

**From:** Mikey Weinstein <mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 21, 2007 12:12 AM  
**To:** JD  
**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

..copy that.....

On Dec 20, 2007, at 8:44 PM, JD wrote:

Mr. Weinstein,

I appreciate the tone of your last email. Moving on sounds like an excellent idea.

JD

[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)

---

**From:** Mikey Weinstein [<mailto:mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 20, 2007 8:56 AM  
**To:** JD  
**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

.....perhaps we should both try to "forget" the bitter acrimony of the current "temperature" of our exchanges here, JD.....?!.....my family and I receive truly grotesque death threats practically every day because of the high profile of our activism.....sometimes I wonder if some of those who deliver these cowardly threats might not also be "reaching out" via e-mail.....ergo, I sometimes have a bit of a hair trigger in response to those who contact me.....the "bad" and the "good" alike....am only human.....you would NOT wanna see the stuff we get out here .....perhaps you'll forgive me in that regard.....perhaps we could move on?.....

On Dec 20, 2007, at 9:23 AM, JD wrote:

Mr. Weinstein,

Funny that *you* quoted Zinn to *me*, given that I have never questioned your patriotism nor your right to disagree. I have taken issue only with the content of your disagreement, not the fact that you do.

On the other hand, you *have* questioned *my* loyalties because I disagree with you. Perhaps *you* forgot that dissent is at the heart of democracy?

JD

[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)

**From:** Mikey Weinstein [<mailto:mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>]

**Sent:** Thursday, December 20, 2007 8:00 AM

**To:** JD

**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

.....yes, a GREAT country indeed, JD!!.....you don't like ny style of "protest"?!?!.....too bad, bro.....you seem to have forgotten Howard Zinn's telling observation that "Dissent is the highest form of patriotism".....instead, it seems likely that you're more an adherent of Samuel Johson's immortal words that "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel"!

On Dec 20, 2007, at 8:50 AM, JD wrote:

Mr. Weinstein,

We're "done?" We never started. You have yet to address the content of the message that initiated this exchange. Instead, you've taken every opportunity to call me a stupid, wrong, naive, a liar, and a traitor. Come to think of it, I've *never* heard you actually defend your accusations. Instead, you change the subject to evangelical coups, rivers of blood, sucking chest wounds, modern day Holocausts in Plan B, pentacostalgons, and the Christian Taliban. Such statements make for great sound bites but poor legal arguments. I wondered if a lack of substantiation was going to be the undoing of your lawsuit (according to Judge Parker, it didn't help your first one), but since you have hired another law firm I suppose they may come up with a way to defend something that you have not.

I have never been to law school (is that where they teach the unique use of the ellipsis?). I keep forgetting that this nation requires one to be a lawyer to speak intelligently about the Constitution, and that if you are a lawyer it automatically makes you right. After all, the Constitution was written by a bunch of lawyers.

Yes, I have learned about the Constitution.

I see the AP picked up your news release, so it appears I was wrong about the media.

Open, free, and civilized debate is one of the great things about America, as is our inherent religious liberty. Don't we have a great country?

JD



[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)

[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)

---

**From:** Mikey Weinstein [<mailto:mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>]

**Sent:** Thursday, December 20, 2007 7:15 AM

**To:** JD

**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

.....we're probably done, JD.....you know ALL too well what I'm "going on about".....your vapid and deliberate, transparent attempt to deny, via lying/"quibbling" over the exactitude of the name, even the existence, of your "website", colors (re; my denotation of your "Christian Fighter Pilots Assn." and your response "nor am I aware of the existence of one" ) the remainder of anything else you'd want to communicate to me.....your highlighting my "inability to communicate a clear thought" only buttresses the now incontrovertible fact that you're quite cognizant that I caught YOU in the aforementioned lie.....no offense taken, however, as I'll go ahead and rest quite securely on my fairly well established "communication skillsets" as I speak

in the electronic and print media everyday and give highly compensated (all fees go as charitable donations directly to our Military Religious Freedom Foundation) public oratories all over the country in many varied venues on a very regular basis.....enough chitchat over your unctuous, mendacious character and proclivities.....now, JD, time for you to go back to violating the sworn oath you took to protect and defend our U.S. Constitution by characterizing EVERYTHING MRFF publically reveals as unconstitutional behavior in the U.S. military to be, in YOUR personal view, perfectly acceptable.....by the way, which law school did you graduate from??!!.....moreover, have you EVER been exposed at ANY level of your education to ANY robust study of our nation's beautiful Constitution....??!!.....MIkey  
On Dec 20, 2007, at 7:30 AM, JD wrote:

What in the *world* are you going on about? Your inability to communicate a clear thought is astounding.

Are you trying to say that because I have a website that I'm running an organization or association of people?

I can't read your mind. When you'd like to actually to communicate (that is, participate in an exchange of information in an educated and courteous manner), let me know.

