession of Bashan, when its king, Og, deployed troops and engaged the Hebrews. In none of these or similar instances does the securing of one’s border per se appear to have provoked God’s wrath. Where exercising border security in a defensive posture, local kingdoms escaped punishment.

Leach: Where is the example of this? What kingdom did not attack, and what kingdom was spared?

Of course, forced migration occurred as a result of national conquest. In many of these instances, God used pagan nations as instruments of punishment. Occasions such as the Babylonian exile of Israel in 586 B.C. (II Kings 24:10-25:21) illustrate God’s hand of judgment against the offending party to the Mosaic Covenant (see Exodus 20:1-17, 24:1-12). This mass migration was unwanted by the deportees.

New Testament times involved changed political circumstances. The independent Israelite kingdom was no more. Palestine had become conquered territory of the Roman Empire. Hence the Jewish religious leaders’ seeking Jesus’ political entrapment when he replied to “render to Caesar” one’s temporal, public duties (Matt. 22:15-22). Caesar maintained local authorities (e.g., King Herod) with Roman governors (e.g., Pontius Pilate) (see Luke 3:1-2). The imperial regime’s Pax Romana in certain ways eased travel and increased safety, as well as extended the privileges of Roman citizenship.

Caesar Augustus ordered a census (Luke 2:1-3). Thus, people like Mary and Joseph traveled to the hometown of their lineage. The couple later fled to Egypt for protection against King Herod (discussed below). The Jewish religious leaders persecuted followers of Jesus, recorded in the first several chapters of Acts. Acts 8:1-3 relates that the crackdown in Jerusalem scattered believers to other parts of Judea and Samaria. After Saul the Pharisee persecutor became Paul the apostle of Christ, he traveled throughout the Mediterranean region, from Jerusalem to Damascus to Crete to Athens to Rome. His missionary journeys were integral in spreading the faith, planting and growing churches. Acts 21 and 22 record that Paul was a Roman citizen by birth, and he relied on the rights of a Roman (see especially Acts 22:25-29).

The point here is that those subject to Roman rule, citizen or not, Christian or otherwise, benefited in tangible ways, such as lawful travel within the empire. And temporal citizenship served both God’s and early Christians’ interests, affording individuals such as Paul certain civil rights and privileges. Despite a less than perfect or moral civil authority, Christians of the early church “rendered unto Caesar the things that were Caesar’s.” **There is no evidence here that early Christians broke any laws when crossing borders.**

Leach: They certainly would have broken immigration laws, had the countries they entered had ungodly immigration laws like this author insists we maintain in the U.S. today!

**Humanitarian Migration.** Some people mistake examples of fleeing persecution in particular instances in the lives of biblical characters with a broad mandate of open borders, where none exists. These examples most closely match modern refugee and asylum policies. Today, nations will accept foreigners as temporary or permanent residents, depending on the circumstances, because of warfare, natural disasters, or political or religious persecution in their homelands that makes it impossible for these people to continue residing there without exceptional danger.

Perhaps the most notable example comes in Mary and Joseph's flight to Egypt. They fled King Herod's murderous decree to kill all male Hebrew children under age two, after the Magi from the East failed to inform him who and where Jesus was. Matthew 2:16-21 recounts this event in the life of the very young Jesus. An angel warned Joseph of the danger and specified Egypt as the family's destination. Verse 15 gives the scriptural reason for that destination, which was the fulfillment of prophecy pertaining to the Messiah.

Misguided modern misinterpretation notwithstanding, this act did not constitute illegal immigration. Nothing indicates that the holy family broke any Egyptian laws. Their intent was finding temporary humanitarian relief. They stayed only until they could return to Israel.<sup>10</sup>

Leach: They certainly would have broken immigration laws, had the countries they entered had ungodly immigration laws like this author insists we maintain in the U.S. today! As if Mary and Joseph knew when they would return! They didn't know until the angel told them. It was years later! "Temporary", indeed!

Another example comes when David fled King Saul's attempts to kill him. The book of I Samuel records Saul's growing hatred of David, how David's popularity as a war hero outshone his own military reputation (popular slogan at that time: Saul has slain his thousands and David his ten thousands), and his self-imposed exile. First, David sought asylum with King Achish of Gath (in Philistine territory). This was hometown to David's old archenemy, Goliath. David resorted to acting insane there, for safety, before returning to Judah to take refuge in a cave.

David fled — to his former enemy's nation — to seek sanctuary (his destination maybe not the best judgment call, and apparently not specifically directed by God). But there was no illegal immigration involved. Nor was he punished for any sort of illegal entry (Achish's advisors worried for national security reasons, though).

Leach: He certainly would have broken immigration laws, had the countries they entered had ungodly immigration laws like this author insists we maintain in the U.S. today!

Instances such as the migration of Abraham (who fled to Egypt to escape famine; Genesis 12:10) and of Jacob's entire household (invited by Pharaoh to Egypt, as Joseph's family, to gain relief during a famine; Genesis 45-46) do not provide modern-day immigration or refugee policy prescriptions. They simply exemplify times in which ancestors of Christ sought humanitarian help and God provided it through governing authorities.

No illegal immigration occurred here. The rulers of the receiving states were aware of the visitors' presence. Importantly, Christians believe that God is sovereign over everything. Thus, if or when, in His providence, a state denied a believer entrance into its territory, God provided another means for meeting his needs.

Leach: Oh? What is THIS based on?

On occasion, Scripture shows the refusal to be part of God's discipline or judgment. The answer, for the true faithful, is not to take matters into one's own hands.

Leach: Old sayings make a poor substitute for Scripture. God's heroes took all kinds of "matters into their own hands."

Something else should not be missed. Because Abraham lied about his wife's marital status and the consequences that followed, Pharaoh ordered Abraham and Sarah (called Abram and Sarai at this time) to be deported from Egypt (Genesis 12:20). And the circumstance of the Hebrew people residing in Egypt soured as

their stay became increasingly permanent and their presence became an internal security threat. Settlement by invitation led to enslavement and harsh measures, such as the killing of their offspring (Genesis 50:8ff).

Leach: Calling Abraham a liar is simplistic and hypocritical.

Hypocritical because modern society understands you don't tell the truth to criminals and terrorists who will use information to destroy. We have spies, undercover investigators, and lawyers who routinely use deception to protect the innocent, and no one calls them "liars" unless it is one of God's Heroes doing it.

Simplistic, because God rewarded Israel's midwives for lying to a later Pharaoh in Exodus 1, in order to save thousands of lives. And God Himself authorized lying spirits, in order to bring a king to judgment. 1 Kings 22:22.

Pharaoh was a thug. Abraham's fear of him was justified. Abraham had sized up Pharaoh accurately. He was in a situation like Christians today hounded by thug governments. Some through faith escape torture and death. Others through faith endure torture and death. Those who cooperate with their thug governments, telling them all they want to know, betray their fellow Christians.

We may question Abraham's strategy of buying time while God "plagued" Pharaoh, but we may not criticize it before we have thought of a more effective alternative, and we cannot. It worked. We may not criticize Abraham for "lying" to a thug government.

The rest of the paragraph is confusing, unless the author thinks Abraham never left Egypt but remained until the time of Moses. The final cite appears to be a misprint.

Therefore, instances of migration chronicled in Scripture provide no sanction for open borders. These movements of people across territories generally deferred to the national sovereignty of the local authorities regarding whether or not to grant entrance.

Leach: God's people certainly would have broken immigration laws, had the countries they entered had ungodly immigration laws like this author insists we maintain in the U.S. today! Those pagan nations will rise up in judgment against America on Judgment Day, because even they, without the benefit of the Word of God, did not add to the oppression of God's people as we do today who have the Word of God!

Mat 12:41 The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here. 42 The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.

The theme given the Hebrews of fairly treating aliens and sojourners resembles "equal justice under law" more than an admonition to take all comers without conditions. Even humanitarian migration (fleeing persecution, etc.) did not trump national sovereignty, as preserving law and order even as it relates to immigration is a duty of governing authorities and a manifestation of general blessing (under common grace) of all lawful residents of a jurisdiction.

Leach: The author presumably thinks this paragraph is supported by his previous "argument from absence" - that the absence of evidence of immigration law violations proves that had those pagans passed laws as ungodly as ours, God's people would not have crossed those hostile borders.

Additionally, particular movement on the part of certain individuals and of the Hebrew people to the Promised Land were elements of God's carrying out His will through the affairs of men. They should not be generalized beyond their context of time, place, and actors. Absent perfectly clear direction by God, such as leading His chosen people by pillars of cloud and fire, believers after the age of Christ should default to immigration standards that particular states may enact, within their delegated sovereignty. That would seem the most in keeping with the will of a God whose character includes the quality of order.

Leach: In other words, the immigration of our Heroes of Faith was OK then. They

are not examples to us, or to our immigrants, today. Any immigrant who comes without God's leading in a pillar of cloud and fire should submit to the leading of godless Christians who refuse to obey the Word of God which they process. Because it is the Will of God to maintain "order". It matters not that it is the Devil's "order", maintained by the Devil's standards.

### **The Immigrant's Responsibility**

Advocates for illegal immigrants like to blur moral lines. They offer up illegal aliens who purport to be Christians.<sup>11</sup> Yet, wrapping their lawbreaking in Christian terms stands at odds with the clearer teachings of Scripture. It becomes all the more curious when a supposed Christian justification overlooks conduct that might be regarded as inconsistent with biblical standards. For example, purportedly Christian illegal aliens set the poor example of a criminal life, often abandon their young children to grow up without a parent's daily guidance, and leave their community back home without the influence of "salt and light."<sup>12</sup>

Leach: In a majority of Earth's population today, thug governments call being a Christian "criminal". Why do we believe they are not? Why do we believe it is the government which is criminal? Not by any legal arguments based on their "laws". Only by God's standards. So it is with us. Christian immigrants who violate our "laws" are not criminals. The criminals are the Bible believing evangelical conservative Christian voters who maintain such Laws from hell.

Thus, what is the biblical position relating to those who would be immigrants? Have they the right to impose themselves on a sovereign nation, an established society?

First, the biblical standard for immigrants is that they obey the laws of a nation (the general standard for all, discussed above). Obviously, this relates to abiding by a nation's decision whether or not to admit an alien, and on what terms and conditions. It also includes an assimilationist ethic. Foreigners duly admitted into a particular society are expected to assimilate, not impose their own customs, language, etc. and remake the receiving society in their own image.

Leach: Again, this criticism lands squarely on a number of Moslems, which are not the target of this study, but this shoe does not fit Latinos, who not only assimilate at the same rate as our ancestors did, (the first generation struggles with English; the second generation is fluently bilingual; the third generation knows only English), but to their credit they do it despite the huge obstacle we place in their way, of giving them reason to hide from fluent English speakers.

Scripture passages such as Deuteronomy 16:9-15 illustrate the biblical assimilation ethic. Here, the Lord establishes for the Israelites the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles. These were religious observances, but also civil laws. In both cases, these laws required resident aliens to participate in the observance of these holidays. Likewise, the Fourth Commandment, calling for observance of the Sabbath day, also binds the resident alien (Deut. 5:14). Thus, in their public life, those aliens granted permission to reside in a nation owe a moral duty to the accepting nation to abide by its laws and assimilate to its customs. Such is morally responsible individual conduct in the context of immigration.

Leach: By the way, the purpose God gave for those national holidays was to remember Israel's Godly heritage. It is Biblical precedent we have today for requiring new citizens to learn how our freedoms function.

Second, forcing oneself on an existing nation is both unjust and unjustifiable. In other words, illegal immigration is morally wrong. Lawbreaking aliens bear moral responsibility for their unlawful actions.

Leach: Actually, God says it is He who manages immigration, even when immigration proceeds by invasion and violence.

Amo 9:7 *Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the LORD. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?*

Even desperate circumstances do not justify illegal immigration. Proverbs 6:30-31 says, “People do not despise a thief if he steals to satisfy his appetite when he is hungry, but if he is caught, he will pay sevenfold; he will give all the goods of his house.” The New International Version (NIV) translates the terms as “hunger” and “starving.”

Here, a man steals food to keep from starving. Everyone can understand the desperation that led to his lawbreaking. But despite his sympathetic circumstances, the fact remains that he stole. He took what belonged to someone else. Caught for stealing, he now faces punishment. He has to make restitution, even to the point of his own bankruptcy.

**Leach: The issue before American Christian voters is: who is the thief, according to God?**

Could we not make an exception for a starving man? The private owner can; civil government cannot. The larger principles in this example involve his willfully breaking God’s commandment against stealing. The man in this proverb could have looked for other, lawful options to satisfy his need. He could have asked people for bread. He could have prayed and asked God to supply his need. Even this desperate man was not at liberty to take matters into his own hands with unlawful acts. Scripture does not leave him free to become a law unto himself.

Even this understandable, but lawless, act wars against the peace of society. Civil government exists to preserve the peace. Were the government not to hold lawbreakers accountable, that laxity would send the wrong message to others who might not be in quite as dire circumstances. The forgiven lawbreaker might take the government’s mercy as lack of will to enforce its laws. In other words, the actions here of both the government and the lawbreaker have consequences for the rest of society.

**Leach: refusal to obey laws from Hell has made God’s people martyrs for 6,000 years. But their blood has sown the seeds of the freedom we take for granted today. Their blood has broken down tyrannies.**

Obedying a nation’s immigration laws (this applies to employers, as well as aliens) is a practical application of the two paramount commandments, loving God and one’s neighbor (e.g., Matt. 22:37-40, Mark 12:29-31). It also follows Christ’s directive to “render unto Caesar” matters in the temporal government’s jurisdiction (Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25). Such obedience shows one’s trust in God’s promised provision and faith in His ability to meet one’s needs. Jesus taught such contentment and trust in God in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 6:25-34; 7:9-11) and elsewhere (Matt. 19:29-30; Luke 12:22-34).

**Leach: These appeals by Jesus, that we sacrifice our selfish interests to trust God to enable us to do His Will, does not constitute authority for Christian voters today to ignore God’s Will in pursuit of our selfish interests!**

**Jesus’ concession to Caesar was actually a shot across the bow, warning Caesar not to exceed his jurisdiction as defined by God. This was not a singular warning; all the titles which we routinely associate with Jesus, were titles which Caesar had claimed for himself, making worship of himself a matter of Roman law.**

Almost no illegal aliens to the United States are fleeing starvation or physical danger. A Pew study found that most illegal aliens quit a job in their home country in order to break U.S. immigration laws merely to make more money here.<sup>13</sup> Thus, illegal immigration is at its core principally a matter of greed and envy on aliens’ part.

**Leach: I interviewed a man who had seven younger siblings to care for after his father died. He came here, not to keep *himself* from starvation, but to save his mother and siblings, who could not support themselves, and whose land offered them no “safety net”. Judging from the huge volume of money flowing from Latinos here to their families back home, which itself is criticized by anti-immigrants, and which would not be occurring if the workers here did not perceive their loved ones to be in dire need, my interviewee’s situation must be typical.**

Those illegal aliens and those purported Christians who defend their illegality, advocate mass amnesty, and argue against the lawful enforcement of U.S. immigration laws particularly veer far from what would seem a more sound, biblical position. Illegal aliens who claim to be Christians especially would do well to own up to their responsibility under God to be content in their home nation.

Leach: This author would have criticized the Good Samaritan, and preached to the robbery victim to be content in his pool of blood because that is "godly".

Instructive are such passages as I Timothy 6:6-10; "Now there is great gain in godliness with contentment," verse 6 reads. Hebrews 12:1-13 notes how the difficulties each person faces serve a purpose; for the believer, that purpose is conforming one's character to Christ's. "It is for discipline that you have to endure. God is treating you as sons" (v. 7). James 1:2-18 expands on this theme: "Count it all joy, my brothers, when you meet trials of various kinds, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness" (v. 2-3). So too states James 5:7-11.

