

The Progressive Revolution



*Volume I:
2007–08 Writings*

*Liberal Fascism
through the Ages*

ELLIS WASHINGTON

THE PROGRESSIVE REVOLUTION

Liberal Fascism through the Ages

**Volume I
2007-08 Writings**

Ellis Washington


**University Press of America,[®] Inc.
Lanham · Boulder · New York · Toronto · Plymouth, UK**

**Copyright © 2013 by
University Press of America,[®] Inc.**
4501 Forbes Boulevard
Suite 200
Lanham, Maryland 20706
UPA Acquisitions Department (301) 459-3366

10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth PL6 7PP
United Kingdom

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
British Library Cataloging in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013933549
ISBN: 978-0-7618-6109-6 (clothbound : alk. paper)
eISBN: 978-0-7618-6110-2

 The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992

DEDICATION

To Justice Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States (1991-present)—

. . . For teaching me love, courage, and steadfastness in the midst of your “high-tech lynching” before the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings and for enduring the slanderous, unjust attacks by the propaganda press and from your former friend and employee, Anita Hill during that fateful summer of 1991.

. . . Exceeding gratitude to you Justice Thomas for standing by me 20 years ago during my intellectual emergent years when most others whom I reached out to simply ignored me; for writing me all those letters which gave me encouragement and hope.

. . . But most importantly for writing all of those law review articles, Court opinions, fatherly wisdom to our youth to never, ever give up; speeches and lectures to us adults to return to the wisdom and Natural Law of America’s Founding Fathers, and for your classic memoir *My Grandfather’s Son*.

Indeed, this is your true and enduring legacy for America, for the Ages which has served as beacons of hope and tablets of truth in a world increasingly shrouded in liberal *living* constitutionalism, evolutionary materialism, intellectual relativism, political fascism, and moral darkness.

EPIGRAPH

It is my argument that American liberalism is a totalitarian political religion. . . . [F]or some liberals, the state is in fact a substitute for God and a form of political religion as imagined by Rousseau and Robespierre, the fathers of liberal fascism.

~ Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism* (2007)

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiii
<i>Prologue</i>	1
 Chapter One— <i>On Law</i>	 15
1. Justice Clarence Thomas—my friend	
2. Justice Kennedy channels Alfred Kinsey	
3. Atlanta's criminal <i>injustice</i> system	
4. Obama, Ayers, Dorhn and double jeopardy	
5. Laurence Tribe's Tribalisms	
6. Where are Scalia's intellectual children?	
7. The Supremes Vote against the Republic	
8. Obama 2001, uncensored	
9. Obama and our coming constitutional crisis	
10. An American oligarchy of 5	
11. Justices gone wild	
12. Fleecing Florida's landowners	
13. No 'real victims' in Spitzer case?	
14. A 'reasonable person' in an unreasonable world	
15. Are your 2nd Amendments rights safe?	
16. Tyranny of the American Bar Association	
17. The treachery of <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	
18. Mike Nifong and the sin of ambition	
19. Judges gone wild	
20. Common Law vs. Continental Law: Rules vs. Truth	
21. The <i>real</i> Medellin Cartel	
22. Law 101: The Commerce Clause, FDR & Original Intent	
23. Are hate crimes constitutional?	
 Chapter Two— <i>On Politics</i>	 90
1. What is Plantation Liberalism?	
2. Why does the left so hate America?	
3. Is Giuliani a dime-store Dewey?	
4. RINO careerists: Nothing more than traitors	
5. Goebbels, Paterson, Obama and the eternal lie	
6. Obama, Blago and 'The Chicago Way'	
7. Rangel's rank hypocrisy	

8. Limbaugh: Our link to Reagan conservatism
9. Why Kwame gets a pass in Detroit
10. A Savage prediction for McCain
11. Are liberal Democrats the real racists?
12. The day I took fire from 'Obama'
13. A critique of President George W. Bush
14. Teflon brothers: Barack and Kwame
15. What I'd do as president
16. What I'd do as president, Part 2
17. What I'd do as president, Part 3
18. If I were mayor of Detroit
19. If I were mayor of Detroit, Part 2
20. A critique of Justice Thurgood Marshall
21. The *real* Medellin Cartel
22. D-Day for Kwame (6 years late)
23. Why I became a conservative
24. Calling all criminals: Come to Detroit!
25. FDR's legacy: Tyranny
26. Rep. William Jefferson and other false prophets
27. Why I praise Sen. Joseph McCarthy
28. Neville Chamberlain's revenge
29. Is Islam compatible with a Republic?
30. D-Day in Denver?
31. Barackracy Hypocrisy
32. An Angel(ica) descends in Detroit

Chapter Three—*On Foreign Policy*

188

1. War for oil? I wish it had been
2. The canary in the mine
3. Condi plays piano while Islam destroys the West
4. Liberalism bombs Bombay
5. Does Colin Powell believe in the Powell Doctrine?
6. Happy 60th birthday, Israel!
7. Reagan vindicated: SDI works
8. The Osama bin Laden Equal Protection Act [O.B.L.E.P.A.]
9. Why is Israel afraid to be Israel?
10. Obsolete lawyers and IEDs

11. U.N. treachery, the Nuremberg Trials and the seeds of 9/11
12. 'De-Islamatization' Why it must be done

Chapter Four—*On Philosophy*

224

1. Hitler's ideology, 'right-wing'?
2. How Thomas Hobbes is helping destroy America
3. Egalitarianism, sports and rewarding failure
4. I think, therefore I am [On Descartes]
5. Machiavelli in the house
6. Communism then and now [On Karl Marx]
7. It's all about pleasure? [On John Stuart Mill]
8. Rousseau and the savageness of humanity
9. Nietzsche and the damnation of ideas
10. Black Democrats and the 'Battered Wife Syndrome'
11. *Symposium*—3 legends face Judgment Day
12. *Symposium*—A Socratic dialogue on greatness
13. *Symposium*—Should public education be free?
14. *Symposium*—Should public school be mandatory?
15. Hellary: Machiavelli's evil twin

Chapter Five—*On Aesthetics*

278

1. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, R.I.P.
2. *Symposium*—Clara Wieck: The anti-feminist feminist
3. Requiem for Sen. Joseph McCarthy
4. 3 classical views on government
5. The curse of beauty
6. *Symposium*—Why secularists hid Bach's music (The forgotten genius)
7. A Christmas Valentine

Chapter Six—*On the Academy*

300

1. Reparations or redemption?
2. A letter to Professor Laurence Tribe on *Veritas*
3. Harvard, the Ivy League and the forgotten Puritans
4. Is a college degree required for success?
5. Our leftist propaganda factories
6. Stalin in Detroit
7. *Symposium*—Dialogue with a crazy liberal professor

8. Universities of socialism
9. Harvard's propaganda for Obama (On Professor Cass Sunstein)

Chapter Seven—*On Religion* 330

1. A giant in a wheelchair
2. Obama, Bishop T.D. Jakes and Me
3. Obama, me and our pastors
4. Unto us a Son is given
5. 10 Commandments of post-'60s liberalism

Chapter Eight—*On Economics* 346

1. Faust, Greenspan and America's financial collapse
2. Obama and the virtue of selfishness
3. I praise the poor

Chapter Nine—*On Science* 356

1. Darwin's deadly delusions
2. California burning
3. *Symposium*: Freud's legacy—Does medication = healing?

Chapter Ten—*On Culture and Society* 367

1. Clarence Thomas' *My Grandfather's Son*
2. Time for revolution?
3. A Tale of Two Cities: Grosse Pointe and Detroit
4. The bewildering mind of President Geo. W. Bush
5. Spitzer, Kilpatrick and the road to perdition
6. KKK or KKK (Kwame 'Klan' Kilpatrick)?
7. Today's unborn blacks: More vulnerable than slaves
8. Detroit's middle-finger salute
9. Clarence Thomas: No 'Black self-respect'?
10. Detroit rapper: Our mayor's a murderer
11. Liberalism triumphs in Detroit's demise
12. Another pathological black mayor
13. Blacks slaves again . . . to the Democratic Party
14. I remember Detroit
15. PC = Perversity (not political) Correctness
16. Queen Oprah and her anointed squire
17. What ruined Detroit?

18. Ira Einhorn, Al Gore and the Cult of Celebrity
19. Heresy in Denver
20. Critical thinkers vs. Kool-Aid drinkers?
21. Birmingham on the brink
22. How the Detroit Lions mirror their host city
23. Arbitrary Ideas: Hollywood, Reagan and imbeciles voting
24. Same-sex marriage a right?
25. Is liberalism political madness?
26. Where's Gen. Patton when you need him?
27. A critique of Dr. Martin Luther King
28. Detroit's 'Operation Sistergirl'
29. Detroit's tragic love affair with liberalism
30. Why Blacks vote against their own interests
31. Obscurity was good for me

Epilogue—*On History* 465

1. Liberal Fascism through the Ages

Endnotes 472

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Have you ever had an idea that you didn't share with anyone because you thought they would think it was a bad idea, or would probably mock you? Then coincidentally, someone comes up to you and suggests the very idea you tried in vain to keep to yourself? That event, in a nutshell was how this collection of 140 essays were eventually published into a two volume book—*The Progressive Revolution, Vols. I and II*. My dear friend, Leonard McCoy, a former professor of Political Science at Savannah State University, is the person of whom I allude to. In a subsequent essay, *Letter to Generation Y*, I wrote the following lines about Professor Leonard McCoy: "He is also an emergent scholar, a brilliant critical thinker and one of the most dispassionate, logical-minded men I've ever met. During my short tenure at SSU (2008-09) Professor McCoy and I put on eight symposiums and participated in about four or five others."

¹ It was this man who singularly urged me in November 2008 to arrange the articles I write twice a week for WorldNetDaily.com into a book; an idea that I had for almost two years earlier, but fear kept me from fulfilling my destiny. It was he that also suggested that I arrange the articles in a topical fashion divided according to the primary discipline which the individual articles addressed.

I have to admit in hindsight that Professor McCoy's social, moral and intellectual support of me has truly helped me to do things I probably would not have achieved on my own; at least not in this short time frame. Without his steadfast encouragement, wisdom and academic skills, I doubt that this work would have ever come to fruition. Lenny is definitely a glass-half-full person as opposed to myself where oftentimes I love to linger longingly in the bed of despair.

Exceeding gratitude to Justice Clarence Thomas to whom I have ded-

icated these two volumes. Justice Thomas is a dear friend and intellectual mentor of mine whom although I've never met before personally, nor spoken to other than by letter, nevertheless I feel like I've known the man for a lifetime. Justice Thomas has been a true inspiration to me since 1991, my first year in law school and also during the time of his infamous Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee where his judicial record and legal philosophy were perverted and disparaged by the liberal Democrats on the committee, as well as by progressives, socialists, Black activist groups and the largely White liberal media who has historically gotten a pass on being racist demagogues whenever a Black conservative like Clarence Thomas came in public view because they "made it" without the aid of Democrat social programs. A reoccurring abnormality in our political discourse is when otherwise nice, normal, gregarious, rational White progressives or liberals become unhinged lunatics on the rare occasion that a Black conservative comes into the public spotlight like Clarence Thomas. I was outraged by the merciless slandering of this conservative legal scholar by America, a man of unimpeachable character and moral resolve. Virtually no one came to his defense. The Clarence Thomas case was my most notable epiphany and made a profound impact on my life. It was a defining event that solidified my emergent legal and philosophical worldview. His resolute intellectual, philosophical and moral support has cemented a life-long bond between Justice Thomas and myself that exists to this day.

Throughout this work in articles like, *Justice Clarence Thomas—my friend, Clarence Thomas' 'My Grandfather's Son', Time for Revolution and Clarence Thomas: No Black 'Self-respect', and Tribe's Tribalisms*, and in other works are references either directly or indirectly inspired by the natural law jurisprudence of Justice Thomas. In these essays I endeavored to pay a small homage to this brilliant legal mind whom I consider a jurist of the highest order and one of the truly great legal minds to have ever had the honor to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States. On this point Jeffrey Toobin, a senior legal analyst for CNN and longstanding critic of Justice Thomas after 20 years of magnificent judicial opinions was literally forced to admit what conservative legal commentators as myself already knew years ago—that Justice Clarence Thomas was *the* "intellectual leader" of the Supreme Court whose uncompromising conservative jurisprudence rooted in a synthesis of law and morality, natural law and

the original intent of the constitutional Framers, heroically brought the Court back from the abyss of the naked judicial activism, welfare-state liberalism, progressivism and positive law of the Warren Court (1953-69) and Berger Court (1969-86). The ship has not been righted yet, however, America can thank the singularly brilliant legal mind of Justice Thomas (a man incidentally that rarely speaks from the bench in open Court) for setting the ship U.S. Supreme Court on the right course that the constitutional Framers mandated 230 years ago.

Toobin wrote in an article on Justice Thomas in the *New Yorker* in August 2011 which was intended to be a severe criticism of Thomas's alleged "conflict of interest of his politically active wife, Jeanne Thomas and her criticisms of ObamaCare. Toobin and other socialists, liberals and progressives have been demanding that Thomas recues himself from the upcoming Supreme Court case to determine the constitutionality of ObamaCare, particularly the mandate that forces individuals to buy private health-care insurance. However, before he began his typical tortured, incoherent diatribe against Thomas (as most leftist legal commentators are prone to do) he surprised most legal observers by his open praise of the legal mind and jurisprudence of Justice Thomas writing:

[T]his year has . . . been, for him, a moment of triumph. In several of the most important areas of constitutional law, Thomas has emerged as an intellectual leader of the Supreme Court. Since the arrival of Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., in 2005, and Justice Samuel A. Alito, Jr., in 2006, the Court has moved to the right when it comes to the free-speech rights of corporations, the rights of gun owners, and, potentially, the powers of the federal government; in each of these areas, the majority has followed where Thomas has been leading for a decade or more. Rarely has a Supreme Court Justice enjoyed such broad or significant vindication.¹

The writer, Jeffrey Toobin, quotes New York University law professor Steve Calabresi, a co-founder of the Federalist Society: "Of the nine Justices presently on the Court, he is the one whose opinions I enjoy reading the most, [says Calabresi]. They are very scholarly, with lots of historical sources, and his views are the most principled, even among the conservatives. He has staked out some bold positions, and then the Court has set out and moved in his direction."² Ezra Greenberg, in an article in the *American Thinker* wrote regarding the Toobin's article in *The New Yorker* that "The article is ostensibly about how Justice Thomas

and his wife Virginia may succeed in shutting down ObamaCare at the constitutional level. Walter Russell Mead and Rush Limbaugh have interpreted the piece as a warning to liberals that it is time to abandon the caricature of Thomas—who now poses a lethal threat to their political ends—as an unqualified intellectual lightweight.”³

I remember 20 years ago some of my law professors teaching us students that conventional wisdom stated that just as the first Black member of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Thurgood Marshall, merely mimicked the judicial philosophy and opinions of William Douglass, likewise Clarence Thomas always agreed with Scalia, but we were lead astray by exactly *who* was influencing *who*? Greenberg adds clarity to this paradox writing, “Toobin also notes that Thomas, not Scalia (as is widely thought) has been the driving force propelling the Supreme Court to an originalist approach on a host of issues, including federalism, gun rights, and election speech.”⁴ To that list I would add Thomas’s most important contribution a reemergence of natural law jurisprudence which was the original philosophy of the Framers of the Constitution. Nevertheless, despite eloquently and accurately describing the vast positive influence of Justice Thomas on the Court, Toobin’s mind is hopelessly shackled in his liberal/progressive ideology which forces him to disparage the entire jurisprudence of originalism which as I’ve written for over 20 years is indeed rooted in natural law. Toobin writes:

Thomas’s approach to the Eighth Amendment underlines some of the problems with his approach to the Constitution, and with originalism generally. . . . notwithstanding Thomas’s enduring certainties, it is difficult to know what the framers would have thought of any given situation. . . . It is true, too, that the framers often disagreed profoundly with each other, making a single intent behind the Constitution even more difficult to discern, and the twenty-seven amendments (all with their own framers) created another overlay of complication. For all of Thomas’s conviction, originalism is just another kind of interpretation, revealing as much about Thomas as about the Constitution.⁵

Toobin is dead wrong. Originalism or natural law isn’t “just another kind of interpretation” but is based on the original intent of the constitutional Framers which is rooted in an inseparable synthesis of legality and morality and the morality historically has its foundations in America’s Judeo-Christian traditions.

Thanks to Dr. Benn Bongang, former Chair of the Department of Political Science at Savannah State University for participating with me and Professor Leonard McCoy in several symposia to help our students reach the Parnassus of critical thinking. These intellectual symposia were co-organized with Professor Leonard McCoy, Dr. Benn Bongang and others. Subsequently I summarized the intent of these symposiums in several articles titled, *Reparations or Redemption?*; *Barackracy Hypocrisy*; *The day I took fire from Obama* and *Dialogue with a Crazy Liberal*. Our students at Savannah State really inspired all of my colleagues to endeavor to be the best professors that we could be.

Thanks also to Joseph Farah, founder and CEO of WorldNetDaily, for giving me a public voice to express my ideas and ideals and for the rare opportunity to write and publish literally hundreds of articles for this outstanding and essential internet political journal. I have been a legal and political commentator for WorldNetDaily since February 2007. Prior to Joseph accepting my unsolicited inquiry to be a commentator at WorldNetDaily, for the prior 24 years (since 1983) when I first became a published author, my writings and intellectual contributions had been virtually ignored by liberals, conservatives, independents and libertarians alike. To his credit, Farah always had a singular vision most other media figures (of every ideological spectrum) lacked and in my case he literally plucked me out of the pit of obscurity and lifted me to a place of literary honor. For this gesture I am eternally grateful to him as I'm sure every writer that has ever written for WND.com including my esteemed colleague, former GOP presidential candidate Herman Cain, who although few people in the state-controlled media took his campaign seriously, Joseph Farah believed in his conservative ideas and gave him a forum at WorldNetDaily to express them long before the general public even knew who this man was. In the article, *Obscurity was good for me*, I paid homage to Farah and several special others who helped my intellectual development through the years. Thanks also to my primary commentary editor, Ron Strom as well as fellow news editors, Drew Zahn and Chelsea Schilling at WorldNetDaily for their exemplary editorial skills on my essays over the years.

My graduate student assistant at Savannah State University, Lemaro Thompson, read the entire manuscript cover to cover and provided valuable corrections on syntax, style, and format as did my son, Stone Washington (age 14) whom I paid well-deserved tribute to in an article

to be published in a later set of volumes in 2012 (*Letter to Generation Y*). Here is an excerpt from that essay:

My son, Stone Washington, is 14 and will be entering high school this fall. Since he was about 8 I've had him read the great works of literature and book summaries of the classics and write his own summary analyses of those works in addition to reading them to me, correcting his sentence structure, and most importantly making him defend his thesis and arguments.

On July 14, Stone completed writing 100 essays from an anthology called, *Book of Great Books: A Guide to 100 World Classics* by W. John Camp (2000), which is 100 literary classics from the canon of Western civilization including writers like Homer, Plato, Machiavelli, Shakespeare, Voltaire, Goethe, Shelley, Dickens, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Melville, Hemingway, Faulkner, Geo. Orwell, Winston Churchill, Zora Neal Hurston, Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison and many, many more magnificent writers.

I wanted to teach my son that in order for anyone in the world to give a damn about his opinion he needed to *first* have an informed, rational and intelligent opinion. In order to have a coherent, logical opinion he needed to read (and re-read) the great books of Western civilization, to teach him to think in grandiose, sublime and transcendent ideas (i.e., ideas above himself).

To demonstrate how knowledge is power and character is destiny, a few months ago when Stone was in the eighth grade he was chosen to be part of a special writing group. When the essays were written and collected, the teacher (Ms. Currier) by chance chose Stone's essay to read to the entire class and was stunned at his level of clarity, sentence structure and intellectual depth. She stated his writing was at the level of a 20-year-old, a college junior.

Overnight Stone's reputation for writing and intellectualism spread across the school campus, including to the principal's office. I told Stone in addition to the bad letters in his file for being repeatedly tardy and bullying that little boy ("Jimmy") in the seventh grade, now you have a good paper in your permanent file to showcase your literary and philosophical side. Stone was visibly proud of this achievement, which made my fighting with him all that time in writing those 100 essays (772 days) worth every word, every sentence . . . every effort.⁶

The collective readership of my weekly columns has proven themselves to be both an invaluable and enduring mainstay to my intellectual growth and development as well as the evolution of the breath and

scope of my writings. You are all the wind beneath my wings. My readership has always forced me to constantly revise and rethink my ideas; to never be satisfied no matter how many complimentary emails I receive; to ever improve with each subsequent article or in the words of my favorite Black conservative intellectual, Booker T. Washington who famously wrote—*Do what you can with what you have and never be satisfied.*

Exceeding gratitude to Katie Smith, customer service representative of Joe Christenson Printing Co. in Lincoln, Nebraska, for typesetting the entire text of both volumes 1 and 2 under very constrained circumstances, and for doing this excellent work with graciousness and professionalism. Whenever I called upon her to help me in the shaping of this manuscript into a book, she was always there to provide her outstanding skills in this regard. If anyone reading this book ever has the need for a professional printer I hope that you will solicit Joe Christenson Printing and tell them Ellis Washington sent you.

To Hans Gruen my friend, creator and host of my new website: www.EllisWashingtonReport.com (beg. Feb. 2011), and for his editorial and proofreading assistance. To my friend, Josh Price who is the founder and editor of the ConservativeBeacon.net for his unwavering support and for partnering with me to regularly appear as a guest on his wonderful video blog.

Other media entities that regularly carry my columns include: Dr. Michael Savage, a iconoclastic conservative intellectual and national radio host, RonPaul2012.net, National Writers Syndicate, BookerRising.com (Shay), BoaNow.com, Citizens for a Constitutional Republic, GreenScreen.com, David B. Shields, Editor-Publisher at Ware Op-Ed & News, WesternFrontAmerica.com, Newsvine.com, WesternJournalism.com, Clipmarks.com, BradleySmithBlog, ChristianityBoard.com, MinorityRepublican.com, FreeRepublic.com, Conservativehq.com, USA-Partisan.blogspot.com, Squidoo.com, BigFlushToilet.com, BlogCatalog.com, TownHall.com, RfcRadio.com, FaithReaders.com, Tara-ganaBlog.com, Sphere.com, EarlPundit.blogspot, llAmericablogger.com, AIPNews.com, David Ben-Ariel, Johnny2K.com, and last but not least my many liberal antagonists—Sensuouscurmudgeon.com, Ed Brayton of Scienceblogs.com, Terry Krepel, for Media Matters and ConWeb-Watch.com and whose work is often appears on Arianna Huffington's liberal website, HuffingtonPost.com, and many, many more citizen newspapers commonly known as "blogs."

To Dr. Levon Yuille, founder and host of Joshua's Trail, the radio show, voice of Black conservative thought in the metro-Detroit area. Exceeding gratitude to Joshua's Trail radio show, for inviting me to be a co-host on this very important voice of reason and sanity in a growing sea of moral relativism and liberal fascism. To my fellow co-hosts on the show—Milt Harris, Charles McCollough, Ron Edwards, daughter LeVonne Maxwell, Dale Marsh and Fillippo (Phil) Stargel and to WDTK AM Detroit staff, Chris MacCourtney (GM), Brad Smith (Sales Manager), Brian, our faithful engineer and to Salem Communications for supporting Joshua's Trail for seven years and counting. Many of the ideas contained in these essays came from Dr. Yuille outstanding scholarly research and monologues he delivers every week and from my fellow colleagues who always have such wonderful words of wisdom and truth to what America's constitutional Framers and Founders dreamed our nation could become.

Finally, I would like to give special thanks to my dear children whom I love exceedingly—Stone Allen (age 14) and Eden Alice (age 10), who both read small portions of the manuscript and offered their innocent, precocious, but nevertheless, profound perspectives which for even the most jaded or seasoned writer must covet as an invaluable resource to keep one's writing interesting, pure, engaging and relevant. To help my son improve on his reasoning, research and writing skills, Stone has so far written summary analyses on over two dozen of my WND.com essays.

Prologue

[President Woodrow] Wilson's view of politics could be summarized by the word, "statolatry," or state worship . . . Wilson wrote approvingly in *The State*, "does now whatever experience permits or the times demand." ²

~ Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism*

My sixth and seventh books—*The Progressive Revolution*—was originally titled, "Statolatry and Progressivism." I changed the initial title because I was afraid it sounded too esoteric and ambiguous. I wanted to be very clear here about my intent to expose the historical significance and deconstruction that the Progressive Age or the Progressive Revolution (*circa* 1870—present) has continuously plagued society under. These volumes are a collection of selected essays and articles from the weekly columns I write for WorldNetDaily.com—an Internet independent news website of conservative thought and ideas. This opus is divided into two volumes—Vol. I (2007-08 articles), Vol. II (2009 articles) which rather than being arranged chronologically by date, are organized topically according to their subject matter as well as the primary intellectual disciplines which they cover. While invariably there were some overlap between the primary and secondary subject matter of each essay, nevertheless their categories have been arranged according to the dominant stream of thought I had for each opus at the time they were conceived. For example, an article that has both law and political aspects will fall under the law group of essays if that stream of thought predominates in the article and vice versa.

The articles are written in a variety of styles from essays in the traditions of great essayists of the past like Bacon, Franklin, Jefferson, Carlyle, C.K. Chesterton, C.S. Lewis, Allan Bloom, to present writers like: British historian Paul Johnson, P.J. O'Rourke, William Kristol, Bill Bennett, George Will, Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams and one of my earliest intellectual mentors, John Whitehead (Founder of The Rutherford Institute), a very important guardian of our civil liberties according to the

original intent of America's Framers and for whose organization I clerked for during my first year of law school. Other essays hearken back to antiquity and are conceived in the dialectical style of my favorite philosopher, Socrates (470-399 B.C.). The essays written as a dialogue I have euphemistically titled, *Symposium*, after Plato's opus by that same name which classically detailed the life, times, philosophy . . . and the eventual death of his beloved and iconic teacher, Socrates. Other essays are in free-style and possess an improvisational manner in style, form and substance amounting to an extemporaneous intellectual discourse on a particular literary theme, while other essays are general news columns, iconoclastic articles, or opinion-editorials of a more general and topical nature. To borrow a musical genre from the classical masters, some of my essays follow polyphonic or counterpoint styles like theme and variations, suite or prelude and fugue forms (after Johann Sebastian Bach) and the Baroque Period (1600-1750), other essays follow a deeper more complex subtleties of a *leitmotiv*, referring to a recurring musical or literary theme, associated with a particular person, place, or idea (after Richard Wagner's music dramas) or an *idée fixe*, fixed idea (after Hector Berlioz's tone poems) which emerged during the introspective, passionate, fantastic and macabre world of the Romantic Period (1820-1900), my favorite period of music and literary history. One thing all of these assorted and diverse essays, articles and Socratic dialogues have in common besides the author is a specific intent not to merely be written for a specific time and place. These essays, although separate entities were originally conceived and designed as small parts of a greater whole. They were also originally written to be timeless, literary works for the ages and would transcend the existential history, parochial politics transfixed by time and current events despite the fact that many of the issues discussed have long since passed, yet the ideas and ideals represented in these volumes are timeless and people, ideas, and motives have endured for the ages.

The phrase, "liberalism fascism," next to progressivism is the major theme of this work in addition to the subtitle of both volumes 1 and 2. My analysis of liberal fascism through the ages in these various short essays covering 11 different subject areas is the common philosophical thread that holds the entire book together. My chief inspiration came from Jonah Goldberg's outstanding book, *Liberal Fascism: The Secret History of the American Left, from Mussolini to the Politics of Meaning*, who

made this singular statement of truth regarding this political philosophy who wrote, *It is my argument that American liberalism is a totalitarian political religion*. Using this thesis statement in the manner that classical music composer Hector Berlioz used as an *idée fixe* or in Richard Wagner used as a *leitmotiv*, in virtually every essay I am either critiquing liberalism, criticizing liberal politicians (including RINOs [e.g., Republicans in name only]), moderates, Green Party, communists, communist sympathizers socialists, socialist sympathizers, leftist intellectuals, Marxist academics, positive law judges, liberal lawyers, evolution scientists; even offering rebuttal to conventional thinking and people and society who espouse a progressive, liberal or a socialist worldview. The ideas of progressivism contained in these volumes are not new, unique, nor especially creative, but history has repeatedly demonstrated that progressive politics are excessively destructive to culture and society . . . and purposely so for it was Lord Acton who said, “The central idea of Machiavelli is that the state power is not bound by the moral law. The law is not above the state, but below it.” That, in a nutshell is what I mean by “statolatry” or state worship which I contend are ideas synonymous with liberalism, progressivism, socialism, Darwinism, and liberal fascism, damnable ideologies which are all merely variations on a Marxist theme.

While I do not intend to be polemical for arguments sake, but draw my line of argumentation out of classical intellectual and philosophical traditions; particularly those paradigms in the dialectical manner of Socrates (Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Locke, Montesquieu, Blackstone, etc.) This is not my first effort at this genre. Two earlier attempts to use Socratic dialectical reasoning are in my books: *Beyond the Veil: Essays in the Dialectical Style of Socrates* (2000, 2004 [rev. ed.]). However, in this *opus* only a small percentage of articles are in Socratic dialogue style, nevertheless, Socratic logic, inductive/deductive reasoning, rationalism, anti-Gnosticism and his enduring love for *Veritas* (truth) predominates throughout these volumes.

In these books I will endeavor to raise profound and pivotal issues in a creative, multi-dimensional formats borrowing heavily from literature, history, philosophy; to scrupulously critique what I consider many of the inherent contradictions of liberalism and its related political philosophies—humanism, egalitarianism, secularism, Marxism progressivism, socialism, communism, and Keynesianism. To plumb the intellectual depths of ancillary related ideas that have sprung forth from magnificent

writers of the classical liberal traditions of the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, Romanticism into modern times of the twentieth post-Modernism and emergent new ideas of twenty first century.

Goldberg makes the following prescient statement which will serve as a leitmotiv throughout this opus:

The militarization of society and politics was considered simply the best available means toward this end. Call it what you like—progressivism, fascism, communism, or totalitarianism—the first true enterprise of this kind was established not in Russia or Italy or Germany but in the United States, and Woodrow Wilson was the twentieth century's first fascist dictator.²

Here Goldberg succinctly summarizes political liberalism and progressivism and places it in its proper historical context; a virtual unified field theory for leftist politics whereby the classical liberalism of Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Blackstone, Locke, whose ideas and writings of politics and philosophy were of critical importance to America's Constitutional Framers of the eighteenth century, as well as America's Founding Fathers, legendary men like—Washington, Ames, Adams, Franklin, Madison, Jefferson, Mason, Adams, Witherspoon, have in many respects morphed into progressivism of the 1870s and '80s, which over time transposed into the full-blown liberal fascism of Woodrow Wilson (1913-21) of whom Goldberg dubbed "the world's first fascist dictator." (However, I believe that Theodore Roosevelt [a Republican] was actually the first Progressive U.S. president). After a 12 year hiatus during so-called "Roaring Twenties" liberalism, or as I more accurately reference throughout these volumes, "progressivism" came back with a vengeance with the four terms of Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-45), whose omnipresent, Leviathan welfare state he erected to provide among many things Social Security was in reality envisioned to secure Democratic Party security and power for eternity. What FDR's braintrust ubiquitously referred to as the "New Deal" and was originally designed to enslave the people to Marxism and socialist cradle-to-grave government like a crack addict is enslaved to cocaine; to so grow government by leaps and bounds so much so that it becomes a permanent part of conventional society and culture and any Republican politician that would later come along foolish enough to cut or defund any aspect of the New Deal and later LBJ's "Great Society" would be deemed to have stepped on the

“third rail” of politics and will have been deemed to commit political suicide. 80 years since FDR plunged America into socialism without legitimate constitutional legality such mainstay programs like Social Security, AAA, WPA, NLRB and *statolatry* (state worship or worship of the state) has almost become passé. What began under Wilson and was completed under FDR, essentially amounts to Third American Revolution and under the current president Barrack Hussein Obama (2009—), will, especially if he wins a second term in 2012, for a least a generation if not more send America into a second Great Depression and societal anarchy from which we shall probably never recover. America, the greatest nation in the history of the world has for decades been mired in the abyss of this grand, existential Marxist welfare state of which Winston Churchill prophesied in the 1930s that, “Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery.”

Goldberg continues his historical discourse on liberalism and its comprehensive and deconstructive devastation into every aspect of culture and society, to its irrevocable roots— the evolution theory of Charles Darwin:

The progressives were the real social Darwinists as we think of the term today—though they reserved the term for their enemies . . . They believed in eugenics. They were imperialists. They were convinced that the state could, through planning and pressure, create a pure race, a society of new men. They were openly and proudly hostile to individualism. Religion was a political tool, while politics was the true religion. The progressives viewed the traditional system of constitutional checks and balances as an outdated impediment to progress because such horse-and-buggy institutions were a barrier to their own ambitions. Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers.³

Of course most universities in America (or anywhere else for that matter) will not teach you this anti-consensus view of history and the indelible connection between social Darwinism—imperialism—individualism—anti-Christianity—totalitarianism—fascism and liberalism, because to do so would cause this tragic cognitive dissonance in young, impressionable college students and their leftist professors to abandoning the morality of their parents or even discard their entire intellectual worldview. Nevertheless, this entrenched, intractable Darwin

zeitgeist, if one has an open mind of history, has essentially permeated every aspect of society. The Democratic Party, progressives, socialists, and liberals who have controlled the mainstream media and the public education and the academy since the creation of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1857, have made an art form out of controlling the dialogue by using classical Freudian techniques of displacement, transference and psychological projection, a psychosis and defense mechanism whereby one ascribes to ones enemies ideas and beliefs that you yourself practice or believe to be true but are afraid to admit. Liberals control the language via the media, education, the academy, Hollywood through Orwellian newspeak, the definition and use of any word is what Goldstein says it is as demonstrated in this well-known passage from George Orwell's famous 1948 dystopian novel, 1984:

But what was strange was that although Goldstein was hated and despised by everybody, although every day and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, his theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were, in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less. Always there were fresh dupes waiting to be seduced by him.⁴

In a tribute essay to Professor Allan Bloom (d. 1992), a great but forgotten American philosopher, classist and historian who started a reformation in the late 1980s arguing that the leftist academy had lost its moral authority as the intellectual arbiters of society by embracing liberalism, Darwinism, moral relativism, legal positivism among other pseudo philosophies which since the 1960s has lost the faith of students who look to teachers and professors as protectors of the collected wisdom of the ages. Bloom, like the ancient prophets of the Old Testament declared that the academy needed to return to teaching the classics. Inspired by Bloom's 1987 classic, *The Closing of the American Mind*, in a 2011 essay I wrote these lines:

If Lenin boasted, "Give me four years to teach the children and the seed I have sown will never be uprooted," then the 100 years the academy has incessantly labored to deconstruct the canon of Western civilization and replace it with a existential progressive revolution, a Marxist zeitgeist, Social Darwinism, Nietzschean nihilism and relativism—from the 1880s to the publication of his book in 1987—makes professor Bloom a truly heroic figure of Homeric proportions for even attempting to up-

root the evil seeds this diabolical trinity had planted in American intellectual life and worldwide.⁵

Therefore, liberals, primarily through the media, the academy, and Stalinist public schools since the advent of social Darwinism in 1860s have characterized Republicans (particularly conservatives) with such enduring epithets as the "philosophy of hate," "hatemongers," "radicals," "fascists," "Nazis" "censors," "right-wing fanatics" and all the other scandalous epithets. However, a cursory reading of America history and American intellectual politics sets our current battle of ideas at the publication of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859), but more particularly, his follow-up to that book, *The Descent of Man* (1871). Up to modern times there is an unmistakable connection Darwinism and all of its permutations (i.e., Social Darwinism, evolution, imperialism, individualism, anti-Christianity, totalitarianism, Marxism, socialism, Trotskyism, positivism, naturalism and fascism), which as I stated many times before are the primary foundations of modern liberalism.

Law professor, Herbert Hovenkamp, in his law review article, *The Mind and Heart of Progressive Legal Thought*, wrote these important lines about the much-disputed actual starting point of the Progressive Era:

The beginning and end of Progressive legal thought are difficult to locate, but dates and events help place ideas in context. For the beginning I suggest 1871, or the publication date of Charles Darwin's *The Descent of Man*, which linked the human species to the theory of evolution.⁽¹⁾ For the end the year that comes to mind is 1960, the publication date of Ronald Coase's *The Problem of Social Cost*,⁽²⁾ the text that re-invigorated the law's renewed interest in the "unregulated" market. But there are alternative choices: James M. Landis's *Report on Regulatory Agencies to the President Elect* in 1960 ⁽³⁾ has become a symbol of our loss of faith in the Progressive vision of government regulation.⁽⁴⁾ The critique of democratic process made by Kenneth Arrow in the late fifties and sixties,⁽⁵⁾ and of James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock in 1962 ⁽⁶⁾ did much the same for political decision making generally. Although these documents differed substantially from one another, each worked to convince us that government process is unstable or incoherent, or that regulation will not find the public interest, but is more likely to be captured by special interest groups. Each of these critiques represents a sharp turn from the essentially republican vision of government that dominated Progressive legal thought, to a more classical view emphasizing the efficiency and robustness of private markets, and the many imperfections of public processes.⁶

I would agree with Hovenkamp thorough historical analysis regarding the 1871 date as year one of the progressive revolution, but also the year democratic socialism and the welfare state which as state policy first occurred in Germany under Otto von Bismarck (1862-90) who created the modern welfare state by building upon a tradition of welfare programs established in Prussia and Saxony in the 1840s. Otto von Bismarck, prime minister of Prussia (a hero of Hitler and the Nazis) originated the welfare state in actual German policies particularly from 1871 to 1878 and established a radical secularization policy as a pretext to destroy the influence of the Roman Catholic Church on society. At its foundation liberal fascism is of necessity anti-religious and anti-intellectual thus facilitating state socialism first starting in Germany and quickly spread throughout Europe, America and the world where it plagues society to this day.⁷ I differ with Hovenkamp and most consensus liberal historians like Charles Beard, Carl Becker, and Richard Hofstadter is that I don't view the Progressive Age as a singular movement occupying a specific period of time, but an existential revolution (like the French Revolution) which since the early 1870s in Bismarkian Germany continues in one form or another to this day in the openly progressive and socialist policies of President Barack Hussein Obama. I contend that progressivism (like communism and Neo-Nazism) simply went underground during periods of conservative politics in American history like the 1920s under Warren, Coolidge and Hoover (the early years) and the Reagan Revolution (1981-08) give or take a couple of years. No one could rationally argue against the fact that under President Barack Obama a new age of Progressivism has been aggressively enacted.

Another aspect of progressivism I explore in this book is liberalism's willful blindspot towards evil which has lead historically to their irrational devotion to dictators and embrace of totalitarian policy initiatives (at least until they go "too far"), which violate people's fundamental rights as a means of totalitarian morality, coercion, control and punishment. Liberals, socialists, fascists, radicals and progressives beginning with Woodrow Wilson and effecting such a diverse group of progressive intellectuals as Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw, W.E.B. Du Bois, Herbert Croly, Theodore Roosevelt, Walter Lippmann, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Charles Beard, Richard Hofstadter, Margaret Sanger, and many others, revered and coveted the power of fascist, totalitarian dictators like Lenin, Stalin, Hitler and especially Mussolini. These influential

American intellectuals on the left maintained a religious-like devotion that the State could, through planning and pressure, create a Utopia, a pure race, a society of new men. Nietzsche called this end, *Übermensch* (Superman), aristocracy paradigm, *Will to Power*, atheism and moral relativism. Of course the apotheosis of Nietzsche was concurrently manifested in 1933 in Hitler's Nazism and his Third Reich and in America's first and second socialist dictators—Woodrow Wilson, but particularly Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his "New Deal." Regarding the dystopia 1920s and 30s that ushered in a new and grotesque era of savagery and genocide, Professor Bloom wrote:

But the Weimar Republic, so attractive in its left-wing version to Americans, also contained intelligent persons, who were attracted, at least in the beginning, to fascism, for reasons very like those motivating the Left ideologues, reflections on autonomy and value creation. Once one plunges into the abyss, there is no assurance whatsoever that equality, democracy or socialism will be found on the other side. At very best, self-determination is indeterminate. . . . Both [Heidegger and Nietzsche] helped to constitute that ambiguous Weimar atmosphere in which liberals looked like simpletons and anything was possible for people who sang of the joy of the knife in cabarets.⁸

Historically, if twentieth century secularists, socialists, liberals and progressives, it appears that progressives were openly hostile to individualism and American exceptionalism. The apotheosis of liberalism in America reached its zenith in the societal collapse of the early 1960s where Democrats, particularly after the death of JFK in 1963, fully mastered the political techniques of community organization, coalition building of desperate, radical elements of society—ethnics, homosexuals, Blacks, feminists, anarchists, communists, academics, unionists, artists, leftist intellectuals, working-class Catholics, etc., which came to its inevitable apotheosis under disastrous failure of presidential candidate Walter Mondale in 1972. These diverse groups essentially made up the liberal Democratic Party even to this day and they did not go away, but like good Machiavellians, adopted their amoral tactics of the end justifies the means by hiding their true intentions and going underground. The irony of putting together this coalition is that those each group were courted to join the Democrat coalition because of their differences, liberals hate individuals and love to balkanize us into warring factions that they can then exploit for their own acquisition of political power. The transcend-

ent guarantees of the Declaration of Independence: “. . . Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness,” are meaningless rhetoric to most progressives to today. (When was the last time you saw liberals express any real patriotism in public?) To the liberal mind we are not individuals created in the image of God, but faceless, warring groups (Blacks, Jews, gays, Hispanics, Indians, Asians, elderly, poor, rich, middle-class). To progressives we are proletariat cogs in the vast machinery of the Leviathan State, manipulated like rats chasing cheese through a maze for the “greater good” by self-appointed progressive elites . . . nothing more!

Modern liberalism is also openly hostile to religion, especially Christianity and fights to make it illegal or impotent in the marketplace of ideas at every opportunity (especially during the Christmas season). Karl Marx, an atheist, Satanist and the father of communism, called “religion the opiate of the people.” Many political historians credit George Soros’s money, influence and his vast media empire to be largely responsible for electing a inconspicuous senator from Illinois who voted “present” 130 times; a Marxist professor who taught social nihilism tactics of Saul Alinsky, whose first memoir was ghostwritten by Bill Ayers, co-founder of the terrorist group Weather Underground, as president of the United States in November 2008. Indeed, President Obama is singularly the triumph of the Progressive Revolution.

Liberal and progressive pressure groups like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), founded in 1930 by the communist and communist sympathizer Roger Baldwin, Planned Parenthood, a radical abortion rights group founded by the racist, Darwinist and eugenicist, Margaret Sanger, NAACP, a Black civil rights group founded in 1909 by a group of White and Black progressives including the famous Black intellectual W.E.B. Du Bois, a Harvard-trained scholar who openly disdained the lower classes of Blacks and like most progressive intellectuals of his era, openly praised Hitler’s Nazism as a paradigm for America to follow even as late as Obama’s Chicagoland comrade, Nation of Islam leader, Minister Louis Farrakhan, called “Hitler a very great man for Germany” in March 1984 speech.

History has borne out time and time again that Marxists, progressives and liberals have always had a love affair for fascist governments abroad as well as at home beginning with the Woodrow Wilson administration (1913-21) who among other things immediately fired all Black federal workers, imprisoned thousands who protested World War I and

pushed the Sixteenth Amendment which created the Federal Reserve Act, a federal income tax and the Federal Reserve and the Seventeenth Amendment which caused many contemporary political historians to dub "1913-The Worst Year Ever!" Wilson's fascism predated Lenin's Bolshevik revolution by 4 years (1917) and Mussolini's fascist revolution by 9 years (1922) which is why Goldberg rightly states "Woodrow Wilson was the twentieth century's first fascist dictator." Other well-respected progressives of the early 1900s who had sympathetic views towards fascist governments included: Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Norman Thomas, the head of the American Socialist Party, Rexford Guy Tugwell, an important member of FDR's braintrust, Walter Lippmann, Herbert Croly, John Dewey, and Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. Each of these progressives as well as legions of progressive and liberal pressure groups (most recently *Occupy Wall Street* [OWS]) from their beginnings have had a covert and overt hatred of free market capitalism, traditional religion, and fanatically believe that liberalism is the only legitimate religion of the left that is allowed full expression in what Holmes called the "marketplace of ideas." Goldberg characterized these sentiments this way: *It is my argument that American liberalism is a totalitarian political religion.*

America having endured eight years of yet another establishment Republican President George Bush (2001-2009) where such socialist, anti-conservative policies as printing money to spend trillions of dollars led to TARP I, and under President Obama, led to TARP II, bailouts (i.e., government welfare) of Wall Street investment banks, the mortgage industry, and big-cities across America in bankruptcy, without even making the pretense of constitutional legitimacy. Bush-43 even had the gall to admit, "You have to destroy capitalism in order to save it." ⁹ Bush-43, perhaps unwittingly, seems to make Lenin's tactics to destroy capitalism seem prophetic: "The proletariat needs state power, the centralized organization of force, the organization of violence for the purpose of crushing the resistance of the exploiters."

Starting with President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, but continuing with renewed vigor under FDR in the 1930s and 40s, Goldberg said of the progressive movement of the late nineteenth, early twentieth century that:

The progressives viewed the traditional system of constitutional checks and balances as an outdated impediment to progress because

such horse-and-buggy institutions were a barrier to their own ambitions. Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers.¹⁰

We see the apotheosis of Leviathan liberalism in modern times with contemporary American presidents, including such openly liberal and progressive presidents as—Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Hoover, FDR, Truman, Eisenhower, LBJ, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Bush-41, Clinton, Bush-43 and Barack Obama, that the age of neo-Marxism, anti-constitutionalism and judicial activism has fully manifested itself in all its dictatorial glory that very few commentators on TV or radio or in print rarely refer to the blackletter text of the Constitution either as a point of debate or to bolster one's argument or criticism against the president, Congress and the Courts when they overtly deviate from the original intent of the Constitution's Framers. In modern parlance it's simply not good manners to quote from the Constitution when discussing the Constitution or even to publically show George Washington or religious symbolism.¹¹ To American's traditional guardians of the Constitution (e.g., judges, lawyers, law academics, politicians, think tanks), the Constitution has tragically become an existential deadletter.

Goldberg concludes his analysis of liberalism and liberal fascism with these words: "Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers."¹² This brings to mind a persistent observation I and others like Justices Clarence Thomas and Antonin Scalia and conservative intellectuals, Ann Coulter and Laura Ingraham have made about liberals and liberalism for years: Liberals hate the Constitution because it reminds them too much of the Biblical precepts of the Judeo-Christian tradition and natural law which originated it. What I mean is that for anyone who has even a cursory understanding of the Constitution and the history of how America became a Republic one cannot ignore the fact that Christianity was an inseparable concept in the foundation of the Constitution which is why George Washington, the father of the American Revolution famously said that "It is impossible to rightly govern any nation without God and the Bible." Liberals aren't stupid; they know the obvious Christian history of America and therefore for the past 150 years have since Darwin's theory of evolution endeavored to obfuscate and rewrite history to re-

move every aspect of America's Judeo-Christian heritage and replace it with atheism, evolution, Marxism and progressivism. Tragically, progressives have been very successful at this.

What Goldberg alludes to with language like, "Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws," is precisely what I mean by liberals 150 year war against Christianity. If they can destroy or render impotent the presuppositions of Christianity and the Constitution, what do you have left? A socialist state in the manner of what Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ and now Obama are assiduously trying to resurrect since Reagan's counter socialist revolution (1981-89). One primary technique to pulling America away from its moral roots is to destroy the idea that the Constitution as the supreme law of the land. If liberals are successful at achieving this, then the progressives including the socialist engineers, activist judges, Marxists academics, U.N. bureaucrats and Democratic Party socialists will fill the void. It was the Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, a progressive jurist who also ran for president of the United States in 1916 (loosing narrowly to Woodrow Wilson) who infamously said: "The constitution is what the judges say it is." ¹³ This is tantamount to treasonous. Justice Hughes might as well have added the unspoken sentiment . . . *and the Constitution and the Framers of the Constitution be damned!* This has been the original intent of the progressive revolution and the majority of intellectuals, judges, lawyers, academics and politicians on the left since the 1870s, and tragically the Age of Progressivism and continues to plague society and undermine America's Republic under President Barack Obama to this day.

Once the constitutional Framers and natural law is summarily ignored, deconstructed or perverted by Congress and the courts, socialism (which has morphed in progressivism) is virtually instantaneous then concepts like freedom, liberty, free market economy, capitalism, freedom of religion, the press and assembly will be anachronistic relics of a long-dead era of the past as liberals will treat conservatives, Republicans, independents, Jews, Christians and all those who give credence to the original intent of the Constitution's Framers in the words of Goldberg will be considered, "the enemy of progress [because they] shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers." ¹⁴

CEO Joseph Farah, my fellow colleague at WorldNetDaily.com once wrote, "Government is not your friend; it is the enemy of freedom. Government is not Santa Claus; it is the Grinch. Government is not your

servant; it tends, all too often, to be our master. Government seldom helps people; it often enslaves them.”¹⁵ Farah is absolutely right, but due to the Stalinist public education in America over the past 150 years, fewer Americans have the historical understanding or intellectual capacity to realize these self-evident truths through deductive reasoning.

Indeed, Sir Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, echoed similar sentiments as Hitler’s dreaded Nazi’s unleashed their blitzkrieg (lightning war) across Europe in World War II, said that “Socialism [liberalism] is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery.”¹⁶ Another great English Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher who said, “The cry for freedom dwells within the heart of each person and is divinely inspired.” Would to God that President Barack Obama would heed the wise words of these conservative intellectuals, but he won’t for his allegiance is toward a more sinister and diabolical lineage of political leaders—not the laudable intellectual tradition St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Montesquieu, Blackstone, Burke, Locke, Washington, Madison, Jefferson, but the Progressive’s political genealogy follows the more ignoble and damnable ideas of Hobbes, Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau, Napoleon, Marx, Darwin, Wilson, Margaret Sanger, Mussolini, Hitler, FDR, LBJ, Saul Alinsky, Laurence Tribe, William Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn . . . culminating in the apotheosis of Barack Hussein Obama.

As you are reading the articles and essays of this book remember the profound words of America’s third president, Thomas Jefferson—*A government big enough to give you everything you want is strong enough to take away everything you have.* To that prophetic statement I would only add . . . including your liberty.

Every morning I make it a habit to listen to the transcendent music of Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750), in my opinion the greatest musical genius in the history of music. I do this to cleanse my mind of the cares of this world, the evil ideas and anti-intellectual poisons that vexes everyone who loves *Veritas* (truth). Bach would often write this inscription at the end of his most ambitious works—*Soli Deo Gloria* (To God alone be the glory) . . . and so do I . . .

Soli Deo Gloria.

Grosse Pointe, Michigan

25 September 2011

CHAPTER

~ 1 ~

ON LAW

ON LAW—ESSAY 1

JUSTICE CLARENCE THOMAS—MY FRIEND

June 23, 2007

[A]s far as I'm concerned, it is a high-tech lynching for uppity Blacks who in any way deign to think for themselves, to do for themselves, to have different ideas, and it is a message that unless you kowtow to an old order, this is what will happen to you. You will be lynched, destroyed, caricatured by a committee of the U.S. Senate rather than hung from a tree.

~ Clarence Thomas, before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 1991

What is a friend? A single soul dwelling in two bodies.

~ Aristotle

For 16 years I sat patiently, I sat silently while they mercilessly slandered your name. For 16 years I sat patiently, I sat silently while they called you all manner of epithets: "Uncle Tom," "Uncle Clarence Thomas," "marginal," "a joke," "incompetent," "a pornographer," "traitor," "a

slave." For 16 years I sat patiently, I sat silently while they caricatured you in blackface as "Aunt Jemima" and a diminutive lawn jockey on the cover of a national magazine (George Curry's *Emerge* [now defunct]). For 16 years I sat patiently, I sat silently as propagandists like New York Times journalist Adam Cohen explained your 16 years of silence on the bench with claims like: "He is afraid that if he speaks he will reveal his ignorance about the case."

For 16 years I sat patiently, I sat silently while our own people—Black law professors, academics, doctors, lawyers, judges, civil rights activists, mayors, Black preachers, teachers, federal and state employees, politicians, journalists, political commentators, Oprah—improved their public standing and launched lucrative careers vilifying your name without just cause . . . yet, I sat patiently, I sat silently . . . until now.

I consider Justice Clarence Thomas, born this day 59 years ago, one of the closest friends I will ever have in this life. However, he is not a friend in the traditional sense of knowing someone you grew up with, or even someone you see often or visit with regularly. I have never met the man. "Well, Ellis, if you never met Justice Thomas, how can you call him your 'friend'?" Justice Thomas is my friend because 16 years ago when I was a freshman law student about to flunk out of law school, this man sent me letters of encouragement urging me "Onwards ever—backwards, never."

It was the summer of 1991, the same time of Thomas's grueling Supreme Court confirmation hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee when as a novice conservative Republican of just three years, I witnessed the attempted "high-tech lynching" of this honorable man by a coalition of feminists, Democrats, liberal special interest groups, the American Bar Association, the law academy and the mainstream media, notably the mercurial Nina Totenberg of National Public Radio (who outed the infamous Anita Hill). Even my own people all excitedly applauded the looming demise of the Thomas nomination from the shadows.

All the factions of liberalism were literally beside themselves and ecstatic with glee. They were preparing for a lavish victory party. Noted feminist Florence Kennedy, at a July 1991 conference of the National Organization of Women, triumphantly exclaimed, "We're going to 'Bork' him [Clarence Thomas]."

As they got their party preparations all in order—the cake, the ice cream, the streamers, the confetti, the party horns, the colorful hats and of course, the Kool-Aid, to memorialize their imminent victory in scuttling the nomination of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court, they were jubilant. Hurray! Hurray! What joy! Then, suddenly, I heard a voice from heaven in the manner of Bishop T.D. Jakes, saying: “BUT WAIT A MINUTE, DEVIL . . . DON’T . . . CUT . . . THE CAKE . . . YET!”

Up until that time during the Senate confirmation hearings, Clarence Thomas was mute, he was silent. Now it was *his* turn to answer his critics, his accusers, his adversaries. Although he was alone in that chair before the omnipotent Senate Judiciary Committee, which was high and lifted up, Clarence Thomas had God by his side and stood tall like a man. He gave a memorable and passionate defense of his worldview, his legal philosophy, his jurisprudence on a litany of controversial Supreme Court cases—past and potential cases he could rule on in the future—and most notably he ably defended himself against the political hatchet job attempted against his character by Senate Democrats, the white liberal mainstream media and their lackeys, the Black elites.

I have just read the latest biography on Justice Clarence Thomas, *Supreme Discomfort: The Divided Soul of Clarence Thomas* (Doubleday, 2007) by Washington Post reporters Kevin Merida and Michael A. Fletcher. If one is looking for a reasoned and substantive treatment of the most influential and powerful Black person in America, then you must look elsewhere, for all you will find in reading this book is the same old hackneyed, ignorant, servile, irrelevant rhetoric about Justice Thomas from two affirmative-action appointees of the white liberal propaganda press.

I surmise that because these two gentlemen aren’t law scholars or academics, they felt little need to include very much on Thomas’s Supreme Court opinions, nor do these gentlemen attempt to offer a substantive and trenchant critique of Thomas’ ideas on politics, his speeches, his legal and judicial philosophy, which after 16 years on the Supreme Court is quite voluminous and magnificent. However, they do devote extended passages in their book to Thomas’s prep school, college and law school years as an affirmative-action recipient only to see him (in their portrayal) hypocritically rule against affirmative action from the bench. However, Justice Thomas resolves this seeming contradiction in the affirmative-action case *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003), arguing “that affirmative action stigmatizes *all* Blacks, who are either promoted above

their abilities or subjected to the unfair suspicion that they would not be where they are absent a racial preference." ¹

If Justice Thomas is truly a great man, as I contend here, then why is he so hated by his own people? Like Prometheus, Elijah, David, Socrates, Jesus, St. Augustine, Galileo, Beethoven, Wilberforce, Booker T. Washington, Einstein, Churchill, Ronald Reagan, Mother Teresa and other iconoclasts, Justice Thomas refused to stay on the plantation or have his mind shackled by political mediocrities, subservient thinking or slavish liberal orthodoxy.

Rhetoric by Black elites that Thomas has no right to think the way he does because he is Black is precisely the type of slavish thinking I'm talking about. Neither Justice Thomas' mind nor his soul is "divided." He can (and does) think for himself, and his brilliant ideas are forever codified in his law review articles, speeches and Supreme Court opinions, and are deeply rooted in the three things that made America the greatest nation in the history of humanity—Horatio Alger self-reliance, veneration of the Constitution, and ideas grounded in the Judeo-Christian intellectual traditions of *Veritas* (Truth).

Thank you, Justice Thomas, for writing me for all those years when most others disregarded me because I embrace the same originalist judicial philosophy as you do, and thus get the same derision you get. Thank you for your excellent legal scholarship on the Supreme Court these 16 years and for your yeoman's efforts to bring America (and Black people) back from the abyss, back to Reason and back to the original intent and principles of the Constitution's Framers.

Happy birthday, Justice Clarence Thomas . . . my friend.

ON LAW—ESSAY 2

JUSTICE KENNEDY CHANNELS ALFRED KINSEY

July 05, 2008

There are no such things as sexual deviations. If something happens sexually, it must be part of the natural spectrum; if it is part of the natural spectrum, it cannot be considered either abnormal or unnatural, even if it is relatively uncommon; but as it turns out to be so much more common hence quite natural.

~ Dr. Benjamin Wiker, on Kinsey's "Human Sexuality in the Human Male" (1948)

Prologue

Today's essay continues my review series of Dr. Wiker's book, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 Others that didn't Help* (Regnery, 2008). Here I will combine my critique of Kinsey's work in light of a recent Supreme Court case, *Patrick Kennedy v. Louisiana* (June 25, 2008) that outrageously overruled a Louisiana state statute giving the death penalty to men who rape children under age 12 as a violation of the Eighth Amendment's "cruel and unusual punishment" provision of the Constitution.

Coincidentally, Dr. Michael Savage, my favorite radio talk show host and a bona fide conservative intellectual, Monday on his radio program said that "Kinsey was a sexual pervert who made up his own data." Dr. Savage, as usual, is right on point.

Kinsey's one-man sexual revolution of the late 1940s lobbied and received academic legitimacy to render normal and to promote the vilest sexual ideas imaginable including, pedophilia, child rape, sadomasochism and bestiality.

With such pernicious ideas having the stamp of scientific authority, Kinsey's perversities traversed through American society like strains of a deadly virus. Despite promising vaccines, Kinsey's evil ideas on human sexuality mutated and transformed to influence and vex each subsequent generation until this day.

SCOTUS majority rapes children again?

You may query dear reader: How does a book that Kinsey wrote in 1948, 60 years ago, on human sexuality affect the judicial philosophy of the highest court in America in 2008? I'm glad you asked.

Last week, SCOTUS.org (Supreme Court of the United States) cited in the case *Patrick Kennedy v. Louisiana* that it is unconstitutional to require the death penalty for the crime of raping a child, despite an existing Louisiana state statute that protects child rape victims.

In a majority opinion written by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, the Court applied the tortured reasoning that since the rape victim lived, nor was death intended, therefore capital punishment for that crime violates the Eighth Amendment. (Talk about blaming the victim!)

Another of Justice Kennedy's justifications for such draconian measures as overruling the Constitution is that the child victim will be required, possibly on more than one occasion, to retell the crime, forcing on the child "a moral choice" that the youngster is not mature enough to make. "The way the death penalty here involves the child victim in its enforcement can compromise a decent legal system," Justice Kennedy wrote.

Justice Samuel Alito, rejecting the Kennedy majority opinion proclaiming a "national consensus" against the death penalty for one who rapes a child, argued that the emphasis is misplaced by pointing out that only six states now have such laws. Alito reasoned that additional states might have had laws on the books giving the death penalty to child rapists long ago if the Supreme Court in 1977 case *Coker v. Georgia* hadn't overruled the execution *for raping an adult*.

Alito rightly theorized that in the pro-defendant climate of the 1970s many state legislators had "good reason to fear" that they never could pass such a law. The expansive dicta in that case, Alito also pointed out, were not even upheld by all the justices that voted with the majority in *Coker v. Georgia*. Thirty-one years since that case, Alito added, state courts have read the *Coker* opinion in its broadest interpretation, "stunting legislative consideration" of capital murder in cases where there is a child victim.

Kinsey's kinder [children] and SCOTUS

Dr. Wiker, particularly in his thoughtful critique of Dr. Alfred Kinsey's work, "Human Sexuality in the Human Male," said that we find "the belief that our natural state is one of amoral sexual extravaganza; the evolutionary reduction of human beings to the level of animals; the adept use of science to mask propaganda; the attack on the Judeo-Christian understanding of male, female, marriage and family."

Wiker further commented that "even more than Rousseau or Mead, Kinsey's revolution was intensely personal, a revolution rooted in his own epic sexual perversity. He represents, in sterling coin, the evil that results from attempting to change the world to match one's character, rather than changing oneself to match the deep moral order written into human nature."

Here is where the recent child rape case embraces the sexual perversity and nihilism of a Dr. Kinsey. Wiker writes:

One can barely stand to read the sections of Kinsey's "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male" on the repeated raping of babies and small children. What makes it so thoroughly nauseating is the high-sounding pretence to scientific objectivity. It all appears hauntingly like the Nazi researchers' detached, objective accounts of their experiments on living victims. Both, no doubt, yielded real data, and in both we are faced with a science twisted to purposes that destroy the humanity of victim and perpetrator, all in the name of human progress.²

How is it, therefore, that Kinsey's "kinder" (German for "children") are coming home to roost in the august and sacred halls of SCOTUS? (Please excuse the mixed metaphor.) Wiker answers that question in the concluding chapter on Kinsey:

Kinsey's pseudo-science became foundational for the sexual revolution, used both in courts and classrooms to push a limitless sexual revolution that began in the 1960s and through which we are still living. . . . It will not be complete until it extinguishes all opposition, the greatest of which is Christianity. Once again, we see atheism at the root of rebellion.³

Instead of Justice Anthony Kennedy, whose sophistic opinion was merely channeling Dr. Kinsey, enter defendant Patrick Kennedy, who ironically (and fittingly) shares a surname with Justice Kennedy. Could

this despicable child rapist just have easily written this infamous opinion exonerating himself and giving fellow child molesters and rapists across America the green light to destroy the lives of as many children as they can get away with?

However, there is one more man I will include in this triumvirate of infamy who could have written the majority decision removing the death penalty for child rapists. You guessed it, dear reader, that villain Dr. Alfred Kinsey.

Epilogue

In June 1939, on the eve of World War II, France ended its practice of public capital punishment by the guillotine, not because it was *unusual*, but because beheadings in one form or another had existed in France and in other countries throughout the world for hundreds and thousands of years.

Admittedly, it is arguable that the guillotine was “cruel,” and there is the rub with liberal activist judges. They ignore the contraction “and” in the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition against “cruel *and* unusual punishment.” It is a two-part test founded in morality, not positive law, whereby many judges use their own personal policy preferences and prejudices to ignore the “unusual” clause and make the Eighth Amendment a one-part test.

The result: the judge arrogantly queries himself—is this punishment cruel? If “yes,” case closed, child rapist gets freed from the ultimate punishment.

ON LAW—ESSAY 3

ATLANTA’S CRIMINAL INJUSTICE SYSTEM

July 17, 2008

I have a dream, that one day my four little children will live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

~ Dr. Martin Luther King

Now that I live in the Atlanta, Ga., area, I thought in today’s column I would comment on a topic of news germane to this region. A news

item that caught my eye last week was an article by Steve Visser of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution regarding the Brian Nichols murder trial, which is being moved out of the Fulton County Courthouse in downtown Atlanta to another as yet unknown location.

Nichols has pleaded guilty by reason of insanity to the quadruple murder charges, but contends his will to resist committing the crimes was overpowered by delusion.

Nichols is charged with 54 crimes related to the March 11, 2005, killings of Fulton County Superior Court Judge Rowland Barnes, court reporter Julie Ann Brandau, Fulton County deputy sheriff Sgt. Hoyt Teasley and U.S. Customs Agent David Wilhelm after Nichols escaped from custody at the Fulton County Courthouse, where he was on trial for rape. He was captured later that day.

With this litany of crimes and mayhem in mind, as I read Mr. Visser's article I became even more outraged. Apparently, Superior Court Judge James Bodiford, the judge who currently is to hear this case, has granted the defense motion to move the trial to another venue.

Why? Follow the money. The innocent citizens of Atlanta will pay through the nose for this irredeemable miscreant. How? With this order to change venue, Mr. Visser states: "Bodiford issued his order a short time after County Manager Zachary Williams recommended not moving the trial to Atlanta Municipal Court because of costs."

Williams said a proposed agreement between the city and the county would require the county to forgive a \$376,000 city debt. In a Thursday memo to the County Commission, he said moving the trial would cost \$151,345 a month in overtime and security costs indicated in the security plan for the municipal court.

Williams said that would cost the county an extra \$1.8 million if the trial lasted a year, which is the length of the proposed lease. Bodiford contends the trial will be over before the end of this year.

That's right, dear reader, the citizens of Atlanta who have already paid millions in trying to convict a man obviously guilty as sin will now have to pay millions more for a ridiculous change in venue.

This is the same city that presently is willing to pay \$32 million to return Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s collected papers to the city of his birth only to have Dr. King's remaining three siblings file lawsuits against each other for fraud and mismanagement over the MLK foundation established by Coretta Scott King.

This is the same Atlanta that just last week in the name of balancing the budget fired hundreds of policemen and firemen, including 20 firemen trainees taxpayers had just finished spending hundreds of thousands of dollars training to be firemen *in Atlanta*. Way to waste tax dollars for the benefit of neighboring cities, Mayor Franklin!

The incompetence of city governance in Atlanta reminds me of another great leader where I used to live, Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick of Detroit, who has the city literally held hostage with five or six different criminal and civil trials against him from perjury, conspiracy, misconduct in office, obstruction of justice and no doubt additional charges to come. He has also cut city services to the bone while taxpayers fund his legions of \$700-dollar-an-hour attorneys defending the mayor of "The most miserable city in America," according to a 2008 survey of American cities in *Forbes* magazine.

But I digress. Back to the Brian Nichols trial in Atlanta. "Well, Ellis, what would you have done to bring judgment to Nichols in a more expedited manner?" First I would have taken serious the defendant's Sixth Amendment rights to a "speedy trial" and follow that lion of liberalism, FDR, in the *Ex parte Quirin* case of 1942, the so-called "Nazi saboteur case," where in the midst of World War II eight Nazis landed on the shores of New York and Florida with explicit orders by Hitler to sabotage key military and war industry facilities in America to weaken our resolve and our will to fight abroad in Europe.⁵

What did FDR do when we caught those eight Nazi saboteurs shortly after their invasion of America in June 1942? No, he didn't let them go on "Oprah" or do a cover spread for the *New Yorker*, *Vanity Fair*, or *People* magazine. He put his best prosecutor on the case, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and had a special summary trial on the facts conducted by the Supreme Court that lasted just over one month, whereby they were promptly found guilty and six were executed on Aug. 8, 1942.

Now there's old school justice for you, American style—and guess what, Hitler and his Nazi henchmen didn't try that stunt again because FDR sent a strong message to Germany, Japan and the world: Don't mess with America in America! Why in the middle of one of the greatest wars in America's history was a socialist like Franklin Delano Roosevelt able to get a unanimous verdict from the U.S. Supreme Court against eight Nazi spies *in less than two months* and today we can't even imprison

one vicious murderer who practically killed his victims on national TV *three years* after the fact?

Of course, FDR didn't have a seditious ACLU to contend with, nor an American public brainwashed for decades in our Stalinist public education system and a crazy propaganda press hell-bent on undermining America at every opportunity, so here we are. Nichols, three years after he murdered in cold blood four innocent people, has still not come to trial. This notorious murderer is frequently on TV sitting in court with that stupid smirk on his face, making fools of us all and mocking our so-called criminal justice system.

If Atlanta had the necessary moral resolve, we should give Nichols an expedited summary trial on the facts, convict him on all four murder counts and either give him four life sentences or the death penalty. Perhaps there is no justice in Atlanta in the Nichols case because one of the favorite mantras of progressivism is: *It is better that 100 guilty men go free than one innocent be wrongfully punished.* This sounds very egalitarian, but where will the liberals and activist judges be when those unrepentant, evil men you have unleashed upon society each murder or terrorize more victims? To paraphrase MLK: I have a dream that one day Atlanta and every place in America will have the moral courage to judge a murderer by the content of his character rather than the color of his skin. Only then will there be justice in Atlanta.

ON LAW—ESSAY 4

OBAMA, AYERS, DOHRN AND DOUBLE JEOPARDY

September 06, 2008

William Ayers, in the age of terrorism, will be Barack Obama's Willie Horton.

~ Larry C. Johnson, former counterterrorism expert

I don't regret setting bombs. . . . I feel we didn't do enough.

~ William Ayers, N.Y. Times interview, Sept. 11, 2001

I don't know about you, dear reader, but it vexes me to no end every time I see or read anything about Bill Ayers and his wife, Bernadine

Dohrn, co-founders of the radical '60s anarchist group the Weather Underground. Ayers and Dohrn are people who are very close friends to Democrat presidential candidate Barack Obama, who over the years sat on various boards with Bill Ayers and to whose home Obama was compelled to make a pilgrimage at the beginning of his political career to secure their blessings and exploit their essential financial and political connections in Chicago.

How in a rational world could Obama, a man that wants to be president of the U.S., have actively associated (for perhaps over 20 years) with people like Ayers and Dohrn, avowed, unrepentant terrorists? On Sept. 11, 2001, shortly before the first planes hit the Twin Towers in New York, Bill Ayers gave an interview for the New York Times, in which he lamented, "We [the Weather Underground] didn't do enough." Well, what did they do?

From 1969-73, the Weather Underground committed hundreds of acts of violence and terrorism in America and against her citizens. Some of the more spectacular acts included the bombing of the U.S. Capitol, the State Department, the Pentagon and the New York Police Headquarters. On March 6, 1970, several of their WU members, including Ayers' then-girlfriend, Diana Oughton, were killed in a New York apartment as they were preparing a nail bomb to blow up the Fort Dix Army base in Burlington County, N.J. This bomb was designed by Bill Ayers himself and intended to be built according to his expressed specifications.