JD

  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)

---

**From:** Mikey Weinstein [<mailto:mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2007 10:33 PM  
**To:** JD  
**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

...evidently you are likely NOT an Air Force Academy graduate or you would recognize the dishonor and ethical repugnance of "quibbling", JD??!!.....(dude, just look at the 2 url's and the e-mail address listed under your name at the end of each e-mail!)...I doubt you would recognize "civility" if it spit in your face.....and I don't have to "give" you ANY "amplifying information" at all.....you know damn well that you lied to me irrespective of when I called you on it.....the putrescent stench of your feeble justifications and weaksister rationalizations are quite sad for me to behold.....if calling a liar a "liar" is impugning that liar's character, then consider yourself so impugned.....seems like you can dish it out but you can't take it, champ.....naturally, makes me wonder what other lies you've told.....  
On Dec 19, 2007, at 11:17 PM, JD wrote:

Mr. Weinstein,

What, you didn't read my email the first time you replied? Then to what were you replying?

As I state on my website, the only organization of which I am aware is the Association of Christian Fighter Pilots (ACFP). Their website hasn't been up for years. I have a website, but I do not have an organization. As I stated, I am unaware of such an organization. Are you? You could have simply asked me these questions without impugning my character. Is civility too much to ask?

You're going to have to give me amplifying information (or just use slightly different formatting or grammar) on the F-22 half-question, because I don't follow what you're asking. You know that I am in the military, and as a government employee I used the generic term civil servant. Is that what you're trying to ask?

JD

  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)

---

**From:** Mikey Weinstein [<mailto:mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2007 9:16 PM  
**To:** JD  
**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

..JD, I take it that you are bald face lying to me when you assert that you are not aware of the existence of the Christian Fighter Pilots organization??!!.....does an F-22 Raptor pilot constitute the title of a "lowly civil servant"??!!.....it would seem that veracity may not be your strong suit, sir??!!.....plz advise, Mikey  
On Dec 19, 2007, at 1:21 PM, JD wrote:

Mr. Weinstein,

My replies were "specious" and "sophomoric?" I thought name-calling went out in the third grade. I would have liked to see you address the issues themselves, but I suppose delusive accusations are difficult to defend.

*"and your founding of the "Christian Fighter Pilots Association" must bring great pride and joy to you"*  
- I did not found such an organization, nor am I aware of the existence of one. If you are, please let me know. Sounds interesting.

*"I...wish...you...HAD...the slightest nuance of a faint clue about the sworn oath you took to protect and defend, support and to serve a document you seem to know as much about as you likely know about performing brain surgery."*

- That's an awfully strongly worded allegation (and it contradicts your previous statement of my service). Would you like to detail why you would make such a sensational accusation? I suspect not. I have yet to get a reply from you that says much more than "you're stupid and wrong." Maybe one day you can get past personal denigration and actually talk about the issues.

I may only be a lowly civil servant, but I wasn't the one who had his "landmark civil rights lawsuit" tossed out with prejudice, then failed to deliver on my promise to immediately refile to overcome the "technicality." Of course, I've never driven a Lotus, so maybe I'm in the wrong line of work. Then again, I'm not in it for the money.

I defend daily *your* freedom to attempt to restrict *my* Constitutional religious freedoms. Irony abounds. Enjoy it.

JD

  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)  
[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)

---

**From:** Mikey Weinstein [<mailto:mikey@militaryreligiousfreedom.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2007 7:23 AM  
**To:** JD  
**Subject:** Re: MRFF vs. CCC

....hey, JD, good to hear from you again anyway.....ahhhhh, if ONLY "JD" stood for "Juris Doctorate".....alas, it does not and it SHOWS quite balatantly, bro.....every single one of your "retorts" is specious, as a matter of law, at best, my friend.....at worst, they are sophomoric and simply wrong in the extremis .....it DOES seem that you have much time on your hands these days.....plz do enjoy this surfeit of spare time and I wish you a very Merry Xmas.....perhaps we'll meet at the Federal Court trial in Kansas City??!!.....I'll buy you a burger and fries during a lunch break and you can buy dessert.....??!!.....in any event, good sir, I thank you for your service to your country.....and your founding of the "Christian Fighter Pilots Association" must bring great pride and joy to you, eh??!!.....I just wish, again, that you really HAD even the slightest nuance of a faint clue about the sworn oath you took to protect and defend, support and to serve a document you seem to know as much about as you likely know about performing brain surgery; the United States Constitution.....take care, JD, and what say you consider dedicating the New Year of 2008 to sincere Constitutional study?!.....Mikey  
On Dec 19, 2007, at 12:19 AM, JD wrote:

Mr. Weinstein,

You may want to have your Senior Researcher Mr. Rodda do a little more "robust" research. Much of what was contained in your press release was inaccurate. I'll list a few of the more interesting examples:

Air Force Academy Video:

*"The participants in this promotional video, three Academy cadets and two chaplains, violated the same regulation...as the officers at the Pentagon who appeared in the Campus Crusade Christian Embassy video."*

- No, they didn't. Did you watch the video? Only one person ever even *mentions* the positive aspects of only Campus Crusade, and because that person lacked the mantle of a "general officer," they did not imply that "they spoke for senior leaders" or made an "official DoD endorsement." All other quotations on the video were directed toward the importance of Christ in one's life and the Academy SPIRE program (an official Chapel program), neither of which involve "endorsing a non-federal entity." The responses appeared to be carefully phrased and well edited. None endorsed CCC.

