

Newsbytes

The First Watch

July 1, 2020

No. 976

Since 2001

Newzbytes is a ministry of Calvary Chapel of Appleton

www.ccapleton.org

“Let us be alert to the season in which we are living. It is the season of the Blessed Hope, calling for us to cut our ties with the world and build ourselves on this One who will soon appear. He is our hope—a Blessed Hope enabling us to rise above our times and fix our gaze upon Him.” Tozer

Well, it doesn't get much worse than this. The socialist gospel is running free with socialist justice, and it appears to be all over but The Shout:

Southern Baptist President to Join Pro-Gay Militant Anarchy Groups in NC to Protest the Government

By Jeff Maples



Raleigh, North Carolina is home to Summit Church, which is subsequently home to the Southern Baptist Convention's current president, JD Greear. For those of you who don't know who Greear is, he is the symptom of a massive influx of leftism in the denomination.

Greear is now promoting an initiative by one of his underling pastors, Michael Georges Jr. who is leading a team from Summit Church to join with militant anarchy groups like the pro-LGBTQ Black Lives Matter and domestic terrorist group, ANTIFA to protest the government. While we support the Constitutional right to peacefully assemble, this protest has clearly devolved into anything but peaceful and has accomplished nothing but more chaos, destruction, vandalism, and even death — clearly something the Church has no business being involved in. Yet, for woke social justice warriors like Greear, their pet cause of social justice has once again overshadowed the mission of the Church by officially

supporting from the Church platform an organized protest against the civil government.

Georges has made it clear that this protest is not just a gathering of their church or other churches, but with “community leaders,” including Black Lives Matter and other anti-police hate groups.

The call to “protest and pray” while “lamenting” can be reduced to effeminate white people virtue-signaling while getting down on their knees and apologizing for their “white privilege” — a concept heavily promoted by Greear and the vast majority of his colleagues in the denomination. After the killing of Ahmaud Arbery, JD Greear had a pro-abortion feminist and a Sunday School teacher at his church write up a statement lamenting “white privilege” and several hundred Summit church members signed the statement. Let that

sink in.

All Christians believe in justice and all Christians should speak up for the injustice of those who don't receive it. But the Southern Baptist Convention has proven to be nothing more than a Democrat social activist platform and they are using the tragic deaths of these people to advance an ideology that has no business in the Church.

A Call for Kristallnacht Against Christians

Murals and stained glass windows of Jesus are a "gross form of white supremacy" and "should all come down," says non-black leftist Shaun King.

Wed Jun 24, 2020

"All murals and stained glass windows of white Jesus, and his European mother, and their white friends should also come down. They are a gross form of white supremacy. Created as tools of oppression. Racist propaganda. They should all come down."

That was a June 22 tweet from Shaun King, and the "far-left activist," wasn't done.

"Yes I think the statues of the white European they claim is Jesus should also come down. They are a form of white supremacy. Always have been," King tweeted. "In the Bible, when the family of Jesus wanted to hide, and blend in, guess where they went? EGYPT! Not Denmark. Tear them down."

The casual reader might wonder about this man Shaun King, so eager for a Christian Kristallnacht. As Fox News noted, King was "a surrogate for Sen. Bernie Sanders," and introduced the Vermont socialist at a rally for his presidential bid. Bernie Sanders is big fan of Denmark, so King's anti-Jesus tweets may be a form of socialist distancing. For their part, other groups on the left have been distancing themselves from Shaun King.

"King was once a leading voice in the Black Lives Matter movement," according to Fox News, "but fell from grace when his race was questioned and he was accused of being a Caucasian falsely portraying himself as black." In the 2015 "The Shaun King Controversy Explained," German Lopez delved into the back story.

Shaun King had "been told" that his actual father was a light-skinned black man. Lopez found that official sources in Kentucky listed the father as Jeffery Wayne King, like his mother "also white." A family member also told CNN that King's parents were both white, but King claimed he didn't lie about using his race to obtain an Oprah Scholarship to historically black Morehouse College.