For committing such treasonous, hateful crimes against humanity in the past, why are Ayers and Dohrn *today* not only free citizens, but are well-paid, tenured professors at the University of Chicago and Northwestern Law School, respectively? Because liberals dominate the academy, the trial lawyers associations and all levels of the judicial system.

More precisely, Ayers and Dohrn got off on a technical violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, and the dismantlement of the so-called COINTELPRO (Counter Intelligence Program). Apparently, the FBI blew their case against them by illegally wiretapping their terrorists' plots without a warrant. During this period, the Senate's Church Committee, Congress and several pivotal court cases eventually ruled COINTELPRO operations against terrorist, communist and socialist groups to be outside the lawful statutory limits of FBI activity and thus contravened constitutional protections of freedom of speech and association.

I wrote about FISA in an earlier column called, "O.B.L.E.P.A.—'The Osama bin Laden Equal Protection Act'" where I cited the history of this perverted law first proposed by President Carter and passed by the Democrat-controlled Congress in 1978:

President Carter, no doubt was motivated by the findings of the zealous and partisan "Church Committee" chaired by Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, from 1972-75, sought to seriously weaken the effectiveness of the CIA, NSA, FBI and the dozen or so other intelligence agencies under the pretext of bringing reform and accountability to what liberal Democrats considered immoral and untrustworthy agencies.⁶

To his credit, President George W. Bush has since 9/11 made a major plank of his war on terrorism to remove some of the irrational strictures of FISA, which Congress amended in July 2008 so that the phone companies can monitor the lines and send notice of foreign terrorist plots or communications to America directly to the FBI without the bureaucratic red tape of first securing a warrant from a FISA court judge each time. On this issue, Democrats in Congress have fought Bush every step of the way.

FBI bungling of what should have been a slam dunk case against Ayers and Dohrn allowed them to beat the criminal charges on a technicality of an illegal wiretap surveillance violation, thus Ayers and Dohrn are now protected by the Fifth Amendment's prohibition against double jeopardy—" . . . nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb."

An article on Wikipedia.com cites the legal history of the Fifth Amendment:

This clause [double jeopardy] is intended to limit abuse by the government in repeated prosecution for the same offense as a means of harassment or oppression. It is also in harmony with the common law concept of *res judicata* which prevents courts from re-litigating issues which have already been the subject of a final judgment.⁷

More specifically, as stated in *Ashe v. Swenson*, 397 U.S. 436 (1970), "when an issue of ultimate fact has once been determined by a valid and final judgment, that issue cannot again be litigated between the same parties in any future lawsuit."⁸ Stanley Kurtz, a Hoover Institute Fellow and National Review contributor, has for the past few months done

yeoman's work in forcing the University of Chicago library to open up its files on the so-called "Annenberg Challenge," a prestigious foundation that Obama as chairman and Ayers, as the founder and a board member, served together from 1995-2000 to give grants to Chicago-area organizations to support educational opportunities for minorities.

During the years Ayers and Obama served together on the board of the Annenberg Challenge, they were responsible for disbursing over \$49 million dollars, supplemented by another \$100 million dollars in public and private funding—yet Obama minimizes his relationship with Ayers.⁹

If I were president, I would demand that the Justice Department find some crime, any crime, that the Weather Underground had committed in the past that was not yet adjudicated that can be connected to Ayers and Dohrn to bring them up on charges of terrorism, murder, conspiracy under the RICO statutes or under whatever *criminal* charges I could legitimately muster.

As a lover of America the arrogance of Ayers and Dohrn is galling to me, and as president I would endeavor to once and for all wipe that smug smile off their faces by imposing upon these rogues a very long stint in federal prison. Regrettably, that plan seems no longer feasible unless new felony charges can be discovered. However, I would encourage some of the family members of those who the Weather Underground unlawfully murdered to bring a class action *civil* lawsuit against Ayers, Dohrn (a la O.J. Simpson) and against the University of Chicago and Northwestern University—academic institutions that continue to aid and abet these murderous terrorists.

While I understand and respect the legal and judicial history of the Fifth Amendment's prohibition against prosecuting someone twice for a capital offense, we do have the confessions of these people in books, speeches, interviews and in court transcripts. We know that these terrorists for years created utter anarchy and mayhem in America yet have not paid any price for their crimes against humanity and remain unrepentant to this day. That Obama has no record as a community organizer, as the author of two best-selling memoirs, as a Chicago state representative, as a constitutional law professor, or as an Illinois senator of putting one *pro forma* statement against the villainous Ayers and Dohrn on the Congressional Record speaks volumes of actually *who* Obama the Man really is.

ON LAW—ESSAY 5

TRIBE'S TRIBALISMS

September 13, 2008

The invisible Constitution undergirds and pervades what most people understand the Constitution to be. When you look at the visible Constitution at the National Archives and draw the logical and linguistic inferences it supports, it doesn't tell you very much about what matters in constitutional law.

~Laurence Tribe, Harvard's Carl M. Loeb professor of Constitutional Law

Words mean things.

~ Rush Limbaugh, conservative radio host

Harvard professor of constitutional law Lawrence Tribe has just released his latest book, *The Invisible Constitution* (Oxford Press, 2008). In this interesting but bizarre work, professor Tribe proposes the thesis that lines between the actual black-letter text, what Tribe calls "the invisible constitution," is the *actual* Constitution.

Chicago attorney Michael O'Connell, on Bookforum.com, attempted a review of Tribe's book that basically said he didn't understand it, and as an epilogue he opined: Oh yeah, Justice Clarence Thomas sucks! O'Connell writes, "[The Supreme Court in the *Printz v. U.S.* case] first had to decide whether the word *cruel* means what the Founders regarded as cruel, or what seems cruel today, or simply what the dictionary says. While Clarence Thomas took the preposterous first view, he failed to acknowledge that the Constitution doesn't command such literalist fealty."

To this uninformed opinion, I would counter: Mr. O'Connell, if one cannot glean an understanding and a means to interpreting the Constitution from the Founders, then to whom can we turn for guidance and enlightenment about what it actually means? O'Connell doesn't say, and Tribe is too subtle to let us know explicitly—but in reading Tribe for 20 years, I think I know. The oracles to tell the unwashed masses what the "invisible constitution" means are liberal judicial activist judges like Ginsburg, Breyer, Souter, Stevens (and often times Kennedy) whose ju-

dicial opinions are essentially a mockery of the original intent of the Constitution's Framers.

You think I jest, dear reader, but O'Connell's "book review" was less a book review and more a plea for help, because the reviewer had difficulty understanding Tribe's opaque writing style. I hope I can fair better in this review. When a seasoned detective is investigating a difficult murder case, often the police will round up "the usual suspects" to determine the logical path to take in solving a particular case. Likewise, before I do a book review, especially one by a scholar of such renown as Laurence Tribe, I usually endeavor first to read what others had written about the book.

Here, the usual suspects in support of Tribe's book are:

- ❖ *Diane Feinstein*, a very liberal feminist U.S. senator from California and former mayor of San Francisco;
- ❖ *Aharon Barach*, Chief Justice of Israel, a very liberal justice of a foreign court whose perverted ideas of due process and equal protection frequently allow unrepentant, genocidal Muslim terrorists to go free, thus endangering the citizens of Israel;
- ❖ *Doris Kearns Goodwin*, the quintessential liberal revisionist historian who first came to prominence by her Pravda-esque biographies of LBJ, FDR, JFK and other U.S. presidents;
- ❖ *Akhil Amar*, a respected liberal constitutional law professor at Yale, now a visiting professor at Harvard. Clerked for Justice Stephen Breyer and a consultant for the liberal cult classic TV show "West Wing";
- ❖ *Nina Totenberg*, the quintessential liberal legal correspondent at National Public Radio who in 1991 tried desperately to scuttle the nomination of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court by outing Anita Hill to lie that Thomas sexually harassed her while employed at the EEOC. Her treachery thankfully failed, and Justice Thomas has since then distinguished himself as one of the most faithful jurists to the original intent of the Constitution's Framers;
- ❖ *Scott Turow*, popular novelist of the liberal left. He favors legal-themed narratives like the autobiographical cult classic for first-year law students, "One L" (1977).

Of course, neither myself nor Justice Clarence Thomas, Judge Robert Bork, John Whitehead, Michael Steele, Clint Bolick nor any other conservative jurist were asked by professor Tribe to do a review of his book or contribute a book jacket blurb. This is for two basic reasons: First, Tribe and other liberal elites that love his judicial activism and his so-

called "living constitution" legal philosophy considers conservative scholars *persona non grata* of the academy, because conservative legal philosophy pays credence *first* to the original Framers of the Constitution and to their original intent and ideas. To progressive academics at the Ivy League law schools and other top-tier schools across America, that view of the Constitution is like a cross in the face of Dracula. Second, as a big shot Harvard law professor, Tribe, I am convinced, isn't the least interested in having his ideas openly challenged in the arena of ideas, but to have his views of the Constitution affirmed, much in the same manner as a parishioner would accept or affirm the words read them out of the Bible by a minister from the pulpit.

You have heard the term "Obama Messiah"? Well, Obama was an acolyte to Professor Tribe who is considered a demigod at Harvard throughout the academy. I recently read that Obama, during his Harvard Law School years (1988-91), actually worked for Professor Tribe as a research assistant on one of his books—*Abortion: The Clash of Absolutes* (1990). Early in Obama's candidacy, Tribe even did a very congratulatory political commercial in support of his campaign. Tribe's judicial philosophy would be right up there with the most radical leftists of the Supreme Court, like Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg, John Paul Stevens, Earl Warren, Harry Blackmun, William Brennan, Thurgood Marshall and many other enemies of the original intent of the Framers.

In an interview about professor Tribe's book by Dick Dahl, which was posted on Harvard Law School's website, Tribe further discussed his rather eccentric, New Age, countercultural understanding of the Constitution: "Tribe explains how the real power of the Constitution rests in what we don't see but nevertheless accept as "constitutional." He argues that, despite the textual silence of the Constitution on many of the issues we believe it addresses, the unwritten beliefs we have come to accept are as binding as if they were spelled out in the text."

Tribe further writes that the written Constitution "floats in a vast and deep—and, crucially, invisible—ocean of ideas, propositions, recovered memories, and imagined experiences." Yet at a latter point in the interview Tribe seemingly contradicts himself, saying: "Calling it something mysterious like an aura or a shadow does it injustice," he said. "It's a set of fundamental beliefs and traditions that operate in a binding way. It's a living body whose existence is impossible to deny." I'm confused, Professor Tribe; which one is it? Is the Constitution's text based on real,

tangible, transcendent ideas, or on invisible, intangible, vague, unwritten, penumbral shadows?

Tribe's book claims: "The invisible Constitution is not simply a mask for imposing a particular ideology on the Constitution, which is what people sometimes think." . . . "What I'm hoping is that people will come to see that we're all engaged in the same game and that the political reality of the Constitution, which is not confined to a written text, is an equal-opportunity reality." I am not convinced. On the contrary, I am convinced that Tribe's latest book at its foundation is essentially a rehash of his long-cherished and perverted views of the Constitution as a "living constitution"—a document that can be manipulated at will by any liberal activist judge or Progressive Justice on the Supreme Court for the common good to reach conclusions which in every respect are not only diametrically opposed to the original intent of the Constitution's Framers, but antithetical to history, morality and America's Judeo-Christian intellectual traditions.

As I have stated many times before, it's not really difficult to understand what liberal jurists like Tribe, Goodwin, Justice Baruch, Amar, Totenberg, Turow, the propaganda media, the humanist academy or virtually any Democrat in Congress actually thinks about the Constitution's Framers. I summed up their legal philosophy many times before in these three words—F- (Forget) the Framers! What is especially galling to me as a budding constitutional scholar myself is that when I attended Harvard Law School in the late 1980s, just after Michelle graduated and concurrent with Barack Obama, we, as idealistic young students, really looked up to legal scholars like Tribe, Dershowitz, Ogeltree, Derrick Bell, Randall Kennedy, Martha Minow and others.

Tribe, in particular, being a Jew whose descendants were called "People of the Book" should realize better than anyone else the utter necessity of venerating and obeying the black-letter text of the Torah and the Constitution. Why? The Constitution's Framers explicitly followed that ancient Jewish moral tradition of canon veneration in creating the text of the Constitution by erecting its foundation squarely in the Judeo-Christian tradition of intellectual thought—transcendent words codified in black-letter text. Why did the Framers take this approach? They intended for the Constitution to endure through the ages.

Tribe's antithetical, yea his almost nihilist view of the Constitution, however, looks suspiciously at moral considerations having *any* relation-

ship with legal ones. That secular, positivist legal philosophy is self-evident in all of professor Tribe's academic writings; it is evident in the cases he has argued before the Supreme Court as well as lectures and speeches he has given about the Constitution. At every opportunity, professor Laurence Tribe has repeatedly demonstrated a contemptible, visceral hatred of originalism jurisprudence, original intent, the ideas of the Framers, natural law and even America's actual constitutional history. In the final analysis, do we want people like Tribe on the Supreme Court, or will he do less mischief in his current capacity serving Kool-Aid (i.e., Marxist, socialist jurisprudence) masquerading as constitutional law to the legions of "intelligent" young law students at Harvard?

Admittedly it is a Hobson's choice, but I choose the latter.

ON LAW—ESSAY 6

WHERE ARE SCALIA'S INTELLECTUAL CHILDREN?

October 09, 2008

Last week, on Oct. 2, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia became the inaugural speaker of the Herbert W. Vaughan Lecture Series at Harvard Law School. His subject, "Methodology of Originalism," was given before a crowd of over 650 students, faculty and the general public. Originalism, or "strict constructionist" is a form of judicial philosophy that approaches constitutional interpretation according to the original intent of the Constitution's framers wherever possible. As an originalist, Scalia is loathe to impose his own personal views or opinions of the Constitution into any of his judicial opinions because he believes to do so violates the separation of powers doctrine and places the judge into the realm of lawmaker—a super legislator—a function a judge is ill-equipped to legitimately perform. "The initial approach to interpretation of the U.S. Constitution," Scalia said, "which remained as orthodoxy until the Warren Court, holds that the Constitution is no different from any other legal text such as statutes that do not change meaning from generation to generation."

My association with Justice Scalia, or I should say my attempted association with this legendary conservative jurist, goes back 20 years when I was a graduate student at Harvard. Concurrent with this period,

I became a conservative and took a few courses at the law school. In the late 1980s, I began to read some of Scalia's judicial opinions and started writing Scalia and other members of the Court about my ideas on the Constitution. Later, I sent him various book manuscripts, law review articles and books on constitutional law, legal philosophy and judicial philosophy I had written as gifts of gratitude for his yeoman's work on the bench. While I received replies from justices representing all three judicial philosophies of the Court—liberal (Ginsburg, Breyer), moderate (Souter, O'Connor), conservative (Thomas), nevertheless I have yet to receive any reply from Justice Scalia—nor did I receive one from then-Chief Justice Rehnquist, both conservative justices.

Why? To give Scalia the benefit of the doubt, perhaps as a matter of policy or practice he doesn't respond to unsolicited gifts from the public. I understand that as a member of the Supreme Court he receives lots of bizarre and crazy correspondence, but as I stated before, I wrote him as a young student of constitutional law whose philosophy was in part nurtured by his originalism jurisprudence. I was trying to pay homage to Justice Scalia, and I feel remiss that to date he has yet to acknowledge my gratitude of him, though several of his colleagues on the Court have done so repeatedly, including Ginsburg, Breyer and Souter, jurists whose ideas about the Constitution are antithetical to my own. Perhaps a reason that I never received a response from Justice Scalia over the past 20 years is that my approach to constitutional interpretation and jurisprudence, while strongly rooted in the original intent of the Constitution's framers, is nevertheless also grounded in moral philosophy, which, according to his lecture at Harvard Law School last week, Scalia considers a "non-originalist" approach to constitutional interpretation.

On Scalia's lecture, Elaine Mc Ardle wrote:

Scalia took to task proponents of a non-originalist approach, whom he says improperly stray into the realm of moral philosophy. "Much as I love Harvard Law School, it didn't make me a moral philosopher," he said. Not only are lawyers better suited to historical inquiry than to moral philosophy, "that task has become easier over time," he said, with the proliferation in the past 20 years of legal historians in the academy as well as the increasing number of historically laden amicus briefs submitted to the Court, especially in controversial cases.¹⁰

While I venerate Scalia's work on the Supreme Court, if he truly made those comments equating moral philosophy with non-originalism, I must demur in the strongest possible terms, for if one considers himself to be a constitutional originalist, then one must come to the understanding that it is frankly impossible to separate law from morality. Moreover, it is intellectually dishonest to try and separate history from moral philosophy, particularly when discussing America's constitutional and jurisprudence history.

Scalia's ideas on this subject reminds me of a very rude correspondence I received from Judge Robert Bork whose nomination to the Supreme Court by President Reagan in 1987 was scuttled by a cabal of liberal Democrats, leftist academics, including Laurence Tribe, and the National Organization of Women among other organizations of the left. In that correspondence about seven or eight years ago, Judge Bork was replying to my letter of gratitude for his contributions to constitutional law, particularly in his books *The Tempting of America* (1990) and *Slouching Towards Gomorrah* (1996). I especially thanked him for his moral and historical philosophical approach to constitutional interpretation, which I viewed as indebted to and reliant upon Natural Law philosophy and the original intent of the Constitution's framers.

Judge Bork up to this point had never responded to any of the books and law review articles I had sent him, but he finally could tolerate no more. He sent me a terse e-mail stating that nothing in his writings on constitutional law has anything to do with Natural Law and that he does not view Natural Law philosophy as having any bearing on his understanding of the Constitution in modern times. Of course, Judge Bork's reply devastated me . . . then I became angry, now regretful. I found Judge Bork's reply to me to be particularly regretful and bewildering, because for a time he and I were even affiliated with the same academic institution—Ave Maria—a law school founded by Domino's Pizza CEO Tom Monaghan, a devout Catholic who put up millions of his own money to create a law school that proposed a Natural Law approach to the law and a veneration of the original intent of the Constitution's framers.

While I realize that there are legal scholars at prestigious law schools and universities across America who in their research and writings pay lip service to the voluminous and distinguished record of the Constitution's framers, nevertheless for whatever reasons are loathe to acknowledge the underlying religious veneration of the framers that is

rooted in the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought. This school of legal thought is largely founded on humanism, liberalism and Positive law—a separation of law from morality.

In modern times, it is beyond all *rational* argument that the writings of the Constitution's framers were inextricably founded upon the Bible, Natural Law and the moral philosophy of Blackstone, Locke, Montesquieu, Hobbes and others. (Note the emphasis on rational because many of the ideas from the left on the constitutional interpretation are based on feelings and emotions, not the dispassionate rule of law). In an earlier column, "Why the left so hates America," I tried to put the ideas and writings of Constitution's framers in a proper historical context:

What writers and writings most influenced the constitutional framers? To answer this question, University of Houston political science professors Donald Lutz and Charles Hyneman in 1985 published a monumental study that took them 10 years to bring together. They amassed over 15,000 items, including 2,200 books, newspaper articles, pamphlets and monographs of political materials written between 1760-1805 and discovered that the three writers the constitutional framers quoted from the most often were: 1) Barron Montesquieu (1689-1755), 2) William Blackstone (1723-80), and 3) John Locke (1632-1704). Incidentally, all of these men were strong adherents of Natural Law philosophy, which believed in an inseparable connection between law and morality.

The Pilgrims, the Puritans *and* the constitutional framers all insisted on cementing the connection between law and morals by infusing biblical precepts into the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and Bill of Rights. In fact, one other source was quoted more than Montesquieu, Blackstone and Locke combined—the Bible. Fully 96 percent of the literature, books, articles, monographs and political tracts the framers used and that were analyzed in the Lutz/Hyneman study had their origins in the Word of God.¹¹

Returning to Scalia's lecture, at this venue surrounded by liberal jurists like Tribe, Dershowitz and those who believe an activist justice in the tradition of a Warren, Brennan, Thurgood Marshall, Blackmun, Stevens, Ginsburg and Breyer to be the ideal judge, I am convinced that Scalia missed an important and rare opportunity to be exceedingly definitive in his denunciations that political activism on the bench of any ideology openly perverts the original intent of the Constitution's framers by conflating the judicial branch with the legislative branch.

Instead, Scalia on occasion seemed to try to placate his audience with phrases like, "My burden as an originalist is not to show that originalism is perfect but merely to show that it beats the other available alternatives, and that is not difficult. . . ." However, in other parts of his speech, Scalia acquitted himself quite well in his delineation of originalist jurisprudence particularly in the excerpts below:

❖ Regardless of which medium is involved, libel is unprotected speech. For that reason, Scalia said, a decision such as *New York Times v. Sullivan*, in which the Warren Court determined that good faith libel of public figures would be "good for democracy," deviates from the Court's proper role under the Constitution.

❖ [A]n exchange with HLS professor Alan Dershowitz provided the liveliest moment. Dershowitz referenced a 2003 case on the Fifth Amendment, *Chavez v. Martinez*, which addressed whether the Constitution prohibits coercion in eliciting self-incriminatory statements. In that case, Scalia joined the majority opinion by Thomas in finding that the coercive questioning by police under the circumstances of the case was not a constitutional violation. In the opinion, according to Dershowitz, there was "not a single word about history" because such inquiry would have led to a different result.¹²

Although overall Scalia performed very well at the inaugural Herbert W. Vaughan Lecture, my only regret is that while Tribe, Dershowitz, Ogeltree, Noah Feldman, Lani Guiner and the majority of liberal law professors at Harvard Law School have many "children," i.e., students, to propagate their ideas, Scalia seems content to be a highly sought-after conservative jurist . . . yet virtually alone. To my knowledge, Justice Scalia has not found it important during his distinguished judicial career to encourage a new, younger generation of legal scholars like myself (as Justice Clarence Thomas has done) to propagate his originalist ideas to America's law schools, American society and throughout the world. Unless Justice Scalia reaches out to a new generation of legal scholars, I predict that he will leave this earthy realm with few intellectual children of his own and that his judicial ideas and his intellectual legacy will pass away like the sands of time.

ON LAW — ESSAY 7

THE SUPREMES VOTE AGAINST THE REPUBLIC

October 22, 2008

The Act [Help America Vote] helps to ensure that those votes count, or to put it another way, the Act helps to ensure that those votes are not diluted by guarding against voter fraud. The one goal complements the other: Enabling the casting of one vote does little good if another voter fraudulently cancels it out.

~ U.S. 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, 9-5 *en banc* decision

Last Friday, the Supreme Court of the U.S. (SCOTUS) on SCOTUSblog.com published an article, "Court blocks Ohio voter match order." ¹³ In the case of *Brunner v. Ohio Republican Party*, the Court overruled a federal judge's order that would have mandated Ohio election officials to institute new regulations to authenticate voter registration across the state in the weeks before the Nov. 4 balloting. The unsigned ("Per Curiam") order, in my humble opinion, was a gutless and shameful attempt by the high Court to hide their shame after abrogating their sworn judicial duty to "solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic . . ." and putting this solemn mandate in the hands of a partisan hack.

The order stops an attempt by the Ohio Republican Party to have access to registration information that would allow the GOP and other interested parties to challenge voters' eligibility at polling places. The state GOP had argued that the Ohio secretary of state (Jennifer Brunner, a Democrat) had neglected her duty, under federal election procedures law, "to provide the lists of voters whose names in a voter registration database do not match data in the state's driver's license files with county election boards." The GOP argued that the secretary of state had prevented all attempts to forward the non-matching data and integrate it with all the other authenticated voter rolls in Ohio so that local election officials could evaluate these lists for possible voter fraud. Absent this crucial step in the voter authentication process, the state of Ohio could

open itself up to a flood of constitutional challenges and lawsuits by literally tens of thousands of voters.

The Supreme Court demurred on the question whether the state official had violated federal election law. Instead, SCOTUS addressed their opinion on the narrow question of jurisdiction: Does federal election law give a private party—like the state GOP—a right to go to court to enforce those provisions in the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), an act specifically enacted by Congress in 2002 to avoid the voting catastrophe of Florida's 2000 presidential election? Justice John Paul Stevens, perhaps the most liberal activist justice on the Supreme Court, wasn't satisfied with granting the secretary of state's plea to stay the federal judge's temporary restraining order, but actually vacated it, thus removing *any* legal obligation spelled out in that order and effectively rendering HAVA a dead letter.

For the few American citizens out there that still give a damn about preserving this democratic republic we call the United States, SCOTUS' ruling on the Ohio voter match order in essence allowed the secretary of state of Ohio, a partisan liberal Democrat, the tyrannical, unchecked power to validate or authenticate over 200,000 questionable voter registrations forms. This despite the fact that the information on the voter forms doesn't match the public records like driver's licenses, lease or mortgage contracts, etc. Of course, ACORN (Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now), a community-based organization rooted in Marxism, socialism and every Machiavellian stratagem, is at the center of this Ohio voter fraud controversy. ACORN, a group Obama did legal work for and recently contributed over \$800,000 to "help get out the vote," is following its Marxist tactics to the letter in Ohio—win the election for Democrats *by any means necessary*.

This decision by SCOTUS is outrageous and goes to the very foundation of our republic, based on a written Constitution and infused with moral, ethical and legal values out of the common law and Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought.

If an oligarchy of justices on the high court can so cavalierly dispense with direct elections mandated in black letter text of constitutional law without even the pretense of the entire Court taking the time to hear the case or any meaningful dissent from the press, my fellow Americans, it is truly beyond the pale! If, God forbid, the election should come down to Ohio again as in 2004, then the willful negligence and treachery of SCO-

TUS will be complete, and America will be plunged into another “constitutional crisis” that our democratic republic may not be able to recover from this time.

Trial attorney Bill Dyer, writing for Hugh Hewitt’s Townhall.com blog, made the following prescient remarks about the Ohio voter fraud case:

1) Today’s ruling turned on important but esoteric legal principles that don’t have much to do with voting rights in general or the situation on the ground in Ohio in particular, and it ought not be interpreted as the Supreme Court either rejecting or accepting the proposition that there’s widespread and systematic voting fraud being undertaken there or anywhere else.

2) It does, however, emphasize that the Supreme Court thinks this is an important topic. And most importantly, 3) *Congress desperately needs to further reform the voter fraud and voter registration laws to specify who may sue under them, when, how, and for what relief.*¹⁴

What is that sound you hear, dear readers? No, it isn’t our two presidential candidates, Barack Obama and John McCain, calling a special joint press conference to vociferously criticize SCOTUS for its outrageous opinion against democracy and against the voters of Ohio. That silence you hear in the *Brunner v. Ohio Republican Party* case is *indifference*—it is the tragic silence of the lambs. As we consider the “indifference” of the Supreme Court in the crucial state of Ohio, allow me to end this article with the poignant words of that angel in the flesh, that intellectual giant and Holocaust survivor, Elie Wiesel: *The opposite of love is not hate, it’s indifference. The opposite of art is not ugliness, it’s indifference. The opposite of faith is not heresy, it’s indifference, and the opposite of life is not death, it’s indifference.*

ON LAW—ESSAY 8

OBAMA 2001, UNCENSORED

October 29, 2008

To that extent, as radical as I think people try to characterize the Warren Court, it wasn’t that radical. It didn’t break free from the essential constraints that were placed by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution.

~ Barack Obama, 2001

Earlier this week, conservative pundit Michelle Malkin, on her blog, wrote a revealing piece titled, "Obama in 2001: How to bring about 'redistributive change.'" In her very intriguing article about the recently released radio interview of "The One" in 2001, we are peeling back the onion layers and are finally getting at the core of *who* Barack Obama the man actually is in his own words.

WARNING! . . . and it's not going to be good for America.

Listening to this interview, we do not hear Obama's characteristic halting, stumbling, bumbling speaking manner he usually exhibits while separated from his trusty teleprompter. No, no, no! Here, Obama was rather forthright about what type of America he wanted—an America free of the "constraints that were placed by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution"—and in so doing, achieve "social justice" through "redistributive change."

Below are the main points of interest from Obama's 2001 interview. Why didn't the mainstream liberal media make this interview public two years ago? Obama states: "If you look at the victories and failures of the civil rights movement and its litigation strategy in the court, I think where it succeeded was to invest formal rights in previously dispossessed people, so that now I would have the right to vote. I would now be able to sit at the lunch counter and order. As long as I could pay for it, I'd be OK."¹⁵

Here, Obama, the professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, one of the elite institutions of higher education, shows his glaring ignorance of his subject matter. If Obama is speaking here as a black man, we (I'm a black man also) got the constitutional right to vote on Feb. 3, 1870, when the 15th Amendment was ratified. To be fair, maybe Obama was trying to use inclusive language with other groups like women (of all races) who did not get the vote until the passage of the 19th Amendment, which was ratified on Aug. 18, 1920.

Secondly, it trivializes the heroic efforts of black people who fought injustices during the segregation eras (1865-1965) where blacks had rights on paper (*de jure* = by law), yet suffered systemic, vicious and de-meaning racist and discriminatory practices (*de facto* = by practice). If Obama means that the road to full integration wasn't fully realized until the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1968 and the Voting Rights

Act of 1965, then good. However, my point here is that no black person I know of or read about invited beatings, racism and death so that they could, in the words of Obama, be allowed to "sit at the lunch counter and order." That's an outrageous perversion of history by Obama. I guess Obama couldn't go into that level of constitutional law history I cited above because he never learned it at Occidental, Columbia or Harvard Law School. I certainly didn't learn it at Harvard, either.

Obama continues:

But, the Supreme Court never ventured into the issues of redistribution of wealth, and of more basic issues such as political and economic justice in society. *To that extent, as radical as I think people try to characterize the Warren Court, it wasn't that radical. It didn't break free from the essential constraints that were placed by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution*, at least as its been interpreted, and the Warren Court interpreted it in the same way, that generally the Constitution is a charter of negative liberties. Says what the states can't do to you. Says what the federal government can't do to you, but doesn't say what the federal government or state government must do on your behalf, and that hasn't shifted. And one of the, I think, tragedies of the civil rights movement was, um, because the civil rights movement became so court-focused, I think there was a tendency to lose track of the political and community organizing and activities on the ground that are able to put together the actual coalition of powers through which you bring about redistributive change. In some ways, we still suffer from that.¹⁶

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we are getting into what the old timers called the "real nitty gritty." The above passage is where the real Barack Obama is revealed, uncensored. This is what Obama means by his mantra "change," "yes, we can," "economic justice," "social justice" and "spreading the wealth." Most frightening is what Obama would do to the original intent of the Constitution's framers—f—the framers! (forget the framers). The Constitution would in essence become a dead letter. In other words, an Obama administration would be FDR, part II and the Earl Warren Court, part II where the most reactionary liberal judges he could find would be chosen to sit on the Supreme Court, the court of appeals and on the circuit courts—all lifetime appointments!

Any "constitutional law professor" or American, for that matter, that says the Warren Court "wasn't *that* radical" is not someone I would trust to be president of the United States. The Warren Court (1953-69) is the

same court that handed down some of the following contemptible and unconstitutional opinions:

- ❖ Systematically perverted the Constitution and turned judicial activism and legislating from the bench into an art form;
- ❖ Made up the underlying suppositions of *Brown v. Board of Education* out of whole cloth;
- ❖ Gave us *Miranda v. Arizona*, *Mapp v. Ohio* and *Katz v. U.S.*, literally shackling the hands of the police to fight crime and endangering the public;
- ❖ Legalized contraceptives and birth control pills, even among unmarried couples, which help usher in the sexual revolution of the 1960s and '70s (*Griswold v. Connecticut*, et. al.);
- ❖ Invented the so-called "right to privacy" to essentially legalize all manner of moral and ethical perversion, leading to the quintessential liberal activist decision, *Roe v. Wade* (1973) during the Burger Court (1969-86);
- ❖ Repeatedly affirmed the sophism, "separation of church and state" (*Engle v. Vitale*), rendering Christianity illegal in many public venues like the public schools;
- ❖ Outlawed the death penalty (*Furman v. Georgia*); and
- ❖ Literally opened the jailhouse door for any murderous defendant with a shyster lawyer dishonest enough to find one of the many gaping loopholes in the law the Warren Court created (*Terry v. Ohio*, *Escobedo v. Illinois*, *Gideon v. Wainwright*, etc.).

Any American who laments, like Barack Obama, that, "[The Warren Court] didn't break free from the essential constraints that were placed by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution . . ." [i.e., separation of powers] in my humble opinion is stupid, ignorant or unenlightened. Either way, he does not deserve to be a constitutional law professor or the president of the United States—but I would cast the first vote for such a person to become the "Inmate Commandant" of Arkham Asylum where Batman's Joker, Riddler and Two Face rule without rival.

ON LAW—ESSAY 9

OBAMA AND OUR COMING CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

November 08, 2008

I was in the delivery room in [Mombosa,] Kenya, when he was born Aug. 4, 1961.

~ Obama's paternal grandmother (radio interview Oct. 16, 2008)

Nothing is more important than enforcing the Constitution.

~ Philip Berg, petitioner—*Philip J. Berg v. Barack Obama, et al.* (2008)

As President-elect Barack Obama ascends to the presidency of the United States, there still remains a looming cloud above his head like the sword of Damocles. If and when that sword will fall plunging America into a constitutional crisis depends on a number of desperate and remarkable variables. Before I get into these variables, let's examine what the Constitution says. What are the requirements to become president? Section 1 of Article II of the U.S. Constitution states that a president must:

- ❖ Be a natural born citizen of the United States;
- ❖ Be at least 35 years old;
- ❖ Have lived in the U.S. for at least 14 years.

The inevitable constitutional crisis regarding Obama, of course, revolves around his inability (or unwillingness) to produce an authentic Hawaiian birth certificate with the raised certificate stamp that the Federal Elections Commission can independently verify. I know there are those who say Obama has produced an authentic birth certificate and posted it on his website, but experts and amateurs alike quickly found numerous errors in that document and deemed it a forgery (and a bad one at that).

Philip J. Berg, a Democratic operative and former deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, has assumed the tragic role of Prometheus, ascended Mount Olympus, the abode of Zeus, and has launched a one-man campaign to force Obama to verify his U.S. citizenship by suing the senator, the Democratic National Committee and the Federal Election

Commission, to verify that indeed he is worthy to be president of the United States by producing a real birth certificate. Here are some of the unanswered issues hanging over the head of President-elect Barack Obama and the question of his American citizenship cited in an earlier article by WND news editor Drew Zahn:

- ❖ The allegation that Obama was born in Kenya to parents unable to automatically grant him American citizenship;
- ❖ The allegation that Obama was made a citizen of Indonesia as a child and that he retained foreign citizenship into adulthood without recording an oath of allegiance to regain any theoretical American citizenship;
- ❖ The allegation that Obama's birth certificate was a forgery and that he may not be an eligible, natural-born citizen;
- ❖ The allegation that Obama was not born an American citizen; lost any hypothetical American citizenship he had as a child; that Obama may not now be an American citizen and even if he is, may hold dual citizenships with other countries. If any, much less all, of these allegations are true, the suit claims, Obama cannot constitutionally serve as president.
- ❖ The allegations that "Obama's grandmother on his father's side, half brother and half sister claim Obama was born in Kenya," the suit states. "Reports reflect Obama's mother went to Kenya during her pregnancy; however, she was prevented from boarding a flight from Kenya to Hawaii at her late stage of pregnancy, which apparently was a normal restriction to avoid births during a flight. Stanley Ann Dunham (Obama) gave birth to Obama in Kenya, after which she flew to Hawaii and registered Obama's birth."
- ❖ The claim could not be verified by WND inquiries to Hawaiian hospitals, since state law bars the hospitals from releasing medical records to the public;
- ❖ Even if Obama produced authenticated proof of his birth in Hawaii, however, the suit claims that the U.S. Nationality Act of 1940 provided that minors lose their American citizenship when their parents expatriate. Since Obama's mother married an Indonesian citizen and moved to Indonesia, the suit claims, she forfeited both her and Barack's American citizenship.

Unfortunately, just 10 days before the election, a court of appeals judge threw out Berg's lawsuit challenging the veracity of Obama's U.S. citizenship status on technical grounds. Judge R. Barclay Surrick, a Jimmy Carter-appointed judge, amazingly (and with a tinge of irony), stated his opinion in part:

In a 34-page memorandum that accompanied the court order, the Hon. R. Barclay Surrick concludes that ordinary citizens can't sue to ensure that a presidential candidate actually meets the constitutional requirements of the office. Surrick defers to Congress, saying that the legislature could determine "that citizens, voters, or party members should police the Constitution's eligibility requirements for the Presidency," but that it would take new laws to grant individual citizens that ability. "Until that time," Surrick says, "voters do not have standing to bring the sort of challenge that Plaintiff attempts to bring." Judge Surrick, quoting from Hollander, concludes, "The alleged harm to voters stemming from a presidential candidate's failure to satisfy the eligibility requirements of the Natural Born Citizen Clause is not concrete or particularized enough to constitute an injury."

Surrick also quotes *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, which stated, in part, "The Supreme Court has consistently held that a plaintiff raising only a generally available grievance about government—claiming only harm to his and every citizen's interest in proper application of the Constitution and laws, and seeking relief that no more directly and tangibly benefits him than it does the public at large—does not state an Article III case or controversy."¹⁷ Constitutionally speaking, Judge Surrick's reasoning is completely illogical and a total dereliction of his duty as a judge to substantively address this most vital constitutional controversy. Instead, in a gutless manner, Surrick dismissed Berg's complaint 10 days before the elections on a technicality of standing, which to any rational person begs the question: *If Philip J. Berg as an American citizen, a respected Democratic operative and former attorney general of Pennsylvania doesn't have the "standing" to bring this type of lawsuit against Obama, then who in America does have standing?* The good judge in all 34 pages of legal mumbo jumbo didn't bother to answer this pivotal question. That Berg's complaint is not "concrete or particularized enough to constitute an injury" is an amazing admission by any person that went to law school and even more so given the fact that Surrick is a respected appellate judge.

I am somewhat hopeful that Berg will successfully appeal Surrick's outrageous decision to 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals and then to the United States Supreme Court if necessary, even if technically he doesn't have standing to hold Obama accountable to the Constitution. Why? Because this is America, and out of 300 million people, someone should give a damn enough about this republic to make sure the person who

holds the highest elected office in the land holds it legitimately based on the black letter text of Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Unless and until Obama's citizenship question is definitively put to rest, then the proverbial sword of Damocles will continue to dangle precariously over his head and America will face 50 lawsuits from all 50 states demanding that President Barack Obama prove that he is an authentic American citizen according to the U.S. Constitution.

ON LAW—ESSAY 10

AN AMERICAN OLIGARCHY OF 5

June 21, 2008

The court lacks the authority to impose its chosen remedy.

~ Justice Antonin Scalia

Prologue

The tyranny of the judicial branch was realized by Thomas Jefferson shortly after the original sin of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) was handed down, where the Supreme Court seized the right to be the final authority on *all* constitutional questions—not Congress, not “We the People,” but an unelected cartel of five justices can now with Stalinesque efficiency control every aspect of our lives. That judge-created doctrine of law is called *judicial review*. In 1820, just 17 years after the *Marbury* decision, Jefferson lamented to a friend in a letter, “To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.” Jefferson and all of the Constitution’s framers through their protracted war with King George III understood that all governments of men—whether from a king (monarchy), the people (democracy, which the framers called “mobocracy”) or a majority of five Justices on the Supreme Court (oligarchy)—had the potential of being a tyranny, because it often violated natural law and natural rights of We the People, which come from God and therefore cannot lawfully be contravened by man.

Case: *Dada v. Mukasey* (June 17, 2008)

The Court Monday in the *Dada* case addressed the question of how to treat aliens subject to orders of voluntary departure who, before their visas expired, which would force them to leave the country, can now successfully delay the extradition process based on the discovery of “new facts.” Prior to the *Dada* case, existing immigration law and Supreme Court precedent allowed aliens who agreed to leave the country voluntarily to retain the right to file motions to reopen their cases regardless of whether or not their claim had been resolved. The conflict was that petitioner Dada wanted more time to file appeals, while the government, which was the respondent in this case, wanted the Court to follow precedent and have Dada file his appeals from his home country of Nigeria, not from America.

Justice Anthony Kennedy, writing the majority opinion for the Court, dispensed with both the petitioner (Dada) and the governments’ remedy and essentially drafted new immigration law, legislating from the bench. Kennedy found that tolling (stopping) the voluntary departure period would invite frivolous filings and rob the government of its end of the voluntary departure bargain, while the government’s solution would leave aliens “between Scylla and Charybdis”—forced either to ignore their extradition date (adding additional statutory penalties) to wait for the motion to be resolved, or leave the country on time and forfeit a potentially valid claim. The petitioner in the case, Nigerian native Samson T. Dada, entered into a sham marriage to a U.S. citizen in 1999 after overstaying the temporary visa on which he entered the country. This (along with Mexican women crossing the Rio Grande eight and a half months pregnant) are two of many common subterfuges by legal *and* illegal aliens to circumvent America’s immigration laws by sneaking into this country and delaying or avoiding extradition by any means necessary.

A court of appeals panel rejected Dada’s claim in per curiam opinion, relying on an earlier case that found a tolling approach would allow aliens to stay longer under orders of voluntary departure than Congress had ever intended. Chief Justice John Roberts, along with Justices Thomas and Scalia, in a dissenting opinion, argued that the majority opinion rested on a false premise. Comparing voluntary departure to a plea bargain in which a defendant gives up a right to appeal, Scalia argued that

"aliens granted orders of voluntary departure effectively forfeit their right to reopen their cases in the limited time in which they must depart." Calling it commonplace that litigants' pursuit of one type of relief often requires the surrender of another, Scalia said the voluntary departure bargain "seems entirely reasonable to me." I agree.

The Dada case underscores the original sin of *Marbury v. Madison*, a case that over 200 years ago established the diabolical doctrine of judicial review whereby an unelected oligarchy of five justices have the unchecked, godlike power on all constitutional questions—to dictate to "We the People" and our elected representatives in Congress not only what the law *is*, but what the law *ought to be*. Under this perverted paradigm of jurisprudence, America is no longer a representative republic as the Constitution's framers intended, but an omnipotent oligarchy where 300 million people are essentially held hostage to a capricious, oppressive, illegal tyranny of five.

Congress was clear in its original intent to stem the tide of illegal immigration and sought to lessen the bureaucratic strictures many legal aliens were exploiting by adding transparency and common sense to existing immigration law and policies. However, the Court in the Dada case, threw congressional intent, judicial precedent and the will of the people out the window to literally give a green light to every unscrupulous legal and illegal alien in the U.S. to stay as long as they desire, to file appeal after frivolous appeal—and if you can't afford your own attorney, no worry because these dupes over here called "We the People" will pay for an attorney for you whether they like it or not. Why? Because five liberal activist hacks on the Supreme Court say so, that's why.

Epilogue

America! We have got to do something at the congressional level to reign in these renegade justices who treat the U.S. Constitution like toilet paper, who arrogantly pervert the original intent of the Constitution's framers to comply with their own personal policy preferences. In my opinion, this alone is grounds for impeachment proceedings against these five traitorous justices—Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg, Breyer and Stevens. The Dada case is a blatant violation of the rule of law, as Justice Scalia lamented in the Guantanamo Bay cases decided on June 12, by which another Kennedy-led majority of five gave full constitutional due process rights to 270 hateful, murderous, irredeemable Muslim terrorists.

Ironically, contrary to President Bush's equivocation with these detainees, that liberal lion, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had tried eight and executed six Nazi terrorists in one month in the Nazi saboteur case *Ex parte Quirin* (1942)—66 years ago!

In the Guantanamo Bay case, Scalia predicted that decision "will make the war harder on us. It will almost certainly cause more Americans to be killed." Likewise, the Dada immigration decision has perverted the rule of law to such an extent that I predict this case will further erode existing immigration laws and ultimately will make America's borders and our citizens less protected from enemies within and abroad. In a word, the Dada decision will make it easier for legal and illegal aliens, many of whom desire to do this country great harm, to become permanent, *de facto* U.S. citizens thanks to the turncoat Justice Anthony Kennedy and his four liberal comrades on the U.S. Supreme Court.

ON LAW—ESSAY 11

JUSTICES GONE WILD

June 19, 2008

To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.

~ Thomas Jefferson

On June 12, the Supreme Court in the consolidated case of *Boumediene v. Bush* and *Al-Odah v. U.S.*, gave the roughly 270 prisoners held at our prison camp in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the same constitutional rights as you and I. These foreign terrorists all plotted, planned, fought against and even killed American soldiers, who, now thanks to an oligarchy of five justices, can go before a U.S. federal judge in civilian court to challenge their years-long detention. Of course, the liberal media, socialist pressure groups and the Democrat Party in unison gleefully cheered the opinion as vindication of the civil rights of these global citizens, viewing them (even if they won't admit it) as "freedom fighters." However, they were especially joyful because the Court handed a bitter defeat to George W. Bush and a stinging rebuke of the president's vaunted seven-year "war on terrorism."

In a contentiously argued 5-4 vote, the Court, rejecting the administration's war on terrorism in these Guantanamo Bay cases, cavalierly struck down the will of "We the People" who through our representatives in Congress in 2006 passed comprehensive, anti-terrorism legislation specifically designed to thwart earlier mischievous opinions by the Court (*Rasul* and *Hamdan* decisions) and to affirm our over 230-year tradition of treating foreign terrorists ("enemy combatants") as a distinct class of defendants not worthy of or eligible to the same constitutional rights and due process American citizens take for granted. Instead, the Court in the *Boumediene* and *Al-Odah* willfully and wantonly overruled the will of the people and Congress to suspend the habeas corpus rights of this dangerous and irredeemable class of criminal defendants. This decision tragically puts foreign terrorists' rights above the safety of the American people.

As if perverting the will of the Constitution, Congress and We the People alone wasn't enough, to add insult to injury "moderate conservative" Justice Anthony Kennedy had the hubris to say, "The laws and Constitution are designed to survive, and remain in force, in extraordinary times. Liberty and security can be reconciled; and in our system they are reconciled within the framework of the law." That said, I only can wonder why it took Justice Kennedy 70-pages to write his majority opinion. He could have written this (and virtually all of his opinions since Reagan tragically appointed him to the bench 20 years ago in 1988) by using these three simple words—*F— the Framers!* (Forget the Framers). These three words alone eloquently sum up the jurisprudence of Kennedy and his liberal colleagues on the bench, as well as their entire approach to constitutional law and judicial decision-making.

FDR and the Nazi saboteur case

I only wish President Bush would have taken the approach FDR took in the Nazi saboteur case, *Ex parte Quirin* (1942), where in the midst of World War II eight Nazi terrorists were captured on the coasts of New York and Florida. After a summary trial in July 1942, six were summarily executed one month later after the Supreme Court upheld the jurisdiction of a U.S. military tribunal. Regarding the Guantanamo Bay decision, President Bush six years ago should have followed FDR's lead in the *Quirin* case and dispatched these Muslim terrorists with a prompt military trial and a public hanging. I guarantee you that if he had acted deci-

sively like FDR and the four great statesmen of Mount Rushmore acted during their presidencies that his name would have been regarded in as laudatory a manner as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, instead of associated with the legendary incompetence of a Jimmy Carter.

Chief Justice John Roberts in dissent wrote that the American people "lost a bit more control over the conduct of this nation's foreign policy to unelected, politically unaccountable judges." And Justice Antonin Scalia wrote of the ruling, "Most tragically it sets our military commanders the impossible task of proving in a civilian court . . . that evidence supports the confinement of each and every prisoner." The liberal pressure group Amnesty International, which has been a long-time enemy of Bush's war against terrorism, was elated over the ruling. "The Supreme Court did the right thing. Everyone has the right to challenge why they're being thrown in prison, to hear the charges against them and to answer to that," said Dalia Hashad, the group's domestic human rights program director.

Of course, the ACLU was euphoric about the Court's decision on the Guantanamo Bay cases. Steven Shapiro of the American Civil Liberties Union said, "Today's decision forcefully repudiates the essential lawlessness of the Bush administration's failed Guantanamo policy." If we only had a few courageous men with a bit of testosterone, a few intelligent men who actually read and understood the U.S. Constitution, not in the perverted manner of the five activist justices on the Court who only see the Constitution as tool of "social justice."

Bush and the Justice Department essentially fiddled for seven years while Americans have suffered under the trauma of 9/11, instead of Americans witnessing most if not all of the 270 Muslim terrorist swinging from the gallows as FDR did in the Quirin case 66 year ago. Now, America must needlessly suffer more pain and suffering as we soon witness these vile enemies of Israel, America and the Judeo-Christian ethic be treated as full-fledged American citizens with all the rights and privileges therein. Is this what our Founding Fathers bled and died for? Justice Scalia rightly held that the decision "will make the war harder on us. It will almost certainly cause more Americans to be killed." Revisiting my opening quote, Jefferson was prescient in his understanding that if we allowed a majority of five justices of the Supreme Court to have the

final word on *all* constitutional questions, America will no longer remain a representative republic, but an oligarchy.

ON LAW—ESSAY 12

FLEECING FLORIDA'S LANDOWNERS

June 05, 2008

No part of Florida is more exclusively hers, nor more properly utilized by her people than her beaches.

~ *City of Daytona Beach v. Tona-Rona* (1974)

Outraged at how liberalism and socialism has utterly decimated America's minority populations as well as its cities, towns and villages, I have methodically endeavored to present proven, substantive policy ideas rooted in the original intent of the Constitution's framers, in conservatism, in free-market capitalism and especially in rugged American individualism that has made the USA the greatest country in the history of the world. The critical question I will address here is this: How has America's tragic love affair with socialism and liberalism for the past 75 years, since FDR's "New Deal" impacted America's cities, towns, villages and its citizens in modern times?

My next stop takes us to the state of Florida, particularly the homes adjacent to Florida's storied coastline. One of my readers, "Ed M.," commenting on my article on Birmingham, Ala., and accepting my invitation for others to send me examples of how socialism, liberalism and Leviathan government has affected the quality of life in their areas, submitted the following narrative:

You want cases—look at the heavy hand of the "it's everyone's beach" movement in Florida. People who paid millions for private beaches and hundreds of thousand in property taxes are having the "masses" backed by their cronies in office *take* their property. But the "owners" are still responsible should any trespassers get injured—can't keep them off and are responsible for them—just because you bought something they now want. Disgusting.

As a background to the Florida case, I cite the case of *Kelo v. New London* (2005) where the U.S. Supreme Court in a bitterly divided 5-4

opinion infamously held that the U.S. Constitution allows the taking of private property for *private* economic development. The *Kelo* case is a blatant violation of citizen property rights, also an obvious misinterpretation of the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment, which mandates, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." How could this liberal majority on the Supreme Court allow the city officials of New London, Conn., eminent domain rights over private-property landowners? Answer: So the Court could give the spoils to the private pharmaceutical giant Pfizer Corporation, enabling it to expand. Justice O'Connor, writing the dissenting opinion, rightly called it "Robin Hood in reverse."

Compare this travesty of justice to the complaint by "Ed M." and his sister's increasing concern of blatant encroachment by trespassers of homeowners' private beachfront property in Florida. Right now many of Florida's landowners along the beach are literally being held hostage on their own property by aggressive trespassers who now have the *de facto* right to use the land of another for their own pleasure, while the homeowners are stuck with the taxes and the responsibility to repair any damage to their property done by these lawbreakers. To add insult to injury, craven pols and activist judges in Florida hold innocent landowners legally liable if *any* trespasser is hurt on their land. This is Hobbes's revenge.

Just last week, I wrote about Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), the great atheist philosopher and giant of the Enlightenment whose radical ideas on political philosophy and the nature of government in relation to Man and the State were put forth in his magnum opus, *Leviathan* (1651).¹⁸ Looking at the two issues discussed in this column: 1) radical eminent domain policies sanctioned by the Supreme Court in the 2005 *Kelo* case, and 2) "Ed M." and his dear sister's concern regarding hedonist-seeking trespassers invading homeowners' property all along the Florida coastline, strikes at the heart of one of the great pillars of the American republic—individual property rights. So cherished and sacred was this one idea that America's founders fought and defeated the greatest superpower power of the 18th (and 19th) century, Great Britain.

Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Hamilton, Adams, Mason, Witherspoon, Madison and all of the other Founding Fathers knew that without a Constitution that zealously protected the property rights of its citizens, a king, a pope, a landlord, a tyrant, a battalion of soldiers, or in

modern times, your trespassing neighbor or an oligarchy of five justices on the Supreme Court, could take away your property rights—natural rights founded on natural law precepts that were literally written by the blood of our forefathers.

In an earlier column, I wrote of the essential societal conditions for socialism and Leviathan government to triumph over “We the People”:

Liberalism only prospers where there is angst, societal upheaval, cultural chaos, crime, apostasy, disorder, jealousy, corruption—a zero-sum gain—the idea that all resources are finite, therefore if one group of people appears to be doing well, liberalism teaches another group that *their* success is at *your* expense, and you’ve got to get even.¹⁹

This in a nutshell is Hobbes (and later Rousseau’s) state of nature theory. What you see in the Connecticut and Florida cases above is modern-day liberals, socialists, activist judges, the U.N., political hacks (on both sides of the aisle) and radical special interest groups systematically applying the principles of Hobbes’ “Leviathan” to law, politics, economics, medicine, the environment, public policy, education, culture, society—*Good* simply means getting whatever you want, and *evil* is anything that might stand in your way of getting it. My desires equal my rights.

Show me a monopoly (radical eminent domain, trespassers’ rights) and I’ll show you a tyranny (Florida’s beachfront property belongs to everybody).

ON LAW—ESSAY 13

NO ‘REAL VICTIMS’ IN SPITZER CASE?

March 15, 2008

These laws [criminalizing adult consensual prostitution] may be sins, but there are no real victims, except for family members.

~ Alan Dershowitz

I first met Alan Dershowitz 20 years ago while a graduate student at Harvard. Then, I was thinking about suspending my graduate studies in music history and to go law school; therefore, I took a couple of law courses to see if it would be a good fit for me. This was also during the ascendancy of the Rev. Al Sharpton and the case of Tawana Brawley, a 15-year-old black girl from New York who received national attention

when she claimed that some white men kidnapped her, sexually assaulted and abused her by chopping off her hair, wrote "NIGGER" and "KKK" on her body and smeared her with feces. Although later it was conclusively proven to be a tragic fraud, it launched the political career of that false prophet, "the Rev." Al Sharpton.

In late 1988 or early 1989, one of Brawley's attorneys, C. Vernon Mason, was invited to Harvard Law School to discuss the Brawley case at a faculty/student assembly. About a third of the way through his speech Dershowitz strolls in with about three or four students in tow covered in winter attire. He walks right up to the front of the hall and sits down off to the right. I didn't think much of his appearance and was kind of perturbed that he so rudely interrupted the speaker, but I later understood this swagger as being vintage Der-SHOW-itz. After Mason finished speaking, he took questions. Dershowitz then launched into his obviously pre-planned diatribe against Brawley's attorney, basically characterizing him and his case as a complete fraud. Although history has proven Dershowitz right on this count, decorum suggests he could have been a little more discrete with an invited guest to the law school. This was my first encounter with Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz.

As you can see, Dershowitz has a flare for the dramatic. He displayed that skill again Monday on all the major TV shows and later in articles in the Jewish magazine *Forward* and the *Wall Street Journal*, where he further explained his controversial opinion about Spitzer's 10-year affair with prostitutes that recently caused him to resign in disgrace as governor of New York. It was once again vintage Dershowitz, insisting that people need to: "[T]ake a collective deep breath and try to regain a sense of proportion about the essentially private actions of this public man." ²⁰

We are a nation of hypocrites who publicly proclaim against acts that so many of the proclaimers perform in private. Yes, Eliot Spitzer can be charged with hypocrisy for prosecuting prostitution rings while patronizing prostitutes himself. . . . But . . . forcing him to resign or using vague criminal statutes to prosecute him for federal crimes for which no one is prosecuted would constitute an abuse of the political and criminal processes. Oh, that Dershowitz would have exercised such magnanimity for Clarence Thomas in 1991 during his Supreme Court confirmation hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, or for *any* Republican

president going back to Nixon!—but all we heard from the good professor was intellectual partisanship, vitriol and demagoguery.

You must understand, dear reader, that Dershowitz is an unabashed liberal academic and has no use for conservatives, Republicans or what he and many of his Ivy League colleagues consider biased, ignorant and irrelevant ideas. At this point, Dershowitz takes his exalted position as a law professor at Harvard and descends into the purgatory of liberal hypocrisy. It's not enough for Dershowitz to exonerate Spitzer—a notoriously vindictive, ambitious, arrogant, narcissistic and evil man—for the delicious paradox of being hoisted upon his own petard that he himself built for others to hang upon. But to add insult to injury, Dershowitz arrogantly lectures America, calling us “a nation of hypocrites” because we dare to “publicly proclaim against acts that so many of the proclaimers perform in private.” This is beyond the pale.

Dershowitz, a Jew, and like me, a strong advocate of the nation of Israel, should know better than most from his own people's storied history, which is indelibly chronicled in the Torah, that a nation that forsakes “the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” for the expediency of political power, position, privilege, riches or lust will soon fall into the abyss of infamy. The prophet Hosea warned Old Testament Israel: “They have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind.”

Dershowitz continues his apology (argument) for Spitzer:

There is another issue that is potentially quite troubling in this case. The story about how Spitzer's alleged crimes were discovered does not ring true. . . . I strongly suspect that we will learn more about how the feds came to focus on Spitzer's financial transactions. The money laundering statute is so vague and open-ended that it can be used selectively to target political and economic opponents. On this issue, stay tuned. We have not heard the last of it.²¹

As a nation we must learn how to distinguish between sin and crime, between activities that endanger the public and those that harm only the actor and his family. The criminal law should be reserved for serious predatory misconduct. There is an old expression: “When you don't have the law on your side, argue the facts. When you have neither the law nor the facts on your side, just argue.” After attacking America for being religious prudes, Dershowitz now impugnes the motives and tactics of the feds, claiming they have a personal vendetta or a political

ax to grind. I believe that neither are true in that Spitzer was hated (and feared) by politicians on both sides of the aisle.

Dershowitz continues his apology (argument) on behalf of a champion of liberalism, Gov. Eliot Spitzer:

The laws criminalizing adult consensual prostitution—especially with \$5,000-an-hour call girls—are as anachronistic as the old laws that used to criminalize adultery, fornication, homosexuality and even masturbation. These *may* be sins, but *there are no real victims*, except for family members.²²

Here, Dershowitz attacks the very foundation of the Ten Commandments by Moses from where the moral-based laws in America's legal system originated as being outdated and irrelevant. In an earlier piece on Dershowitz's Harvard law school colleague, Laurence Tribe, I also strongly criticized Tribe for brazenly perverting the rule of law. Tribe not only advocates the legalization of partial-birth abortion, homosexual sodomy and same-sex marriage, but he ridicules traditional marriage today as "constitutionally suspect" and a "federal constitutional issue."

It is the same intellectual war strategy liberal academics have waged against society since they successfully separated morality (Judeo-Christianity) from science by deifying Charles Darwin's "theory of evolution." For the past 150 years, Darwin's theories have disseminated Western societies as they have infiltrated every discipline of the academy and intellectual thought—from philosophy, science, medicine, law, to economics, education, business, politics, art, culture, even the United Nations and beyond.

Dershowitz and Tribe's view of the rule of law must not carry the day because according to Dershowitz's apology on the Spitzer affair, "there are no real victims." However, the real victims here will be the rule of law and the deconstruction of society if Spitzer and other powerful men can successfully escape the bar of justice simply because Dershowitz says so.

ON LAW—ESSAY 14

A 'REASONABLE PERSON' IN AN UNREASONABLE WORLD

February 16, 2008

The law does not attempt to see men as God sees them.

~ Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes

Prologue

What happens to the efficacy of the law when a primary standard of constitutional review is undermined by the very law itself? Does it explode? Does it implode? . . . or does the law just devolve into the abyss of the lowest common denominator? What I am referring to is the reasonable man or reasonable person standard, which is a frequently used legal term that originated in the development of the common law. The "reasonable person" is a hypothetical character who is theoretically supposed to represent a sort of "average" citizen. The capacity of this hypothetical person to understand matters is associated with the procedure of making sound legal decisions. The question "How would a reasonable person act under the same or similar circumstances" performs a critical role in legal reasoning in areas such as constitutional law, negligence (torts) and contract law.

The rationale for the reasonable person standard is that the law will promote the general welfare when it serves its reasonable members, and thus a practical function of the law is sought, along with planning, working, or getting along with others. The reasonable person is not automatically the "average person"; it is not a "democratic" standard. To foresee the correct sense of responsibility and other measures of the reasonable person, "what is reasonable" has to be the crucial inquiry. Indeed, but what happens to the foundation of the law when a "reasonable person," a legislator or a judge, is not only unreasonable, but may even be a little crazy?

The Reasonable Man in the Common Law

The common law case that gave us the modern view of the reasonable person standard was the 1837 English case *Vaughan v. Menlove*. In that case, the court rejected an argument by the defendant's lawyers that the defendant should be found negligent only if he failed to act "bona fide to the best of his judgment; if he had, he ought not to be responsible for the misfortune of not possessing the highest order of intelligence." The court reasoned that such a standard would be too subjective and therefore ruled that the better test was whether the defendant had exhibited "a regard to caution such as a man of ordinary prudence would observe."

Justice Holmes and the Reasonable Man

According to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes (1841-1935), the reasonable-person standard originated from the necessity that life in an organized society mandated "a certain average of conduct," saying that "a sacrifice of individual peculiarities going beyond a certain point, is necessary to the general welfare." Following the court's reasoning in *Vaughn v. Menlove*, Holmes contends that "the law does not attempt to see men as God sees them." Following Justice Holmes' reasoning, subsequent legal opinions found that in the law there is a reasonable-person standard for children. In most states, children under the age of 6 or 7 are exempt lacking sufficient capacity to know right from wrong. Children from 7 to 17 are usually held to a reasonable-person standard that takes their age into account, unless a child is involved in an adult activity such as driving a motor boat or involved in criminal activity. Also, there is a reasonable-person standard for doctors. If a doctor misdiagnoses a patient, the question is not, "Was that diagnosis wrong?" but rather, "Would a professional acting under the same circumstances, with the knowledge available to the field at the time of the diagnosis, have concluded that the given diagnosis was reasonable?"

Judge Learned Hand and the Reasonable Person as Cost-Benefit Analyst

The conception of reasonableness that is most familiar to contemporary law students was introduced by Judge Learned Hand (1872-1961) in the famous 1947 case *United States v. Carroll Towing*:

[T]he owner's duty, as in other similar situations, to provide against resulting injuries is a function of three variables: 1) The probability that she will break away; 2) the gravity of the resulting injury, if she does; 3) the burden of adequate precautions. Possibly it serves to bring this notion into relief to state it in algebraic terms: If the probability be called P ; the injury, L ; and the burden, B ; liability depends upon whether B is less than L multiplied by P : i.e., whether B less than PL .²³

The meaning of the Learned Hand $B < P \times L$ formula is controversial, but one convincing reading of Carroll Towing is that it adopts cost-benefit analysis as the test for negligence. The reasonable person, so the story goes, analyzes the costs and benefits of her actions and does not act in such a way so as to impose costs that are not justified by their benefits. Economists might associate the Hand formula with what the economic concept of efficiency popularized by appeals court judge Richard A. Posner.

Aristotle, Natural Law and the Reasonable Man

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) taught another approach to the "reasonable person." He and his followers believed that virtue jurisprudence or the natural law view is derivative from Aristotelian moral theory (or virtue ethics)—the idea that the central standard for morality is the "virtuous agent," the person who possesses the moral and intellectual virtues. What are these virtues? The moral virtues include characteristics such as morality, courage, good-temper and temperance. The intellectual virtues are *sophia* (theoretical wisdom) and *phronesis* (practical wisdom). A criticism with a natural law conception of the reasonable person standard is that this standard seems too demanding. The Aristotelian person of virtue is a *phronimos*, not a person of average ability but rather possessed of an extraordinary capacity to evaluate and choose.

In conclusion, the reasonable person is the judge or legislator that endeavors to see through another's eyes, and in regards of the facts of a given situation attempts to remove every petty human tendency and unrealistic desire, as a balancing test. However, this characterization of the reasonable person leaves no room for a heroic or a transcendent use of law. How can there be limits on efforts to prevent the negligent loss of life or limb, prejudiced in favor of a cold, economic calculus of loss demonstrative of a Judge Hand or the secular humanist view of Justice Holmes to determine when human life is "worth it?" Advocates of the

“reasonable person” standard defend it as an exercise in approaching objectivity, while critics see it as another form of political correctness. I hold the latter view; however, in a previous article I strongly argued that the acronym “PC” should stand not for political correctness, but for “perversity correctness.”²⁴

Epilogue

The word “aspire” means to reach for something higher than yourself. For over 2,500 years the classical tradition following the Aristotle-natural law paradigm understood law as an aspiration to the transcendent—otherwise who would follow it? Likewise in history, many of our greatest kings, jurists, heroes and civilizations have followed this credo. I strongly disagree with Justice Holmes’ view of the reasonable person who contends that “the law does not attempt to see men as God sees them,” for that secular humanist view, although popular with most modern judges, law professors and legislators, is nevertheless born out of a profound cynicism that has nurtured modern liberalism—a separation of law from morality—and unless remedied it will inevitably lead beyond the deconstruction of the original intent of the Constitution’s framers to the collapse of the rule of law and society.

ON LAW—ESSAY 15

ARE YOUR 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHTS SAFE?

February 09, 2008

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

~ Second Amendment, U.S. Constitution (1789)

. . . Madison did not invent the right to keep and bear arms when he drafted the Second Amendment—the right was pre-existing at both common law and in the early state constitutions.

~ Thomas B. McAfee & Michael J. Quinlan, *North Carolina Law Review* (March 1997)

If you think your Second Amendment rights are secure, think again. The Bush administration recently appears to be openly at odds with the

Second Amendment on two counts. First, on Jan. 8, President Bush inconspicuously signed the Veterans Disarmament Act (H.R.2640) sponsored by Rep. Carolyn McCarthy, D-N.Y. This anti-gun bill, created in the atmosphere of the Virginia Tech massacre (April 16, 2007), is designed to make the screening process much tougher for gun ownership; a law that is particularly burdensome for our veterans. Second, last month, Rep. Virgil Goode, R-Va., sent the following letter to the White House asking the administration to undo the enormous damage it will potentially cause the Second Amendment with the amicus brief president Bush's solicitor general filed in support of the D.C. gun ban case, *D.C. v. Heller* (2008).

Jan. 22, 2008

President George W. Bush
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington DC 20500

Dear President Bush:

Your solicitor general has just filed a brief with the U.S. Supreme Court in the *D.C. v. Heller* case arguing that categorical gun bans of virtually all self-defense firearms are constitutional if a court determines they are "reasonable"—the lowest standard of constitutional review.

If this view prevails, a national ban on all firearms—including hunting rifles—could be constitutional, even if the court decides—on ample historical evidence—that the Founders intended the Second Amendment as an individual right.

I would ask that you direct the Justice Department to withdraw this unfortunate brief and to replace it with an opinion which reflects the right of law-abiding Americans to keep and bear arms.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Virgil Goode

Rep. Goode is not stopping there, but is urging all members of Congress to join his cause and sign the above letter, which he will resend to President Bush as a show of solidarity and outrage at the administration's blatant harassment directed toward gun owners of every category—from individual U.S. veterans that carry guns for personal protection

of home and family, to general gun owners, hunters, recreational gun users and beyond.

Gun Owners of America, or GOA, a grass-roots lobby organization representing over 300,000 Americans, has called on the Bush administration to withdraw its anti-gun brief recently filed with the U.S. Supreme Court. Executive Director Larry Pratt and his Second Amendment rights organization is on the case. They are aggressively pursuing the Heller case, and two weeks ago their legal and educational arm, Gun Owners Foundation, officially notified the Court of its intent to file its own *amicus curiae* ("friend of the court") brief. GOA has promised to make that brief available to the American public as soon as it is filed. In the meantime, on Jan. 18 GOA issued a press release strongly criticizing the solicitor general's action against American's fundamental Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. What is especially galling to me is that this deliberate treachery is not by a liberal Jimmy Carter or Bill Clinton administration, but by a George W. Bush "conservative" administration. The administration's brief argued that any gun ban—no matter how broad and extensive—could be constitutional if some court determines that ban is "reasonable."

In constitutional law, "a reasonable person is the jurist or legislator that pretends to see through another's eyes, and in light of the characteristics of a given situation tries to subtract every petty human trait and unrealistic expectation, as a balancing test." The problem with using the reasonable test in determining statutory legitimacy is that it leaves no room for a heroic or transcendent use of law. Therefore, a biased judge, under a cold economic calculus, can deny millions of Americans their Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms and be perfectly within the law if *he alone* deems the anti-gun statute as "reasonable." I call that tyranny!

The solicitor general's proposition that comprehensive gun bans are constitutional if some court interprets that gun ban as "reasonable" was welcomed with glee by anti-gun organizations across America—almost certainly because it signifies the *lowest* standard of constitutional review and thus the easiest way to pass constitutional muster with any court. To counter the Bush administration's anti-gun brief, GAO's Pratt said in the press release, "If the Supreme Court were to accept the solicitor general's line of argument, D.C.'s categorical gun ban of nearly all self-defense firearms possibly will be determined to be constitutional, despite if the

court, as expected, determines that the Second Amendment protects 'individual' rights."

Pratt further argued that, "In contrast to other provisions in the Bill of Rights, which can only be violated by 'compelling state interests,' the Second Amendment would be relegated to an inferior position at the lowest rung of the constitutional ladder, should the Justice Department prevail." "Rather than argue that 'shall not be infringed' is a categorical prohibition on government gun-banning, the administration has chosen to align itself with those who do not believe in self-defense or civilian gun ownership," Pratt concluded. As a consequence, GOA is making this widespread public call for the Justice Department to vacate its anti-gun brief, and requested that the National Rifle Association join it in combating the Veteran Disarmament Act.