*"One of many group photos of soldiers holding up their Bibles..."*

- And? They're in training. They're required to have their uniforms and allowed (even encouraged) their weapons, and they're allowed to go to religious gatherings. Is your problem the fact that someone took a picture of it? Would you like to ban photography?

Chaplain School Patch:

*"The image below is of the Distinctive Unit Insignia of the U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School... This is from the official explanation of the symbolism: "The pages of the open Bible represent the primacy of God's Word."*

- Actually, no, it isn't. Check out the website, and you'll see that there is a different design listed. Given that the patch became more generically "inclusive," it is likely that they symbolism may have also; however, there is no way to know, since the explanation of the "symbolism" is not listed. The description you gave was from an old patch.

*"The Military Ministry director is permitted to hang posters..."*

- Good observation. So is every other organization that obtains the appropriate permission.

*"...If you're in the military, you're in the ministry..."*

- And your point is? You never say anything bad about this; you just repeat it over and over. Just as military members are told that they are "ambassadors for the military" whenever they go anywhere (in uniform or not), so, too, Christians are told that they are "ambassadors for Christ" (that other phrase you hate) wherever they go.

*At the Fort Riley PX, they are not only selling "The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam," but display it right next to "The Soldier's Bible."*

- Noted. The exchange also sells books of witchcraft next to the Pope's book. What's your point?

*AAFES...is military run and has a military chain of command...so the approval for this store is a government endorsement not just of the name on the sign, but of anything hung in the windows..."*

- By that logic, the US government is also endorsing "Think outside the bun," "Eat fresh," as well as every lewd comment on the front of the adult magazines they sell. Don't think that argument will fly.

I noticed this press release lacked the acerbic vitriol of some of the MRFF's previous announcements; I assumed it was either a conscious effort to tone down the rhetoric or a product of a different author. After I read the Military.com article, I realized it was probably the latter. *"Weinstein said the officials can "tell it to the judge," since he plans to include the allegations into a lawsuit he and Army Specialist Jeremy Hall filed..."* If you're really going to do that, I suspect you have one of two goals: you're *trying* to get your own lawsuit dismissed, or you're "throwing mud against the wall and seeing what sticks," to repeat a phrase someone used before about the MRFF. Most of these new "allegations" beg the question others on the web have already posed: so what? You don't even assert that there's anything wrong with most of the statements, you're just tossing anecdotes out. The release almost sounds like a weak cry for attention rather than an actual news event.

In the end, if a real news organization picks up on the story, you'll have achieved your objective of making one final public relations splash in 2007, which I guess is all that matters. Since there's not really anything new in it, though, I wonder if they will.

I find it interesting that you focus much of your ire against private organizations. At the Pentagon, you focused much of the attention on Christian Embassy, and here you focused much of the attention on CCC. (Your title, after all, is *the MRFF vs CCC*.) While interesting, the arguments are irrelevant. A private individual is free to get behind a podium and announce to the world that he wants to turn members of the military into stiff-suited fundamentalist Baptists; when he goes knocking at the base gate, he'll get let in just like the Imams, Rabbis, Wiccans, and Jehovah's Witnesses (who, by the way, also have an "evangelical" objective). There is nothing unconstitutional or illegal about a citizen doing that. There is nothing unconstitutional or illegal about having a house off base that you let military members come to, even if you are associated with Cadence. It is curious that someone of your constantly-repeated credentials would accuse private, non-military organizations—which are not affected by establishment clause claims—of Constitutional violations. Why would anyone make such inaccurate and sensational claims?

As I have noted elsewhere, your bellicose accusations and self-declared "war" against "P-MRDE Christians" are doing more damage to "Military Religious Freedom" than they are good. Some people are unsure if water-cooler talk can delve into religious topics (even though the military explicitly says they have that *religious freedom*), and others practically try to hide their beliefs to avoid misperceptions, even though the military encourages *religious freedom* in spiritual involvement. You've made the chaplains' job

harder when they have to explain to military members that the accusations they read about in the paper weren't founded or substantiated—and that the “unconstitutional” actions were, in fact, not. You have done one good thing, though. You've encouraged many to hone their knowledge of Constitutional law, the UCMJ/IG/MEO, and you've improved relationships with the Chaplaincy. Those things have helped military members know that when someone starts decrying as “egregiously unconstitutional,” say, a picture of a soldier with a Bible, they don't have a leg on which to stand.

You once accused me of not having a “clue” as to what you were all about. Scary thing is, I think I actually do.

Happy Hanukkah,

JD



[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com)

[www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog](http://www.ChristianFighterPilot.com/blog)