Leach: This author would rewrite Luke 3:11, ...He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise. preach to him that hath none, the wonderful blessings of trials and tribulations, and how that will produce steadfastness.

James 2 would come out,

Jas 2:13 For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment. **14** What *doth it* profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? **15** If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, **16** And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be *ye* warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; *what doth it profit?* **17** ~~Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.~~ know ye that your faithfulness to help your brother in Christ maintain his blessing of tribulation will secure to your Treasures in Heaven, seven golden pennies.

This is the theology of Hinduism's B'hagavad Gita, which argues that helping people only interrupts the burning off of their Karma, causing them the suffering of having to reincarnate back to Earth again after they die. So the best way to bless people is to oppress them.

Foreign lawbreakers' envy toward Americans' material and political blessings may bring upon themselves eternal consequences: "It is through this craving [love of money] that some have wandered away from the faith and pierced themselves with many pangs" (I Tim. 6:10b). Violating immigration laws, just as violating other civil laws, manifests one's failure to trust God to meet His people's needs. Illegal aliens and their activists must ask themselves what the cost of such sin is worth to their souls. "For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life?" Jesus asks in Mark 8:36. The NIV translates the word as "soul" instead of "life."

Leach: The issue before American Christian voters: WHO is wandering from the faith for love of money? How ironic, that such hatred of immigrants fuels myths about their cost to us, actually cutting us off from the wealth they offer us were we to accept it!

Luk 6:38 Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.

But while the consequences of our actions suggest our hearts care nothing for money, our words make it pretty clear money is our reason for calling God's Word "irrelevant". It is our intentions which will be judged, 1 Cor 4:5.

The question each of those vocal advocates of illegal immigrants and those who have perpetrated this offense must face up to is where their true love lies. I John 2:15-17 warns believers of exactly this: "Do not love the world or the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (v. 15). "World" here refers to enticing things that become objects of desire, including material, sensual, and prideful things. The point is that someone has put temporal treasures ahead of loving God. Those misplaced treasures may include breaking civil laws regulating immigration in a nation's interest in order to make more money, accumulate more material goods, and live outside the bounds of laws adopted by God's agents of justice within a certain nation.

Similarly, apologists for immigration law-breaking and mass amnesty tread on hazardous ground, because their words blur moral lines that are brighter than they admit. But their tactics fall under sobering light

from passages such as Isaiah 5:20-21: “Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter! Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes, and shrewd in their own sight.”

Leach: Amen!

Thus, breaking immigration laws flouts God’s provision for each person’s well-being, because civil authorities made those laws and, as seen earlier, those authorities act under God’s delegated authority. “But let none of you suffer as a murderer or a thief or an evildoer or as a meddler,” 1 Peter 4:15 reads. In context, this passage means Christians should only suffer in righteousness for the cause of Christ, not as those who disobey civil laws that should be accorded with. Except in the rarest of instances, disobedience of duly adopted laws, therefore, dishonors God; it displays hatred toward one’s neighbor. 1 John 5:20 says, “. . . [F]or he who does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen.” In the context of members of nations, one’s neighbors are those people who share one’s citizenship, patriotic allegiance, and sacred duty to the body politic.

Leach: 1 Peter 4:15 is followed by:

1Pe 4:16 Yet if *any man suffer* as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf. 17 For the time is *come* that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if *it first begin* at us, what shall the end *be* of them that obey not the gospel of God?

God delegates political authority, in general. God nowhere tells His People to obey a “higher authority” who violates the Highest Authority. 1 Peter 2:13, read carelessly, sounds like an endorsement of the Divine Right of Kings theology. But in the Greek it means “Rearrange your lives in submission to every institution created for man by God.” The rest of Peter’s letter goes over all these human relationships instituted by God – government/citizens, husbands/wives, employers/employees, younger/elder, and finally we are all to be subject to each other – with advice how to function in them. Our obedience is not to the wickedness of any human who perverts those relationships, but to God’s vision for them. Thus God’s prophets confronted political leaders who misused their authority, for which they were martyred, increasing freedom for those that followed.

But American Christian voters today don’t even have to face martyrdom! All they have to do is overcome their lust for wealth which is actually blinding them to their own destruction of it, long enough to perceive God’s warning about the Mark of the Beast technology which American Christians are blindly demanding to catch and drive out “illegals”, and flee from Hell into the secure arms of Love.

This author goes to the extreme of equating disobedience to laws, however cruel, with “hatred toward one’s neighbor”! There are no bounds on this cruel theology, to keep it, were it in the early American South, from justifying slavery; or were it in Nazi Germany, from condemning Anne Frank; or were it in 1776, from condemning George Washington; or were it in the land ruled by the Pharisees, from condemning Jesus!

### Conclusion

We may fairly conclude that it displays questionable judgment to rigidly construct an immigration policy for 21st century America based on a handful of Scripture passages taken out of context or from particular instances of migration spanning centuries, vastly different nations and kingdoms, wholly different circumstances, etc. found in Scripture. Rather, carefully discerning applicable principles better fits the situation.

Leach: Agreed.

Further, obeying civil laws is the normative, biblical imperative for Christians, as discussed above. National sovereignty is part of the authority God has delegated to civil authorities. Whatever the immigration laws of a particular nation, determining the policies of how many immigrants to admit and the terms and conditions applying to immigrants are the prerogative of the national body. Each society may set or change its nation’s immigration laws. Those decisions rest within the society, and outsiders have no legitimate voice in that exercise of national sovereignty.

Leach: God is no outsider. It is we who are the outsiders, before God. See pages 7-8 of this article.

The Reformer and statesman John Calvin wrote of the sovereignty of the state. The duty of its lawful authorities is to dictate the course of justice and the sword. This extends to individuals crossing sovereign borders:

*If they [civil authorities] ought to be the guardians and defenders of the laws, they should also overthrow the efforts of all whose offenses corrupt the disciplines of the laws. . . . For it makes no difference whether it be a king or the lowest of the common folk who invades a foreign country in which he has no right, and harries it as an enemy. All such must equally be considered as robbers and punished accordingly.<sup>14</sup>*

Leach: I agree with Calvin, who had little respect for evil laws and spent a great deal of his theology figuring out how to defy them. See his “lesser magistrate” doctrine.

Though varying in manner in different jurisdictions, Calvin noted that civil laws have the same general end in mind, including such offenses as murder, theft, and false witness. “But they [states] do not agree on the manner of punishment. Nor is this either necessary or expedient. There is a country which, unless it deals cruelly with murderers by way of horrible examples, must immediately perish from slaughters and robberies. There is a century which demands that the harshness of penalties be increased. There is a nation inclined to a particular vice, unless it be most sharply repressed.”<sup>15</sup> In other words, different places rightfully may craft laws that deal with their unique circumstances of time, place, and character. This is a matter of the sovereignty delegated by Heaven.

The immigration laws of the United States have been adopted through lawful, legitimate, democratic processes. None of us may agree with every policy represented in the laws on the books, and many of us might advocate certain changes in U.S. immigration law. But this nation is blessed with a republican process for making laws. There is a just and fair way, through the political process, to modify statutes. Thus, the will of the Congress, as manifested in U.S. laws, represents the collective wisdom of the people’s representatives, and the will of the American people as a whole as it informed lawmakers’ decisions throughout the political process. This is how “the consent of the governed,” a solemn principle in American life, operates — as messy and unsatisfying as that at times may be.

Leach: The issue before American Christians is not whether to obey evil laws, but whether to vote for them.

As for mass amnesty, by legalizing millions of illegal immigrants, government does not show mercy. Rather, it obligates its citizens to bear the injustices aliens have committed against the body politic, as discussed earlier. This fact stands all the clearer in light of Calvin’s point above.

An instructive understanding of the temporal allegiances of each person comes from Francis Scott Key, a lawyer and the author of “The Star Spangled Banner.” A Christian himself, Key explains how believers appropriately, biblically fulfill their calling as citizens of both the City of God and the City of Man.

*. . . Finding himself associated with numberless fellow-creatures, “framed with like miracle, the work of God,” he has been solicitous to learn his relation to them. He is told that they are his brethern, that he is to love them, and that it is to be his business to fill up the short measure of his life by doing good to them. Engaged in this work, he has perceived himself peculiarly connected with some, who are brought nearer to him, and therefore more within the reach of his beneficence. He has observed that he is a member of a particular social community, governed by the same laws, exercising the same privileges, and bound to the same duties. His obligations therefore to this community, are more obvious and distinct. His own country, to which he is immediately responsible, by whose institutions he has been cherished and protected, has therefore a peculiar claim upon him (emphasis added).<sup>16</sup>*

Today, Americans find immigration policy causing their nation to suffer unnecessary consequences. Legal immigration is four times the historic average. Legal and illegal immigration are interrelated through distant relative (chain migration) visa categories, source countries, and enabled by the ease of modern travel and

communication.<sup>17</sup> The failure to require adequate educational, literacy, skills, and other qualities in prospective immigrants results in the significant subsidization of immigrants by American taxpayers.

The adverse effect of immigration today on the economic well-being of our most vulnerable fellow Americans, particularly blacks and those with a high school education or less, results in economic injustices that advantage the foreign worker over the American in the American's own nation. Mass immigration, exacerbated by large-scale illegal immigration, distorts the U.S. labor market and drastically inhibits the ability of the market to regulate itself into the "virtuous circle" that makes for a "win-win" situation for both labor and business owners. And both a criminal and a national security threat exist as a result of overly liberal immigration policies and lax enforcement of the laws on the books.

Therefore, it is time for Americans, particularly those who are Christians, to "be wise as serpents and innocent as doves" (Matt. 10:16) about this country's immigration policies at the start of the 21st century.

---

## End Notes

<sup>1</sup> For example, see Karen Lee Ziner, "Across U.S., church leaders have been calling for reform," Providence Journal, August 22, 2008; Ray Henry, "RI bishop wants U.S. to halt mass immigration raids," Associated Press, Aug. 21, 2008; Randy Hall, "Liberal Christians call for end to immigration hate speech," CNSNews.com, Nov. 16, 2007; Julia Duin, "Safety under the steeple," Washington Times, May 27, 2008; John Dawson, "Defining immigration," World, May 13, 2006; Jaqueline L. Salmon and Michelle Boorstein, "NAE's Cautious Look at Immigration Reform," April 2, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, see "Catholic bishops to left of flock on immigration," Washington Times, April 17, 2006; Ruth Melkonian-Hoover, "Christian views on immigration policy: Are laity following leaders?" paper presented at Midwest Political Science Association, April 3-6, 2008, Chicago, Ill.

<sup>3</sup> All Bible citations are English Standard Version, <http://www.gnpcb.org/esv/search/?q=Romans+13%3A1-7>.

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Genesis 3's account of the Fall, Psalm 53:1, and Romans 5:12-17. Also, see commentary on the God-given authority of the state to execute justice in G.I. Williamson, The Westminster Confession of Faith (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1964), p. 242.

<sup>5</sup> Stephen Steinlight, testimony before the U.S. House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, May 22, 2007, <http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/steinlighttestimony052207.html>.

<sup>6</sup> T.A. Bryant, et al., Today's Dictionary of the Bible (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1982), p. 596.

<sup>7</sup> Bryant, et al., Today's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 29.

<sup>8</sup> For a more detailed look at this concept, see Gerald R. Thompson, The Lawgiver: A Study of Biblical Jurisprudence (Annandale, Va.: Christian Legal Society), 1995.

<sup>9</sup> See Arthur C. Brooks, Who Really Cares: America's Charity Divide; Who Gives, Who Doesn't, and Why It Matters (New York: Basic Books, 2006) for a fascinating study of charitable giving and conduct in the United States, and how certain quarters of the population tend to withhold their own money and resources and feel they are being magnanimous when they advocate for taxpayer dollars and public resources to be allocated in "charitable" ways. The principle would seem to hold that those segments of society that define charity as government action funded by taxpayers are likely also to be the ones who regard liberal immigration policies as generous and merciful, despite the fact they personally bear little actual impact of such policies.

<sup>10</sup> See Mark D. Tooley, "Jesus Christ: Illegal Immigrant?" FrontPageMagazine.com, September 15, 2006, [www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Printable.asp?ID=24407](http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Printable.asp?ID=24407).

<sup>11</sup> See, for instance, Associated Press, "Second Illegal Immigrant Takes Refuge in Chicago Church," January 29, 2008; Jennifer Riley, "Hispanic Christian Groups Split on Illegal Immigrants, U.S. Census," Christian Post, April 24, 2009; or Julia Duin, "Safety Under the Steeple."

<sup>12</sup> This phrase comes from Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, found in Matthew 5:13-16 and reprised in Luke 14:34, regarding Christians having a positive influence upon society.

<sup>13</sup> Rakesh Kochhar, "Survey of Mexican Migrants, Part 3: The Economic Transition to America," Pew Hispanic Center, December 6, 2005, p. 4, [www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/58.pdf](http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/58.pdf).

<sup>14</sup> John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Ford Lewis Battles, translator (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 214.

<sup>15</sup> John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, p. 217.

<sup>16</sup> Edward S. Delaplaine, Francis Scott Key: Life and Times (Stuarts Draft, Va.: American Foundation Publications, 1998), pp. 114-115.

<sup>17</sup> See James R. Edwards, Jr., "Two Sides of the Same Coin: The Connection Between Legal and Illegal Immigration," Center for Immigration Studies, February 2006, <http://cis.org/node/263>.

# Letter to Tamara Scott

Christian radio interviewer, Des Moines IA

(Tamara never answered this letter)

Dear Tamara,

If you have any theology in defense of classifying as “illegals” many of those whom Matthew 25:39-45 judges us with hell for not “taking in”, I would love to hear it. The discussion Sunday had too little Scripture, and very little opportunity for me to interact in order to learn more.

You started to talk about a verse that has been misunderstood. I would like to have asked you what verse that was, and I would have liked more detail about how you thought it should have been translated, and why.

It is very difficult for me to listen to so many of my fellow Christians engage in so much talk which, as nearly as I can determine from Scripture, is a target of the wrath of God, where I have so little opportunity to exercise my Ezekiel 3:18 duty to warn people.

I wonder if the verse you started to talk about was Leviticus 19:33? I wonder if you have thought about the meaning of that Hebrew word yawNAW, translated “vex” in the KJV? I wonder if you know the same word is translated “thrust out” in Ezekiel 46:18, where 24 of my 24 translations render it some version of involuntary removal? And that in all 21 verses containing yawNAW, the context supports “involuntary removal” as the correct meaning of the word?

In other words, the verse is correctly translated,

*Leviticus 19:33 And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not DEPORT him. 34 But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the LORD your God.*

My evidence is in a 28 page article for which I am seeking publication, found at [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-shall-not-deport-a-stranger.pdf](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Ye-shall-not-deport-a-stranger.pdf).

Not that God wants us to welcome criminals and terrorists, or that we should not use watch lists for those groups at our borders. The phrase “thou shalt love him as thyself” does not say we should let them move about freely after they commit offenses for which we would lock up citizens.

Exodus 12:49 One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you.

*Luke 6:31 And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.*

This actually says the same thing as our “equal protection” clause of our 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment:

*“No State shall ...deny to any person within its jurisdiction [whom the state can arrest] the equal protection of the laws.”*

Have you thought about Jesus’ Second Greatest Commandment, and what it says about our expulsion of “illegals”?

“And who is my neighbour?” Jesus answered with a story about “the Good Samaritan”, in a day when His Samaritans were our Mexicans. Who is the hero of the story? A Mexican. What is God’s highest example of the kind of Love of Neighbor to which God calls us?

The Mexican who, despite all our cruel labels and burdens which we will not touch with our little fingers, Luke 11:46, still treats us with decency, not returning cursing for cursing (1 Peter 3:9), as he works hard for us. (Luke 10:29-37)

You agreed with my general statement that Numerical Limitations that allow only 1% of applicants to come legally was a problem, but you added “but this is not the right way to solve it.” I

would like to have asked you, “*what* is not the right way to solve it?” (I wonder if you have any concept of the solution I find in God’s Word?) and “*what is* the right way to solve it?”