If you wish to fight against this blatant assault on American's Second Amendment right "to keep and bear arms," please go to the Gun Owners Legislative Action Center to send a pre-written message urging your representative to be a part of this important initiative to protect our Second Amendment rights.²⁵ Why? Because the Constitution's framers understood from their own bloody, personal and protracted war against the naked tyranny of King George III that it is much easier for a monarch or the State to infringe on the people's liberty where the citizenry are unarmed, than to attack an armed, informed and vigilant "We the People."

ON LAW—ESSAY 16

TYRANNY OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

January 12, 2008

My study found that Clinton nominees had more than 10 times better odds of getting the ABA's highest rating than similarly credentialed Bush appointees . . . In short, being nominated by Bill Clinton was a stronger positive variable than any other credential or than all other credentials put together.

~ Professor James Lindgren, Northwestern University School of Law

Show me a monopoly, and I'll show you a tyranny.

~ Ellis Washington (*Unpublished Thoughts*, 2007)

In a prescient article on the American Bar Association, "Yes, the ABA Rankings are Biased," Northwestern University law professor James Lindgren compiled a remarkable study outlining the clear-and-present bias of the ABA against judicial nominees to the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court, made by a Republican president, as compared to the judicial nominees of a Democrat president. The differences were so prejudiced that his findings were beyond rational argument.

Lindgren writes:

Although 62 percent of Clinton's 66 confirmed appellate nominees got the ABA's highest rating of unanimously "Well Qualified," only five of the first 11 new Bush nominees—45%—have received the highest ABA rating, the same percentage that confirmed nominees received under the administration of the elder Bush.

At the end of the day, one nagging question remains: Why hasn't the ABA itself noticed the large political differences in its evaluative processes and worked harder to understand, explain or eliminate them? Now that there are hard data that support the claims of its critics, it would be good to see fewer denials and more introspection and reform.²⁶

This brings me to address the following questions: 1) What is the ABA? 2) Why does the ABA have so much power over law school accreditation and a 50-state mandated bar admissions requirement? 3) Why does America allow the ABA to judge the competence of the president's judicial nominees? 4) To shape and control policy over a host of law areas from constitutional law, torts, contracts, family law and trial litigation to patents, trademarks, bankruptcy, corporations and recently, environmental law?

The American Bar Association, founded 130 years ago on Aug. 21, 1878, like many associations that came of age during the Victorian and Progressive eras, did so without the president, Congress, the courts or the Constitution granting them their power. They merely assumed power. The ABA was suppose to be a *voluntary* bar association of lawyers and law students, which was not specific to any jurisdiction in the United States, yet today it lords over them all. Originally, the ABA was little more than an elitist club for white upper-class males that only until very

recently actively shunned women, blacks and foreigners from its leadership ranks.

The ABA has monopolist mandates: for example, the bar exam requirement in all 50 states. It controls academic and accreditation standards for law schools, and the formulation of model ethical codes related to the legal profession. Presently, the ABA has close to a half million members (roughly 50 percent of all lawyers). Regarding the ABA's monopolistic stranglehold over law schools, the courts and America's legal system, the government brought an Article 1 Sherman Act violation against the ABA to try to lessen the ABA's leviathan domination over all aspects of our legal system and law schools in the case: *United States of America v. American Bar Association* (D.C. 1995). Although the U.S. District Court ruled against the ABA and placed many new checks on its powers, the overall effect of this case has been business as usual.

The ABA claims that "ABA accreditation is important not only because it affects the recognition of the law schools involved, but it also impacts a graduate's ability to practice law in a particular state." However, this is circular reasoning: Who concocted the ABA in the first place and seized power over law school accreditation and academic standards? That's right, the ABA. The ABA's mandate that all 50 states require graduation from an ABA-accredited law school is an ironclad prerequisite for being allowed to sit for that state's bar exam, and even for existing lawyers to be admitted to the bar of another state upon motion. This is a monopoly. This is tyranny.

What's the purpose of going to law school, paying tens of thousands of dollars, giving up three or four years of your life, taking dozens and dozens of law school exams only to be required after graduating from law school to take another test—the bar exam? An exam that many experts have claimed for decades has no association or relevance whatsoever with what students learned *in law school*. Either law school or the ABA has got to go! In my view, the ABA is a diabolical and needless layer of bureaucracy that has little to no effect in maintaining academic excellence or indicating success as a lawyer, and most people know that one of the least regarded (and most powerful) professions in America is the law profession.

Politically-speaking, the ABA is an extreme leftist, special-interest group with a strong liberal bias regarding its philosophy, interpreting the Constitution and *against* giving excellent conservative appellate and

Supreme Court nominees a "highly qualified" rating. For example, the ABA gave Ronald Reagan's judicial nominees, Richard Posner and Frank H. Easterbrook, low "qualified/not qualified" ratings; later, the ABA gave Bill Clinton judicial nominees with similar resumes "well-qualified" ratings. Meanwhile, Judge Posner (a beloved mentor of mine), and Easterbrook, who took over as chief judge from Posner of the 7th Circuit in Chicago, have gone on to become the two most highly cited judges in the federal appellate judiciary.

In July 2006, an ABA task force under then-President Michael S. Greco released a report concluding that George W. Bush's use of "signing statements" violates the Constitution. These are documents attached by the president to bills he signs in which he states that he will enforce the new law *only to the extent that he feels the law conforms to the Constitution*. The ABA's anti-signing statement policy shows the intellectual vacuity of the leadership of this organization and goes to the heart of my argument that the ABA should be abolished, for it has led to the downfall of our entire legal system. What unmitigated arrogance does the ABA have in thinking that it can force the president of the United States to sign and enforce laws attached to *any* congressional bills that he (or any rational person) knows are obviously unconstitutional? Over the past 35 years, the ABA has also drawn criticism from numerous conservative and libertarian groups for taking positions on controversial public policy issues such as abortion, capital punishment, gun control, border enforcement, judicial activism and the limits of presidential authority. This blatant partisanship of the ABA's official non-partisan position in favor of abortion rights led to the formation of an alternative organization for lawyers—the National Lawyers Association.

In conclusion, why should the ABA be abolished? In addition to all the reasons cited above, the ABA is driving up law-tuition costs, actively creating a litigious society and is basically a needless, bloated, self-serving bureaucracy whose leadership and membership contain a bunch of self-important, shyster lawyers who in many cases aren't in the least interested in "improving the legal system for the public," but merely lust after money, power, prestige and privilege by mandating obedience to this relatively small organization that wields such disproportionate amount of political power by no other authority than by its own self-aggrandizing decrees. As stated in the opening quote, any man, woman

or organization that has such a comprehensive, monopolistic influence as the ABA, in my opinion is equal to a tyranny.

ON LAW—ESSAY 17

THE TREACHERY OF *BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION*

January 05, 2008

The *Brown* opinion forever created in the minds of American society that black people are not equal to white people based on the moral suppositions of the Constitution.

~ Ellis Washington, "A Voice Crying Out in the Wilderness: A Word about *Brown v. Board of Education*"

Racial integration was the battle cry of the hour in the 1950s. No one thought about what would happen to black schools.

~ Dr. Margaret Just Butcher, Board member, Washington, D.C., Public Schools

Last week, I was visiting an excellent website by one of my most avid supporters called, "Center for a Constitutional Republic." Of the many interesting article and book links he features was an article that I read many years ago by one of my intellectual mentors, Dr. Thomas Sowell, "The Education of Minority Children." ²⁷ In this classic 1974 article, Sowell chronicles the true history of black educational achievement pre-1954. *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), that landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court, overturned earlier rulings going back to *Plessey v. Ferguson* (1896) by declaring that state laws which established separate public schools for black and white students denied black children equal educational opportunities. ²⁸

Brown is arguably the most important and venerated Supreme Court decision of the 20th century and tantamount to holy scripture by most liberals. Nevertheless, Sowell's article obliterates the primary assumptions of *Brown v. Board of Education*—that black children *must* be allowed to attend public school with white children in order to get a good (or equal) education. Sowell writes:

Back in 1899, in Washington, D.C., there were four academic public high schools—one black and three white. In standardized tests given that year, students in the black high school averaged higher scores than students in two of the three white high schools.

This was not a fluke. It so happens that I have followed 85 years of the history of this black high school—from 1870 to 1955—and found it repeatedly equaling or exceeding national norms on standardized tests. . . . [Dunbar High School's] academic performances on standardized tests remained good on into the mid-1950s.

The year 1954 was a critical one at Dunbar and for black high schools all over America as black parents foolishly believed the utopian propaganda of Brown and desperately tried to integrate their kids into white schools to get a “good education.” It was all a heartbreaking Faustian bargain white liberals made with black elites like the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall and the civil-rights establishment—a deal with the devil my people have been paying dearly for over 54 years as black educational achievement plummets year after year.²⁹

Black people, as well as the press, liberals and conservatives alike, thought the unanimous opinion in *Brown* would usher in the classical age of black educational achievement—but did it? Not in the least. *Brown* was the right decision, but utilized the wrong judicial reasoning because it failed to rely on the explicit text of the Constitution and thus became a terrible miscarriage of justice, a treachery against black people that evolved into an insurmountable barrier to their aspirations to obtain quality education that exist to this day.

Outraged at *Brown's* disastrous and racist legacy, four years ago I wrote a series of law review articles highly critical of *Brown* that received some notice from the academy. Below are the reasons I outlined for the shameful legacy of *Brown*:

1. There is not a single judicial precedent in the entire Brown opinion. The Court merely applied the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the 14th Amendment to the states. This judge-created rule, which originated in the 1940s, has no legitimate constitutional foundation and is referred to as *the incorporation doctrine*.
2. The Brown opinion was based on the political pressures of the day, not on universal principles like the rule of law, natural law, morality, equality under the law, justice, or truth.
3. The Brown opinion was based on the false social science theories of *racial relativism* (all people are equal no matter what they do) and *radical*

liberalism (separation of morality from public policy). The Court even cited what later proved to be the flawed scientific research of Drs. Kenneth and Mamie Phipps Clark. Their research on color and dolls was critical in persuading the Court to adopt the then-radical public policy remedy of racial integration of the public schools in America. Once again, right decision, wrong reasoning.

4. The *Brown* opinion was founded on purely positive law grounds (secular, man-made law), rather than on natural law grounds (morality/legality integrated in the Judeo-Christian intellectual tradition) or on constitutional grounds (particularly the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause, and the 14th Amendment Privileges and Immunities and Equal Protection Clauses).

5. The Court refused to utilize any of the arguments against the evils of racial segregation that the abolitionists had used for over 130 years because their ideas were based on morality and affirmed the dignity of all God's creation—including black people. The Court thought that the abolitionists' reasoning that black people were equal to white people based on natural law, moral, religious or humanitarian grounds as fanatical, provincial and unsophisticated.

6. The humanistic and New Age language the Court used conveyed the idea that segregation in education must end in America because to keep segregated schools based on race would "hurt the feelings" of "Negroes," and their "self-esteem" and "educational success" would be hindered. In one telling passage, the Court quoted from the researcher's brief, which was included in the arguments the NAACP presented to the Court: "To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a *"feeling of inferiority"* as to their *"status in the community"* that may *"affect their hearts and minds* in a way unlikely ever to be undone."³⁰

This type of pop psychology masquerading as legal reasoning the Court used in the 1954 *Brown* decision was totally fraudulent *then* as it is totally fraudulent *now*—lacking in any legitimate judicial precedent, a valid historical context, or plausible constitutional foundation. The unintelligent public policy presupposes that black people, prior to 1954, were totally uneducated, ignorant and (*in slave dialect voice*): *Just waiting for Masser to open up the school house door so us poor Negroes can finally get educated by going to school with the white folks.* This logic that is beyond the pale. The horrible assumptions *Brown* makes about Black people should be publicly denounced by all rational persons of any race, class, or creed. But alas, I am sad to report that the few sounds besides Dr. Sowell and

my voice crying out in the wilderness for Reason regarding *Brown* is their—the judiciary, Congress, the executive branch, the teachers unions, the academy, the legal community, the civil-rights activists, race merchants, poverty pimps—silence of the lambs.

ON LAW—ESSAY 18

MIKE NIFONG AND THE SIN OF AMBITION

May 12, 2007

The problem with guys like you is that you don't realize who you are . . . you got ambition.

~ John Shaft from the movie *Shaft* (2000), dialogue with a two-bit drug dealer

Finally, on April 11, all charges against the three Duke lacrosse players were dropped. All rational people of goodwill knew this day would come. We had suspicion of it going back to Jan. 14 when that shyster district attorney from Durham, N.C., Mike “NiFraud” Nifong, was forced to resign as prosecutor in the now infamous rape case, due to increasing public pressure and a lack of evidence as his case collapsed at his feet like Nebuchadnezzar's image with feet of iron mingled with clay. Although much has been written about this villainous prosecutor, here I would like to address a subtext of this ignominious, Shakespearean drama from tobacco road—the seductiveness of ambition.

On one level Mike Nifong is no different from the average Joe. A man of marginal-to-average skills who went to college at the University of N.C.-Chapel Hill, then three years later to the University of North Carolina law school, achieving more than even his classmates or colleagues thought. After several years doing odd jobs where he even volunteered as a non-paying assistant DA, he worked his way up through the ranks until he was appointed DA of Durham, N.C., by Gov. Mike Easley in April 2005. Durham, the city that boasted one of the most prestigious law schools in America—Duke University. What a story! A hometown boy makes it big. Nifong had arrived. He was the man. He

was like Richard the Lionhearted . . . yet there was a small chink in his armor.

Nifong was well on the road to achieving a successful and respectable law career before the Duke rape case came across his desk. We all know the facts, so I won't repeat them. What is important is that Nifong's craven, arrogant, perverse nature came into shining display when, after the alleged rape allegations were first made against the entire Duke lacrosse team, but later reduced to three students: David Evans, 23, Collin Finnerty, 20 and Reade Seligmann, 20, Nifong grandstanded. This was his first step into the abyss.

At the urging of the usual suspects—the propaganda media, the political hacks of the Congressional Black Caucus, black demagogue leaders like Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson, the majority of the Durham black community were whipped up into an irrational frenzy. Sensing a book deal, an appearance on Oprah and a Hollywood moment, Nifong rushed to judgment against these boys before the trial commenced, judging them publicly before he had all the evidence. Nifong realized from the beginning that the evidence he possessed against these three Duke students was flimsy at best, non-existent at worst—but welcome to the Alice and Wonderland world of liberal politics where up is down, down is up, good is evil, and evidence isn't an impediment to discovering the truth (against the right defendant).

To this ambitious DA, all the elements for a conviction were there—a house full of rich, horny, white college boys, a poor, vulnerable black maiden who was forced to perform demeaning dances for their lustful entertainment, sex, gang rape, interracial entanglements, a public mob yelling for blood, a shyster lawyer out to make a name for himself—what further evidence do we need? Armed with this new liberal perversity paradigm, Mike “NiFraud” fraudulently, cravenly and with Machiavelian tactics publicly championed the alleged rape victim's case, which he knew to be utterly untrue. He knew the alleged victim was no Joan of Arc and merited closer scrutiny, which is why he refused to even interview her, lest he be on notice of the truth. (To the ambitious, ignorance is always bliss.) Even the other dancer (Kim Roberts) refuted the alleged victims' account and claimed the accuser, Crystal Gail Mangum, tried to get her join in the conspiracy that *they both* were raped. She refused.

With re-election only a few weeks away, Nifong vigorously hit the black church circuit (Durham having a large black population of about

40 percent) and played on racial hatred, class envy and economic resentment against those rich white Duke college boys. Like America's dark, racist history of unrestrained white mob trials of the slavery and segregation eras, the blacks of Durham were blinded by their own racism and overwhelmingly re-elected Nifong. The fix was in. The DNA test results, (which for six months Nifong and the DNA analyst conspired to keep hidden from the defense lawyers), not only presented definitive evidence that *none* of the three Duke defendants had violated the rape victim; it definitely showed that *none* of the 45 Duke lacrosse players who were at the party appeared on Ms. Mangum. However, there was semen of five other men in her vagina and anus, one of which presumably had now fathered her third child, which was born in January 2007.

Ambition, which should be considered the eighth deadly sin, had driven this lawyer with a respectable academic background, but mediocre lawyer skills and intelligence, into the abyss of humiliation and infamy with the worst yet to come. In the end, what has ambition done to this diminutive liberal lawyer with an oversize ego? He abused the power of his office for craven political purposes, ruined the lives of three innocent young men and exploited the black voters of Durham, bamboozling them to re-elect him into the DA's office with the promise that justice would be served. He forgot to tell the black voters just one thing: Justice will indeed be served; however, it won't be served on the innocent Duke lacrosse players, but on Mike NiFraud's hoary head.

ON LAW—ESSAY 19

JUDGES GONE WILD

November 03, 2007

There was in a city a judge, which feared not God neither regarded man.

~ Saint Luke

The Constitution isn't a suicide pact.

~ Justice Robert H. Jackson

In our modern, post-Christian, post-monarchy, post-Enlightenment, post-rational society, the closest thing our humanist culture has to a “god” is the judge. In 1907, Chief Justice Charles Evan Hughes famously remarked, “We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judge says it is.” Case closed! This inimical judicial philosophy was enshrined early in American constitutional law by that controversial Supreme Court decision authored by Chief Justice John Marshall, *Marbury v. Madison* (1803). The *Marbury* opinion invented out of whole cloth what latter became known as the doctrine of “judicial review” and gave to judges what was traditionally a limited and discrete power to now with godlike authority dictate what the law *is* (judicial interpretation). But here is the diabolical part: Where no law existed, or the law was vague about what Congress intended, this newly created Super Judge (whom law professor Ronald Dworkin calls “Hercules”) could decree to We the People—the ignorant, unwashed masses—what the law *ought* to be. The radical effects on constitutional law, on jurisprudence, on the rule of law, on society caused by the *Marbury v. Madison* decision over 200 years ago are still being felt in modern times, with more horrible consequences to come.

Judge Gone Wild No. 1: Roy L. Pearson Jr.

Last week, Roy L. Pearson Jr., the judge that infamously sued a mom and pop dry cleaners for \$54 million for allegedly loosing his pants that he brought in for \$10.50 worth of alterations, has served two years on the bench of the Office of Administrative Hearings. Thankfully, the case against Custom Cleaners and the Chungs was decided in their favor in June. However, because of mounting legal expenses due to Judge Pearson’s frivolous and outrageous lawsuit against them, the Chungs were forced to sell their cleaners where the incident occurred. Although Pearson’s two-year term was up in May, remarkably he still remains on the payroll at a \$100,000 annual salary as an “attorney adviser.” However, the Commission on Selection and Tenure of Administrative Law Judges finally decided last Tuesday evening not to reappoint him. All they have to do is send him a formal letter.

Judge Pearson isn’t as much of an aberration, as the mainstream legal community would have you to believe. Sure, \$54 million is outrageously exorbitant, but setting the monetary value aside, Pearson’s action was ultimately an attempted rape of our legal system, a violation of

his sacred oath as a judge. Like that shyster ex-DA from Durham, N.C., who brought bogus rape charges against three Duke lacrosse players (Mike Nifong),³¹ we can only hope that Judge Pearson will not only never work as a judge again, but like his ideological twin, he will eventually be disbarred. Clearly, he has some cognitive issues that need immediate attention by a neutral and dispassionate professional.

Judge Gone Wild No. 2: John Coughenour

In January of this year, federal appeals court Judge John Coughenour, using *Marbury* jurisprudence, vacated a sentence against none other than Ahmed Ressam, the Algerian Muslim who tried unsuccessfully to blow up the Los Angeles International Airport. But for the sharp eye of a U.S.-Canadian border agent, this terrorist would have brought in the 21st century with a big bang for the U.S. In an Associated Press story that came out on Wednesday about the Ressam case, which is being appealed by the Justice Department to the Supreme Court, the reporter wrote:

The U.S. Supreme Court has been asked to intervene in what federal prosecutors say is a procedural gaffe that led to a too-lenient sentence for a terrorist who brought explosive devices into Port Angeles in 1999. A federal appellate court's decision to toss one of the charges against Ahmed Ressam—an Algerian national who trained in one of the Afghanistan camps of Osama bin Laden before going to Canada—could “significantly diminish” the government's ability to prosecute terrorists, the Justice Department wrote Thursday in asking the Supreme Court to take the case. Ressam was sentenced to 22 years in prison in 2005 after being convicted on nine counts for plotting to bomb Los Angeles International Airport around Jan. 1, 2000—more than one and a half years before the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York and outside of Washington, D.C. Prosecutors had asked for at least 35 years in federal prison.³²

Political analyst Michelle Malkin, writing on her blog about the Ressam case and Judge Coughenour, whom she called “Hitler's little helper,” stated:

Whatever the message the judge hoped to send, the one he in fact did send was to Islamicists all around the globe: Come to America. Try and kill us. Either you succeed and get to your version of heaven, or you'll get a second chance 22 years later after spending a couple of dec-

ades setting up networks that can help you with round 2. . . . I am ashamed to say Judge Coughenour is a Reagan appointee.

In 2005, Malkin states that Coughenour was the original judge that came up with the 22-year sentence initially and, despite the urging of his colleagues, refused to justify his legal reasoning. Incredulously, he sent the case back to the lower court for them to justify why *he* (Coughenour) gave Ressam a 22-year sentence in the first place. If you are confused, dear reader, then so am I.

Judge Gone Wild No. 3: Justice Stephen Breyer

Justice Stephen Breyer, in a CNN interview with former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in late 2006, was unusually candid about his vision of a Supreme Court oligarchy when he stated: "The best guarantee that minorities will not be oppressed, that the Constitution will be lived up to, is to give that very last word—under narrow circumstances—to a group of judges." He later said, "Someone has to have the last word." Yes, Justice Breyer, I agree that someone has to have the last word. However, while your only job as a justice of the Supreme Court is to *interpret* the Constitution, the legislature (Congress), elected by their voting constituencies (We the People), under our republic, must have the last word on not only what the law *is*, but what the law *ought* to be. Remember the words of Justice Robert Jackson, who said, "The Constitution isn't a suicide pact." In my opinion, a cadre of five justices having the omnipotence to force Americans to be or not to be is a suicide pact. America, if we fail in our duty to reign in these renegade judges at *all* levels, our culture will always be held hostage by the "Tyranny of One," and society will increasingly witness these alarming examples of judges gone wild.

ON LAW—ESSAY 20

COMMON LAW VS. CONTINENTAL LAW: RULES VS. TRUTH

December 29, 2007

The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered.

~ Justice Benjamin Cardozo

You're out of order! You're out of order! The whole trial is out of order!

~ Arthur Kirkland (Al Pacino's character) movie: "And Justice for All" (1979)

In the movie, "And Justice for All," Al Pacino's character is an unrealistic and rather naive young lawyer who is literally the man the ancient Greek philosopher, Diogenes (412-323 B.C.), spent his entire life looking for in vain—an honest man. The narrative is about the trials and tribulations of this idealistic and upstanding lawyer in the midst of a perverse society and a corrupt legal system. In one scene, Pacino's law partner is shipped off to the insane asylum because a client he successfully defended for murdering a child later killed two more children.

Pacino's utopian worldview is slowly crashing in on him. The final straw occurs when Pacino's character is compelled to defend an arrogant, corrupt judge who is obviously guilty of numerous criminal charges including fraud, bribery and multiple counts of sexual battery against a woman. At trial, just before Pacino's opening argument, his client leans over to Pacino's ear as he looks over his shoulder at the woman victim he so unmercifully abused and uttered the vilest blasphemy—"That's an attractive woman; I'd like to have *her* again!" Pacino could take no more. Would Pacino now cross the Rubicon? If so, he could never turn back again. A defense attorney usually spends his opening argument defending his client, however, Pacino now understands is completely guilty, therefore he becomes a zealous prosecutor *against* his own client by telling the judge and a shocked courtroom audience basically—my client is a pig! Pandemonium ensues as bailiffs drag Pacino out of the courtroom. His last words were memorable—*Hold it! Hold it! I've just completed my opening statement!*

This brings me to the thesis of this article—why did they drag Pacino out of the courtroom? Did he do anything wrong? Was he supposed to zealously defend his client, or justice and truth? Under the Anglo-American/common law system of jurisprudence, especially over the past 100 years, rules trump the truth. However, in this article I would like to explore the continental (civil or European) legal system of jurisprudence which I argue by design usually chooses to defend justice which is *veritas* (truth). The main difference usually drawn between the two systems is that common law draws abstract rules from specific cases, whereas civil law starts with abstract rules, which judges must then apply to the vari-

ous cases before them. For example, the Warren court (1953-69) and the Burger court (1969-85), made up out of whole cloth a plethora of criminal defenses from two abstract rules: 1) *the exclusionary rule*; 2) *the incorporation doctrine*, whereby portions of the U.S. Bill of Rights are applied to the states through the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Below are some of the most infamous cases from this era:

- ❖ *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961), Decided that evidence obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment protection against "unreasonable searches and seizures" may not be used in criminal prosecutions in state courts, as well as federal courts.
- ❖ *Gideon v. Wainwright* (1963), Required that all felons (including the indigent) be given their Sixth Amendment right to legal counsel.
- ❖ *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) The court held that criminal suspects must be informed of their right to consult with an attorney and of their right against self-incrimination prior to questioning by police.
- ❖ *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971) Supporting busing to reduce *de facto* racial segregation in schools.
- ❖ In *United States v. U.S. District Court* (1972) the Burger court issued another unanimous ruling against the Nixon administration's desire to invalidate the need for a search warrant and the requirements of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution in cases of domestic surveillance.
- ❖ In *Furman v. Georgia* (1972) the court, in a 5-4 decision, invalidated all death penalty laws then in force.
- ❖ *Roe v. Wade* (1973), Burger voted with the majority to recognize a broad right to privacy that prohibited states from banning all abortions.

These and many other cases from this period have thoroughly perverted the rule of law and the original intent of the Constitution's framers, plunging American law, culture and society into our present state of chaos.

Under the Anglo-American and common-law jurisprudence this rigid, illogical adherence to "rules," if broken anywhere during the trial, can, in effect, have key evidence withheld from the jury causing a mistrial, and the prosecutor will either have to start anew or perhaps, because of financial constraints, allow the criminal to go free. *Mapp*, *Gideon* and *Miranda* all have a built-in exclusionary rule. On this point, Supreme Court Justice Benjamin Cardozo once cynically remarked in a famous opinion—"The criminal is to go free because the constable [police] has blundered." The other cases cited above have no legitimate constitutional

foundation outside of the judge-created incorporation doctrine. However, under the continental system of jurisprudence (also in England) you have the lord (judge), solicitor (prosecutor) and the barrister (defense attorney). The only concern of the court is not merely strictly following procedure (rules), but determining *veritas* (truth).

Regrettably, judges in America are supposed to be “neutral and detached,” which in my opinion likens the judge to a referee or a neutered dog. However, judges under the continental legal system in Europe are engaging, dynamic, Socratic, independent, probing and powerful judges who actively participate in discovering the truth and also can cross-examine witnesses for himself. Ironically, at the Court of Appeals and Supreme Court levels they follow a modified continental legal system—firing questions at the attorneys on both sides of the issue in an effort to get at the truth. Why not adopt this European system at all levels in our American courts?

The standard division to be made between the two systems is that the common law system is case-centered and thus judge-centered, allowing room for an agile, pragmatic approach to the particular problems that appear before the courts. The law can be developed on a case-by-case basis. Conversely, the civil law system tends to be a codified body of general abstract principles (truth, justice, equality under law) which manage the exercise of judicial discretion. Following the continental system of jurisprudence would remedy these deficits cited above. How? Because the law’s primary purpose should not be to legalistically follow a case-driven, judge-centered template, not the rules of evidence, not politics, liberalism, conservatism, feminism, humanism, secularism, positivism, pragmatism or any other “ism” . . . but justice, equality under law and *veritas*—truth.

ON LAW—ESSAY 21

THE REAL MEDELLIN CARTEL

April 12, 2008

The president’s authority to act, as with the exercise of any governmental power, must stem either from an act of Congress or from the Constitution itself.

~ Chief Justice John Roberts, *Medellin v. Texas* (2008)

For those of you who do not follow the sometimes dry recitations emanating from the Supreme Court as I do, nor really appreciate the bona fide conservative justices America is blessed with like—Thomas, Roberts, Alito and Scalia, this column should give you pause. On March 28, the Supreme Court handed down a magnificent victory defending America's sovereignty and the supremacy of the U.S. Constitution over international treaties, international law and the United Nations in the case *Medellin v. Texas* (2008).

Medellin v. Texas held while an international treaty may constitute an international commitment, it is not binding *domestic* law unless Congress has enacted statutes implementing it or unless the treaty itself is "self-executing"; that decisions of the International Court of Justice are not binding domestic law; and that, absent an act of Congress or constitutional authority, the president of the United States lacks the power to enforce international treaties or decisions of the International Court of Justice. Here is the tragic narrative regarding the case:

It was June 1993 when 14-year-old Jennifer Ertman and 16-year-old Elizabeth Pena fatefully decided to take a shortcut home along a railroad trestle. There, they encountered Jose Ernesto Medellin and other members of a vicious Houston street gang. Medellin and his fellow savages repeatedly raped the girls, murdered them by strangulation, and then discarded their bodies, which were finally found days later.³³

Medellin was soon arrested. He was 18 at the time and had lived most of his life in the United States. The arresting officers gave him standard *Miranda* warnings, advising him that he was under no obligation to speak with them, that any statements he made could be used against him and that, whether or not he chose to speak, he had a right to have a lawyer—paid for by the state—present and assisting him. As many defendants do, he waived those rights. Within three hours, he had confessed to, among other things, murder in the course of a sexual assault. The people of the sovereign state of Texas, through their elected representatives, have made that crime a capital offense. Given that the death penalty is expressly mentioned in the Constitution—including three times in the Fifth Amendment alone—there is no plausible argument that Texas' policy is unconstitutional.

Medellin, however, was a national of Mexico. Consequently, under Article 36 of a treaty known as the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the police were obligated to notify him of his right to have his con-

sulate advised of his arrest. The police failed to fulfill this duty, but this dereliction was patently immaterial. The treaty says the notification should occur "without delay"; but this term does not have a clear meaning. It has been interpreted to require notice within one-to-three days, and it has never been understood to mandate that notice occur before an arrested suspect is questioned. It is important to understand that treaties are not "self-executing." That is, they don't form rights that persons can enforce in courts; they are, instead, agreements between governments. The government's failure to give notice to the Mexican Consulate wouldn't have made any difference in *Medellin's* case. He had given police a complete confession lasting hours before notice was necessary. Had the police given consular notice according to the treaty, they would still have obtained the confession, and Medellin would still have been convicted and sentenced to death.

Remember, when the World Court hears disputes it is between *countries*. In the *Medellin* case, the parties, called an Avena, were Mexico and the United States, not *Medellin* and the other murderers. America's treaty commitments were merely to authorize the World Court to decide whether a country was in agreement with its consular duties. The World Court has no authority to order American courts to remediate individual defendants. The United States, in its role of the judicial branch, has the sole determination of what the law is. The president, in his chief role in implementing foreign policy, is given extensive autonomy regarding the ratification of treaties. However, the Supreme Court has the final say on the interpretation of treaties and their legal effects under constitutional law. For example, in its 2006 *Sanchez-Llamas* case, the Supreme Court rejected the World Court's interpretation of the Vienna Convention, holding that states were free to enforce their procedural default rules. That is exactly the decisive question in *Medellin*. In the absence of controlling legislation by Congress, the president cannot accept the World Court's decision and, in effect, overrule the Supreme Court.

In the final analysis, the case is about the freedom of Texans to govern themselves, to put sadistic murderers to death if that is what they choose democratically to do, as long as they adhere to American constitutional procedures in carrying out that policy choice. Sure, it offends Mexicans, Europeans, international law professors and a motley collection of jurists who see themselves as a supra-sovereign tribunal. But that is not a basis for the president to interfere. Liberals and transnational

progressives hate the death penalty. These people will support any cause that impedes execution, no matter how evil the acts. That's why these radicals came out in force and defended Medellin, that vile murderer who shouldn't have been in America anyway.

Who is the real Medellin Cartel? No, not the notorious Columbian cartel who through Mexico and a network of surrogate countries and criminal gangs are responsible for shipping billions of dollars in cocaine annually into America, devastating our country, above all our big cities where poor blacks and Hispanics are trapped in a hellish inner-city existence exacerbated by gangs driving out businesses, peddling drugs and killing each other and innocent bystanders over "territory" throughout America. The *real* Medellin Cartel are homegrown socialists, liberals and progressives who have unreasonable hatred of America and the heroic and transcendent ideas and ideals she has stood for since her founding, including their contempt of the death penalty. These domestic traitors will use every legal artifice and sophism to deceive gullible Americans to give up sovereignty that was bought by the blood of her own people and give it to a bunch of U.N. bureaucrats or political hacks from some socialist European country or Third World hellhole.

Medellin v. Texas shows us that presidents have no authority to amend state procedural law—treaty or no treaty. Thank God once again for our ever vigilant sentinels at the gates of the Supreme Court, preserving our constitutional liberties and keeping the liberal, progressive, socialist and anarchist barbarians at bay—Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Scalia and Chief Justice John Roberts.

ON LAW—ESSAY 22

LAW 101: THE COMMERCE CLAUSE, FDR & ORIGINAL INTENT

August 18, 2007

If a judge can interpret the Constitution or laws to mean something obviously not intended by the original makers . . . then the nation's Constitution and laws are meaningless.

~ Lawrence P. McDonald, *We Hold These Truths* (1976)

A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law. . . . If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, that which has the superior obligation . . . the Constitution ought to be preferred to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of their agents.

~ Alexander Hamilton, *Federalist Papers* No. 78

With the exception of the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment, perhaps in the history of American constitutional law has so much mischief been wrought by the Supreme Court than in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the so-called, "Commerce Clause." On Feb. 5 of this year, President Bush submitted to Congress a \$2.9 trillion dollar budget, most of whose spending is possible due to a perverse interpretation of the Commerce Clause over the past 70 years dating back to FDR's first term (1933) and his socialist take over of government called the New Deal. Like all constitutional law, in the beginning it all seemed so simple, so sublime, so logical—but as time passed, Machiavellian presidents, ambitious congressmen, activist judges, humanist academics and the ubiquitous "special interest groups" all had a hand in perverting the original intent of the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, known as the Commerce Clause, gives authority to the United States Congress "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." That's all it is, dear reader, 16 words. Since the ascendancy of FDR and socialism in early 1930s, the application of the Commerce Clause by Congress to justify its legislative power over every conceivable interstate transaction has flourished virtually unabated. Using these simple 16 words above, the Commerce Clause has greatly shifted the balance of power from the individual states and We the People to the federal government. This shift in the balance of power has had dire consequences on the daily lives of the average U.S. citizen.

Marbury v. Madison and the Garden of Eden

How did America get to such a broad expansion of the Commerce Clause? Like Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, this treachery against the Constitution began long ago. This perverted understanding of the Constitution was started by Justice John Marshall in the famous case *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) where Justice Marshall greatly expanded

a power the Court implicitly possessed, but after *Marbury* would now be essentially unlimited. This power is often referred to by legal scholars as "judicial review." Prior to *Marbury*, judges could of course interpret a federal statute the legislature passed or an executive order the president enacted, to make certain it was in accordance with the Constitution, but now under *Marbury*, not only could the Court decree what the law *is* but what it *ought* to be. The power of the Court was greatly expanded and would find fertile ground in the heretofore little used Commerce Clause. A judge, now armed with this newly created power, could in essence become an unelected Super Legislator, or what legal philosopher Ronald Dworkin calls, "Hercules."

It didn't take long for Marshall's expansionist view of judicial review power to germinate. In *Gibbons v. Ogden* (1824), now-Chief Justice John Marshall expanded Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce even more to include the power to regulate interstate navigation. Marshall writes: "Commerce undoubtedly is traffic, but it is something more—it is intercourse. . . . [A] power to regulate navigation is as expressly granted, as if that term had been added to the word "commerce." . . . [T]he power of Congress does not stop at the jurisdictional lines of the several states. It would be a very useless power if it could not pass those lines."

In complicity with the two great social movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries—the Industrial Revolution and Progressivism—the judiciary expanded the powers of the Commerce Clause ever the more. For example, in *Swift v. United States* (1905), the Court held that the activity of the meatpackers fell under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Clause, despite the fact that their activity was geographically "local." Nevertheless, the Court reasoned that this activity had an significant relation on the "current of commerce" and thus could be regulated under the Commerce Clause. The Court's decision made unconstitutional the monopolist practices of price fixing. The Commerce Clause has been stretched so far that by the case of *Stafford v. Wallace* (1922), the Court affirmed a federal law regulating the Chicago meatpacking industry even though these businesses were only native to the city of Chicago. The Court in *Stafford* reasoned that the stockyards "are but a throat through which the current (of commerce) flows," and that the stockyards were "great national public utilities." This type of sophistic jurisprudence is beyond the pale!

Not until the *United States v. Lopez* (1995) and later *United States v. Morrison* (1995), did the Court under Rehnquist narrow the seemingly invincible Commerce Clause. Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist delivered the opinion of the Court in *Lopez* and ruled that Congress had the power to regulate only three areas: 1) the channels of commerce, 2) the instrumentalities of commerce, and 3) action that *substantially* affects interstate commerce. Critics call this new interpretation of the Commerce Clause that returns power to the states a “new federalism.” A year after the *Lopez* decision, the Court found in *Seminole Tribe v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44 (1996) that, unlike the 14th Amendment, the Commerce Clause does not give the federal government the power to abrogate the sovereign immunity of the states. Justice Thomas particularly has championed this strict interpretation of the Constitution’s interstate Commerce Clause and favors limits on the power of federal government in favor of states’ rights. Finally, after 70 years of liberalism and activist jurisprudence, the Court seems poised to return some type of reasonableness and sanity to the heretofore ungainly and intractable Commerce Clause. Let’s hope that the Roberts Court will continue this trend to limit congressional *and* judicial power over We the People.

ON LAW—ESSAY 23

ARE HATE CRIME STATUTES CONSTITUTIONAL?

June 09, 2007

Are hate crime statutes constitutional? It seems like a reasonable question to ask. If you asked that question to a typical liberal Democrat you would no doubt get a string of euphemisms and incoherent rants like this: “Well, of course hate statues are constitutional because America is an imperious, racist, sexist, homophobic country that is killing the planet! We must have special laws to protect our most vulnerable citizens from hate crimes done against them with punishments above and beyond those for normal crimes.” However, that response begs the question: Are hate crime statues constitutional?

Legal writer Lawrence McDonald said in his book on constitutional law, “If a judge can interpret the Constitution or laws to mean something

obviously not intended by the original makers, then the nation's Constitution and laws are meaningless." For over century now, unremarkable presidents, activist judges, unscrupulous pols, atheists, socialists, progressives, liberals and others hostile to the Judeo-Christian origins of America have been manipulating the law for Machiavellian ends, demoralizing American society, the Constitution and the rule of law. During these post-rationalist times, the West generally, and American culture specifically, is rife with anti-Jewish and anti-Christian sentiment. Hate crime statutes were explicitly promulgated by secular leftists to once and for all neutralize a group that has long stood in its way of completely perverting the culture—the religious right.

The Family Research Council said of the hate crime statutes: "If 'hate crime' legislation were to become a law, it would be used against individuals and churches who speak out on issues such as defending marriage and religious liberty." FRC was right. With hate crime statutes operable in all 50 states as well as at the federal level, liberals and socialists now have free reign to essentially criminalize being a Jew or a Christian in America, which is ironically the primary objective of Islamic hegemony against the West.

Public Law No. 103-322A, a 1994 federal law, defines a hate crime as: "A crime in which the defendant intentionally selects a victim, or in the case of a property crime, the property that is the object of the crime, because of the actual *or perceived* race, color, *religion*, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation of any person." Don't be fooled. What this benign-sounding legalese means is exceedingly inimical to religious liberty and freedom of speech. For example, landlords can now be brought up on charges of discrimination for refusing to rent to couples "shacking up," or living together unmarried. Military chaplains are being given dishonorable discharges for praying "in Jesus' name." Christian denominations that refuse to ordain women or homosexuals are having their tax-exempt status threatened.

Jewish, Christian and conservative student organizations are losing their privilege to meet on campus because their mere existence makes Muslim students "uncomfortable," thus contravening the sacred liberal orthodoxy of the academy—"thou shalt not be offended." Fire-and-brimstone preachers like Dr. John Hagee of San Antonio, Texas, who regularly preaches against leviathan government, same-sex marriage, sexual promiscuity, the mis-education of students by godless public

schools, the societal nihilism caused by the ACLU, etc., is constantly being threatened with Stalinist tactics of censorship even during a so-called “compassionate” conservative Republican administration.

The Framers of the Constitution would never have allowed hate crimes statutes for several reasons: 1) It was considered settled jurisprudence for over 200 years that the law was incompetent to criminalize thoughts no matter how wicked these thoughts were; 2) Hate crime statutes diminish the legitimacy and severity of *real* crimes. (The sentiment is this: You may plead out for murder, rape, arson, malicious assault and mayhem, but boy if you did those crimes with hatred in your heart against blacks, gays, women, transsexuals, transvestites, Muslims or midgets, you’re gonna pay!); 3) Studies now show hate crimes statutes, paradoxically, actually *increase* crime because they denigrate the rule of law and malign the respect or what Harvard law professor Lon Fuller calls “fidelity to law.”

The irony of the hate crime statutes is that they were conceived, promoted and enacted into law by socialists, progressives, liberals, leftist pols and activist groups like the ACLU, People for the American Way, MoveOn.org, NAACP, NOW and the Human Rights Campaign, and codified into law by liberal activist judges who have nothing but utter contempt for the original intent of the constitutional Framers and the rule of law. However, in line with the zeitgeist of this post-rationalist age, they carve out a class of special punishments against the criminal defendant that has violated one of *their* protected groups—minorities, women, atheists, gays, Islamic terrorists, anarchists, illegal aliens. *This*, dear reader, is the height of cynicism and a shameless perversion of the rule of law and the Constitution.

Sixty years ago, George Orwell foretold of this diabolical zeitgeist that would propagate hate crimes statues, in his own inimitable manner: “. . . [A]lthough Goldstein was hated and despised by everybody, although every day and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, his theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were, in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less. *Always* there were fresh dupes waiting to be seduced by him. Who is “Goldstein” today? Goldstein is the embodiment of contemporary liberalism and progressivism that has so utterly poisoned and perverted American

law, politics, society and culture. Big Brother welcomes you, comrades.
Welcome to Amerika!

CHAPTER

~ 2 ~

ON POLITICS

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 1

WHAT IS PLANTATION LIBERALISM?

May 05, 2007

In January, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice testified before a Senate subcommittee regarding President Bush's new Middle East foreign policy and to answer questions regarding the funding of 21,500 additional troops and ancillary personnel to send to the war in Iraq—a subcommittee now controlled by the Democrats and the mercurial Sen. Barbara Boxer, D-Calif. Normally, in a time of war when you have one party that controls the executive branch and another party controlling the legislative branch, the debate at these hearings can become exceedingly combative. Why? As President George W. Bush descends into the oblivion of lame-duck status and the 2008 presidential elections loomed ever closer, Democrat lawmakers, both in the House and the Senate, like moths to the flame, have unrestrained and irrational illusions of grandeur to become president. Thank God there is only one presidential chair. The hearings were pretty uneventful until the nation saw Boxer,

high and lifted up, peer down from her lofty perch toward the direction of Secretary Rice; she fixed her eyes forward with a vulture-like gaze, cleared her throat and spewed out that now-infamous diatribe of a rhetorical blasphemy: "Who pays the price? I'm not going to pay a personal price," Boxer said. "My kids are too old, and my grandchild is too young." Then, to Rice: "You're not going to pay a particular price, as I understand it, with an immediate family."

Then, silence, camera pans to Secretary Rice's face, a lamentable expression that for a brief instant seemed like infinity. At that moment, I saw that with all of her education, with all her accomplishments, with a lifetime of self-discipline, international acclaim, tremendous power and influence as the secretary of state of the greatest nation in the history of the world, nevertheless she could not hide the hurt, the pain of Boxer's venomous words spewed out from this contemptible little woman with the sole purpose of poisoning her victim's humanity. Condoleezza stood strong. There was something evil and diabolical about Boxer's words. It was vile rhetoric filled with racism and hatred that a black woman "made it" without acknowledging the aid of white liberal paternalism; that a black woman "made it" without giving due consideration to liberals and their omnipresent civil rights and affirmative action programs.

It was like a reoccurring nightmare. It was like the summer of 1991 all over again and the Supreme Court hearings of my intellectual mentor, Justice Clarence Thomas—the "high-tech lynching" liberals on the Senate Judiciary Committee conspired to do against this honorable man who, in my opinion, has already secured his position as one of the greatest justices in the history of the Supreme Court. You can hear it in the tenor of Sen. Boxer's words as if she were saying, "Who does *she* think she is?" "Well, I'm going to show this uppity little wench who really is the boss!" I call this phenomenon, which is particularly acute in modern politics and culture, *Plantation Liberalism*, or the idea that all black people "owe" Democrats (white people) an unpayable debt, a slavish allegiance to the Democratic Party for life—and any black person who dares to even insinuate that they "made it" without affirmative action, without marching in the streets for "rights" we already have, without giving due deference to the historical civil rights legislation that liberal Democrats *alone* are wholly responsible for and magnanimously bestowed upon us are (metaphorically speaking) "off the plantation" and are castigated as "Uncle Toms," "Oreo cookies," "heretics," "apostates," "ingrates" . . .

"uppity niggers." These renegade black conservatives will be dealt with in the requisite manner as a slave master would treat a captured runaway slave—viciously, summarily, personally. This was the despicable conduct Sen. Boxer spewed upon Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice—a disgusting spectacle indeed that received little coverage from the largely white, liberal mainstream media.

For over a generation now, liberal Democrats, with the help of their willing accomplices in the perverse propaganda media, have surreptitiously hidden the philosophy of Plantation Liberalism from public view, though on occasion, as with the Boxer episode, liberal politicians in power find it exceedingly difficult to conceal their utter hatred, contempt and racist paternalism they have for *any* black person that achieves the pinnacle of his or her profession without kissing the ring of liberal Democrats: *This* is the unpardonable sin! If you think I write from hyperbole, consider the shrill rhetoric from the Rev. Al Sharpton, the Rev. Jesse Jackson, the Congressional Black Caucus, the National Association of Black Journalists, and all the other liberal black activist groups and their "useful idiot" rent-a-mobs. A few weeks ago they were literally apoplectic about radio talk show shock-jock Don Imus and his juvenile rhetoric against the Rutgers women's basketball team. Compare that response to the silence-of-the-lambs treatment Dr. Rice got from those same hypocrites when she was dissed by Boxer. Why? She was "off the plantation"; she wasn't a card-carrying liberal Democrat. Therefore, it has never been solely about race or color, but distorted ideology and a slavish allegiance to a Democratic Party's diabolical agenda that only 150 years ago enslaved my people. The Republican Party under Abraham Lincoln and a little skirmish called the Civil War freed my people from bondage. The press has forgotten this historical fact.

If you think I write from hyperbole, ask yourself, would Sen. Barack Hussein Obama have any measure of the sycophantic celebrity status he daily enjoys from Oprah, from Hollywood and the propaganda media *but* for the fact that he is a black man, a brazen liberal Democrat with a voting record more extreme than even Hillary Rodham Clinton or Teddy Kennedy?! Certainly not. Obama's political views are so excessive that he once voted *against* a bill that would have provided medical treatment to newborn babies that survived an abortion! Ironically, that's the same savage partial-birth abortion procedure the Supreme Court condemned

April 18 by overruling the precedent case—*Stenberg v. Carhart* (2000)—in a pivotal 5-4 decision.

Sociologists now tell us that proportionately speaking many more black babies are aborted than any other race in America, which was exactly the original intent of that racist, demagogue, feminist icon, Margaret Sanger (1879-1966), who founded Planned Parenthood in 1916 primarily because of her Hitler-like hatred of black people, whom she considered tantamount to animals. Take that, Mother Teresa! Sophocles (495-406 B.C.), that great ancient Greek tragedian, once wrote, "Silence is a woman's ornament." Despite the immense lachrymose expression written in Condoleezza's beautiful brown eyes as she took the savage blow from Sen. Boxer's wickedly racist words attacking her very humanity as an unmarried woman, as a childless woman, as a black woman who nevertheless ascended the steps of Parnassus without Mammy Boxer's assistance, or said, "Mother, may I" to the liberal plantation owners in the Senate, Condoleezza's silent, steely demeanor crystallized the words of Sophocles in a most profound way indeed.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 2

WHY DOES THE LEFT SO HATE AMERICA?

June 02, 2007

Having been relieved of those uniquely American qualities—guilt and fear—he has nothing to worry about.

~ Dr. Yen Lo, of The Pavlov Institute (From the movie *The Manchurian Candidate* [1962])

In the May 1, 2006, edition of Newsweek, there appeared a book review by David Gates of Nathaniel Philbrick's book, "In the Heart of the Sea." I knew from the article's title ("Pilgrims' Bloody Progress") precisely where the sentiments of the author (and the reviewer) resided. It was another hatchet job on the Pilgrims, the Founding Fathers, and on Amer-

ica—the most wicked, racist, sexist, homophobic, imperious, murderous nation in the history of humanity . . . isn't it?

Philbrick's propaganda tome was about the beloved Pilgrims, the Adam and Eve of America's beginnings, the progenitors of each of us, the great and courageous adventurers who wanted a country where they could freely worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience—all sentiments reviewer Gates calls "fairy tales." While the Pilgrims did many great deeds and overcame great adversity, including by the end of the first winter losing over 50 percent of their members due to a variety of maladies, with the Indians, the Pilgrims, admittedly, had many conflicts. One of the redeeming characteristics of Philbrick's book is that at least he details that for the first 50 years, interaction between the Pilgrims and the Indians was largely friendly.

However, Philbrick's dispassionate treatment of the Pilgrims soon gives way to outright open hostility, a propaganda treatment of his subject matter that would make the editors at the Communist newspaper *Pravda* blush with envy. Philbrick vividly details all the sins of the evil white man who invaded this pristine land called "America." The author chronicles how these first white settlers from Europe gleefully began to rape and pillage the land, and as a bonus killed virtually all of the Indians with guns, alcohol and disease. This popular but erroneous view of early American history is in line with the *Zeitgeist* of the current squatters in the academy and complies with the liberal template for the history of the West in general.

Philbrick starts his book by narrating a story about a Pilgrim scouting party from the *Mayflower* that stole some corn and were attacked by about 30 Indians with yard-long arrows. The results—"one Indian was probably wounded; the whites were unscathed." You can almost feel the cynicism in the tenor of the author and the reviewer's sentiments—"How dare those damn Pilgrims steal corn from the noble Indians. I don't care if the Pilgrims were freezing and starving to death, for this outrage they deserve to die!") Philbrick laments, "The nation's history began with the Pilgrims and then leapfrogged more than 150 years to Lexington and Concord and the Revolution." Why? Neither reviewer Gates nor author Philbrick gives the reader any reason for these omissions in the standard history textbooks. Perhaps it is due to liberals having largely taken over most of America's educational institutions (including textbook publishers, public schools, colleges and graduate schools—

science, economics, law school, medical school, journalism school, business schools, seminary, etc.) Also, with the ascendancy of liberalism came their tools, techniques and theories to pervert the truth—evolution, Marxist theory, Freudian theory, revisionist history, deconstructionism, secularism, humanism, Higher Criticism, positivism, egalitarianism and particularly since the 1970s, feminism, homosexuality, environmentalism and liberalism, the latter of which is used by many leftist academics to denigrate all that America was founded upon.

Of course, Philbrick's tome (revisionism and all) was awarded a National Book Award in 2000, but does a book award a great book make? Or even a good book make? Or even a propaganda book make? Gates remarks: "The Pilgrims weren't Jeffersons and Franklins with some quaint religious customs. They believed in signs and miracles and that God's hand guided their weapons against Satan's mission." Philbrick and Gates are wrong in their characterization that the ideas of the Pilgrims and Franklin and Jefferson were vastly different. The salient question, therefore, is this: What writers and writings most influenced the constitutional framers? To answer this question, University of Houston political science professors Donald Lutz and Charles Hyneman in 1985 published a monumental study that took them 10 years to bring together. They amassed over 15,000 items, including 2,200 books, newspaper articles, pamphlets and monographs of political materials written between 1760-1805 and discovered that the three writers the constitutional framers quoted from the most often were: 1) Barron Montesquieu (1689-1755), 2) William Blackstone (1723-80), and 3) John Locke (1632-1704). Incidentally, all of these men were strong adherents of natural law philosophy, which believed in an inseparable connection between law and morality.

The Pilgrims, the Puritans *and* the constitutional framers all insisted on cementing the connection between law and morals by infusing biblical precepts into the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and Bill of Rights. In fact, one other source was quoted more than Montesquieu, Blackstone and Locke combined—the Bible. Fully 96 percent of the literature, books, articles, monographs and political tracts the framers used and that were analyzed in the Lutz/Hyneman study had their origins in the Word of God. Take that, Robespierre!

To revisit my initial question—Why does the left so hate America?—the answer lies in a word: jealousy. Liberals are jealous of America and

the moral foundations of her greatness because, having rejected God and embraced the secularism of the Enlightenment Age, these socialists, atheists, anarchists, craven pols, activist judges, Hollywood hacks and humanist academics seek to eradicate all vestiges of morality from the history of America and of the West. Under their new paradigm, God is replaced with science (evolution) and eulogized as “dead” by Nietzsche. Welcome to the Orwellian world of contemporary liberalism, politics, culture and society. Welcome, Manchurian candidate Nathaniel Philbrick. “You have been relieved of those unique American qualities—guilt and fear. Now you have nothing to worry about.” Happy 400th birthday, America!

ON POLITICS—*ESSAY 3*

IS GIULIANI A DIME-STORE DEWEY?

November 17, 2007

[Rudy Giuliani] a thrice-married, ex-mayor of New York whose career [43% approval rating] was on life-support, but for 9/11.

~ Ellis Washington, “Neville Chamberlain’s revenge”

When I look at the movers and shakers in modern times, I always try to find their “precedent figure” in the annals of history. For example, Republican presidential candidate, front-runner and former mayor of New York Rudy Giuliani is a fascinating person. In my opinion, Giuliani’s precedent figure was a man named Thomas Dewey. You may ask, dear reader, who is Thomas Dewey? He was one of many obscure, self-made men of American political history who came to prominence in the 1930s and 40s. Although Dewey was of diminutive stature, he was very aggressive, fearless and ruthlessly ambitious. He first made headlines as the zealous New York district attorney that waged an all-out war against organized crime. He even had the guts and cleverness to put the “boss of all bosses,” Lucky Luciano, in prison. Thomas Edmund Dewey (1902-71) was the three-term governor of New York (1943-55). In 1944 and 1948, he ran unsuccessfully as the Republican candidate for president of the United States. He lead the liberal faction of the Republican Party and fought against the conservative wing of the GOP, led by Sen. Robert A. Taft.

Dewey represented the Northeastern business and professional community that accepted most of FDR's New Deal policies after 1944. His successor as leader of the liberal Republicans was Nelson A. Rockefeller, who also became governor of New York, in 1959, and from whose name the term was coined "Rockefeller Republicans." In 1970, Rudy Giuliani (born 1944), joined the United States attorney's office for the Southern District of New York. In 1973, he was appointed chief of the Narcotics Unit and later appointed United States attorney. In 1975, the Ford administration appointed Giuliani as associate deputy attorney general and chief of staff to Deputy Attorney General Harold "Ace" Tyler. His first high-profile prosecution was of U.S. Rep. Bertram L. Podell, D-N.Y., who was convicted of corruption. In 1981, the Reagan administration appointed Giuliani to the Justice Department's third-highest position, associate attorney general. In 1983, Giuliani first received national attention from his appointment as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York because of two high-profile cases that lead to the convictions of Wall Street figures Ivan Boesky and Michael Milken for insider trading.

A comparative analysis of Dewey and Giuliani brings to the surface some intriguing similarities:

First, Dewey and Giuliani were both zealous and courageous U.S. attorneys from New York that made their reputations and gained extensive public notoriety as incorruptible crime fighters. Second, Dewey and Giuliani, because of the many enemies they made by going against the Mafia, had contracts placed on their heads (Dutch Schultz on Dewey; John Gotti on Giuliani). Fortunately, both death plots were thwarted: Lucky Luciano prevented the hit against Dewey by ordering a hit on Schultz and his entire crew. Giuliani's life was spared because three of the five New York Mafia families voted "no." (Gotti, head of the Gambino crime family, voted "yes"). Third, Dewey and Giuliani throughout their political careers ran as "liberal Republicans," making the mainstream conservative Republicans in Washington, D.C., very suspicious of their core political beliefs and reticent to endorse their presidential candidacies enthusiastically.

Fourth, Dewey, as governor of New York, was regarded as a trustworthy and highly capable leader. He cut taxes, doubled state aid to education, increased salaries for state employees and reduced the state's debt by over \$100 million. Additionally, he put through the first state law in the country that prohibited racial discrimination in employment.

Likewise, Giuliani, as a two-term mayor of New York, cleaned up New York's infamous dirty streets and graffiti, arrested aggressive bums and squeegee men, closed down the XXX theatre district, revitalized Times Square and the business community throughout the city, cut public and private corruption and helped minorities by improving public school education. Fifth, Dewey and Giuliani were both media hounds that skillfully parlayed their political careers as U.S. attorneys into opportunities for attention-grabbing headlines. For example, Dewey got an incredible 30-50 year prison sentence against Lucky Luciano, the greatest Mafia don in American history, based on trumped up charges of "white slavery" and for being a "pimp." And of course, the epic notoriety Giuliani reveled in post-9/11 witnessed his approval ratings dramatically rise from a paltry 43 percent to a deified 80 percent.

Sixth, In the early 1940s, as Dewey ran for president against Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his myopic isolationist stance became increasingly difficult for him to defend as the Nazis conquered Poland, Holland, Belgium, France and threatened Britain. As a result, many Republicans switched to supporting Wendell Willkie. Likewise, Giuliani's overt pro-gay, pro-abortion, pro-illegal immigration, pro-gun control and liberal judicial appointments have caused much dissension in the conservative ranks, leading many to support other candidates. Seventh, In 1952, Dewey enthusiastically endorsed the nomination of Dwight Eisenhower as president to cement what would later be called the Country Club/Nelson Rockefeller wing of the Republican Party. Dewey also was instrumental in pushing Richard Nixon to become the vice president. Likewise, Giuliani, just last week, received a coveted endorsement from one of the great pillars of the modern conservative movement, Christian Broadcast Network Chairman Pat Robertson, despite the fact that Giuliani is extremely liberal on all the major social issues like abortion, gay rights, domestic partnerships, illegal immigration, which are so important to conservatives.

Finally, in analyzing the credentials of these two men, I ask you this pivotal question, dear reader: Is Rudy Giuliani merely a dime-store Dewey, or does he have the gravitas to become a great Republican president in the mode of a TR or Reagan? The propaganda press and the liberal mainstream media have been aggressively pushing the Giuliani candidacy. Conservative skeptics claim that the liberal media desperately want Giuliani to be the Republican nominee so that Bill Clinton's infi-

delities and the Clintons' criminal past, along with their radical liberal worldview, will become a mute point due to the moral aphorism: People who live in glass houses should never throw stones. If this triangulation strategy is successful, like Dewey, Giuliani will indeed descend into the abyss of obscurity and become a dime-store Dewey, and in January 2009 Americans will be forced to hail Her Majesty President Hillary Rodham.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 4

RINO CAREERISTS: NOTHING MORE THAN TRAITORS

November 12, 2008

There never existed any other Government against which treason was so easy, and could defend itself by such plausible arguments as against that of the United States.

~ Henry James, *Hawthorne*, Chapter 7 (1879)

The anonymous, treacherous lies McCain's advisers have been launching against former VP candidate Sarah Palin since the clothing allowance story was leaked several weeks ago is truly reprehensible, but not unexpected. Whenever liberal Republicans and their allies in the Old Media stumble into a true conservative believer, they go right to their Saul Alinsky socialist playbook—conservatives are stupid, naïve, Christian fanatics, sexist, homophobes, racists, hypocrites, etc. Some of the more memorable slanders and libels include:

- ❖ Palin thought that Africa was a country, not a continent;
- ❖ Palin didn't know the countries that signed the NAFTA treaty;
- ❖ Palin went overboard in her shopping spree.

What is that sound you hear? No, not a strong denunciation by John McCain in support of Palin . . . it's crickets chirping. McCain by his silence is tacitly supporting the hateful slander against Palin. In my opinion, McCain is a bitter, jealous political hack whose days in the spotlight have long passed (i.e., his defeat by Bush in 2000). Nevertheless, like Goethe's "Faust," McCain made a deal with the devil (RINOs) for one

last run. He only made one mistake that would have sealed his immortality with liberals—he picked a conservative running mate.

What vexes me most as a conservative is that there are so many RINOs (Republicans in name only) who irrationally hate conservatives more than they hate the murderous, slavish public policies of liberal Democrats—people who would love to turn the Republican Party into the Whig Party of the 21st century: extinct. In my search for reasons why Republicans have a predilection to pick the intellectually weakest, stuttering, bumbling, most uninspired candidates (with the exception of Ronald Reagan), I have come to the following conclusions:

1. Advisers, staffers, administrators, counselors or those that work on a candidate's campaign are essentially administrative hacks, not visionary thinkers. With few exceptions, most of these people are "yes men" and "yes women" who will say and do anything that the politician (their boss) wants them to.
2. Careerists have a problem (or should have a problem) with their conscience. How do you push a politician, an agenda or a political policy that in every respect is not only immoral but unconstitutional and still are able to look at yourself in the mirror the next day?
3. Careerists care little for the Constitution, the rule of law, morals or principle. They care only for their next paycheck and an invitation to the latest Washington, D.C., cocktail party so they can schmooze for their next job—"We the People" be damned!

With these three principles of careerism outlined, in a Machiavellian perverse kind of way, it was predictable that anonymous senior McCain staffers have come out of the woodwork to denigrate and slander Sarah Palin, a virtuous and capable governor of Alaska who was unceremoniously thrown into the lion's den as VP, took the treacherous abuse from those hired to "help" her and has triumphed to become the *de facto* leader of the Republican Party and the front runner, should she decide to run, for president in 2012. What a man! (I mean a woman). Palin was right to refer to these gutless hacks of the McCain campaign as "cowards." When will the GOP grow a pair and follow her lead?

You may ask, "Ellis, why are these former staffers treating Palin with such vile contempt?" The key word to your question is "former." Like a cross in the face of a vampire or a dress in the face of Hillary Clinton, the word former anything to the power brokers in Washington, D.C., is a death sentence. Careerists want to be able to secure employment to work

on future campaigns or on current staffs of other politicians. Somebody has to take the blame for the lackluster, incompetent, train wreck of a campaign John McCain and the Republican Party just ran. I mean, with all due respect, Barack Obama destroyed McCain and in many respects the Republican Party. Someone has to pay; certainly not the treasonous careerists, but who? Throw the girl under the bus. Didn't Obama do this with his sainted grandmother (God rest her soul), implying that the woman who lovingly raised him all those years in Hawaii was a racist?

I heard defeat in the voice of McCain when he first announced his candidacy. As Rush Limbaugh said, "McCain's presidential announcement *was* his concession speech." Why didn't McCain announce his candidacy on the Michael Savage show (my favorite), Rush Limbaugh, Laura Ingraham, Mark Levin or on the Sean Hannity radio shows? No, no, no. Their tens of millions of listeners per week were not enough for the "Maverick" McCain. McCain needed a bigger, more diverse audience, so on May 1, 2007, he dragged his stiff, moribund visage to David Letterman's show to announce his second run for president while at the same time giving the conservative base the middle-finger salute. That's why conservative intellectual Michael Savage calls this pol "McShame."

In early March 2008, it was like the GOP leadership went to the back door of Congress to see who was first in line next to the garbage cans and said, "Well, all right, John, it's your turn (again); let's dust you off, slap some new dentures in your mouth and send you out there." By picking McCain over the more polished and qualified Republican candidate, Mitt Romney, I knew the fix was in. Another careerist, New York Times "conservative" writer David Brooks, appearing on "Face the Nation" last weekend, gleefully characterized the GOP as having no belief system and claiming that since losing the election to Obama, Republicans are engaging in "a circular firing squad." Yeah, David "Benedict" Brooks, it is a circular firing squad *you* and your colleagues at the New York [Pravda] Times have enthusiastically helped conduct every day in your op-eds and news reports by constantly denigrating the Republicans and deifying that empty suit and Manchurian Candidate, Barack Obama, a man whom we don't know for certain is even a legitimate American citizen or an illegal alien!

Well, Mr. Brooks, you and the other RINO careerists out there got your candidate with the help of eight years of the incompetent liberal Republican, President George W. Bush, who systematically spoiled eve-

rything Ronald Reagan built over the past 44 years since his famous speech for Barry Goldwater at the 1964 Republican Convention. Let's see how long it will be before careerists like David Brooks subject the American public to his hand-wringing, propaganda columns with titles such as: "How did America choose a Marxist for president?" When I read that column on the New York Times, that's the newspaper issue I will save . . . to line the bottom of my garbage can.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 5

GOEBBELS, PATERSON, OBAMA AND THE ETERNAL LIE

December 20, 2008

If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie.

~ Dr. Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's Minister of Propaganda

Please forgive me if by the opening quote of the Nazi Goebbels I come off to some as unduly polemical. This is not my intent. What I do want to discuss here is New York Gov. David Paterson's new \$121 billion budget for the Empire State and how Paterson's FDR, leviathan-government tactics are surely a prelude to what America can expect in the first 100 days of a Barack Obama administration.

Rush Limbaugh is often fond of saying, "Liberals are liberals first." What this means to me is that liberal Democrats crave power, money and control over "We the People" more than anything else in the world. Using the ubiquitous power of the State over the people is what animates them. Raising taxes for a liberal is like a "street tax" the Mafia imposes on legitimate businesses for "protection." The New York Daily News reported, "Trying to close a \$15.4 billion budget gap, Paterson called for 88 new fees and a host of other taxes, including an 'iPod tax' that taxes the sale of downloaded music and other 'digitally delivered entertainment services.'" With each new tax increase Gov. Paterson imposes on New Yorkers, already the most taxed state in the Union, that measure of individual liberty and freedom to do what one wants with his own mon-

ey and resources fades away into the abyss, never to return. Why are the usually animated New Yorkers not protesting Paterson's draconian tax increases in Albany and Manhattan, especially during these dire economic times? Yes, ignorance and apathy have a role—people don't know that their fundamental constitutional rights to what Jefferson called "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" are being stolen right out from under them by devious politicians like Gov. Paterson and the Democrat Machine. And yes, people have become apathetic or indifferent to the endless machinations of dishonest politicians. After all, didn't America just elect a shining star right out of the bowels of corrupt Chicagoland in President—elect Barack Obama?

Remember: Humanists, secularists, communists, progressives, socialists and liberals have been in charge of our Marxist public school system for over 100 years, so unless you attended a parochial school, had enlightened parents, relatives, professors or mentors to tutor you against socialism or self-educated yourself by going to the library (as I did from about age 5), then you will probably believe the propaganda Paterson, Obama, Bush and the other outrageous politicians on both sides of the aisle are trying to get the American people to believe: *The eternal lie, Free-market capitalism, conservatism, Christianity are all failed ideologies. We've got to evolve beyond these anachronistic and exclusionary ideas of the past and chart a bold, new course for the America of the 21st century...*

Returning to Nazi Dr. Goebbels, the master of spin and propaganda who continued the epigraph above with these sinister words: "It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State." How are Goebbels' ideas exemplified today? Pick your contemporary political hack—Blagojevich, Obama, Bush, Kennedy, Clinton, Paterson, Schwarzenegger, Pelosi, Harry Reid, McCain, Kwame Kilpatrick—they all have in one way or another perverted truth as the "mortal enemy of the lie," thereby making truth (free-market capitalism, conservatism, Judeo-Christianity) "the greatest enemy of the State."

New York Mayor Bloomberg was incensed at Paterson's proposed budget cuts, especially in education, the Holy Grail to liberalism. The Daily News article reads:

Paterson aides say the budget represents a net gain for New York City, but Mayor Bloomberg wasn't buying it. He said it could cost the

city more than \$1 billion, including a \$600 million reduction in school aid. "I don't know that 100 percent of it is going to go the classroom, but a large percentage of any reduction we get from the state will go to the classroom," Bloomberg said. "That will mean larger class sizes and fewer services." ¹

I could save New Yorkers \$30 billion immediately. Disband all public schools in the state of New York, including all ancillary bureaucracy like the teachers, the teachers unions and the bloated legions of administrators, superintendents, deputy superintendents, janitors, deputy janitors, police, pregnancy counselors, school psychologists and all the rest. The money saved by the taxpayers could be used for vouchers to go to any charter or religious school that their intellectual gifts could take them (or no school). Let New Yorkers go back to the pre-1830s era, before the advent of public schools where each person (family) was responsible for their *own* education. To a degree, Americans are already on our own regarding education, because the public schools don't really educate—they propagandize and indoctrinate students to become mindless, dependent cogs of the socialist state.

As a point of comparison, who could rationally argue that a George Bush or a Barack Obama educated in modern times at elite prep schools, Yale, Columbia and Harvard had a better education than an Andrew Jackson, a self-taught lawyer of the 1780s, or an Abraham Lincoln's self-education of the 1820s? Reclaiming the pursuit of education from the secular humanists and returning it to the people would cause educational egalitarianism to be dead forever. "But Ellis, what about the poor?" Ah, yes, and this is the eternal lie straight out of the mouth of Goebbels that liberals reflexively use to hide the diabolical reasons for their litany of altruistic policies—"We just want to help the poor and the disenfranchised."

Regarding liberals' so-called care for the poor, I have these grave words written in the very blood of human history—*slavery, abortion and the welfare state*. These are just three evolution-derived policies that are the mainstays of liberalism, even to this day. This trinity of evil is an affront to natural law, natural rights, freedom and the inalienable, God-given liberties of all people. In a moving eulogy to one of the recently deceased godfathers of the modern conservative movement, Paul M. Wyerich, Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform, said, "Liberty doesn't need new ideas to advance, but institutions to give

muscle and skeletal structure to a political movement for liberty." Why don't we hear more GOP leaders saying this?