Lopez claims that race "may not be biologically real," but it's clear that Shaun King, 40, is a genuine fake. Aside from the racial issue, the former "senior justice writer" for the New York Daily News has been criticized as self-promoter, narcissist and incompetent activist. King's anti-Jesus hatred is likely an effort to recover credibility with Black Lives Matter. On the other hand, it recalls a central reality of the left.

Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries have always hated Christianity because it elevates truth and offers a moral authority beyond politics. In America, black leftist radicals continued the tradition. As University of Pennsylvania professor Thomas J. Sugrue notes, black-power radicals derided the Rev. Martin Luther King, a Christian minister, as "de Lawd" and branded him as "hopelessly bourgeois, a detriment rather than a positive force in the black freedom struggle."

In the novel *Dreams from My Father*, so proclaimed by the "composite character" author's own biographer David Garrow, young Barry's strongest influence is "Frank." Frank is the African American Communist

Frank Marshall Davis, a lifelong supporter of all-white Soviet dictatorships. When it comes to reading, Barry tries James Baldwin, Ralph Ellison, and such but “only Malcolm X’s autobiography seemed to offer something different.”

In a supposedly “white supremacist” United States, the son of an African American father and white mother became president of the United States, the most powerful person in the world. That president brought Black Lives Matter bosses to the White House and the ex-president recently expressed the hope that his vanguard of protesters would “seize the moment.” As he knows, the current surge of violence has nothing to do with George Floyd and everything to do with taking power by force.

Any campaign against murals and stained glass windows would be a prelude to the targeting of churches, ministers, and Christians. In similar style, the axis of Black Lives Matter, Antifa, and prominent Democrats aims to remove President Trump from office, but the strategic target is the United States itself. For this crowd, the ultimate statue for takedown is Lady Liberty herself, and radical Muslims are taking the lead.

“The Islamic State militant group (ISIS) planned to attack the Statue of Liberty in New York City with pressure cooker bombs,” Newsweek reported in January of 2018, “the Statue of Liberty has a very weak point in its lower back,” noted Munther Omar Saleh, 21, “if I can get a few pressure cooker bombs to hit the weak point, I think it will fall face down.” The FBI busted Saleh and fellow bomber Fareed Mumuni, 22, who were aided by Australian jihadi Neil Prakash and an English supporter of ISIS.

Islamic militants and the American left are united in their hatred of Christians and Jews. As Daniel Greenfield notes, a Farrakhan supporter played a leading role in violence that targeted Fairfax, the oldest Jewish community in Los Angeles. For Melina Abdullah of Black Lives Matter, these were people “who think that they can just retreat to white affluence.”

Shaun King follows suit with a call for a Kristallnacht against Christians.

Henry Kissinger: US Must Join ‘Global Program’

The United States must join a “global program” that will usher in a new “liberal world order” after the coronavirus lockdown ends, according to Henry Kissinger, who warns the world could be “set on fire” if this does not happen.

Kissinger, 96, a former secretary of state and national security adviser — and a key front man for a powerful movement aiming to impose what he and other globalists refer to as a “New World Order” — recently outlined some of the establishment’s concerns.

The Wall Street Journal published Kissinger’s response to the coronavirus crisis on Friday, April 6.

Kissinger stated that “the world will never be the same after the coronavirus” and that the United States government will have to sustain “the public trust.”

The Nobel Prize winning foreign policy adviser instructed the USA to uphold “the principles of the liberal world order,” saying that “prosperity depends on global trade and movement of people.”

“The founding legend of modern government is a walled city protected by powerful rulers, sometimes despotic, other times benevolent, yet always strong enough to protect the people from an external enemy,” Kissinger wrote.

“Enlightenment thinkers reframed this concept, arguing that the purpose of the legitimate state is to provide

for the fundamental needs of the people: security, order, economic well-being, and justice,” he continued

“The pandemic has prompted an anachronism, a revival of the walled city in an age when prosperity depends on global trade and movement of people.”

Kissinger believes that “the world’s democracies need to defend and sustain their Enlightenment values.”

Kissinger warned that failure either to conquer the coronavirus or to build the post-coronavirus world order might lead to global catastrophe.

“The historic challenge for leaders is to manage the crisis while building the future,” he concluded.