Lowell did a great job of venting the frustration of employers who are the latest targets of the “Enforcement Only” approach. Republicans started it, and Democrats have proved only too happy to pile on.

I would love to have a recording of his testimony, or a written version of it, to include in my articles and letters to lawmakers.

I wonder if you have been following the latest “solutions” both at the state and federal levels, to force employers to stop letting “illegals” work?

Given his sentiments on the issue, I assume he voluntarily participates in the E-Verify system. But have you thought about the impact of making it mandatory? Congress would make it mandatory through the “Save America Act”, H 4088. State lawmakers came within a hair of making it mandatory for all practical purposes, by imposing liability on employers who did not use it, if any of their employees were found later to be here illegally. In other words, the legislation puts the burden on employers to prove in court that they did not “knowingly” hire an illegal, but if they use E-Verify that burden is removed.

The problem is the errors in the SSA database, upon which E-Verify relies. “According to the Office of the Inspector General in SSA, 12.7 million of the 17.8 million discrepancies in SSA’s database - more than 70% - belong to native-born U.S. citizens. (AFL-CIO Press Release, 8/29/7) The DHS had acknowledged a 4% error rate, (I read that on the DHS website but can’t find it now) and said its goal was to hone the databases until they had only a 2% error rate.

In other words, millions of U.S. Citizens would be dragged into court to prove they are U.S. Citizens, and if they can’t win in time they would lose their jobs. H 4088 gives them 10 days to win in court!

H 4088 would cause additional computer alarms to go off when a citizen works for two jobs, because two employers are reporting the same worker. HR 4088 would make any citizen with two jobs to arm wrestle with bureaucrats to prove that he’s the same guy, and that he’s a citizen.

The problems which no legislation would solve:

- \* Millions will have to wrestle with bureaucrats to prove they are citizens, or lose their jobs.

- \* Citizens must already wait an average 499 days for a Social Security Administration hearing regarding benefits. And now we want SSA, with no additional staff, to start another waiting list for citizens wanting to work?

- \* Names and SSN’s of citizens don’t “match” for dozens of legitimate reasons. How is it “knowingly” hiring unauthorized workers, to not fire workers who get “no match” letters?

Did you know that the DHS attempted to enact the essence of H 4088 by administrative rule, 8/10/7, and that it has since been tied up in court because it could cause millions of American citizens to lose their jobs? (Timeline below.) Did you know a few American citizens have already been wrongfully incarcerated during deportation proceedings because as soon as they are falsely accused of not being citizens, they have no right to a lawyer in immigration proceedings, and while in jail they cannot do “discovery” for themselves such as producing documents proving their citizenship, and that in the American legal system neither the judge nor the prosecutor will assist the accused in researching alleged such documents? Imagine millions of Americans brought under the same cloud of suspicion by enforcing firings in “no match” cases!

The Court acts as if there would be no threat to our freedom, if our national databases were error free. As if a few years of citizens wrestling with bureaucrats and courts, to purge our databases of errors, would be great for America if it just weren’t quite so costly to our economy.

But as a Christian, can you think of any problem with an error free national database? A national database with no errors is the *supreme* threat to our freedoms. The more accurate our national databases, the more bureaucrats are tempted to become dictators.

Do you know about the “photo tool” which the DHS added to E-Verify 9/25/07? Did you know it uses facial recognition software to turn photographs into unique identifiers as accurate as fingerprints? (Although the most accurate procedure is a series of photos from different angles.) Did you know the Comprehensive Immigration Reform that died in June, 2007 insisted upon “machine readable” Real ID cards with digital photos?

I did not see it spelled out that every employer would need to scan each new job applicant’s Real ID card as he applied, but assuming that were later spelled out by administrative rule, that photo and name would instantly reach the national computer database so that anyone the government wants for any reason, citizen or otherwise, could conceivably be arrested before completing the job interview.

Did you know that even with the full implementation of Real ID at workplaces (Real ID has been rebelled against by the states and by the Senate), Senator Jeff Sessions quoted a CBO report saying even all that Big Brother would reduce the illegal population by only 13%? Have you thought of how much more Big Brother it would take to identify all of them? Well, with all that technology already in place, what would be the next logical step? Wouldn’t it be to link up existing surveillance cameras to the national database with its facial recognition software, to track the movements of every U.S. resident?

Did you know one of the Greek meanings of “in” in the verse “Rev 13:16 And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads:”, is “based on”? And that one of the Greek meanings for “mark” is an image? And that the Greek for “forehead” actually means “the prominent part of the face”? So a digital photo in a government database, processed by facial recognition software, literally satisfies the technical requirements of Rev 13:16, does it not? Just as a fingerprint record satisfies the description of a “mark in the right hand”. The primary identification biometrics I have seen are fingerprints and digital facial photos.

Revelation says everyone who submits to the mark will go to Hell. Everyone. If God takes submission to the mark that seriously, even though the alternative is decapitation, how much more severe will God’s judgment be upon Christians so eager for this technology that they *vote to impose it not only upon themselves but upon others?*

**Mat 18:6 But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.**

God offers win-win solutions for every real and imagined immigration problem. I don’t hear Christians discussing them. I asked you previously if I may talk with you about these things, either on your show, on my show, or privately. You declined then. I ask you again: please?

### **“Job Magnet” Attack History**

**August 10, 2007**, the DHS, without Congressional permission, ordered employers to fire anyone whose names and numbers didn’t match in SSA records, and who couldn’t prove to the satisfaction of bureaucrats, within 10 days, that they were citizens.

**August 29:** the AFL-CIO sued, saying that would have caused tens of millions of citizens to be fired, and a few to be deported, in the opinion of AFL-CIO who sued.

On **October 10**, the Court ruled against the DHS, which then asked for time to figure out some way to modify its rule so it could identify illegals without firing citizens. In March 2008 it released a revised rule which is almost the same as the old rule. ([AFL-CIO v. Chertoff, N.D. Cal. No. 07-4472-CRB](#))

**December 6**, H 4088 (see also H 5515) was introduced in the U.S. House, 112 cosponsors, called the “Save America Act”, even though it has about the same threats to America as the DHS initiative still tied up in court. It requires the “E-Verify” system, to which a “photo tool” had been added September 25. It would require states to digitize their birth and death records and combine them

with existing national databases.

3/21/8, The DHS released a revised rule, almost the same as the original rule.

12/8/8 (Or perhaps the day before) Federal Judge Breyer, in San Francisco, refused to shorten the standard review schedule. a decision will not come until late February or March of 2009. Since the arguments against the rule are that it will adversely affect millions of American citizens, the review process includes time to receive and process public comments.

# Brandon Howse

Video: [www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Brandon-Howse-Leach-Response.MP4](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Brandon-Howse-Leach-Response.MP4)

Howse's original video: <http://worldviewweekend.com/worldview-tube/video.php?videoid=4423>

*Brandon Howse posted an anti-immigrant Bible study December 15, 2010 on his website. I responded to it in my own video, in which I played his video and interleaved my response. The composite video is posted at [www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Brandon-Howse-Leach-Response.MP4](http://www.TequilaPartyOnline.US/Brandon-Howse-Leach-Response.MP4). The following is the script of my response.*

Intro: I have gone to the rallies of a man named Brandon Howse. I appreciated them. His literature table is prepared to relieve you of a couple hundred dollars worth of books and DVD's, and I would buy them if I had the money and the time to read them.

He is a very busy, difficult man to get a minute with unless you are in line to buy a bundle of books. But I had a rare opportunity to communicate with him through emails, through his wife when he spoke November 21 in Dsm, and through his representative, Joe, at an October Christian conference in Minneapolis. I am frustrated that this video, which he posted Dec 15, 2010, well after I had supplied him with Scriptures and information, acts as if he had never heard of any of the Scriptures I mentioned.

Brandon's video is 15 minutes. I will replay it all. Copyright law allows us to replay portions of a copyrighted work that we have "critical comment" about, and I have "critical comment" about all of it. But I won't play it in order, because there is so much redundancy. For example, in this first section, after a brief introduction, he beats the word "amnesty" into the ground. He does this throughout his 15 minutes, so I bunched up all those times and put them one right after the other, so that when I respond to them, I only have to respond once. ADD NUMBERS COUNTING HOW MANY TIMES.

1<sup>st</sup> break:

Amnesty, he calls it, even when immigration reform includes fines and jail time? Honestly, there is no objective definition of that word that I have ever heard anyone spell out, capable of distinguishing between one man's immigration vision and another's. People like Congressman King and Tancredo use the word as if it means "the other guy's plan, if it is any more merciful than mine."

Can anyone please send me a precise definition of the word "amnesty"? Brandon talks about "amnesty" as if the meaning of the word is so clear that two congressmen can look at an immigration plan, compare it with the precise definition of the word "amnesty", and agree whether the plan fits the word. But there is so little agreement what the word means, that it is like two church denominations accusing each other of being "apostate".

Arlen Specter, on the floor of the Senate June 27, 2007, said: "I have grave reservations about punitive measures which do not have some substantive meaning, but that concession has been made to try to avoid the amnesty claim. We have gone about as far as we can go. Amnesty, like beauty, may be in the eye of the beholder. "

Congressman Steve King declared "Amnesty means to reward lawbreakers with the object of their crime", when he filled in July 4, 2007, for WHO talk show host Jan Mickelson.

The trouble with that definition is that every time a law changes, it makes actions legal which used to be illegal, or vice versa. This didn't used to be called "amnesty". This used to be called "passing a law".

Passing a law is what lawmakers do. It is the only thing they do. It is what they are supposed to do. In fact, the stupider the law, the better reason they have to change it. It is not "amnesty", even though whenever they do it, the definition of who is breaking the law changes. Raising the speed limit from 5 mph to 70 mph is not "amnesty", even though those who have always gone 65 are now rendered

innocent.

“Amnesty” used to mean to not prosecute supporting the enemy, after the enemy has been defeated and the war is over, even though the law against treason has not changed. That doesn’t apply logically to the benefits received by the victims of a stupid law, by fixing the stupid law.

Amnesty might be where you keep the speed limit at 55 but pardon every speeder caught before noon.

I’d like to sing you a little song, to the tune of All Of Me, copyright 1931 (expired; public domain now)

Amnesty!  
Please define amnesty!  
Can’t you see the word is confusing!  
Read my lips: changing a dumb law  
lawmakers do if not dozing!  
Amnesty (is) setting lawbreakers free  
while we keep the law they have broken.  
Raising the speed up to 70  
Should not be called Amnesty.  
(Repeat last 2 lines of song)  
Drivers who've always gone 65  
would not receive Amnesty.  
(Repeat last 2 lines of song, slower)  
Fixing broke laws is what lawmakers do  
without saying it's "amnesty".

If you would like more understanding of this mixed up word, look up [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Amnesty.htm](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Amnesty.htm).

2 Let me repeat: the NY Times said Matt Staver, who heads the Christian legal group Liberty Council, opposes deporting immigrants because the Bible says to “welcome the stranger”. Apparently the NY Times only mentions Leviticus 19:33-34, so Howse apparently assumes that is the only verse Matt Staver knows about, so he will next attempt to shove that verse out of the way figuring that will end the discussion. But if Staver talked about welcoming the stranger, that sounds more like Matthew 25:35 than Leviticus 19:34. Leviticus says you shall love him as yourself. But Matthew 25 specifies action: you shall take him in, as if it were Jesus Himself standing out in the cold.

3 Notice Leith Anderson didn’t cite any verse, but only said he cared how Bible said to treat “strangers in the land”. So why do you suppose Howse assumed he was talking about Leviticus 19:34? The only reason I can come up with is that Howse thinks that is the only verse in the Bible that talks about how to treat immigrants! If you would like to read all 190 verses about God’s immigration policy, check out [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Stranger-Bible-Study.htm](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Stranger-Bible-Study.htm). Here is the breakdown: 12 verses say God’s people were immigrants. 30 verses warn of judgment against those unmerciful towards immigrants. 14 verses place citizens and immigrants under the same law. 8 verses say that as soon as immigrants meet the same criteria as citizens, they merit the same rights. 11 verses which seem to deny worship opportunities to immigrants actually apply equally to citizens. 20 verses give

immigrants equal access to the church, which is also the seat of government. 24 verses give immigrants the same protection of laws as citizens enjoy, even when they do not meet the same criteria. 7 verses say immigrants suffer the same penalties for violating laws as citizens. 19 verses command welfare for immigrants – although it is a fraction of the national budget, and the entire national budget, for church AND state, is only 10%. But most of the welfare commanded is not even government welfare, but are instructions to individual citizens. There are two verses which are exceptions to God’s absolute equality for immigrants: one verse does not allow an immigrant to be your president, and another verse allows lenders to charge interest to immigrants which may not be charged to citizens, just like our Constitution. And lenders today charge interest to immigrants and citizens alike, although immigrants often have to borrow at higher rates because they appear as a higher risk, being less established.

4 Howse says he is not opposed to immigration, just illegal immigration. I listened to this long post in vain for some indication he understands that for literally 99% of immigrants, coming legally is not permitted by us Christians. Astonishing that he *does* seem to remember that most of us came here as immigrants, us or our families, but that doesn’t help him relate to the 12 verses saying to treat the stranger like yourselves since “ye were strangers in the land of Egypt”. The evil numerical limitations which allow only a tiny fraction of immigrants to come legally, did not exist when our 5<sup>th</sup> generation ancestors came. The first time America even thought of not allowing any group of people to come here legally was 1882. That was Chinese. By 1920, thanks to the philosophies of eugenicists like Margaret Sanger and Hitler, we decided Northern Europeans were much better immigrants than Southern Europeans like Italians and Spaniards, and blacks were highly restricted. I think we were still trying to export blacks back to Africa. Brandon’s hypocrisy reminds me of Matthew 11:46 - **Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.**

5 Brandon insists we follow laws that violate the Laws of God, and which are unspeakably cruel to some 12 million American residents. Has he heard none of their stories? He quotes immigrants who managed to come legally, who demand that in order to be fair to them, all other immigrants should have to suffer as much as they did! Yet the immigrants they want to suffer like they did, are suffering far more, because there is no line left for them, the few places in line having been taken by these legal immigrants who are demanding all this suffering in the interest of fairness!

I have never met one of these complainers, but I know at least one exists, because Michelle Malkin is one of them. She didn’t actually have to suffer herself, but her parents did. They came from the Philippines. There are a lot more places in our “line” for Philipinos, in relation to the number waiting to come, than there are for Hispanics.

Will these complainers feel that way when a neighbor or sister or cousin wants to come, and no line is found for them? Why must everyone suffer equally in the interest of fairness? Why not simply stop the suffering, since the solution for it is simple and without cost?

6 Brandon characterizes Romans 13 as saying the purpose of government is to reward the righteous and punish the wicked. So then why does Howse support laws which oppress the innocent whose so called “crime” is trying to find work? How about if we put that passage in context with **1Timothy 5:8 But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. Immigrants come here to provide for those of their own homes, in obedience to God.** Why is Brandon demanding that our government punish people for obeying God?

Let’s actually look at Romans 13, which Brandon did not actually show us, but only characterized. He was probably thinking of verses 3-4, which say **Rom 13:3** For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and

thou shalt have praise of the same: **4** For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to *execute* wrath upon him that doeth evil.

According to this passage, if we do good, we should have no fear of government. But when millions of Hispanics do good, in obedience to God, caring for their families as God commands, they have much to fear from our government. Why? What went wrong?

The answer is found in verse one. **Rom 13:1** Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

Notice it says to obey the “higher powers”, plural. This presumes the higher powers are in agreement, since it is impossible to obey all of them when they contradict one another. This raises the question, which power should we obey, if a higher power contradicts the highest power? The answer to this question is found in Acts 5:29: we ought to obey God rather than man!