As Gov. Paterson prepares to raise taxes and cut services in the Empire State, as Obama prepares for his coronation to be president of the United States where he will no doubt raise taxes and nationalize more private industry under federal control, instead of jubilation, all I hear ringing in my ears is the eternal lie of Joseph Goebbels who said, "Intellectual activity is a danger to the building of character." Truer, evil words have rarely been spoken. This is the eternal lie of liberalism, which can only be defeated by courageous people rising up out of their slumber to publicly extol eternal truths.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 6

OBAMA, BLAGO AND 'THE CHICAGO WAY'

December 13, 2008

We were approached "pay to play." That, you know, he'd raise me 500 grand. An emissary came. Then the other guy would raise a million, if I made him [Senate Candidate 5] a senator.

~ Illinois Gov. Rod Blagojevich (discussing the Chicago Way on FBI wiretaps)

As Barack Obama, other sundry Democrat politicians and their willing accomplices in the liberal media scurry around like a pack of alley rats in a dark corner disturbed by a flashlight, I can't help gloating just a little bit. I mean, who in America is really surprised by the recent criminal charges brought against Rod Blagojevich, the embattled governor of Illinois who up to a few days ago was a good friend and a close political ally of President-elect Barack Obama? Since I lived and worked in Chicago for several years (1994-97), I understand the milieu of Chicagoland and am familiar with "The Chicago Way." What is this phenomenon? Think a Midwest version of "Tammany Hall"—the legendary corrupt Democratic political machine in New York from the 1790s to 1960s.

The Chicago Way is any person, politician, businessman, children's hospital or entity within the boundaries of the state of Illinois that wants to do business in Chicagoland. You've got to: 1) know the right people,

and 2) pay the right people. Basically, that's how business and politics are conducted in Chicago. If you don't like it, then Chicago may not be the city you want to live in. So far, the public has heard about three minutes out of over 300 hours of FBI wiretaps of conversations Blagojevich had with "emissaries" from President-elect Obama's administration and at least five different Chicago politicians or political appointees who wanted the governor to appoint them to Obama's vacated Senate seat. The asking price: \$500,000 to \$1 million, said the good governor, to perform his constitutionally mandated legal obligation.

The state of Illinois is not alone in this business. Presently, David Patterson, the governor of New York, is publicly entertaining numerous "bids" for Hillary Clinton's vacant Senate seat since her acceptance of the secretary of state post with Obama, including from JFK's daughter, Caroline Kennedy-Schlossberg, who has absolutely no quantifiable experience for the Senate except for having a pretty smile, co-authoring a couple of books and graduating from Harvard Law School. . . . Oh, yes, and she's a Kennedy. Pennsylvania Gov. Ed Rendell, a staunch Democrat, last Thursday on Neil Cavuto's show admitted that when Sen. Arlen Specter was diagnosed with cancer last April 15, which turned out not to be terminal, *that day* Gov. Rendell said, "I received five calls to my office saying, 'I want that seat!'" Disgusting indeed. Forget the fact that Sen. Specter gave Rendell his first political job, but to paraphrase the great rock star Tina Turner, "What's loyalty got to do with it?"

Information on the FBI wiretaps indicates that "Senate Candidate 5" was Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr. and that somehow Jesse Jackson Sr. may have been involved, perhaps as an emissary. Both Jacksons now have lawyers and refuse to comment publicly on their association with Blagojevich's Senate-seat selling scheme. As more and more details of the FBI wiretaps are revealed, you can believe that many more Chicago politicians and Obama associates will need personal legal counsel. Who tipped off the feds? Rahm Emanuel, an Illinois congressman and Obama's chief of staff? What about Eric Holder, a Clinton retread and Obama's choice to be attorney general, whose insertion teams have become privy to all ongoing federal cases of President Bush's Justice Department that Holder will soon head? Furthermore, it seems like U.S. Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald's ongoing investigation was interrupted too soon, before a larger net could be cast to catch more Chicago/Washington, D.C., alley rats. Why was the trigger pulled so soon? Perhaps Obama and his minions saw the

handwriting on the wall and as his coronation, I mean Inauguration Day approaches, wanted to stop the FBI's investigation before it got too close to Obama the Messiah.

In a revealing Wall Street Journal article on the Blagojevich scandal, an interesting sequence of events took place Monday Nov. 10 in a marathon two-hour conference call between Blagojevich, his wife, his chief of staff, John Harris, an unnamed adviser, Obama aide Valerie Jarrett, his original pick to take over his Senate seat, and "various Washington, D.C.-based advisers." Who were these mysterious people from D.C.? Was Obama in the loop? I believe he was.² I think it's safe to say that, except for the most dedicated Obama Kool-Aid drinker, the bloom has left that rose. Obama knows that he is neck-deep into the Blagojevich seat-selling scheme; after all, it is Obama's Senate seat that is for sale. Obama didn't defeat the Clinton machine, the Republican Party and raise almost a billion dollars in private campaign contributions by being naive and not paying attention to every detail.

Obama knew full well what was going on, and being true to form he treated Blagojevich like he did his sainted grandmother who raised him, the racist Rev. Jeremiah Wright, the slumlord/convicted felon Tony Rezko and terrorist Bill Ayers—when the political heat got too hot, Barack does the Obama Shuffle and throws them all under the bus to avoid tainting his Messiah-like image. Meanwhile, the liberal media and the Democrat Party dutifully give Obama political cover. Thank goodness the American public can rely on the alternative media like WorldNetDaily and conservative talk radio to keep this vital story alive.

Remember Chicago is the land of Al "Scarface" Capone and bare-knuckle Democratic politics that oftentimes resort to savage Mafia tactics to get things done. What are these tactics? First, the Mafia would send one of their henchmen to a business owner and say, "You need protection; we can provide protection for you for X dollars per month. If you don't pay us, if you don't pay on time, you're going to lose a lot business." Second, The Democratic Party tells Wall Street, tells the home mortgage industry, tells America's Big Three automakers and tells conservative talk radio (through the so-called Fairness Doctrine): "You need protection; we can provide protection for you for X dollars per month. If you don't pay us, if you don't pay on time, you're going to lose a lot business." To most people of goodwill, these outrageous Mafia tactics we see played out in Chicago politics today are truly disgusting, but to the

movers and shakers in incestuous Chicagoland, people like Rahm Emanuel, who took over Blagojevich's congressional seat, David Axelrod, a Chicago insider going back 25 years to his days as a key adviser for Mayor Harold Washington, Jesse Jackson Jr., son of civil rights icon Jesse Jackson, Valerie Jarrett, former deputy chief of staff for Mayor Richard Daley, Barack Obama and all his other Chicago cronies, it's "pay to play," it's payola, it's business as usual, it's . . . The Chicago Way!

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 7

RANGEL'S RANK HYPOCRISY

July 24, 2008

This immorality [New York's rent-control laws] produces a host of evils so obvious you would expect even the city's illiterate public-school graduates to understand them.

~ Becky Akers

Recently, "Paul" of Birmingham, Ala., one of my most ardent and devoted readers, sent me a fascinating article by writer Becky Akers on Rep. Charlie Rangel, D-N.Y., and his current scandal regarding the 65-year-old infamous rent-control scam against the tenants, landlords and the good people of New York City. For decades, this 19-term, powerful, bellicose chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee has quietly exploited a loophole in rent-subsidy laws that were supposedly designed to protect "poor tenants" from the bloodlust of New York's notoriously "greedy" landlords. Regarding Rangel's blatant hypocrisy in abusing New York's rent control laws, Akers stated:

On July 11, the usually gutless New York Times revealed that Rangel leases four rent-stabilized apartments in one of Harlem's most luxurious buildings. He combined three of them into a home so opulent that a recent book on interior design devotes several pages to it; he turned the fourth into a campaign office.

This has New York City in an uproar. Its rent-control laws permit each tenant only one such cut-rate apartment, and it must be his "primary residence." No living elsewhere and keeping the apartment for occasional visits to the City, no converting it into a storeroom or office, even

for campaigns. But—and can't you just see the legislators grinning at this little loophole?—*such usages and multiple rent-controlled leases become illegal only when a landlord objects*. Believe me, landlords object—unless the offender is a powerful politician who can put them out of business.

Regarding the historical background that brought about such a tyrannous, anti-capitalist policy, Walter Block, in a fine article in "The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics," wrote:

New York State legislators defend the War Emergency Tenant Protection Act—also known as rent control—as a way of protecting tenants from war-related housing shortages. The war referred to in the law is not the recent Gulf War, nor the Vietnam War. It is World War II. That is when rent control started in New York City. Of course, war has very little to do with apartment shortages. On the contrary, the difficulty is created by rent control, the supposed solution. Gotham is far from the only city to have embraced rent control—a *form of housing socialism*. Many others across the United States have succumbed to the blandishments of this legislative "fix."

The historical background behind rent control in New York would serve as the template for how socialists, liberals and progressives would realize their nefarious ends by infusing Leviathan government into every conceivable aspect of our lives: First, create or co-opt a pretext. In this case, in 1943 America was in the middle of World War II when mandated shortages of every conceivable item were understandably the norm, and most Americans were in dire straits. Second, create a boogey man or a red herring to keep the people's eyes off the *real* enemies of freedom and liberty. In this case, socialists and their willing accomplices in the media, using Machiavellian tactics, sold the rent-control policy as a magnanimous gesture by the government to stave off the merciless moneychangers (landlords) who couldn't wait to raise the rents of the poor during war time and kick them out into the mean streets of New York.

Both the pretext and the policy was all a colossal farce. Aker writes:

Rent control has cursed New York since World War II, when it transferred decisions about where and how residents will live from us to the Legislature. But tenants don't see it that way. Instead, they rejoice that politicians save them from a horror more dreaded than terrorists: free-market rents. And politicians rejoice that tenants, who vastly outnumber landlords in the voting pool, are that gullible.

Ergo, Our Rulers force certain entrepreneurs to subsidize some of the apartments they lease. Exactly which landlords, buildings and even apartments within those buildings depends on so many variables that it keeps battalions of lawyers in court. At the end of the war, some apartments rent for only a fraction of what the same space across the hall costs. The landlord eats the difference.

Here, I want to take a detour from Akers' analysis of Rangel's criminal exploitation of New York's rent-control programs to chide the people of New York who have tolerated this corrupt policy against their own vested interests for over six decades. Thomas Jefferson, in his transcendent Declaration of Independence, upholds the standard of all free peoples: *We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. . . . We are Americans. We were born into freedom and liberty, and our country is the oldest and continuing representative republic in the world. That means that any time fat-cat, corrupt political hacks like Rangel and the remnants of the crooked Tammany Hall machine in New York overtly or covertly try to put their filthy mitts on our tax dollars, we must hold them accountable, and when we find corruption, we must throw the bums out of office—Democrats or Republicans—it doesn't matter to me because truth transcends any political ideology.*

But as Shakespeare said in Hamlet's famous soliloquy, ". . . and there's the rub." The people of New York, who pride themselves on being some of the most intelligent, progressive, sophisticated, cosmopolitan, high-class people on the planet, for the past 65 years have allowed unscrupulous politicians they elected to high office in the name of rent egalitarianism, rent equality and socialized housing to shamelessly exploit millions of tenants and their landlords for no other reason than to enrich the politicians that enact these policies and the shyster attorneys who enforce them in the courts, thus denigrating the quality of life for *all* New York residents. But why?

What this entire Rangel-New York rent-control fiasco shows me is that the curse that progressivism, liberalism and socialism has bequeathed to America isn't so much FDR's "New Deal," LBJ's "Great Society," Jimmy Carter's admonition to turn down our thermostats to 68 degrees, Obama's scolding us to speak Spanish or stop driving our SUVs, or any other of the innumerable socialist policies done in the name

of good intentions like "helping the poor," "making the rich pay their fair share," or the most ubiquitous pretext: "for the public good." No, no, no, dear reader, the triumph of liberalism that strikes a mortal blow to Jefferson's inheritance to us over 230 years ago—*Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*—is that we allowed the teachers unions and progressive educators to establish and then take over the public schools.

The tragedy of America's Stalinist public education system has in turn produced generation, after generation, after generation of brain-dead, illiterate people who can't think or reason for themselves, who don't understand the basic precepts of logic, deductive reasoning and a representative republic to comprehend when they are being bamboozled by devious government bureaucrats. The Russian dictator Josef Stalin was right when he said that, "[State-controlled] education is a weapon, whose effect depends on who holds it in his hands and at whom it is aimed." A propagandized or poorly educated populace is how we tolerate an unscrupulous pol like Charlie Rangel. Charlie has no fear of an honest, strong man challenging him in the next election. Why should he worry? He has been successful at hoodwinking his own people for 40 years. Why not 40 more?

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 8

LIMBAUGH: OUR LINK TO REAGAN CONSERVATISM

July 26, 2008

Editor's note: This column is one in a series of WND tributes this week to Rush Limbaugh by our columnists in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of his national radio program Aug. 1.

[T]here's no reason to be afraid of these people [the liberal establishment]. There's no reason to cower. Whenever somebody is coming at you with lies and a false premise, you don't accept the lie, you don't accept the false premise. You just laugh at them, and you fight back, and you ram it back down their throats.

~ Rush Limbaugh, Oct. 19, 2007, interview on Fox News' *Hannity and Colmes*

Harvard University (*circa* 1988)

My first memory of Rush Limbaugh was 20 years ago. I was an idealistic young man of 26 walking around the campus of what many con-

sider liberal Mecca—Harvard University. I expected to have a drama-free, wonderful life backed by the stamp of approval of a big-name school. However, like with most pessimistic people, I was waiting for the other shoe to drop, so to speak. I didn't have to wait long. The narrative below was in part cited in an earlier autobiographical column. In that piece, I cited the critical event that lead me to shift my intellectual allegiance from liberalism to conservatism during a fateful conversation I had with several Harvard graduate students at a party, when I had the unmitigated temerity to question the underlying suppositions of the modern feminist movement (here, think Michelle Obama before her makeover). The excerpt reads:

These three erudite, classy, intelligent black Harvard graduate students surrounded me and suddenly transformed themselves into Lady Macbeth, Nurse Ratchet and Hillary Rodham Clinton as they in unison went nuclear on me. They read me the riot act and essentially characterized me as a crazy, uninformed idiot. From another room, my buddy Leon heard all of the commotion and rushed in to my aid, but his altruism and intervention was all to no avail. I and I alone had committed the unpardonable sin of liberalism—Thou shalt not have an independent thought (apart from liberal dogma). After the party, I knew that my political and intellectual life would never be the same again. Like Caesar, who with his Roman Legions boldly marched onto Rome in 49 B.C., I had now crossed the Rubicon and had forsaken liberalism forever. This night I became a conservative.

From that point forward, I determined to set my own intellectual milieu at Harvard as I began the arduous task of self-educating and learning about the principles of conservatism. I wrote:

The year 1988 was a time of great angst for the largely liberal faculty and student body at Harvard because (in their view) America had greatly suffered for eight years under a Ronald Reagan administration. Many of my own people *to this day* consider Reagan the Antichrist. Why? Because the number of letters in his name, Ronald Wilson Reagan, amount to the number of the Antichrist of the book of Revelation—666.

Like any new convert, I set upon the task of educating myself regarding the tenets of classical conservatism. I got a subscription to the *National Review* and the *Conservative Chronicle* and read every book I could find in the used bookstores by Bill Buckley, Gertrude Himmel-

farb, Walter Williams, Thomas Sowell, Antonin Scalia, Robert Bork and others. I also studied the political speeches of President Reagan.

One of the influences helping me grow in conservative philosophy that I neglected to mention in that piece was the path-breaking, conservative intellectual, Rush Limbaugh, whom I started listening to around November 1988 just three months after he started his national show. Rush's influence on my own intellectual development came in myriad forms, but primarily through the way he articulated his conservatism with such clarity, force, confidence and humor—characteristics he maintains to this day.

Lately, particularly during this presidential election and the many debates between the candidates, Rush has literally been on a one-man crusade in his yeoman's efforts to educate the public in the basic principles of Debate 101—*Never accept the premise of your opponent [liberals]*. For example, during an interview last year on Fox News' "Hannity and Colmes," Rush made the following prescient remarks on the proper and improper way to debate liberal Democrats: "[T]here's no reason to be afraid of these people [the liberal establishment]. There's no reason to cower. Whenever somebody is coming at you with lies and a false premise, you don't accept the lie, you don't accept the false premise. You just laugh at them, and you fight back, and you ram it back down their throats." This quote alone contains all of the genius that is vintage Rush—rational, trenchant, unapologetic conservative ideas stated in his patented jovial manner with a modicum of satire. Satire to Rush is the sword he wields so skillfully to bring his intellectual and political enemies to their knees.

If the Republican Party and the conservative movement can avoid shriveling up and dying on the vine, so to speak, they must accept Rush Limbaugh, Dr. Michael Savage, Laura Ingraham, Sean Hannity, Mark Levin and other radio talk-show hosts' open invitations to appear regularly on their shows. If the GOP wants to win the presidential election, McCain and the Republican Party must stop their quisling behavior and return to unapologetic Ronald Reagan conservatism. Paraphrasing the ideas of Rush: Stop accepting liberal premises on policy differences by throwing the conservative base of your party under the bus to curry favor from the liberal media. In the end, they still hate your politics and will not vote Republican.

The American public is not stupid. They would rather vote for an authentic FDR-liberal like a Hillary Clinton or a certified socialist like Barack Obama any day before they vote for a Neville Chamberlain-like opportunist that is John McCain. In other words, people prefer an authentic original rather than a moribund copy. That's how Ronald Reagan won 44 states in 1980 and 49 states in 1984. The American people plainly understood that Reagan was an authentic American that loved God, his country and her people above all else. Like Reagan, Rush is also an authentic American that loves her people and her unique traditions of liberty.

Rush was recently rewarded with the second largest radio contract in history. Real businessmen know that truth and authenticity sells, and that's why they clamor to advertise their products on the 600-plus stations that carry Rush's prescient radio show.

Twenty years ago, Rush, through the vehicle of the virtually dead AM radio signal, together with his singular, unshakable belief in the transcendent ideas of Ronald Reagan conservatism, free-market capitalism and rugged American individualism, continued a revolution that Reagan eloquently spoke of at the 1964 and 1976 Republican conventions, that William F. Buckley gave an intellectual voice to when he began *National Review* magazine in 1955 and that tens of millions of Americans have supported and championed in living their daily lives, by aspiring to the transcendent ideas and ideals of Jefferson—"Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Thank you, Rush, for mentoring me 20 years ago when you first began your radio show and when I was a new convert to the dynamic conservative movement; a young graduate student roaming precariously in the liberal wilderness, yet daily I heard your clarion call to *Veritas* (truth). We need your leadership now more than ever as you help give vision and direction to the conservative movement 20 years into the future. Exceeding gratitude to you, Rush, for teaching the legions of conservatives here in America and all over the world, who daily wage battle in the arena of ideas, to never, ever accept the tyrannical, sophistic premises of leviathan government liberalism—for if one does so, the argument is lost before it begins.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 9

WHY KWAME GETS A PASS IN DETROIT

September 04, 2008

For any of my liberal friends out there who are still in denial about whether or not there is a liberal bias in the media, I have just three words for them: Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick. Can you imagine all of the drama, the salacious text messages between KK and his former chief of staff, Christine Beatty, the ruined lives and careers costing the city tens of millions in lawsuits (as well as hundreds of millions more at stake), the angst, the treachery, the waste, fraud and abuse KK has visited upon the city of Detroit being perpetrated by, say, a black conservative Republican like a Clarence Thomas, J.C. Watts, Michael Steele, Thomas Sowell or Walter Williams?

As a case in point, you see how the socialist media is virtually apoplectic regarding the recent revelations of vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin's daughter being five months pregnant. Feminists across the nation, our supposed sentinels of the rights of women, have said virtually nothing about KK's pathological womanizing ways, but are now on the warpath against Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin. Why? Palin, though a woman, is a conservative Republican, whereas KK is black and a liberal Democrat. Feminists could really care less about women or women's rights; it's all about power, control and forcing a radical socialist agenda upon every aspect of culture and society. Since the Palin pregnancy revelation emerged, the mainstream media even interrupted coverage of a major hurricane (Gustav) as well as coverage of the Republican National Convention to speculate whether or not Palin was properly vetted by McCain since this info presumably wasn't discovered until *after* Palin was picked as McCain's running mate.

Likewise, if a black Republican were mayor of Detroit and had done just *one* of the dozens of alleged crimes KK has done, I could imagine the DNC at their convention last week in Denver devoting 24/7 coverage: that Mayor Clarence Thomas has ruined the once great city of Detroit; that Mayor J.C. Watts or Mayor Michael Steele's ruinous leadership over black people and repeated abuse of women is nothing short of evidence of racism and sexism against the fine citizens of Detroit; that Mayor

Thomas Sowell or Mayor Walter Williams' felonious and fraudulent behavior must be put away immediately—otherwise the city of Detroit, the state of Michigan and the Republican Party are doomed! Yet regarding KK's notorious acts, Detroit actually receives little national attention from the mainstream media—why? KK is a liberal hack out of the tradition of Coleman Young and Marion Berry and skillfully plays the race card as a diversion. On the other hand, people like Gov. Sarah Palin, Justice Clarence Thomas and the other highly accomplished black conservatives cited above do not easily fit the liberal template. These people did not kiss the ring of the civil rights leaders and therefore owe no intrinsic allegiance to the civil rights movement. Neither does Palin owe her position to the feminist movement.

Palin doesn't hate men, didn't burn her bra in college and wasn't a member of NOW or a Saul Alinsky "community organizer" in the '70s; therefore, liberal Democrats are very suspicious, even paranoid about these dissenting opinions, thus hoping to ruin their reputations by any means necessary. KK in a liberal world can do no wrong. Sure, he bankrupted Detroit, is a scoundrel, a thug, a felon and a soon-to-be ex-mayor who is about to be forcibly removed from office by a reluctant Gov. Jennifer Granholm, yet because he rules over black people in a black city, in the liberal Democrat way of thinking, it's all in the family. KK had good intentions, and since he was on the right side of all "the issues," he gets a pass.

Like Sen. Ted Kennedy and Mary Jo Kopechne, the young woman that drowned at Chappaquiddick 39 years ago, or the murky connections between Ted Kennedy's elder brothers, JFK and RFK, and the mysterious 1962 death of legendary actress Marilyn Monroe, Democrats freely offer absolution for any sins done as long that politician follows liberal dogma (i.e., devotion to abortion and FDR/LBJ big-government programs, etc.). Remember how J.C. Watts for years was the lone black Republican congressman? How he was constantly vilified by the liberal media and considered a turncoat by his fellow Congressional Black Caucus members who refused to allow him to join their group? Remember how Michael Steele, Ken Blackwell and Lynn Swann all ran unsuccessfully last year for senator of Maryland, governor of Ohio and governor of Pennsylvania, respectively, while the white liberal media and black "community organizers" of their states constantly denigrated them as not being "au-

thentically black” and whose candidacies did not represent “black values”?

Why are black conservatives and black Republicans demonized by the white mainstream media and white Democrats? Because white liberals who are transfixed and guilt-ridden by race must promote the Big Lie as truth—that white liberal Democrats by the policies that they and they alone have created over the past 75 years have done what 400 years of slavery could not do: destroyed the black family. They know this. Civil rights activist and the Congressional Black Caucus realize this also and therefore have become masters at blame shifting. Any unbiased reading of history will reveal that there is an irrevocable correlation between big government welfare programs and the destruction of the black family. However, to keep the 92 percent of voting blacks on the liberal plantation, these liberal politicians, intellectuals and activists have employed the tried and true technique of *displacement*.

What is displacement? “According to Freudian psychoanalytic theory, displacement is when a person shifts his/her impulses from an unacceptable target [liberals] to a more acceptable or less threatening target [conservatives]. That KK is still mayor of Detroit after six years of continuous scandals is the best evidence that there is a liberal bias in Detroit and why Democratic power brokers even as high as the anointed Barack Obama, Hillary the Congressional Black Caucus and most Democrats on a national level have had little to say about this rogue in their midst.

John summarized it best in John 3:18, 19: *If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before [it hated] you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.* I don’t fight against liberal media bias anymore. Now I thank God for liberal media bias, for it means that those that fall victim to it are on the road of truth and that in the end one sincere word spoken in truth will defeat a thousand words of flattery spoken in deceit.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 10

A SAVAGE PREDICTION FOR MCCAIN

October 11, 2008

Not only do I predict that John McCain will lose to Obama in a landslide, but that McCain will also lose his Senate seat in Arizona because he ran an incompetent campaign and will soon disappear from the political landscape.

~ Michael Savage's radio show, Oct. 6, 2008

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? (Who will guard the guardians?)

~ Plato, *The Republic* (question to Socrates)

As we approach the November elections, I—like many conservatives—am in a state of impending angst. I am convinced during these perilous times that without the Bible, WorldNetDaily and the Michael Savage radio show to comfort me, I would be certifiable for the asylum by now. Last Monday, while listening to Dr. Michael Savage perform one of his brilliant impromptu monologues, he made the following statement, which I will paraphrase in the following manner: “Not only do I predict that John McCain will lose to Obama in a landslide, but that McCain will also lose his Senate seat in Arizona because he ran an incompetent campaign and will soon disappear from the political landscape.” As he spoke these words, I felt a burning in my heart like I was listening to a prophet of ancient Israel. While I hoped he was wrong, I knew deep down in my soul that Savage was right. But who's listening? Certainly not the McCain campaign.

Sen. McCain, despite his self-admitted lack of knowledge of economic issues, should be taking a crash course by reading “An Idiots Guide to Economics.” He and Palin should be hammering Obama and the Democrats every day regarding the bailout of the Wall Street crooks and incompetent mortgage executives at Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG, Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers and others. These corporate criminals have been protected for years by the Democrat majority in Congress, even as Republicans repeatedly sought for tighter regulations of Wall Street and the home mortgage industry. Instead, what does McCain do? On Sept. 24th he concocted a ridiculous political stunt by suspending his presi-

dential campaign and traveling to Washington, D.C., ostensibly to help the Senate steal \$1 trillion dollars from the American people in order to pay off the arrogant thieves of Wall Street and their Democrat enablers in Congress, particularly Chris Dodd and Barney Frank, chairmen of the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee, respectively.

Why would Sen. John McCain, a so-called "conservative Republican," so cavalierly misuse the taxpayers' money by voting for this outrageous \$1 trillion corporate welfare bailout bill, yet seems oblivious to his own political suicide by continually angering his conservative base?

The fix is in.

Savage then did a masterful analysis of the current congressional hearing of Lehman CEO Richard S. Fuld Jr. who received \$350 million in compensation just since 2000, including a \$20 million bonus shortly before for bankrupting Lehman Brothers, a once-vaunted investment bank on Wall Street that has existed for almost 160 years! Below are some excerpts of the testimony from a New York Times article:

At the start of 2008, Mr. Fuld said he believed that Lehman's capital position was strong and that it did not face an impending liquidity crisis. It was on that basis that he approved billions in compensation and other cash payments, he said. As late as five days before Lehman's collapse, investors were told in a conference call that no new capital would be needed, that the bank's real estate investments were properly valued. "Did you mislead your investors?" Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich, Democrat from Ohio, asked Mr. Fuld.

"No sir, we did not mislead our investors, and to the best of our ability at the time, we made disclosures that we believed to be accurate," Mr. Fuld responded.

Mr. Fuld's individual compensation, which totaled some \$350 million since 2000, was repeatedly criticized by lawmakers. But Mr. Fuld pointed out that he had still held 10 million shares in Lehman when the bank filed for bankruptcy, and therefore lost out on tens of millions in additional compensation.

Savage then reminds Congress that as part of its investigatory powers, they can immediately arrest someone brought before one of its committees who is found to commit perjury while under oath. What galls me the most regarding Fuld's testimony is the last sentence where he arrogantly and in an accusatory manner states that, "he had held 10

million shares in Lehman when the bank filed for bankruptcy, and therefore lost out on tens of millions in additional compensation."

Boo hoo hoo!

Fuld's jaded, selfish view of America's dire financial collapse is extremely insulting to all Americans of good will. It was as if he was some great heroic figure that was doing America a favor by giving up tens of million dollars of his ill-gotten gain. While the hubris of Fuld and the titans of Wall Street is beyond the pale, Savage reminded his listeners of Plato's paradox from his magnum opus, "The Republic," where Socrates answers the question: *Who will guard the guardians?* with these words for the ages:

"... [W]e must choose from among our guardians those men who, upon examination, seem most of all to believe throughout their lives that they must eagerly pursue what is advantageous to the city and be wholly unwilling to do the opposite."

Analysis: Plato's Socrates is clearly saying that in addition to having the wisdom-loving and spirited parts of their souls well-trained, the rulers of his ideal state are to have a very highly developed sense of social concern [care] (throughout their lives, he says, they are to be tested to see that they don't put their own advantage above that of the state).

Essentially, Plato's Socrates contends that the guardians will guard themselves. This view admittedly is Pollyannaish; however, in his defense, Plato hadn't considered scoundrels like Fuld, Wall Street and their enablers in the Democrat majority of Congress—men who place profits above people, principle and morality. Surely in the ideal republic or state these men would not be allowed to benefit from their thievery, right?

About 200 years before Plato's dialogues on Socrates were written, 2,600 years ago, the great biblical prophet Ezekiel declared: *I searched for a man among them who would build up the wall and stand in the gap before Me for the land, so that I would not destroy it; but I found no one.* So it is in America today. As the stock market continues to drop around the world, I am not at all hopeful that those who have abused our financial system in America will not only profit greatly, but are enabled by our very own guardians (i.e., Congress, the president, the SEC, the Federal Reserve, the courts) who are supposed to protect the interests of "We the People" over their own selfish needs. Tragically, McCain is neither the philosopher-king that Plato exalted in "The Republic," nor the man to stand in

the gap as the ancient prophet Ezekiel longed for the nation of Israel. McCain seems to be an example of an old, moribund, uninspired political hack of a bygone era who is desperately trying to have his last hurrah on the backs of America's taxpayers. America's other choice for president is a certified Marxist Manchurian Candidate against whom I probably played basketball 20 years ago while at Harvard.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 11

ARE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS THE REAL RACISTS?

October 04, 2008

[A]nybody toting guns and stripping moose don't care too much about what they do with Jews and blacks.

~ Rep. Alcee Hastings, D-Fla., Sept. 24, 2008

Prologue

Rep. Alcee Hastings, a liberal Democrat representing Florida's 23rd Congressional District, is a perfect example of the pathetic leadership that has poorly served black America over the past 40 years. His brand of racist liberalism has given this pol a lucrative and influential career where he has perfected the art of exploiting social, racial, gender, economic, religious and political differences for his own Machiavellian ends. Like many of his colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus, or CBC, Rep. Hastings came of age during the 1960s and the apotheosis of the civil rights movement. During that era and before, the civil rights movement had legitimacy and was represented by intelligent, rational leaders like Howard Thurman, A. Philip Randolph, Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins, MLK, Ralph Abernathy, James Farmer, Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, Thurgood Marshall and others.

I am convinced that the gap between the *rhetoric* of civil rights leaders and their vaunted promises encapsulated in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1968, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, failed to match the *reality* of the utter despair, crime, discrimination and self-inflicted hardship black people suffered under in small, medium and big cities across America. Black people quite understanda-

bly felt betrayed and became increasingly enraged as the civil rights movement became separated from the existential needs of black people. Concurrent with the rise of the civil rights movement, the 1960s witnessed the increasing radicalism of the Democrat Party and its desire to obtain votes and power by balkanizing the American public—treating people not as individuals but as groups—blacks, Jews, Hispanics, women, gays, union workers, midgets, etc., that could be pitted against each other.

Divide and Conquer

Concurrent with the rise of blacks in political office, Democrats systematically began exploiting peoples' gender, race, anti-religion, disability or sexual preference, and through liberal activist judges on the courts, began elevating these natural differences or "choices" as protected constitutional rights. The late 1960s witnessed the opening of Pandora's Box as the storied Democratic Party of Wilson, FDR and JFK devolved into a political party resembling George Orwell's "Animal Farm"—where every misfit, pervert, criminal, crazy person and bum in society now had a political voice.

The early 1970s witnessed black Americans in big cities across the country elect black local political officials like mayors, clerks, judges and city councilmen. Also at the state and national levels black politicians began to be elected in majority black districts. However, a major problem with the rise of black political power during this period of history was that they followed the wrong political philosophy—big-government liberalism. Rep. Alcee Hastings and many of his Congressional Black Caucus colleagues—John Conyers, John Lewis, Jim Clyburn, Maxine Waters, Sheila Jackson Lee, Cynthia McKinney and others—all dutifully follow the ideas of W.E.B. Du Bois (1968-1963) who founded the NAACP in 1909.

Rights vs. Responsibilities

Here is the blind spot of the civil rights movement: Du Bois and the mainstream civil rights movement leaders placed the onus for securing equal *rights* of blacks solely upon white America and none of the *responsibilities* of following what Booker T. Washington called "the fundamentals of civilization" upon black America. This civil rights strategy made Du Bois very popular among the black public from the early 1900s even

until modern times; however, many other critical-thinking black people held other views regarding black racial redemption in America—self-help philosophy, personal discipline, love of America's founding ideals, rugged individualism and morality espoused by Du Bois' contemporary Booker T. Washington (1856-1915), a self-taught former slave who later became the founder of Tuskegee University. Rep. Hastings and the modern-day civil rights movement took the easy road of W.E.B. Du Bois and embraced the big-government liberalism of Wilson, FDR and LBJ, which along with abortion has virtually destroyed the black family in America. This is why Hastings can make the vulgar comments he made before a Jewish group in Florida: "Anybody toting guns and stripping moose don't care too much about what they do with Jews and blacks"—and the room erupts into thunderous laughter.

Race hustlers like Rep. Hastings have mastered the art of Marxist class warfare rhetoric. These techniques have made him and his colleagues in the CBC very powerful and influential leaders of the black community. However, here is CBC's Faustian bargain with the devil: Black Democrat leaders at every level of government, including "community activists" like young Barack Obama, Rev. Al Sharpton and Rev. Jesse Jackson, are only of use to the Democrat Party if they can keep the overwhelming majority of voting blacks on the liberal Democratic plantation. Black leaders have achieved this monopoly with ruthless efficiency since the days of FDR in the early 1930s and in virtually every election since obtained 90-95 percent of the black vote for the Democratic Party. Therefore, the Democratic Party (blacks and whites) have a vested interest in continuing to foster black anger, mis-education, pathology, victimhood and dependency. It is the currency of liberal Democratic politics.

Palin: Justice Clarence Thomas Redux

Finally, let's explore this important question: Why is Rep. Hastings, the Democratic Party and the liberal media so apoplectic and obsessed about Gov. Sarah Palin? Palin's mistreatment by the media reminds me of the utter fear and loathing the liberal establishment demonstrated regarding the appointment of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court in 1991. I believe the answer is that secular liberalism at its core is a fundamentally racist and vacuous political philosophy. White liberals especially seem to demonstrate a venal, irrational hatred whenever they are presented with one of their special interest group representatives (blacks, women, His-

panics) that “made it” without their permission, approval or groveling allegiance to one of liberalism’s government programs.

Like Clarence Thomas, Sarah Palin drives liberals crazy because she doesn’t fit the liberal paradigm for women, for examples: America is an evil, greedy, racist, sexist, homophobic country and hates you; You are not an individual, you belong to one of our balkanized groups; You can’t make it in America without abortion, one of our civil rights acts or Stalinist government programs. Heroes like Booker T. Washington, James Farmer, Clarence Thomas, Sarah Palin and millions of other anonymous citizens from every walk of life who just want the government out of their lives so they can have the freedom and liberty to pursue happiness by their success have on one level helped to destroy these liberal myths—yet like a vampire, big-government liberalism seems to rise again.

In the final analysis, people of goodwill across America must put pressure on racial demagogues like Rep. Alcee Hastings and his fellow colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus and cultivate competent, intelligent conservative candidates to run against these charlatans. Until Republicans get out of their country clubs, put away their golf clubs, stop trying to compromise with Democrats and get a coherent, consistent, substantive vision to win the hearts and minds of Jews, blacks, Hispanics and Americans of every ethnic group, then I predict that another generation of angry, brainwashed, dependent socialist voters will continue to elect poverty pimps like Alcee Hastings to be the warden of their own voluntary prison.

ON POLITICS—*ESSAY 12*

THE DAY I TOOK FIRE FROM OBAMA

November 01, 2008

Unlike the boring, scripted debates we see on TV, this debate will be a no-holds-barred, knockdown, drag out political brawl where ALL relevant policy issues about each candidate will be on the table.

~ Ellis Washington, Mock Presidential Debate flyer, SSU, Oct. 29, 2008

Invitation to a *real* political debate

Last Wednesday at Savannah State University, where I teach law and political science, I organized a political forum called, “Mock Presidential Debate—Obama v. McCain.” Barack Obama was played by my colleague Kevin Hales (professor of history); I played Sen. John McCain.

The political debate was a smashing success. We had over 250 students and about 15 faculty and staff participate. Several faculty members even brought their entire class. We also had a TV crew from the local Savannah affiliate WSAV that filmed the entire political forum.

To encourage students, administration, faculty and staff to attend, I sent out the following announcement:

ATTN: ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, STAFF & STUDENTS OF SSU

On behalf of the Political Science Association at Savannah State University, I would like to formally invite the entire SSU family to attend an interesting and unique political forum—a Mock Presidential Debate—between BARACK OBAMA (represented by professor Kevin Hales [History Department] & JOHN MCCAIN (represented by professor Ellis Washington [Political Science Department]).

Professor Leonard McCoy [Political Science Department] will be the moderator along with student moderators Chelsea White and Sheila Adu Poku.

Unlike the boring, scripted debates we see on TV, this debate will be a no-holds-barred, knockdown, drag out political brawl where ALL relevant policy issues about each candidate will be on the table.

See the attached flyer for further details regarding the Mock Presidential Debate.

PLEASE SPREAD THE WORD AND SEE YOU ALL ON WED. AFTERNOON AT 1:00!

Peace,

Ellis Washington, J.D.

Faculty Advisor, Political Science Association

Of course, I knew going in that I was a marked man, that participation in this presidential debate would be a great challenge that would put my intellectual, political and spiritual capacities to the test—yet like a lamb to the slaughter, I embraced my destiny.

‘Why do you want to be president of the United States?’

This was the opening salvo of this political beat down. In order to set the proper tone, I knew my answer must be strong and unequivocal. I said in part:

The blood that flows throughout my veins is not red; it is red white and blue! I am an American. I believe in American exceptionalism. My grandfather and father were both decorated admirals in the U.S. Navy, fought fascism and bled for this country. I served six years in Vietnam, five and a half years as a prisoner of war of the dreaded Vietcong where I was almost continually tortured. I want the best leadership for America ... and that's why I want to be president of the United States of America! (*Stunned silence*)

Although most of the questions from the SSU student body were passionate, earnest and intelligent, the overall tone was hostile, even antagonistic against the character I played, Sen. John McCain, and against the Republican Party. Surprisingly, some of the students braved the jeers and asked difficult questions to Sen. Barack Obama, while others nodded approvingly when I spoke like they were saying, “Professor Washington, I’m with you; I just can’t say so publicly.” At the beginning of the debate, many questions centered on domestic issues, particularly the welfare state and how Obama promised a tax cut for 95 percent of Americans, free health care, dental care, child care, prenatal care, college education, job training, mortgage assistance, free gas for your car and free oil to heat your home, etc.

When I could take no more socialist propaganda from Obama and his youthful minions (many of them my own students), I launched into an extemporaneous tirade, which I paraphrase below:

What is wrong with you people?! How long will you allow your minds to be shackled by Big Government liberalism and the Democratic Party? In the early 1930s, Franklin Delano Roosevelt promised you a “New Deal” and got your forefathers hooked on the drug of welfare and government handouts. In the 1960s, LBJ gave you the “Great Society” and over \$5 trillion dollars in new welfare spending to fight what LBJ called his “War on Poverty,” yet poverty over the past 40 years has grown exponentially. Even worse, there is a poverty of the spirit that is particularly acute in the black community that remains undiagnosed and unacknowledged ... even to this day.

Ladies and gentlemen, when will you say I don't need your welfare, your universal health care, dental care, Social Security, food stamps and government cheese? I'll buy my own cheese. [Slams fist on the table] "GET OFF THE DAMN PLANTATION!" (*Stunned silence, followed by a crescendo of jeers*)

I thought to myself, "Ooooo noooo, I did it now! I really messed up. Did I cross the line of civility?" However, when I met the following day with my department chairman, Dr. Benn Bongang, he said, "Ellis, that was my favorite part of the debate. The students needed to hear what you said." Dr. Bongang is from Cameroon in West Africa and further remarked that like Africa, Black people in America must look within and really analyze *why* they are voting for Barack Obama. Is it because your parents are doing so, or told you to do so? Is it because all you have been exposed to are Democratic Party policies? Is it because of the color of Obama's skin? None of those reasons is acceptable. I then went across his desk and gave Dr. Bongang a big hug like I had just met a long-lost friend; I breathed a huge sigh of relief (until this meeting I didn't even know that he attended the event) and said, "Thank you, Dr. Bongang, for your support. You made my day!"

Meeting 'Obama' face to face

I knew I did the right thing when the next morning my colleague, professor Hales, who played Obama, came to my office. He was somewhat emotional and said: "All my life people who I thought were my friends, people whom I have known for years, people whom I share the *exact* political worldview with . . . later stabbed me in the back. . . . God brought you into my life, Ellis, and we have views that are diametrical from one another and I . . ." (*his voice gets choked up at this point*) I interjected and said, "It's not about ideology, professor Hales; it's about humanity, and as long as we place our humanity *first*, hopefully we can eventually overcome our political differences."

Epilogue

Professor Leonard McCoy, who served as the moderator of this event, conducted the debate like the great jazz musician Miles Davis directed his famous quintet. Several times McCoy even came to my aide by asking Obama difficult questions and serving as the sergeant of arms when the students got too rowdy. That day I truly believe that our political

forum touched a lot of hearts and minds at Savannah State University during Homecoming Week and that the worldview of those 250 young minds and 15 faculty and staff was changed when they saw conservatism debated on par with liberalism in the arena of ideas . . . a change hopefully that will plant a seed for a better America.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 13

A CRITIQUE OF PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH

October 18, 2008

President George W. Bush is a fiscal socialist that greased the skids for the [Marxist] socialist, Barack Hussein Obama.

McCain can win this election if at tonight's debate he says, "You know, Barack, your economic policy has been tried by Karl Marx, in the Soviet Union, in Cuba and by Jimmy Carter . . . it is really trickle up poverty.

~ Dr. Michael Savage, Oct. 15, 2008

Prologue to a catastrophe

I, like most conservative Republicans, have been increasingly outraged and frustrated with the presidency of George W. Bush. However, let me state at the onset there are several things I can think of off the top of my head that Bush did well during his two terms as president of the most powerful country in the history of the world:

- ❖ In 2001 Bush implemented a \$1.35 trillion tax-cut program—one of the largest tax cuts in U.S. history;
- ❖ His father, Bush 41, appointed one conservative justice—Clarence Thomas, Bush 43 appointed two moderate conservative justices to the U.S. Supreme Court—John Roberts and Samuel Alito;
- ❖ Bush has kept America from another terrorist attack since 9/11.

That said, Bush lied to the American people by portraying himself as a conservative Republican in the tradition of a Ronald Reagan. With less than 100 days left on his presidency, it is self-evident that Bush 43 indeed is his father's son—a liberal Republican in the tradition of Prescott S. Bush (father of Bush 41 and grandfather of Bush 43), Thomas Dewey,

Dwight Eisenhower, Nelson Rockefeller, Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford.

On Oct. 13, Washington Times reporter Bill Gertz was on Fox News' show "Hannity & Colmes," being interviewed about his newest book, "The Failure Factory," and made a shocking revelation about the Bush administration:

COLMES: . . . You know what I find very amusing about the book was that all the bad guys are liberals. And you referred to, for example, liberals in the White House, liberals at State. Condi Rice is a RINO—Republican In Name Only. Andy Card, liberal Republican. Stephen Hadley conducted liberal policies at State. Dan Bartlett, communication director for Bush, had a liberal political outlook. Karen Hughes, Bush adviser, a liberal Republican. These aren't just entrenched bureaucrats. These are people Bush chose to be around. I didn't know Karen Hughes was a liberal or Dan Bartlett was a liberal or Condi was a Republican in name only, as you say in the book.

GERTZ: Well, I think—I think it's very important to point out that, beyond just being liberal, they're anticonservatives. That is, they regard conservatives as worse than liberals. And that puts them, to me, in the liberal camp.

COLMES: Condi does? Dan Bartlett? Andy Card? The people who ran the Bush White House?

GERTZ: Oh, yes. Yes, they facilitated this liberal bureaucracy which is now out of control.

COLMES: So are you saying that Bush is not in control of his own White House?

GERTZ: Well, he cast himself as a compassionate conservative, and I argue that he's neither, that his administration is neither. He's done tremendous damage to the conservative movement. At the end of his second term, Americans can now plainly see that they have been made fools of by Bush's so-called philosophy of "compassionate conservatism."

In my opinion, the entire Bush presidency was a colossal sham. Bush's *rhetoric* was as Ronald Reagan; however, his *reality* was as Savage characterized him, a "fiscal socialist" who favors open borders, exploding debt and anti-American, globalist policies that economically, morally, socially, culturally, legally has plunged America into a paroxysm that

we may never recover from once the Marxist Obama assumes the presidency. Why has Bush 43 been such a miserable, incompetent president? While the reasons are too many and complex to delineate in this short article, allow me cite a few policy concerns:

- ❖ By August 2007, due to increases in domestic and foreign spending, the national debt had risen to over \$10 trillion dollars, an increase of over 70 percent from the start of the year 2000, when the debt was \$5.6 trillion, according to Wikipedia.com;
- ❖ Bush is perhaps the worst communicator out of all the presidents in modern times. He is so inept at conveying even the simplest ideas without that bewildered look, pausing in awkward places, repeatedly saying, “uuuhhh,” “aaahhh,” “uuuhhhmm” and excessively stuttering for no apparent reason even while reading the teleprompter;
- ❖ The United States entered 2008 with a shaky economy, consisting of a housing market correction, a sub-prime mortgage crisis, soaring oil prices and a declining dollar value. In February, 63,000 jobs were lost, a five-year record, and many observers believed that a U.S. recession had begun.

In retrospect, I truly believe that George W. Bush was an accidental president—a man unworthy of the presidency; a man who shouldn’t have even been elected governor of Texas. Bush is a pitiable figure with deplorable political skills, a lack of intelligence and most tragically, an inability to surround himself with competent advisers who have read, understood and can explain these three fundamental books during these perilous times—the Bible, Plato’s “Republic” and Milton Friedman’s “Free to Choose.”

Moses vs. Bush

What is the difference between Bush 43 and the ancient prophet Moses? Both were given gargantuan tasks by God—leading America from 2001-09 vs. leading the children of Israel through the desert from the grinding bondage of slavery in Egypt to the promised land of Canaan (1450-1410 B.C.).

Here is the difference: While both men had terrible rhetorical skills, Moses honestly assessed his abilities and his audience; he knew that he didn’t deserve so great an honor to be the leader of the children of Israel. Moses was fully aware that his speaking skills were poor and constantly petitioned God to choose someone else: “And Moses said unto the LORD, O my LORD, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since

thou hast spoken unto thy servant: but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue."

God eventually granted Moses his brother Aaron to become his spokesman: "And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth: and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do. And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God."

Conversely, Bush, seemingly too proud and ignorant to realize that he is a horrible speaker with even fewer political instincts and intellectual abilities, faked it for almost eight years and drove the greatest country in the history of civilization into the Great Depression part II. Moses was wise because he honestly admitted his inabilities before God. Therefore the great prophet has ascended the steps of Parnassus as one of the greatest heroic figures of both Judaism and Christianity.

Since Bush seems impervious to both criticism or correction, after he leaves office in January 2009, history will justly cast him into the abyss of ineptitude, corruption and irrelevance along with other failed U.S. presidents of the past—men like Millard Fillmore, James Buchanan, Andrew Johnson, Franklin Pierce (descended from a second cousin of his mother, Barbara Bush [*née* Pierce]), Herbert Hoover, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 14

TEFLON BROTHERS: BARACK AND KWAME

July 03, 2008

Today, I want to return to the issue of Detroit and write about what I consider to be a vulgar double standard local political leadership and activist demagogues use either to prevent a substantive, comprehensive critique of the town or avert *real* solutions to seemingly intractable big-city problems. For instance, I contend in this column that current city governance and existing public policy in Detroit would have *never* been tolerated to this degree in any other city or by any other majority race of people in modern times.

Many honest, industrious Detroiters daily struggle to survive in the face of rampant political corruption, religious leaders on the take, inefficient or non-existent city services, vicious gangs running wild, worst schools in America, the worst quality of life in America, "the most miserable city in America" (according to a recent survey by Forbes.com), and to top it off: unbridled pathology, promiscuity, ignorance and endemic crime. With the great resources we have here in Michigan—five great lakes, abundant natural resources, dozens of top-tier academic institutions, the auto industry, the business and legal communities, the high-tech, economic sectors and public policy organizations—why with all this human capital is Michigan in general and Detroit in particular currently the worst run state and city in the Union?

The problems

Let's begin with the Detroit City Council. There are new allegations as a result of a federal probe that several members of the council and their staffs have taken bribes from the Houston-based Synagro company, which has an annual \$47 million dollar contract with the city for waste treatment. Implicated so far include Councilwomen Talabi, Collins and Conyers, the latter of which is the wife of Rep. John Conyers, D-Mich., chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee. Last Friday, John Clark, the chief of staff for Council President Ken Cockrel, submitted his resignation when he was videotaped by the feds taking bribes on two occasions for \$2,000 each time. The Synagro investigation seems to be just one of several ongoing probes into systemic corruption by numerous political officials in Detroit.

The grass-roots campaign to recall Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick seems to be gaining momentum. The group circulating petitions for Detroit residents to sign to remove Kilpatrick from office has already had several recall rallies. The most recent was on June 28, and two more rallies to solicit signatures are planned for July 12 and July 26. Of course, there are allegations that the mayor has sent his minions out to these recall events to disrupt and undermine them with typical Kilpatrick thuggish tactics including telling people to purposely write false signatures in an effort to render the recall petitions void. Let's hope Detroit's grass-roots recall efforts are swift and successful. They only need a little over 59,000 signatures in a city of 850,000. That's way below 10 percent of the population.

It has been a year since Dr. Connie Calloway left Missouri to become the superintendent of the Detroit Public Schools (DPS) on July 1, 2007. She has guided a school district with the lowest MEAP scores and the highest dropout rates in America history. Furthermore, she has plunged this mismanaged school district even further into the abyss than anyone could have ever imagined. For instance, recent reports show that the DPS currently has a \$408 million deficit due largely to mismanagement, naked cronyism in the bidding procedures and political payoffs involving the mayor and his cronies, but most notably, accounting incompetence by people Calloway brought with her from Missouri. Such ineptitude by educated people who should know better seems to me like outright thievery of taxpayers' funds.

If public education continues to devolve here the dwindling student population left will have diplomas that won't be worth the paper they are written on. Kwame's mafia tactics and political strategy follow this pattern: Detroiters are too stupid and unorganized to recall him, the City Council too compromised to impeach him, and most so-called "political activists" and "community workers," including a large percentage of the black preachers and black churches, are either afraid to speak out or are to some degree beholden to King Kwame's "Friends & Family First" payola programs. Let the trumpets sound, KKK (King Kwame Kilpatrick) will win a third term as mayor of Detroit in January 2009 by crook or by crook, even if he has to run the city from the federal penitentiary as mobster Al Capone did for a time while incarcerated at the Atlanta Penitentiary in the early 1930s.

Michigan vs. New York

When I write of Detroit, I always try to place this city in context with how other better-run cities handle their business. Take New York, for example. On March 10 when New York Gov. Eliot Spitzer was found to be involved with a prostitution ring cavorting with hookers across state lines on taxpayers' time and money for over 10 years, what happened? No, he didn't remain in office and win another term as Kilpatrick did in Detroit, but within 48 hours Gov. Spitzer was shamefully and summarily forced out of office. The Empire State did the right thing. However, the dirty little secret demonstrated by Spitzer's successor, David Paterson, a black man, was that he had a much more licentious past than the man whom he replaced. How could this be? The double standard liberal

whites demand be given to liberal black leaders is beyond the pale. This policy is disgusting and it should be stopped immediately, beginning with the propaganda press, who are the primary enablers of this *de facto* rule.

Even Democrat presidential candidate Barack Obama has been painted with this Teflon coating of being a messiah, as being beyond criticism. If you're white and you criticize Obama, you're castigated a racist; if you're black and you criticize Obama, you are ignored or dismissed as an "Uncle Tom." Conservative intellectual Rush Limbaugh has often remarked you can't criticize presidential candidate Obama.³ Some of the amusing things Rush says we can't mention about Obama are his big ears, his middle name (Hussein), his mother, his father, his grandmother, his outspoken wife, voting record, pastor, people who shaped his political career, etc. All these things are out of bounds regarding Obama, just like with Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick. Could anyone imagine these two political figures being more untouchable than white party bosses of a bygone era—Chicago mayors Richard J. Daley (and his son, Richard M. Daley), the political hucksters of New York's Tammany Hall particularly during the late 1800s and early 1900s era, Huey Long, the infamous governor of Louisiana and later senator in the late 1920s and early 1930s—even doing a fraction of political crimes Detroit's Kilpatrick has done and still be in office seven years later?

And what of Sen. B. Hussein Obama, who, though he has the most "audacious" voting record in the history of Congress, is only one step from the U.S. presidency. If you think that is outrageous, KKK is the front runner for a third term! Only in Detroit . . . only in America! That's why in many respects, the double standards of affirmative action increasingly denote to me a double portion of affirmative corruption and incompetence.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 14

WHAT I'D DO AS PRESIDENT

April 26, 2008

The study of history is a powerful antidote to contemporary arrogance. It is humbling to discover how many of our glib assumptions, which seem to us novel and plausible, have been tested before, not once but

many times and in innumerable guises; and discovered to be, at great human cost, wholly false.

~ Paul Johnson

In the tradition of Dr. Thomas Sowell's columns titled "Random Thoughts," I am attempting my first foray into this genre, which I will call "Arbitrary Ideas." As a prologue to my discourse, let me say that while I'm no Freudian, I truly believe that each of us are profoundly shaped by the experiences of our childhood—that for good or evil those fuzzy, obscure memories from our earliest youth will in great measure determine our destiny. One of the most disturbing aspects of the human condition in modern times is that *everyone* wants to matter regardless of his talents or contributions to God or humanity. Shakespeare wrote long ago, "All the world's a stage." True, but the critical question here is what will you do to get on that stage?

Will you compromise your morality? Will you lie, cheat, steal or "throw grandma under the bus" to attain power, position, privilege . . . pleasure? If yes, have you read Johann Goethe's "Faust"? Warning: The ending is not at all good for professor Faust who sold his soul to the devil (Mephistopheles) for the promise to be young again, to love again, only to lose his life, his soul and destroy the lives of all those whom Faust claimed to have loved. Conservative intellectual Rush Limbaugh has long been a singular voice of reason in the arena of the battle of ideas. What frustrates him (and me) is that today's Republicans are so bereft of ideas and leadership that we either: blindly accept the sophistic premises of liberal views on public policy, or we tweak liberal and socialist ideas and try to give them the patina of conservatism. Either way, it's like fixing your makeup while holding onto a greased pole to hell.

President Ronald Reagan made *three* promises to the American people, which he essentially fulfilled during his two terms in office (1981-89): 1) lower taxes, 2) rebuild the U.S. military and make America a world superpower again, and 3) defeat the Soviet Union and prevent genocidal communism from taking over the world. If I were to become president, I would solemnly promise the American people that I would do *four* things: First, using Israel's border wall with the Palestinians as my paradigm, I would immediately build a border wall between the U.S. and Mexico to stem the tide of drugs and illegal aliens. I would include a \$250 finder's fee for every illegal alien turned in by an American (a \$250

fine if your info is wrong). This policy will secure our borders, make society much safer for Americans and create thousands of new jobs by shipping these criminals back to their countries of origin. To direct this project, I would appoint Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio to be my czar of homeland security and change his title from "Czar" to "Sheriff." (Sheriff sounds more American to me). Second, following FDR's model during World War II, I would declare martial law against our present energy crisis and move five battalions of military forces to the following areas: Anwar, Alaska, off the coasts of Florida, Louisiana and California, and inside designated sections of Colorado. I would do this to guard oil workers drilling for oil and to keep environmental radicals at bay. I would also build at least 200 oil refineries across America using *non-union* prison labor and, like France and most all European countries, supplement at least 50 percent of our current energy usage with nuclear power.

Third, to help pay for proposals 1 and 2, I would de-fund the Department of Education and the Department of Commerce, remove the compulsory education requirement after grade 8 (It has never worked anyway: Detroit has a 75 percent dropout rate *with* compulsory education) and allow the free market to regulate itself. Four, in the name of America's sovereignty and national and international security, I would shut down the United Nations. Relying upon my new sheriff, Joe Arpaio, I would send in security forces to purge that building of every U.N. bureaucrat and ship them (and their flags) the hell out of America within a year of my taking office.

If I survived impeachment—or assassination—I would run for office again, and I guarantee you that I would win a 49-state landslide victory, as Reagan did in 1984. Every judge, whether elected by the voters or appointed by the president or a governor, should, at his swearing in ceremony, be given a one page contract that simply says:

BE ADVISED: Should any of your subsequent judicial opinions contravene the original intent of the Constitution's Framers, you will be immediately removed from said judgeship according to Article II, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, clause 2 pertaining to "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

The operative word here is "treason." That sanction would immediately put an end to all of the anti-constitutional, foolish, arrogant and

tyrannical judicial opinions that have shocked the conscience of the nation and perverted the Constitution since *Marbury v. Madison* (1803). See John Rowland's excellent article, "Meaning of 'High Crimes and Misdemeanors.'" This one proposal alone if followed would cause the Democrats to become the Whig Party of the 21st century—extinct.

Regarding the executive and legislative branches of government, *any* official who cannot stand flatfooted and give an extemporaneous three-minute speech on any topic of domestic or international policy without stuttering or saying one of the following phrases: "uuuhhhmmm," "aaahhh," "you know," "uuhhh," then that pol should either hire a speech therapist, or "We the People" should fire the bum! Ditto for all journalists that appear on TV (albeit, as president, I would have no authority to enforce this policy). Regarding our three presidential candidates, Obama, Clinton and McCain, I urge every intelligent American that still gives a damn about this country and hasn't been brainwashed by our Stalinist public education system, on Election Day, Nov. 4, 2008, to write in "N.O.T.A."—None of the above . . . or write in "Sheriff Joe Arpaio."

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 15

WHAT I'D DO AS PRESIDENT, PART 2

May 03, 2008

Ours was the first revolution in the history of mankind that truly reversed the course of government, and with three little words: "We the people." "We the people" tell the government what to do, it doesn't tell us.

~ President Reagan's Farewell Address, Jan. 11, 1989

Note: Admittedly, many of the policy assumptions in this column are presently untenable in America, but could become practical once "We the People" regain control of all our courts and force judges (and politicians) at the threat of the Impeachment Clause to follow faithfully the original intent of the Constitution's Framers according to Article 2, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which declares: "The President, Vice President and all Civil Officers [=Judges & Congress] of the United

States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors."

My column last weekend, "What I'd do as president," received more responses than any other column I've written to date. In that piece, I believe I struck a poignant chord with the American people, as well as with people as far away as Brazil, China, Israel, Africa, Australia and other lands. Therefore, I will continue this theme in part 2 of "What I'd do as president."

Policy No. 1—As your president, I would solemnly promise to fulfill Reagan's third term and even try to enact many policies Reagan didn't get to do because he was term limited and had people in his administration that lacked *his* magnificent vision for America.

Policy No. 2—As your president, in my first speech to Congress I would have as my back drop a giant pen (about 6 feet tall) and would tell everyone of those political hacks on both sides of the aisle that if you send me *one* budget that has *any* pork, earmarks, political payoffs (bribes) or any unlawful spending measures that contravene the original intent of the Constitution's Framers, I will immediately call a press conference and use my giant pen to write on that congressional budget "DOA"—Dead on Arrival.

Yeah, I'd shut down the government (for my entire first term if I have to) in order to remind the great America people of their long-forgotten rugged individualism—that you don't need the government dominating every aspect of your life from cradle to grave to enjoy what Jefferson referred to as "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Policy No. 3—As your president, I would put all 50 states on notice that states *rights* are constitutional again, but also states *responsibilities*. Therefore, any state that wants to provide services to their residents *must* pay for them. I would urge each state to prepare for every foreseeable (and unforeseeable) contingencies in their annual budgets, including "acts of God."

Policy No. 4—As your president, I would champion the recent Supreme Court (6-3) decision upholding Indiana's mandatory picture ID requirement prohibiting voter fraud. I would also urge all 50 states not only to pass mandatory picture ID requirements, but also English-only ballots and a \$365 annual "poll tax" (a *non-racist* poll tax, of course). These policies would prohibit illegal aliens, dead people, bums and imbeciles from voting or any longer perverting our elections and help defray

some (if not all) of the exorbitant operating costs in conducting federal and state elections. This is America's third generation *without* a poll tax. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said it best: "Three generations of imbeciles are enough!"

Policy No. 5—As your president, I would construct a large computer screen (like the scrolling electronic board inside the stock exchange) of all 50 states citing their monthly progress (in real time) in all relevant categories: new business/lost business, property values, education, state economy, health, birth/death rates, crime stats, percentage on welfare, MEAP scores, population change, etc. I want the American people to be able to clearly see, day by day, state by state, essentially which states suck and which states are nice places to do business and raise a family. America has a wonderful tradition of people "voting with their feet" by moving the hell out of a city or state if the residents don't have the political acumen to impeach incompetent or corrupt politicians that are ruining their city or state.

Policy No. 6—As your president, I would declare a proclamation to the world that *true* free trade will become legal again in America and with every country that desires to have *true* free trade with America.

Policy No. 7—As your president, I would implement the biblical welfare policy taught for centuries by St. Paul the Apostle: "If a man doesn't work, a man doesn't eat." This simple but profound aphorism would immediately terminate many diabolical policies of the socialist welfare state that have utterly destroyed the black family; evil policies that Americans have been fooled into believing for the past 75 years—FDR's "New Deal" of the 1930s, LBJ's "Great Society" in the 1960s and regretably, George W. Bush's expansion of Leviathan government in the 21st century.

Policy No. 8—As your president I would stop using our military as a multi-billion dollar "Meals on Wheels" program. As conservative intellectual Rush Limbaugh frequently says, "The military has two uses: breaking things and killing people." With the technology we have today, no war should last over 100 days if the military is *unleashed* instead of being *micromanaged* from Washington, D.C. That's why I despise the Nixonian foreign policy of *détente*, ("relaxing of tensions"), but I am a big believer in Reagan's foreign policy of "peace through strength" and the policy I would enact, "rocket diplomacy." America! Look at our four greatest presidents enshrined at Mount Rushmore—Washington, Jeffer-

son, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt. The three character traits these magnificent men all had in common, virtues that are so rare in modern times were these: 1) a brawny brain, a keen intellect and wise judgment, 2) an orator's tongue and the means to competently communicate the ideas inside their brain (without stuttering or saying "uuuhhh," "aaahhh," uuuhhmm" or "you know") and 3) a huge pair of brass cojones!

Stay tuned next week for part 3 of "What I'd do as president." God Bless America!

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 16

WHAT I'D DO AS PRESIDENT, PART 3

May 10, 2008

"We the People" tell the government what to do, it doesn't tell us. "We the People" are the driver, the government is the car. And we decide where it should go, and by what route, and how fast.

~ President Reagan's Farewell Address, Jan. 11, 1989

My recent column "What I'd do as president" received more responses than any other column I've written to date. Having struck a profound and poignant chord with readers in that column, I have continued that format in Part 2 and today in Part 3.

Policy No. 1—As your president, if America doesn't have enough room on Mount Rushmore to build a fifth monument to President Reagan, I would conduct a nationwide contest to find who could most efficiently transform Theodore Roosevelt's likeness into Ronald Reagan's likeness.

Policy No. 2—"People First, Environment Second." I love Theodore Roosevelt (my grandfather and uncle were named in his honor); however, TR was the first president to go *way* overboard on environmentalist policy, which 100 years later has devolved into irrational, unscientific and extremist policies:

❖ Rachel Carson's now patently discredited 1962 book ("Silent Spring") ultimately lead to the universal ban of DDT lead by the United States in 1972, a genocidal policy that *to this day* has doomed untold hundreds of millions of black Africans to death or a life of abject suffer-

ing due to malaria. Have you ever heard the so-called "civil rights movement" say *anything* about this "African Holocaust"?

- ❖ The green movement;
- ❖ Global freezing predicted by activist scientists with a socialist agenda in the early 1970s;
- ❖ Global warming and global climate change movements of the 1990s to the present; and
- ❖ The corn-based ethanol catastrophe that is currently causing food hoarding, shortages and food riots in Haiti, Mexico, Egypt, China, Africa and throughout the world.

Policy No. 3—As your president, America would return to free market capitalism again both at home and abroad. Therefore, no tariffs, anti-competitive or protectionist interference from any country we trade with *or from America*. Let the free market regulate all commerce with very minimal intrusion from politicians or judges (most of which have never managed or operated a lemonade stand let alone a business enterprise of any relevance). This policy alone would substantially lower the multi-billion dollar deficits we annually run against countries like China, Canada, Japan, Germany, Mexico, Nigeria and many other countries we trade with because these countries aren't burdened with the endless number of silly environmental regulations, union thuggery, shyster tort lawyers and the litany of socialist taxes just to pay for all the ancillary costs and red tape to hire and keep employees.

Policy No. 4—As your president, my military foreign policy would be called "Rocket Diplomacy," following President Reagan's wise and masculine foreign policy, "Peace through Strength" and "Trust but Verify," that eventually led to the demise of the Soviet Union and freedom for tens of millions of citizens of former satellite Soviet states. If a country messes with America in an egregious way—like 9/11, the Iranian hostage crisis in 1979, the truck bomb that killed 241 Marines in Lebanon in 1983, the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941—let the rockets do the talking. It saves American lives, protects the environment *and* puts existing and future tyrants on notice. (Remember how President Reagan bombed the palace of Libya's Colonel Gadhafi in 1986? Since Reagan's gutsy move we have had virtually no more problems from that tyrant.)

Policy No. 5—As your president, I would promote a "Pursuit of Happiness" policy. I would champion those immortal words found in Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and make that

worldview a major policy throughout my administration, affecting all cabinet departments. It would be no longer criminal to be an American. Following Jefferson's worldview, I would urge the American people to closely monitor *any* elected officials—Republican or Democrat—that tries implementing any policies that in any manner contravenes American's pursuit of happiness, which was adopted by Jefferson from Genesis 1:28, which reads:

And God blessed them (Adam and Eve) and God said unto them,

- ❖ Be fruitful, and
- ❖ Multiply (have lots of babies), and
- ❖ Replenish the earth, and
- ❖ Subdue it (organize, cultivate) and
- ❖ Have dominion (power, authority, control) over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Empire and the fall of communism in 1989, socialists, progressives, liberals, country club Republicans and the diabolical philosophies of transnational liberalism have morphed into the numerous tentacles of the environmentalist movement, which is a frontal assault against capitalism and free market enterprise. Controlling your daily behavior is what animates these people.

Conservative radio host Dennis Prager said it best: "Liberals love humanity, but hate humans." God created the earth for mankind to rule over and enjoy, not for men and women to be treated by their governments like squatters, like landless serfs or intruders upon the earth, deferring to polar bears, melting polar ice caps, spotted owls, kangaroo rats, snail darters or puddles of water in your backyard which the Environmental Protection Agency retroactively now decrees is a "wetland." Wake up, America! Who will you believe? The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob or that nitwit Al Gore and the globalist, corrupt plutocrats at the United Nations who utterly hate America, Israel and despise natural law, natural rights and natural liberties that can only come from God and therefore *cannot* lawfully be contravened by man? I choose God. And that is what I would do if I were president of the United States.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 17

IF I WERE MAYOR OF DETROIT

May 01, 2008

Show me a monopoly (liberalism) and I'll show you a tyranny (Detroit).

~ Ellis Washington

Note: Many of the policy assumptions in this column are presently untenable in Detroit (and America) but could easily become workable once "We the People" regain control of all our courts and force judges (and politicians) at the threat of the Treason Clause to follow faithfully the original intent of the Constitution's Framers according to Article 2, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution—"The President, Vice President and all Civil Officers [=Judges & Congress] of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors."

My column last weekend, "What I'd do as president," received more responses than any other column I've written to date. In that piece, I believe I struck a poignant chord with the American people, as well as with people as far away as Brazil, China, Israel, Africa, Australia and other lands. Therefore, I will continue this theme and apply it to Detroit, the city of my birth.

What would I do if I were mayor of Detroit? The stage would contain five figures in effigy sitting in five chairs. These five symbols of Detroit would have the following names and background:

❖ *Jowakka Jones*, age 39, a grandmother of four with eight children by five different men, uneducated, with a bad attitude because her welfare payments aren't enough for her needs and are sometimes "late."

❖ *Tyrone "Tupac" Tipton*, age 19, Jowakka's son, a senior at Cooley High School, a gangbanger, a drug dealer with a spotty class attendance record, a poor employment record, a promising criminal record and a bad attitude because "mah baby mama's always sweatn' me for some child support."

❖ *Jose Jesus Rodriguez*, age 55, a resident of the Southwest side of Detroit ("Mexican Town") who took an early buyout from Ford Motor Company after 30 years on the assembly line and as a union steward. He and his wife, Rosia, have been married 35 years and have 10 children.

❖ *Shawniqua Thompson*, age 11, a fifth-grader and a daughter of Jowakka Jones, stepsister to Tyrone Tupac Tipton.

❖ *KKK or King Kwame Kilpatrick*, age 37, mayor of Detroit since 2002, member of the liberal Democrat machine that has ruled over Detroit politics since before FDR.

(With the stage now set, the lights are dimmed. As I speak to the five effigy figures sitting forlornly on their chairs, a spotlight is shone upon each of them.)

