

cally unpopular business could be targeted for a public nuisance lawsuit whenever politicians want to argue that their legal products have deleterious social effects. These lawsuits, of course, generate giant payoffs to state government, creating an incentive for Sacramento's big-spenders to supplement the state's income and perpetuate the machinery of big government. Meanwhile, the possibility of such lawsuits will deter investment and innovation and stifle the economy of a state that is already billions of dollars in debt.

YET, THERE is one even bigger reason that this case is frivolous and should be dismissed. *Brown v. General Motors et al* implicates uniquely serious questions: Are CO² emissions from automobiles and other man-enabled activities responsible for global warming, and if so, what can or should humans do to combat it? What is the proper way to balance concerns for the global environment with humanity's needs for productivity, housing, employment, transportation, health, education, and public safety? These and other hard questions are serious matters of policy that require the sort of political judgment, tradeoffs, and consensus-building best left to the policy-making branches of government. The U.S. Constitution delegates such matters to Congress, not the judicial branch, because the unelected federal judiciary is simply not equipped to address them.

The state's attorney general should be an outspoken

If Brown prevails, any politically unpopular business could be targeted for a public nuisance lawsuit whenever politicians want to argue that their legal products have deleterious social effects.

opponent of frivolous lawsuits, not a leading proponent of them. Yet Jerry Brown brought his case against the automakers on for hearing before the trial court. Then, although that court dismissed the case using the same basic reasoning PLF had urged that both the attorney general and the court consider, Brown has filed an appeal. The case now sits before the federal Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Once again, PLF will be opposing the AG in court.

Exploiting the legal system in this way could not possibly benefit the environment. But it could have catastrophic effects on the economy and general welfare of California — and that of the entire country. It's time for Jerry Brown to act responsibly and drop this wasteful grandstanding.

CPR



The Good Guys

What would Jesus do?

In this election, voters are choosing a president, not a pastor.

MICHAEL S. FREDENBURG

CHRISTIANS, THROUGH the centuries, have asked themselves this question when seeking to do the right thing, and today many are asking it with regard to the presidential race — a race in which major Christian figures have

taken active roles. For instance: Pat Robertson endorsed Rudi Giuliani — would Jesus have done that? James Dobson, questioning Senator Fred Thompson's faith, effectively told the evangelical community not to support Thompson's candidacy — and one assumes

that, at a minimum, Dr. Dobson believes Jesus would not object to what he did. Then there is the hot question of Mitt Romney and whether or not it is right for Christians to vote for a Mormon. Finally, Christian evangelicals are flocking to Governor Mike Huckabee as the one, true, viable Christian in the race — would Jesus do that?

THIS QUESTION COMES with certain limitations, to be sure. Slightly rephrasing it, the question becomes: what would God do or say about the presidential race? The answer, of course, is that we do not know. After all, if we adhere to any kind of Christian orthodoxy, we understand that we're talking about knowing the mind of God, something simply beyond our capability. Further, good reason exists to question whether Jesus would actively support *any* political candidate.

However, while we cannot presume to be specific about what Jesus would do, we can look at the Bible, at what God has done in the past. Further, we can consider general principles and values in the Bible and apply

these as followers of Christ to help decide who to support.


For instance: has God blessed believers who have supported leaders who are non-Christians/non-Jews? Yes. According to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, God worked through a long line of Persian Kings who were sympathetic to the Jewish people's desire to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem. God used these non-Jewish kings to advance His kingdom and the cause of his people. That is, God blessed his people even as they "collaborated" with non-Jewish leaders to advance the cause. The case can therefore be made that it is fine for God's people to work with and support someone who is not a Christian.

Is this example precisely analogous to voting for a non-Christian in a democracy where "We the People" are supposed to be the government? The answer to that would be no, but if you are personally struggling with these questions, ask yourself if you would rather vote for a pro-abortion, pro-big government, weak on defense, "born again Christian" — *i.e.*, Jimmy Carter — or for a pro-life, pro-traditional family, small government, strong defense Mormon. For the record, I'd vote for neither — to be the Pastor of my church. But in a civic election, I would vote for the viable candidate who most closely reflects my public policy values.

Specifically regarding Mitt Romney, he is certainly espousing views reflecting traditional Judeo-Christian values and positions Christians can whole-heartedly support. But how firmly can we rely on Governor Romney to follow through on his words if he is elected president? His many recent changes of heart on abortion, homosexuals serving openly in the military, gun rights, taxation, illegal immigration, and other issues seem to warrant a healthy skepticism. Nonetheless, Governor Romney is now saying the right things, publicly committing himself to these positions. That means — should he be nominated — he would, from a Christian perspective, be head and shoulders above any potential Democrat nominee, even Hillary Clinton (who claims to be Christian).

CHRISTIAN ENOUGH? Fred Thompson's campaign was severely damaged when one of the nation's two most respected evangelical leaders, James Dobson (the other being Billy Graham), asked publicly: is Fred Thompson really a

Michael S. Fredenburg covers social issues policy and politics for California Political Review. His column, inspired by the principle that evil triumphs if good men do nothing, endeavors to keep track of those good men and of what they are doing.