7 I don't trust Howse's statements about construction workers being able to bid low because they don't pay taxes or inspection fees. It's pretty hard to do very much construction without getting permits. As for taxes, it's pretty scary for a non citizen to even apply for those permits, and it is unthinkable to operate a business with several employees without reporting anything to the IRS! At least the owner needs to be here legally, and needs to pay taxes, and what he reports to the IRS can't be too far off or he will face audits just like the rest of us. If he hires undocumented immigrants and pays them “under the table”, what he pays them still has to come out of income which he reports to the IRS as personal income, which actually puts him at a higher tax rate than if everything were reported honestly. So I don't understand how there can be ANY truth to Howse's accusations here.

But I haven't double checked these conditions. Let's say Howse is right. Then if we care about unfairness, shouldn't we support a change in immigration law that allows these people to be here legally, so they CAN pay all the taxes and licenses and permits that the rest of us do? Why are we calling them criminals for not doing what it is impossible for them to do because of the laws WE created for them? Since the problem is caused by OUR laws, why are WE not accepting responsibility for the injustice they dictate? If someone is a criminal here, isn't it US? Especially people like Brandon who go around insisting these evil laws are the will of God?

Brandon defines “just” as whatever is consistent with the character and nature of God. I would think a more direct way of determining what laws are just would be to read God's laws, since God's laws are the definition of Justice. Rather than have us make up laws from scratch which seem to us consistent with our fuzzy impression of the character and nature of God. **Psa 119:172 My tongue shall speak of thy word: for all thy commandments are righteousness.**

8 This is the ONLY verse in Brandon's 15 minutes which he actually shows us, as opposed to characterizing it without actually showing us, which says anything about how we should treat immigrants. Yet this one verse ought to make Brandon a little more sympathetic. It says we are to love the immigrant as ourselves. If we loved immigrants like ourselves, would we still insist they shoulder unthinkable bureaucratic burdens which we would not tolerate having to touch with one of our fingers? It says our laws must treat immigrants the same as citizens born here. Does Brandon think our immigration laws treat immigrants the same as citizens born here?

Just this one verse tells us, if we never read another verse in the Bible, that in God's model laws, there is no such thing as classifying someone here as being here illegally. Just as there was no such thing in America, before 1882, as classifying someone here as being here illegally. America's founders pretty much founded our nation on the model of the laws of God. When America departed from God's immigration policy in 1882, America began, as it were, kicking the roses barefooted. (That's a metaphor from Acts 9:6.)

You are probably wondering: now that Brandon has shown us this one glorious verse, how is he going to dismiss this verse as irrelevant to the subject of immigration? Here is where he brings in a big

technical word: “context”. He beats us into submission by repeating this word again and again throughout this video. I have put them all together so you can count them with me. While we are counting, ask yourself, as I ask myself, how can he be so insistent that WE read this verse in “context”, when during his entire 15 minute video about how the Bible says we should treat immigrants, *this is the only verse that he actually shows us?* ADD NUMBERS COUNTING HOW MANY TIMES.

9 Listen to how many times Brandon repeats that verses should be in context, and yet for the whole rest of his speech, this is the ONLY verse he addresses! My Bible study deals with 190 verses about immigration. There is more than just one verse about it in the Bible. But if Howse’s only information about how much the Bible says about immigration comes from one New York Times article, that would explain why this is the only verse he knows about. But even then, I don’t know how he can think he is studying this verse in context, when he doesn’t mention a single other verse.

10 I wonder if Howse understands what the phrase “civil law” means? Because if it were really true that Leviticus 19 is full of civil law, that would the relevance of Leviticus 19 to today’s immigration law, since today’s immigration law is called “civil law”. As opposed to “criminal law”. But whatever category of law it belongs in, does Howse think God does not care if we pay any attention to it? Throughout the rest of this video, Brandon never shows us a single other verse from Leviticus 19, to support his theory that the whole chapter consists “only” of “civil and ceremonial laws”. Later I will review the chapter briefly to show it contains mostly criminal laws and no ceremonial laws.

But Brandon does characterize one other commandment from Leviticus 19, in an effort to get us to regard the entire chapter as irrelevant.

11 Did you just hear Brandon call stoning for adultery a “ceremonial law”? That was quite a ceremony, don’t you think? The other example he gave, of stoning teenagers, is not from Leviticus 19 but from Deuteronomy 21:18-21. I want to talk about these two things later.

Brandon Howse tells us an entire chapter of the Bible, containing several of God’s laws, are irrelevant to any lawmaking that Americans are considering today. Let me put this in the perspective of what Brandon’s ministry is all about.

Brandon offers a series called “Worldview Weekend”. His whole thrust is an understanding of political issues and national public policy in the light of God’s Word.

I don’t understand how he can even believe his own preaching if he doesn’t understand how to apply the principles behind Moses’ laws to our situation today.

Jesus’ parable of new wine in old wineskins, in Matthew 9, was applied to observance of an old law which didn’t apply to a new situation. Jesus’ parable teaches us to intelligently apply the principle behind God’s laws to modern situations. But Brandon cuts away vast swathes of Scripture from what he considers relevant to modern lawmaking.

I haven’t forgotten about Brandon’s claim that Leviticus 19 is full of “ceremonial” laws. I’m still coming to that. But first let me address these two examples Brandon gives of why we should consider so much of what God says as irrelevant:

First, Moses’ law about stoning adulterers to death.

About 50 years ago America decided to decriminalize adultery; before that it was against the law in every state. Was that so much wiser than God’s ideal vision? Adultery didn’t stop destroying families, economies, our nation’s health, and children. I still think God’s ideas are pretty good.

That doesn’t mean I would support a law that immediately executes everyone guilty of adultery! Jesus’ handling of the woman caught in adultery in John 8 makes the point that it is hypocritical for a jury to execute a criminal for doing what the jurors themselves do. In American law we call this principle “jury nullification”. We ended prohibition, not because we decided drinking was harmless,

but because so many jurors drank that they could not in good conscience convict violators. Drinking did not stop becoming very costly to our society, any more than adultery. We should repent as a nation of these evils, and look for the day when these crimes are so rare that doing them violates not only God's standards, but every standard of human society.

Brandon asks, "Why don't we stone rebellious teenagers?" His meaning is that parents did, in Moses' time. Let's look at the actual verses. Ordinary teenage rebellion is hardly what is described here. (Show verses: **Deuteronomy 21:18** *If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them: 19 Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; 20 And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard. 21 And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die: so shalt thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear.*)

Notice the charges in verse 20. The child is a drunkard. Our laws don't even allow children to be drunkards. If they are, the adults are prosecuted who made it possible. So already, this child is worse off than almost any child today. Next, this child is always fighting. This is one of the meanings of one of the Hebrew words, Afat. Contentious, one of the lexicons says. A drunken child who is always picking fights can terrorize the whole neighborhood.

Now look at the judicial process in verse 21. The parents have no power to punish their child. The state has to do it. So the child has to be so out of control, that even the state agrees the child cannot coexist with society. Indeed, when you look at how our state disciplines children it has taken from parents, the state treats the children in its care far more brutally than the mere spanking which it prohibits parents from doing. The state uses electric shocks, leather restraints all day, lots and lots of drugs, and mental abuse administered by a psychiatrist and labeled "therapy".

But the point is that the drunken, violent rebellion has to be so bad that jurors with ordinary levels of rebellion in their own teenagers will agree the accused child is a particularly serious threat to society.

Should the jury see some hope for the child, the jury certainly has other options other than execution. Counseling, for example. Judges today sometimes offer creative appropriate punishments as an alternative to the statutory punishment, and no one questions their authority to do that.

Notice the final phrase: all Israel shall hear, and fear. In other words, the punishment is so rare that it makes the headlines all across the nation, which at that time was at least 5 million population.

In most of our states, which reject God's institution of capital punishment even for the gravest crimes, application of these principles would not result in execution of any child, but life in prison, with the possibility of parole. But our states already do that with the most dangerous children. And the times they do that are not at all rare. It is so common that it doesn't even make headlines.

So while we look at these verses and imagine ourselves so much more compassionate than God that society would be going backwards to obey Him, the truth is that our own handling of dangerous children is not significantly different than God advises. It turns out that God may actually understand children even better than Hollywood.

There is something very heartbreaking in Brandon's use of this passage about handling children, where he imagines that this passage shows us so much more compassionate than God that we should be careful about obeying any of Moses' other laws too lest our nation fall backwards spiritually, as an excuse for dismissing God's commandment to love immigrants as ourselves, which is the very last thing he is willing to do.

What does Brandon mean, Leviticus 19 has only civil and "ceremonial" laws? First are hygiene laws; don't eat unrefrigerated meat that has been sitting around 3 days. Pretty basic hygiene. We have hygiene laws a lot fussier than that! Next are laws telling businesses to allow the poor some opportunity to work for surplus; a cultural equivalent would be telling restaurants not to throw away

their leftovers but allow the poor to work for them. That's no mere ceremony: it has as much substance as any law today. It is life and death for many. Next we are not to steal, or commit fraud. Those are criminal laws! What is "ceremonial" about a law against stealing? Next is a law against taking excessively long to pay workers. Next are disability laws. Does Howse find these to be mere "ceremonies"? Our laws like this today put you in jail for violating them. Verse 15 is a precedent for our 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment "equal protection of the laws". Verse 16 criminalizes perjury, lying in court. Verse 17 is an amazing verse not found in our laws, but it is hardly ceremonial: it says when another sins, we have a responsibility to correct him. Verse 19 is harsh on genetic manipulation. Next is penalties for adultery. Verse 23 says when you plant a fruit tree, don't harvest the fruit until the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Seed catalogs recommend the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, I think; but if you plant them very small it takes 4 years before they bear fruit. V. 26 criminalizes eating meat with the blood still in it, which American law does likewise. V. 27-28 says not to disfigure yourselves as part of mourning for the dead, as pagans do. v. 30 says to keep sabbaths, which our government does to this day. V. 31 criminalizes fortune telling, which is fraud; Houdini figured out and exposed the magic tricks they use to deceive their customers, a century ago. V. 32 bans discrimination on the basis of age. V. 33-34 are about immigration. v. 35-36 are about weights and measures. Our Constitution says about the same thing about them. Which of these laws does Howse regard as "ceremonial"?

12 It's fine to say the verse means not being arrogant, if by that you mean the principle of the verse applies to your personal attitude as well as to your actions. But is Howse imagining that only one of the very many wrongs to which this verse applies, is the ONLY wrong to which it applies? And that we are supposed to disregard what this verse directly says, and replace it with an implication which Brandon has spotted between the lines?

But why all this trouble, if none of the laws in this chapter are for us today anyway? Is Brandon on the fence about whether these laws are for our benefit?

13 Treat him as if he were an Israeli citizen, Matthew Henry says. What is going through Brandon's mind, I wonder? Does it not occur to him that if you treat the immigrant as a citizen, that you won't deport him? How many citizens do we deport? Our 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment says the same thing: everyone who is subject to our laws; that is, who can be arrested for breaking our laws, is "guaranteed" equal protection of our laws. I am here to tell you that undocumented immigrants can be arrested. But they sure don't get equal protection of our laws! We have laws just for them which we wouldn't touch with one of our little fingers.

14 Howse quotes Matthew Henry saying the verse means to put no hardships on immigrants. Does Howse think our immigration laws put no hardship on immigrants? Matthew Henry wrote generations before America ever thought about not allowing people to come here legally, or he might have talked about it. I would consider forcible deportation a pretty significant hardship.

15 Howse's train of thought is kind of tumbling around here. First he says no commentaries say this is about immigrants who break our laws. This is what students of logic call a "straw dog" argument. If you can't refute your opponent's argument, pretend your opponent argued something so much stupider that you CAN refute it. No one is defending immigrants who commit what would be crimes if citizens did them. But immigration laws which violate the laws of God and which are wrecking our economy and destroying our border security do not deserve the dignity of being called "law". Our founders specifically said laws which violate the laws of God are NO LAW AT ALL.

Next Howse says many immigrants commit crimes, meaning other than being here without documentation. Again, straw dog. No one disagrees. Deport the real criminals.

He gives the figure 20 million. Congressman Tancredo and WHO radio talk show host Jan Mickelson use that figure. Even though Tancredo's dream act, the Save America Act, gave the figure of 11 million!

Howse says many of them get on welfare. Simply not true. The Center for Immigration Studies in 2004 calculated that the average illegal family pays \$4,000 in taxes but receives \$6,000 in government "services". But \$3,000 of that is a ridiculous "infrastructure" bill. The cost of war, government waste, is divided among the population, as if the more immigrants who come, the more soldiers have to go to Iraq. And \$2,000 of it is welfare for citizens. That leaves the average undocumented family paying \$4,000 in taxes and receiving \$1,000 in government "services", which includes jail, public education, and emergency hospital visits, which no one calls "welfare" that I have ever met.

FAIR puts out all kinds of reports like that, which count government waste as welfare and citizens as illegals. But I thought this was going to be a Bible study. We who believe the Bible only need to know what God says to do; and then if some man made study concludes God was stupid to say that, to be a Christian means to be subject that study to extra scrutiny.

17 Brandon says he wants immigrants to come "As long as they do it legally". Matthew 11:46, woe unto you, ye lawyers, which lade burdens upon mens shoulders grievous to be born, which you will not touch with one of your little fingers. We are happy to have these men shoulder our unbearable burdens; we lawyers just insist they do it legally. Since our laws make it impossible for them to shoulder our burdens legally, are we not justly furious with them for evading our impossible demands?

18 Yes, we are generous compared to the rest of the world. But not compared with God's standards. In a world ready to worship Antichrist, it may not be sufficient to be merely the most generous in the world.

19 Who pays the hospital bills, Brandon asks? In the first place, federal law only requires hospitals to treat patients until they are stable enough to be transported. After that, it is a hospital's own humanity that motivates them to not let patients die, the same as they do for citizens all the time. I admit I did see one weird case where a court thought the law required a hospital to pay for an undocumented cancer patient's chemo treatments. But if we legalize them, that is the way to get them to pay back the hospitals. First of all they will better be able to afford it, second they can do it without being deported, and third we can offer them faster immigration processing as an incentive for repayment.

20 This is one of the places where I just have to conclude Howse really doesn't know how the USCIS treats immigrants today, compared with the wide open borders his own ancestors enjoyed. He says most of us, presumably meaning our ancestors, came here by the means which he wishes all immigrants today would come. Immigrants today would LOVE to come as freely as U.S. laws allowed our ancestors to come!

No one can say it better than Jesus: **Luk 11:46** And he said, **Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.**

21 Now get ready. He is going to show you a lot of verses showing God approves of national borders. But that is not the issue. No one disagrees that there ought to be a border between the U.S. and Mexico. The issue is who God says we ought to let cross it. Howse NEVER talks about ANY verse in which he finds guidance who God says to let come. Brandon justifies these verses as relevant because, he says, if you let anyone cross the border who wants to, you don't HAVE a border. That is an absurd

rationale if you think about it. Even if you don't think about it, it is just as absurd. When you cross a border you cross into another legal jurisdiction. You are subject to different laws. Different police enforce them. No one has proposed that we let armed banditos cross our border and carry out mass murders. That violates our laws. You don't have to pass laws saying millions of U.S. residents can't remain here legally, in order to have a border! America allowed anyone to come freely, from 1789 to 1882, without making our borders nonexistent.

22 Notice that not one of these verses tells us how to treat immigrants. None of them tells who we should allow to cross.

23 It is nonsense like Howse's that makes us vulnerable to Islamic invasion. If we repealed numerical limitations and allowed all to come who meet basic criteria, those who just want to work would come through the legal checkpoints. Only a few thousand, rather than millions, would still cross between the checkpoints, making them much easier to catch. When people come through the checkpoints, we can compare them with criminal and terrorist watch lists. And we have their names, fingerprints, and addresses. We know where to find them. And we can administer a loyalty oath.