Inaugural Address by Detroit Mayor Ellis Washington

Ladies and gentlemen of the city of Detroit, before I deliver my brief remarks, please allow me to share with you four little words. The words are taken from Justice Clarence Thomas's grandfather, whom he called "Daddy." Daddy's tough love helped raised Justice Clarence Thomas to become the sterling example of humanity we have today, therefore . . . "THE DAMN PARTY'S OVER!" For over 40 years, since the 1967 riots, you and your forefathers have turned a once magnificent city that 100 years ago was called, "The Paris of America" and 65 years ago was called, "the arsenal of democracy," into America's largest ghetto. This madness ends here. This day is the *real* May Day celebration—May 1, 2008.

Effigy No. 1, Jowakka Jones—Now, Ms. Jones, you don't know me and I don't know you. I speak to you not as a real person, but as a symbol representing tens of thousands of your fellow sistergirls in the city of Detroit. You have four issues that I will identify for our audience: promiscuity, ignorance, crime and laziness. Jowakka, beginning *this day*, We the People of the city of Detroit will no longer be obligated to pay for your subsidized housing, your cable TV, your welfare, your cigarettes, alcohol or crack, your "baby daddy's gambling money," nor for Medicare, food stamps, your GED, Tupac's bail money, or your grandchildren's "Head Start" and lunch programs. Jowakka Jones, I advise you to get a job.

I will agree with you (and your ACLU attorney) that while you *do* have a constitutional right to be a lazy, promiscuous, ignorant woman to three generations of people, nevertheless, you will no longer pimp We the People and make us pay for your worthless lifestyle. To quote a famous Supreme Court Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes: "Three generations of imbeciles are enough." The damn party's over!

Effigy No. 2, Tyrone "Tupac" Tipton—Mr. Tupac, you are 19 years old now. How long will you be in the public schools? I've viewed your attendance records. You have already missed more days than you have been present, which prohibits you from graduating. Why, then, does your name appear on the attendance rolls? I'll answer that question for you: So that your corrupt governor, your naive superintendent, your cowardly principal and your incompetent teachers union can all collect your annual price, \$7,557. Tupac, since you love to be a gangbanger and a "ladies man," you will be assigned to cleaning gang graffiti off the walls all over the city and you will pay child support to *all* of your "baby mama's children."

Effigy No. 3, Jose Jesus Rodriguez—Mr. Rodriguez, why should We the People, the taxpayers of Detroit, pay for you *not* to work at age 55? Social Security is found nowhere in the U.S. Constitution. On the contrary, the Constitution's Framers bled and died fighting against the naked tyranny of England's King George III to oppose what they called "taxation without representation." If you want money for education, vacations, health care, food or your "retirement," I strongly suggest that you (and Rosia) find another job or create your own business and begin saving your own money for your own retirement as the Constitution's Framers intended. As of this day, May 1, 2008, "retirement" in city of Detroit will only occur when your body is deposited in the grave. The damn party's over!

Effigy No. 4, Shawniqua Thompson—age 11. Shawniqua, I have you on this stage as a prevention, an intervention, if you will. You already heard the example *not* to follow (Effigy No. 1). My advice to you: Leave the little boys alone! You will have plenty of time for love when you get married. Instead, go to the library every day after school to do your homework. During the summer, go to academic camps so your mind and body won't be idle. Personal discipline, church and what Theodore Roosevelt called "The Strenuous Life" will do more for you, dear Shawniqua, than 1,000 welfare checks could ever accomplish. I'm not *asking* you what you thought about what I just said, I'm being the father you never had and I'm *telling* you . . . Shawniqua, the damn party's over!

Effigy No. 5, KKK or King Kwame Kilpatrick—Mayor Kilpatrick, I apologize for the handcuffs, but immediately after my inauguration speech these nice gentlemen to my right with the dark blue jackets and sunglasses will escort you to your new mansion—federal prison. If you want some strippers, I suggest that you work out those details with your

new cellmates—Bubba, Bust a' Cap and Khoas. They *love* to party. Because of your slavish allegiance to liberalism and the diabolical policies of FDR, LBJ, Clinton and Obama, rather than truth, you and your predecessors, mayors Coleman Young and Dennis Archer, have betrayed your own people and the Constitution by ruining this great city, using it for your own personal ATM bank card. The damn party's over!

As the assembled citizens, dignitaries and potentates looked at each other in puzzled amazement, I would quietly slip out the back door, drive myself to my office and begin implementing my reform policies collectively called, "Operation Kick-A--."

And that is what I would do if I were mayor of Detroit.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 18

IF I WERE MAYOR OF DETROIT, PART 2

May 08, 2008

Jowakka Jones, Tupac Tipton, Jose Jesus Rodriguez, Shawniqua Thompson and Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick: The damn party's over!

~ Ellis Washington (a paraphrase of Justice Clarence Thomas' grandfather)

Many of the policy assumptions in this column are presently untenable in Detroit (and America) but could easily become workable once "We the People" regain control of all our courts and force judges (and politicians) at the threat of the Treason Clause to follow faithfully the original intent of the Constitution's Framers according to Article 2, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution—"The President, Vice President and all Civil Officers [=Judges & Congress] of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors."

My column "What I'd do as president" received more enthusiastic responses than any other column I've written to date. In that opus, I believe that I have struck a poignant chord with the American people, as well as with people as far away as Brazil, China, Israel, Africa, Australia and other lands. I continued this theme and applied it to Detroit, the city

of my birth, in my column "If I were mayor of Detroit." This is Part 2 of that effort. Using my campaign theme borrowed from Justice Clarence Thomas' memoir, I would frequently and emphatically tell every Detroit resident: "The damn party's over!" I would immediately put into effect my policy initiatives collectively called "Operation Kick-A--"—polices that are pro-American, pro-Ronald Reagan, pro-free market, anti-bum, anti-welfare state policies that will apply to all city government departments, from the mayor's office to a trainee assistant in the Department of Sanitation.

Policy No. 1—I would turn Detroit into a "Union-free Zone." For the past three months, Detroit has been entangled in the American Axle strike, which to date has destroyed or stopped manufacturing operations in 29 U.S. factories, affecting over 37,000 salaried workers and over 4,600 hourly workers . . . for what?! This idiotic and untimely strike was perpetrated by our local cabal of union thugs *after* GM had already settled with the national union—United Auto Workers (UAW). Detroit's local UAW said *their* strike is for "local concerns." These union hacks have held the free market hostage and crippled free enterprise in Detroit and other now "rustbelt" cities for over 120 years. Enough is enough.

I can hear the union leaders and their membership complaining now: "Mayor Ellis Washington is trying to *break* the union." I'm not trying to break the union; I'm trying to *kill* the damn union and bury it, forever! Why? Because labor unions are un-American, anti-constitutional, anti-capitalist, thoroughly corrupt, but most diabolically, promote an envious, lazy, group-think mentality wherever unionism thrives—from the academy and the National Education Association to city, state and federal workers, from mega-corporations to the meter maids. Therefore, as mayor I would turn Detroit into a "Union-free Zone." President Reagan, in August 1981, when faced with naked union thuggery, eventually broke the union and fired over 11,000 air traffic controllers who refused to return to work—people that so selfishly and cavalierly put America's air safety in jeopardy.

Policy No. 2—I would urge all business leaders and citizens throughout the metro-Detroit area that still believe in free enterprise to put money into a "New Media Fund" creating an Internet, TV, radio and print media founded upon conservative, free-market, pro-American principles. Here, I feel like I'm in Stalin's gulag. The only conservative radio we get in Detroit is piped in from other venues like Rush Limbaugh,

Sean Hannity (New York), Dr. Michael Savage (San Francisco) or Laura Ingraham (Washington, D.C.). I would champion a truly free press locally that will present a "fair and balanced" view of the news in line with the original intent of the Constitution's Framers, not just the liberal, socialist, communist side of a policy argument.

Policy No. 3—Grab your bootstraps, baby! Any resident of Detroit, whether educated, non-educated, black or white, students or retirees, white-collar, blue-collar, or no-collar, who willingly follows the rule of law and is motivated to work daily at self-improvement by pulling yourself up by your *own* bootstraps, like Booker T. Washington taught, and avoid bad life choices, it will be heaven for you. If not, and you take the W.E.B. Dubois-NAACP-Rev. Jeremiah Wright's demand, protest, raise-hell-*only* approach, Detroit will be hell for you.

Policy No. 4—To fight crime, I would reinstitute the undercover police units called STRESS (Stop The Robberies Enjoy Safe Streets). This was a very effective crime-fighting program instituted in the early 1960s *before* the city went to hell in the riots of 1967. STRESS put thieves, loiterers, gangbangers, hoochie mamas and other criminal elements to flight and made all law-abiding citizens (black and white) feel safe to enjoy life again. However, Detroit's first black mayor, that Rev. Jeremiah Wrightesque demagogue, the five-term Coleman A. Young (1974-94), in 1974 ran on a platform to disband STRESS, which at the time was a nationally recognized police crime-fighting unit. You see how well that worked out for us. Thanks, Mayor Young!

Policy No. 5—Detroit will not be a sanctuary city. No amnesty for illegal aliens, Muslim terrorists or Muslim terrorist supporters. I would push for a sheriff in the mode of Arizona's Sheriff Joe Arpaio (perhaps one of his protégées) to become sheriff of Wayne County. Sen. Joe McCarthy said it best: "You [all Americans] cannot offer friendship to tyrants and murderers . . . without advancing the cause of tyranny and murder."

Policy No. 6—Following the paradigm of the city of Chicago, I would turn Detroit's neglected and mismanaged waterfront into a world-class economic juggernaut with gleaming skyscrapers called, "The Gold Coast II," by making all waterfront property south of Jefferson Avenue to the Detroit River, from Cobo Hall east to Grosse Pointe, a "No Hobo Zone." Why? Because other than Cobo Hall and GM World Headquarters, this prime real estate is largely populated by substandard, dilapidated or

abandoned business, factories, homes . . . and hobos. As mayor, I would put forth perhaps the first proposal by any big city mayor in history by willingly annexing *in perpetuity* this 6.5-mile strip of land to neighboring Grosse Pointe. My reasoning can be found in my recent column comparing these two cites.

Policy No. 7—I would put an amnesty on all applications for new strip clubs, casinos, porn shops and liquor stores, and make it very onerous for existing businesses of these types to operate in Detroit. Michigan has more strip clubs per capita than any other state in the America—72 in total, 44 in Wayne county, 34 in Detroit alone and ZERO in neighboring Oakland county. Through my reform policies collectively called, “Operation Kick-A--” I would endeavor to turn Detroit and all of Wayne County into a magnificent region where lazy bums, poverty pimp preachers, union thugs, unscrupulous businessmen, high school drop-outs, gangbangers, welfare queens, deadbeat dads and your garden variety imbeciles, hoochie mamas, jailbirds and their enablers—the entire corrupt liberal Democrat Machine—will no longer be welcomed in my city, *unless* they transformed themselves and their worldview from being *takers* to becoming *producers*.

I would transform Detroit into a *real* Renaissance city befitting Renaissance men of the past, like Galileo, Montesquieu, Jefferson, Burke, Blackstone, Booker T. Washington, Churchill, Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, instead of following these corrupt, socialist hacks we currently have ruining Michigan, like Conyers (husband and wife), Granholm, Kilpatrick (mother, father and son), Stabenow, Archer, Dingell, the Levin brothers and their ilk. Going back to Rep. John Dingell, since 1955 these dishonorable men and women have built their entire careers upon the abject ignorance, poverty and misery of my people and all those other citizens who have foolishly wasted their lives believing in the seductive and addictive lies of Leviathan government and liberalism—diabolical policies predicated on stealing money from thy neighbor and giving the spoils to thyself and to thy lazy constituencies and calling the ill-gotten gains Social Security, universal health care, “a tax increase on the rich,” “a loan,” “a gift.” I call it legalized extortion.

Detroit, the damn party’s over!

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 19

A CRITIQUE OF JUSTICE THURGOOD MARSHALL

April 19, 2008

What distinguishes the rule of law from the dictatorship of a shifting Supreme Court majority is the absolutely indispensable requirement that judicial opinions be grounded in consistently applied principle. That is what prevents judges from ruling now this way, now that—thumbs up or thumbs down—as their personal preferences dictate.

~ Justice Antonin Scalia

During times of introspection, I have come to realize that being a *true* philosopher or an intellectual is an existential experience—an exceedingly lonely place to be. Why? This person has to think on such a transcendent level where few men fear to tread—beyond politics, beyond consensus, beyond conventionalism, beyond status quo, yea, beyond orthodoxy. It is *here* where I will launch my critique against one of America's great heroes, Justice Thurgood Marshall (1908-93).

First, let me say at the onset that I believe that Justice Marshall in many respects was a great man. His ascent from the social, physical and intellectual bondage of *de jure*(by law) and *de facto*(by practice) racial discrimination and naked racism to the chair of the U.S. Supreme Court is the stuff legends are made of. However, let's set aside some of the mythology and look at the real man. I first came to know of Justice Marshall's work in a substantive way 20 years ago while a graduate student at Harvard. Since I was mulling over the idea of changing my major, a law school friend of mine named Leon Betchet encouraged me to take a couple of law classes. One of the classes I took was "Human Rights Law," a class that explored the apartheid legal system of South Africa. It was taught by that noted legal scholar of critical race theory and civil rights, Randall Kennedy.

Later, I discovered that Professor Kennedy actually clerked for Justice Marshall and in his books and law review articles wrote reverently of his mentor, so I started reading books and articles about Justice Marshall as well as some of his Supreme Court opinions. As I read, I had an ominous revelation. The rhetoric regarding Justice Marshall, whether it was from cases he argued as a young lawyer and later as chief counsel of

the NAACP, or as a judge on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, flattering biographies, but most disturbingly his many dissenting and majority opinions he authored with his jurisprudence compatriot, Justice William Brennan, simply did not line up with the blackletter text of the U.S. Constitution. Was I crazy?

I held my peace and kept on reading and studying case law, yet questions about Justice Marshall abounded. For example, in my constitutional law class, I quickly deduced that whatever the original intent of the Constitution's framers was, that Justices Brennan and Marshall would mechanically vote *against* that understanding of the Constitution. One of my classmates bluntly summarized Marshall's view of the Constitution in this wise—"F--- the framers!"

I wrote about this bulletproof Brennan/Marshall pact in an earlier column about my mentor, Justice Clarence Thomas, an excerpt of which follows below:

I believe Justice Thomas has a judicial record that is even more praiseworthy than his early mentor, Antonin Scalia, as well as John Jay (the first chief justice), John Marshall (the second chief justice), Joseph Story, Louis Brandeis, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Benjamin Cardozo, Felix Frankfurter, Earl Warren, William Brennan, William Rehnquist and yes, even Thomas' predecessor, the venerable Thurgood Marshall, who few constitutional scholars have the courage to admit could care less about what the original intent of the Constitution's framers was.

Excuse my candor, but Justice Marshall's so-called liberal view of the Constitution treats that sacred covenant like toilet paper: A document to be manipulated for *his* own political ends. Yet Dr. Martin Luther King once famously uttered, "All I want from America is to be true to what you wrote on paper."

Do words matter? If so, then how can we reconcile these two diametrical views—(Scalia [King] vs. Marshall) to understand the *real* meaning of Constitution? Is the Constitution a contract between "We the People" and our government, to protect and defend our liberties, natural rights and allow each individual's "pursuit of Happiness," or is it a weapon used by activist judges to annihilate one's political enemies and to promote what liberals call "social justice"? For 20 years I kept on reading and studying Marshall's *oeuvre* and came to the following conclusions:

[A]long with *his* "Scalia," William Brennan, [Thurgood Marshall] left a legacy of liberal activist jurisprudence and shameless legislating

from the bench that their opinions are considered sacred scripture and revered orthodoxy by the law academy and in all Democrat circles, even to this day.

Despite Marshall's heroic virtuosity in the 1930s and 1940s where he successfully integrated the University of Maryland Law School and other segregated universities, despite in 1954 starting America down the road of racial integration in the public schools arguing the case of *Brown v. Board Education*, despite his legal brilliance in court rooms throughout America, despite appearing before the Supreme Court 32 times (winning 28 of those battles), despite his legacy as an "activist Justice" for black people, for the poor and the disenfranchised, despite all of that, something critical was lacking in the *man*—But what?

For the sake of argument, I will accede that the majority of Marshall's legal arguments and judicial opinions were the *right* decision, yet tragically, I argue that they followed the *wrong* judicial reasoning. As Shakespeare would say, ". . . and there's the rub." Because Thurgood Marshall came of age during an era of American history that had virulent racism hurled at him and his people in the most venal and appalling ways, his understanding of the Constitution was irrevocably (and I contend incorrectly) viewed solely through the prism of the color line.

Ironically, Justice Marshall's racist and activist understanding of the Constitution as an vehicle for social change, most times caused him to ascribe to a Machiavellian, "the end justifies the means" approach to constitutional interpretation. A judicial interpretation in the words of Justice Scalia leaves the Constitution to the tyrannical whims "as *their* personal preferences dictate." For example look at the end/means paradigm below of some of Justice Marshall's essential Supreme Court decisions:

❖ *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954): The End = Blacks should be allowed to attend public school with whites. The Means = Overrule the "separate, but equal" philosophy of *Plessey v. Ferguson* (1896) by judicial fiat and pseudo science regarding dolls, rather than reliance on the explicit text of the Constitution.

❖ *Furman v. Georgia* (1972): The End = Abolish the death penalty because it violates the Eighth Amendment's "cruel and unusual punishment" provision of the Constitution. The Means = A judicial activist rant by the Stewart/White majority that totally ignored the original intent of the Constitution's framers. That history and the Constitution supported

the death penalty as a bulwark against mankind's anarchist and savage tendencies against man. (The death penalty is mentioned three times in the Fifth Amendment alone).

❖ Despite the death penalty being reinstated four years later in *Gregg v. Georgia* (1976) Justices Marshall and Brennan *never* accepted the legitimacy, which ruled that the death penalty was constitutional in *some* circumstances. Thereafter, Brennan or Marshall dissented from every denial of *certiorari* in a capital case and from every decision upholding a sentence of death.

❖ *Roe v. Wade* (1973): The End = A women alone has the sole constitutional right to kill her baby if she desires, and if she can't afford to do so, the government ("We the People") will pay for it. The Means = Brennan and Marshall enthusiastically codified into law the racist suppositions of Margaret Sanger—a vile eugenicist who taught that blacks were inferior to whites on every measure; a Jezebel-like woman who, in order to facilitate black genocide, founded Planned Parenthood in 1916 where her Holocaust against my people is realized today according to the 2007 U.S. census where 503 per 1,000 *viable* black births are terminated.

❖ In *Cottage Savings Association v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (1991): The End = Giving the poor access to home loans. Justice Marshall weighed in on the income tax consequences of the savings and loan crisis, permitting a savings and loan association to deduct a loss from an exchange of mortgage participation interests. The Means = Overruling the common law traditions dating back to medieval England protecting the "right to contract" by mandating banks insure obvious bad loans of the poor and when defaulted upon, banks deduct the loss (i.e., pass the loss on to the taxpayers, "We the People").

America's current mortgage crisis is a direct effect caused by Justice Marshall's opinion in that case and the Congress, Clinton and Obama wants to encourage more Americans to live way above their means by taking out exorbitant mortgages they and the bank know they cannot pay. Who pays?—We the People.

I will end my critique of Justice Marshall by quoting an earlier colleague of his that Marshall would have had little respect for, Justice Roger B. Taney, chief justice of the supreme court from 1836-1864 and a notorious racist who in the infamous *Dred Scott* decision of 1857 not only upheld slavery, but helped drive America headlong into a genocidal civil war four years later. Taney wrote: "[The Negro] has no rights that the white man was bound to respect." Likewise, Justice Thurgood Marshall, as well as supporters of the so-called "living constitution" theory must under-

stand that *his* legacy of liberal activist jurisprudence ultimately will have no force of law that the Constitution's framers are bound to respect.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 20

D-DAY FOR KWAME (6 YEARS LATE)

March 27, 2008

Damn that, Never busted. Busted is what you see!

~ Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick (KK) text messaging chief of staff Beatty on Sept. 12, 2002

On Monday, March 24, the eyes of the world were on Detroit. Kym Worthy, our always-vigilant Wayne County prosecutor, finally held her long-awaited press conference on whether or not she would bring criminal charges against Detroit's embattled mayor, Kwame Kilpatrick. It took her about two months to answer "yes" to that inquiry. Her excuse for the delay is that she had to wage numerous legal battles with the mayor's team of attorneys for every scrap of paper she and her legal team requested as part of their investigation. Some requested documents were outstanding as late as last Friday when Prosecutor Worthy was forced to go all the way to the Michigan Supreme Court to compel compliance. For other discovery requests, claims were made by the mayor's legal team that documents were "lost" or "destroyed," presumably by the mayor and his surrogates.

Worthy brought a 12-count criminal indictment—15 felony charges in all (eight against Mayor Kilpatrick; seven against his former chief of staff and concubine, Christine Beatty)—including: perjury, obstruction of justice, misconduct in office, perjury in a court proceeding, perjury other than a court proceeding and conspiracy. Let us remember that Worthy *only* took up this case under tremendous public pressure once some of the text messages between Kilpatrick and Beatty were published from a Freedom of Information Act request, not by the good prosecutor's office, but by the Detroit Free Press and only after years of legal wrangling with the mayor and his legion of taxpayer-paid attorneys.

Prosecutor Worthy had the nerve to lecture the American people about the rudiments of our constitutional republic and what the symbols

of Lady Justice mean, but she forgot one aspect implicit in the balance scales she holds aloft: time—tick-tock-tick-tock.

It didn't take Worthy 59 days to bring felony charges against the mayor, it took her over six years!

- ❖ Six years since the infamous wild sex party at the Manoogian Mansion in October 2002, a party that the mayor and his buddy, Republican Attorney General Mike Cox, *to this day* call "an urban legend."

- ❖ Six years since the mayor's wife, Carlita Kilpatrick, somehow got wind of the party, perhaps catching the mayor in the very act with dancer Tamara "Strawberry" Greene.

- ❖ Six years since the savage beat-down Ms. Greene took from Mrs. Kilpatrick, an incident corroborated by retired police clerk Joyce Rogers, who read the original police report (now lost) and gave a sworn deposition about that event.

- ❖ Six years since Tamara Greene was rushed to a nearby hospital by the mayor's bodyguards where soon thereafter all medical records of this event mysteriously disappeared (even computer copies?)

- ❖ Five years since the head of internal affairs, Deputy Police Chief Gary Brown, mayor bodyguard Harold Nelthorpe and 31-year veteran Lt. Alvin Bowman were all treacherously and unjustly fired by the evil trinity of Police Chief Ella Bully-Cummings, Beatty and Kilpatrick, costing the city of Detroit over \$9 million in a subsequent whistleblower lawsuit in 2007.

- ❖ Five years since their investigation was abruptly barred by the mayor's corrupt crony, Bully-Cummings, when it got too close to the truth about the parties, the strippers, the numerous extramarital affairs, the expensive trips on private jets and spas, rampant nepotism, rigged bids to cronies, etc.—all on the taxpayers tab.

- ❖ Five years since a second dancer at the party who fled the city after Greene's murder was tracked down to Atlanta, Ga., and killed by the same 40-caliber Glock police-issued weapon, according to Lt. Bowman.

- ❖ Five years since a major unsolved murder case sat on Prosecutor Worthy's desk gathering dust with hardly a peep from our zealous and contentious legal official *until* the Detroit Free Press on Jan. 23 released excerpts of over 14,000 text messages, covering only a four-month period in 2002 and 2003 and *only* of Beatty's text messenger devise, yet Worthy has the arrogance to lecture Detroiters and America on the precepts of our legal system and justice. This is beyond the pale.

Kym Worthy is at best a mediocre prosecutor, at worse an incompetent public official that in other more well-ordered parts of the country

would be a third-rate lawyer on the verge of disbarment, not functioning as our county's chief legal officer.

To give you an idea of the *real* Kym Worthy, allow me to quote from an earlier column, "Detroit's middle-finger salute":

A few weeks ago I received an e-mail from a retired Detroit police officer named Larry Nevers (a member of STRESS [Stop the Robberies Enjoy Safe Streets]), who was one of the officers unjustly and for crass political reasons put on trial regarding the 1992 accidental death of Malice Green—Detroit's version of the Rodney King affair. To avoid bad press the Detroit City Council in a gutless move quickly awarded Malice Green's family \$5.1 million in damages.

The notoriety from this racially hysterical case catapulted an inconspicuous DA of unremarkable talent (Kym Worthy) to win a large verdict against white police officers "who killed Malice Green," and parlay that into a judgeship and now her current position, Wayne County Prosecutor. Yet, that same speed Kym Worthy used to exploit an accidental death of a unruly drug addict by the police, is slow as frozen molasses to bring perjury charges against Mayor Kilpatrick despite the vast powers and resources of her office and the fact that Detroit Free Press columnists have basically written the legal brief for her case.

Like Democrat presidential candidate Barack Obama, Kym Worthy is a typical liberal hack politician who is part of the Michigan Democrat Machine. She does what she has to do to keep her patronage job as Wayne County Prosecutor. How? By keeping the black masses angry, frustrated and in a *constant* state of expectancy about the downfall of Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick . . . six years after the fact. Monday's press conference was a big charade. Worthy staged the entire event as she and she alone has flown in with her cape and her boots and will get *us* (Detroiters) justice. Balderdash!

Worthy, like so many of our craven pols on both sides of the aisle all over America, has built her career on lies, racial pandering, opportunism, shameless ambition and sistergirl demagoguery. She knows that the eyes of the world are on Detroit, and she is going through all the motions to bamboozle the blacks of Wayne County who will next year no doubt re-elect this opportunist once again, regardless of whether or not she and her legal "dream team" even have the ability to put this delusional, narcissistic, psychopathic "leader" in prison.

Black people of Detroit have made themselves the laughingstock of the world because of their irrational 75-year love affair with liberalism and the Democrat Party, which forbids ideological or public policy competition. Moreover, Detroit has made every closet racist self-righteously say inwardly, "See, I told you Negroes can't govern themselves!" This state of affairs vexes me to no end, for I was born and raised in Detroit. I was educated here, and my family and I presently worship in this city. D-Day for KK? We shall see, but don't hold your breath. After all, we are talking about Detroit, which Forbes Magazine awarded the villainous designation "America's most miserable city."

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 21

WHY I BECAME A CONSERVATIVE

March 22, 2008

Harvard University (*circa 1988*)

The party, as the kids say today, "was on and poppin'." My friend, Leon Betchett, a second-year law student, and I were so pumped-up and excited. We could *feel* the pulse of the music from the speakers as we walked up the stairs to the house party; my first party before graduate classes would soon begin. Sensing the caldron we were about to enter, my wise friend gave me a gentle warning that I would soon foolishly ignore to my own detriment—"Ellis, *please* don't talk about politics!" As the party ensued, Leon and I met many beautiful, bold, confident and exceedingly intelligent young women from all over the world. Seemingly with each breath I took, I felt my worldview expanding to even higher heights and deeper depths—*until* a conversation I was having with several young ladies veered off into politics, particularly the subject of black feminism.

In the spirit of a rigorous exchange of ideas, I told the women I thought the feminist movement was a white woman's movement and totally irrelevant to black women because of its central presuppositions—that before the feminist movement of the early 1970s, women were locked up in the house, excluded from the job market and involun-

tarily shackled with kids. This view simply did not fit the social or historical paradigm of virtually any black woman in America I knew of, including my mother, my grandmothers and my great aunts.

Well, well, well, after that last statement the conversation took a precipitous downturn to hell as the spirit of Sistergirl entered the room. These three erudite, classy, intelligent black Harvard graduate students surrounded me and suddenly transformed themselves into Lady Macbeth, Nurse Ratchet and Hillary Rodham Clinton as they in unison went nuclear on me. They read me the riot act and essentially characterized me as a crazy, uninformed idiot.

From another room, my buddy Leon heard all of the commotion and rushed in to my aid, but his altruism and intervention was all to no avail. I and I alone had committed the unpardonable sin of liberalism—Thou shalt not have an independent thought (apart from liberal dogma). After the party, I knew that my political and intellectual life would never be the same again. Like Caesar, who with his Roman Legions boldly marched onto Rome in 49 B.C., I had now crossed the Rubicon and had forsaken liberalism forever. This night I became a conservative.

In despair but with resolve, I sat down at my dorm desk, took out a sheet of paper, drew a line down the middle and wrote at the top of the paper: "Liberal Democrat" and "Conservative Republican." I then wrote down the basic core tenets of these two political ideologies, and at the end I was surprised to realize that the majority of my ideas and ideals lay with the conservative movement. Could a black man in America be accepted into the party of Ronald Reagan as a full-fledged member?

The year 1988 was a time of great angst for the largely liberal faculty and student body at Harvard because (in their view) America had greatly suffered for eight years under a Ronald Reagan administration. Many of my own people *to this day* consider Reagan the Antichrist. Why?—Because the number of letters in his name, Ronald Wilson Reagan, amount to the number of the Antichrist of the Book of Revelation—666. Like any new convert I set upon the task of educating myself regarding the tenets of classical conservatism. I got a subscription to the National Review and the Conservative Chronicle and read every book I could find in the used bookstores by Bill Buckley, Gertrude Himmelfarb, Walter Williams, Thomas Sowell, Antonin Scalia, Robert Bork and others. I also studied the political speeches of President Reagan. But deep down in my soul, the desire I had most was to "convert" my fellow black brothers

and sisters who have voted for liberal Democrats at over 90 percent since FDR's first term in 1933—for over three quarters of a century. But how could I achieve such a feat?

In a recent letter to Republican leaders in Georgia, I wrote about my strategy of affecting a Black Republican majority:

My main intent is to help the Republican Party return to being the party of Lincoln, the party of the disenfranchised, *not by government largess no matter how well-intentioned*, but by helping black people to help themselves. In my weekly column on WorldNetDaily, I delineate many strategies that can help the Republican Party recapture the majority black vote they once enjoyed from 1870-1932, after which time blacks left the party *en masse* in the early 1930s at the urging of W.E.B. Dubois and the NAACP to vote for FDR.

Black people have voted Democrat at over 90 percent ever since that time. With your help, I want change that tragic scenario that has so decimated the real and vested interests of black people all over America.

To this end I have started writing a new Thursday column for WorldNetDaily.com, a synopsis on the tragic crisis of leadership plaguing black people in Detroit due to the multiple scandals, corruption, perjury, fraud allegations and failed liberal policies of Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick—using the paradigm of Detroit, a once great city which now has the ignominious epitaph by Forbes Magazine: "The most miserable city in America." With your help, I want to change that.

It's been 20 years of giving lectures to students from grades 4-12, as well as to college and law schools students; 20 years of writing books, publishing scholarly articles on law, politics, political philosophy, critical race theory, feminism, education and other subjects, which the powers that be in the Republican Party have largely ignored. A few have offered words of encouragement, but no one has offered me the resources I need to further this most defensible and worthy cause of substantive political coalition building. Thank God for WorldNetDaily founder Joseph Farah, who a little over a year ago gave me a voice to present consistently my intellectual ideas and share them with the vast and intelligent readership of the WorldNetDaily audience, a readership I believe to be one of the most sophisticated audiences in the world.

Twenty years of offering my intellectual, strategic and tactical abilities in vain to the Republican Party to utilize my skills to build new and more substantive coalitions, has not dimmed my resolve nor provoked

me to lash out in anger at their missed opportunity. Nevertheless, I do hope that readers of this column will circulate this article to the Republican National Committee and to GOP branches in all 50 states as a urgent plea for genuine coalition building. The RNC must ask itself *why* my fellow black Americans would sign up to join a party that has long ago forsaken the conservatism of Ronald Reagan and seems more interested in mimicking slogans of Obama—"consensus," "change," "bringing America together." Ignore the black vote at your own doom. Remember the last couple of elections have been virtually 50/50.

What attractiveness to black people is there to a political party dominated by legions of gray-haired white men in dark suits who seem more interested in securing a better tee time at their local country club than in doing the down and dirty work of substantive coalition building? I cannot answer these questions, but be answered they must! Nevertheless, the heroic and transcendent ideas and ideals of conservatism and the Constitution's Framers mean infinitely more to me, to my worldview and to my life as a Christian, as a black man struggling to support his family in America than *all* the power, position and privilege of mere men.

And that's why I became a conservative.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 22

CALLING ALL CRIMINALS: COME TO DETROIT!

March 20, 2008

We are in the middle of shift change. Maybe you should call 911 again.

~ Detroit Police 911 Operator's response to a citizen in distress

NOTICE: Calling all criminals!

Are you a criminal? Do you take from others what is not yours? Do you want to live in a city where you can run wild and don't have to worry about being hassled by the police? Then come to Detroit where you can be inside someone's house robbing them while the owners are locked inside a bedroom calling 911, and the police will tell the homeowners:

"We are in the middle of shift change. Maybe you should call 911 again," or in another case, your 911 call goes into voice mail. Calling all criminals! And don't worry about rising violent crime statistics that year after year has made Detroit the murder capital of America and, according to Forbes Magazine, "The most miserable city in America," because Detroit's police chief refuses to report accurately *all* of the violent crime statistics committed by black people against black people here in Detroit. Here, even the police pad their own time cards with impunity.

Kwame Kilpatrick, the current embattled mayor of Detroit, seems to have a new scandal hit him daily since the so-called "sex, lies and text messaging" scandal first broke in late January. The Detroit Free Press published excerpts from over 14,000 text messages the mayor and his former chief of staff, Christine Beatty, exchanged with one another, conclusively proving that Kilpatrick committed perjury by firing Deputy Police Chief Gary Brown and former mayoral bodyguard Harold Nelthorpe during their whistleblower lawsuit settled late last year for \$9 million.

Once all of the mayor's text messages are reviewed and those of his top appointees are published, it will be clear to all the evidence of malfeasance, fraud, abuse, perjury, cronyism, obstruction of justice—perhaps even double murder?—as well as many other infamies reaching up to the highest levels in Detroit city government. On this point, Detroit-area attorney Norman Yatooma has recently received a judgment from U.S. District Judge Gerald Rosen to view the text messages of the mayor and all of his top appointees in the denial-of-access claim Yatooma filed on behalf of dancer Tamara Greene's 14-year-old son, Jonathan Bond. Greene was the stripper who was gunned down in 2003 after performing at a party at the mayor's Manoogian Mansion.

Before I address Mayor Kilpatrick's top law enforcement appointee, Police Chief Ella Bully-Cummings, let me give you an idea into the Machiavellian and Clintonian tactics the mayor regularly employs to seize, maintain and wield power. Like a ganglord of the Crips, the Bloods or the Gangster Disciples, the last thing a gang recruit has to do to get into a gang is commit some egregious act like rape, sadistically beating someone up, or even murder. Why? So the gang will have something over your head to force your lifelong allegiance. One notorious gang even has the ominous motto: "In feet first, out feet first." These are the evil tactics Kilpatrick uses to demand allegiance to his omnipotent

authority. Even the black preachers of Detroit aren't exempt, which is why they have been so uncharacteristically silent for the past six years of Kilpatrick's tyrannical administration. He has them right in his back pocket.

The mayor knew the political and legal heat he was under when he appointed Bully-Cummings police chief in November 2003. By that time, it had been over a year since his mysterious party at the Manoogian Mansion (October 2002)—a party the police chief of Southfield, Mich., was even invited to, but wisely declined; a party that was investigated by Deputy Police Chief Gary Brown, Lt. Alvin Bowman, Harold Nelthrope and barred by Bully-Cummings (at the direction of the mayor) when the investigation got too close to His Honor. In fact, *the very day* Officer Brown's investigation memo regarding the mayor's Manoogian Mansion party was to become public (April 30, 2003), one of the three dancers at that party, Tamara "Strawberry" Greene, was viciously murdered as she and her boyfriend sat in a car at the corner of Roselawn and Outer Dr.—literally around the block from where I grew up in the late 1960s-80s.

A second dancer at the party, which the mayor and Michigan Republican Attorney General Mike Cox still insist was "an urban legend," was tracked down to Atlanta and reportedly killed with the same 40-caliber police-issued weapon. All this drama for a party that never happened? Like my grandmamma used to tell me, "Boy, where there's smoke, there's fire." Bowman, a 31-year decorated veteran officer, was fired by Bully-Cummings and his life repeatedly threatened by fellow Detroit police officers for his investigations into the Manoogian Mansion party and the deaths of the two exotic dancers, which his independent investigation strongly implied were murdered by Detroit police officers.

Bully-Cummings has proven herself to be a worthy ally for Kilpatrick, for even as the mayor's litany of infamies became public knowledge in the sex, lies and text messaging scandal, even as the murder rate rose in Detroit and as year after year Detroit won the dubious distinction as "murder capital of America," this police chief has become very clever at cooking the books—altering or not accurately reporting the homicide and violent crimes statistics so that Mayor Kilpatrick could campaign in 2005 on a platform that Detroit's crime rate was down. Down compared to what? Beirut, Lebanon, Iraq or Afghanistan? Chief Bully-Cummings is an utterly compromised, corrupt and incompetent public official. She,

like all of the other sycophantic appointees and cronies under Kilpatrick's authority, will say and do anything to keep their coveted city jobs and lucrative perks. Under Bully-Cumming's leadership, there has also been a systematic and devastating brain drain in the ranks of the Detroit Police Department as hundreds of veteran police personnel were either laid off or forced into an early retirement. Detroit is now begging people to fill the vacancies, yet because of the criminal backgrounds or the mis-education of many otherwise able-bodied young black men in the city, Detroit regrettably has few qualified candidates for the police academy.

Consider this bitter irony: Would black people in Detroit and the so-called civil rights movement tolerate today the tyranny of a white racist leader like Alabama Gov. George Wallace or a sadistic, pathological police chief like a Bull Connor of the 1960s? No, because history has proven their singular valor against white racism. Then why do black people in Detroit and in cities across America sit so passively by as they have done here while being openly terrorized, abused, lied to, cheated upon and so utterly misrepresented by their own people? Liberalism is killing my people here in Detroit, and they don't even realize it.

Calling all Criminals . . . Come to Detroit!

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 23

FDR'S LEGACY: TYRANNY

March 08, 2007

The American Republic will endure, until politicians realize they can bribe the people with their own money.

~ Alexis de Tocqueville (1835)

I didn't earn it, I don't deserve it, but if the government misses one of my payments, I'll raise hell!

~ Grandpa Simpson (from the TV show *The Simpsons*)

On Feb. 5, 2007, President George W. Bush submitted a budget for Congress to consider passing. It contained \$2.9 trillion dollars in spending, not including \$235 billion in additional military spending for the war in Iraq for 2007 and 2008. Regrettably, what you don't hear from Democrats or Republicans is that the overwhelming majority of that

spending is against the original intent of the framers of the Constitution, yet it exists and is growing exponentially in the face of a multi-trillion dollar U.S. deficit largely being financed by, of all nations, China. What if China calls in our several trillion dollars in U.S. debt they presently hold? Bye-bye, USA.

The origins of what is ubiquitously referred to as “Big Government” dates back 75 years to the first of four terms of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-45). FDR’s legacy essentially rests on replacing God with Big Government to fulfill human needs. The church, philosophy, Jewish, Christian and other religious organizations became secondary and increasingly irrelevant in the face of this unprecedented leviathan government expansion. FDR and his socialist bureaucrats would never again rely on the religion-based charity or the church to help the people in need. The State, proud and lifted up, had ascended Parnassus as the new god of the latest, dynamic, Progressive Era and would provide all needs for everyone. FDR’s legacy was his comprehensive and utter demoralization of America’s can-do spirit called the “New Deal.”

The Great Depression of October 1929 was a godsend for Roosevelt. America’s dire economic conditions, including 25 percent unemployment (up from 4 percent) and the collapse of manufacturing output by one-third, sent prices falling everywhere—making the burden of the repayment of debts almost impossible. Heavy industry, mining, lumbering and agriculture all felt its impact. These very grave economic circumstances gave FDR the perfect pretext for fundamentally changing America from a representative republic form of government to a socialist state. He wasted no time. Within the first 100 days of taking office, he and his advisers quickly formulated a series of leviathan programs, and between 1933 and 1937—with the goal of relief, recovery and reform of the United States economy—the U.S. moved slowly out of its economic malaise of the Great Depression (at least that was the rhetoric from the propaganda press).

A posthumous quote attributed to Scottish historian Sir Alexander Fraser Tytler long ago predicted a man like FDR seizing power:

A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largess from the public treasury. From that time on the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the public

treasury, with the results that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship.

The three Rs of FDR's New Deal programs were direct relief, economic recovery and financial reform. *Relief* was the immediate effort to help the one-third of the population that was hardest hit by the depression. *Reform* was based on the supposition that the depression was caused by the inherent instability of the market and that government intrusion was necessary to justify, correct and stabilize the economy, and to balance the interests of farmers, business and labor. *Recovery* would be a series of program initiatives that in theory would pull the U.S. completely out of the Great Depression. The New Deal didn't, World War II did.

By 1934, the Supreme Court began ruling against many of FDR's New Deal programs as unconstitutional. In his second term, Roosevelt, flush from his 1936 landside presidential victory was outraged and was convinced he had a mandate from the people to continue and expand his New Deal programs. This conflict between the Court and the Executive branches of government led to FDR's court-packing bill in 1937. Although the bill failed, the Supreme Court, fearing FDR's attempt to neutralize them, began declaring his New Deal laws constitutional. By 1942, the Supreme Court had virtually stopped its conservative "judicial activism" of striking down congressional laws passed by New Dealers. Through an unconstitutional expansion of Article I, Section 8, the Supreme Court, in cases like *Wickard v. Filburn*, ruled that the Commerce Clause applied to virtually any regulation allowing the necessary expansion of federal power to make the New Deal "constitutional." The fix was in, and in subsequent decades, as the federal government grew in power over the people, their constitutionally enumerated freedoms became a dead letter (i.e., Ninth and 10th Amendments, Commerce Clause protection, etc.).

Historian Clarence B. Carson captured the intoxicating optimism of the 1930s regarding government's comprehensive and exalted role to solve all the problems that have plagued mankind since ancient times, saying: "At this remove in time from the early days of the New Deal, it is difficult to recapture, even in imagination, the heady enthusiasm among a goodly number of intellectuals for a government-planned economy . . . as General Hugh Johnson put it, from "the murderous doctrine of savage and wolfish individualism, looking to dog-eat-dog and devil take the

hindmost." Mr. Carson's rather dour assessment of free-market capitalism pre-FDR is exactly what made America the greatest nation in the history of humanity—each individual, limited only by his ability and imagination, had the freedom to pursue in Jefferson's words—"Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" by God's power, not government's encroachment on We the People's inalienable rights.

What is FDR's legacy to America? In a word: tyranny. C.S. Lewis put it thusly: "Of all tyrannies, a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their consciences." FDR taught America to forsake the three things that made her great—free-market capitalism, its Judeo-Christian traditions and rugged American individualism. How? By pitting church against state, sacred against secular, men against women, race against race, rich against poor, creed against creed, Jew against Gentile, liberals against conservatives, class against class, the haves against the have nots. What is the result of this state of affairs in modern times?—Thou *shalt* covet thy neighbor's ass.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 24

REP. WILLIAM JEFFERSON AND OTHER FALSE PROPHETS

August 04, 2007

William F. Buckley, the father of the modern conservative movement and my intellectual godfather, once stated: "We eschew the recital of our credenda." I used those august words for the first quote in the first chapter of the first book I ever wrote, "The Devil is in the Details: Essays on Law, Race, Politics & Religion" (1999). I didn't understand those words then, but now I see. The Buckley quotes means "I hate to do what I have to do, but this is what I must do."

At the beginning of 2007 America viewed that farce of a coronation the Democrats held in the nation's Capitol Jan. 5, a day that saw the 110th Congress ascend the steps of Parnassus to pass lobbying and ethics reforms. I witnessed the Congressional Black Caucus, or CBC, (the so-

called representatives of my people) give a standing ovation to one of their members, Rep. William "Dollar Bill" Jefferson, D, La. The occasion was presided over by none other than that ubiquitous, silver-tongued orator, Rev. Dr. Michael Eric Dyson, who, as an ordained minister, shamelessly boasted, "The haters . . . and negative nabobs . . . the people who spoke against him couldn't prevail against the people who spoke for him." I was shocked. To add insult to injury, on Feb. 16, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi appointed William Jefferson to a coveted seat on the Homeland Security Committee.

As the assembled CBC members exulted over their perceived victory at getting majority voting power in the House of Representatives, I thought of two black leaders of a long-forgotten era, two giants of intellectual thought, two forgotten prophets that set the paradigm of today's ideas for my people in politics, science, philosophy, economics, education, law, religion and employment—Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois.

Could it be proper that the American public witnessed Rep. Jefferson take the coveted congressional chair? William Jefferson, a man all but convicted of receiving a \$100,000 bribe from a Nigerian businessman in exchange for business contracts to be sent his way—\$90,000 of which was found by the FBI neatly wrapped inside his freezer? A man that is now *not* cowering in fear from the law or fleeing in shame into the abyss of obscurity; nay, but re-elected to office by his majority black constituency in Louisiana and now stood proudly waving his hands before his CBC colleagues in exultant triumph with the blessings of a Christian minister though he would be indicted six months later? This is beyond the pale.

Who is this forgotten prophet that black people should have followed, but now have utterly ignored and disdained nearly 100 years since his death in 1915? I speak of none other than Booker T. Washington (1856-1915), that great intellectual, orator, educator, leader, philanthropist, black people's "Elijah," former slave and self-educated man that pulled himself up by his bootstraps through sheer will power, eventually became founder of Tuskegee University. A man that tirelessly preached the gospel of Horatio Alger: self-help, moral uprightness and individual responsibility in the face of the naked racism of his day. This great black prophet who once extolled: "The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and that

progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of *artificial forcing*.

Instead, black people have followed an intellectual and political false prophet, Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois (1868-1963)—that erudite, *effete* black academic who was the first black person to earn a graduate degree from Harvard (1895). A man that was one of the founding members of the Niagara Movement (1909), which later became the premier civil right group, NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People). Race hustlers and demagogues like Rev. Al Sharpton, Rev. Jesse Jackson, the Congressional Black Caucus and black elites that believe that their salvation is in another government program, another minimum wage increase, another welfare handout, or artificially forcing white people to accept blacks as equals via litigation (“artificial forcing”) will fail. Their tactics are diametrically opposed to what Booker T. Washington taught, and thus, what I believe.

To summarize his views about the direction black people should go, Du Bois once stated the following: “We claim for ourselves every single right that belongs to a free American, political, civil and social, and until we get these rights we will *never* cease to protest and assail the ears of America.” These words are courageous and eloquent, but foolhardy, for they fail to delineate a key issue—what are black people’s responsibilities to themselves and to society? On this point, Du Bois and the contemporary black elites are unusually silent. Why? Because, it takes the blame off white people and puts it squarely on the backs of black people.

Du Bois frequently lambasted Booker T. Washington as being “the first Uncle Tom” and other vile, false epithets. Until late in Du Bois’ life (the early 1960s), when the vacuity of his “Talented Tenth” theory, his litigation = salvation philosophy, and the Sisyphus-effect of government programs were seen as self-evident failures, black regression and black pathology was made more acute as other races and ethnic groups who instinctly relied on Booker T. Washington’s precepts without knowing the man ascended the ladder of prosperity, passing many blacks who in vain and in smoldering resentment still wait on handouts from the white man until this day!

Even the Honorable Elijah Mohammed and his minority black Muslim organization, who openly patterned their economic, political and business programs after Booker T. Washington’s self-help philosophy,

had more to show for their efforts than the vast multitudes of black people (educated and uneducated) who languished in the ghettos of small towns and big cities and throughout America since the 1930s; who increasingly produced fatherless babies with no shame, who annually committed crimes at a brazen rate, who made a religion out of idleness, ignorance, crime and promiscuity. Nothing the white man could or could not do to my people would change these facts.

Also, let us not forget Du Bois' "Talented Tenth" philosophy whereby the black educated class in complicity with black ministers, in their lust for political power and ambition, treacherously sold out their own black brothers and sisters and convinced black people to abandon the Republican Party that freed their forefathers from slavery, and instead in the early 1930s made a traitorous, Faustian bargain with FDR and the Democratic Party—that Leviathan, socialist big government was the *only* way to help black people succeed in America . . . in life. It was all a colossal deception for the naive, for the indolent and for those who despise history because they don't read history. It was in the words of poet Langston Hughes, "A Dream Differed." This is the Big Lie that exploits my people, a seducing lie that continues until this day.

Finally, perhaps my people can learn a lesson from ancient Israel when in the midst of apostasy (as narrated in the book of 2 Kings 22), one of the scribes "found" a copy of the Torah, which set the stage for a glorious religious reformation of the Jewish people that lasted a generation. Likewise, I pray that my people will one day *find* the words of that venerable prophet, Booker T. Washington, and take heed of them before black people go the way of the Canaanites and the Philistines.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 25

WHY I PRAISE SEN. JOSEPH MCCARTHY

April 14, 2007

You cannot offer friendship to tyrants and murderers . . . without advancing the cause of tyranny and murder.

~ Sen. Joseph McCarthy, R-Wis. (*circa* early 1950s)

There's always a conflict of interest when people who don't really like America are called upon to defend it.

~ Ann Coulter

Perhaps second only to Woodward and Bernstein's newspaper articles in the 1970s that exposed the Watergate scandal and forced President Nixon to resign has the liberal propaganda press been so utterly successful at destroying a single Republican—an exhilarating and heady era that predated Watergate by 20 years.

From 1950-54, Wisconsin Sen. Joseph McCarthy, in a series of Senate hearings modeled after the famous House Un-American Activities Committee, or HUAC (including the Tydings Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [1950]; the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations [1953-54]; and the ill-fated Army-McCarthy Hearings [1954]), with irrepressible zeal and courage, sought to root out Communists, Communist sympathizers and spies in the State Department, the Treasury Department, the military and in other areas of the government, but also in Hollywood, in unions, in the academy and throughout American society. Ironically, HUAC, a House committee, was formed not by McCarthy, a senator, but by liberal Democrats 12 years before, in 1938, on the eve of World War II during an era before political correctness and radicalism became the norm; where being a liberal Democrat meant defending America from tyrants abroad and German spies and terrorists at home.

Sen. McCarthy wasn't the first politician to mount a crusade to bring down intrinsic corruption. The annals of American political history are filled with them. There was the Tea Pot Dome Scandal of 1922 that made a national hero out of the heretofore unremarkable Montana Democrat Sen. Thomas J. Walsh, when he exposed the land for oil deal of the Warren Harding administration. The Truman Committee investigated charges of war profiteering and shoddy materials sold to the military during World War II by U.S. corporations, which lead to numerous reforms and elevated Truman to vice president and, at the death of FDR, to the presidency.

There was Robert F. Kennedy's stentorian questioning of Mafia dons and corrupt union leaders like Jimmy Hoffa in the early 1960s; this feat lead to RFK's presidential run, which was tragically brought to an end by the assassin's bullet in June 1968. However, politics does make strange bedfellows because RFK made his bones as a staffer to none other than Sen. Joseph McCarthy during his anti-communism crusade of the early 1950s. Despite his close association with McCarthy, however, RFK's

memory is kept pure by the propaganda press even until this day. Why? Two reasons—RFK was a liberal Democrat and a Kennedy. McCarthy was neither. Finally, and who could forget Newt Gingrich who in 1989 dethroned powerful Texas Democrat Speaker Jim Wright over a fraudulent book deal scandal, only to resign six years later for literally the same bogus book deal.

Back to McCarthy—As I revisit this tragic Promethean figure of the early 1950s, let us first answer two basic questions lucidly without emotion: 1) Did McCarthy find Communists, Communist sympathizers and Soviet spies in the State Department, in Hollywood, in the academy, in the literary world, in the military, in the media during his Senate committee hearings? 2) Does an unbiased account of history show that McCarthy abused his power? Yes on the first question, No, on the second.

Conservative political writer Ann Coulter said this of McCarthy and the 50 years of incessant demonization by the liberal propaganda press: "I know he got a bad rap because there are no monuments to Joe McCarthy. Liberals had to destroy McCarthy because he exposed the entire liberal establishment as having sheltered Soviet spies. . . . There's always a conflict of interest when people who don't really like America are called upon to defend it." Today, McCarthy's name has been turned into a vile epithet (*McCarthyism*) and is stricken from the congressional record, from the marketplace of ideas and from public memory. Ironically, neither Marx, Lenin, Mao, Stalin, Mussolini, Idi Amin, Pol Pot nor Hitler's names engenders such malediction from the left as does Sen. McCarthy, despite the fact that those leaders and the tyrannical ideals they propagated killed hundreds of millions of people.

In my opinion, Joseph McCarthy is the only man that can be put in the same sentence with the two other great Republican leaders of the 20th century, and they were both presidents—Theodore Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan. Yet McCarthy's face isn't carved into Mount Rushmore as TR's is, nor does even a statue or a \$5 plaque appear of him in Washington, D.C., or in his home state of Wisconsin. Yet a few weeks ago the fine people of Amsterdam, Holland, erected a magnificent statute to one of their greatest leaders—no, not Rembrandt, not Grotius, not Spinoza, not van Gogh, but to that great ubiquitous figure ... The Prostitute, and to the ancient glorious art of prostitution. Take that, Spinoza! The craven cowardice and historical ignorance regarding this great man's contribu-

tions to America is appalling, but not surprising to me. Therefore, I also praise Ann Coulter. If it weren't for her prolific, courageous writings, and the radio and TV appearances of this bold, beautiful political commentator, McCarthy's memory would be all but totally forgotten or continually and utterly reviled by the political left without challenge. On this point, I'll let Ann Coulter speak in her own voice:

Among the most notorious Soviet spies in high-level positions in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations—now proved absolutely, beyond question by the Soviet cables—were Alger Hiss at the State Department; Harry Dexter White, assistant secretary of the Treasury Department, later appointed to the International Monetary Fund by President Truman; Lauchlin Currie, personal assistant to President Roosevelt and White House liaison to the State Department under both Roosevelt and Truman; Laurence Duggan, head of the Latin American Desk at the State Department; Frank Coe, U.S. representative on the International Monetary Fund; Solomon Adler, senior Treasury Department official; Klaus Fuchs, top atomic scientist; and Duncan Lee, senior aide to the head of the OSS. Is there no man, no conservative, no Republican during this upcoming 2008 presidential election who has pledged to continue McCarthy's magnificent legacy of combating radical liberalism, Country Club Republicanism, Communism, totalitarianism and civilization's newest enemy, Islamic terrorism? From way in the back of the room, Ann Coulter stood tall like a man and didn't ask for it, but *took* McCarthy's mantle.

And that is why I praise Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 26

NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN'S REVENGE

April 07, 2007

We have peace in our time.

~ Neville Chamberlain (The Munich Pact with Hitler, 1938)

Democrats are on the precipice of securing their reputation as the Chamberlains of our time. In fact, today's appeasers are worse than Neville Chamberlain: Chamberlain didn't have himself as an example.

~ Ann Coulter

Never have I seen such a collection of gutless, uninspired, craven pols as this present motley crew of presidential hopefuls for 2008. All of our great leaders are either dead (Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Churchill, FDR, Joseph McCarthy, Reagan), retired (Margaret Thatcher, Gen. Colin Powell), or hounded out of office in disgrace (Newt Gingrich, Tom DeLay, "B-1" Bob Dornan, J.D. Hayworth, Rick Santorum). Where are our strong conservative leaders? They are either signed up for that prime tee time slot at their local country club, or trying to beat the Democrats to the next microphone to crow about how they are *now* against the war in Iraq by passing a useless "non-binding resolution." Yes, I put FDR on my list of great leaders because, although I differ with him politically, when the nation was at her darkest hour during the Great Depression and later, during the time of Hitler's Nazi menace, FDR had the vision, leadership and administrative skills to move us to decisive action against our enemies—domestic and abroad.

As we gear up for the 2008 elections, all we have is a combination of the unusual suspects preening about—irrelevant senators desperate to secure a relevant legacy (Dodd, Hagel, Biden, McCain, Edwards, Brownback, Fred Thompson, Kerry [until recently]); retread or unexceptional congressmen (Newt Gingrich, Dennis Kucinich, Ron Paul, Tom Tancredo, Duncan Hunter); Lady Macbeth and Machiavelli all rolled into one (Hillary Rodham Clinton); a smattering of unremarkable governors (Mitt Romney, Bill Richardson, Jim Gilmore, Tommy Thompson, George Pataki, Mike Huckabee); an unexamined, untested flavor-of-the-month (Barack Hussein Obama); a thrice-married ex-mayor of New York whose career was on life-support, but for 9-11 (Rudy Giuliani); and a bootleg minister standing in the wings for comic relief (Rev. Al Sharpton).

As the multitude of presidential hopefuls and their handlers assemble, the air is tense with anticipation when the esteemed speaker mounts the podium. Suddenly, in unison, there is thunderous applause and ear-shattering ovations from the awestruck audience of the elite movers and shakers of Washington, D.C. Who is this man that will lead us to victory against Islamic terrorism wherever it raises its ugly head?

"Ladies and gentlemen, this man needs no introduction. You all know him. You all *are* him, and he is you. Let us welcome that great statesman of two generations past—Neville Chamberlain!" (*more applause for five minutes.*)

What will this man speak to us as Hitler and his children clamor at the gates to put Western civilization under the savage, unmerciful boot of Nazi tyranny for a thousand years? Is he seeking to convert us? To co-opt us? Or perhaps, to destroy us? What will Chamberlain say that will assuage our fears about the imminent annihilation of our most faithful ally, Israel ("little Satan") and our concern for ourselves, the United States ("great Satan")? What will Chamberlain achieve to make President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the Iranian mullahs fear us once again like in days of old—in primeval times when Christian leaders like Charles "the Hammer" Martel (686-741), Charlemagne (742-814), Richard the Lionhearted (1157-99), Elizabeth I (1533-1603), Peter the Great (1672-1725), all fought so valiantly against the Muslim menace, face to face?

Neville Chamberlain waits for the applause to subside, clears his throat, and says to America's illustrious future leaders and to the American people—"ALLAH IS GOD AND MUHAMMAD IS HIS PROPHET!" . . . As the audience recoils in horror at his words (for they are the words of a traitor), Chamberlain continues his speech undaunted: "We have peace in our time. I have in my hand the agreement that I just signed with the Nazi, Hitler/Ahmadinejad and the Saudi princes at Munich/Mecca and he/they promised not to send war/jihad against us if we surrender/convert to Hitler's/Allah's will."

Still stunned silence from the audience, but as shock gives way to resignation and resignation to approval, Chamberlain's final words are even more accepted by this gaggle of would-be presidents. Chamberlain, sensing the hour of his destiny is at hand, proceeds to his grand finale: "My brothers, my sisters, you are my lineage, my legacy. Do as I did, except for one thing . . . KILL EVERY CHURCHILL THAT ARISES!" However, before he completely leaves the stage, he returns to the podium and motions the audience to cease its thunderous applause. Chamberlain adjusts his clothes, clears his voice and proclaims to the crowd of presidential hopefuls looking up to him with rapt attention:

"Ladies and gentlemen, please disregard my last statement, my last remarks about "killing every Churchill that arises." "Why?" someone shouts from the back of the room. And with a twinkle in his eye and the slightest smile which in the lights reflects so handsomely off his silver mane, Chamberlain intones in his most Shakespearian manner, "Because now I can manifestly witness from viewing *this* audience, indeed there are no Churchills here to kill."

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 27

IS ISLAM COMPATIBLE WITH A REPUBLIC?

March 24, 2007

"Dr. Franklin, what have you given us?" "Madam, we have given you a Republic, if you can keep it!"

~ Benjamin Franklin (1787)

Since 9-11, the societal and cultural battle lines for the soul of civilization have become ever more defined and at the same time, increasingly opaque—between America's Judeo-Christian traditions and Islam, between a representative republic (not democracy, which is mob rule) and totalitarianism, between freedom lovers and religious tyranny, between Justices Thomas and Scalia and the ACLU, between Reagan and craven politicians that will say and do anything to get elected.

How can men of goodwill reconcile two worldviews so diametrically opposed to one another, yet which are so interconnected? America and Israel have not only welcomed Arabs and Muslims from every country on earth, but allowed them to build mosques and to worship their god according to the dictates of their own conscience, yet our magnanimity is not reciprocated by Muslims. If you think I write from hyperbole, just try building a church or a synagogue in an Arab nation. They won't even allow you to bring a Bible into most Arab countries. Not even our well-traveled secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice (who earlier this year was in Saudi Arabia), is allowed to read a few comforting passages of peace from the book of Psalms in the land of Mecca and Medina as she lies down to sleep. No! It is forbidden by the Quran. Islam will tolerate no other gods before it.

Islam's command from Quran in the book of Sirah—"Kill the infidel where you find him"—has been the rallying cry of the majority of Muslims despite the sham protestations of the so-called "moderate" Muslims to the contrary whenever the world community demands contrition at the most recent Muslim bombings that occur worldwide almost daily. To counter this, America should heed the words of that Lion from Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, whose indomitable courage and steely demeanor in the face of Hitler's Luftwaffe bombs falling all around his head nightly during World War II, solemnly intoned:

We shall fight them on the beaches,
We shall fight them on the shore,
We shall fight them in the fields and streams,
We shall fight them in the city;
We shall never surrender, never, never, never . . . !

Where is Churchill today? Where is Reagan? Where is Margaret Thatcher? At that fateful hour where we need a champion there is no one to stand in the gap as Churchill did during World War II, a leader who instinctively knew that "This is no war of chieftains or of princes, of dynasties or national ambition; it is a war of peoples and of causes. . . ." His courage was not alone in history—from Franklin and the constitutional framers, who stood firm against the naked tyranny of King George III, to Ronald Reagan, who, despite the venomous protestations from the academy, the ACLU, political mediocrities on both sides of the aisle and the propaganda press, showed resolve and destroyed Soviet Communism and stemmed the tide of Marxist tyranny across the world.

During these perilous times, does America have a man that will stand in the gap? Nay, all we have is this craven, ambitious political class that only aspires to the presidency or to plunder the federal treasury to give largess and political bribes to their lazy, covetous constituencies. In the meantime, potential Muslim "sleepers" are exploiting our First Amendment religious freedoms and have for the past generation built more and more mosques right here on American soil with Saudi Arabian money—while daring us to try to put one brick for one synagogue or one church on Muslim land. Presently, Muslims are building the largest mosque outside of the Middle East right in the middle of London. The civilized world is indeed shrinking.

The Benjamin Franklin opening quote is a testament to the ignominious results America would suffer if she chooses the wrong worldview. It was made by that august sage of the Colonial Period as he departed from Constitution Hall in Philadelphia at the end the First Constitutional Convention, Sept. 18, 1787. Franklin had just finished a grueling series of meetings with representatives from all 13 colonies, each with their own petty, selfish interests and provincial agendas. They tried with every Machiavellian artifice to make their narrow interests pre-eminent in America's charter document. Finally, after weeks of arguing, debating,

threatening, drafting, redrafting, amending and re-amending, our beloved Constitution was essentially born. Nevertheless, Franklin, knowing the savageness and intractability of human nature was convinced that unless America's republic was rooted in strong moral precepts out of the Judeo-Christian tradition, that republic would die a stillborn death in the cradle—thus his sardonic reply to that inquisitive, anonymous lady: "Madam, we have given you a Republic, if you can keep it!" In other words, if you [America] don't %!&*@ it up.

To revisit my initial question—Is Islam compatible with a republic? With Islamic radicalism running rampant both in America and throughout the West, all people of goodwill and those who love liberty must emphatically answer, No! With this said, what will America do about the enemies in our midst? Continue to put our heads in the sand and ape the idiotic rantings from the propaganda press?—"Islam is a religion of peace"; "Islam welcomes all faiths"; "George W. Bush is the biggest enemy of freedom, not al-Qaida"; and other asinine babblings of the political left, or will real men rise up, demand that the FBI put every mosque and imam in America under constant surveillance (as J. Edgar Hoover would have done) and find out what is really going on with our Muslim friends here in America?

In conclusion, I propose that the Justice Department bring criminal charges against the American Civil Liberties Union under the RICO statutes and confiscate all its assets. Why? Since the 1930s, this inimical group has so perverted the Constitution and the rule of law that our government can no longer properly function to protect the American people for fear of a lawsuit by these radicals. Remember, we used RICO statutes to neutralize the KKK, religious cults and the Mafia; the ACLU is more dangerous than those groups put together. I believe at the 11th hour America will wake up and fight against our enemies—domestic and international, as she finally did against the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941. My repeated vexing concern is that this generation's "Pearl Harbor" was on Sept. 11, 2001, over five and a half years ago, while America, Britain, Israel and all nations of goodwill still slumber and sleep.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 28

D-DAY IN DENVER?

July 31, 2008

Join us in the streets of Denver as we resist a two-party system that allows imperialism and racism to continue unrestrained. We will demand change by making the Democrat Convention of 1968 look like a small get together in 2008.

~ Recreate '68

During my daily search of interesting news across cyberspace, I came across an item posted on DrudgeReport.com from the Denver Rocky Mountain News, "Mayor says no to Tent State overnight." As the Democratic Party prepares festivities to present its presidential candidate, Barack Obama in Denver next month, all is not quiet on the Normandy coast (to borrow a World War II metaphor).

In the Battle of Normandy, launched June 6, 1944, we successfully used propaganda and disinformation to fool Hitler into believing that the Allied Powers were *not* going to attack the French coasts of Normandy, but Norway and France at the Pas de Calais. While "Operation Fortitude" did fool Hitler's generals (to a degree), dug in across the Normandy coast were Hitler's vaunted storm troopers prepared to exact a grim causality count from our valiant Allied forces.

This brings me to my point, with less than 100 days before the 2008 presidential elections and less than one month before the Democrat convention (Aug. 25-28), not all Democrats are in a celebratory mood. Many rank-and-file liberal activists are out for blood from their own party. There are tens of thousands of shock troops that want to dig in and camp out at the Democrat National Convention in Denver and the Democrat National Committee is doing everything it can to prevent this self-sabotage (again). These student activists aren't the DNC's only problem. There is even a quasi-terrorist, fascist group calling itself "Recreate '68" promising to spread anarchy and mayhem at the convention.

You will remember that 1968 was the year the Democrat Convention was held in Boss Richard J. Daley's Chicago where a very radical group of protesters called "The Chicago Eight" (later pared down to seven) were

charged with conspiracy and incitement in connection with the bloody riot at the convention. Remarkably, all charges were later overturned by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. (You can always count on those liberal activist judges to let the devil himself out of jail). The eight protesters charged with conspiracy and incitement were the usual suspects of their day—Abbie Hoffman, Tom Hayden, David Dellinger, Rennie Davis, John Froines, Jerry Rubin, Lee Weiner, and Bobby Seale. These eight “freedom fighters” and the multitudes of useful idiots (the mob) who took part in Chicago’s “police riot” in 1968 successfully sabotaged their own party along with the presidential aspirations of the great Hubert Humphrey and running mate Edmund M. Muskie (who in his own presidential run in 1972 would achieve infamy for crying at a certain spot—“Muskie cried here”), thus paving the way for Richard Nixon to win two terms, both landslide victories.

So it seems inevitable that history will repeat itself 40 years later in 2008 as a motley assortment of progressives, anarchists, students, radicals, demagogues, socialists and leftists of every stripe will all try to have their voices heard at the Democrat Convention. Since the Democrat National Committee is already giving them the middle finger salute, the mob will feel that its only recourse is to lash out in vengeance by sabotaging the Democratic candidate, B. Hussein Obama. The latest controversy revolves around a college-age group from Tent State University petitioning Denver Mayor John Hickenlooper to allow its group (and presumably about 50,000 likeminded student protesters and activists across the country) to camp out overnight at City Park near the sports arena where the convention will be held. At the time of this writing, the mayor and virtually every Democrat politician in the state of Colorado are in unison in answering the students’ inquiry with a resounding NO!

The delicious, irresistible irony here is that for over 100 years, since the advent of the progressive movement that gave birth to modern liberalism, the American public has been relentlessly propagandized with such ideas as socialism, humanism, radical egalitarianism which is the equality of results (rather than access); that the Democratic Party alone is the party that cares for everybody, even “the little guy,” that they are the real “big tent party” where “everyone has a voice” and no one is marginalized. The events developing in Denver would seem to betray that characterization and highlight the utter hypocrisy of liberal Democrats who zealously demand fairness, equality and “social justice” from eve-

ryone else, but when it is their turn to show equanimity even to a bunch of non-violent, idealistic students who just want to be "part of history," their compassion turns icy cold. At \$500 a night for hotel rooms near the Democrat Convention, "the poor" need not bother to attend.

Speaking of the poor, I heard that the Democrats, the party of the people, by the people and for the people, are strongly urging all of the bums (or homeless for the PC crowd) in Denver during the time of their convention to please go to a movie on their dime. This is an incredible assertion. Where is all the love and camaraderie Democrats claim to have for *all* people, races, classes, colors and creeds? This seems to me like liberals are promoting a policy of hiding or segregating the bums from the rest of society. I guess one creed liberals don't like is a vow of poverty, and the only color welcomed at the Denver convention is good ol' American *greenbacks*.

In the article cited above, Denver resident "Madison" was quoted as saying: "'Right now, we don't even let the Boy Scouts sleep in the parks. It isn't political. It doesn't have anything to do with any message or anybody. It's just that we don't do that,'" she said. "Once you let one group do it, even though (the DNC) is an extraordinary circumstance and all that, I think that it opens up the door to a lot of people just thinking that they should be able to do it, and then if we say no, they can sue us for it," Madison added. The downside, she said, is that no one knows where the protesters will go at 11 p.m. Oh, I know where the protesters will go after 11 p.m., the same place where they went 40 years ago in Boss Daly's Chicago—into the streets itching for a fight against the police or anyone who tries to stop these youths from raising hell. And that's how Obama and the Democrats will "Recreate '68" and perhaps lose the presidential election in 2008 (again).

Re-create '68 has repeatedly promised to make the bloody 1968 Democratic convention "look like a small get-together." The mayor of Denver has promised that if the students camp out at City Park as they plan to do that the water sprinklers will be turned on them. Why don't they just throw in some free bars of soap when the sprinklers are turned on those exercising their First Amendment rights, for I'm sure the students will need a good shower by then. Better yet, forget the sprinklers, Mayor Hickenlooper. Where are the water hoses of Gov. George Wallace, Bull Connor and Boss Richard J. Daly when you really need them? Will D-Day happen in Denver next month? While I certainly hope that *Tent*

State University will not become *Kent State University* (where four college war protesters were infamously killed in May 1970), I do love to see liberals being entangled in their own egalitarianism and their irrational PC ideas where *everyone* has to have an equal voice. Rev. Jeremiah Wright notwithstanding, it is these chickens (Chicago 1968) coming home to roost 40 years later (Denver 2008) along with the litany of perverse ideas (fascism, egalitarianism, social justice, anarchy) they love to foist upon others. Now they will be forced to contend with themselves

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 28

BARACKRACY HYPOCRISY

December 03, 2008

While I have heard McCain state many times, “I am not George Bush,” I have never heard Obama say once, “I am not Bill Clinton.”