“Failure could set the world on fire.”

Former British Prime Minister Gordon Brown has also called on world leaders to create a new order by forming a “temporary” global government to tackle the medical and economic crises caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

According to Brown, the global government is necessary to make sure the efforts of central banks are coordinated.

Face mask virtue signaling and COVID-19 lies have to stop

By Cheryl K. Chumley - The Washington Times - June 29, 2020

ANALYSIS/OPINION:

One of the Freddy’s Frozen Custard & Steakburgers in Fredericksburg, Virginia, has a policy requiring customers to wear face masks in order to receive in-facility service — but at the same time exempts its own employees working in the food preparation area from having to cover their faces. Why?

That’s a great question — and the answer from management was this: Because they work around heat and the coronavirus isn’t so easily spread in the warmth.

Hmm. Interesting.

So why the shuttering of beaches around the nation?

Why masks at all since America is heading into heatwave season?

This is the stuff of tortured logic, and it’s a primary reason why Americans are suspicious of government’s COVID-19 guidance, and frustrated with private business response to the guidance. First off: The signs on business doors — like on CVS — that warn, “Wear a face mask; it’s the law” are lies.

There is no national law in America requiring citizens to wear face masks.

There are no state laws in American requiring citizens to wear face masks.

Some local governing bodies, like in Montpelier, Vermont, have actually passed a law requiring all citizens to wear masks while entering buildings. But there are exemptions for those who cannot wear masks due to medical reasons. And who’s a business owner, who’s a city council member to demand a citizen provide a doctor’s note or share personal and private medical information? The exemption makes the law moot;

at the very least, the exemption sets the stage for legal challenge.

But by and large, face mask mandates are actually not.

There are executive orders — which are far from laws. There are government recommendations — which are not laws. There are health and safety guidelines — again, which are not the same as laws.

So to post signs on store windows saying face masks must be worn because it's the law is an outright lie.

And to the many in America who aren't sheep, it's just another lie in a long list of COVID-19-related deceptions that have fueled national angst and sparked backlash against government and now, private business, overreach.

There were the closings of hospitals around the nation save for coronavirus cases that left health care workers dependent on stimulus dollars to keep operations in the black — setting the stage for conflicts of interests with the reporting of coronavirus patient numbers.

There were the reports of hospitals coding all fatalities who tested positive for the coronavirus as having died from COVID-19, accompanying health problems be danged, pre-existing heart condition, or liver problem, or long-time serious medical issue be danged.

There were the conflicting government orders: Wear a face mask, don't wear a face mask, wash hands and social distance — whoops, nope, stay home, stay far away from all others.

There were the dark currents of money to be made in vaccines by the very folks who were given global platforms to press the need for worldwide COVID-19 vaccines, i.e. Bill Gates, Dr. Anthony Fauci, and their partnership on the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's Decade of Vaccines campaign — and the almost complete blackout of press coverage of these obvious conflicts of interests.

There were the World Health Organization's issues of complicity with China.

There were the Democrats' support for mass protesters in the streets and complete takeovers of sections of city blocks — but dire warnings about church openings and the COVID-19 fallout that could come. There were threats by New York City's Democrat mayor, Bill de Blasio, to permanently shut down churches that didn't obey.

There were the massive death projections, only to be lowered, then lowered again, then lowered again, and the ridiculous computer models that put a nation on lockdown, in stay-at-home mode. And no apology from the wildly wrong prognosticators, either.

That's just a drop in the bucket of curiosities, conflicts, political grandstanding, deceptions, skewed truths and outright lies that have plagued Americans more than the actual coronavirus.

And it's time to stop the lying. Americans, by and large, aren't a blindly obeying bunch — but they are the most compassionate, concerned and care-taking people in the world and will act selflessly at the drop of a hat, when expedient, when necessary, when the facts point to that need. But nobody likes to be deceived and manipulated and forced into illogical acts. And in America, the rights fall to the people first, not government, certainly not business.

If government wants Americans to take seriously the threat of the coronavirus, government needs to stop the lying. And so does private business.