24 Communists want to fix immigration laws, which is what I want, which should make me not want it. Hmm. Do I need to diagram that train of thought? I read Ted Kennedy's immigration dream bill. He wanted to enforce workplace fairness by giving legal temporary workers the right to sue their employers. And since the workers have to go back before the court hears the case since they are on short temporary visas, he wanted them to be able to sue even after they are back in their home country. The devil is in the details. The devil typically alleges he wants what Christians want. He just wants to go about it a little differently.

I actually wouldn't mind my immigration vision being associated with Richard Land, of the Southern Baptist Convention, or Matt Staver, of the Liberty Council.

25 We could actually remove all "illegals", Brandon assures us, without explaining how. I have never heard anyone explain why they think it is possible to significantly reduce undocumented immigration. Here's a quote from the Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate, June 4, 2007, regarding the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007, page 8: "the enforcement and verification requirements of the legislation would act to reduce the size of the U.S. population. CBO estimates that implementing those requirements would reduce the net annual flow of illegal immigrants by one-quarter..."! Now keep in mind that the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act would have required the Real ID national tracking card in order to get a job, as well as to fly on a plane, or enter a federal building to sue the monsters who created this Big Brother nightmare. The Real ID card would have been a tighter national tracking program than the E-Verify system which politicians want employers to be forced to use now. Because the E-Verify system uses only the Social Security database, which has 18 million no-match errors in it, 12 million of which are for citizens. But the Real ID card would have combined the social security database with the drivers licenses records of all 50 states, AND with IRS records. And yet even with all that mark-of-the-beast technology, the Congressional Budget Office estimated a reduction in undocumented immigration of only 25%?!?! That raises a hugely significant question for Christians who know that Revelation says everyone who takes the Mark of the Beast will go to Hell: how much MORE national tracking would it take to find and deport ALL undocumented immigrants?

The grim answer jumps out at us when we consider that the database will gather photographs of everyone, which computers can identify using facial recognition software. The answer: hidden cameras on every street corner, cataloging everyone who passes by, using facial recognition software connected to our national database. Then whenever an unfamiliar face passes the camera, police could be immediately dispatched to the scene to check it out.

God-fearing Americans, is this the future you demand?

26 Howse started off about to say the Left wants immigrants because they vote Democrat. To which we might respond that they vote Democrat because Democrats don't insult them so ruthlessly, although Hispanics are generally far more conservative than that. We can also add that certainly not Richard Land, or Matt Staver, or myself have that motivation! But Howse stopped himself and said it's because we don't know Scripture. But certainly not Richard Land, or Matt Staver, or myself are that ignorant of Scripture, compared with Howse who knows only one verse about immigration policy! Then he stopped himself and said "follow the money". Well, Somos Republicans have, and it turns out all the "facts" quoted by Howse come from FAIR, which began with Eugenicist funding and to this day has 2 abortionists on its board. Has Brandon received abortionist money? Has he received support from FAIR, or from admirers of FAIR?

27 And why don't we do away with laws on murder in response to the fact some murder? Because laws against murder are among the Laws of God. By contrast our immigration policy violates the laws of God.

28 We have to have laws. But not stupid ones! Not cruel ones which oppress the innocent and threaten border security in the name of securing our borders. We are not required to have laws which are a fraud upon the American People, causing all the problems they promised to solve.

29 I agree that the fact people have violated a law for 20 years is not a reason to abolish the law. I'm not even sure the concept of a statute of limitations applies, since the clock would proceed from the most recent violation, which is today. But the fact that a law is stupid, accomplishes nothing but destroy border security, is.

30 Would Hispanics vote Democrat? Were it so, that is not a reason to exclude them! Is that the vain motivation of Howse, though? Vain, because the Hispanic population keeps growing anyway. But is it so? Many are Latinos are Catholics, and along with Catholics, are conservative on social issues. But Catholics like government in charge of welfare, and the Mexican government professes to do that regardless of what a terrible job it does of it. So there is schizophrenia. But Mexicans are used to abortion being illegal.

31 So, Communists want immigration reform to help them win in November? Again, even if that were true, it wouldn't be a reason to disenfranchise millions of American residents. But what does this prove? Communists and Democrats see short term benefit in NOT insulting Hispanic voters like Howse does. That doesn't mean Communists OR Democrats have any deep commitment to or understanding of immigrant concerns. Both are good at playing groups off against each other for their OWN benefit. Democrat sympathy for abortion, sodomy, immigration, etc is not historic but recent, and shallow as a mud puddle. If they found out a literalist, conservative understanding of the Bible solidly supports immigrants they would be gone. Especially if Hispanics started opposing abortion and sodomy, as their culture demands, the Democrats and Communists would drop them like a hot tamale.

32 Brandon Howse cannot possibly believe what he is saying, about the popularity of a theological position being relevant to determining its merit. If he believed that, he would be a Catholic, not a Protestant. Or better yet, a Muslim.

33 Well actually I have studied the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment quite a bit. Brandon's view comes from FAIR, which was founded with funding from population control eugenicists whose dream is to reduce Earth's population by other than natural means. It is contradicted by a century of court rulings, by a majority of politicians, and by common sense. The argument centers on redefining the word "jurisdiction". It means the right of governing authority to enforce its rulings by the use of force, whether you are talking about the jurisdiction of parents over their children, a church over its members, a boss over his employees, a government over its citizens, or God over all creation. But Brandon, Steve King, FAIR, several talk show hosts, etc. think "jurisdiction" should mean the obedience of someone to the authority over him. By that definition, if I don't obey the police, police have no "jurisdiction" over me! By that definition, undocumented immigrants who violate immigration laws are therefore not under the "jurisdiction" of our USCIS! Brandon then argues that since the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment gives citizenship only to babies born here whose parents are under the "jurisdiction" of U.S. laws, therefore their babies should never have been made citizens!

But they still want to use the old definition of "jurisdiction", when the border agents come to arrest undocumented immigrants: they still want the agents to have enough "jurisdiction" over the immigrants to arrest them!

If Brandon and his friends manage to change the legal definition of "jurisdiction", that will not affect only the birthright clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. It will also affect the "equal protection" clause, which says everyone under the jurisdiction of our laws must have the equal protection of our laws. That is the clause that ended slavery. If that clause is changed, by saying someone who violates our laws is thereby not under the jurisdiction of our laws, so therefore needs no equal protection under our laws, then all we have to do is pick any group of people in America, enact laws against them which they cannot possibly obey, strip them of equal protection, and then legally enslave them. I would like to ask Brandon if that would be an agreeable outcome to him. I would ask him, "Will you emphatically assure us that you would never tolerate any move towards enslaving illegals?" If he will give us that assurance, then I would ask him why he would want to change the one clause in our Constitution that prohibits slavery?

# Steinlight, interviewed by Jan Mickelson

Audio: [http://mickelson.libsyn.com/thursday\\_may\\_6\\_2010](http://mickelson.libsyn.com/thursday_may_6_2010)

Here are my summaries of the conversation, (with a few comments I've added), with numbers showing the minutes and seconds into the audio where you can hear them say it for yourself. The audio starts at 1:01:45 (one hour, one minute, 45 seconds)

1:02:15 Mickelson: Every time I bash immigrants, someone emails and says I thought you were a Christian! Leviticus says to treat them like the native born! (Lev 19:33) In fact in this morning's Des Moines Register letters to the editor, a caption says "Christians cannot declare people 'illegal'".

1:04:25 Steinlight's father immigrated from Russia in 1921.

1:05:25 Reading of the verse: "...he must be treated as one of your native born; love him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt. I am the Lord."

1:06:05 Steinlight's initial response is that the divinely inspired authors of the passage didn't anticipate today's immigration problems!

Leach: How do I respond to an answer that spiritually ignorant? I'll let God respond:

Isa 46:9 Remember the former things of old: for I *am* God, and *there is* none else; I *am* God, and *there is* none like me, **10** Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times *the things* that are not *yet* done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:

1:06:25 Steinlight says "there's nothing in the Bible that I know of about Birthright Citizenship, or E-Verify, or identify theft; in fact there is no word in the Bible for "immigrant" or "immigration".

Leach: Does Steinlight actually believe himself? "There is no word for 'immigrant', he says, as a response to a verse about 'aliens'?"

There is nothing in the Bible about E-verify, he says? Has he ever heard of the book of Revelation, whose 14<sup>th</sup> chapter warns about a Mark of the Beast without which no man can buy or sell, which is 90% achieved with E-verify, and which, once taken, reserves one's eternal home in Hell? Has he ever heard of the census taken by King David, where the army took 9 months scouring the land to count people, which so concerned God that He sent a pestilence to skewer the results?

Has he thought to compare that with Moses' census, in which a half-shekel coin (worth a week's wages) was collected from each man, and counted by a single man per tribe, in a single day, and all the people were brought to him, so that he had time only to count the coins (about one per second) and certainly no time to even hear, much less write down, each name, much less each address?

(See [www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Mark-Beast-Matters.htm](http://www.Saltshaker.US/HispanicHope/Mark-Beast-Matters.htm))

God called that coin a "ransom" to save the people from pestilence.

In other words, God is that concerned with government having the names and addresses of all its people! God knows, and we should know by now, that the more a government can track its people, the less freedom they have! God wants us to be free! America's first census collected only last names per county, and the bureaucracy grew from there. Even that was way more than God wants governments to know!

Steinlight wants government to have a single national database with names, addresses, social security numbers, birth certificates, a photo that can be processed by facial recognition software so that remote cameras can identify everyone passing by, without which no man can work, and Steinlight flatters himself that God has not foreseen his scheme or said anything about it in the Bible?!

He says there's nothing in the Bible about identity theft! When God sent the pestilence, He skewered the results, which saved many lives from cruel government tyranny. When immigrants "steal identity", they skewer or databases, forestalling the necessity of divine intervention.

According to the Word of God, skewering a government national tracking database cannot be a crime! It is the database which is the crime, and the Bible believing Christian voters demanding such crimes, led by the likes of Jan Mickelson and Stephen Steinlight, are the criminals.

Jan, Stephen, stop snickering. This is serious. While you are minimizing God's concern, I tremble, along with God, for the threat to our freedom whose way is paved by your sloppy theology.

I do not mean to call these men "criminals" in general, any more than I myself am a criminal. Although by God's standards, I am too, as we all are. Rom 2:17-24, Jas 2:8-13

I have listened to Jan, been his radio guest, reasoned with him, and I respect his theological good sense most of the time, as long as he isn't talking about immigration. But here he has an ugly blind spot. This show is focused on justifying dehumanizing 12 million U.S. residents as "illegals", whose "crime" is disobedience to our Immigration Laws from Hell which America's Founders called "no law at all" because it violates the Laws of God. In this context, if anyone in this discussion is a criminal, it is Mickelson and Steinlight.

Besides the crimes already explained, they have "respect of persons", (a phrase which often in the Old Testament means denial of Due Process in court), which God counts as a crime making one a "criminal". God warns that on judgment day, they will be judged with the same degree of mercy by which they judge 12 million U.S. residents.

Jas 2:8 If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well: 9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. 10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all. 11 For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. 12 So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. 13 For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.

1:06:45 Pro-immigrants don't have very good arguments. They have mainly three: (1) we were all immigrants – well yeah, but before 1965 we were all legal; (2) if you don't support open immigration you're bigoted – well, we know Americans love immigration, but they want it to be legal. Americans aren't against immigrants; they are against people who break the law. And go to the front of the line. And (3) Leviticus 19:33.

1:07:45 God Almighty doesn't have a Legislative Affairs office on Capitol Hill. He's not issuing policy statements on immigration.

Leach: One, "we were all legal"? They why do anti-immigrant groups look back with fondness to "Operation Wetback" under President Eisenhower where he brutally rounded up Hispanics and shipped them south? Before 1882, all immigrants were "legal" because no one had thought of restricting how many could come, and no one had thought about restrictions based on nationality!

Two, Americans don't know how cruel our immigration laws are. I know because I talked with the central Iowa campaign manager for Tom Tancredo, leading anti-immigrant presidential candidate in 2008, and he didn't know. He didn't know we have Numerical Limitations which only allow 1% of those applying to "get in line" to succeed. He imagined anyone who wants to be in line can, so therefore those who don't, refuse because they want to keep breaking the law and not pay taxes! He had gotten that impression from Tancredo himself, so perhaps Tancredo doesn't understand immigration law either. Either that or he was lying.

I know the general ignorance of immigration basics because I communicated with Tancredo's press secretary, who didn't know Tancredo had voted for the Real ID Act. He was incredulous to see the link I sent him, to Tancredo's vote.

The American people simply don't know how unreasonable our immigration policy is.

Three, back to Lev 19:33. See the first pages of this article for my response to that.

God doesn't care what lawmakers do? Blasphemy, as I explained before. But let me now add: the Pharisees were lawmakers. Christians today simplistically imagine that only the Romans held political authority, but their laws really didn't cover very much of Jewish life. They wanted their taxes, they didn't want rebellion, soldiers could compel Jews to carry their burdens a mile, but Jews were even exempt from worshipping Caesar. The rest of the laws that kept Jews in line were interpreted by the Sanhedrin and enforced by the Temple police. Two punishments were excommunication, which was really really bad for business, and stoning, which was even worse for business.

My point? Pharisees were lawmakers, and the majority of Jesus' teachings were responses to, and criticisms of, the Sanhedrin's lawmakers. Yes, God cares what lawmakers do!

Throughout Biblical history, prophets were slain, not for criticizing church boards, but for criticizing lawmakers.

The Mark of the Beast, the taking of which is the only sin in the Bible that guarantees your reservation in Hell, is a political issue, created by lawmakers.

In America, "we the people" are the lawmakers. God cares how we vote. When we vote for Hell, God sees, and God judges.

1:08:15 The translation for the Hebrew word "alien" is "sojourner" or "visitor".

1:08:30 Steinlight cites Richard Friedman for his definition of "alien" as a "visitor". The word means someone residing temporarily with you.

Leach: I've responded to this in the first pages of this article.

1:10:08 It doesn't mean that the alien remains among you forever.

Leach: As I said, yes I agree; aliens probably wore out their welcome around year 430.

Another passage quoted by pro-immigrants says there shall be one law for the stranger and for the citizen. (He didn't cite it, but it's Exodus 12:49.) But that's interpreted by those who make it mean anything goes. But it isn't a bill of rights for sojourners. It means the person residing with you must obey your laws.

Leach: (1) When God decrees that the same set of laws shall govern immigrants as governs citizens, that transfers to immigrants all the legal protections of citizens – except for the explicit exceptions, kind of like the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment clause that reserves to states all powers not explicitly given the Federal government in the Constitution. The preceding verses illustrate the principle that immigrants enjoy the full rights of citizenship the instant they meet the same criteria that citizens meet.

(2) It does *not* mean that the person residing with you must obey laws you have created just for him, while exempting yourself!

1:10:45

1:11:15 We can treat visitors with warmth and kindness, while expecting them to obey our laws.

1:11:45 The 10 million here got here by breaking our laws, and remain here by breaking many other laws; for example, identity theft.

Leach: Oh, the hypocrisy! Immigrants commit "identity theft" and we call them "criminals". Obama commits it and we elect him president!

1:12:30 Mickelson: many of them have no intention of assimilating. They just want to take advantage of our social safety net. (Welfare.)

Leach: This is one of those dehumanizing accusations without support in evidence or experience. It's easy to accuse, and dare the accused to figure out how to defend themselves. One defense would be to show how little undocumented immigrants receive compared with how much they pay in taxes, unless you count government waste as "welfare" and citizens as "illegals", as the Aug 2004 CIS study did. (Mentioned previously in this article.)

1:17:45 No issues so divides Americans from both their political and religious leadership, as

immigration.

CIS did a huge study, and established a huge disconnect between the pulpit and the pew. 95% of born again Christians believe in reducing illegal immigration by attrition, encouraged by enforcement that gets people to leave the country voluntarily. (By harassing immigrants until they can't stand being here any longer.) 89% of mainline Protestants and Catholics, and 80% of Jews, tend to be very liberal. So the preachers preach (Lev 19), and the people in the pews don't go along.