~ Professor Leonard McCoy, Fmr. Professor, Savannah State University

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, who taught Aristotle, who taught Alexander the Great. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form “*dialectic*”—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates (a pseudonym for the author)
- ❖ Professor Leonard McCoy

{*Setting: Department of Political Science, Savannah State University*}

Socrates: We are gathered here today at this Symposium to discuss whether Barack Obama’s rhetoric matches reality—Is Obama *really* about “Change we can believe in”; “We need to bring change to Washington, D.C.”; “I will bring change we can believe in”; or is it just more of the same political charade?

Professor McCoy: First let me state that while my political background has been with the Democrat Party, intellectually I am an independent,

and on some issues ideologically a conservative. For the past 20 years, I have operated at the highest levels of party politics—state and local government in both Ohio and New Jersey, working effectively with radicals, liberals, moderates and conservatives.

The reason why I raise the question of Barackracy hypocrisy is because of the two years he has been on the campaign trail when he frequently distinguished himself from his archrival, Hillary Rodham Clinton, by promising a new paradigm in politics that would be open and transparent from top to bottom.

Socrates: What is the context and the concept of Obama's "transparency"?

McCoy: Based on his recent transitional team and his early appointments, the process by which these individuals have been selected and vetted have not at all been transparent in that Barack made a statement that he would always listen and engage the American people and make their opinions a high priority. Indeed, have the America people elected Barack Obama or Bill Clinton, part II? Furthermore, the American people have some questions relative to the Clinton legacy, which has become so prominent in the Obama administration.

Socrates: What about the fact that 31 of the 47 people so far named to the transitional team or as part of the Obama administration have ties to the Clinton administration, including all but one of the members of his 12-person Transition Advisory Board and both of his White House staff choices?

Former Clinton or past appointees who are in Obama's Cabinet include:

- ❖ Rahm Emmanuel, chief of staff
- ❖ Hillary Clinton, secretary of state
- ❖ Paul Volker, former chairman of the Federal Reserve
- ❖ Ron Klain, Biden's chief of staff
- ❖ Larry Summers, senior economic adviser (mentor to Timothy Geithner)
- ❖ Timothy Geithner, secretary of treasury
- ❖ Bill Richardson, secretary of commerce
- ❖ John Podesta, transition chief
- ❖ Eric Holder, former deputy attorney general
- ❖ Tom Daschle, former Democratic leader in the U.S. Senate, secretary of health and human services
- ❖ David Axelrod, chief strategist

- ❖ Gene Sperling, economic adviser
- ❖ Neera Tanden, policy director

McCoy: Obama talked about change from the bottom up, but when you look at what Obama is doing, the change is from the top down. There seems to be something very sinister here. “Change we can believe in” was a major political slogan of Obama. Is this Barackracy hypocrisy? Who is making the decisions of his campaign?

The assumption is the promise of “change” Obama made to the American people; however, the first opportunity he has to make good on his promise of change, not only did he bring in other people from his opponent’s administration, but that he brought in Hillary as his chief foreign policy voice. Is this change we can really believe in or more of the same?

Socrates: Professor McCoy, are you implying a *quid pro quo* between Obama and Clinton—her capitulation to concede the nomination to him for her appointment to a high-profile Cabinet position?

McCoy: While I’m not a conspiracy theorist, as we revisit the justification of why Obama is using so many former Clinton appointees, the reason Obama gave is that he is following the Abraham Lincoln “team of rivals” model to staff his Cabinet—in other words, government by consensus. However, I question the validity of Obama’s premise because three of the four Lincoln rivals were gone by the end of his first term as president. This Obama Barackracy rings of hypocrisy. Is this a team of rivals or a rival of teams?

Socrates: Do you think Obama put Hillary in that position?

McCoy: Perhaps Hillary was not *Obama’s* choice for secretary of state. I believe that there are some unseen, nefarious forces within the Democrat Party that are still alive and have some major influence on his decision-making. The only change Obama seems to have brought thus far is a change in skin color, not in policy. Ironically, his financial and national security teams are more conservative even than President Bush.

Does Obama represent the change in America based upon the Constitution, or a change that the office of the presidency is the last office to be integrated? He doesn’t represent change for the disenfranchised, those who are dying prematurely because they are not getting the same health care, education, employment, the declining economy, our super-

power status in the international community. His campaign was directed at the middle class, not the poor. How can that be change?

MLK, on the other hand, dealt with the heart of all humanity, the things that were important to all of us. Therefore, he brought a social consciousness, a challenge to America to fulfill Jefferson's ideal: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal . . ." To bequeath to all Americans "Life, liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." However, Obama, while mimicking the persona of JFK, virtually all of his policies are diametrical to his. For example, consider the aphorism JFK uttered in his Inaugural Address Jan. 20, 1961—"A rising tide raises all boats."

Socrates: What do you mean by the polemical phrase "Barackracy hypocrisy"?

McCoy: Based on the decisions we've seen thus far from Obama, I am not at all convinced that this man has the presidential will power to really sever the political ties to the liberal establishment of the past and to reconstruct a new brand of politics, a substantive political paradigm where the will of "We the People" are of singular importance to Obama's agenda. While I have heard McCain state many times, "I am not George Bush," I have never heard Obama say once, "I am not Bill Clinton." On the contrary, he has never tried to disassociate himself from Bill and Hillary Clinton, the Clinton regime and most regrettable, the old liberal Democrat establishment.

Socrates, in conclusion, the questions we're seeking to answer regarding Barack's presidency is the decision-making force behind the bureaucracy: Is Obama an authentic historical figure of change, or is Barackracy the latest hypocrisy?

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 29

AN ANGEL(ICA) DESCENDS IN DETROIT

July 10, 2008

Earlier this week, I came across a fascinating op-ed written by a talented young writer named Angelica Brown. Angelica is a recent graduate of Mumford High School in Detroit as well as a summer apprentice at the

Detroit Free Press. She has a full scholarship to attend the University of Michigan—Dearborn this Fall where she will study film making.

I was so impressed by the courage and intellectual rigor of this precocious writer that I immediately wrote her the following e-mail:

Hello Angelica Brown,

I enjoyed your column today [July 7]. Keep up the good work. Below is a weekly column I write. Send me an e-mail if I can help your writing career in any way.

Peace,

Ellis Washington

The headline for her op-ed was “Why my first vote will be for John McCain.” There are several reasons why I thought this was a very intriguing article. First, I was curious how she came to pick McCain over Obama. She magnificently set the background that led her to pick whom she thought would be the best presidential candidate. Partly because her family, friends and associates seemed to robotically choose Obama based on skin color alone and partly because some of her fellow students thought of John McCain (and presumably most Republicans) as “the anti-Christ.”

These half-baked, uninformed opinions prompted Angelica to do her own research. Wow! What a novel idea in this day and age where two-bit hucksters think they are the Alpha and Omega of all knowledge and look askance at anyone who can think for themselves using age-old methods of deductive reasoning (e.g., If A causes B then B is logically dependent on A). This was the basis of all classical knowledge out of the Western tradition for more than 2,500 years—from the ancient Greeks to early Romanticism.

Angelica detailed her intellectual apotheosis in this manner: “Ironically, I began to actually start watching more political shows, reading excerpts from candidates’ books online and researching their backgrounds before deciding to be a McCain supporter.” She further distinguished candidates Obama and McCain on the issue of health care. Angelica believed Obama wants universal health care, “but Obama fails to realize that life is not a fairytale.” She characterizes McCain’s health care plan as more interested in “cost-containment” and, thus, a more realistic and viable public policy alternative. Other reasons Angelica gives for her

support of McCain cite experience. "Having Obama in office" Angelica said, "would only initiate a negative reaction from other countries because he is so inexperienced. He is still very young, and although the world believes they can handle a new American leader without white skin, I don't know if I believe it."

Continuity is also a very substantive reason for her support for McCain. Angelica writes, "Change comes over time; therefore, alternating between an extremely conservative president and a candidate who has traditional values but is open to new ideas is exactly what we need right now in America." I would only correct Angelica by saying President George W. Bush is no conservative by any stretch of the imagination. Throughout her political article you can almost hear the deductive reasoning cogs grinding in this young writers' prescient brain—presenting a strong apologetic, anticipating arguments, crafting brilliant, succinct counter arguments that render her vanquished opponents powerless.

Angelica hits her stride when she writes the following passage comparing the oratorical attributes of Obama and Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick with another great orator of the past:

Just because Obama can write up and deliver a speech better than others does not mean he is the best candidate. If I remember correctly, Adolf Hitler and Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick convinced mass numbers of people that they were respectable through dialogue. In no way do I mean to compare Obama to the likes of such immoral men, but let's just be honest—you cannot judge someone based on what he says. There has to be more to that person.

Here, Angelica distinguishes herself as a valiant writer who isn't afraid to swim against the tide: a young philosopher who refuses to be shackled to the servile thinking by neither her forefathers of the past nor her peers of the present by taking on two cherished black icons of politics, Obama and Kilpatrick. Angelica, by using a well-placed simile without too much hyperbole, aptly disabuses the notion that a good orator equals a good leader. Her example of Hitler shows that it doesn't.

On a deeper level, Angelica seems to argue that to place symbolism over substance with any political candidate is a dangerous proposition that can lead to disastrous public policies and even tyranny over the people. It is amazing to me that Angelica, despite her youth, seems to

understand this historical view that few seasoned politicians in modern times seems to comprehend.

In the end, I predict that young Angelica will have a brilliant future as a writer if she protects her youthful zeal, her yearning for knowledge and guards her heart from the buzzards of the progressive mainstream media who would love to have her become yet another worker on the liberal Democrat plantation. To Angelica, take this advice: Always do your own research and check all your facts. Consider all rational opinions, and follow Socrates' wise admonition to let truth be your guide in all things. If you want some good reading for this summer, I advise that you read Justice Clarence Thomas' excellent memoir, "My Grandfather's Son," and my article narrating my own intellectual journey, "Why I became a conservative."

Why did I suggest these items to read? In the epic movie trilogy of J.R.R. Tolkien's, "Lord of the Rings" there was a transcendent scene when the Hobbit-hero (Frodo) was taking a respite from his arduous journey in the woods of the Elves. In the middle of the night, he was summoned in a dream by the Lady of the Wood (Galadriel) and given a gift for his journey, a crystal vial containing the precious light of Eärendil's star. What was that light for? The Lady of the Wood told Frodo: "To shine for you in dark places when all other lights grow dim." Angelica, your courage to step out from among your peers and your intellect to publish such an article of high quality is that light (of Eärendil's star), which I predict will guide you to exceedingly wonderful places in the future.

CHAPTER

~ 3 ~

ON FOREIGN POLICY

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 1

WAR FOR OIL? I WISH IT HAD BEEN

December 17, 2008

I am saddened that it is politically inconvenient to acknowledge what everyone knows: The Iraq war is largely about oil.

~ Alan Greenspan (from his memoirs, September 2007)

As the president surreptitiously departed off to Iraq and Afghanistan for his final victory tour earlier this week to bask in the two identifiable foreign policy “victories” in an otherwise unremarkable eight years as president, Bush was jubilant. The Iraqi government he helped installed welcomed him as an honored statesman; the adoring crowds that followed him shouted words of welcome and gratitude. Nevertheless, there was a nagging malaise in the air—something amiss, something sinister in the land of the Garden of Eden.

After several meetings with top Iraqi officials, it was time for the perfunctory press conference, when Chaos appeared at Destiny’s door, reared his ugly head and said . . . “Whut’s uuupppp!?” An irate Iraqi

journalist, a Sunni Muslim and devotee of Saddam Hussein, was angry at President Bush and exercised his freedom of speech rights, stood up in the middle of the press conference and did the unthinkable. The event reads in part:

The president successfully ducked both throws. Photos show him with his head down near the top of the podium. The embarrassing incident marred a visit meant to show off the improved conditions since the troop "surge" dramatically reduced casualties to U.S. troops.

"This is a gift from the Iraqis. This is the farewell kiss, you dog," the journalist shouted (in Arabic), Steven Lee Myers of the New York Times reported in a pool report to the White House press corps. Myers reported that the man threw the second shoe and added: "This is from the widows, the orphans and those who were killed in Iraq." Journalists at the scene said the hurler was Muntadar al-Zaidi, a reporter for Al-Baghdadia TV, an independent satellite channel based in Cairo.

Remember: No good deed goes unpunished.

The good news was Bush had quick reflexes, like he was expecting this insult and wasn't hit by the shoes, the bad news is the picture of Bush ducking at a news conference in Iraq will be his eternal legacy— incompetence, insult and dishonor. Conservative intellectual Michael Savage was right all along, but few people listened. Savage contended that at the start of the Iraq war in February 2003 that Bush should have gone straight to the Iraqi oil fields, put them under American authority and started shipping oil tankers filled with black gold back to the U.S. Why? To pay the \$1 trillion war debt we incurred fighting this miserable, ill-defined war for over five years, longer than World War II. Why? To make the 4,200-plus American soldiers who gave their lives have a tangible reason for their heroic service to their country other than the invisible "weapons of mass destruction."

Admittedly, Bush would have had to endure the caterwauling from the liberal left of, "War of oil," "No blood for oil!" but most Americans would accept the rationale for the Iraq war for the following reasons:

- ❖ America fought the war in Iraq to remove an evil, irascible dictator hell-bent on destabilizing the Middle East;
- ❖ America set up a viable Iraqi government in that strategic area;

- ❖ America exercised hegemony in the Middle East, replenished our oil reserves here in America;
- ❖ America drove down gas prices to pre-1990s levels;
- ❖ America retired the escalating debt and fought a war as the Roman Empire did in antiquity—we fought a war for a profit not a net loss.

Who but the most reactionary liberal could argue against this kind of reasoning for the Iraq war? But with President Bush, it was not to be. Instead of being Ronald Reagan II, Bush was Bush II. He is indeed his father's son. Not only that, Bush didn't even fight the war as competently as his father, who in Operation Desert Storm (1991) completed his task in 100 days, yet allowed Saddam Hussein to escape and exact revenge on the Kurds by the thousands, raised taxes, squandered a 91 percent approval rating as a wartime president and set the stage 12 years later in 2003 for the son to further denigrate America's international standing by the bumbling, stumbling way Bush has fought Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Who got the oil?—It seems like everybody but America. The ingrate Iraqis recently took a break from daily burning Bush in effigy, chanting "death to Israel" and denigrating the American flag to give a 20-year Synopsis oil rights contract to our avowed geopolitical enemy—China. With all of the financial problems America is having since the collapse of the financial markets, banking, mortgage, auto industries, and even with the several states, wouldn't five years of free Iraqi oil have gone a long way toward defraying the exorbitant costs of this war and mitigate the ill effects of these historic financial crises that have befallen the nation?

Summarily and efficiently winning the war in Iraq, President Bush could have gone down in history like President Truman, who decisively finished FDR's war in 1945 (World War II). To coin a phrase from Godfather I, Bush could have been our "Wartime Consigliore." However, by *not* confiscating the Iraqi oil fields and sending free oil to America until Iraq's war debt was paid in full, Bush has instead been embarrassed by an obscure little Iraqi journalist who vividly and outrageously demonstrated Iraqi ingratitude to America for saving their people and their country. Bishop T.D. Jakes once said in a sermon on the Old Testament judge Gideon—"Listen at the gossip." What this means is sometimes God will speak through your enemies to predict your deliverance or to outline a winning strategy for you to effectively deal with geopolitical tragedies like war if you have an ear to hear.

After Bush launched Operation Iraqi Freedom in February 2003 to overthrow the evil Saddam Hussein and to destroy his weapons of mass destruction, liberals crowed, "Bush went to war for oil." Instead of being defensive, Bush and his advisers should have replied, "That's a great idea, since we've got to pay for this war. A 'war for oil' policy will give tax relief to the American people by lowering the cost of domestic energy consumption until the war is won." However, it wasn't to be, because Bush seems comfortable with his own bewildering mind and not at all interested in hearing wise counsel from his own foreign policy advisers. Nevertheless, there is an unintended blessing from this appallingly embarrassing shoe incident in Iraq . . . at least President Bush won't have to wait for the other shoe to drop.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 2

THE CANARY IN THE MINE

December 31, 2008

Right now we have to go from passive response to active assault. . . . In the long term, the toppling of the Hamas regime is inevitable.

~ Benjamin Netanyahu, Likud Party leader

In the old days, I am told that coal miners would lower a cage with a tiny canary into a mine to determine if the levels of methane, carbon monoxide or other noxious gases were present. The logic was as long as that canary kept on singing in the mine, the miners knew that their air supply was safe; however, when the singing stopped, it was time to leave that site immediately, for death would quickly follow. That simple deductive reasoning lasted scores of years and saved many lives, yet in our modern technological age, the nations of the world seem oblivious to the one country that metaphorically speaking is the little canary who daily sings its sobering aria to this perverted, psychopathic world—that canary in the mine are the Jewish people and the nation of Israel.

On New Year's Eve, the day before 2009, as Israel, three years since giving the Palestinians Gaza, has been repaid with thousands of unprovoked rocket attacks, the canary in the mine is gagging from Muslim hatred, world apathy and U.N. anti-Semitism that surrounds the Jewish

state, and after years of forbearance is finally fighting gallantly for her survival. My questions to my Jewish friends are these:

1. Why do you continually give your sworn enemies, the Palestinian Muslims, your land—Gaza, the West Bank (greater Judea), Hebron, Bethlehem, half of Jerusalem, which is *your* birthright given to you by God himself, which is thoroughly chronicled in the Torah?
2. Why have you allowed the anti-Semitic United Nations and corrupt world leaders who hate your very existence drive you into political madness by the untenable geopolitical policies—“Two State Solution,” “land for peace” and “bilateral diplomacy”?
3. Israel, has giving land for peace granted you one day of peace? One hour of peace? One second of peace? No, of course not, because Hamas, Fatah, the Arabs and the Muslim nations don’t want peace; they want Israel pushed into the Mediterranean Sea. Israel, you have no friends, no allies in this world but the Israeli army, the will to fulfill your destiny and the God of the Torah.

Israel, you know that the 44 Muslim nations hate you by *religious* mandate, the socialist welfare states of Western Europe hate you by *political* mandate, the communist and tyrannical nations hate you by *ideological* mandate, and virtually the entire world is against you because they don’t believe in the biblical prophecies that the Jews are indeed “God’s chosen people.” Your one ally in the world, the United States, is at best a fickle friend that, as soon as President-elect Barack Obama gets into office, will sell you out to the Muslim states just as President Bush sold Israel out to his Saudi Arabian friends. (Recall Bush strolling through the White House Rose Garden or on his Texas ranch holding hands with Prince Abdullah like two little school girls?—a disgusting spectacle indeed.)

Politics aside for a moment, what rational, civilized nation on earth would tolerate terrorist attacks for eight minutes, let alone eight years of incessant bombings by its neighbor without retaliation? Would England allow Ireland or Scotland the right to launch unprovoked attacks against their country and their citizens in the name of peace? Would America allow Hamas, al-Qaida, the Taliban, Hezbollah or some other terrorist group unfettered access to enter our country, to launch deadly rockets into our country all in the name of peace, and we not exact an immediate, punishing revenge? Would Egypt, Turkey, Germany, Russia, China, Iran, Syria or any of a host of U.N. member states presently criticizing

tiny Israel and its desperate attempts to protect its borders allow Hamas to launch 3,000 rockets into one of their countries? Absolutely not!

Indeed, the canary is hacking on fumes in the coal mine while the world says to itself: "It's safe to go into the mine and work. Just because Israel is dying doesn't mean we will die." Really?—An AP story on the Gaza war states:

The assault has sparked diplomatic fallout. Syria decided to suspend indirect peace talks with Israel, begun earlier this year. The U.N. Security Council called on both sides to halt the fighting and asked Israel to allow humanitarian supplies into Gaza. The prime minister of Turkey, one of the few Muslim countries to have relations with Israel, called the air assault a "crime against humanity," and French President Nicolas Sarkozy condemned "the provocations that led to this situation as well as the disproportionate use of force."

This world's bizarre and perverted response to Israel rightly defending itself from Hamas rockets seems to come not from prudent, civilized nations, but from the wards of the insane asylum.

"Liberalism is a mental disorder," wrote conservative intellectual Michael Savage in his best-seller by the same title in 2005. "Socialism," Sir Winston Churchill presciently characterized, "is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery." Unfortunately, modern Israel is a socialist state and seems hell-bent on embracing liberalism in its domestic and foreign policy. Israel must forsake liberalism, socialism, egalitarianism, and extricate itself from the self-destructive philosophy of seeking favor of those sworn by allegiances to Islam, socialism and moral relativism. As the little canary sings her plaintive aria, consider these observations:

- ❖ Iran is putting the final touches on her nuclear missiles conceived for the singular purpose of the annihilation of Israel;
- ❖ For the first time ever senior military officials in Russia and China are discussing bilateral agreements via a direct phone link;
- ❖ China owns the strategically crucial Panama Canal that America built under President Theodore Roosevelt 100 years ago;
- ❖ Russia boldly and without challenge re-establishes its iron curtain throughout South America, Cuba (90 miles from America's border), Georgia, Iraq, the Middle East and throughout Africa;
- ❖ A ragtag band of Somali pirates on speed boats now have *de facto* control of the Gulf of Aden, extracting hundreds of millions of dollars in ransom payments;

❖ And America's unflappable secretary of state, Dr. Condi Rice, is meeting with Libyan terrorist, Moammar Gadhafi and in an interview just a few days ago made this remarkable confession: "I'm not a type-A personality" as she is compelled to exert diplomacy with corrupt, totalitarian, murderous type-A personalities all over the world.

God's solemn promise to Abraham, the father of the Jewish people, clearly delineated Israel's inextricable connection and fate with the nations of the world—Genesis 12:13: "I will bless them that bless thee [Israel], and I will curse them that curseth thee: *and in thee shall all families [nations] of the earth be blessed.*" As this grand Shakespearean tragedy comes to its inevitable apotheosis, unless leaders of goodwill and real men of moral resolve come to their collective senses, then the civilized nations of the world won't be too far behind that tiny, little canary struggling to sing her elegiac song of life . . . from deep inside the mines.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 3

CONDI PLAYS PIANO WHILE ISLAM DESTROYS THE WEST

December 06, 2008

Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

~ Anonymous, *circa* A.D. 64

The headline sounded innocuous enough—"Condoleezza Rice plays piano for Queen Elizabeth II." My first thought was how nice, how quaint it is for Dr. Rice to play the "Brahms Piano Quintet" with Foreign Secretary David Miliband's wife, Louise, and three members of the London Symphony Orchestra. Then I mused for a moment as my passing interest turned to rage. "How could Dr. Condoleezza Rice, America's secretary of state, America's eyes and ears on the international stage, our nation's most powerful and high-profile position second only to the president himself, find time to play a recital for the queen of England while America and most of the Western world are in the midst of a recession bordering on an economic depression?"

Dr. Rice played piano for the Queen, while Islam destroys Western Civilization.

Somali pirates running wild are looting ships at will in the Gulf of Aden and collecting tens of millions in ransom from nations. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have lasted longer than World War II with no end in sight, and India's major city, Mumbai (colonial Bombay), the largest city in the world with over 18 million people, just last week was terrorized by a well-trained Pakistani military terrorist group, Lashkar-e-Taiba.

Eyewitnesses at the train station said that the Indian police were frozen with fear because most of them had never fired a gun before. Do you notice that socialist states and other fascist governments of the world love to have the citizenry unarmed? Pick any dictator—Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, Mao, Hitler, Franco, Pol Pot, Saddam Hussein, Omar Bashir (Sudan), Abdullahi Yusuf (Somalia)—one of the first things they do to secure power is to disarm the citizens so they can deny the people their fundamental human rights.

The genius of the Constitution's framers is they mandated through the Second Amendment that their citizens could bear arms. Not so in India, which has some of the most draconian anti-gun laws of any nation in the world? That's how 10 men with machine guns and grenades held 18 million citizens in abject terror for 60 hours. I bet you this scenario wouldn't have happened in Texas.

Dr. Rice played piano for the queen, while Islam destroys Western Civilization.

What does Ms. Rice, our globetrotting academic, do during times of crisis? Why, she retreats to her favorite abode of safety, predictability and comfort—Dr. Rice plays some soothing Brahms for the queen of England. However, she should have played Chopin's or Beethoven's funeral march. Better yet, a more appropriate musical selection would have been Mozart's "Requiem" . . . a requiem for Western Civilization. And what about Queen Elizabeth II—does she even have a clue about the clear and present danger her people are in? Apparently not, because the queen is still living in galling, opulent luxury; a delusional, Dorian Gray existence of a once-vaunted British empire, where the sun never set in 1908, now disintegrates beneath her feet by the onslaught of radical imams fomenting hatred in mosques throughout England under the protection of liberal privacy laws in 2008.

Since the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species" (1859) and "Descent of Man" (1871) and increasingly since the early 1900s, Western

intellectuals, jurists, journalists, politicians and academics forsook the tried and tested paradigm of natural law (integration of legality and morality) in favor of positive law (separation of law and morals). This intellectual paradigm shift from the Judeo-Christian tradition to secularism, progressivism, liberalism and paganism led to a growing number of perverted egalitarian laws being enacted by judges, codified into law that treats all people, beliefs, ideas and religions as equal. However, these progressives arrogantly and dangerously ignore the fact that some people, creeds and ideas indeed *are* evil. The diabolical philosophy of egalitarianism has conflated freedom and liberty with anti-Christian license, thus granting freedom of speech, assembly and religion to those who think they are doing Allah's will by cutting a child's throat, murdering a rabbi and his wife, or blowing up and shooting as many innocent people as possible at crowded public venues. Did you know that the largest mosque outside the Muslim world is being built right in the heart of London? Presently in England the most common baby name is "Muhammad," not "William" or "John."

Dr. Rice played piano for the queen, while Islam destroys Western Civilization.

The article about the recital in part reads, "A palace spokeswoman told AFP that Rice expressed a wish to play at Buckingham Palace, and the queen offered her to play in the music room. The queen listened to part of the private performance and afterwards, presented Rice with a recording of the recital as a present." I would like to ask Dr. Rice as she prepares to return to her first love—the academy at Stanford University—while she is walking the exalted corridors of that prestigious institution, will she be playing that CD the Queen of England cut for her at Buckingham Place while Western Civilization and America under an Obama administration lurches ever more precipitously into the paroxysm of Muslim terrorism?

Dr. Rice played piano for the queen, while Islam destroys Western Civilization.

After leaving England earlier this week, Secretary Rice found time in her busy music schedule to travel to Pakistan for a four-hour meeting regarding the recent bombings in Mumbai. Why does it take four hours to tell a lie? Of course, Pakistan emphatically has denied any involvement and told Dr. Rice, "The government will not only assist in investigations but also take strong action against any Pakistani elements found

involved in the attack," President Asif Ali Zardari said. Balderdash! Dr. Rice accepted their denials and reassurance that Pakistan is doing all it can to fight terrorism, and then she demurely asked the president of Pakistan if he wanted to hear her play the piano. Of course, this last section about the piano is purely fictional, but what makes it chilling is that this ghastly scenario *could* be true, and the Western world wouldn't care because, like ancient Rome, we have destroyed ourselves from within by the trinity demons *ignorance* (I don't know), *apathy* (I don't care) and *cowardice* (I am afraid).

. . . And Dr. Rice played piano for the queen, while Islam destroys Western Civilization.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 4

LIBERALISM BOMBS BOMBAY

November 29, 2008

But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you; then it shall come to pass, that those which ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell.

~ Numbers 33:55

The heart is deceitful and desperately wicked above all things. Who can know it?

~ Jeremiah 17:9

The gut-wrenching headlines told of the recent terrorist attacks in India—"Day 3: Terror at the Taj"; "Gunmen seemed to be sure of hotel terrain"; "Rabbi and wife killed"; "New York guards against Mumbai-like attacks"—yet all of the liberal media outlets, ABC, CBS, NBC, MSNBC, CNN and even Fox News seem to ask the same ignorant questions: "Who is behind the recent terrorist attacks? What is the motive of the people who perpetrated the bombings and kidnappings in India?" The Prime Minister of India seems to be the only person on the planet who realizes *who* perpetrated such horrid terror upon his country: "India points the finger at Pakistan." Yes, it is quite obvious for any person who

hasn't been completely indoctrinated by our Stalinist public school system that Muslim religious fanatics, perhaps trained in or facilitated by neighboring Pakistan, are the culprits.

If one needs further assurance of who these evil men were, just ask some of the hostages who were lucky enough to escape who said the first question the Islamic terrorists asked the kidnapped victims was, "Who has an American or British passport?" The plot gets more diabolical. Now we know that perhaps the only Jews in this city of 18 million residents were also killed. A Brooklyn rabbi and his wife were found among the dead in a series of terrorist attacks in India that have claimed more than 300 lives and rising. Rabbi Gavriel Noach Holtzberg and his wife, Rivka, who ran the Chabad-Lubavitch local headquarters in Mumbai were killed during a hostage standoff at the center. The chances of indiscriminately killing perhaps Mumbai's only Jewish family? One in 18 million.

Yet the liberal media, the president, the president-elect, the politicians on both sides of the aisle and the ubiquitous "military experts" all seem to be dumbfounded about *who* caused these well-orchestrated series of seven concurrent terrorist attacks?—And more importantly, what to do? Who are these enemies of civilization? Yes, in India's case, Islamic terrorists, but it goes deeper than that.

What cultural, societal, political philosophy allows a pseudo-religion like Islam to exist and grow in its midst?—Liberalism. In my view the political madness of liberalism is the real culprit behind the bombs of Bombay. How?

- ❖ Liberalism preaches a brand of egalitarianism that places all religions, beliefs and ideas on the same intellectual plane, but this contradicts the principle of rationality because all ideas and religions are not equal—some are evil.

- ❖ Nonetheless, under the liberal tenets existent at the founding of the League of Nations (President Woodrow Wilson, 1919) and United Nations (FDR, 1945), nations are mandated under international law to take the diplomatic route verses common sense tactics when their country suffers an unprovoked, naked act of religious-based terrorism.

- ❖ Therefore, liberalism prevented India from taking common sense action against her Muslim enemies when, in 1947, the U.N. formed Pakistan out of whole cloth, trying to stem the tide of Islamic fanaticism against the nation of India, but effectively leaving the country to be overrun by the more than 115 million Muslims living in India today.

Conservative intellectual, Ann Coulter eloquently prophesied the world's pathetic reaction to an international crisis: "There are only two choices with savages: Fight or run. Democrats always want to run, but they dress it up in meaningless catchphrases like "diplomacy," "détente," "engagement," "multilateral engagement," "multilateral diplomacy," "containment" and "going to the UN." Instead of exporting throughout the world the elements of a representative democracy and a republic rooted in the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought, America has since FDR exported a bastardized socialism—a diabolical brand of liberalism that is more akin to Marxism and communism than it is to republicanism and freedom.

How do you "negotiate" with an enemy like radical Islam whose proponents think they are following the will of Allah when they mercilessly murder as many innocent men, women and children as they are able? Liberalism seeks to "understand," to justify, rationalize and form a consensus with our Muslim brothers under the presumption, "Why do they hate us?" The madness of liberalism is that it always shifts the blame away from the perpetrators to America. We are the only nation that has this developed sense of self-hatred, an irrational self-loathing that borders on the mentally insane.

Regarding the recent bombings in Bombay, liberalism says, "We can't jump to conclusions that these terrorists' acts had anything to do with Islamic radicalism. No, no, no. That would be imprudent, rash and racist. We must dialogue with our Muslim brothers to find the real reasons for their rage against us." This kind of perverse logic will cause the death of America, the West and the entire civilized world and what I mean by 'civilized' here are those nations that still believe in and practice the fundamentals of civilization: obeying the rule of law, a Constitution rooted in liberty, justice and equality, freedom of religion, the press, the right to protest and freedom of assembly. The last rudiment of civilization any nation needs to survive is to have the courage to outlaw and destroy any philosophy, religion, ideology or belief that doesn't honor the aforementioned fundamentals of civilization. On this point I wrote an earlier article, "Is Islam compatible with a republic?" In a word, No!

In my opinion Islam is *ipso facto* contrary to every vestige of liberty, morality and truth that mankind has fostered for the past 6,000 years of human history. Why civilized nations allow Islam to even exist in their countries is, as evidenced by the most recent episode in India, only an

invitation to a slow and painful national genocide. While President George Bush, the invisible President-elect Barack Obama, the leaders of the free world, U.N. diplomats and the liberal media all mindlessly wring their hands and fret about what to do in response to the recent savage acts of Islamic terrorism, Israeli commandos are plotting *lex talionis*, an eye for an eye justice. Why? Because contrary to the self-genocide of liberal egalitarianism and U.N. diplomacy, when dealing with blood-lust savages, only a more savage nation can survive.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 5

DOES COLIN POWELL BELIEVE IN THE POWELL DOCTRINE?

August 21, 2008

As we approach the time of the Democrat National Convention in Denver, Colo., next week, there is increasing political noise about whether or not Gen. Colin Powell, the former secretary of state, national security adviser and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will cast his support for Barack Obama. Perhaps he might even be given a coveted speaking opportunity at the convention? For Gen. Powell to even consider supporting Obama, a politician who ran to the left of Hillary Rodham Clinton on one issue alone—"I didn't vote for the Iraq war"—is troubling for the good general on a number of levels.

For Colin Powell to support Obama, he would have to renounce totally every aspect of "the Powell Doctrine," a prudent list of questions the general developed that all have to be answered affirmatively before military action is taken by the United States, including:

- ❖ Is a vital national security interest threatened?
- ❖ Do we have a clear attainable objective?
- ❖ Have the risks and costs been fully and frankly analyzed?
- ❖ Have all other non-violent policy means been fully exhausted?
- ❖ Is there a plausible exit strategy to avoid endless entanglement?
- ❖ Have the consequences of our action been fully considered?
- ❖ Is the action supported by the American people?
- ❖ Do we have genuine broad international support?

Barack Obama, as a liberal Democrat with neo-Marxist tendencies, wouldn't in any way feel obligated to adhere to any of these points in the

Powell Doctrine as part of his foreign policy or his war policy, for in most cases, current Democrat talking points on whether or not America should go to war is dependent primarily on the last point of the Powell Doctrine: Do we have genuine broad international support? I cite this point because the rhetoric of Obama and the Democrats is obsessively concerned with how America is viewed by the world—a dangerous way to conduct one's foreign (or domestic) policy indeed.

It seems counterintuitive to me—how can Powell, a respected moderate Republican, support the neo-Marxist Barack Obama? It all boils down to the color of his skin rather than the content of his character, and secondly, Powell was never a real “conservative” intrinsically because he was never comfortable being loyal to the core tenants of conservatism, though he made his career primarily under Republican presidents like Reagan, Bush 41 and Bush 43. I am convinced that Powell is willing to back Obama simply because he is black, that Powell longingly sees his own aborted political aspirations in Obama and also that Powell over the past 20 years has taken increasing pleasure at sticking it to the conservatives—whom I believed he quietly despised for all of those years but now feels no hesitation to openly disrespect at every opportunity since leaving public office.

Powell's likely support of Obama is racist politics at its worst. It is a vulgar form of identity politics where one is willing to throw all of one's core moral, ethical and political principles to the wind for the sake of racial unity (here, race transcends morality, virtue, truth, common sense and patriotism). Gen. Powell was one of the few visible black conservatives in the Cabinet of Republican administrations. He also had been rumored in the past as a potential presidential or vice presidential candidate.

However, Powell felt he was used by George W. Bush, placing a “blot” on his record by being compelled to present false or misleading information to the U.N. Security Council on Feb. 5, 2003, regarding evidence that Iraq was pursuing weapons of mass destruction. His presentation led to a resolution endorsing military action against Iraq where we've been fighting a war for over five years—longer than our involvement in World Wars I and II. The general consensus by the propaganda press and the international community was that Powell lied to the U.N. Security Council at the behest of President Bush, thus there is a lot of bitterness harbored by Powell against the Republican Party.

How could Powell in good faith support Obama for president of the U.S.? Think of the core values of modern conservatism: small, less intrusive government, government based on the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought, freedom, liberty, lower taxes, freedom of the individual to go as far as his talent can take him. In the words of Dr. Walter Williams: "More government equals less freedom"; therefore less government equals more freedom. Who could rationally be against that? Now compare those core values of conservatism with modern liberalism as practiced by today's Democrats: large, ever more intrusive leviathan government, government that methodically seeks to turn back the clock on America's unique Christian heritage in society and culture, enslaving black people (and others) in the Faustian bargain of amorality, comprehensive welfare, higher taxes to support an ever-bloated government that is bankrupting the country. Obama's political philosophy evidences a depressing, cynical worldview where you have no individual identity, you don't belong to God, but are owned by the State. Under Obama's brand of progressivism, liberalism and socialism, the State is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent and will take care of you from cradle to grave.

What could Gen. Powell, or any other conservative for that matter, see in any policy issues of Obama that he is in agreement with, unless he has first disparaged his own values and belief system and cast them to the wind? Only then is it understandable why Gen. Powell would cast his lot against a fellow, decorated Vietnam vet like John McCain and cross party lines to vote for a man like Barack Obama. Has Powell forsaken his own Powell Doctrine? If he gives his support to Barack Obama, I truly believe that he has. Furthermore, just to *consider* supporting a man like Obama for president with all we know about his radical ideas borders on treason.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 6

HAPPY 60TH BIRTHDAY, ISRAEL!

May 17, 2008

I am four things—I am an American, I am a black man, I am an academic without a home, and I am a lover of the Jewish people and of the nation of Israel.

~ Ellis Washington (2007)

Musings on Madam C.J. Walker Library, Detroit, Mich., (*circa* 1967)

I was almost 6 years old, my brother 3 and my little sister 1. We were waiting for my mother to check out some books. Her co-workers at my local elementary school called her “White lady” because she believed in educating yourself and strove for a better life through personal discipline. I remember walking up and down the aisles, looking in amazement at row after row of wonderful books from floor to ceiling in this very old library built in the Georgian, Neo-classical style. Reminiscing with my mother last weekend she affirmed my recollection of some of the book titles she either checked out or were titles I read in later years—Maimonides, Moses Mendelssohn, Spinoza, Emma Lazarus, Einstein, Gustav Mahler (one of my favorite composers), Wiesel, Golda Mier, Allan Bloom and others. Who were these Jewish people?

Following my mother’s lead, I later began going to the library on my own, reading marvelous books on history, theology, philosophy, epistemology, sociology, music, art, politics and of course a young teenagers favorite—Ripley’s “Believe it or Not.” Many of these books I would later learn were in some manner written by or about the Jews, their literature (the Torah) and their culture (Judaism). Who were these Jewish people?

John Marshall Law School, Atlanta, Ga. (*circa* 1992)

The classes were called “Jurisprudence” and “Constitutional Law II,” taught by Dr. David Meltz, the dean of John Marshall Law School. He was a libertarian and a Jew. Dean Meltz was a very affable, learned and magnificent man whose teachings about the U.S. Constitution as well as books he gave to me on jurisprudence, political philosophy (Leo Strauss,

Allan Bloom), philosophy (Spinoza, Ayn Rand), history (Paul Johnson's, "Modern Times," "A History of the Jews") and economics (Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman) utterly transformed my intellectual worldview. Who were these Jewish people?

In an earlier column praising the nation of Israel called "The 2-state solution against Israel," I recalled one of my frequent visits to Dean Meltz's office where he frequently told me: "If Israel doesn't own the land explicitly and repeatedly decreed to them by God in the Torah, then no nation can ever claim better title to any land on earth." I memorized those words and wrote them in my heart. Moreover, I endeavored to establish my entire worldview on history, law, economics, political philosophy and geopolitics to be based upon the foundation of those profound words uttered by Dr. David Meltz, my dean, my law professor, mentor, friend . . . and a Jew. Who were these Jewish people?

Not every Jew is a friend of Israel. Here, I must add a somber word of caution to the wonderful nation of Israel, whose people, literature and culture, in my opinion, has done more to improve the human condition than any other race of people from antiquity. However, everyone that calls themselves a Jew is not for the nation of Israel. For example, the great classical music conductor and pianist Daniel Barenboim for years has been very public and gratuitously provocative in his frequent pronouncements against his own nation and his own people's biblical and constitutional mandate for peace and self-determination in Israel.

A case in point is that Barenboim has recently stated publicly that he would not celebrate nor take part in any of the events celebrating the 60th anniversary of the nation of Israel. For shame, Maestro Barenboim, but why? Let me say here that 25 years ago, before I became a lawyer and a legal scholar, I was a classically trained orchestral musician (French horn). I cut my teeth on the magnificent recordings by Barenboim. That said, Barenboim, like many artists, intellectuals, academics, scholars, political opportunists and those who place their feeble opinions and ideas above the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the Torah, will *always* exist and will *always* be wrong. Pick a man, a woman, an event or an historic epoch of time and I guarantee you it is the same, irrevocable refrain of ignominy by the enemies of Israel and the Jews:

- ❖ The biblical patriarch Abraham (at this time an old man) with 318 servants vs. a confederation of five pagan Canaanite kings and their armies. Who won? The Jews (here, the father of the Jewish people).

❖ Moses and the children of Israel vs. the Pharaoh of Egypt (perhaps Ramses II ["The Great"]). Who won? With God's help, the Jewish slaves won over the then-superpower of the ancient world, Egypt, which after the famous 10 plagues God sent denigrating 10 pagan gods, has never recovered her greatness since.

❖ Mordecai/Queen Esther vs. the wicked Haman in the book of Esther. Who won? The Jews. Haman was an Old Testament precursor of Hitler who for a perceived slight by Mordecai wanted to kill every Jew within the 120 provinces of the Persian King Ahasureus—from India to Sudan.

❖ The Jews vs. the Muslim persecution in the Middle Ages. Who won? The Jews thrived in Arab and European lands during these times despite overwhelming religious persecution, slavery and pogroms against the Jewish people.

❖ America! We owe the Jewish people an invaluable debt of gratitude for the crucial year 1492 was the time that Spanish King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella sent out their racist, anti-Semitic decree that all Jews either convert to Catholicism or be kicked out of Spain. However, prescient Jewish merchants in search of a new land outside of Europe and Arabia where they could live in peace as Jews helped finance Christopher Columbus' mission, which led to the discovery of "the New World"—America.

❖ Even in the early 1780s, when America's republic was in the cradle of her existence and the revolution against the omnipotent superpower of England and King George III was about to crush our collective yearnings for freedom, liberty and self-determination, a wealthy Jewish merchant and financier named Haym Solomon loaned Gen. George Washington and the fledgling government of America, by the time of Solomon's death in 1785, the modern equivalent of about \$40,000,000,000!

From the Jewish people I have learned to be an eternal optimist. That for every Haman there is a Mordecai and a Queen Esther; for every Jezebel and her 450 false priests on the payroll, there is *one* true prophet, Elijah, on God's payroll; for every giant Goliath there is a passionate, obscure shepherd boy, David, with a giant's heart; for every Antiochus Epiphanies there is a Judas Maccabeus. For every Sultan Suleiman I there is a King John III Sobieski who at the Battle of Vienna stopped the Muslim menace and saved Europe on a fateful Sept. 11, 325 years ago; for every Hitler, Himmler, Goring, Heydrich, Eichmann, there is a Raoul Wallenberg, Per Anger, Arthur Schindler, Elie Wiesel, Simon Wiesenthal

and countless other lovers of liberty who in their own way valiantly fought the Nazi menace and won.

It is these Jewish heroes and allies of the wonderful Jewish people whom I celebrate on this most magnificent commemoration 60 years after Israel's rebirth as a nation. Happy 60th Birthday, Israel. Israel *will* live forever. Shalom!

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 7

REAGAN VINDICATED: SDI WORKS

March 08, 2008

Reagan's SDI was a very successful blackmail. . . . The Soviet Union tried to keep up pace with the U.S. military buildup, but the Soviet economy couldn't endure such competition.

~ Gennady Gerasimov, senior Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman

It was a cold, brisk autumn day in 1985. I had just finished my classes at the University of Michigan and had rushed home to my dorm to wind down and watch a little TV when I saw this regal figure stroll confidently down the stairs of this magnificent mansion without a coat and with an extended hand of friendship to his Russian counterpart, who was covered from head-to-toe with winter attire looking very uncomfortable. Who was this man? This was President Reagan at the Chateau Fleur d'Eau just outside of Geneva—the prologue to the Reykjavik summit a year later. This was my first introduction to President Ronald Wilson Reagan. Three years later, as my disenchantment with liberalism grew and in reaction to my militant feminist colleagues while a graduate student at Harvard, I became a conservative. Since I couldn't vote for Reagan (he had just left office) in 1989, I gladly cast my first vote for Reagan's successor—George H. W. Bush.

Fast forward to today when on Feb. 20 the world sat stunned as it watched a modified SM-3 missile launched from the USS Lake Erie intercept the NROL-21 satellite before it could de-orbit naturally. This wasn't merely a virtuosic display of rocket science, but a magnificent vindication of the singular vision by one of our greatest American presidents in modern times—Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative program, or SDI. In a wonderful review by the Hoover Institute of Mark Davis' book,

"Reagan's Real Reason for SDI" (2000) the reviewer wrote: "Ronald Reagan soldiered on before audiences indifferent to his ideas, speaking in idealistic ways that would be dismissed as infantile goo-gooism if uttered by a president today. In an August 1985 press conference, he asserted that such a defense should go beyond protecting America and protect 'the people of this planet.'"

In a September press conference, he spoke more explicitly: "I'm sorry that anyone ever used the appellation Star Wars for it because it isn't that. *It is purely to see if we can find a defensive weapon so that we can get rid of the idea that our deterrence should be the threat of retaliation*, whether from the Russians toward us or us toward them, of the slaughter of millions of people by way of nuclear weapons."

U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet premier Mikhail Gorbachev had that critical nuclear-arms-control summit at the famous house of Höfði in Reykjavík, the capital city of Iceland, on Oct. 11-12, 1986. Why did the initial talks at Reykjavik collapse? Although in 1986 Reagan had proposed banning all ballistic missiles, he rigidly insisted on continuing research on the Strategic Defense Initiative that could potentially be shared with the Soviets. Yet, despite the U.S. promise to share this technology, Soviet hatred and fear of SDI was a *cause célèbre* to the party bosses of the Soviet Union as well as American leftists of all varieties, thus negatively impacting the already volatile U.S.-Soviet relations—a geopolitical meltdown further exacerbated by the failure of the 1985 Geneva Summit and by the Daniloff-Zakharov espionage affair.

The Reykjavik discussions languished due to Gorbachev's insistence on linking the SDI program to any agreement on eliminating INF missiles in Europe and reducing NATO tactical nuclear weapons and Warsaw Pact conventional forces, but especially because of Reagan's insistence that SDI research be non-negotiable. Although the meeting adjourned with no agreement, history has vindicated Reagan's shrewd diplomacy, for it led directly to the signing of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty in Washington, D.C., Dec. 8, 1987.

As a young graduate student in the late 1980s, I had a moderate but growing interest in politics and therefore could appreciate the far-reaching geopolitical considerations of America having *some* defense against a nuclear attack by our sworn enemy, the Soviet Union, yet I heard little support of Reagan's SDI program here in America. Instead, I heard almost unanimous vitriol by the Democrats, the propaganda press,

the academy, my fellow students at Harvard and of course the anti-war left. They all mocked Reagan as a "warmonger," "a simple man," "naïve," "intransigent" and derided his SDI program as "Star Wars." Twenty years later history has aptly praised Reagan and vilified the myopic vision of the left in regards to nuclear arms policy.

Conservative icon Rush Limbaugh, in a moving tribute to Reagan on June 7, 2004, made the following remarks about Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative: "I attended a lecture given by Lady Margaret Thatcher at the Waldorf in New York. She made a point of saying it was Reagan, not Gorbachev, who brought down the Soviet Union primarily by proposing SDI. It was at that moment that Gorbachev knew it was over *because he knew we Americans could do SDI and his country couldn't.*" But back then, SDI was regarded much as the whole war in Iraq is today. SDI was treated as a joke; SDI was dangerous; SDI was going to blow up the world; SDI was impossible. It was typical liberalism: greatness couldn't be done. Greatness can't happen. "This is only going to kill us all! This is just the meanderings of a B-actor." I mean, you people have forgotten how absolutely mean-spirited the critics of Reagan were about him and to him personally.

[Reagan] never flinched, never cared. He smiled at it. . . . She stood up and went through this list of things and made the point that it was at that moment Mikhail Gorbachev realized it was over because he couldn't keep up. His country couldn't do it, and he knew Americans could create SDI. . . .

Since its conception in 1983, our enemies have been terrified that Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative *will* work. If you think I write from hyperbole, ask yourself what countries are most intimidated by this technology? That's right—China and Russia, our two closest militarily competitors. These countries have been literally apoplectic since the U.S. shot down that satellite with a rocket last month. Their worst fears are realized. SDI *is* a success! From a geopolitical standpoint, these aggressor nations cannot as effectively threaten America or our allies with impunity as they could absent SDI technology. Thank you, President Ronald Reagan.

ON FOREIGN POLICY — ESSAY 8

THE OSAMA BIN LADEN EQUAL PROTECTION ACT [O.B.L.E.P.A.]

September 15, 2007

There's always a conflict of interest when people who don't really like America are called upon to defend it.

~ Ann Coulter

I have never respected former President Jimmy Carter. I thought he was a disastrous president. In 1976, I began my secondary studies that same year Carter was elected to his moribund presidency. By the time he left office in January 1981, I had finished my first semester of college. During that period, my political philosophy was infantile and emergent; nevertheless, I knew from several bizarre events of his presidency that this guy was . . . peculiar. For example, at his inauguration he refused to ride in the presidential limo and instead walked down Pennsylvania Avenue. He made a big deal out of carrying his own luggage onto Air Force One like a diminutive skycap, not the respected leader of the free world. (The luggage was later discovered to be empty.) And who could forget Jimmy Carter wearing that moth-eaten cardigan sweater as he lectured and scolded us greedy Americans on national TV with the brilliant strategy of turning our thermostats down to 68 degrees? It was Jimmy Carter's plan to get our nation out of the "energy crisis." What a visionary leader he was.

Part of President Carter's legacy was instituting FISA. What is FISA? It was a statute created by Congress at the behest of Carter in 1978 and stands for the Foreign Intelligence Security Act. Some of the basic parameters of FISA are cited below:

The President may authorize, through the Attorney General, electronic surveillance without a court order for the period of one year provided it is only for foreign intelligence information; targeting foreign powers as defined by 50 U.S.C. §1801(a)(1),(2),(3) or their agents; and there is no substantial likelihood that the surveillance will acquire the contents of any communication to which a United States person is a party.

Alternatively, the government may seek a court order permitting the surveillance using the FISA court. Approval of a FISA application requires the court find probable cause that the target of the surveillance be a "foreign power" or an "agent of a foreign power," and that the places at which surveillance is requested is used or will be used by that foreign power or its agent. In addition, the court must find that the proposed surveillance meet certain "minimization requirements" for information pertaining to U.S. persons.

In addition to electronic surveillance, FISA permits the "physical search" of the premises, information, material, or property used exclusively by" a foreign power. The requirements and procedures are nearly identical to those for electronic surveillance.

So many ridiculous strictures ("substantial likelihood," "minimization requirements," "foreign power" or an "agent of a foreign power," "used exclusively") mandated by the FISA statute and the FISA courts have put a terrible and unnecessary burden on the intelligence agencies tasked with apprehending evildoers in our midst, while giving al-Qaida, Hamas, Fatah, Hezbollah, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and other Islamic terrorist groups all over the world free reign to commit mayhem against Americans and American soldiers here and abroad.

President Carter no doubt was motivated by the findings of the zealous and partisan "Church Committee" chaired by Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, from 1972-75, who sought to seriously weaken the effectiveness of the CIA, NSA, FBI and the dozen or so other intelligence agencies under the pretext of bringing reform and accountability to what liberal Democrats considered immoral and untrustworthy agencies.

While on the surface this sounds reasonable, in the hands of a radical leftist politician like Jimmy Carter; a person who since leaving office seems hell-bent on undermining America, Americans and our most faithful ally, Israel at every opportunity, you can understand Ann Coulter's sentiments regarding a pol of his ilk: "There is always a conflict of interest when people who really don't like America are called upon to defend it." It is now clear that the undermining of our intelligence agencies by the Church Committee, Jimmy Carter and the FISA courts has lead directly to many subsequent terrorist events on American soil reaching its crescendo, yea, its apotheosis at 9/11. What are the effects of the FISA courts on our federal intelligence agencies? Welcome to the world of perverse liberalism and Jimmy Carter's war on America. Carter views the enemy as not being Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri or Iranian

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the Revolutionary Guard that are murdering our brave American soldiers almost daily, but President George W. Bush, Vice President Dick Cheney, and the overzealous CIA and FBI agents who are actually on the front lines in the War on Terror. FISA is a patent example of an outrageous and restrictive statute that needlessly ties the hands of our federal intelligence agencies and must be repealed as soon as the Republicans get the vision and the guts to do so.

Enabled by the usual suspects—the propaganda press, leftist academics, craven Republicans, treasonous Democrats, Hollywood propagandists, ranting socialists, ACLU anarchists and activist judges, FISA has had a long and distinguished career of leveling the playing field *in favor* of Muslim fanatics that want to kill Americans and Jews at every opportunity. In the final analysis, I agree with my mentor and antagonist of some of my prior writings, Judge Richard A. Posner, who eloquently wrote: “FISA retains value as a framework for monitoring the communications of known terrorists, but it is hopeless as a framework for *detecting* terrorists. [FISA] requires that surveillance be conducted pursuant to warrants based on probable cause to believe that the target of surveillance is a terrorist, when the desperate need is to find out *who* is a terrorist.” To alleviate some of the strictures on our intelligence agencies to conduct warrantless wiretaps of telephone, e-mail and financial reports and use of other eavesdropping techniques to thwart terrorists and protect Americans, President Bush has for the past few years put up a yeoman’s effort to establish into law the Patriot Act (a.k.a. *The Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001*). However, his efforts have been repeatedly undermined by liberal Democrats and their de facto legal arm, the ACLU, MoveOn.org, et al.

Thank you, President Jimmy Carter, exceeding gratitude from America for no longer being our president. Regards also for instituting and establishing the FISA courts to frustrate America’s war on terrorism. Islamofascists all over the world extol your praise for implementing the FISA statutes, or what I like to refer to as OBLEPA—“The Osama bin Laden Equal Protection Act.”

ON FOREIGN POLICY — ESSAY 9

WHY IS ISRAEL AFRAID TO BE ISRAEL?

April 21, 2007

Excavating near the Temple Mount isn't worth fighting for.

~ Anon (popular Israeli sentiment)

Is there not a cause?

~ David

I am four things—I am a black man, an American, an academic without a home, and a lover of the Jewish people and the nation of Israel. Years ago I made a vow to dedicate my career and my talents to defending the Jewish people and proclaiming the truth about this great nation. This article is my feeble but earnest attempt in this regard. The Six Day War began on June 5, 1967, 40 years ago, with a pre-emptive attack by Israel against Egypt due to Egypt's increasing bellicose, anti-Israel rhetoric, Gen. Nasser's banishment of Israel from using the Suez Canal, and troop movements that seemed poised to attack Israel's southern flank. Israel's response was so swift, fierce and legendary that by day three Israeli forces was at the base of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Later that day, Israeli armies ascended the Temple Mount by defeating a confederation of six Arab armies. Truly it was a blessed day for the nation of Israel as Gen. Uzi Narkiss hoisted up the Israel flag at their holiest site. Yet, in subsequent days, as the politicians sorted through the ramifications of the victory, there is tension, there is fear, there is hesitation, there is a lost opportunity to secure that holiest Jewish site—a lost opportunity that may never again be seized. The actual events are narrated below:

Israel conquered the Old City of Jerusalem on the third day of the Six Day War, in June 1967. The paratroopers were overcome with emotion upon entering the Jewish Holy Places from which they had been banished 2,000 years ago by the Romans. Defense Minister Moshe Dayan marched triumphantly to the Temple Mount. There he suggested to Gen. Uzi Narkiss that part of the Old City walls be pulled down—an ancient practice symbolizing conquest. Rabbi Shlomo Goren also had an idea: In preparation for the imminent Messianic era, the IDF Israeli Defense

Forces should utilize the explosives it had on hand and demolish the Temple Mount's mosques. Narkiss ignored both proposals.

To my Israeli friends I ask: Why didn't the Jews finish the job and take over the entire Temple Mount area 40 years ago? After all, was not this their birthright? Was not this the area where in the Bible Abraham was to sacrifice his son Isaac but at the last moment the Angel of the Lord stayed his hand? Was not this the site where David, Israel's greatest king, endeavored to build the first Temple, which was built by his son, Israel's second greatest king, Solomon? Was not this the same Temple Mount where another Temple was rebuilt bigger and more gloriously in the first century A.D. by Herod the Great? Then surely if there were any site in Israel worth fighting for, worth exercising sovereignty over, for re-establishing the Temple Mount as the center of Jewish worship in all of Israel, then it was this area. Why is Israel afraid to be Israel?

The Palestinians, Israel's sworn enemies and fellow countrymen, have an interesting and diabolical way of influencing the marketplace of ideas in Israel and in the international community, and imposing their will over a much stronger people, the Jews—public policy by temper tantrum. This policy was on great display in February of this year at the Temple Mount where archeologists of the Israel Ministry of Housing are shoring up a bridge that collapsed in 2004 due to heavy snow. The Israel Antiquities Authority is concurrently excavating ancient artifacts in the area. This bridge would give the Jews access to the Temple Mount area to worship at the Wailing Wall. The archeologists have assured the Palestinians that the dig will not in any way disturb the foundation of the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque, which is Muslim's third-holiest site in the world. The response from the Muslim world both in Israel and abroad has been swift, predictable and violent. For example The Committee of Muslim Scholars and the Islamic Action Front, Jordan's largest political opposition group, immediately responded in a statement whereby they "urge[d] . . . proclaiming jihad to liberate Al Aqsa and save it from destruction and sabotage from Jewish usurpers." Also, Arab regimes that refuse to concede to their demands to save the Al Aqsa mosque by force will be attacked starting with King Abdullah of Jordan, said the Islamic Action Front.

For weeks now, Palestinians Muslims have executed virtually continuous attacks in east Jerusalem at or near the Temple Mount area in protest of the bridge reconstruction and archeological excavation, which

in the Old City is mandated by Israeli law. For example, on Feb. 20, Arab protesters were arrested for rioting, and violence was caught on photo and video. A week later, terrorists in Gaza set off bombs near the separation barriers as soldiers approached—and on and on and on. Israel must ask themselves this question: Why is Israel afraid to be Israel? Three thousand years ago on the wind-swept hills of Judea, Israel's future greatest king, then just a lowly anonymous shepherd boy of 16, saw the armies of Israel cowering in their bunkers listening to the daily taunts and blasphemies of this 9 foot 6 inch Philistine champion, Goliath. David, shocked at his own people's cowardice and indifference to defend their own national heritage in the face of this pagan, uncircumcised enemy that David believed in his heart could be easily vanquished, asked a most sublime and profound question—*Is there not a cause?*

Indeed, if Israel doesn't have a cause, yea, as Prime Minister Begin iterated, even a God-ordained right "to all of Israel," then surely *no* nation on earth can claim a better title to any land in its possession. Therefore, what should Israel do to be Israel? The same thing David did when he made Israel the greatest and most powerful nation at that time: 1) Conquer or neutralize all of your surrounding enemies; 2) Define and secure your borders; 3) Withdraw membership from the United Nations, because this so-called "neutral" international organization has always been one of Israel's greatest enemies and has been complicit with Arab states to bring about Israel's destruction since the U.N. was called the League of Nations in the early 1920s; 4) Immediate deportation of all Palestinians that refuse to sign a statement of sole allegiance to Israel (a mandated loyalty oath), starting with the political leadership of Fatah and Hamas; and 5) Annex Gaza and the so-called West Bank (which is actually greater Judea) and make all of Israel one united country again.

To Israel and to the Jews whom I love, I end with this message—You have been in the wilderness for 40 years; 40 years since your great victory in June 1967—The Six Day War. Forty is the number of testing, of judgment, of wandering, of wandering around this sacred site of your forefathers. The Temple Mount is Israel's birthright. As boy David asked King Saul, "Is there not a cause?" Indeed, there is. Israel must reclaim all of Israel beginning with the Temple Mount, and Israel must never be afraid to be Israel again.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 10

OBSOLETE LAWYERS AND IEDS

November 10, 2007

The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers.

~ Shakespeare, "Henry VI" (Part II)

Desperate times calls for desperate measures. We as Americans may not always understand or agree with such tactics, but leaders must seize the moment (*carpe diem*).

On Saturday Nov. 3, President Gen. Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan declared a state of emergency on state TV just before a crucial Supreme Court decision was to be handed down that could overturn his recent election victory. Musharraf's draconian action is one step away from declaring martial law, which Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has stated recently America cannot tolerate. The Bush administration, contrary to the reactionary liberal media, has been cautious in its official pronouncements. They realize that President Musharraf, as the leader of a 97 percent Muslim country that has between 48-60 nuclear weapons, cannot jeopardize those lethal weapons falling into the hands of some fanatical Muslim clerics, which is exactly what would happen absent Musharraf's recent necessary and draconian response to stem the tide of anarchy raging throughout Pakistan.

In the face of weeks of rising political chaos and Islamic militant violence, what would a prudent American or European leader do to quell such mayhem and to bring *his* country under the rule of law? That's right—shut down the Supreme Court and arrest several thousand political dissidents including hundreds of lawyers. Perhaps Musharraf, unlike our untutored leaders here in America, has read something more substantive than the New York Times, Vanity Fair or the National Enquirer. Musharraf has taken a page from Shakespeare's "Henry VI" and has not killed all the lawyers, but has arrested a couple hundred of them. Why? Because the Supreme Court and their willing minions, the Pakistani bar, has time and time again undermined the rule of law in Pakistan and thus frustrated Musharraf's ability to effectively rule his nation.

But Ellis, don't Musharraf's actions amount to totalitarianism? That is overstated, but I will agree that Pakistan's road to democracy has taken a brief detour, that previous constitutional orders have lead to the suspension of some basic rights of citizens and that judges will probably have to take a new oath of office. However, Musharraf's actions have precedent here in America:

1. In 1861, at the eve of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln suspended habeas corpus, allowing him to imprison at will hundreds of his political enemies (including politicians and journalists). Was Lincoln right? As a black man whose forefathers were mired in the wicked institution of slavery, I think I can speak for the tens of millions of my fellow black Americans who enjoy the privilege of freedom today that truly Lincoln did the *moral* thing. (Note, I didn't say *legal*).
2. In 1942, FDR, in preparation to wage war against Japan over the bombing of Pearl Harbor and imminent war with Hitler and Germany in Europe, first had the wisdom to protect America's flank. He built dozens of internment camps throughout the country. These were not like the "concentration camps" Hitler used to torment and kill millions of Jews, but holding areas to house members of the ethnic groups we were fighting abroad—primarily Japanese, Italians and Germans.
3. In 1794, President George Washington used federal military force to quell rowdy Philadelphians (the Whiskey Rebellion). In 1798 and 1800, Adams used the Alien and Sedition Acts to punish his political enemies. In 1803, Jefferson's land grab (the Louisiana Purchase) more than doubled the size of America. Theodore Roosevelt invaded Colombia in 1903 to create a new nation (Panama) so that he could create a southern waterway (the Panama Canal) to ship goods to the West Coast and Europe, etc.

What has this little brief history lesson to do with lawyers and IEDs, the subject of this column? Washington Post Columnist David Ignatius in a June 10, 2007, article titled, "Improvised Explosive Defeat?" stated the following shocking facts about America's politically correct war being fought in Iraq:

The insurgents who kill our young soldiers are ruthless, but we have sometimes been cautious in our response. Take the question of targeting bomb makers: There may be an unlimited supply of explosives in Iraq, but there is not an unlimited supply of people who know how to wire the detonators. In 2004, CIA operatives in Iraq believed that they had identified the signatures of 11 bomb makers. They proposed a

diabolical—but potentially effective—sabotage program that would have flooded Iraq with booby-trapped detonators designed to explode in the bomb makers' hands. But the CIA general counsel's office said no. The lawyers claimed that the agency lacked authority for such an operation, one source recalled.

There are technologies that would allow us to detonate every roadside bomb in Iraq by heating the wires in the detonators to the point that they triggered an explosion. But these systems could severely harm civilians nearby, so we're not using them, either.

If this narrative is true, there should immediately be a nationwide populist movement organized to impeach President George W. Bush (and I say this as a Republican). Why? If it can be definitively shown that *any* U.S. president using his vast wartime powers is not giving our brave American soldiers every available technology and strategy to utterly kill the enemy (Islamic insurgents) before they kill us, that, in my opinion, is an impeachable offense. Once again the damn liberal lawyers (this time at the CIA) are directing the war. Dear readers, could you imagine FDR (no conservative by any measure) consulting with lawyers before authorizing Gen. Dwight Eisenhower to launch his D-Day invasion against the Nazis on the French coast of Normandy? Or President Lincoln (a fabulous lawyer in his own right) consulting with a bunch of hackneyed, self-important lawyers before the Battle of Antietam, Gettysburg, Fredericksburg, Manassas? If he did, I guarantee you that his face would not be enshrined on Mt. Rushmore for the ages, and my people would still be mired in the bondage of slavery.

For President Bush to allow a bunch of faceless CIA attorney bureaucrats in any way to dictate to him, the constitutional commander in chief of all U.S. military forces, is a slap in the face of every red-blooded American that loves this country and who venerates the Constitution. Despite the journalistic malpractice of the liberal media on this most important issue, thank God for WorldNetDaily.com founder Joseph Farah for giving a voice to critical stories like this one. Otherwise, the blood of our brave men and women fighting in Iraq and in other battlefields across the world would be shed in vain. Dear reader, allow me to coin a phrase combining a quote from Shakespeare's "Henry VI" and the public policy of FDR whenever America finds itself at war: "The first thing we do, let's shred the bar cards of all the lawyers."

Happy Veterans Day!

ON FOREIGN POLICY — ESSAY 11

U.N. TREACHERY, THE NUREMBERG TRIALS AND THE SEEDS OF
9/11

September 08, 2007

The modern Islamic terrorist movement began on May 14, 1948, the day Israel was reborn as a nation.

~ Hal Lindsey, WND columnist

In my upcoming book, "The Nuremberg Trials: Last Tragedy of the Holocaust," I do a systematic and exhaustive analysis on the legal/philosophical origins of the Nuremberg Trials. In this opus I trace the positive law (separation of law and morality) origins of the U.N. and its first international tribunal, the Nuremberg Trials, and critically detail how this crisis of philosophy via diplomatic expediency and geopolitical cowardice lead to the sham show trials at Nuremberg, where 13 trials were held over a four year period supposedly to vindicate the Jews and to usher the day of reckoning for the crimes of the Holocaust. It did neither.

Only 177 Nazis were tried during the initial Nuremberg Trials. In the first and most famous trial, 24 Nazi leaders were brought up on charges of crimes against humanity, and only 11 Nazis received the death penalty. The majority were either acquitted (3) or given token prison sentences (most served less than seven years). So angry at the paucity of the sentences, French prosecutor Josiah Dubois angrily stated that the punishments "were light enough to please a chicken thief!" If Hitler's merciless and savage Nazis weren't guilty of *something*, then who among us is innocent of *anything*?

The Jewish people got a raw deal at Nuremberg, and there would be more treachery afoot in subsequent years against them. Let's examine the U.N.'s critical role in passing a resolution that led to the birth of the Jewish state on Nov. 29, 1947, giving them a homeland—no doubt out of embarrassment and guilt for not foreseeing Hitler's genocide against them. The Jewish Zionist movement was key in lobbying the U.N. and mobilizing member states of the world to vote for a homeland for the

Jews just three years after World War II, but there was a caveat. (The devil is *always* in the details.) The day after the U.N. resolution was passed granting Israel statehood, five Arab nations (Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Iraq) attacked the Jews and the infant Jewish state in a devastating united front. Regrettably, this wouldn't be Israel's last war. All this was done under the blatant treachery of the U.N. being complicit with the Arab states "to finish what Hitler started" and to bring to its apotheosis "the final solution" against their mutual hated enemy, Israel, under the guise of giving Jews a homeland. It was all a duplicitous, colossal sham.

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a modern-day Hitler, has made his plans perfectly clear—"to wipe Israel off the map." His three-part plan is to: 1) Destroy or neutralize Israel's only ally, the U.S.; 2) Destroy the nation of Israel; and 3) Establish Shariah Law and a Muslim caliphate throughout the world where those of other religions, especially Jews and Christians, will either have to convert to Islam, become permanent second-class citizens (which is tantamount to slavery), or be summarily executed. The U.N.'s silence here reminds one of Holocaust survivor and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Elie Wiesel's prescient words: "To remain silent and indifferent is the greatest sin of all." In 1947, the U.N. General Assembly created the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, or UNSCOP, to propose a solution to the Palestine problem. To make the committee more "neutral," none of the great powers were represented. This was a strategic coup for the U.N. and the Arab states in their conspiracy to bring to conclusion Hitler's "Final Solution." Why? Because the U.S. (one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Israel's greatest ally) and Great Britain (the colonial power over most of the Middle East including Palestine) would have limited input on the Palestine/Israeli peace negotiations with the Arab states regarding Israel's statehood, or even its existence. The fix was in.

UNSCOP's partition plan was summarily rejected by the Palestinian Arab leadership and by most of the Arab population. Likewise, many prominent Jewish leaders rejected the proposal out of hand. For example, future Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, then leader of a Israeli paramilitary group called Irgun, announced:

The partition of the homeland is illegal. It will never be recognized. The signature by institutions and individuals of the partition agreement is invalid. It will not bind the Jewish people. Jerusalem was and will

forever be our capital. The Land of Israel will be restored to the people of Israel. All of it. And forever.