And here's yet another reason to be fight the nonsensical policies being put in place in random, haphazard fashion around the United States: Some are being put in place by rogue operators.

From Freddy's corporate public relations manager, Jill Tinsley, in an email: "In this current stage of dining rooms reopening, all Freddy's Team Members are required to wear non-medical cloth face coverings. Freddy's does not require Guests to wear a mask unless it is required to comply with a local ordinance. [Mandated face masks for guests] at the franchise location in Fredericksburg was not in compliance with Freddy's current standards."

The takeaway?

It's time to stop the lying.

The Future of Israel's Borders: International Law and Islamic Law. Part I

by Denis MacEoin

June 30, 2020 at 4:00 am

Today's Palestinian children are taught to hate Jews and glorify -- and handsomely profit from -- violence against them.

It is common today to find references to Palestine as a mainly Muslim Arab state that has supposedly been "stolen" by Jews, or promised but not given to those people who describe themselves as Palestinians. That is an immense misconception, albeit one that seems to influence political and legal thinking internationally, especially among people who would like to believe it.

In a clearer understanding [of international law], Israel's planned move appears to be legal.

"The Palestinian people does not exist. The creation of a Palestinian state is only a means for continuing our struggle against the state of Israel for our Arab unity. In reality today there is no difference between Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese. Only for political and tactical reasons do we speak today about the existence of a Palestinian people, since Arab national interests demand that we posit the existence of a distinct "Palestinian people" to oppose Zionism.... [T]he moment we reclaim our right to all of Palestine, we will not wait even a minute to unite Palestine and Jordan." — PLO leader Zuheir Mohsen, the Dutch newspaper Trouw, March 31, 1977.

The rejection of President Donald Trump's Middle East peace plan by the UN Human Rights Council and others ignores the reality that it is one of the most balanced documents drawn up in favour of peace and the creation of a viable State of Palestine in the West Bank and Gaza.

In general, taking territory from another country is treated under international law as illegal. Much of our sense that such illegality is as much morally wrong as it is legally prohibited comes from historical realities in modern history. The Nazi German takeovers of numerous countries across Europe between 1938 and 1945, together with the brutality with which they were carried out, stand even today as notorious examples of unacceptable behaviour in an attempt to dominate other peoples without the least pretence of legality of purpose or practice. More recently, the Russian Federation's 2014 invasion of Crimea has caused unnecessary conflict with Ukraine and damaged Russia's own international reputation.

Article 2 of the first chapter of the United Nations Charter declares:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of

the United Nations."

This was formulated in 1945, in a very understandable response to the aggressions by Nazi Germany. It remains a valid ruling on the dangers posed by powerful nations should they too choose to use force to take over neighbouring territories. Even so, Article 2 was contravened by China in 1959 when it overran Tibet; by Turkey in 1974 when it invaded northern Cyprus, and is constantly contravened by Iran -- with the evident complicity of most of the members of the UN -- in its expansions into Iraq, Syria, Yemen and Lebanon, as well as its 41-year-long threats to obliterate a fellow UN member state, Israel.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC), with its existing and locked-in bias against Israel, should condemn Israel for its plan to extend Israeli law to disputed lands, in line with the US peace plan revealed in 2020. The rejection of the US plan by the UNHRC and others ignores the reality that it is one of the most balanced documents drawn up in favour of peace and the creation of a viable State of Palestine in the West Bank and Gaza.

Plans designed to bring about peace between the state of Israel and the Palestinians have been multiple, yet none has succeeded -- in all instances because of Palestinian rejectionism. The worst case was President Clinton's offer to the head of the PLO, Yasser Arafat, that would have required the Israelis to hand over about 90% of the lands to help create a State of Palestine. Arafat seemed to agree, then walked away and, from 2000-2005, waged against the people of Israel a campaign of terrorism known as the second intifada.

Peace plans and treaties only work when both sides sincerely want to make them do so, and then can require one or more generations of young people who learn the benefits of an end to violence. Sadly, that is still a remote hope. Today's Palestinian children are taught to hate Jews and glorify -- and handsomely profit from -- violence against them.