Leach: Perhaps Steinlight meant to say laymen are "conservative", instead of liberal. His words are contradictory if they were correct.

1:19:25 Mickelson's question: temporary residents could become permanent citizens by converting, right? Yes.

Steinlight: Yes. And the only route was by conversion.

Leach: Not so. I do not know where God requires anything like what Christians today call "conversion", to become an Israeli citizen. There is no "statement of faith", or "loyalty oath" or "testimony" of a "conversion experience". No list of "fundamentals of the faith" to recite and pledge allegiance to.

Only circumcision, according to Exodus 12:43-48.

1:21:00 aliens' debts weren't wiped out after 6 years of serving your lender, as for citizens. And this was a tribal society going back thousands of years. Tribal societies today are not so different. There are rules that govern the kind treatment of people coming through.

Leach: (1) If these "rules" were so universal among "tribal" societies, why did God waste so much ink pressuring people to do what they were already naturally doing?

(2) Maybe Steinlight meant "nomadic" rather than "tribal" societies. There is nothing unique about "tribal" societies, since "nations" are merely "tribes" who have forgotten their common ancestors.

(3) Abraham wasn't all that "nomadic", either. He spent a lot of time near Hebron, and dug wells. One doesn't dig a well and then hit the road. Digging a well wasn't the hard part: finding water was.

(4) Steinlight's evidence fails to prove God's sense of fairness was limited to *temporary visitors*.

(5) If God really meant Israel to be fair to temporary visitors and unfair to people who stayed, there would have to be some standard of how long was too long, or how you tell how long someone will stay who doesn't know himself.

(6) God's standard of how long is *not* too long is 430 years. (See first pages of this article.)

1:21:45 Even after conversion, immigrants couldn't participate in the selection of judges or in the political process for several generations, right? Right.

Leach: This is a new one on me! Totally! Where does he GET that? I can't imagine. I would like to know.

(1) Most Christians don't even know Israelites participated in the selection of their judges. Numbers 1 implies it, and Josephus, especially the translator's footnote, explicitly asserts that judges were voted on by the people after the candidates gave campaign speeches, the pattern also followed in selecting elders/pastors of churches for several centuries. But I didn't know Mickelson knew it. One reason most Christians don't know it is because the Bible says nothing explicit about it, that I can find. And there are lots of people who don't trust Josephus.

(2) So what is the closest I can think of, to what Mickelson asserts? Well, the Moabites and Ammonites couldn't enter the temple of the Lord until the 10<sup>th</sup> generation, Deu 23:3. Maybe Mickelson confused them with all other immigrants, AND assumes judges were selected in the Temple square. I doubt if all Israel came to the Temple to do their campaigning and voting, Especially since the smallest units over which judges presided was 10 families. One would expect that rather than move the entire population to Jerusalem for the process, which would be 100 miles in some cases, or a 20 day journey,

the people would just take care of their business where they are. Scripture doesn't say.

(3) Maybe Mickelson is thinking of the Gibeonites. They were taken as prisoners of war, sort of, and pressed into temple service, and were not set free in 6 years as other servants were. Presumably they would have been released during the 50<sup>th</sup> year Jubile, Lev 25:10, had Israel obeyed God's Jubiles. The situation makes sense by comparing it with Palestinian prisoners today. Israel has suicide bombers in custody longer than 6 years, and everyone knows were they released they would go right back to their genocide. But perhaps after 50 years, they and their descendants MIGHT be ready to get along and refrain from murdering others just for disagreeing with them.

And yet Steinlight readily agrees with Mickelson that immigrants couldn't vote – without a verse passing over either of their lips.

1:22:45 Sojourners had to be circumcised to become citizens. Now if we did THAT, “that would stop a lot of border crossings!” We should replace the border patrol with Rabbis! Rabbis with sharp knives! That would send them back to old Mexico! “Boy, do we have a ceremony for you!”

Leach: Just to keep fact clear from humor, God's laws did not require immigrants to be circumcised just to cross the border and live in Israel! That was only required before an immigrant could enjoy the full rights of citizenship. One gets the impression that Mickelson and Steinlight were having so much fun with this scenario that they forgot this distinction, and actually thought armed border Rabbis would fully apply God's vision for border control, their point being that God's vision is so far beyond anything pro-immigrant Christians are willing to impose that they are hypocrites to say they care about Biblical standards.

1:23:45 3 religions competed for top position in the Roman world: Christianity, which was classified as a Jewish cult; classical Judaism, and the Cult of Mithros, kind of a New Age religion from Persia with a different scheme of deities than the Romans had. But 20% of the Roman world was Jewish by conversion! And that involved circumcision!

1:24:15 Mickelson calls Steinlight “The Guilt Reliever” (for anti-immigrants).

1:27:25 Moslems in Turkey have birthing trips: fly to the U.S. during the 9<sup>th</sup> month, the baby pops out a citizen.

1:27:55 Birthright citizenship was created in 1868 to end slavery. We didn't even have immigration law until 1875 and we certainly didn't have illegal immigration. It twists that for people to take that as a precedent for legalizing themselves.

Leach: What a dumb argument, that the freedom of *our* ancestors to immigrate without restriction, is no precedent for today's immigrants to come without restriction, since *our* ancestors were more honorable: they didn't come illegally!

Can I make this nonsense even more obvious? It's like Johnny and sister Susie playing with chairs. Susy comes in, and Johnny invites his sister to sit down. Sally comes in, sees Suzy sitting, and proceeds to sit down herself. Johnny stops her.

He says “You can't sit down. It's against the rules.”

Sally says “But your sister is sitting down.”

Johnny explains “Suzy sat down before I made a rule against sitting down. You will have to stand.”

Sally: “That's not fair! You have a different rule for your sister than for me!”

Johnny: “No, I have the same rule for everybody.”

Sally: “But she is sitting and I must stand!” Sally defiantly sits down.

Johnny: “Now you are a rule breaker. You broke the rule. For that you will have to leave.”

Sally: “Well then Suzy is a rule breaker too! She will have to leave with me!”

Johnny: “No, Suzy is NOT a rule breaker. There wasn’t even a rule when she sat down. That makes her a rule keeper, while you are a rule breaker. She can stay, but you must leave. And don’t ever expect amnesty.”

Sally: “How could Suzy be a rule keeper, if there was no rule for her to keep, and after you made a rule, she stayed sitting down just as if you had made no rule? What evidence is there from her behavior, that had you made the rule earlier, she would have obeyed it?”

Well, I tried. I don’t think I can make the absurdity of Steinlight’s argument any more clear than it already is.

1:28:15 Jan’s theory about Jacob Howard, co-author of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

1:29:45 Arizona discussion

1:30:15 Lieberman has a bill that would strip citizenship from citizens who join foreign terrorist organizations.

1:31:00 I’m still stuck on the border with those teams of Rabbis. Great idea. They could do it on a commission basis. It would be a tremendous incentive.

# Steinlight's Jewish Perspective

Steinlight is a Jew whose father, born in 1921, immigrated from Russia just before immigration was ruthlessly stopped.

He tells his story in his October 2001 article "The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography/ Reconsidering a Misguided Immigration Policy", posted at <http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back1301.html>.

Steinlight grew up in New Jersey, and LinkedIn says he lives in the Greater New York City area, so it is hard to imagine he could relate to the argument that there is not enough room in America to absorb very many more immigrants, the focus of Numbers USA and a great concern of FAIR, whose 10 member board has four who are top leaders in abortion, population control, and environmentalism.

Steinlight grew up in a state with a population density of 1,196 per square mile, more than the United States would have if literally half the world immigrated here, and yet people in New Jersey do not seem to be fleeing to Iowa but from farms to cities, attracted by the higher standard of living. The average New Jersey resident makes 3 times as much as the average Polk County, Iowa resident.

Steinlight does not live in a sewer. He is not trapped in a ghetto, praying for some rap star to finance his trip to a summer camp in Iowa so he can be inspired to do well in school and escape to a family farm. He lives in so densely populated an area by choice. He apparently finds it comfortable there. He would actually rather live there than elsewhere. So it is hard to imagine him relating to the paranoia that if U.S. population density rises from 71 to, say, 115, that Americans will no longer be able to live comfortably.

Rather, in his article, he takes the remarkable argument that Latino immigration is threatening Jewish power, because Latino population is exploding while Jewish population is stagnant (because Jews, who are staunch Democrats by about 82%, love to kill their unborn babies?) and he fears Latinos aren't familiar with the story of the Jewish Holocaust so won't be sympathetic to Jewish safety! So, therefore, Jews, in the interest of their own safety, need to do what they can to reduce the Latino population increase through immigration.

Uh, wasn't that the same reasoning followed by Pharaoh in Exodus 1?

**Population** If ½ the world came, the U.S. would be a bit more densely populated than Polk County, Iowa. No Problem: quality of life is proportional, not to population density, but to freedom of religion, speech, and opportunity protected for all. Proof: density per square mile/avg. income, U.S. 71/\$22,212. Mexico 115/\$2,936. China 315/\$370. U.K. 611/\$15,000. Israel 658/\$10,500. Polk Co. IA 756/\$23,654. Japan 865/\$27,321. U.S. if ½ the world came 912/\$\_\_\_. Bermuda 1,088/\$36,845. New Jersey 1,196/\$69,272. Taiwan 1,669/\$8,083. Manhattan 66,940/ \$100,000+.

Steinlight makes a much more sensible case for limiting the immigration of Moslems who openly, doggedly, dogmatically promote the annihilation of Christians, Jews, and freedoms of religion and speech. He says that is a far graver threat than Latino immigration. However, he spends a lot more time talking about Latino immigration in this article, which is also the case with the Barton and Mickelson interviews analyzed here.

Below are excerpts from Steinlight's article, with my response.

He writes, "A people that lost one-third of its world population within living memory due to its powerlessness cannot contemplate the loss of power with complacency."

I wonder if this reasoning could account for why Jews vote overwhelmingly liberal. According

to Newsmax on June 5, 2011, reporting on an article by Alan Abramowitz, 78% of Jews voted for Obama over McCain; 82% of Jews said they leaned Democrat in several surveys between 1992 and 2008, compared with 43% of white voters; Jews are solidly behind liberal social issues, making them even more unwelcome in the Republican party as “RINO’s” and “moderates” are being squeezed.

Jewish support for anti-Scripture positions has seemed inexplicable to me, since Jews profess the same Scriptures which inspire Christian positions. A majority of the passages cited by Christians in opposition to sodomy, abortion, divorce, gambling, etc. are in our Old Testament, which is their Bible. How can Jews so thoroughly repudiate the Scriptures which identify them as a people?

Especially since Democrats combine their godless social agenda with godless rejection of the rights of Israel to defend herself and to keep her land. How can Jews side with Democrats in *that?! Unexplainable!*

Or so I thought.

But now a theory presents itself, through Steinlight.

Perhaps Jews have imagined what keeps them safe from another Holocaust, right here in America, is their “power” which they have acquired through their “alliances” with Democrats.

But that raises the question, what motivates them to seek power through alliances with Democrats, rather than with Republicans who share their source of moral standards, and especially their reverence for the land of Israel?

Only two explanations occur to me, but that is two more than I had thought of before reading Steinlight’s article: either (1) they find Democrats can be bought more easily than corruption-hating Republicans, or (2) they have wholly rejected their heritage, their Scriptures, and their land. (Or some combination of the two.)

What tragic, foolish irony, if indeed the reason Jews have sold themselves to the enemies of their morals and land is that they have trusted, for their protection from another Holocaust, in an illusion of “power” granted them by their enemies.

Perhaps the folly of such confidence in “power” can be illustrated by its logical extreme. (Steinlight said he was persuaded by listening “to my own side’s thesis articulated by those willing to take it to its extreme, and their *reductio ad absurdum* made plain the very great dangers within it.”)

What if Hamas offered Israel Israel’s choice of a man to fill the 13<sup>th</sup> highest leadership post in Hamas, in exchange for a couple of billion dollars and enough votes to elevate Hamas over Fatah. Is that a sweet deal for Israel?

It would be foolish because Hamas would remain no less committed to Israeli genocide. Nothing would be gained.

Is it any less foolish in America?

Christians manage to vote for Hell by telling themselves the Bible in which they believe is irrelevant to political issues. An example of misguided justification of such a notion is “Jesus never got involved in politics.”

Are Jews similarly able to set aside their Scriptural convictions when they formulate their political principles?

Principles are a sure basis for trust in safety from another holocaust. Deuteronomy 28 has proved true over the centuries: it is God who decides who shall be safe, so therefore the most dangerous thing you can do is treat God’s commandments as “irrelevant”.

Republicans, at least conservatives, are inspired by Biblical principles which they consider greater than themselves. Democrats choke on such concepts.

Jews with a cynical view of others may imagine everyone is selfish and responds only to money, if not bribes, so therefore anyone who refuses a bribe must be already devoted to the other side, and can’t be trusted.

But the opposite is true. People who respond to bribes, kickbacks, campaign contributions, etc as they formulate their positions, can only be trusted as long as you are the highest bidder. It is those

who live by principles greater than themselves, who can be most trusted to never allow oppression that violates those principles.

Jews, for their own safety, need to stop putting their enemies in power, and start putting their friends in power.

This is actually not far from Steinlight's purpose. His actions in the immigration debate have burned bridges between himself and Jewish Democrats, and he writes in this article,

This is emphatically not a time for expending much energy worrying about political good manners and seeking to anticipate each and every qualm of our hypersensitive current political allies (I hope soon-to-be former allies)...

The only trouble is that for his abandonment of Democrats, he has picked the one issue – immigration – upon which Democrats have carved the more principled Biblical position!

And the immigrants he most viciously targets – Latinos who are almost all Christian, largely Catholic – are those least likely to tolerate another Jewish holocaust, while he focuses less on Moslem immigrants whose scriptures and imams openly, officially, dogmatically, proudly declare their Dream Come True will be a final worldwide Jewish (and Christian) holocaust!

Steinlight certainly sympathizes with an expanded admittance of “refugees”. He writes:

It is critically important to state at the outset that this is neither to wax nostalgic (a culturally inconceivable stance) nor - Heaven forbid - to find redeeming features in the evil, xenophobic, anti-Semitic, and Red Menace-based Great Pause in the 1920s that trapped hundreds of thousands of Jews in Europe. My then-teenage father and his brothers, escaping the widespread bloody pogroms taking place throughout the Russian Empire during the civil war that followed the Revolution, were very nearly stranded by it and left to the tender mercies of General "Pogromchik" Petlyura's Russian and Ukrainian Nationalist army. They managed to ship out of Danzig, walking to that Baltic port all the way from a small village outside Kiev, and get in just under the wire before the door slammed shut. Anyone familiar with the national/ethnic quotas that formed the basis for U.S. immigration policy in the years that followed will note not only their vilely discriminatory attitude toward Eastern and Southern Europeans (Jews most prominently), but also that even the tiny quotas allotted these undesirables were rarely met. So extreme was the anti-immigrant, anti-Semitic restrictionist attitude....

While the U.S. administration was fully informed how and where millions were being murdered in Europe, only a handful were grudgingly granted safety here. The story of the ship the *St. Louis* is perhaps the most poignant and widely known instance of this monstrous policy, but scores of Jews seeking refuge could tell equally appalling tales of grotesque treatment. Along with the trade in African slaves and the institution of slavery and the treatment of Native Americans, America's abandonment of the Jews to Nazi annihilation is arguably the greatest moral failure in its history. This shameful, frightening history has formed, as it were, the sacred moral basis for mainstream Jewish support for generous legal immigration.

Which presents the question: do Jews support Democrats because they talk better about immigrants, and immigration is important to Jews because when God said “love ye therefore the stranger, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt”, that hits home so hard that they don't even need to hear it from God?