Although at that time the views of Begin's visionary "One State Solution" were publicly rejected even by the majority of the Israeli Jews, no doubt in large part for expediency reasons, nevertheless, history has vindicated Begin's revolutionary ideas regarding not only the security of the state of Israel, but of the U.S. and the entire West.

The U.N.'s treachery against the Jews by creating this so-called "Partition Plan" or in modern parlance "Bush's Two-State Solution," rather than following Begin's One State Solution, has lead directly to the Muslim's jihad against the Jews, Christianity and the West worldwide, leading directly to 9/11 and the present quagmire wars America and its allies are fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. The future war between America (Israel) and Iran is imminent, and I believe it will ignite before the 2008 elections. Why?

Know for a certainty that the Lord your God will no more drive out any of these nations from before you [Israel]; but they [the children of Ishmael=the Arabs] shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you.

~ Joshua 23:13

May God forbid. Israel LIVES!

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 12

'DE-ISLAMATIZATION': WHY IT MUST BE DONE

July 14, 2007

Is there not a cause?

~ David (c. 1040 B.C.)

Until philosophers rule as kings or those who are now called kings and leading men genuinely and adequately philosophize, that is, until political power and philosophy entirely coincide, while the many natures who at present pursue either one exclu-

sively are forcibly prevented from doing so, cities will have no rest from evils . . . nor, I think, will the human race.

~ Plato ("The Republic" 473c-d)

Bombs, bullets and soldiers alone will never stop al-Qaida, Hezbollah, radical Islam and their religious fanatical jihad against Judaism, Christianity and the West. Why? Because Islam is an idea, a belief, a philosophy, a worldview, a religion that over a billion and a half people follow and live their daily lives by. Islam determines what Muslims think, hear, value, believe . . . even die for. Islam is what a billion and a half Muslims have banked their eternal destiny on and more than not will gladly give their lives to assure a Muslim world, as painfully witnessed recently in the terrorist bomb plots at London's West End and Scotland's Glasgow Airport where so far six of the eight suspects detained are respected, upper-class Muslim medical doctors.

We must change philosophy (religion) by philosophy. This isn't an original idea. Remember that the first thing the victorious Allies did after conquering Hitler and his Nazis during World War II was to institute a comprehensive "de-Nazification" program to change the thinking of all Germans away from Nazi fanaticism and anti-Semitism to a representative democracy, establishing a republic based on the legal/moral paradigm of the rule of law and a Constitution. A similar program was enacted by Gen. Douglas MacArthur to convert the Japanese masses away from the maniacal fanaticism of Emperor Worship, which existed for over 1,000 years. Sixty years later, Japan stands as a faithful ally of America and a bulwark republic in an area rife with Communist dictatorships and growing Islamic hegemony.

Why wouldn't a formal policy of religious conversion, "de-Islamatization" if you will work for a U.S. president that's got the guts, vision, leadership and ability to do it? The critics will prattle: "The Muslim faith is a religion of peace, not war"; "All Muslims aren't bad"; "The Muslims will call us 'Crusaders.'" Let us prove them right, not by reclaiming or conquering Muslim lands, but neutralizing the radical elements of their religion at the meta (intellectual) level by spreading our Judeo-Christian traditions—traditions that are infinitely more compatible with a democratic-republic form of government than any form of Islam, which, I wrote in an earlier column, is incompatible with a repub-

lic. I know to some readers this sounds a bit radical, Pollyannaish and naive, but hear me out. Look at what Muslim countries do to our Judeo-Christian beliefs. There is an explicit, unified and purposeful strategy to forbid strictly the Bible, Christian literature or proselytizing of any kind in virtually all Muslim countries at pains of capital punishment—the most egregious and overt being Saudi Arabia, America’s supposed ally in the war on terror. Yet the Muslims can build mosques in America and in the West as fast as Saudi Arabia, Iran or some other Muslim country, or terrorist organization, sends them the funds. The result: Genocidal Islam grows right here in America, while Judeo-Christianity dies a slow death on the vine due to 150 years of neglect and failure to use the world’s greatest religion as a viable domestic and foreign policy strategy and geopolitical export to the nations of the world. The crux of the argument is: Can a secular liberal democracy ever defeat genocidal Islamic jihad against the West? I answer no. The problem with the war on terror is that we are asking the wrong people for their expert opinion to deal with the West’s vexing problems of worldwide terrorism.

In the fourth century before Christ, the Greek philosopher Plato, in his magnum opus, “The Republic,” had the same dilemma and criticism with his view of history up to that time and even with the rulers of his day. Plato’s contention was that a competent, well-rounded ruler needed, besides a thorough grounding in the military arts, mathematics and music, to also have a meticulous foundation in philosophy. The Greeks called this curriculum *The Quadrivium*. The ideal leader needed to be a philosopher-king. Why? Because philosophers understood better than, say, a military commander, a senator, a well-connected Athenian, “guardians” (officers/soldiers) or “merchants” (business owners/producers), the intricacies of human nature, of mankind’s predilections, perversities, prejudices and what makes them do certain things under certain situations. Moreover, a philosopher, because he is a deep thinker and spends much of his time contemplating the particulars of human nature, would be better equipped to come up with a viable solutions to America’s rhetorical “war on terror.”

Earlier this year in a surprise debate with a former liberal professor of hers, Dr. Mary Grabar made the following prescient remarks on Plato:

I think that’s a big misconception about “The Republic.” In the literature, the claim is often made that Plato was advocating a totalitarian government. But my understanding is that the dialogue is not to be tak-

en literally. Rather, the philosopher-king is the reluctant ruler, motivated not by ego or personal gain. His motivation is the love of wisdom and justice. These ideas, indeed, form the basis for our republican form of government, in contrast to a popular democracy ruled by the masses. You may recall Thrasymachus. . . .

Speaking as a philosopher, I am convinced that America's current military strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan is not only ineffective, but generates increasing numbers of fanatical Muslims championing jihad—something to die for. No wonder our cause in the war on terror is lost before it begins and will only get worse unless President Bush and his war advisers start reading (and following) the enduring and wise admonitions of Plato's "Republic" and begin fighting a war of ideas, a war of philosophy, a religious war against the Muslim infidels like those battles waged by the great philosopher-kings of old—in primeval times when Christian monarchs like Charles "the Hammer" Martel (686-741), Charlemagne (742-814), Richard the Lionhearted (1157-99), Elizabeth I (1533-1603), Jan III Sobieski (1629-96) and Peter the Great (1672-1725) all fought so valiantly against the Muslim menace, face to face.

As President Bush implements his ill-fated military "surge" in Iraq, I wish he understood that he doesn't need more troops to be sent to this 21st century Vietnam; he needs *one* adviser that has read Plato's "Republic" to give him a crash course on how to follow the tried and true strategies of the magnificent philosopher-king. Three thousand years ago, David, a future philosopher-king, was born. A young, anonymous Jewish boy on the back hills of Judea asked his king as the armies of Israel cowered in fear before the dreadful Philistine giant, Goliath, the simple but sublime question: "Is there not a cause?" That same teenage boy took a rag and a rock, ran onto the battlefield to confront this 9-foot-9-inch infidel giant, popped him in the head with his slingshot, killing him, and chopped off his head with Goliath's own sword. Now, in my humble opinion, that boy was a *real* man! Would to God that America, Britain, Israel, and all nations of good will had a philosopher-king to deliver us this day from our two greatest enemies—liberalism and Islamic hegemony.

CHAPTER

~ 4 ~

ON PHILOSOPHY

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 1

HITLER'S IDEOLOGY 'RIGHT-WING'?

August 23, 2008

On this planet of ours human culture and civilization are indissolubly bound up with the presence of the Aryan. If he should be exterminated or subjugated, then the dark shroud of a new barbarian era would enfold the earth.

~ Adolf Hitler

Today's column will end my extended book review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's useful opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 others that didn't Help*. My critique will be on the German leader Adolf Hitler's treatise, *Mein Kampf*, a two-volume book published in 1925 and 1926 that unifies elements of autobiography with an exposition of Hitler's National Socialist political ideology.

In the opening chapter on Hitler, Wiker writes the following:

Many people have read books about Adolf Hitler, but all too few have read Hitler's own book, "Mein Kampf" (My Struggle), a book written prior to his coming to power while he was in jail for instigating revolution. The danger of only reading about Hitler is that one can easily get an entirely distorted view of him as an evil madman rather than an evil genius. A madman is driven by mania for a very particular idea; a genius is driven by a grand vision, a malignant worldview. This distinction is essential for understanding the apex of Hitler's evil: his apparent mania for exterminating the Jews.¹

A leitmotiv throughout Wiker's chapter on "Mein Kampf" was Hitler's overarching vision of how Nazi ideas and ideals would permeate the world, principles he called, *Weltanschauung* (worldview). On this point, Wiker writes, "We might easily think that Hitler's genocidal ambitions were rooted entirely in his virulent anti-Semitism. But 'Mein Kampf' helps to reveal that they were merely one malevolent effect of a far deeper, more profound and pervasive evil, a *Weltanschauung*. . . ." ²

The staggering body count Nazi's perpetuated during World War II (over 18 million) affected the Jews the most, but was not limited to them. Wiker writes: "The Nazi regime murdered not only 6 million Jews but millions of other "undesirables": enemies of the Reich, from Slavs, Gypsies and prisoners of war, to the handicapped, retarded and even mildly "unfit." The Aktion T4 program, the Nazi eugenic plan-in-action, resulted in the state-ordered execution of around 200,000 people who were disabled, retarded, juvenile delinquents, mixed-race children, or even plagued with significant adolescent acne." ³

Remember that Hitler was an atheist who killed millions in the name of atheism and secularism. Also, the Nazi Party was thoroughly grounded in atheist, anti-Christian ideology. Let's not forget that Hitler killed untold numbers of his own people, Christians and Christians ministers like Dietrich Bonhoeffer (who was killed in 1945) and Martin Niemöller (who was tormented in Nazi concentration camps from 1938-45) because they believed in a higher power than the Nazi State. Also, multitudes of other regular German citizens, many devout Christians, spoke out against the Nazi Party and suffered by the millions because they refused to pledge their homes, their business, their family, their lives "for the Reich."

Was Nazism a 'right-wing' ideology?

One of the enduring lies regarding the intellectual roots of Hitler's Nazi Party was that as a philosophy, Nazism was a right-wing or conservative ideology. It was neither. This distortion was ably dispelled by Jonah Goldberg's excellent and well-researched book, "Liberal Fascism." After World War II and the extent of Hitler's genocidal madness became known to the world, the mainstream press, academics and progressive intellectuals both in America and Europe who spoke and wrote so admiringly of Hitler began to join the universal chorus to condemn his acts. Around the same time there was a subtle but concerted effort made in the marketplace of ideas that characterized Hitler and Nazism as a "right-wing" or conservative ideology.

Of course, Nazism, communism, totalitarianism, fascism, even progressivism, socialism and modern liberalism all overlap and are connected ideologically with each other. Furthermore, leftist politics have little relationship with modern conservatism, which, as Goldberg noted, is ironically more closely aligned with the 18th century classical liberalism of Adam Smith, Edmund Burke, Montesquieu, Locke, Blackstone and America's constitutional Framers than with Nazi or fascist ideology. On this point, Wiker writes: "Given the epic scale of their inhumanity, we need to remember that the Nazi regime did not purport to do evil. It claimed to be scientific *and progressive*, to do what hard reason demanded for the ultimate benefit of the human race. The superhuman acts of inhumanity were carried out for the sake of humanity." ⁴

Let's not forget Nazis' connection to the ideas of Darwin, evolutionary theory and eugenics. Wiker writes, "One cannot help but be reminded of Darwin's 'Descent of Man.' 'National Socialism is nothing but applied biology,' said the deputy party leader of the Nazis, Rudolf Hess." In my opinion, the best part of Wiker's analysis of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was that he placed the man and his work in its proper historical context with other intellectuals, writers, political leaders and social movements that influenced and shaped his ideas. Wiker writes:

That struggle is the *kampf* of Hitler's title. Hitler took himself to be that rarest of things, the union of philosopher and king, political philosopher and practical political leader, program-maker and politician in one. Put this way, Hitler seems almost noble, until we realize that the philosophy to which he ascribed was an amalgam of Machiavelli, Dar-

win, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche (as mixed with the racial theories of the Frenchman Joseph-Arthur, comte de Gobineau). We might say that whatever hesitations to action one finds in Darwin, Schopenhauer, or even Nietzsche, Hitler casts aside with the ruthlessness of Machiavelli. Even before Hitler came to power his brand of fascism, first perpetrated in Italy by Mussolini, was admired by W.E.B. Du Bois, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, John Dewey, Margaret Sanger, Walter Lippmann, Herbert Croly and many, many other liberal intellectuals, artists, academics and politicians. Hitler, like many big-government progressives and social engineers in America, began his grand vision with the commendable desire to eradicate poverty. However, shortly thereafter he soon formulated a utopian plan to fix *all* social problems.

By the early 1930s, as Hitler secured comprehensive, dictatorial powers, his grand vision for Germany devolved into the diabolical abyss of his "Final Solution"—the systematic extermination of everyone whom he believed stood in the way of him ruling the world. Therefore, Hitler is a case study in the pure evil and immoderate lengths good intentions can lead a man, a people, a nation that scrupulously separates morality from legality to create a society that perverted the social contract of Hobbes and Locke into a Faustian bargain with the devil.

In conclusion, Wiker made an astute observation that placed Hitler in his proper place in history—not as a fringe, fascist lunatic, but as a serious man of ideas who was admired and respected for a time by a diverse, notable array of journalists, intellectuals, social engineers and politicians. Wiker writes: "But the significant influence on Hitler of thinkers such as Darwin and Nietzsche should bring us to the recognition that we can't hold Hitler up as some kind of singular exemplar of evil. He was a man of his times, a 19th- and 20th-century man who owed as much as Margaret Sanger to the Darwinian eugenic theories in circulation and shared the same reaction as Nietzsche to the Epicurean diminution of man brought about by the liberalism of Hobbes and Mill." ⁵

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 2

HOW THOMAS HOBBS IS HELPING DESTROY AMERICA

May 31, 2008

In a time of universal deceit telling the truth is a revolutionary act.

~ George Orwell

A great leap into the dark.

~ Hobbes (last words)

Dr. Benjamin Wiker has written a very prescient and timely book titled: *10 Books that Screwed up the World: And 5 others that Didn't Help*. Besides reviewing books by Machiavelli, Descartes, Rousseau, Marx, Engels, Darwin, Hitler, Mead, Kinsey and other writers, Dr. Wiker, in chapter 3, delineates an interesting analysis of a book by a legendary philosopher. Hobbes' "Leviathan," the author says, "led to the belief that we have a *right* to whatever we want however morally degraded, vile or trivial it may be . . . and that it is government's right to protect such rights." The singular premise of "Leviathan" is this: *There is, by nature, no good and evil, right or wrong, just and unjust*. Three-hundred fifty years after he wrote "Leviathan," political historians now understand that Hobbes' revolutionary ideas on Man and State led directly to the so-called "Rights Movement" of the 1950s, '60s and '70s.

In *Leviathan*, Enlightenment political philosopher and atheist Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) sets out his doctrine of the foundation of societies and governments of men. *Leviathan* (1651), written just after the Thirty Years War (1618-48) and during the English Civil War, argues for the necessity of a strong central government as a balance against man's predilections toward anarchy and civil war. Starting with a mechanistic understanding of human nature and their passions, Hobbes theorizes what life would be like without government, a condition of humanity later philosophers called a "state of nature." In that state, each person would have a right, an entitlement to everything in the world. However, Hobbes realizes that this state of nature, this Sisyphus-like life of despair, inevitably devolves into anarchy—a "war of all against all" (*bellum omnium contra omnes*), an existential existence where life is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."

To avoid this state of perpetual war, men in the state of nature agree to a social contract, whereby society as a collective entity under a sovereign authority voluntarily cedes to this sovereign (the State or the monarchy, as Hobbes preferred) certain natural rights for the sake of protection. Therefore, for the price of peace, the people must sacrifice some liberties. However, over time, Hobbes expects the people to overturn the State when it becomes too corrupt, tyrannical or fails to protect its citizens. Then man would return to a state of nature until a new social contract is created. Further, Hobbes denied any right of rebellion by the people toward the social contract, which would be later expanded by John Locke (1632-1704) and conserved by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78). Hobbes also rejected the doctrine of separation of powers that Montesquieu (1689-1755) and America's constitutional framers found so essential to good government and civil order.

In "*Leviathan*," Hobbes sets forth his doctrine of the natural condition of mankind. Contained in his theory is that while some men may be stronger or more intelligent than others, none is so strong and smart as to be beyond a fear of violent death. When faced with death, man in his natural state will use every possible means to defend himself. Self-defense against violent death is Hobbes' highest human necessity. Therefore, rights are born of necessity and are not "inalienable rights" from God as Montesquieu, Blackstone, Locke and later Jefferson contended under the paradigm of natural law. In this state of nature, according to Hobbes, each of us has a right (license or entitlement) to everything in the world. Thus, due to the scarcity of things in the world, there is a constant and rights-based conflict—"war of all against all."

After War World II, the Supreme Court's liberal view of a "living Constitution" and "evolving standards of decency" led to radical judicial activist opinions in the areas of racial segregation, civil rights, separation of church and state and the so-called "right to privacy"—in cases like *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947), *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), *Gideon v. Wainwright* (1963), *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965) and *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966)—leading to an entire cottage industry of new rights like the Court's abortion finding in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) and 30 years later to the constitutional right to homosexual sodomy in *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003).

You can thank Thomas Hobbes for elevating our racist, humanist, childish, sexual and vulgar desires to the legitimate level of constitution-

al rights. According to a recent Supreme Court opinion in California, homosexual marriage has once again been raised to the standard of a constitutional "right" by this overtly activist court over the explicit will of the people. It will be interesting where this and numerous other hot button issues takes society as courts grapple with "rights" vs. "privileges," "property rights" vs. "liberty interests, etc. Has this "due process explosion" of the 1950s, '60s and '70s, as federal judge Henry Friendly opined, fundamentally altered the ability of government to manage schools, bureaucracy, agencies, culture, society . . . ourselves? I think it has.

One writer for UC Berkeley's Institute for Governmental Studies defined the moral vs. rights paradigm in this manner:

The traditional and still dominant view in the United States is that marriage is a legally recognized union of one man and one woman. This view is deeply embedded in *moral and religious* beliefs. An alternative view, with roots in the civil rights movement and the political activism of the 1960s, takes the position that marriage is a body of rights which should be extended, *as a matter of fairness and equality*, to couples who do not fit the one man/one woman definition. Many in the gay liberation movement have made the right to marry a key plank in their campaign for equal rights under the law.

This is the catastrophic legacy of Hobbes' Natural Man—*Good simply means getting whatever you want, and evil is anything that might stand in your way of getting it.* Hobbes, on his own death bed, spoke his depressing epitaph of his entire *oeuvre* as, "A great leap into the dark." This tragic view, born of utter despair and fatalism, should give all modern governments pause, including America. Why? Hobbes' sovereign would have total control over all civil, military, judicial and ecclesiastical powers—a diabolical model written in blood over the corpses of untold hundreds of millions by every subsequent despot and totalitarian regime up to modern times.

If Hobbes judged himself and his ideas as "a great leap into the dark," wherefore is humanity 357 years after the publication of *Leviathan* (1651) whose legacy is: Do unto others, so they won't do onto you; Pleasure = good, pain = evil; Morality is a private matter of personal taste; Every man has a right to everything, even another's body; Rights = Human desires (however sordid)? I contend that unless we change course, America and the world will soon be headlong into the abyss.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 3

EGALITARIANISM, SPORTS AND REWARDING FAILURE

December 27, 2008

Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery.

~ Sir Winston Churchill

Prologue

In a 2007 study published in *Nature*, titled, *Egalitarian Motives in Humans*, a modern and disturbing view of egalitarianism demonstrated by American college students showed that highly educated people are willing to pay, even collude with one another to reduce inequality. "When subjects were placed into groups and given random amounts of income, they spent their own money to reduce the incomes of the highest earners and increase the incomes of the lowest earners," the authors concluded. In a rational society, such behavior would be called Marxist, socialist or communist and be eschewed with full vigor by the people. Instead, the philosophy of egalitarianism, which Churchill characterized as socialism, was "a philosophy of failure," "ignorance," "envy" and "misery" and has since the early 1930s and FDR's "New Deal" permeated every aspect of American society and culture. For almost 100 years socialism and egalitarianism have been the dominant form of government in Western Europe and has since then spread to every major country in the world as virtually all of humanity, like Hitler's Brownshirts, is goose stepping into oblivion.

Detroit's love affair with egalitarianism

My hometown of Detroit, Mich., has been in the news as of late for all the wrong reasons. This can in part be traced to egalitarianism and the entrenched, endemic, racist big-city liberal politics—a corrupt Democrat Party political machine that with Stalinesque efficiency punishes success and rewards failure, incompetence and idiocy. Think: President Bush's "bailout" of the Big Three automakers which was an unconstitutional

case of corporate welfare and thievery of \$17.4 billion of taxpayers' money despite the fact that Congress voted down this spending measure only a few weeks before. Recently Detroit has overtaken disaster-ravaged New Orleans as the most dysfunctional city in America. For example, Detroit's twice-elected mayor, the infamous Kwame Kilpatrick, was sentenced to four months in jail for perjury, obstruction of justice and destroying the careers of two decorated police officers who were investigating his profligate ways; particularly a party the mayor had at the Manoogian Mansion in October 2002 where shortly thereafter two of three strippers who danced at that party were mysteriously murdered by the same police-issued Glock handgun. The case remains unsolved.

One of the exotic dancers, Tamara Greene, a mother of three, was murdered in cold blood literally a block from where I grew up on the Northwest side of Detroit. Mayor Kilpatrick, despite his plunging Detroit into a \$300 million deficit, winning "Time Magazine's worst mayor in America" and Forbes Magazines' "Most miserable city in America," is still very popular with black people. Despite his felony record, disbarment as a lawyer and present incarceration in jail, Kwame Kilpatrick is actively planning on running for mayor of Detroit again in future. The egalitarianism displayed in Detroit and in many other major American cities where black people tend to populate is ironically more likely to be oppressive and "racist" to black citizens than the white leaders they began to replace in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Churchill was right: "The equal sharing of misery."

Egalitarianism and the Detroit Lions

How do the foibles of Detroit's ex-mayor relate to sports teams rewarding failure? Let's examine the 0-15 Detroit Lions, the NFL team of that city. The Detroit Lions, a now legendary horrible football team who last Sunday (Dec. 20) in their 42-7 loss to the New Orleans Saints, has forever sealed their legacy into football infamy. The question here I want to address is why does the NFL as well as the NBA, and no doubt other sports franchises, reward failed teams with the honor of picking the best player for the draft? This public policy seems to be an application of the negative effects of affirmative action assumptions to sports—reward failure rather than rewarding excellence.

The presumption for allowing the worst sports teams first pick in the draft was originally designed to allow the bad team's equal parity with

the better teams by giving them access to the better players. Secondly, and most diabolically, it sought to keep the best sports teams from getting even better by blocking their access to the finest young talent available. Does affirmative action work in sports? No. Just look at the pathetic Detroit Lions. Look at their increasingly dismal record over the past 50 years where they have only won one NFL Championship (1957) and only one playoff game in the past 50 years (1992).

You can see a sobering look at the Detroit Lions first-round draft picks throughout history, particularly their all-time draft choices, and how the Detroit Lions have ruined the careers of many very promising, young football players and coaches simply by the misfortune that the Lions drafted them as players or hired them as coaches. For many players, coaches and administrators alike, the Detroit Lions was an entrance to career oblivion, even to this day.

Epilogue

I contend that affirmative action and other anti-meritorious public policies were born out of a perversion of equality, a philosophy derivative of the secular humanist Age of Enlightenment, called egalitarianism. Thus one can see why liberals in politics and sports are loathed to dismantle a failing sports either by force of law or by revision of sports policy. Egalitarianism is a diabolical philosophy that feigns like it stands for social, legal and economic equality, but in reality egalitarianism is not for an equality of *access* but for an equality of *results* and therefore is artificial, a fantasy, diabolical, or as Churchill eloquently stated, "An equal sharing of misery."

My suggestion: Get rid of affirmative action in sports and the cynical policy of giving perennially losing teams like the Detroit Lions the first pick in the draft. Let the bad sports teams have, say, 10 years to reform, to make it to the playoffs or the owners lose their franchises, which can be auctioned off to other potential owners who can effectively demonstrate a better plan for being competitive. This reform alone will end the shameful practice by sports teams of rewarding failure. Finally, let's stop rewarding failure in *all* aspects of society. I'm not saying don't give people a hand who are really in need, but stop social welfare, corporate welfare, pork-barrel spending, earmarks and affirmative action in all of its permutations. Let those people who need help: 1) be the first to step up and demonstrate what they have done to help themselves and 2) conclu-

sively demonstrate how that their present predicament isn't of their own laziness, ignorance, bad life choices or poor judgment.

Once this two-part test is conclusively demonstrated, then, and only then, should a citizen, a race, a gender, a farmer, a sports team, an auto industry, a mortgage industry, an education system, a healthcare system, a retirement system, a juvenile system, a political system be given *limited* aid under the Constitution to perform. Otherwise, all other aspects of egalitarianism and affirmative action should be deemed unconstitutional and dismantled immediately. Come on, America! Let's start rewarding true excellence and stop rewarding incompetence, cronyism and failure. Churchill said it best: *Socialism* (also liberalism and egalitarianism) *is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy. Its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery.*

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 4

I THINK, THEREFORE I AM [ON KARL MARX]

July 12, 2008

I reject as absolutely false everything in which I could imagine the least doubt.

Cogito ergo sum. (I think, therefore I am).

~ René Descartes

Today's column continues my review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's admirable and timely opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 Others That Didn't Help*. Here, I will do a critique on the very influential French philosopher, René Descartes (1596-1650) and his famous treatise, "Discourse on Method" (1637). One of my earliest memories of Descartes was more than 20 years ago when I first read that lion of positivism, progressivism and liberal jurisprudence, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, who in his famous 1897 essay, *The Path of Law*, wrote: "To an imagination of any scope the most far-reaching form of power is not money, it is the command of ideas . . . [A] hundred years after his death the abstract speculations of Descartes had become a practical force controlling the conduct of men. . . . [T]he world is governed to-day by Kant [more] than by Bonaparte."

Ten years ago, I used Holmes' prescient quote in my apologetic against Judge Richard A. Posner, a comprehensive law review article I wrote on the history of law titled, "The Inseparability of Law and Morality." In that opus I lamented just how prevalent and entrenched the ideas of Descartes (and other philosophers) have become in American culture and on Western civilization in modern times. In his chapter on Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, which is subtitled, ". . . of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Searching for Truth in the Sciences, Wiker wrote:

Descartes attacked skepticism, but only by denying reality. He confirmed the idea of the immaterial soul against the pronouncements of the crass materialists of the day, but only by recreating us as insubstantial ghosts trapped in clattering machines. *He proved God's existence, but only by making it depend on our thinking Him into existence.* By his good intentions—if indeed they really were good—he fathered every flavor of self-congratulatory solipsism, led us to believe we are no different from robots, and made religion a creation of our own ego.

Prior to Descartes' criticism of skepticism, philosophers going back far as Socrates had in one form or another been ultimately concerned with God and/or truth. Descartes attack on skepticism feigned as an apologetic for God, ended up denigrating God; *reducing* God as an egotistical product of our own imagination, thus shattering the God-paradigm in classical philosophy that existed for millennia.

Descartes' refutation of skepticism was a treatment worse than the illness because he was able to craftily hide his huge ego and present his sophistic arguments as merely a series of suggestions. However, Descartes, like most philosophers and intellectuals, wasn't the least interested in philosophizing in a vacuum or in vain. Philosophers and intellectuals, like modern day demigods, want their ideas to be applied and celebrated throughout the world. Descartes, as the father of modern philosophy, was no different than the ancients or from contemporary philosophers and intellectuals.

In brief, Descartes' method was to doubt everything. Below is a summary of Dr. Wiker's ideas on the philosophy of Descartes and how his ideas have been disseminated in modern society and culture throughout Western civilization:

❖ Descartes, through the creation of "subjectivism" encouraged imagination to become entirely separated from reality.

❖ Tradition is not a guide to reality because “the very same man with his very own mind, having been brought up from infancy among the French or the Germans becomes different from what he would be had he always lived among the Chinese or among cannibals.” “All is shifting sand,” said Wiker of Descartes.

❖ Descartes’ subjectivism applied to all things including God: “The confusion of true wisdom about God with whatever one happens to think about God.” We define God (and everything in the world) by *our* own thoughts.

❖ Reality is defined by what we think it to be. We are disembodied ghosts trapped in a machine we call a human body. In fact all of nature and existence is merely one type of machine or another.

❖ Descartes’ dualism devolved into monism (just machines are left over after the ghosts die). Human life became reduced to mere mechanism.

❖ Descartes singular statement of philosophy is stated in Part IV of his “Discourse”: “[D]uring the time I wanted thus to think that everything was false, it was necessary that I, who thought thus, be something. And noticing that this truth—I think, therefore I am [*cogito ergo sum*])—was so firm and so certain that the most extravagant suppositions of the skeptics were unable to shake it, I judge that I could accept it without scruple as the first principle of the philosophy I was seeking.”

What is the apotheosis of Descartes’ ideas particularly upon Western civilization? Wiker remarks: “Even if such a method doesn’t lead to insanity it certainly leads to narcissism, the morbid condition of believing that I sit in god-like judgment of everything else but nothing stands in judgment of me.” As Descartes said in Part I one of his “Method” that even among “the most excellent minds who have ever lived . . . there is nothing about which there is not some dispute” in philosophy, “and thus nothing that is not doubtful.” On this point, Wiker says of Descartes, “Where there is disagreement, there is doubt, and where is doubt, throw it out.”

If philosophers from Socrates to Einstein viewed the accumulation of knowledge as a precious reservoir to be preserved for posterity, Descartes ridiculed knowledge (and tradition) as garbage to be discarded upon the ash heap of history. In America during the turbulent 1960s the Hippies’ philosophies, “Don’t trust anyone over 30,” “Go with the flow,” “Don’t be judgmental,” “Create your own reality,” were all an obeisance to the nihilistic skepticism of Descartes 250 years *before* Nietzsche. Wiker attacks Descartes’ singular statement of faith, *cogito ergo sum* and turns it

on its head: "So we should say, 'I am, therefore I can think,' rather than, 'I think, therefore I am.'" The common sense point is this: reality exists *before* our thinking, so that our thinking depends on reality . . . First, our thinking depends on the reality of our own existence. If we don't exist, we cannot think. Second, our thinking correctly depends on our properly conforming our minds to what really exists."

In the end, Descartes, like many narcissists, so-called "intellectuals," academics and scholars, doubted everything *but* his own method. Descartes deified subjectivism (perception is reality) and made it alone the standard of truth. Therefore, I think Descartes stole our humanity and reduced all civilization to an accidental conglomeration of cogs, springs, pistons, nuts, bolts, wheels—nothing more than machinery. Man was merely a ghost trapped inside this dreadful machine we call a human body. This was a precursor to Darwin's evolution theory that would come to us more than 200 years later. In Part V of his *Discourse*, Descartes, as the father of modern dualism, contradicted the Judeo-Christian understanding of man—body, soul, spirit contained in a body and viewed man "[as] two entirely different and independent entities, a ghostly soul banging around in a ghostly machine. The result of Descartes' dualism according to Wiker is that humans have become "a walking philosophical bipolar disorder."

What are the consequences of Descartes ideas upon society, culture and civilization in modern times? Wiker cites some grim policies that are directly related to the subjectivist philosophy of Descartes: "Harvest fetal embryos to prolong your life and destroy whatever you don't need just like according to a 2005 report in the British newspaper the Observer in post-Soviet Ukraine poor pregnant women were being paid about \$180 for their fetuses which abortion clinics then sold them for about \$9,000. The tissue was being used for beauty treatments."

This is the legacy of that Italian philosopher Machiavelli who separated morality from politics (I'll speak on him next week). This is also the legacy of French philosopher Descartes who devolved human life to a mere mechanism and who taught us that God is not real and we can do whatever we want without fear of Judgment Day. It was inevitable that the skepticism of Descartes would betray itself when skepticism questioned whether skepticism was a valid perspective at all. I'm convinced it was the diabolical and illogical ideas like those propagated by Descartes (skepticism, metaphysical subjectivism, dualism) that caused that great

Roman orator and statesman Cicero to lament: "There is nothing so absurd that it can't be said by a philosopher."

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 5

MACHIAVELLI IN THE HOUSE

July 19, 2008

Hence it is necessary to a prince, if he wants to maintain himself, to learn to be able not to be good.

~ Machiavelli

Prologue: Machiavelli in the hood

Today's column continues my review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's commendable opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 Others that didn't Help*. My critique will be on the very prominent Italian philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) and review his famous treatise on political statecraft, *The Prince* (1513). One of my earliest memories of Machiavelli was almost 20 years ago, in 1989. I was a law clerk for Che Ali Karega, a famous criminal defense attorney in Michigan. I have never met a man like Che either before or since. He appeared otherworldly to me. Although he came from the hard streets of Detroit like me, he was a real Renaissance man, a man of immense intellect, legal skill and cunning. Che is also very well-read. Within his home, amongst the medieval tapestries, stunning chandeliers, exquisite furniture, Persian rugs and priceless antiques, was perhaps one of the most substantive personal libraries I have ever encountered.

One of Che's favorite books was Machiavelli's *The Prince*. He even had an original Italian version, which he could translate at will. Che had committed to memory extended passages of Machiavelli's text, which he often quoted to me as I sat in beguiling amazement. Che would tell me how reading Machiavelli's *The Prince* helped him in the courtroom to make the odds better in his favor when he went up against the unlimited resources of the state in defense of his criminal clients. Most times he would win. When I would balk, Che would quickly retort: "Ellis, if you

were charged with a felony crime, wouldn't you want your attorney to use every weapon in his arsenal in your defense?" I grudgingly said yes.

Machiavelli in modern times

Conventional psychology states that we are all in a profound manner shaped by our own early experiences. Machiavelli was no different. He came of age at the ascendancy of the Renaissance where Italy was a collection of disparate, warring city-states—but Italy also was also ground zero for new, bold and revelatory ideas.

Below is a summary Wiker gives of Machiavelli's social and intellectual background:

❖ Machiavelli witnessed the greatest hypocrisy in religion, including cardinals and popes who were nothing more than political wolves in shepherds' clothing.

❖ Suspected of treason, Machiavelli was jailed, and to elicit a "confession" he was given the punishment of the strappado—his wrists bound together behind his back, lifted up into the air and violently dropped to the ground, pulling his arms out of his sockets. This was done several times.

❖ Other writers wrote of wicked leaders, but "what makes Machiavelli different is that he looked evil in the face and smiled. That friend smile and wink is 'The Prince.'"

❖ "Everyone understands that is it laudable . . . for a prince to keep faith, and to live with honesty. Are all rules good? Or does goodness, for a rule, merely mean being successful." An early precursor to pragmatism and moral relativism, right?

In Chapter 7 of *The Prince*, Machiavelli cites the rise to power of a historical figure that he knew, the ambitious Cesare Borgia. Borgia was a former cardinal who resigned so he could pursue political power and glory. He took over the province of Romagna, a "province . . . quite full of robberies, quarrels, and every other kind of insolence." To bring law and order to the renegade province of Romagna, Borgia sent out his strong man, Remirro de Orco, "a cruel and ready man, to whom he gave the fullest power. . . . If any cruelty had been committed, this had not come from him but from the harsh nature of his minister." Borgia showed his duplicitous nature when the people complained of de Orco's brutality.

Using Clintonian tactics of triangulation where you play both ends against the middle, later Borgia had Remirro cut into pieces to quell the

fickle crowd. Machiavelli, throughout "The Prince," praised Borgia's vicious rule as a form of leadership to be emulated. Christianity, said Wiker, was the religion that defined the culture Machiavelli was born into and the religion he rejected—it is never permissible to do evil in the service of good. Machiavelli's singular statement that summarizes his entire worldview—*The end justifies the means*—meant "no act is so evil that some necessity or benefit cannot mitigate it." This idea, Wiker says, has Machiavelli inextricably linked to atheism.

According to Wiker, Machiavelli believed "that it is not only permissible but also laudable to do evil so that good might come—one must reject God, the soul, and the afterlife. That is just what Machiavelli did, and that is the ultimate effect of his counsel." Wiker said, "Because Machiavelli discarded notions of good and evil in 'The Prince,' he could confidently call good evil and evil good. Don't guide your life by what is good, but what is effective. . . ." Wiker makes a profound connection of Machiavelli's work to the ancients and presents an analysis of how Machiavelli's ideas affect us in modern times. Writes Wiker:

Socrates argues that human beings must strive, above all to be good. Cicero's "On the Republic," argues much of the same as Plato [in his "Republic"]. Machiavelli's most important rejection of republics real and imagined was the Christian notion of heaven. This idea is further developed in his *Discourse on Livy* where he argues that the prospect of heaven ruins our attempts to make this life—our only real life—better. From the passage above, Wiker's analysis of Machiavelli gets directly to the precursors of modern liberalism and their humanist, man-centered worldview, particularly the environmentalist movement. I always wondered why liberals put such a high premium on making *this world* the be-all and end-all for humanity. Their obsession with creating a utopia on earth has its intellectual roots in Machiavelli.

Epilogue

Wiker tells the reader that Machiavelli sets up the grand conflict between modern secularism and Christianity that mainly delineates the next 500 years of Western history. Machiavelli contended that belief in metaphysical entities is a waste of time because such pursuits focuses our energies on a fantasy kingdom in the sky and thus prevents humanity from establishing real world peace, making earth a comfortable, even reasonably satisfying home, yea, even a utopia.

What does this tell us? Liberals, progressives, socialists, intellectuals, academics and others adopting Machiavelli's separation of morality from politics and the end justifies the means—both atheistic notions—have no other choice than to create a paradigm where metaphysical concerns are unconnected to public policy, and the only real and relevant heaven one needs to be concerned with is right here on earth. We can thank Machiavelli for separating politics from morality, which turned the rule of law into tyranny—also for deifying cruel, perverse, unconscious leaders, denigrating heaven and transforming it into a utopia on earth . . . thus making earth a living hell.

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 6

COMMUNISM THEN AND NOW [ON KARL MARX]

August 09, 2008

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle.

~ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" (1848)

Today's column continues my review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's fascinating opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 others that didn't Help*. My critique will be on Marxism's founder, Karl Marx, and the chief propagandist of communism, Friedrich Engels, and their celebrated book, *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848).

Wiker wastes no time in detailing the genocide with which Marx's communist philosophy has plagued society even to this day: "Never have so few pages done so much damage. The damage has for the most part already been accomplished, and Marxism itself (outside China) mainly stirs papers at academic conferences. But communism offered one heck of a lesson. On body count alone, 'The Communist Manifesto' could win the award for the most malicious book ever written . . . perhaps upwards of 100,000,000—even the tenured Marxists are a bit squeamish about tooting the Manifesto as a horn of plenty." Marxists and their supporters here in America and throughout the world will judge Wiker's argument linking Marxism to communism as specious because the two philosophies are different and distinct—that the former

is a theoretical construct and the latter an ideological application meant to replace capitalist nation-states.

I am not convinced of this historical revisionism, which allows Marxist scholars like Georg Lukacs, Antonio Gramsci, Herbert Marcuse, Jean-Paul Sartre, Louis Althusser, Cornel West the Democrat Party and others to use Marxism as a structure for examination but do not support a communist society. Wiker further states: "It was possible half a century ago (and even 20 years ago, among the academic elite) to maintain that Marxism was a positive force in history. But since the protective cover has blown off the Soviet Union—and China's has at least been torn—no one can look at the tens of millions of rotting corpses revealed and conclude anything other than this: *If 'The Communist Manifesto' had never been written, a great deal of misery would have been avoided.*"

Marx biographer Francis Wheen was seemingly defensive about the basic rational view of history showing an irrevocable link of Marxist theoretical ideas to Communist totalitarianism throughout the world: "Only a fool could hold Marx responsible for the Gulag; but there is, alas, a ready supply of fools. . . . Should philosophers be blamed for any and every subsequent mutilation of their ideas?" Karl Marx, wrote "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" in January 1848 for The Communist League under the proviso that, "A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism. . . . It is high time that communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the specter of communism with a Manifesto of the party itself."

Marxist communism has had a catastrophic effect upon every aspect of Western Civilization, even on something as pedestrian as property rights. Wiker noted: "The communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas. . . . In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." Wiker echoed the consensus of mainstream historians that Marx was an atheist and a materialist; that Marx's atheism and materialism were interconnected and inseparable in the delineation and application of his communist ideas. Wiker remarked, "The two go together; the denial of spiritual entities means the affirmation of all reality as purely material. What, then, is a human being? He is

an animal that, like every other animal, must provide for his own material well-being."

Historical revisionism has scrupulously tried to recast Marx in a more favorable light in modern times, especially as the body count for people murdered in communist regimes has reached over 100 million (and counting). Marx's ideas about the family were equally as egregious as his radical view on economics and class. Marx said, "The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement [the proletarian family] vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital. . . . The bourgeois claptrap about the family . . . about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of modern industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor."

Wiker notes: "According to Marx, the fulfillment of the communist dream requires the disappearance of an entirely corrupt class. There is no moral blame attached to the revolutionaries who exterminate this class, and there is certainly no God to keep accounts. So it's no surprise that communism advanced by epic brutality. Such is the danger of a bad idea." The most evil, pernicious, diabolical, tyrannical governments of men and the philosophies they ruled by were primarily the ones whose leaders were atheist, materialist and who didn't believe in sin or Judgment Day.

Free from the civilizational restraints that for over 2,500 were codified in the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought and culture, tyrannous despots were free to build their communist empires upon the corpses of those who not only disagreed with them, but paradoxically upon the corpses of the tens of millions of "useful idiots" that foolishly believed in Marxist communism propaganda and who were disposed of when their usefulness to their totalitarian masters expired. Such is the endless, ignominious and predictable refrain of despair, tragedy and genocide humanity has been subjected to as a litany of Marxist dictators entered the world's stage at the dawn of the 20th century—Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Beria, Mussolini, Mao, Hitler, Kim Il-Sung, Che Guevara, Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Pol Pot, Suharto and many others who skillfully exploited Marx and Engel's communist ideology to give intellectual legitimacy to their totalitarian regimes.

Some Western intellectuals sympathetic to Marxist thought have argued that Marx and Engels' *Communist Party Manifesto* is a purely theoretical work whose ideas were birthed in the quiet, monastic solitude of Europe's libraries; however, ideas are not stagnant. These were given birth, developed and ruthlessly applied in the perverted, wicked minds of the irredeemable tyrants cited above. That many socialists, liberals, progressives, academics, leftist intellectuals and communist sympathizers to this day continue to defend the general suppositions of communist thought as espoused by Marx and Engels (Cornel West's "non-Marxist socialism," for example) is to foolishly ignore the substantive aspects of Marxist communism—one of the most murderous and diabolical ideas of the 20th century.

One of the memorable quotes by that great literary titan and a courageous foe of communism, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (1918-2008), who left this mortal plain last Sunday, uttered these prescient words regarding the intrinsic qualities of Marxist communism: *Communism will always be totalitarian and violent, wherever it is practiced. There was nothing special in the Russian conditions which affected the outcome.*

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 7

IT'S ALL ABOUT PLEASURE? [ON JOHN STUART MILL]

August 16, 2008

The ultimate end [of utilitarianism] . . . is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments.

~ John Stuart Mill

Today's column continues my review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's attractive opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 others that didn't Help*. My critique will be on the British philosopher John Stuart Mill's treatise on ethical theory titled, *Utilitarianism* (1863). John Stuart Mill (1806-73), a well-known British philosopher and intellectual, is more famously known for his book *On Liberty*, which considers utility as the final appeal on all ethical concerns. Mill is best-known for the fact that he distilled and synthesized to the masses the ideas of the father of utilitarianism, British jurist and legal philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832). Mill

inherited his atheism from his father, James Mill, a philosopher in his own right and a social reformer who, according to Wiker, felt that he was “liberated from the ‘irrationalities’ of faith [and] believed with immoderate intensity that the entire destiny and happiness of humanity rested upon his own efforts. A very dangerous man indeed.”

Like many modern-day atheists, James Mill makes a fatal philosophical error: “He found it impossible to believe that a world so full of evil was the work of an Author [God] combining infinite power with perfect goodness and righteousness.” James Mill would test his atheist theories upon his young, precocious son, John Stuart, who claims in his own autobiography that his father made him learn Greek at age 3, Latin at 8 and forbade him to play with other children, especially other boys. Thus young Mill was robbed of the stabilizing qualities of parental love, either from of his domineering father or from his aloof, Victorian mother. These traits are present in Mill’s treatise *Utilitarianism* (1863) where he sought to expand upon the work of his mentor, Bentham, who Wiker said was “another atheist [who] gave the world the notion that morality didn’t need God; it needed only a good ledger to balance out pleasures and pains. Morality was merely a matter of calculating the greatest possible happiness for the greatest possible number.”

Regarding young Mill’s bizarre background and the extent his overbearing father would shape his son’s mind, in an earlier column on Rousseau I noted the common traits shared among the world’s most noted philosophers and intellectuals. I made the following connections:

Interestingly, many of the worlds’ great philosophers and intellectuals were atheists and crafted a quasi-autobiographical philosophy based on their own horrific childhood, life experiences and personal policy prejudices. Some of the commonalities among the leading philosophers are these: an absent, cruel or weak father, a predilection toward atheism, materialism, humanism, naturalism, but most notably, an irrational and visceral hatred of the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought.

James Mill and his young genius experiment, John Stuart Mill, embody these traits to the letter. Wiker quotes Mill: “From the winter of 1821, when I first read Bentham, I had what might truly be called an object in life; to be a reformer of the world. My conception of my own happiness was entirely identified with this object.” This object was “Utility, or the Greatest Happiness Principle.” Since Bentham and Mill didn’t be-

lieve in original sin, the happiness principle was what they invented to take the place of morality, Christianity and truth.

Wiker called Bentham, Mill and other utilitarians "comfortable atheists in that they wanted all the moral benefits of Christianity, except without the Christianity part . . . who took the fruits of centuries of Christian moral formation for granted even as they cheerfully chopped down the tree that had born them." Mill admits that utilitarianism was not unique. It originally came from the Greek Sophist philosopher Epicurus (341-270 B.C.). Of this Greek philosopher from classical antiquity Wiker commented, "Epicurus was an atheist convinced that all the world's evils were caused by religion, and therefore religion needed to be swept like rubbish off the historical stage." (Can you say separation of church and state?)

Epicurus believed that since the world existed from eternity, there is no need for gods to create it. All is material, which was due to random forces—thus Epicurus was the real father of evolution, not Darwin. Epicurus synthesized his philosophy with this double equation Wiker cited: Good = Pleasure, Evil = Pain. Bentham and later Mill (James and John) borrowed heavily from Epicurus' ideas on atheism, materialism and pleasure, and despite the myriad of errors in logic of the above equation, repackaged them under the rubric of utilitarianism. Moreover they applied the philosophical speculations of Epicurus to every conceivable aspect of culture and society, which Wiker contends has had disastrous consequences upon Western Civilization. On this point, the hippies, anarchists and radicals of the countercultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s come to mind.

"If morality is reduced to pleasure and pain," Wiker noted, "anything that experiences pleasure and pain must be included in the moral calculation. But here's the contradiction in logic. Once we add the entire sentient population of every fish, fowl, reptile, amoeba, gorilla and so forth, the task of ranking and balancing pleasures and pains becomes impossible." (Can you say radical environmentalism and animal rights?) Wiker ended his analysis of Mill in this manner: "The problem is that Mill, being an atheist, did not see how deep evil runs. He believed his declaration of war on merely *natural* evils was enough to rid the world of all evil. Preventing heart attacks is all well and good, but there is more that ails the human heart."

This characterization created a foreseeable dilemma that Mill seemed oblivious to but which Wiker skillfully delineated in this manner: "Mill, however, was too short-sighted to see it [the nature of evil]. He could not envision, for example, the most likely outcome of utilitarianism: that it would lead to a society addicted to ever more intense, barbaric and self-destructive pleasures, and that its members would be gibbering cowards in the face of even the smallest pains." Mill's obscure little book with the funny title has done much harm to society in modern times by reviving the ancient Greek philosophy of Epicureanism. While I am not a prude and I enjoy pleasurable pursuits just like any normal person, obsessively seeking pleasure above God, above family, above rational impulses has and will continue to lead to the destruction of once-great nations. I hope America will return from the precipice of the abyss before it is too late.

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 8

ROUSSEAU AND THE SAVAGENESS OF HUMANITY

June 28, 2008

Savages are not evil precisely because they do not know what it is to be good.

~ Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Prologue

Today's column continues my review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's excellent and timely opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 Others that didn't Help*. Here, I will do a critique on the great French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78) and his famous treatise, "Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men" (1755). Interestingly, many of the worlds' great philosophers and intellectuals were atheists and crafted a quasi-autobiographical philosophy based on their own horrific childhood, life experiences and personal policy prejudices. Some of the commonalities among the leading philosophers are these: an absent, cruel or weak father, a predilection toward atheism, materialism, humanism, naturalism, but most notably, an irrational and visceral hatred of the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought.

Rousseau's early life

Take Rousseau, for example. Below is a summary of his early years that are inextricably linked to his own philosophy rooted in naturalism, humanism and sexual egalitarianism:

- ❖ He signed his Discourse, "Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Citizen of Geneva." Though he spent much of his life in France, he never felt comfortable there. Rousseau, because of his radical ideas (provoking the church, the monarchy and the state), was essentially a man without a country.
- ❖ Rousseau's mother died a few days after his birth in 1712 when he was then raised by an aunt and his erratic father, an itinerant watchmaker who only stayed with his wife two years before she died.
- ❖ A fugitive from justice, Rousseau's father fled the law, abandoning young Rousseau for good by age 10. Rousseau would tragically follow in his father's footsteps, abandoning all five of his children to the orphanage shortly after their births (a virtual death sentence at that time).
- ❖ Rousseau was socially awkward, sickly, unstable and, without the guidance of a father, bounced around from job to job. He hated work and despised even the slightest bit of authority; therefore, his education was largely autodidactic (self-taught).
- ❖ Rousseau loved romance and crafted his own perverse, sophisticated version of natural law where he could take advantage of as many maidens as physically possible with his bizarre, hedonistic notions contained in his "state of nature" philosophy.

Rousseau the philosopher

In 1750, Rousseau entered a writing competition sponsored by the Academy of Dijon. His essay, which won him the first prize, was titled, "Discourse on the Sciences and Arts." The question was proposed: Has the restoration of the sciences and arts tended to purify morals? Rousseau answered "No." Rousseau believed in the natural goodness of humanity and argued, "The more civilized we become, the more corrupt we become." While the government and laws provide for our safety, they take away our "original liberty," so that we become "happy slaves" with "delicate and refined taste," who have a "softness character and urbanity of customs" that give "the semblance of all the virtues without the possession of any."

Rousseau's second discourse, *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*, extended his argument made in the first. The question the Academy of Dijon asked was this: "What is the origin of

inequality among men, and is it authorized by natural law?" Wiker calls Rousseau's work "a cornucopia of profound confusion." Nevertheless, in this opus we find "the seeds of Romanticism and folk-nationalism, the French Revolution and totalitarianism, Marx and Nietzsche, Freud and Darwin, modern anthropology and Margaret Mead, the sexual revolution and the dissolution of family—all marked with what is characteristically Rousseau: genius and blunder."

Following the theory proposed in the first discourse, Rousseau in the second discourse seeks to trace man's origins to a "state of nature." "The philosophers who have examined the foundations of society have all felt the necessity of going back to the state of nature, but none of them has reached it," proclaimed Rousseau. I wrote an earlier essay on Hobbes' philosophy where this state of nature theory was initially proposed. Rousseau craftily avoids being accused of heresy by the church authorities with such well-placed disclaimers as "setting all the facts aside" and "must not be taken for historical truths, but only for hypothetical and conditional reasoning." Wiker characterizes this tactic as Rousseau bowing to "Machiavellian duplicity." That despite the historical and anthropological knowledge at the time Rousseau lived in (the mid-1700s).

This important point by Wiker on the actual *technique* of philosophy brings us to the following observation:

We stress this because it proves to be a pattern for many modern intellectuals. Their imaginations run away with them, and they run away with their imaginations. They fashion a utopia in the distance, either in the mists of the distant past or the sunlit slopes of the distant future. By the power of their words, they drive otherwise sane and healthy men and women to waste their own lives and countless other, sometimes to the ruination of their countries.

Rousseau wanted to throw off the boundaries of all morality, including the rule of law. "The artificial chains of society did not exist in the state of nature"; therefore, "each man there" was "free of the yoke." In Rousseau, one can *see* the ghoulish shadows of Marx and Hegel arising from the abyss and *hear* the primeval cry of the communist proletariat—"WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!" Wiker made the wise observation that "Rousseau and Marx lead in opposite directions, one back and the other forward. What for Rousseau was a sign of decay became for Marx a sign of progress." These two philosophers' views are two sides of

the same coin, which when placed into the vending machine you receive the same thing: societal chaos, destruction of the family and genocide.

Epilogue

Wiker concludes his chapter on Rousseau with this prescient observation in the context of his place in the history of political philosophy: "As with Hobbes, we see again the power of fiction. Rousseau's account of natural man was no more real than Hobbes', but following the same pattern, once it became the accepted story of human origins, it thereby exercised the power of a self-fulfilling prophecy. In imagining Rousseau to be right, *we have become what Rousseau imagined.*" Rousseau, was a brilliant, self-taught philosopher whose ideas for good or evil (mostly evil) have had an indelible impact on future philosophers, intellectuals and political movements, including the American Revolution (which rejected Rousseau), the French Revolution (which embraced Rousseau in part), Darwin, Marx, Hegel, Freud, Lenin, Heidegger, Nietzsche, Mead, Jean-Paul Sartre, the Counter-Cultural Revolution, the Feminist Movement and beyond.

Once at a dinner party, Scottish novelist, historian and sometime philosopher Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), replying to one of the guests who chided Carlyle for thinking about ideas too much, had this succinct response, "There was once a man called Rousseau who wrote a book containing nothing but ideas. The second edition was bound in the skins of those who laughed at the first." Although Rousseau championed the idea of the natural goodness of humanity, in my humble opinion his books and philosophy in total have lead to the utter savageness of humanity.

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 9

NIETZSCHE AND THE DAMNATION OF IDEAS

June 14, 2008

For Heidegger and Nietzsche alike, good and evil were childish notions. What matters is will and choice. Self-assertion was the highest value.

~ Jonah Goldberg, "Liberal Fascism" (2007)

Dr. Benjamin Wiker has written an outstanding and timely book titled: *10 Books that Screwed up the World: And 5 Others that Didn't Help*. Besides reviewing books by Machiavelli, Hobbes, Descartes, Rousseau, Marx, Engels, Darwin, Hitler, Mead, Kinsey and other writers, Wiker, in Chapter 8, gives the reader an engaging critique of the book "Beyond Good and Evil" by the great German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. "Nietzsche is in the air," wrote a New York Times editorial in 1910, "whatever one reads of a speculative kind one is sure to come across the name Nietzsche sooner or later." While Nietzsche during his lifetime was the epitome of the frustrated artist, his work achieved worldwide notoriety shortly after his death on the eve of World War I—particularly in America, where his ideas were made accessible to the masses by Walter Kaufmann's popular English translations of Nietzsche's work.

The early 1900s witnessed such an intoxicating allure of Nietzsche's ideas over America and throughout the West, that Jonah Goldberg in his excellent new book, *Liberal Fascism*, chronicled, "A week before America joined the war, Walter Lippmann (who would later write much of [President] Wilson's 14 Points) promises that hostilities would bring out a 'transvaluation of values as radical as anything in the history of intellect.'" Herbert Croly, editor and progressive standard bearer of the New Republic, affirmed the radical zeitgeist of Nietzsche writing that "this [WWI] was a transparent invocation of Nietzsche's call for overturning *all* traditional morality." Croly and Lippmann were protégées of William James—father of American pragmatism who in turn was influenced by Italian pragmatism (Mussolini). The philosophical lineage was unbroken—James, Lippmann, Croly, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, H.L. Mencken, liberals, progressives, academics, socialists, artists and

intellectuals pre-World War II, were all in one way or another greatly influenced by the writings and ideas of Nietzsche.

British historian Paul Johnson, in *Modern Times*, wrote:

Nietzsche's Will to Power would produce a new kind of messiah, uninhibited by any religious sanctions whatsoever and with an unappeasable appetite for controlling mankind. The end of the old order, with an unguided world adrift in a relativistic universe, was a summons to such gangster-statesman to emerge. They were not slow to make their appearance.

Johnson masterfully places Nietzsche's radical philosophical ideas in the context of modern times. Although he died in 1900, it was as if Nietzsche were a 20th century prophet regarding his keen understanding of the cataclysmic events to come. On this point, Wiker said that Nietzsche "so accurately predicted the transmutation of faith into political zealotry and the totalitarian will to power."

Wiker further commented that according to Nietzsche: "The person who can impose his likes and dislikes on everybody else thereby defines good and evil." Wiker saw Nietzsche's work in totalizing context—"Life itself is essentially appropriation, injury, over powering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of one's own forms, incorporation and at least, at its mildest, exploitation." In Nietzsche's writings you can almost *hear* the Nazi Brownshirts goose-stepping down the boulevard. When I read Nietzsche, I can almost see the genocidal tyrants as they enter the stage of the 20th century—Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini all read Nietzsche. The Nazis utilized many philosophical ideas of Nietzsche, but did so selectively; this association with National Socialism caused Nietzsche's reputation to suffer following the Second World War.

In his book, Goldberg said that "Nietzsche's 'Beyond Good and Evil' issued the call for a world ruled solely by the 'Will to Power.'" This self-asserting philosophy has come to us in modern times most egregiously in the Holocaust, but also subsequent social upheavals, including the pro-abortion, pro-euthanasia and anti-senior citizen movements popular in America and throughout Europe and Asia, particularly China's "One Child" policy. Regarding Darwin's survival of the fittest theory, Wiker rightly noted that if Darwin emphasized *survival*, then Nietzsche emphasized *the fittest*. Nietzsche believed in an *Übermensch*—a superman, a master race that would ruthlessly rule over all the other inferior races. This theory contains a master/slave paradigm. Nietzsche called one part

master morality—whatever is strong and great is good, whatever is weak and trivial is bad. And the other part was called *slave morality*—the attempt by the weaker races towards self-preservation and to make themselves as comfortable as possible. “Nietzsche considered Christianity to be (at least in certain respects) a species for slave morality and hence a cause of the West’s degradation. . . . Christian charity has worked . . . to worsen the European race,” according to Wiker.

Do ideas have consequences? Do damnable, evil ideas have damnable and evil consequences? If so, then a unbiased view of 20th century history would have to link Nietzsche’s “Will to Power” directly to World War I, but more directly to Hitler’s Third Reich, World War II and the Holocaust. Hitler, Hess, Rohm, Goering, Bormann, Himmler, Heydrich and all of the top Nazi officers venerated Nietzsche’s radical ideas of *Urbarmenschen* and modeled their Third Reich on his grim philosophical speculations. The consequence of Nietzsche’s damnation of ideas was his own personal, protracted descent into madness beginning in January 1889—his perhaps syphilitic-derived dementia so completely cast him into despair that his daily ranting and ravings were: “I am dead because I am stupid. . . . I am stupid because I am dead.”

Regarding the popular “political correctness” movement that dominates the modern academy, politics, culture and civil discourse where one cannot even tell the truth about anything for fear of offending someone, Nietzsche howled against that immature view in his own inimitable style—“Niceness [political correctness] is what is left of goodness when it is drained of greatness.” Where will Nietzsche’s Will to Power take a people, a society, a nation, a world that has long since disposed with the inconvenient niceties of Christianity and morality? Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Mao, Ho Chi Mihn, Pol Pot, Edi Amin, Osama bin Laden, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, North Korea, Syria, Iran, the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have given us a glimpse into the abyss, and it is not very hopeful.

British historian Paul Johnson wrote about Nietzsche and his indelible place in history: “The greatest event of recent times—that ‘God is dead,’ that the belief in the Christian God is no longer tenable—is beginning to cast its first shadows over Europe.” Nietzsche, admittedly, was a brilliant and influential philosopher, but because his ideas are rooted in atheism, humanism, Social Darwinism, eugenics and nihilism, the latter of which is an extreme view that there is no need for values and no justi-

fication for good, evil or morality, in the end he can only offer society perpetual war, genocide, utter despair and no future hope of eternal life with God, because Nietzsche declared, "God is dead."

America, we can do better than Nietzsche . . . can't we?

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 10

SYMPOSIUM — BLACK DEMOCRATS AND 'BATTERED WIFE SYNDROME'

January 19, 2008

A crazy person is one who does the same thing over and over again expecting different results.

~ Albert Einstein

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form *dialectic*—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates (psychologist)
- ❖ Jowakka (aka "Baby Girl"), a metaphor for black liberal Democrat voters
- ❖ Franklin Clinton (a synthesis of the two most popular Democrat presidents)
- ❖ Big Mama (Jowakka's "uneducated" but wise grandmother who raised her)

Prologue

Socrates: We are here gathered today at my academy to discuss politics, political alliances and how for good or for evil they can affect a person, a people, a race, a nation and control their collective destiny. Today we will discuss the following question—Why have black people in America

faithfully voted for liberal Democrats at more than 92 percent, yet year after year for more than 76 years bitterly decry that . . .

Jowakka: "The Democratic Party is disrespecting us, using us, abusing us—taking our vote for granted?!"

Part 1: The psychologist office Dr. Socrates (to Jowakka): I sat with you week after week, holding your hands in solidarity, month after month, weeping with you through boxes of Kleenex, year after year since 1932, for 76 years, vowing that *this* would be the last year, that you would never be disrespected, taken for granted, used and abused again. You swore that *this* year, 2008, would be different. You would look at yourself in the mirror and say, "This is it!" "Enough is enough!" "You're better than this!" . . . or are you?

Part 2: The familiar fist vs. the vote?

Jowakka: (To Franklin Clinton) But then you drove by my house wearing that fragrance that I love so much on you (Liberalism No. 5), your hair coiffed just so, your suit tailored just for your body. You took me out to the restaurant *you said* was my favorite place to eat—Burger King. You even outdid yourself this time and got me some extra cheese on *my* Whopper. You promised me that 2008 would be different. No more abuse. No more familiar fist that you would be true and faithful to me, to me alone . . . that's what you said on Tuesday . . .

But I saw you again in her arms on Friday, gaily strolling down the boulevard going into "The Pump Room"—a high-class restaurant in Chicago that don't even sale cheeseburgers. This was the last straw! I'm voting for another man this year, but who? Who can I trust? What politician can I believe in who won't take me for granted and abuse me without fear . . . who won't lie to me year after year?

Part 3: The wisdom of Big Mama's house

Jowakka: That weekend I drove down South to Big Mama's house way out in the country. She'll tell me what's what. She has so much wisdom for a woman that only finished grade school. Surely she will have the answers for me . . . for thee . . . for my liberty.

Big Mama: Hey Baby Girl, is that you!?

Jowakka: Yes, Big Mama. It's me, your Baby Girl. How are you?

Big Mama: What's wrong Baby Girl . . . ? That man done broke your heart again, didn't he? With all his high-fallut'n promises—

Franklin Clinton: "Baby, I'm going to give you *this*, Baby, I'm going to give you *that* . . . Baby, I'm going to give you the WORLD!"

Big Mama: Where is Franklin Clinton now, Baby Girl?

Jowakka: (In tears of anguish) Big Mama, you were right. What can I do to heal my past to change my life, my destiny? (Big Mama kept right on rocking in her tree swing and gazed heavenward in a blissful expression, then looking at her granddaughter in a rather severe manner saying ...)

Big Mama: What's your grandfather's name?

Jowakka: (*Condescending tone*) I thought to myself, Big Mama must be hard of hearing or getting old. Poor Big Mama, she didn't even hear my question, or if she heard it, she didn't understand it. As I repeated my initial question, Big Mama interrupted . . .

Big Mama: I heard you the first time! "It doesn't say 'stupid' here!" (pointing to her forehead). Will you answer *my* question? She asked sternly.

Jowakka: I'm so sorry, Big Mama. My grandfather's name was Theodore Roosevelt Cowser. Why do you ask? Grandfather's been dead for more than 25 years.

Big Mama: Baby Girl, I'm just tryin' to answer your question. You said you want a change in your life, that you are tired of being used and abused. You said, "What can I do to heal my past, to change my destiny?" Your grandfather was born in September 1902. His father named him after a great man who was president at his birth and one of our greatest presidents. His face is even carved in that great big monument, right?

Jowakka: Yes, Mount Rushmore, Big Mama. It's in South Dakota.

Big Mama: That's right, Baby Girl. What political party was Theodore Roosevelt, Democrat or Republican?

Jowakka: Republican, Big Mama.

Big Mama: And what political party helped fight against the evils of slavery, the Klu Klux Klan, who supported the Abolitionists, Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, Harriett Tubman, Abraham Lincoln, Booker T. Washington and all the great black leaders *before* 1933—before FDR so completely and utterly beguiled our people with the false god of big government?

Jowakka: Republicans, Big Mama.

Big Mama: Then why do our people year, after year, after year, after year vote for liberal Democrats, the party that gladly sacrificed hundreds of thousands of their *own* sons of the South to keep you and your people

slaves forever? The party that to this day think of you as third-class citizens and since FDR's "New Deal" and Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" programs, spent trillions of dollars making policies to keep you in poverty, uneducated, unemployed, ignorant, imprisoned, drunk, drugged-up, frustrated, angry, pathological and most importantly . . . dependent on "Masser Big Government"?

Jowakka: Democrats, Big Mama.

Part 4: The choice

Socrates: Indeed, well stated Big Mama. Let us hear the conclusion of the matter. Jowakka, if you truly want a change in your *life*, then you must change your *thinking*. Forsake Franklin Clinton, for he will only pimp you, abort you, use you, abuse you and make you his slave. Put away that familiar fist. Consider a divorce and eventually dating other people, considering other ideas. Ideas won't kill you, but you may find the one thing your people have been longing for in vain these 76 years since the political idolatry of FDR—life, liberty and the *pursuit* of happiness.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 11

SYMPOSIUM—3 LEGENDS FACE JUDGMENT DAY

November 24, 2007

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form, *dialectic*—starting from a thesis or a question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view in order to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

All that is not eternal is eternally forgotten.

~ C. S. Lewis

All that is not eternal is eternally irrelevant.

~ Ellis Washington (a paraphrase of C. S. Lewis)

In 1982, Professor Peter Kreeft wrote a fascinating book in dialogue style about a date that will live in infamy—Nov. 22, 1963. I want to revisit that opus in a modern light. Most Americans more than 50 years old would be able to make an intrinsic connection to that date if for no other reason than that being the date of the assassination of the exceedingly adored President John F. Kennedy (1917-63). However, there were two other famous men who died on that fateful day—each one just as notable in his own right than the beloved JFK, namely, Aldous Huxley (1894-1963), that pre-eminent scientist, writer and grandson of the indefatigable disciple of Darwinian evolution, Thomas Huxley, and C.S. Lewis (1898-1963), that august Medieval and Renaissance scholar, Cambridge professor, and foremost Christian apologist.

For the uninitiated Nov. 22, 1963, was only one date in an otherwise troublesome time geopolitically. The Cold War between the Soviet Union and the U.S. had been going at full bore for almost 20 years. Satellite nations severed as the new battlefields where the Cold War became hot (the Soviet-bloc States, Israel, Korea, Germany, Vietnam, Taiwan, Bolivia, Cuba, Turkey, Argentina)—an era that metaphorically speaking had the world sitting like a powder keg ready to explode in a nuclear holocaust at any moment.

Just as the world was poised for self-annihilation, five little words were whispered from heaven like a refrain in a song that you can't get out of your mind—*"And it came to pass."* Indeed, Nov. 22, 1963, came and passed, and the world was less three men, but not just three ordinary men, three famous men, but not just three famous men, nay, but three intellectual Titans; three purveyors of three distinct worldviews or philosophy of life—Huxley (= *pantheism*) God is in everything and (= *atheism*) there is no God; Kennedy (= *humanism*) or the idea that man (not God) is the center of all things; C.S. Lewis (= *theism*) the idea that God is the center and creator of all things and will have the final word in everything at the last judgment.

{Setting: Heaven, Date: Nov. 22, 1963}

Narrator: And it came to pass that Huxley, Kennedy and C.S. Lewis died and appeared before the judgment throne of God. There also appeared at this time the sons of God, the angelic host, and Satan appeared with them. And God turned to the angel, the keeper of the Book of Life, wherein all the names were written of every person that ever lived.

God: Let the Books be opened! Aldous Huxley, come forth!

Huxley: {tentative, very afraid} Wh-wh-wh-who are you? Ar-ar-ar-are you G-G-G-God?

God: {silence}

Satan: {the accuser, the prosecutor} Huxley belongs to me now, God. Send him to me! He rejected your advocate. He mocked your Redeemer for his sins. Send him to my domain.

Huxley: {incredulous} B-B-B-But- you can't be God. I am a pantheist. I believed god was all, all was god. God was in everything. God was an ant; god was a rock; god was a tree . . . god was pee; god was me; god was all in all. To cover my bases, I also believed in atheism. There is no god. You must be a figment of my imagination. . . . This can't be happening to me said I to thee. You can't be real . . . can't you see?

God: Open the Book of Life!

Narrator: Here Huxley's entire life, from the time he breached the matrix of his mother, to his last breath on earth, is played before him, before the sons of God, the angelic host, Satan and before his two other companions in death.

God: Do you deserve to rest in my paradise or hell?

Huxley: Paradise? I still can't believe I am witnessing all of this. God, I didn't realize that the Bible was the word of God. I thought that man wrote the Bible. That God was a myth only believed by the gullible, the ignorant and the superstitious; therefore, from my youth until now I rejected a theistic worldview. Like Judge Richard A. Posner I believed that "nothing could be ascertained or ascertainable outside of one's own sensory perceptions."

God: Since you failed to believe in anything outside of *your* sensory perceptions, you willingly rejected my offer of salvation through mine only begotten Son. I AM that I AM, and besides me there is none other. Now, Huxley, tell me who was your god in the other realm?

