

Judge Not-So-Bad-Win

Dub McClish

The incident I discuss below could serve as a “Saturday Night Life” script. It might be something to laugh at if it were fictional, but it isn’t. It demonstrates just how far into the maelstrom of absolute God-hating Humanism (to say nothing of idiocy) some who are in places of great power have sunk. I filed this news story away when it was current two years ago, intending to comment on it when I deemed the time appropriate. The implications of this incident haven’t been lessened by the passing of some time, and it seems particularly timely as our nation prepares for a major election in November.

The irrational behavior I will describe below was exhibited by a federal judge on the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in California. This court has long been known for its outrageously liberal and radical rulings, regardless of the U.S. Constitution or any other body of law. Several months ago, it ruled in favor of an atheist who filed suit to have *under God* removed from the Pledge of Allegiance (a few weeks ago, the Supreme Court overruled that decision, for which we can be thankful). The 9th Circuit Court has led the way for other federal judges and courts to assume legislative powers — making laws, rather than seeing that existing laws are enforced.

One of the 9th Court’s judges was named Alfred T. Goodwin. I say **was** because he has changed his name to “Alfred T. Not-so-bad-win,” according to a July 3, 2002, *San Francisco Chronicle* copyrighted story by Jerry Gervase. His “reasoning”? “Too many people subscribe to the notion that God is Good.” (Somehow, I doubt that he had to worry much about people confusing him with God or “good”). He went on to say that it behooved him to change his name to “maintain true separation of church and state.” He feared that keeping his “Goodwin” name might be construed by some as a “further endorsement of religion.”

But the good (oops!) not-so-bad judge did not stop there. He announced that he would seek to have *goodbye* declared unconstitutional in the public-school setting. He explained that the term is well-known as a contraction for *God be with you*. His motive for outlawing *goodbye* was to relieve the “deep psychological harm” the children of many atheists have suffered as their teachers and classmates wished them “goodbye” at the end of the school day.

This man’s hatred of all things sacred apparently knows no bounds. He was asked (since *goodbye* was “clearly” unconstitutional in his estimate, if it would be acceptable to use *farewell* as a parting word on the school grounds. His reply: “Not really.” He then went on to explain that

farewell is a contraction for *fare thee well*. The judge opined that wishing one *farewell* just might be interpreted as calling on Deity to assist the one about to depart. (Those poor little atheists might be offended again.) He could not resist adding, “Besides, *farewell* is very close to Falwell, and we don’t want to go there, do we?”

One does not have to be a member of Mensa to guess the way Judge Not-so-bad-win and his humanistic fellow-magistrates would rule on the following suits:

- A homosexual sues congregation “A” for acceptance as a member, although he refuses to repent of his abominable behavior and to be baptized to be saved.
- A woman who is a member of the church sues congregation “B” because the elders will not let her preach or be considered for the eldership.
- A sister sues congregation “C” because she elected to have a partial-birth abortion for which she is not penitent, and the church withdrew fellowship from her.

Such judges have become the willing pawns of the left-wing, misnamed American Civil Liberties Union. Together they fully intend to remove every hint of the fact that our nation’s history, morals, and laws are deeply rooted in the Bible and belief of the one true and living God.

If Not-so-bad-win were only an “ordinary citizen” engaging in such insanity as the above indicates, we might pity him and pay him little more attention than the exhibitionist who shows up at many sports events with rainbow-colored hair. However, the man quoted above possesses exceeding power as a federal judge and he is in that position for life. If some sort of reins are not put on runaway federal judges and courts, they have the potential to make of our country one that rivals Communist China in its national anthem and despotism. It is sadder still to contemplate that likely there are not only numerous ultra-liberal, anti-God, religio-phobic judges, but that there are many other men and women of like persuasion in other places of great power as well (e.g., members of Congress, bureaucrats, policymakers, et al.).

These all have a totally different – if not opposite – vision for the USA from that of our Founding Fathers and from the implications of *one nation under God*. Many of them are beyond immoral. They are *amoral*. They are abject hedonists and materialists. If they have their way, it will someday (perhaps soon) be illegal to preach or write what the Bible teaches about homosexuality or abortion.

The ballot box is the only available tool by which to effect the desperately needed directional changes in our nation (especially at the federal level). If all of those who claim to be “Christians” (in the very broadest misuse of the term) would vote, and vote in harmony with

Biblical principles, most of the elected scoundrels would quickly find themselves looking for a way to earn an honest living. In turn, honorable elected officials would then be in place to appoint **judges** instead of **legislators** to our courts. If we don't use our votes to get the right people into office (and the wrong people out), we deserve what we get. If we don't elect people who have at least a modicum of Biblical moral values, we had better start preparing ourselves, and especially our children, to face some real persecution.

I don't speak for anyone else or any organization in urging that we all carefully examine the candidates in the upcoming election. It is not only inconsistent, but hypocritical, to claim to oppose abortion and then vote for a candidate and/or party that proudly and officially glorifies such legalized murder. When our choice is between candidates on the one hand who are not ashamed for others to know that they believe in God, read the Bible, and pray, and on the other hand, candidates who obviously are secular and humanistic to the core. God's people really have only one choice on Election Day. When some candidates openly state that marriage must be maintained as a union only between one man and one woman and other candidates alter their position from week to week on this crucial issue, depending on their audience, our decision is a "no-brainer."

Mere party affiliation or loyalty dare not dictate our decisions at the ballot box when such grave issues are at stake. In the upcoming election, dedication to Truth and righteousness **must** trump such childish things as "party loyalty" or the way one's family may have voted for four generations. Whether we make progress in the fight to push back the poisonous cloud of Secular Humanism that threatens to engulf us totally, or that cloud becomes our inescapable atmosphere, may well depend on whom we elect as our leaders this fall. This is truly a "watershed" election. I urge every reader to register to vote if you have not done so. Then I urge you to vote and to vote for honorable, God-fearing candidates. I also urge you to encourage others to vote for such candidates. If you are not going to vote for such candidates, **then our nation will be better off if you don't vote.**

[**Note:** I wrote this MS for, and it was published in, my "Editor's Clippings" column in the September 2004 issue of *The Gospel Journal*, a 36-page monthly publication, of which I was editor at the time.]

Attribution: From www.thescripturecache.com; Dub McClish, owner, curator, and administrator.