But that wouldn't explain why they still voted so heavily against McCain. And the biggest immigration reform in recent history was led by Reagan, a Republican. (Although, 30 years earlier, Republican Eisenhower oversaw “Operation Wetback”.)

OK, Steinlight stretches credulity with his goal of “a pro-immigrant policy of lower immigration.” Refugees from economies so desperate that their families are starving need relief along

with refugees from tyrannies so cruel that their families are being murdered. But Steinlight, while demanding more compassion for “oppressed minorities” who are “refugees from tyranny”, demands less compassion for refugees from starvation, dismissing them as merely selfishly “seeking economic betterment” - a far less worthy motive!

Yet Steinlight calls his vision of “lower immigration” “pro-immigrant”!

He calls “family-reunification policy, a highly questionable approach to the selection of immigrants”! He puts the “humanitarian grounds” for it in quote marks.

Most people on earth have *nothing*; if they manage to make it to America they will have *something*. But do we really wish to construct immigration policy on the catastrophe of global poverty and chaos, and the breakdown of nation-states around the world that threatens to overwhelm all notions of separate nationhood and erode all borders? An appeal based on global misery can know no boundaries and can make no distinctions. And we must continually bear in mind that the Republicans and Democrats pushing these agendas do not do so out of genuine compassion (where were they during the Rwandan genocide?) but in a shabby public relations battle for the Latino, especially Mexican, vote. And no one imagines that we could afford such compassion economically, or that the American people would stand for such a policy if one were explicitly presented.

This is the most succinct, precise repudiation of everything I stand for regarding immigration that I have yet encountered.

His easiest to refute statement is his last sentence. I am living proof that he is wrong. I fully “imagine that we could afford such compassion”, in fact that it would prosper just as God promised in Luke 6:38! And I fully “imagine...that the American people would stand for such a policy if one were explicitly presented”, because I have talked to hundreds of people who agree with the sense of it. Although I have learned the strength of mental inertia.

Steinlight says “An appeal based on global misery can know no boundaries and can make no distinctions.”

(1) The appeal of God is to a spirit of Freedom. God does not will that immigration be limited to people who are desperate to come, but only to people who want to come. The “appeal based on global misery” is only an effort to soften hearts too hard to respond to the mere Will of God.

(2) “...make no distinctions”? Ezra and Nehemiah make clear that God respects the right of cities to protect themselves from violent invaders. In those days city walls were an important part of that. One function of the wall was to charge a Watchman with keeping out people who looked threatening. Also there was a short door which a man could enter but a camel could enter only by his burdens being unloaded and then the camel crawling through on his knees. This is precedent for criminal watch lists, and legal check points to filter out weapons, bombs, poisons, etc.

(3) Steinlight’s concern that God’s appeal “can know no boundaries” is true regarding Numerical Limitations. Numerical Limitations must be repealed to satisfy God. That doesn’t mean the whole world will come, for several reasons:

(3a) Even if the whole world came here, leaving the rest of the world for farms and hunting, the U.S. would still have only 3% of the population density of Manhattan, where Steinlight lives by his free choice. To this day people flock from rural areas to densely populated cities to take advantage of the opportunities, jobs, culture, and technology which is always increased, the larger the pool of free, secure brain power. But the whole world will not come here.

(3b) When enough of a population are disturbed enough by terrible political conditions to go to the tremendous work, risk, and sacrifice of emigrating, a point is reached where it is simpler for those people, working together, to reform their government so it no longer drives out its own citizens.

(3c) The U.S. already being an economic and military powerhouse, and the world’s tyrannies retaining somewhat fragile control mostly with the indulgence and some support from the U.S., not very much more of the world’s population could come here without the U.S. becoming so

overwhelmingly influential that tyrannies would finally topple, overtaken by governments which no longer drive out their own citizens.

(3d) The threat to America is not numbers, but declining understanding of how our freedoms work, and/or declining interest in freedom. For example, a well publicized Moslem demonstration photo shows a sign reading "Freedom go to Hell." Freedom is a Judeo-Christian value, not a Muslim or Hindu value. While people born here tend to take Freedom for granted and see little urgency about understanding it, America is rejuvenated by refugees from its absence. We are a magnet to the best quality refugees any free nation could ask. We will benefit from as many of them as we can get, while limiting those who come to destroy, who will not renounce their loyalty to governments, religions, or sects which call for the violent overthrow of our Constitution or our freedoms of Speech and Religion.

In an increasingly armed world, a significant increase in our population of citizens committed to our defense, may be our only salvation.

It is a disingenuous "straw man" attack, to accuse voters who support the Word of God of conducting "a shabby public relations battle for the...Mexican vote".

(1) Even if it were true it would not undermine God's position. God doesn't need the Latino vote.

(2) Were it true, it would undermine only the reputations of a few humans. The purity of their devotion to their cause would become suspect, but their cause must be weighed on its merits.

(3) Common sense indicates that out of millions of people holding a view, there is a wide variety of mixed motives, so we might acknowledge that there must be at least one who is motivated as Steinlight charges. Perhaps two. But if we want to jump all the way to three, there simply is no way to prove or disprove such a charge.

(4) 1 Corinthians 4:5 warns us that we cannot judge motives with enough precision to pass sentence on people for their motives. Only God can. It is reasonable for us to estimate the motives of each other, in our effort to escape danger and accomplish good, but the blanket charge that the people who hold a certain position have a particular base motive is intellectually irresponsible. It is impossible to document the motives of even one human being, much less an entire population group.

Steinlight wants to give anti-immigration sophistication and not leave it

in the hands of classic anti-immigrant, xenophobic, and racist nativist forces. The white "Christian" supremacists who have historically opposed either all immigration or all non-European immigration (Europeans being defined as Nordic or Anglo-Saxon), a position re-asserted by Peter Brimelow, must not be permitted to play a prominent role in the debate over the way America responds to unprecedented demographic change.

Left to such racists, Steinlight correctly foresees that very much success for anti-immigration would lead to "ethnic...backlash of unimaginable proportions".

Steinlight concedes

In good conscience and out of self-interest we must not abandon immigration reform to those who would have kept our forebears out of America, including those sent away to be annihilated in the Holocaust.

Yet because he wants everyone else excluded, he laments "our continued failure to distinguish refugee policy from immigration policy".

Will a country in which enormous demographic and cultural change, fueled by unceasing large-scale non-European immigration, remain one in which Jewish life will continue to flourish as nowhere else in the history of the Diaspora? In an America in which people of color form the plurality, as has already happened in California, most with little or no historical experience with or knowledge of Jews, will Jewish sensitivities continue to enjoy extraordinarily high levels of deference and will Jewish interests continue to receive special protection? Does it matter that the majority non-European immigrants have no historical

experience of the Holocaust or knowledge of the persecution of Jews over the ages and see Jews only as the most privileged and powerful of white Americans? Is it important that Latinos, who know us almost entirely as employers for the menial low-wage cash services they perform for us (such a blowing the leaves from our lawns in Beverly Hills or doing our laundry in Short Hills), will soon form one quarter of the nation's population? Does it matter that most Latino immigrants have encountered Jews in their formative years principally or only as Christ killers in the context of a religious education in which the changed teachings of Vatican II penetrated barely or not at all? Does it matter that the politics of ethnic succession - colorblind, I recognize - has already resulted in the loss of key Jewish legislators (the brilliant Stephen Solarz of Brooklyn was one of the first of these) and that once Jewish "safe seats" in Congress now are held by Latino representatives?

I don't merely charge Steinlight with racist paranoia.

I grieve for the fear under which he suffers. I grieve at the tragedy of a man so oppressed by fears of dangers which are not even real.

"Historical experience of the Holocaust" is not, alone, any insurance against another holocaust. The very Jews who suffered it freely support a holocaust against 10 times as many unborn babies, and become furious when someone even compares the two Holocausts!

It's quite a reach, to fear that decades-old Catholic anti-Jewish teachings, in Mexico, will lead Hispanics to oppress Jews - especially since newer Catholic teachings have renounced the old ones, and the old ones are not to be found in U.S. Catholic churches.

And it was precisely the flawed reasoning of Pharaoh, to oppress the Jews before the Jews could oppress the Egyptians.

Exo 1:8 Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. 9 And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we: 10 Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land. 11 Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. 12 But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.

Steinlight articulates a concern I share, and for which I propose a solution:

Does it matter that in a period of unprecedented immigration combined with modern technology (e-mails, phones, and fax) and cheap airfare reinforcing the link between immigrant communities and their homelands in ways inconceivable to previous generations of immigrants, little or nothing is being done in a conscious way to respond? That little or nothing is being actively undertaken to foster loyalty to the United States or a thoughtful adhesion to American values?

The simplest solution is a loyalty oath similar to that given during naturalization ceremonies, but given even to people who visit here, requiring them to renounce all loyalty to any government, religion, or sect which promotes violence against our Constitution, or Freedoms of Speech or Religion.

But let's be as honest as Steinlight struggled to be in this article: where is the greater threat to America, the one million Moslems who justify suicide bombings, or the 100 million Democrats who vote to murder babies, support Palestinians against Israel, welcome Sharia law in our courts, and suppress Truth which offends their friends?

We have a lot of spiritual work to do to restore America. But as impossible as it has always seemed, our Freedoms have enabled the work to be done many times in the past.

Steinlight confesses, perhaps not consciously, the same truth for the Jews, that it is themselves who present them with the greatest danger, beginning with their love of abortion:

While other ethnic/religious groups grow by leaps and bounds, Jewish fertility is flat, its

growth rate zero, and we continue to decrease both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the general population. We have a rapidly aging population; rates of intermarriage that run to nearly 50 percent; no effective strategies to harvest intermarried; a religious tradition that eschews the seeking of converts; ...Surveys also indicate that younger secular Jews are less and less enamored of or identify with Israel, and that Jewish affiliation with Jewish institutions, including synagogues and religious schools, continues to decline steadily. For many, even gastronomic Judaism is only a memory (sushi, burritos, and curry overwhelm deli). The Jewish content in the lives of most U.S. Jews consists of cheaply exploitative cinematic treatments of the Holocaust, gaudy, lavish and meaningless bar and bat mitzvahs that resemble sweet-16 parties, and television sitcoms in which ostensibly "Jewish" characters are universalized as if they were in witness protection programs.

Here is another instance of Steinlight's Machievellian, paranoia-driven, Pharaoh-like scheming against Latinos:

Jewish voter participation also remains legendary; it is among the highest in the nation. Incredible as it sounds, in the recent presidential election more Jews voted in Los Angeles than Latinos. But should the naturalization of resident aliens begin to move more quickly in the next few years, a virtual certainty - and it should - then it is only a matter of time before the electoral power of Latinos, as well as that of others, overwhelms us.

This really raises the question, what really is special about the Jews that makes them endure as a distinct people for over 4,000 years despite the most heroic efforts of the most powerful nations to exterminate them, which fact makes Steinlight's paranoia so pathetic, that what the Devil failed to do over all those centuries will finally be accomplished by Latino voters?

The simple answer is that God has promised to keep them His people, and to always preserve a remnant even when they reject Him. But I have often marveled at the wisdom by which God accomplishes His will through "natural consequences". With this perspective, I compare Israel with America.

The preservation of Jews 4,000 years, even though so many generations of them rebelled against God, is like the preservation of Freedom of Speech and Religion 400 years, established by the Pilgrims in their Sabbath afternoon Prophesying services from Bible study, despite the intervening generations which forgot God.

This process is easy to observe in America today. Even atheists, pagans, communists and Moslems living in America have really grown comfortable with Freedom of Speech and Religion, which the Pilgrims established through published Bible studies. (See the Works of John Robinson, the Pilgrim's pastor.) Not even many Christians realize these are Biblically inspired. And yet they have become habits spreading from the Bible even to people of other faiths, causing pagans to live as if they were Christians more profoundly than if they merely professed a few dogmas or were more baptized. Although this may not translate to personal eternal benefits, the national earthly benefit is that a people is devoted to habits which just happen to promote freedom, prosperity, and security.

A great many other exclusively Christian habits shape America which many Americans have forgotten, which I could list and document. But the point is, I see that the more so with Jews, in whom Godly habits have shaped their character even in between Godly generations, when the "secular Jews" have forgotten their heritage.

Surely the most important thing that has preserved American Freedom, and Jewish survival, for so long, has been that both have preserved their founding documents. As Romans 3:2 says, the Jews have the Oracles of God. More than that: the Jews have *preserved* the Oracles of God, faithfully, right down to every "jot and tittle". Mat 5:18. And Americans have preserved, and lived under, our Constitution, and before that, our principles of religious freedom created by the Separatists (Pilgrims) from their published Bible studies, in the Works of John Robinson.

(Unlike the Puritans who required not only church membership but a particular kind of conversion experience before you could vote and own church property, the Pilgrims gave the vote even to nonchurch members, even though nonchurch members outnumbered them! They deliberately brought over more “strangers”, they called them, than “saints”. So from 1632 when the Puritans arrived, religious freedom existed side by side with old-world religious persecution. But our forefathers did not allow religious freedom to die, and eventually it prevailed and it was persecution that died.)

The natural consequences for a generation that forgets God are listed in Deut 28, but there have been enough God-fearing Jews over the centuries to preserve the habits promoting survival.

Let me try to reassure any other Jews who fear the specter of multiplying Latino voters, another way.

Jews have survived all these centuries because God has equipped them to be extremely useful to all the people of the world. They are not just outstanding in getting out the vote. They have inventions, they provide top quality service, they are wise. They are useful to Latinos, too.

Latinos don't just see Jews as the rich white guy who pays them to do menial work. (Which, by the way, is the kind of stereotype popular with Democrats.) Latinos see them as wise employers who are able to connect people who want service with people who want to provide service, in a way that allows everybody to eat.

We are *not* advocating an anti-immigration position. It would be the height of ingratitude, moral amnesia, and gracelessness for a group that has historically benefited enormously from liberal immigration - as well as suffered enormously from illiberal immigration policies - to be, or to be seen to be, suggesting that we cruelly yank the rope ladder up behind us. It is also, frankly, in our own best interest to continue to support generous immigration. The day may come when the forces of anti-Semitic persecution will arise once more in the lands of the former Soviet Union or in countries of Eastern Europe and Jews will once again need a safe haven in the United States. The Jewish community requires this fail-safe. We will always be in support of immigration; the question is whether it should be open-ended or not? The question is what constitutes the smartest approach to supporting immigration?

Steinlight would reduce Latino immigration out of compassion, so they won't have to be poor here in the U.S., the same way abortionists want to murder unborn babies to spare them having to grow up “unwanted”. He writes:

Now, [the lack of education and skills among Latino immigrants] would [not] be a problem if we were willing to adopt the Chamber of Commerce/*Wall Street Journal* mentality. That worldview applauds an endless supply of immigrants as desirable in order to fill the bottomless demand for the wretched of the earth to occupy the bowels of the service sector, to suppress U.S. wages overall, and to further weaken the already marginalized American labor movement. But if we are interested in sustaining the American dream of upward mobility and social integration, that [other] vision is both cynical and hopelessly inadequate.

Let's see. A working man in Mexico makes \$3 a day. In the U.S. he makes \$5-12 an hour. But Steinlight, out of compassion for him, desiring to spare him the terrible fate of coming here and not making \$200 an hour, pushes him back to Mexico where, if he is lucky, an American brake parts factory will hire him at \$5 a day.

This is like the mentality of a city council which bulldozes the shacks of the homeless along the river because their homes do not pass inspection – not to mention are built on land they don't own. Such compassion! No one wants a homeless man to have to live in substandard architecture – except the man, whose alternative is a box under a bridge. But this isn't about freedom of human beings to choose for themselves which alternatives are best for them. This is about compassion.

As for the nutty charge that immigrants working for low wages “drive down wages”, when was the last time someone thanked their lawyer and doctor for “driving UP wages” by charging so high?!

When immigrants compete with citizens in a relatively low paying job, most do not charge lower because they have to pretend to be here legally. But even where they do, they create a job for each job they take, since they have to pay for the services of citizens in order to live here, and they have to pay the rates charged by citizens. The citizen is not the one short changed by the exchange!