**California's "go-to" think tank
for policy solutions**

The Pacific Research Institute is California's top resource for practical, non-partisan solutions for workers' compensation, tax policy, health care, education, and telecommunications policy.

Recent publications include:

- ★ ***No Place to Learn: California's School Facilities Crisis***
- ★ ***How to Fix California's Broken Workers' Compensation System***
- ★ ***Telescam: How Telecom Regulations Harm California Consumers***

To learn more call **415.955.6120** or visit PRI's website **www.pacificresearch.org** to download a complimentary copy of PRI publications.

Christian? It was an injudicious question and should not have been posed publicly, especially by Dr. Dobson who had never met Senator Thompson. Still, the question was posed and the damage done, effectively sending a message to pro-family groups that supporting Fred Thompson could bring potentially negative fallout, despite Senator Thompson's long-standing voting record on the right side of issues of concern to Christian voters.

BUT IS Fred Thompson Christian enough? Senator Thompson has publicly admitted he does not make it to church every week and is divorced and re-married. Should Christian leaders disqualify him on that basis? Clearly, no. Attending Church every week is a great tradition and a potentially wonderful discipline, but a lot of Christians do not believe it is mandated by the Bible. And of course, divorce does not eliminate a man from the ranks of Christianity. After all, President Ronald Reagan did not attend church every week and was also divorced and remarried, yet no serious Christian evangelical leader today questions Reagan's faith or fitness to lead our nation. Since Fred Thompson has declared himself to be a follower of Christ and since he espouses Judeo-Christian values (and has a voting record reflecting them), I think only one person is in a position to question his faith — Christ Himself — and He has, to my knowledge, remained silent on the topic.

In contrast to Thompson and Romney, Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee has clearly benefited from evangelical Christian support. His recent surge in the polls, and especially his Iowa caucuses victory, largely resulted from his having convinced the Christian community of his Christian *bona fides*. In addition, unlike most of the other candidates, Huckabee is not only fluent in *evangelese*, but has been comfortable using it in public. He has down pat the Christian jargon evangelicals are used to hearing at church and among their social cliques. Several other candidates clearly possess solid Christian credentials that even Dr. Dobson would not question (including Congressmen Duncan Hunter and Tom Tancredo). But none have clicked with the evangelical community like Huckabee.

Is it legitimate for Christians to flock to Mike Huckabee merely because he is one of them? To some degree, sure. We are all more comfortable with people who seem to be like us. But in choosing a president, it is incumbent for all voters, even Christians, to know more than that a candidate can talk their language. Overall, Huckabee's record is not that of a conservative. Yes he is strong on the life issue and what consti-

Would you rather vote for a pro-abortion, pro-big government, weak on defense, 'born again Christian' — i.e., Jimmy Carter — or a pro-life, pro-traditional family, small government, strong defense Mormon?

tutes genuine marriage. But his record on taxes, illegal immigration, federalism, and U.S. foreign policy is clearly not conservative.

If you believe big government leads eventually to liberal social policy and that liberal social policy eventually leads to big government, then Governor Huckabee, despite his Christian credentials, is not your candidate. Yes, it is possible to be a good person, a Christian, and still be wrong about certain public policy issues. Christians should evaluate the public policy record of *all* the candidates, and vote accordingly.

Finally, what would Jesus think of Pat Robertson's endorsement of Rudy Giuliani? Since we do not know God's mind, we can't know what Jesus would say or even whether or not He would say anything at all. But we do know that Giuliani is on the wrong side of major issues having a big impact on women, children, the integrity of the family, and the overall health of society. His positions are unequivocally and radically opposed to Christian teachings on family and social justice. That makes the endorsement by Robertson, as a major evangelical leader, and his claim that Giuliani is an acceptable candidate for Christians, a head-scratcher. Frankly, this endorsement appears unwise and downright foolish, especially with so many other candidates now publicly on the Christian side of these critical issues.

Bottom line is that we are not God and do not have the information and wisdom God draws upon to make decisions. Perhaps Jesus would endorse Rudy Giuliani — if He knew the former New York mayor would, in the near future, undergo a sincere change of heart on critical issues. We, however, are not privy to such information. Ask God for wisdom and guidance, by all means, but also use the brain He gave you to evaluate the candidates' records, listen to what they say, and make the decision accordingly.

CPR

Mr. Speaker's empty gesture

by **Chuck DeVore**



One nuclear reactor saves about \$1 billion of natural gas fossil fuel every year. So why is supposed carbon-foe Fabian Nunez handing out meaningless CO² 'Emission Reduction' certificates while doing nothing to promote nukes?

Thanks for the gift of carbon, Mr. Speaker. Or, should I say, the gift of “non-carbon” — a sort of anti-coal for the Christmas stocking. At the close of the year, Speaker Fabian Núñez presented to every legislator a certificate of ownership for three metric tons of “California Registered Van Eck Forest Carbon Dioxide Emissions Reductions.” Now, I’m not one to look a



A portion of the Fred van Eck estate given to Purdue University