There is every reason not to feel hopeful about yet another plan for peace. Even if the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank could be persuaded to act in its own self-interest (and there is little sign of that), the intransigent Islamist terror movements in Gaza -- Hamas and Islamic Jihad -- would most likely still not be brought around in the manner advocated in the plan as the only way to improve the lives of the Palestinians living there.

Nevertheless, we need to take one step at a time. Progress is held back by opposition to the proposed Israeli move. The EU, plus the chief of the United Nations, a multitude of Arab states, the international Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, some countries in Europe, and numerous countries historically unfriendly to Israel have, not surprisingly, condemned the move.

Possibly, once the move takes place, and Israeli sovereignty is extended into parts of Judaea and Samaria and the Jordan Valley, the Palestinians might respond with violence. Fifty-eight per cent of Israelis believe that the move could lead to a third intifada. The Israel Defence Force (IDF) is already preparing for action in that eventuality.

But is that inevitable? Most of the arguments concerning international law are based on a flimsy understanding of how and why Israel was brought into existence within international law, not to mention why Palestinian rejection has, for more than seventy years, been conducted outside that law. Moreover, in a clearer understanding, Israel's planned move appears to be legal.

The Israel-Palestinian conflict is unique for several reasons, and to proceed by citing legislation that applies to very different countries and historical situations pretty well guarantees discrimination against the state of Israel -- a level of discrimination from which Israel has suffered from since the day of its birth.

Let us take this in stages. Why did the idea of a Jewish state take hold legally in the early twentieth century? The First World War had ended with the defeat of Germany, but it was the overthrow of the vast Ottoman Empire that prompted the League of Nations to rescue their former Ottoman colonies from chaos and anarchy by creating the basis for nation states across the Middle East: Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine (considered as the modern Jewish homeland). There had never been anything resembling an Arab or Islamic state known as "Palestine". The name came from the ancient Romans' Latin version of the land for the Philistines and had nothing to do with Arabs or Muslims. At the time, the Roman Emperor Hadrian was trying to make it seem as if land actually named Judea was purely Roman and had nothing to do with Jews. The use of the word in Britain's 1922 Mandate for Palestine was simply based on the classical learning of the British learned and ruling classes.

Despite this, it is common today to find references to Palestine as a mainly Muslim Arab state that was supposedly "stolen" by Jews, or promised but not given to those people who describe themselves as Palestinians. That is an immense misconception, albeit one that seems to influence political and legal thinking internationally, especially among people who would like to believe it.

There are two chief inspirations for this mode of thinking. The first is Palestinian Arab nationalism, whose adherents portray Palestine as a long-term basis for loyalty from all the Arabs once living under the original Mandate territory or those currently restricted to Gaza and the West Bank. A state of Palestine is thought assured under the rights given to so many other people -- from the Irish to all other post-colonial nations achieved through the end of empires. But that argument does not validate the fantasy that any state of Palestine ever existed or that the Palestinian Arabs are the indigenous inhabitants of Israel, Jordan, and the would-be state of Palestine.

In fact, Palestinian nationalism as a political movement only started around 1920 and was formulated in the form of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964.

As the PLO leader Zuheir Mohsen openly admitted in the Dutch newspaper Trouw in 1977:

"The Palestinian people does not exist. The creation of a Palestinian state is only a means for continuing our struggle against the state of Israel for our Arab unity. In reality today there is no difference between Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese. Only for political and tactical reasons do we speak today about the existence of a Palestinian people, since Arab national interests demand that we posit the existence of a distinct "Palestinian people" to oppose Zionism.

"For tactical reasons, Jordan, which is a sovereign state with defined borders, cannot raise claims to Haifa and Jaffa, while as a Palestinian, I can undoubtedly demand Haifa, Jaffa, Beer-Sheva and Jerusalem. However, the moment we reclaim our right to all of Palestine, we will not wait even a minute to unite Palestine and Jordan."

When international bodies legitimize Palestinian demands on the basis of such nationalism, they ignore the artificiality of the concept. To add to this is the manufactured and long perpetuated myth of the Palestinian refugees.

Finally, we must examine the very real clash between today's international law and the Islamic equivalent. We shall turn to these in Part Two.