Steinlight is frustrated that the immigrants here, whom our Numerical Limitations do not allow to “get in line”, do not “get in line” (to become a citizen). Although he is deeply involved in immigration, he apparently has a very rosy picture of how reasonable immigration law is. He apparently thinks any immigrant can become a citizen, who wants to. He writes,

Something like half of the Italians who immigrated to the United States at the turn of the 19th century returned to Italy. Now we have large groups remaining but not naturalizing. The time may have arrived to advocate a policy that determines that a legal prerequisite for immigration, in the first instance, is a sworn affidavit that the prospective immigrant will seek citizenship at the earliest practicable date, with timeframes rigorously enforced by deporting violators. The bottom line should be up or out. Needless to say, adequate funding must be provided to the INS to handle this process in an orderly and efficient manner. The goal of immigration should be citizenship, an acceptance of the rights and obligations of full participation in the national life, accompanied by an embrace of American political and social values; its goal should not be access to opportunities for better-paying jobs and public benefits, and nothing more.

Steinlight speaks eloquently of the moral, intellectual, and political depravity of “Generation X”. They are pampered, lazy, uninformed, cynical, and nothing motivates them to any political response.

To whatever extent this is true, immigrants may be our salvation. Immigrants have plenty to motivate them to a political response: the xenophobia of people like Steinlight. One doesn’t have to attempt political involvement very long, before one understands the value of education, good English, and knowing what you are talking about.

But Steinlight’s solution is to require all young people to serve two years of national service! I can’t wait to find out what bureaucrats will decide best serves America!

A great idea of Steinlight’s:

It is incumbent on government at the state and local levels, ideally with the generous support of the corporate and foundation sectors, to develop large-scale and long-lasting initiatives to build understanding of and respect for Western ideals of civil society in the new immigrant communities. Without such ambitious initiatives, it may take more than one generation to break the stranglehold of the Old World.

The only trouble is, I don’t trust government to explain how our freedoms work, any better than they manage it in our public schools. I believe this initiative will have to come from churches, and from concerned leaders within each language group.

That Jewish groups should remain stout defenders of an uncritical immigration and visa policy that allows for the open-ended entry of Muslim fundamentalists to the United States and then provides government agencies no means of keeping track of them is self-defeating to the point of being suicidal.

# Appendix: Hebrew Lexicons, on “stranger”

<sup>S</sup>1616 <sup>TWOT</sup>330a <sup>GK</sup>1731<sub>92</sub> n.m. Ex 12:48 **sojourner** (Arabic جَارُونَ (*jārun*), Ethiopic ገላር, ጎር (*gəyyur, gor*) Aramaic ܓܝܘܪ (*giyur*), גִּיּוּר, *proselyte*, גִּיּר *proselytize*, Ph. גַּד in n.pr., & pl. גַּר—(גַּרִּים Gn 15:13 ± 74 times; sf. גַּרְדֵּי Ex 20:10 + 4 times, גַּרוֹ Dt 1:16; pl. גַּרִּים Ex 22:20 + 9 times, 2 גַּרִּים Ch 2:16;— 1. *sojourner*, temporary dweller, new-comer (no inherited rights), cf. Ex 12:19 Lv 24:16 Nu 15:30 Jos 8:33 (opp. *homeborn*); of Abraham at Hebron Gn 23:4 (P; || תּוֹשֵׁב); Moses in desert Ex 2:22 (J) 18:3 (E; here explan. of name Gershom, Moses' son); as claiming hospitality Jb 31:32; perhaps in above cases, and certainly in general, with technical sense; fig. of Yahweh Je 14:8; of Israel in Egypt Gn 15:13 Ex 22:20; 23:9 (all JE) Lv 19:34 (H) Dt 10:19; 23:8; גַּרִּים with Yahweh Lv 25:23 (H) 1 Ch 29:15 ψ 39:13 (in all || תּוֹשֵׁב cf. 119:19. 2. usually of גַּרִּים in Israel 2 S 1:13 (Amalekite) cf. Jos 8:33, 35 (E) 20:9 (P) Is 14:1; dwellers in Israel with certain conceded, not inherited rights (cf. RS<sup>OTJC</sup> 434; 2nd ed. 342. n.; K 42; Sem 75 f. Sta Gesch. i. 400). The גַּר is to share in Sabbath rest Ex 20:10; 23:12 (both JE) Dt 5:14; otherwise he is to have like obligations with Israel Ex 12:19, 48, 49 Lv 16:29 (all P) Lv 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 20:2; 22:18; 24:16, 22 (all H) Nu 9:14(×2); 15:14, 15(×2), 16, 26, 29, 30; 19:10; 35:15 (all P) Ez 14:7; similar rights Dt 1:16 Ez 14:22, 23; and like privileges Dt 16:11, 14; 26:11; 29:10; 31:12 cf. 2 Ch 30:25; very rarely any distinction made, in obligation Lv 25:47(×3) (H), in permissible food Dt 14:21; in future success Dt 28:43; kindness to גַּר frequently enjoined: Lv 19:10 (|| 23:22, עֲנִי, || *id.*) 19:34 (all H); Dt 10:18, 19; 14:29; 24:19, 20, 21; 26:12, 13 (all || יְתוֹם || *id.*); oppression prohibited Lv 19:33 (H) Dt 24:14; Ex 22:20; 23:9(×2) (JE) Dt 24:17; 27:19 Je 7:6; 22:3 Zc 7:10 (these eight || יְתוֹם וְאֶלְמָנָה); obj. of care to י' ψ 146:9 (|| *id.*); charge that גַּר has been oppressed Ez 22:7 Mal 3:5 (both || *id.*); also Ez 22:29 (|| עֲנִי וְאֶבְיוֹן), ψ 94:6; cf. also command that a poor brother be treated like גַּר, i.e. kindly, Lv 25:35 (H). Latest conception somewhat different: 1 גַּר Ch 22:2 2 Ch 2:16 (הַגִּירִים) gathered for hard service; yet cf. 2 Ch 30:25. (Often c. verb. cogn. Ex 12:48, 49 Lv 16:29; 17:8, 10, 12, 13; 18:26; 19:33; 20:2 Nu 9:14; 15:14, 15, 16, 26, 29; 19:10 Jos 20:9 Ez 14:22, 23; often || תּוֹשֵׁב Gn 23:4 Lv 25:23, 35, 47 1 Ch 29:15 ψ 39:13).

S *Strong's Concordance*

TWOT *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.*

GK Goodrick/Kohlenberger numbering system of the *NIV Exhaustive Concordance.*

n. *nomen*, noun.

m. masculine.

Ph. Phœnician.

n.pr. *nomen proprium*, proper name.

pl. plural.

± plus, denotes often that other passages, etc., might be cited. So also where the forms of verbs, nouns, and adjectives are illustrated by citations, near the beginning of articles; while ‘etc.’ in such connexions commonly indicates that other forms of the word occur, which it has not been thought worth while to cite.

sf. suffix, or with suffix.

cf. *confer*, compare.

opp. opposite, as opposed to, or contrasted with.

P Priests' Code or Narrative.

|| parallel, of words (synonymous or contrasted); also of passages; sometimes = 'see parallel,' or 'see also parallel.'

J Jehovist.

E Elohist.

fig. figurative.

H Code of Holiness.

RS W. Robertson Smith, Old Testament in Jewish Church.

K W. Robertson Smith, Kinship & Marriage in Early Arabia;

Sem W. Robertson Smith, Religion of Semites.

Sta B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*.

×2 two times.

×3 three times.

obj. object.

c. circa, about; also *cum*, with.

Brown, F., Driver, S. R., & Briggs, C. A. (2000). *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Strong's, TWOT, and GK references Copyright 2000 by Logos Research Systems, Inc. (electronic ed.) (158). Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems.

Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: גֵּר

Dictionary of Biblical Languages With Semantic Domains : Hebrew (Old Testament): 1731 גֵּר

**1731** גֵּר (*gēr*): n.masc.; ≡ Str 1616; TWOT 330a—LN 11.55-11.89 **alien**, stranger, foreigner, i.e., one who is of a different geographical or cultural group, often with less rights than the reference group (Ge 15:13), see also LN New American Standard Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries : Updated Edition: 1615 גֵּר (*gir*)

<?xml:namespace prefix = lbxrt />

**New American Standard Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries, 1615.** גֵּר **gir** (162c); from an unused word; *chalk, lime*:— chalk(1).

85.67–85.85; note: for NIV text in Isa 5:17, see 1531

**1615** גֵּר [*gir* /gheer/] n m. Perhaps from 3564; TWOT 347a; GK 1732; AV translates as “chalkstone” once. **1** chalk, lime. (Enhanced Strong's)

## Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament says

**47:28-31. Jacob lived in Egypt 17 years** ([cf. v. 9](#)) to the age of **147**. (Abraham died at the age of 175 [25:7-8] and Isaac at 180 [35:28].) If the year of Jacob's move to Egypt was 1876 B.C. (see the chart "Chronology from Solomon Back to Joseph" near 39:1-6a) then Jacob died in 1859. His birth, 147 years earlier, would have been in 2006 B.C. (see the chart "Chronology of the Patriarchs").

[cf. confer](#), compare

[v. verse](#)

Walvoord, J. F., Zuck, R. B., & Dallas Theological Seminary. (1983-c1985). *The Bible knowledge commentary : An exposition of the scriptures* (1:97). Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.

Later, in Moses' day when the Israelites were in Egypt, they could count the years and see that **400 years** had elapsed (from the time of Jacob's entry into Egypt in 1876 B.C.; [cf.](#) the chart "Chronology of the Patriarchs," near Gen. 47:28-31) and their time of deliverance from slavery was at hand (**they will come out**). Exodus 12:40 and Galatians 3:17 state that the Egyptian bondage was 430 years (from 1876 to 1446). Apparently, then, Gene

[cf. confer](#), compare

Walvoord, J. F., Zuck, R. B., & Dallas Theological Seminary. (1983-c1985). *The Bible knowledge commentary : An exposition of the scriptures* (1:55). Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.

(2.) The continuance of their sufferings—*four hundred years*. This persecution began with mocking, when Ishmael, the son of an Egyptian, persecuted Isaac, who was *born after the Spirit*, ch. 21:9; Gal. 4:29. It continued in loathing; for it was an abomination to the Egyptians to eat bread with the Hebrews, ch. 43:32; and it came at last to murder, the basest of murders, that of their new-born children; so that, more or less, it continued 400 years, though, in extremity, not so many. This was a long time, but a limited time.

Henry, M. (1996, c1991). *Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible : Complete and unabridged in one volume* (Ge 15:12). Peabody: Hendrickson.

**330** גֹּרַר (gôr) I, *abide, be gathered, be a stranger, dwell (in/with), gather together, remain, sojourn, inhabit. surely, continuing.*

### Derivatives

גֵּר (gēr) *sojourner*) גֵּר 330a

גֵּרֻת (gērût) *lodging (place)* גֵּרֻת 330b

מִגְדָּר (māgdôr) I, *sojourning place*) מִגְדָּר 330c

מִגְדָּרָה (mĕgdârâ) *storehouse, granary*) מִגְדָּרָה 330d

The root means to live among people who are not blood relatives; thus, rather than enjoying native civil rights, the *gēr* was dependent on the hospitality that played an important role in the ancient near east. When the people of Israel lived with their neighbors they were usually treated as protected citizens; foreigners in Israel were largely regarded as proselytes.

Often because of famine the people of Israel lived as protected citizens outside the promised land: Abraham in Egypt (Gen 12:10); Israel in Egypt (47:4); Isaac with Abimelech of Gerar (26:3). In the case of the Patriarchs, however, they became “protected” citizens in the promised land through the call of God (Gen 17:8; 20:1; 23:4). Hebrews 11:9,13 describes them as pilgrims and strangers, evidence that they did not regard themselves as members of the sinful world. Many passages illustrate this meaning. **Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob only sojourned in Canaan (Ex 6:4), although Isaac and Jacob were born there.** The land had not been given to them because the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full (Gen 15:16). **The Israelites are called sojourners (*gērîm*) in Egypt (Deut 10:17–19; Ex 22:20); being outsiders at the beginning and virtual slaves at the end of their stay.**

**Jacob describes his stay with Laban as a sojourn, for he expected to return to Canaan.** Lot dwelled in Sodom, but when he quarrelled with the men of Sodom he was scornfully called a sojourner, i.e. a foreigner, one without voice in community affairs (Gen 19:9).

Israel in exile in Mesopotamia was said to sojourn there (Ezr 1:4) because exiled from their covenant home. wthe Canaanites became *gērîm* after the conquest (Ex 20:10; 22:20; 23:9). because their sin had voided any privileges conferred upon them under the common grace of God. Even Israel is termed a sojourner in the sense that their tenure in the land was effective only as long as they honored the Covenant.

In the age to come the wolf will be the protected citizen of the lamb (Isa 11:6). Evil never enjoys that status with God (Ps 5:4 [H 5]); **but the Psalmist regards himself as such before the Lord (Ps 39:1–13; I Chr 29:15). Indeed, even after the Conquest Israel is still a sojourner in the land, for the land belongs to the Lord (Lev 25:23).**

*gēr*). ***Alien, sojourner, stranger*, referring to someone who did not enjoy the rights usually) גֵּר**

possessed by the resident. The clearest sense of the noun *gēr* is seen when used of Israel in their sojourn in Egypt (Ex 23:9; Gen 15:13). Moses named his son Gershom in memory of his stay in

Midian (Ex 18:3), for he had been exiled from both Egypt and Canaan. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob lived as strangers in Canaan (Ex 6:4) meaning that they had no property rights there.

The *gēr* in Israel was largely regarded as a proselyte. He was to be present for the solemn reading of the Law (Deut 31:12) showing that he was exposed to its demands. The law concerning “unleavened bread” applied to him as well as the native (Ex 12:19), and a circumcised *gēr* could keep Passover (Ex 12:48f.; Num 9:14). He was also included in the festival of the Great Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29) and was expected to celebrate the Feast of Booths (Deut 16:14). With the native he was threatened with the death penalty if he offered a sacrifice to a foreign god (Lev 17:5f.) and was forbidden to eat blood (17:10, 12, 13). Though in contrast to the native he was allowed to eat what had died or was torn (Deut 14:21), like the native Israelite he underwent special cleansing (Lev 17:15f.). He was also included in the rites of cleansing with the ashes of the red heifer (Num 19:10). The laws of sexual chastity applied to him as well as the native (Lev 18:26) along with the Sabbath laws (Ex 20:10; 23:12). In a word he was to show the same fidelity to the Lord (Lev 20:2).

He also enjoyed many of the same rights as the native and was not to be oppressed (Ex 22:21 [H

20]; Lev 19:3; Jer 7:6; 22:3). He is mentioned in connection with the poor (Lev 19:10; cf. 23:22) and with orphans and widows (Deut 14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:17; 26:13; 27:19). With them he shared the sheaf left in the field (24:19) and the gleanings in the olive trees and in the vineyards (24:20–21) along with the tithe every three years (14:27; 26:12). He was to be treated righteously in judgment (1:16; 24:17; 27:19) and the six asylum cities were also cities of refuge for him (Num 35:15). In a word the LORD loves the *gēr* (Deut 10:18). Israel should not oppress him because they themselves were oppressed and know his soul (Ex 22:21 [H 20]; Deut 10:19). They were to love him as themselves (Lev 19:34).

David employed them as stonecutters (I Chr 22:2) and they served in the army (II Sam 1:13). Solomon made them stonecutters and burden-bearers (II Chr 2:17f [H 16f.]). In the curse formulae of Deut 27 it is predicted that the social order would be reversed and the *gēr* become the head, the Israel the tail.

Harris, R. L., Harris, R. L., Archer, G. L., & Waltke, B. K. (1999, c1980). *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (electronic ed.) (155). Chicago: Moody Press.