Huxley: It was Charles Darwin. Darwin was my god. His book, "The Origin of Species," was my Bible. My grandfather, Thomas Huxley, was Darwin's most devoted and fanatical disciple, and he meticulously indoctrinated me in the philosophy of atheism, naturalism and scientism. I believed with all my mind in Darwin's theory of the materialistic origins of all matter through the naturalistic process of evolution, natural selection and material generation; that evolutionary phenomena took place very slowly, over billions and billions of years. To me and my genera-

tion, God was irrelevant. Like that brilliant German philosopher, Nietzsche, I believed the big lie of my era that "God is dead."

God: Indeed. Am I dead? {*profound silence*} You are a scientist, are you not? Why then would you believe such theories, such obscene lies, without empirical evidence?

Huxley: Lord, because evolution satisfied my own twisted ideas of how things *ought* to be. Evolution beguiled us. Evolution complied with my generation's perverted ideas of hedonism. Through evolution, I sought selfish pleasures at every opportunity and didn't care whom I hurt along the way. Yet, we were not content. We wanted more, more, more! We wanted a "scientific" justification to indulge our hedonistic lusts, to commit fornication at-will and found it in the damnable lie of evolutionary theory which was now legitimized by the new high priests of the 20th century—university presidents, provosts, deans and their Brownshirts—the false prophets we called "professors," who all lived and worked in the pagan temple we called "The Academy."

God: Judgment passed. Kennedy, come forth! {turning to the angel} Open the Book of Life!

Narrator: Like Huxley before him, here Kennedy's entire life is replayed before him, before the sons of God, the angelic host, Satan, and before his two other companions in death. Every jot and tittle of his life is reviewed from his breach from the matrix of his mother, to the assassin's bullet which seized his brief, mythical life.

God: Do you deserve to rest in my paradise or hell?

Kennedy: Lord, like Huxley, I categorically rejected the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. Although I was born Catholic, church was just a meaningless tradition that made my mother and America's mothers feel good. God, the Bible, church were all irrelevant to my worldview. I was my own god, and as "god" I lusted for power. I lusted for women. I even dated a Russian spy. Later, I dated a Hollywood starlet and during pillow talk told both of them sensitive national secrets that potentially could have put millions of American lives in jeopardy.

Lord God, I lied incessantly. I did all manner of infamy to stay in power. I made treacherous deals with the mafia to get elected president, then immediately appointed my brother, RFK as my attorney general to prosecute the mafia in a series of highly publicized hearings. What did I care? I was from one of the richest, most powerful and politically con-

nected families in America. I was educated at the best schools—Choate Preparatory, Princeton, Harvard, Stanford. What did I need God for? I believed in humanism—that *man* was the center of all things. I loved living my life, my lie. My way. My theme song, which “Ole Blue Eyes,” Frank Sinatra himself sang at my presidential coronation, was indeed my worldview—I *did it my way*.

But there was more infamy: the PT Boat 109 affair of World War II. My father, “Mr. Fix,” pressured his contacts in the liberal propaganda media and turned my appalling catastrophe—into an occasion where the Navy brass awarded me a prestigious medal for heroism, and that is why I never spoke of that medal in public. Despite my father’s Machiavellian tactics, I knew I didn’t deserve that military honor. It was all a sham; a very pathetic spectacle indeed designed for me to be my father’s surrogate and to fulfill *his* perverted ambition to be president of the United States.

And there was more infamy. We were taught by our father, Joseph Sr., that the world revolved around the Kennedy Klan. Kennedy’s could *do* anything. Kennedy’s could *be* anything. Kennedy’s could have anything our hearts lusted after. It was all a lie. This tragic lie brought a generational curse upon all Kennedys that exists even until this day. {*pause*}

Satan: {the accuser and with bitter sarcasm} Kennedy used you God! To him Lord you were only a tag line his handlers inserted at the end of his speeches to placate the gullible masses; the “useful idiots” who worshipped Kennedy because he was young, tall, rich, strong, handsome, a Harvard graduate and had the most glamorous wife in the world. Yes, he is indeed a KENNEDY! Send him to my domain, Lord. He belongs to me now! Kennedy despised your advocate. Kennedy has no Redeemer for his sins.

God: Judgment passed. C.S. Lewis, come forth! Open the Book of Life!

Narrator: Like Huxley and Kennedy before him, C.S. Lewis’s entire life, when he breached the matrix of his mother to his last breath, is played before him, the sons of God, the angelic host, Satan and his two other companions in death.

God: Do you deserve to rest in my paradise or hell?

C.S. Lewis: Lord, I definitely deserve hell!

Huxley & Kennedy: {incredulous, in unison} What?! But this cannot be! We know about the life of C.S. Lewis after he gave his heart to Christ as

his Savior. We know about how C.S. Lewis became one of the greatest champions of *theism*—the philosophy that God is the center of all things. We know about how C.S. Lewis was *the* expert in Christian apologetics. We know about how C.S. Lewis bested in debate every atheist, agnostic, socialist, communist, liberal and academic that ever dared to challenge him.

We know about his brilliant mind and how C.S. Lewis wrote many, many, many great books proclaiming to the world the verity of Judeo-Christian thought and that all others philosophies of man—paganism, liberalism, fatalism, deism, relativism, positivism, hedonism, evolution, communism, socialism, egalitarianism, scientism, atheism, agnosticism, cultism, naturalism, feminism, Islam and all forms of pseudo-Christianity, were deceptions from the father of all lies, Satan, which C.S. Lewis systematically refuted, point by point, line by line, precept by precept . . . How can Lewis deserve to go to hell?

Satan: {profound silence}

God: "It is written there is *none* righteous, no not one." (Romans 3:10) "For *all* have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23). "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus" (Romans 6:23).

Huxley & Kennedy: You mean none of those other "isms" will get us into heaven?—Not Huxley's pantheism? Not atheism? Not Kennedy humanism? Not hedonism? Not any of the great works we have done on behalf of humanity!?

C.S. Lewis: I remember George MacDonald telling me on one occasion—"No, there is no escape. There is no heaven with a little of hell in it—No place to retain this or that of the devil in our hearts or our pockets. Out Satan must go, every hair and feather!"

Christ: It is written, "*I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me*" (John 14:6). As a man, C.S. Lewis is no better than Huxley or Kennedy, nor any other person in the world including the most wicked men that ever lived—Nimrod, Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, Haman, Attila the Hun, Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot, Edi Amin, Saddam Hussein, the Iranian Mullahs, Osama bin Laden. C.S. Lewis believed *my* words, and thus will enjoy eternal life. You believed in *your* own gods for salvation which cannot deliver and therefore will suffer eternal damnation in the abyss, in hell and finally in

the lake of fire, for you have no advocate to defend your case, no Redeemer for your sins.

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 12

SYMPOSIUM — A SOCRATIC DIALOGUE ON GREATNESS

July 21, 2007

Mediocrities, I absolve you, everyone, for I am your champion!

~ Salieri (Movie "Amadeus" [1984])

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, Plato taught Aristotle, and Aristotle taught Alexander the Great. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form "dialectic"—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates
- ❖ George Washington
- ❖ Thomas Jefferson
- ❖ Abraham Lincoln
- ❖ Theodore Roosevelt
- ❖ Attorney ACLU

{Setting: Mount Rushmore, S.D., 2007}

Socrates: This symposium is held here today at Mount Rushmore, at the base of this colossal monument to America's four greatest presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt. It is a rare occasion for men so fabulously enshrined in stone to have the opportunity to view this tribute to their greatness in person, yet here we are.

Washington: Socrates, I have never been comfortable talking about myself and even less comfortable talking about my so-called "greatness." When called upon by my country during our greatest hour of peril, I did my duty to fight the tyranny of King George III, to secure liberty for her people. I love America. I have no regrets.

Attorney ACLU: {as the Accuser} No regrets? Secure liberty? How do you justify your crimes against humanity, your genocide against black people by enslaving them like animals?

Washington: {silence}

Socrates: Indeed. You must first tell us why this day does America allow an average of 1.5 million abortions annually and 40-53 million abortions worldwide? Why have between 40-50 million abortions occurred in America alone since *Roe v. Wade* (1973)? —This, in a country that in your own Declaration of Independence promised each of her citizens “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness?” Why, Mr. ACLU?

Attorney ACLU: {indignant} B-B-B-But, but, but, but abortions are an entirely different issue than slavery.

Socrates: I agree if by different you mean in the *manner* of execution. However, the public policy is the same: One person, the slave master with slavery and one woman/Supreme Court justice with abortion, has the legal authority to kill another human being, correct, Attorney ACLU?

Attorney ACLU: {profound silence}

Socrates: {turning to Jefferson} President Jefferson, will you answer the question: How does a man become a great president?

Jefferson: I was considered “great” by today’s historians for I was a man of letters, a man of culture, music, architecture, archaeology, paleontology, horticulture, politics, a statesman, author, inventor, a secular Renaissance man—a humanist. To a degree I was all these things, yet revisionist historians and leftist academics omitted my deep and well chronicled faith in God. Instead, they recast me in their own distorted image and made me to be this great deist—a person that believes in a “god” that doesn’t get involved in human affairs, a god of regulation, not revelation. Balderdash!

Attorney ACLU: But Jefferson, you were the man that gave us that great constitutional doctrine, “Separation of church and state.”

Jefferson: Sir, your ignorance of both history and the Constitution is both obtuse and perverse. First, I am not a deist; I am a Christian. In 1802, I, by congressional decree, instituted the public schools in Washington, D.C. In 1805, I was appointed president of the Board of Trustees and in that capacity recommended two books to serve as the principle textbooks of all the public schools in our nation’s capital: 1) the Isaac Watts Hymnal, and 2) the Bible. Does that sound like something a deist or a secular humanist would do, Attorney ACLU? *{pause}*

Socrates: Abraham Lincoln, will you answer the question: How does a man become a great president?

Lincoln: In my case, Socrates, I did not come to greatness; greatness came to me through a series of events that started from my humble beginnings in a log cabin in the backwoods of Kentucky. I helped found the Republican Party, the party that promised to outlaw polygamy, outlaw slavery and free all the slaves. I intended to keep that promise I made to the American people.

Socrates: Yes, indeed. Lincoln, those were all great acts, but what made *you* great? Did any of these acts singularly catapult you to Mt. Rushmore?

Lincoln: No, Socrates. What made me great was the person that caused me the most grief, the person that paradoxically caused my death—regrettably, I speak of my dear wife, Mary Todd Lincoln.

Socrates & all the presidents: {*incredulous, in unison*} Mary Todd Lincoln?

Lincoln: One evening in April 1865, we were to attend the play "Our American Cousin" at the Ford Theatre. Since Mary Todd acted so rudely the night before with Gen. and Mrs. Grant (who had many bodyguards), we had to at the last minute invite new guests—Maj. Henry Rathbone and his fiancé, Clara, who graciously agreed to take their place. (They had no bodyguards.)

The die was cast. The plot was on as Destiny stood menacingly at my door. While we watched the play without a bodyguard at the ready, my adversary, John Wilkes Booth, easily slipped into my theatre box and murdered me in cold blood. This is what made me great. It was the ability to endure Mary Todd's proclivities that allowed me to overcome the savage evils of slavery. {*pause*}

Socrates: President Theodore Roosevelt, will you answer the question: How does a man become a great president?

Roosevelt: {*confident tone*} Indeed, sir. My secret to becoming a great president was following my personal philosophy of the Strenuous Life.

Socrates: Mr. President, what is the philosophy of the Strenuous Life?

Roosevelt: It is a moral philosophy of redeeming the time, of each day utilizing all of your God-given human powers for good, for the glory of God and the helpfulness of humanity. You see, gentlemen, when I was a very young child I was physically very weak and anemic. I was so weak and fragile that the doctors told my parents to enjoy me as much as pos-

sible for surely I wouldn't live to see much of my teenage years. I will soon be dead.

Socrates: What did you do?

Roosevelt: I obtained some weights and dumbbells and lifted them over and over and over. At first I could hardly lift 5 lbs., but soon my limbs began to succumb to the buffeting of my body and I felt myself getting stronger by the day. Yes, on Oct. 14, 1912, I took a bullet to the chest, yet finished my presidential campaign speech! I *lived* the Strenuous Life everyday henceforth, and this was my key to becoming a great president.

Socrates: Indeed. Now, the conclusion of this matter—How does a man become a great president? It is not by the way men (and women) do it in modern times—lying, manipulation, demonizing your opponents, selling out to corporate or extreme special interest groups, and every Machiavellian artifice. No, no, no. While those techniques will yield political power in the short term, history and the next generation will judge that leader to be the fraud he truly is.

Dear readers, these four men—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt—were ordinary men whose souls were tried in the furnace of affliction and they stood the trials, the tests, the tribulations and eventually the triumphs against all odds, not because they are intrinsically great men, but because they allowed the God in Heaven to work through them to achieve His will, for His glory and for the benefit of human civilization.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 13

SYMPOSIUM—SHOULD PUBLIC EDUCATION BE FREE?

February 28, 2007

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form “dialectic”—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates
- ❖ President, National Education Association, or NEA
- ❖ Jowakka (age 14, a typical public school student from America)
- ❖ Mutumbo (age 18, a typical student from South Africa)

"Mediocrities, I absolve you; everyone, for I am your champion!"
 ~ Salieri (mediocre composer and contemporary of Mozart)

Setting: Socrates' Academy, Washington, D.C., 2007

Socrates: We are gathered here today at my Academy to discuss one very important question. Should a public school education be free?

NEA: {indignant} Of course public school education should be free. If it wasn't then the poor wouldn't get educated and would remain poor all their lives, generation after generation, which would lead to more crime and anarchy in society.

Socrates: How many poor people do you know?

NEA: {affronted & afraid} Well, well, uuuhhhmm, uuuhhhmm, I-I-I don't really know any.

Socrates: Well, then why do you have such faith in what the poor can or cannot do? Perhaps it is because you and other so-called teacher's union members built your careers on exploiting poor inner-city children in the ghetto?

NEA: In America we have had a long-standing tradition to give all of its citizens a free public education.

Socrates: Jowakka, you are taking history class or what you call "social studies." Does the NEA speak the truth about the history of education in America as always being free?

Jowakka: {preoccupied} Huh? What? I didn't hear what you said. I wasn't listening.

Socrates: Perhaps, Jowakka, if you take the headphones off your head you could better participate in our dialogue.

Jowakka: {indignant, agitated} What you say to me?! Maaannn, forget you! You don't tell me what to do. You ain't my daddy!

Socrates: Indeed, I am not. Who is your father and why didn't *he* bring you to my Academy?

Jowakka: {resigned} I don't know. My momma and daddy weren't married when I was born and since they argued all the time, he just stopped coming around when I was about 4 years old. I haven't seen or heard from my daddy since.

Socrates: Yes, indeed, now things are becoming clearer. Mutumbo, perhaps you can tell me if the NEA's recollection of the history of education in America is accurate?

Mutumbo: Yes, Master; I will do my best. My reading of American history tells me that public education in this country was not always "free," so on this point NEA is in error. Around the 1830s, liberal-minded educators, mostly in Massachusetts and the northeastern states, believed that all Americans, not just the affluent, should have access to a free education, but it was limited. Legislation was passed by several New England states, and the "free schools" went through the eighth grade. However, from 1607, when the Pilgrims first landed at Plymouth Rock until the early 1830s, most American's were educated at home either by their parents, the church, a tutor, a governess or a private schoolmaster.

Socrates: Why did liberal educators feel so strongly that all Americans need to be educated?

Mutumbo: You must remember the 1830s was the beginning of the so-called industrial revolution where machinery was created that could do the jobs of 10 men, of 50 men, of 100 men and even of 1,000 men and beyond. There was an immediate necessity to standardize education in America. Society was becoming increasingly technological as Americans moved from the South to the North; from an agrarian society that relied on farming technology to one that used industry to make Americans reach the ascendancy of the greatest nation on earth just 100 years later by the early 1900s.

Socrates: Indeed, Mutumbo, your deductions certainly are more enlightened and your analysis more comprehensive than that of the NEA.

NEA: Yeah, but America has a history of racism and discrimination against the poor and against black people like Jowakka. Without a public school education, people like Jowakka would be left out of the American Dream.

Socrates: How many poor black people do you know? How many black people do you know?

NEA: {silence}

Socrates: NEA, do *your* children attend public schools?

NEA: No, Master. I wouldn't trust my children, whom I love deeply, to attend any public school. They have been in the best private schools all their lives.

Socrates: Is it true, NEA, that over 70 percent of the public school teachers send their children to private schools and refuse to send them even to the public schools at which they teach?

NEA: {hesitant, contrite} Yes, that is correct, Master.

Socrates: Indeed, yet you feel qualified to construct this massive, multibillion-dollar bureaucracy called the Department of Education funded annually by craven politicians on both sides of the aisle. The liberals dare the Republicans to try to get rid of the Department of Education (which they frequently say they want to do), yet the Republicans don't even have the guts to cut this leviathan bureaucracy's budget, so there we are. What really is the Department of Education for? Didn't public schools and quality education exist before this department was created by President Carter in 1979?

NEA: Yes, but we really needed a Department of Education. It was created to make sure that all of America's kids have access to a free education, especially the poor, the underclass and the disenfranchised, but also to standardize teaching and testing procedures.

Socrates: Indeed, but aren't "access" and "mandatory" two different concepts? Which one is it? Which one should everyone have—access to a free education? And should this free education be mandatory? Who benefits from this egalitarian scheme? Only the NEA Nazis, the education bureaucrats, yet the people still foolishly fund the Department of Education and no political leader has the courage to tear down this temple erected to a pagan and false god called "free education."

NEA: Temple? Did you say temple? Socrates, there is a law here in America that the NEA helped to pass called "separation of church and state," which means you can't use religious words like "temple" in a public school setting; it violates the law because some child might see a need to go to temple to pray to God and reform his life, and we certainly cannot have that now, can we, Socrates?

Socrates: Whatsoever is free will not be appreciated and will be taken for granted and despised by all—such has become America's so-called "free" public school education. For example, look at this dialogue we are having. Mutumbo is very attentive and takes dictation on every word I

utter because at his own expense and at great sacrifice he paid to fly here to America's capital all the way from South Africa! Yet Jowakka, a public school student from Washington, D.C., who has never paid a dime of her own money for her own education, has been totally disrespectful to me. Even her appearance here at my Academy today was paid for by the NEA. Jowakka refuses to address me as "Master," she chews gum while talking, she is defiant, she refuses to pay attention and participate in this dialogue, and she frequently uses belittling, ignorant language. No wonder America has some of the lowest test scores in the world. With a classroom full of Jowakkas, students that have no personal stake in their own destiny. It is human nature for them to despise what has cost them nothing. Therefore it logically follows that you will have anarchy—drugs, crime, violence, sex, anti-God, disrespect to teachers, everything but learning . . . and it's ALL "FREE."

Mutumbo: Master, why do you refer to education as "free" as though you doubt that it is so?

NEA: Yes, Socrates, education is free here in America, as I stated before. It's now a constitutional right (or at least people think that they have a "right" to an education).

Socrates: Nothing in this world is free but ignorance and death. NEA, since you claim that a public school education in America is free, who pays for the multibillion-dollar Department of Education, the books, the school buildings, the teachers' salaries, the administration staff?

NEA: Well . . . property taxes of course.

Socrates: This is indeed tyranny. If the emperor tried to usurp taxes from the citizens of Athens in ancient times without a direct benefit to the people, there would have been a revolt similar to the one your forefathers executed against the British that history called the "Boston Tea Party." Not all people whose homes are taxed even have children in public schools, yet they must pay. Where is that robust American spirit? Why do the American people continue to pay this unjust tax?

Jowakka: Because if they don't they will go to jail, and people fear jail more than they fear protesting against the unconstitutional principle of taxation without representation.

Socrates: {surprised} I am impressed with your elucidation here, Jowakka. I didn't think you had it in you; that you possessed those ideas in your mind.

Jowakka: Although I had my headphones on, Master, I was listening very carefully and learned from you, Socrates, that if you act ignorant or uninformed your opponent will be lulled to sleep. That's when you hit him with logic and a strong argument and win the debate. This is what you frequently did in Plato's dialogues of you, Socrates. This "under-dog" technique made you one of the greatest philosophers of history. Thank you, Socrates, thank you.

Socrates: I restate my original question: Should public school be free? In light of the evidence presented at this dialogue, the logical conclusion, the rational conclusion, the just conclusion based upon equality under the law and human nature is that a public school education should not be free, but that each family, using their own resources, should secure the proper education for their children as they deem proper. The government should no longer be in the education business, at least at the grade-school level. Property taxes should no longer be used to fund public education, and the money saved by each citizen should be used as a voucher for the family to send that student to any school they choose. The ubiquitous issue of "the poor" can be addressed by schools offering grants, scholarships or work-study programs similar to programs offered in college.

This new educational system based completely on merit will weed out the lazy, the ignorant, the disinterested, the violent, the unqualified, the moron, and leave only those students who are truly interested in learning.

{*Turning to NEA*} Like Hitler's Brownshirts, your NEA union members (teachers) are your foot soldiers in their 100-plus year assault on education under the guise of educating kids. They are what Lenin called "useful idiots." They are the willing accomplices in your grand scheme not to educate, but to control and dominate the entire bureaucracy of education. This is why you, along with the ACLU and other radical socialist groups, had to remove God from the public schools, for America's Judeo-Christian traditions would have exposed your nefarious, anti-education schemes—until now.

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 14

SYMPOSIUM — SHOULD PUBLIC SCHOOL BE MANDATORY?

June 16, 2007

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form “dialectic” — starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *veritas* — Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates
- ❖ President, National Education Association, or NEA
- ❖ Jowakka (age 14, a typical public school student from Washington, D.C.)
- ❖ Mutumbo (age 18, a typical student from South Africa)

Liberalism demands . . . [e]veryone is taxed to support indoctrination into the state religion through the public schools, where innocent children are taught a specific belief system.

~ Ann Coulter

{*Setting: Socrates' Academy, Washington, D.C., 2007*}

Socrates: We are gathered here today at my Academy to discuss a very important question—Should public school be mandatory?

NEA: {*affronted*} Well, what a ludicrous question, Socrates. Of course public school should be mandatory.

Socrates: Why, pray tell?

NEA: {*condescending*} Well, all of the academic studies unmistakably show that children who are not forced to attend public schools are more likely to live the “gangsta” lifestyle—fatherless babies, drugs, drunkenness, stealing, mugging, vagrancy, vandalism, rape, murder, mayhem. The only way to keep these poor, hopeless children off the streets is by forcing them to go to school. {*prideful manner*} It is the public schools that stand between the poor and the abyss!

Socrates: NEA, how many poor people do you know?

NEA: {humbled} None, Master.

Socrates: Then why do you have so much faith in what the poor can or cannot do? Why do you have so much faith in the failure of another?

NEA: {silence}

Socrates: Perhaps it is because you, NEA, along with the American Federation of Teachers and other socialist teachers unions and their de facto legal arm, the American Civil Liberties Union, has since the 1930s been utterly devoted to an *anti*-education bureaucracy dedicated to the Synopsis mandate of wielding left-wing political power in Washington, D.C., and keeping lower-class children imprisoned inside inferior, dangerous schools in the trailer parks, ghettos, barrios and impoverished communities of America . . . correct, NEA?

NEA: I plead the Fifth (Amendment), Socrates.

Socrates: I will ask Jowakka the same question, but before you answer, Jowakka, would you please take the headphones off your head, put away that magazine, take the gum out of your mouth and sit up straight like a lady?

Jowakka: {indignant} Huh? What you say to me?! . . . What-ev-ar! Yeah.

Socrates: Yeah? Yeah, what?

Jowakka: Yeah to your borin' question. I don't like school, OK? I never have and I never will, so I don't think we should be made to go to school, al'ight? That's so stupid! Nobody should be *made* to go to school if they don't want to.

Socrates: Indeed. Now things are becoming clearer to me now. Mutumbo, you are a student from South Africa, a senior in a private school there. Do you think public school should be mandatory?

Mutumbo: Master, such a public school system would be against nature.

Socrates: What do you mean by "against nature"? This is a philosophical concept.

Mutumbo: Master, please allow me to read my notes of your previous lecture "Should public education be free?"

{Quoting Socrates} [It is human nature that] whatsoever is free will not be appreciated and will be taken for granted and despised by all, such has become America's so-called "free" public school education. For example, look at this dialogue we are having. Mutumbo is very attentive and takes dictation on every word I utter because he paid to fly here to

America's capital all the way from South Africa! Yet Jowakka, a public school student, who has never paid a dime of her own money for her own education, has been totally disrespectful to me.

*Jowakka: {robotic tone, irate}*I didn't take no notes because NEA didn't give me no pencil and no paper. I didn't take no notes because Mutumbo didn't give me no pencil and no paper. I didn't take no notes because *you*, Socrates, didn't give me no pencil and no paper. I didn't take no notes because my mama didn't give me no pencil and no paper (*ad infinitum*).

Socrates: I restate my original question at this symposium—Should public education be mandatory? In light of the evidence presented in this dialogue, the logical conclusion, the rational conclusion, the just conclusion based upon rationality, logic, equality under the law and human nature, is that public school should *not* be mandatory, but that each family using its own resources should secure the proper education as they deem proper for their own children. Property taxes should no longer be unconstitutionally confiscated to fund public education, and the money saved by each citizen should be used as a voucher for the family to send that student to any school they choose. The ubiquitous issue regarding “the poor” can be addressed by schools offering loans, grants, work study programs and scholarships similar to programs offered in college.

This new educational system, modeled on my student Plato's Philosopher-King paradigm, would be based completely on the worthiness of the individual and will weed out the lazy, the idiot, the disinterested, the violent, the uneducable, the horrible, and leave only those students who are truly interested in learning. To force children to go to school when they obviously *do not* desire to only guarantees that those students who do want to learn will be prevented from learning in the words of Malcolm X, “by any means necessary.”

Epilogue

This, my dear students, is the shameful and ironic legacy *Brown v. Board of Education* has left America 53 years later. The public schools are more segregated by race, class and ethnicity than they would have been if the secretary of education were the Grand Dragon of the Klu Klux Klan himself. Was this their plan? I'll leave that dialogue for a subsequent symposium.

ON PHILOSOPHY — ESSAY 15

HELLARY: MACHIAVELLI'S EVIL TWIN

December 15, 2007

Politics have no relation to morals.

The end justifies the means.

~ Machiavelli

I'm not going to have some reporters pawing through our papers. We are the president!

~ Hillary Rodham Clinton (as First Lady)

This column is another in a series of articles I have written on the duplicity of human nature. Other pieces I've written in this genre include: "Sen. Barbara Boxer and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice ("What is Plantation Liberalism?"); Ira Einhorn and Al Gore (The cult of Celebrity"); Oprah and Barak Obama ("Queen Oprah and her anointed squire"); Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe vs. Truth ("A letter to professor Laurence Tribe on *Veritas*"), among others. Here, I would like to explore some of the more seductive similarities between Hillary and Machiavelli. Who was Machiavelli? He was an Italian Renaissance philosopher and writer primarily known for his magnificent treatise on political statescraft—*The Prince* (1513). Because of his radical theories on politics and the acquisition of power, his name has come down to us as an adjective—*Machiavellian*—"Suggestive of or characterized by expediency, deceit, cunning, duplicity or bad faith," but also as a noun—*Machiavellianism*—"The political doctrine of Machiavelli which denies the relevance of morality in politics and justifies craft and deceit."

Before I begin my comparative analysis of Hillary and Machiavelli, I must first state emphatically that the dominant political philosophy of the modern Democratic Party of which Hillary Rodham is the leading presidential candidate for—*liberalism*—is defined precisely as the separation of morality from public policy. In this sense modern liberalism = Machiavellianism, which "denies the relevance of morality in politics and justifies craft, deceit, cunning, duplicity, bad faith." For the past 30

years, no candidate has ever won the presidency without winning either Iowa or New Hampshire. Hillary has all but lost Iowa, and New Hampshire and South Carolina are statistical ties. If Hillary loses the Democratic nomination to novice Obama, she will be ignominiously consigned to the looney-left Neverland of Edward Kennedy, Walter Mondale, Gary Hart, Michael Dukakis, John Kerry—her presidential dreams, caput! However, Hillary's narcissistic ego would never allow this, so *off* come the gloves and *on* comes Machiavelli to the tenth power.

Machiavelli, in one of his discourses in "The Prince" stated, "If it is necessary for the prince to use the ways of beasts, he should imitate the fox and the lion, because the lion cannot defend himself from snares and the fox cannot defend himself from wolves." Hillary has mastered this duplicity for she loves to claim that America elected a "co-presidency" or "getting two for the price of one." And remember in 1994 when Hillary and her clandestine panel of "health care experts" tried to push socialized medicine down the throat of the American people (the lion)? But as soon as the conservative media shed the light of truth on her diabolical plans of stealing money from one group of people and giving it to another (which is classical socialism), she flees instinctively to her bedroom vanity, puffs up her hair, and puts on her softest, non-threatening pink outfit (the fox).

Bill Clinton's former chief adviser, Dick Morris, in a prescient article written for RealClearPolitics.com last April foretold Hillary's fall in the polls that we are currently witnessing: "Her overall decline is serious, but her slippage among her key groups—a 10-point drop among all women and an 11-point decline among single women—must be particularly troublesome for her advisers." Worse, from her point of view, there seems no obvious cure in sight. Hillary is not about to clarify her position on the war as she seeks to straddle a general election strategy of being a moderate with a primary campaign emphasis on moving to the left. She has no national forum for new issue positioning, and the more she becomes exposed to public view, the more her negative ratings increase. And she can't alter her personality more than she already has. In short, Hillary is in trouble.

Machiavelli stresses the utility of brute power where necessary and rewards by a Tammany Hall-style, patron-clientalism to protect and preserve the powers that be—by any means necessary. Likewise, Hillary will leave no garbage can unturned to find (or create) scandal, to heap

garbage upon Sen. Obama, or on whatever presidential candidate stands between her and the White House. Hillary touts herself as being this great feminist heroine anointed by feminist icons of past ages to deliver all oppressed women anywhere from the clutches of evil men everywhere. However, in my opinion Hillary isn't a real feminist, at least in the classic sense of the word where a woman achieves great things in a man's world *on her own merits*. In this respect, Hillary isn't a feminist; she is an opportunist.

Conservative commentator, Rush Limbaugh, summarizes Hillary rise to power and her narcissistic worldview, "Bill got to the top; Hillary took over." Rush further delineates Hillary's Machiavellian tactics in his own inimitable manner:

The Hillary Clinton story basically is this—You're a girl; you're a young woman. What do you do? You go off to college. Why do you go? To meet your husband. That's what she did. She wouldn't be where she is if it weren't for her husband. So she goes to college, finds some guy that she thinks is going somewhere, latches on to him. Maybe she steers his career as some women are prone to do. Maybe she followed. Who knows, but the point is that when he got wherever he was going, that's when she moves in to take over.

Machiavelli says of the ruler that "It is better to be feared than to be loved." I would *love* to be rid of the Clinton dynasty forever in January 2009. To this end, I hope we can put together a winning coalition of at least 40 percent legal Americans, 6 percent Chinese millionaire fry cooks and busboys from Chinatown and 5 percent illegal alien landscape workers and nannies from Mexico who will put us over the top.

CHAPTER

~ 5 ~

ON AESTHETICS

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 1

ALEKSANDR SOLZHENITSYN, R.I.P.

August 07, 2008

Now he belongs to the Ages.

~ Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War. Epitaph uttered at Lincoln's death bed, April 15, 1865

Prologue

I, like many lovers of great literature, was deeply saddened by the headline on the New York Times last Monday, "Reverence but no outpouring for Solzhenitsyn." Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (1918-2008) Russian dramatist, novelist, historian, was a prolific writer and a gargantuan intellect. His magnum opus is his legendary—*The Gulag Archipelago* (3 vols., 1973-78).

Other revelatory writings, like *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, (1962) eloquently and profoundly detailed the horrors of Lenin and Stalin's complex network of prison camps throughout Russia; a pernicious,

omnipresent evil Solzhenitsyn knew first hand having spent eight years in Stalin's Gulag (1945-53). For his singular courage, alerting the world of the notorious Soviet Gulag, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1970, expelled from the Soviet Union in 1974, but eventually repatriated in 1994. Despite this horrific ordeal in the Gulag that would have broken most strong men, Solzhenitsyn lived a long, fruitful life just shy of nine decades. Truly the world must know that a giant of literature and a champion of human rights now belongs to the Ages.

Solzhenitsyn Commencement Address, Harvard University (June 8, 1978)

It was my junior year in high school when Solzhenitsyn gave his famous commencement address at Harvard University—"A World Split Apart"—a singular and trenchant condemnation of the excesses of modern American culture. Although I attended a famous prep school (Cass Technical High), I was not introduced to the writings of Solzhenitsyn until my own self-searching at Harvard 10 years later.

What controversial things did Solzhenitsyn say to the Harvard Faculty and students, and why were his words met with such disdain and ridicule, even to this day? Let's examine the opening paragraph for starters:

Harvard's motto is "Veritas." Many of you have already found out and others will find out in the course of their lives that truth eludes us as soon as our concentration begins to flag, all the while leaving the illusion that we are continuing to pursue it. This is the source of much discord. Also, truth seldom is sweet; it is almost invariably bitter. A measure of truth is included in my speech today, but I offer it as a friend, not as an adversary.

As if quoting the words of Jesus and repeatedly using the word "evil" regarding the Soviet Union four years before President Reagan's "Evil Empire" speech wasn't bad enough, Solzhenitsyn had the gall to criticize the intellectual foundation of the modern liberal academy—moral relativism, humanism, progressivism, socialism, deconstructionism, logocentrism or any of that clap trap faire many of the youthful minions for four years were indoctrinated under at Harvard. No, no, no, Solzhenitsyn had a message from God based on Harvard's forgotten motto *Veritas* (truth) and like Elijah, the prophet of antiquity, would not

be deterred by the witchcrafts, Baal worship and paganisms of King Ahab and Queen Jezebel.

Solzhenitsyn in his Harvard commencement address said, "I have spent all my life under a communist regime and I will tell you that a society without any objective legal scale is a terrible one indeed." Continuing he said, "But a society with no other scale but the legal one is not quite worthy of man either. A society which is based on the letter of the law and never reaches any higher is taking very scarce advantage of the high level of human possibilities. The letter of the law is too cold and formal to have a beneficial influence on society. Whenever the tissue of life is woven of legalistic relations, there is an atmosphere of moral mediocrity, paralyzing man's noblest impulses."

In a wonderful tribute to Solzhenitsyn in 2003 by the writers at National Review, Jay Norlinger wrote:

Solzhenitsyn says, "The Western world has lost its civic courage, both as a whole and separately, in each country, each government, each political party, and of course in the United Nations." . . . I love that "of course," before "in the United Nations." For me, it is one of the most priceless parts of the whole speech. I have been studying the U.N. with particular concentration lately, and I am incessantly quoting Solzhenitsyn. If he received royalties, he'd be even richer: *The United Nations is not so much the united nations as the united governments or regimes, no better and no worse than those regimes on the whole.*

Contemporary news accounts said that Solzhenitsyn's speech was interrupted with periodic applause, but also some intermittent boos and hissing, particularly from the student section. Is anyone surprised by this response, for what else would you expect from students indoctrinated and propagandized for four or more years at Harvard on the endless variations of how to hate America and Western civilization?

As a contrast to Solzhenitsyn we had the intellectual pygmy, Garry Trudeau, who created the Doonesbury cartoon as our commencement speaker (DePauw University, 1983) and he was treated like a Solzhenitsyn with thunderous applause and not one "booo" or hiss!

Solzhenitsyn famously respects neither his critics nor particularly cares what even his admirers have to say as Norlinger quoted the Book of Common Prayer: "He was immune to praise" and in applying Solzhenitsyn's august words to the Harvard graduates of 1978, the master seem to follow the logic his son, Igant, who spoke of his famous father, "He

could have written *The Red Wheel* or kept up with his critics—but he couldn't have done both." In the turbulent and angst-ridden political times of the late 1970s Solzhenitsyn spoke candidly and authoritatively regarding the recently ended and controversial Vietnam War with these words of condemnation to the war protest movement of whom he contended was examples of many in the U.S. whom did not understand the Vietnam War.

He rhetorically asks if the American antiwar proponents now realize the effects their actions had on Vietnam: "But members of the U.S. antiwar movement wound up being involved in the betrayal of Far Eastern nations, in genocide and in the suffering today imposed on 30 million people there. Do those convinced pacifists hear the moans coming from there?" Near the conclusion of his commencement address at Harvard, Solzhenitsyn spoke these prophetic words of truth: "It [Western intellectuals] has made man the measure of all things on earth—imperfect man, who is never free of pride, self-interest, envy, vanity, and dozens of other defects. We are now paying for the mistakes which were not properly appraised at the beginning of the journey. On the way from the Renaissance to our days we have enriched our experience, but we have lost the concept of a Supreme Complete Entity which used to restrain our passions and our irresponsibility."

To this magnificent, singular summary of modern culture all I can add is the plea—Why don't we *ever* hear this kind of rhetoric today from our political leaders, Republicans or Democrats?

Epilogue

Solzhenitsyn, last Sunday evening, deservedly ascended the steps of Parnassus. His work here in the mortal plain that vexed him with their vanities is completed, his name, revered across the world and his memory like Lincoln "now belongs to the Ages" while the legions of idealistic, self-important youth that heard the august, prescient words of a modern-day prophet in his commencement speech at Harvard in 1978, the sum of their memory, their life's work and their collective contributions to God and humanity abide within the abyss of irrelevance.

Rest in Peace, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, for truly you now belong to the Ages.

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 2

SYMPOSIUM—CLARA WIECK, THE ANTI-FEMINIST FEMINIST

May 26, 2007

She cannot work at it [composing] regularly, and I am often disturbed to think how many profound ideas are lost because she cannot work them out.

~ Diary of Robert Schumann

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form *dialectic*—starting from a thesis or a question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review, with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Setting: Leipzig, Germany, 1853

Socrates: We are gathered here today at my Academy to discuss Aesthetics—What is Aesthetics (beauty)? As a case study we will examine the life of Clara Wieck, whom I'll call "God's Pianist." Why do I call her this? Because when she played the piano it was as if the heavens opened up and my soul was touched by God. {*Turning to Felix Mendelssohn*} You knew Clara Wieck during her early years. Tell us about her.

Mendelssohn: In 1830, I remember Clara as a child prodigy of 11 years old making her debut with the Leipzig Gewandhaus, an orchestra I founded and conducted. My sister, Fanny, and I were also both child prodigies and piano virtuosos, but Clara Wieck was the greatest of us all!

Socrates: {to Brahms} You met Clara Wieck in 1853 when you went to help your friend and fellow composer, Robert Schumann, who had fallen ill. Their children even called you "Papa Brahms." After Schumann's premature death three years later, you begged Clara to accept your proposal in marriage, which she demurred (for she wanted your genius to meet its destiny without hindrance). Most notable of all was your platonic friendship with Clara Wieck—a legendary relationship tantamount to the sublime. What do *you* think of Clara Wieck?

Brahms: {overwhelmed with emotion} What . . . what to say about Clara? In a word, I loved her passionately. She was my Muse; she was everything to me. Yes . . . after Clara I had other women, but I could never love another. I was 20. As a young inexperienced and insecure composer it was *this* woman, Clara Wieck, who gave me the confidence in myself that I had the ability to become a great composer—a romantic master. She played my early piano sonatas and exclaimed to me that “they were like veiled symphonies.” Yea, she went further and proclaimed that I was the one—that I had received Beethoven’s mantle—I would become the next great symphonist. Like Moses who protested against God to choose someone else to lead the Children of Israel out of the bondage of Egypt, I remonstrated against Clara saying, “Every time I try to compose a symphony, I hear the giant steps of Beethoven behind me!”

Socrates: Brahms, how did you conquer your fear of Beethoven?

Brahms: I listened to Clara’s voice. I looked into Clara’s beautiful brown eyes. The more I listened to her voice, the warmth, the revelatory quality of her piano playing, I heard the very voice of God and I received courage to endure. I resolved within myself that I would not be greater than Beethoven (for he is the greatest or us all!), but I would add to what he did. I would make my own way!

Socrates: {A soliloquy after Clara Wieck} To me, a philosopher, Clara Wieck, you are Aesthetics (beauty) incarnate. You are the anti-feminist feminist—a working woman who devotedly raised eight children, managed the household, was the primary earner of the family by playing concerts in Germany and throughout Europe. Yet, unlike others in your generation—Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, and later Emma Goldman, Margaret Sanger, Bella Abzug, Betty Friedan, Hillary Rodham Clinton—you did not try to become this great feminist icon or feign like you were the first woman who ever worked, as if that were something new, laudatory or exotic. No, no, no! You followed the august words of Booker T. Washington: “Do what you can with what you have, and *never* be satisfied!”

Schumann, since you were half crazy and neurotic for many of your years with Clara, who provided for your eight children? Who maintained the household?

Schumann: Without my wife I would be nothing, a mediocrity at best in the realm of a Telemann, a Salieri . . . or a Ditters von Dittersdorf—Nothing more! Clara Wieck often took charge of the finances and general

house running due to my inclination to depression and instability. These emotional and mental issues grew worse over the years, leading to my own premature death by suicide in 1856. I was only 46 years old.

Socrates: Indeed. Let us hear the conclusion of this matter. What is Aesthetics (beauty)? In the movie about the life and times of the Schumann's, *A Song of Love*, there was pivotal scene where all the superlative romantic masters were gathered together in the grand parlor of this enormous mansion. There was Schumann, Brahms, Schubert, Paganini, Joachim, von Bulow, Chopin, Mendelssohn, Verdi, Wagner, and others. At the piano was Liszt dazzling his listeners with his demonic virtuosity, however, when *she* entered the room filled with the greatest collection of aesthetic genius known to humanity, the music stopped—all eyes were on Clara Wieck (for truly she *is* God's Pianist). They begged her to play and she finally relented. She played her husband's favorite composition, Schumann's hauntingly beautiful *Traumerei*.

Yes, Beethoven, Chopin, Brahms and Liszt and could beguile you with their virtuosity, but Clara Wieck could touch the deepest recesses of your very soul. Yea, she did so much more; her playing could make you fight your own inner demons, your secret sins and compel you to become a better person—a godly person. Surely, this is Aesthetics; this indeed is beauty incarnate and it was embodied in God's Pianist—Clara Wieck, the anti-feminist feminist.

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY

REQUIEM FOR SEN. JOSEPH MCCARTHY

April 05, 2008

Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis. Grant them eternal rest, Lord, and let perpetual light shine on them.

~Requiem Mass text, *Introit*

Suggested background music: W.A. Mozart's Requiem Mass.

Two weeks ago, the Christian world solemnly celebrated the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ and the Jews the Feast of Purim. Easter has passed; nevertheless, because of the 40th anniversary of the

assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. (marked yesterday), my heart is still in a solemn mood, so I will endeavor to memorialize another *authentic* American hero, a forgotten and complex man.

Sen. Joseph McCarthy, R-Wis., was a man's man whose very name *to this day* engenders fear, malediction and loathing from progressive intellectuals, academics, Hollywood and politicians—both Republicans and Democrats who if they were honest, must realize deep, deep down in their hearts that they are mere pygmies to this towering colossus. I remember Sen. Joseph McCarthy. Many of the immortal masters of classical music—Palestrina, Victoria, Vivaldi, Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Brahms, Verdi and others—have written their greatest masterpieces in this most sacred genre of requiem, music that continues to probe the profound, gloomy depths of the human condition to offer this hellish world a glimmer of hope for redemption.

Our modern-day Joe McCarthy, conservative writer Ann Coulter, one of the few contemporary intellectuals with the guts to place McCarthy in his proper historical context as a truly heroic and transcendent figure, had these words regarding the death of one of America's greatest political figures:

Contrary to today's image of McCarthy as a despised Torquemada, McCarthy was given a rare state funeral with a private memorial service in the Senate chamber, his seat covered with flowers. St. Matthew's Cathedral bestowed him with the highest honor the Catholic Church can confer, performing a Solemn Pontifical Requiem Mass before 100 priests and 2,000 well-wishers. Seventy senators attended his funeral, as did J. Edgar Hoover. Thirty thousand Americans lined up outside the Washington funeral home where McCarthy lay to pay their final respects from early in the morning until late at night. Condolences poured in to McCarthy's wife, amounting to more than 70 bags of mail.

Does this magnificent tribute cited above merit the demagoguery, vitriol and slander McCarthy's name *to this day* continues to engender by liberals, progressives, the propaganda press and by many uninformed Americans? Only if those 100 priests, those 2,000 congregants that crammed St. Matthew's Cathedral, the over 30,000 American citizens that crowded outside weeping into the night and the millions of condolences sent to McCarthy's widow paying their respects were all gullible, misbegotten fools. Yet, today there is not a \$10 dollar plaque commemorating his name in Washington, D.C.! I remember Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

Who was the real Joe McCarthy? Was he a conservative Republican zealot that irrationally saw a communist, a communist sympathizer, an “anti-American” under every bed? Was he a man drunk with his own vast political power? McCarthy was a man of singular vision, an authentic American who with irrepressible zeal and courage sought to root out communists, communist sympathizers and spies in the State Department, the Treasury Department, the military and in other areas of the government—but also in Hollywood, the unions, the academy and throughout American society.

Coulter writes:

McCarthy was a popularizer, a brawler. Republican elitists abhor demagogic appeals to working-class Democrats. Fighting like a Democrat is a breach of etiquette worse than using the wrong fork. McCarthy is sniffed at for not playing by Marquis of Queensbury Rules—rules of engagement demanded only of Republicans. Well, without McCarthy, Republicans might be congratulating themselves on their excellent behavior from the gulag right now.

Coulter understands that politics is not a gentleman’s sport as did McCarthy who didn’t attack communists, Democrats, progressives, socialists and anarchists simply to be a partisan hack. McCarthy deeply loved America and sought to defend her from enemies both at home and abroad with every fiber of his being. McCarthy’s worldview, especially apropos in today’s corrupt, compromising times, was blunt and profound—*“You cannot offer friendship to tyrants and murderers . . . without advancing the cause of tyranny and murder.”* What would happen to America if its citizens ignored the uninspired platitudes spewed out daily by Obama, Clinton and McCain and demanded that our presidential candidates and elected politicians followed McCarthy’s trenchant worldview, proving their mettle that they could coherently (without stuttering) delineate a foreign and domestic policy founded upon McCarthy’s transcendent words above? I remember Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

Ann Coulter goes to the heart of why liberals had to destroy McCarthy. His zeal, political skills and efficiency would have made the Democrat Party a 20th century version of the 19th century Whig Party—deceased. Coulter writes: “I know he got a bad rap because there are no monuments to Joe McCarthy. Liberals had to destroy McCarthy because he exposed the entire liberal establishment as having sheltered Soviet

spies. . . . There's always a conflict of interest when people who don't really like America are called upon to defend it."

Once again, we return to the seminal question: Was McCarthy a villain or an American hero? That depends on your state of mind, your heart, your actions, your worldview of history. Simply put, if you sympathize with or aid those who would undermine the laws and ideas America was founded upon or her people both here and abroad, you were a sworn enemy of Sen. Joseph McCarthy. However, if you love America and the Constitution and seek the best for this country and her people, you are a blood brother of McCarthy. Without McCarthy's grunt work in the 1950s, virtually alone, there *couldn't have been* a Ronald Reagan who 30 years later would strike the mortal blow against the Soviet Union and worldwide communist expansion, saving untold millions of lives.

To you, Sen. Joseph McCarthy—you were a colossus among ordinary men and a truly, bona fide American hero. *Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis.* Grant them [Sen. Joseph McCarthy] eternal rest, Lord, and let perpetual light shine on them [Sen. Joseph McCarthy]. Amen.

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 4

3 CLASSICAL VIEWS ON GOVERNMENT

March 12, 2007

There are many of them [aristocracy], but only one of us!

~Beethoven (to poet Goethe)

I recently viewed a wonderful book of the complete works of Dutch painter Vincent van Gogh. I was amazed at how difficult it was for van Gogh to make a living as a painter and how in his letters to his elder brother, Theo (his primary benefactor), he poured out his frustration in eloquent detail of the unbearable realities and hardships of life—frustrations that eventually drove him to despair to such an extent that he cut off his ear. He was committed to an insane asylum where he eventually committed suicide at the young age of 37. Perhaps he had to be half crazy to enter the heavenly gates of Parnassus.

This brings me to the subject of this column: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and three views on the role of government. Haydn was the *career bureaucrat/wholly subsidized*, Mozart the *reluctant bureaucrat/partially subsidized* and Beethoven the *anti-bureaucrat/non-subsidized*. My supposition here is that the more a composer was subsidized or attached to a monarch, aristocrat, archbishop, bureaucrat and the State, the more his music was pedantic, derivative and uninspired. The less subsidized the composer, the more exultant and creative his music became.

Using the example of van Gogh as the archetypal model artist forming his craft in the furnace of affliction, I examined Haydn's background and found some interesting things. Franz Josef Haydn (1732-1809) had a tumultuous upbringing as a choirboy and self-taught musician; he had little to be envious of in his early years (he left his very poor home at age 5 to study music and never lived with his parents again). However, through much hard work and incessant composing, he was able to land the best music job of his era—court musician at the palace of Prince Esterhazy of the Hapsburg empire in Eisenstadt. He kept this position for about 30 years until shortly before his death.

To me Haydn's music (which I have played throughout my own music career) is structurally sound, harmonious and inventive; however it frequently devolves into being pedantic, effete and light-weight. Nevertheless, his coveted position with the prince characterized him politically speaking as a career bureaucrat wholly subsidized by the State, here, the monarchy. Haydn sadly had little occasion to be profound, because the prince and his aristocratic friends appreciated music as only entertainment—background noise for their frequent parties and social occasions. Ironically, Haydn's two finest and most exalting compositions were written *after* his employment with the prince, namely the oratorios *The Seasons* and *The Creation*.

Next there is Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-91), the *reluctant bureaucrat/partially subsidized* composer. Unlike Haydn, Mozart was never able to make the transition from being an amusing boy genius to respected court composer of some prince or king, although he spent most of his 35 short years trying to secure that elusive patronage job. This omission in Mozart's resume I contend was really a blessing in disguise. How? Because unlike Haydn, who was virtually imprisoned at Prince Esterhazy's palace in the hinterland of Austria 11 months out of the year, Mozart had been a world traveler since his child prodigy years of the early 1760s

when he visited all of the prime centers of music at that time—Paris, London, Brussels, Berlin, Mannheim, Amsterdam, Vienna, even Russia.

Although Mozart wanted the financial security of being a musical bureaucrat like his elder mentor, Haydn, he did not possess the discipline, temperament and political sophistication to achieve this. Ironically, this made Mozart's music more interesting, technically proficient, lively, bursting with lyricism, and on occasion, profound, even sublime—for example his operas "The Magic Flute" and "Don Giovanni," his last three symphonies, and his Requiem Mass and Coronation Mass. However, much of Mozart's music, like his elder mentor, Haydn, is mired in the excesses of the Age of Enlightenment of which he was one of its late children—*gallant* style, technically brilliant, structurally sound, but provincial, effete, frivolous and insubstantial.

Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827), the *anti-bureaucrat/non-subsidized* composer is by far the most interesting of the three masters both on a psychological and a musical level. When you listen to his music (especially the middle-late periods) you can hardly believe that Beethoven worked during the times of Haydn and Mozart, for his music is that revelatory and triumphant. Beethoven, unlike his predecessors, had nothing but utter contempt of the monarchy and the hoards of ambitious, treacherous petit bureaucrats that groveled at their feet seeking political patronage and promotion. To Beethoven, a child of the Enlightenment and a man who personified revolution, all monarchs, aristocrats and bureaucrats were mediocrities.

To give you an idea of Beethoven's anti-bureaucracy/non-subsidy approach to music, consider the day Beethoven and Goethe (the greatest poet and literary figure of his day) were going for a walk in Teplitz, Czechoslovakia, in July 1812:

As Beethoven and Goethe walked, some of the nobility passed with their entourage. Goethe politely stepped aside and bowed deferentially to the nobles—while Beethoven, in a gesture entirely typical of him, strode almost defiantly right through their midst, with his hands behind his back and without acknowledging the presence of the nobles, who had no alternative but to give him clear passage. When Goethe asked Beethoven how he could so disrespectfully treat these nobles, the composer replied, again quite characteristically, "There are many of them ['nobles'], but only one of us!"

So Beethoven and Goethe, by the magnificent works they produced, ascended the steps of Parnassus, while this puffed up diminutive prince and the privileged class he represented have descended into the abyss of obscurity and oblivion where they belong, having done nothing for God or humanity but sat on a throne, looked important and squandered the people's confiscated tax money on excess, irrelevance and vanity.

During the FDR administration (1933-45), America was in a critical economic depression. To generate revenue Roosevelt greatly expanded the federal government, including a department of the arts under the Works Progress Administration. However, FDR's artistic largess and legacy was artificial. Zero percent of these so-called "commissioned" works amounted to anything of lasting value, and few of them stand today or are even remembered. What does this say? When government, the State, monarchs or kings get into "supporting the arts," you usually get derivative or perverse art, miserable music, unremarkable sculpture, ugly architecture, uninspired poetry. This is why there have been no Michelangelos since Michelangelo, no J.S. Bachs or Handels since Bach and Handel, No Rembrandts, van Goghs or Wagners since Rembrandt, van Gogh and Wagner, and lamentably no Beethovens since that magnificent master put down his quill for the last time on his unfinished manuscript, the 10th Symphony, on a cold, stormy, rainy night on March 26, 1827.

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 5

THE CURSE OF BEAUTY

July 07, 2007

In all Israel there was none to be so much praised as Absalom for his beauty: from the sole of his foot even to the crown of his head there was no blemish in him.

~ II Samuel 14:25-26

Case No. 1: Annie Mae (*circa* 1972)

In the early 1970s, Annie Mae was the legendary beauty at our local elementary school in Detroit, Mich (Lillibridge). Like presidential candidate Sen. Barack Obama, Annie Mae was from a mixed-race background—her father was black and her mother white (German). She had long, dark

brown curly hair that went past the middle of her back; her big, beguiling light brown eyes captivated all who gazed upon them. Her mother always put a lovely bow in her hair. She looked like an exquisite doll in a curio cabinet that you would never touch, but only admired from afar. We went to different middle and high schools and I lost touch with her. Ten years later, after college, I found out from an old friend that Annie Mae was caught up in the gang life, had a baby and dropped out of school. I was devastated to hear the news.

The mid-1970s saw the ascendancy of organized gangs—the Errol Flynns, The BKs (Black Killers) and the Scony Onyes, among many other black youth gangs that terrorized the community with violence and mayhem. Gone were the long, curly locks of thick, beautiful black hair, that captivating smile, that sweet high-pitched voice, the twinkle in her big, light brown eyes, and that lovely bow her mother put in her hair every day that she came to school. All gone! The curse of beauty.

Case No. 2: Marilyn Monroe (*circa* 1960)

Perhaps the most lionized beauty in American history was Marilyn Monroe. In the early 1950s, she became one of Blue Book's most well-known models, appearing on dozens of magazine covers. Her first screen test was with 20th Century Fox for a starting salary of \$125 per week. In December 1953, she appeared in the first edition of Playboy. After a storied movie career, Monroe was found dead at her Los Angeles home by Eunice Murray, her housekeeper, on Aug. 5, 1962. She was only 36 years old. The coroner ruled her death as an overdose of Nembutal, a sleeping pill. Nevertheless, questions of foul play regarding her death refuse to allow Marilyn to rest in peace. The most well-known conspiracy resurfaced in 2006 in FBI-released documents that implicated John and Robert Kennedy as having had a cause in her demise. The curse of beauty.

Case No. 3: Anna Nicole Smith (*circa* 2005)

Born Vickie Lynn Marshall Nov. 28, 1967, she was known to most people by her stage name, Anna Nicole Smith, an American model, actress and celebrity. She caused great public controversy by her marriage to oil business executive and billionaire J. Howard Marshall, who was 63 years her senior, which caused most people to openly speculate that the marriage was a sham pretense in order to get the old man's money, which she denied. However, after his death, Anna Nicole began a long and ac-

rimonious legal battle over a share of his estate with Mr. Marshall's children. The case *Marshall v. Marshall*, because of a question of federal jurisdiction, went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Despite her meteoric rise to fame, fortune and celebrity, Anna Nicole did not have a storied life in her early years. Born and raised in a small Texas town, Smith dropped out of high school and first married at the age of 17. In the early 1990s, she gained notoriety by posing for Playboy, becoming the 1992 Playmate of the Year. Next, Guess Jeans came calling and she modeled for that famous clothing company. The TV people recruited Anna Nicole and offered her own reality TV show, "The Anna Nicole Show." Next, death came knocking at her door twice—first was the controversial death of her son, Daniel Smith, while on vacation in the Bahamas.

As the news media were transfixed on the death of her son, next the grim reaper came for Anna herself on Feb. 8, 2007, in room 607 at the Seminole Hard Rock Hotel and Casino in Hollywood, Fla. The ignominious end came at age 39, just three years older than her idol and role model, Marilyn Monroe, at the time she mysteriously died. The official coroner's report cited death by drug overdose. Until this day, her mother, her "husband," lawyer Howard K. Stern, and Anna's baby daughter's father, Larry Birkhead, are fighting over custody and Anna's fortune in courtroom battles for the world to see in Florida, in California, in the Bahamas . . . and in future places of infamy. One writer summarizing Anna Nicole's circus life said, "She was entropy porn at its finest." The curse of beauty.

Case No. 4: Absalom (*circa* 1000 B.C.)

Absalom, that tragic, Promethean Old Testament figure and favorite son of Israel's greatest king, David, was the most legendary beauty of the four people I narrate here. How was Absalom cursed by beauty? Like Marilyn Monroe and Anna Nicole, he was beautiful on the outside, but very ugly on the inside. He foolishly believed his press reports and what others said about him—and not God—that he was not only beautiful but intelligent beyond everyone, and thus entitled to whatever his heart lusted after, including his father's kingdom.

After a time Absalom achieved his *coup d'état* and had his father on the run in the wilderness of Judea. However, while he was riding his mule, the story takes a dramatic and unexpected turn. The biblical narra-

tive reads: "And Absalom rode upon a mule, and the mule went under the thick boughs of a great oak, and his head caught hold of the oak, and he was taken up between the heaven and the earth; and the mule that was under him went away."

The irony here is irresistible—the long, thick, beautiful, gorgeous hair of which the Bible states when cut annually weighed 4 lbs, the legendary beauty that made Absalom the Adonis of Israel, was the very thing that led to his demise, for while hanging there precariously between heaven and earth by his hair, Joab, the impetuous and equally ambitious general of the army of Israel, happened upon the ruthless king and immediately killed him with several darts through his heart. Joab then unceremoniously threw Absalom's mutilated dead body under a pile of rocks like a dog.

One of the great theologians, Father Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, wrote of Satan, but can be equally said of Absalom, "He rose in pride and fell in despair." Indeed, this is the curse of beauty. What is the curse of beauty? It is believing what others say about more than what God says about you. It is the difference between the facts and the truth. Facts ("Paris, you are so beautiful"; "Hillary, you deserve to be president of the U.S.") clouds ones judgment, leading to a perversion of the truth and distortion of judgment, which leads to foolish and self-destructive life choices, which leads down the rose-covered, star-studded road to Hollywood (I'm sorry, dear reader) . . . I mean to Perdition.

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 6

SYMPOSIUM—WHY SECULARISTS HID BACH'S MUSIC {*THE FORGOTTEN GENIUS*}

December 08, 2007

Note: This column is to be read with Bach's music playing quietly in the background—perhaps the Aria from his "Goldberg Variations" for solo piano (Glenn Gould's 1951 original version).

Prologue

This dialogue is a fictional conversation based on historical facts.¹ The characters are the great German classical music composer and conductor Felix Mendelssohn and his son. Felix Mendelssohn was grandson of Moses Mendelssohn (1729-86), that legendary genius of philosophy. Felix Mendelssohn was a key figure in resurrecting the music of Johann Sebastian Bach from obscurity with his famous performance in 1829 of Bach's supreme masterwork—"The Passion According to St. Matthew." Prior to this historic performance, for almost a century Bach's music lay in boxes in the cellars of the German cathedrals where he once performed. This short invention pays homage to . . . The Forgotten Genius.

{Setting—In the study at the home of Felix Mendelssohn, Leipzig, Germany, 1828}

Dialogue characters

- ❖ Felix Mendelssohn
- ❖ Mendelssohn's young son

Narrative

Son: Father! Whose music is this in these old, dusty, dirty, moldy boxes?

Mendelssohn: *{As tears begin to well up in his eyes and a tremble in his voice}* My son—my dear, dear son. This music is by a very, very great composer who lived many years ago.

Son: What is his name?

Mendelssohn: Johann Sebastian Bach.

Son: Where did he live, Father?

Mendelssohn: He was born in Eisenach, Germany, in 1685. He died in 1750.

Son: Where did Bach work?

Mendelssohn: He worked right here in the city of Leipzig, Germany, at the Cathedral of St. Thomas Church, only a few blocks from here.

Son: Where did you get these boxes of old, dusty, dirty, moldy music from, Father?

Mendelssohn: I found this music in the basement of the Cathedral of St. Thomas Church down the street where Bach used to work, son.

Son: Father, why did they put Bach's music in these old, dusty, dirty, moldy boxes in the basement of the church? *{Highly inquisitive, looking up into his father's eyes}* Father?! . . . Was Bach a bad man?

Mendelssohn: *{with tears streaming down his face now}* No, son . . . no. Bach was not a *bad* man, he was a very, very *good* man!

Son: Father, they can't play Bach's music in the basement of that church, can they Father?

Mendelssohn: No, son, they can't play his music while the music stays in those old boxes in the basement of the church.

Son: Father, why are you crying? Did I do something bad?

Mendelssohn: No, son. You did nothing wrong. I cry tears of joy and tears of sadness.

Son: Tears of sadness, and joy? . . . But father, I-I-I don't understand.

Mendelssohn: Yes, son. My tears of joy are for the magnificent discovery I've made in finding this music of Bach.

{Proclamation style} Johann Sebastian Bach was the greatest composer, violinist, organist, choirmaster and harpsichord player of his day, and the more I read and play his music—*this* music in these old, dusty, dirty, moldy boxes—the more I realize that he was the greatest composer and musician that ever lived, yea, he was the greatest composer that will ever live.

Son: Father, then why do you cry the tears of sadness?

Mendelssohn: Son, because Bach, like many truly great individuals in history, Jesus Christ, for example, were not appreciated in their day. He was not appreciated by his own people. Remember the Bible verse I taught you last week?

A prophet is not without honor, except in his own country, and in his own house.

~ Matthew 13:57

Son: Father, why didn't the people appreciate Bach's music?

Mendelssohn: Son, that is a very, very hard and complex question. I'll do my best to answer it. You see, times were changing during the time Bach lived in. Bach lived during the Baroque Period of music history where great artists glorified God with their works. Likewise, the Renaissance Period before was a time where everything man did was dedicated to God.

Bach's death in 1750 ended the Baroque Period and a new worldview emerged—the Age of Enlightenment, where men consciously and purposely sought to free themselves from following God's laws. Man now saw himself as autonomous, independent, secular, humanist and liberated! Bach's Christian-based music was now considered out of style with the times.

Son: Father, but how can man be free without God?

Mendelssohn: He can't be free, son. Man thinks he is free, but he's actually a slave:

- ❖ A slave to his passions;
- ❖ A slave to his lusts;
- ❖ A slave to materialism;
- ❖ A slave to sex, power, money, influence;
- ❖ A slave to what people say, think and believe, not to what is good, virtuous and honorable, *despite* what the people say;
- ❖ A slave to his own achievements.

Son: Father, what piece of music is that on your desk?

Mendelssohn: Son, this is a very, very special piece of music. This is Bach's original manuscript to his "Passion According to Saint Matthew." It was written for two large four-voice choirs, a boy's choir and large orchestra, which includes full strings, woodwinds, brass instruments and tympani.

{Proclamation style} IT IS ONE OF BACH'S SUPREME MASTER-PIECES AND ONE OF THE GREATEST PIECES OF MUSIC YET WRITTEN!

Son: Was that the music in one of those old, dusty, dirty, moldy boxes, father?

Mendelssohn: Yes, son. Yes, it was.

Son: *{with urgency}* But Father! Why was the greatest music yet written kept in those old, dusty, dirty, moldy boxes? Why, Father?! . . . *{looking up at his father}* Why?

Mendelssohn: *{pause, big sigh}* I imagine because those people who conclusively believed in the Age of Enlightenment weren't very enlightened, were they, son?

Son: No, Father, those bad people who put Bach's music in those old, dusty, dirty, moldy boxes were not very enlightened at all!

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 7

A CHRISTMAS VALENTINE

December 22, 2007

Prologue

This essay was written in January 1999 and was originally titled, “Caroline My Valentine.” It was written in the dialectical manner of Socrates, in quasi-poetical verse and is basically a short narrative of how the Lord used me to lead my sister-in-law (Caroline) to become a Christian. During this period, Caroline had planned on doing two terrible deeds just as soon as she saw her relatives one last time. First, she planned on buying a gun to murder her then husband who was mercilessly abusing her. Next, she planned to turn the gun on herself and commit suicide. . . .

Fortunately, God had other plans.

Part I—Caroline My Valentine

On the eve before Valentine’s Day, the night was transfixed. The celestial audience is in their place. Caroline My Valentine and I conversed on the green couch as we had many, many times before, but something was wrong. Something was dreadfully amiss. You must understand dear reader that Caroline My Valentine had come for a week-long visit. This night, her heart was very heavy—exceedingly burdensome. Life was crushing her to death!

Caroline My Valentine wanted to die this night. She tried to die—she really did. She only made one mistake that would have completed her journey to hell. . . . She picked the wrong house to die in.

God to Caroline:

And as for thy nativity, in the day thou was born thy navel was not cut, neither was thou washed in water to supple thee; thou was not salted at all, nor swaddled at all. None eye pitied thee, to do any of these unto thee; but thou was cast out in the open field, to the loathing of thy person, in the day thou wast born and when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee when thou was in thy blood, LIVE!; yea I said unto thee when thou was in thy blood, LIVE!

~ Ezekiel 16:4-6

I gently picked thee off the ground (You must understand dear reader that she is my sister, and I love her so). I carried thee up, up, up to your bed. I took thy shoes off—one at a time. I tucked thee into bed as a child, as a little stone.

Oh my valentine, my lovely, lovely valentine . . . and softly brushed thy brow. Rest, rest, Caroline My Valentine, for tomorrow will be the first day of your life. *Bottom of Form*

Part II—the apotheosis

It is Valentine's Day night. The celestial audience is in their place. Caroline My Valentine and I sit on the green couch.

I read the verse,

We said the Prayer,

The Cord is cut,

Life is There . . .

Caroline My Valentine . . .

Caroline My Valentine . . .

Epilogue—the message

Dear reader, during this holiday season, let us take pause to remember that *before* we allowed the self-appointed experts, the ACLU, the activist judges and the craven politicians to secularize the culture, “holiday” meant “holyday”—a nationwide commemoration of God's goodness to mankind. Before “Christmas” and “Santa Claus,” there was “Christ Mass” and “Saint Nicolas.” Before Thomas Jefferson's words written in a personal letter in 1802 to the Danbury Baptist Association were perverted to imply a “separation of church and state,” there were Jefferson's immortal words written in the Declaration of Independence in 1776 which emphatically stated that America was founded on “The Law of Nature and of Nature's God.”

I wrote extensively on America's legal/moral foundations in my book “The Inseparability of Law and Morality: The Constitution, Natural Law, and the Rule of Law.” Finally, let us remember God's greatest and most precious valentine given to *all* humanity—His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. I heard brother Isaiah remember that blessed day in this wise:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

~ Isaiah 9:6

CHAPTER

~ 6 ~

ON THE ACADEMY

ON THE ACADEMY—*ESSAY 1*

REPARATIONS OR REDEMPTION?

November 19, 2008

Before the reparations question, how do we [Black people] extricate ourselves from the ignominious legacy of slavery, colonialism and a slave mentality?

~ Dr. Benn Bongang, chairman, Department of Political Science, Savannah State University

On Monday, at Savannah State University (SSU), where I currently am a professor, I had the honor to participate in a fascinating panel discussion on the question of reparations for American slavery. The event was sponsored by the student organization "Black Students with a Mission" and was attended by about 50 students and about a half-dozen faculty.

On the panel were four SSU faculty, including Dr. Benn Bongang (chairman of the Department of Political Science), Dr. Stephen Asperheim (History), Kevin Hales (History) and myself. The reparations fo-

rum was a big success not so much for the number of people who showed up, but from the profound statements emanating from the panelists and particularly insightful comments and questions from the audience.

Two noteworthy comments were from Dr. Deborah Fonteneau (Liberal Arts), who eloquently discussed "mental colonization" and stated that as of 2008 there are over 26 million slaves throughout the world (primarily in Muslim, Asian and African countries), and Dr. Mohamed Mukhtar (History), who challenged the panelists and the audience alike to raise the level of discourse beyond the "parochial" level of American slave reparations and to view this subject through the lens of an international paradigm. After a brief overview of the reparations question by the moderator, professor Davida Harris, I gave a short synopsis of reparations from an historical perspective based on America's first attempt at repaying slaves for hundreds of years of free labor.

Professor Kevin Hales (my colleague who played Barack Obama to my McCain in an earlier political debate I wrote about in an essay: *The day I took fire from 'Obama* was in rare form; his ideas eloquently and passionately presented a pro-reparations argument and were delivered in his usual trenchant, historical, witty, interesting and piercing manner. For example, his retort to a woman who admonished the audience not to get stuck in the past waiting for reparations was, "You can't look forward until you look back!"

My comments regarding reparations were based on both a historical and a legal paradigm. Historically speaking, the reparations question goes back to 1865, at the end of Civil War and the vanquishing of the pro-slavery South. In Special Field Order, No. 15, Union Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman endeavored to stem the rampant poverty and despair black ex-slaves suffered after the war by giving them "40 acres and a mule." However, after Lincoln was assassinated, his predecessor, Andrew Johnson, cruelly rescinded Sherman's order and multitudes of black ex-slaves received no reparations.

I then moved from a historical perspective to a legal one where I outlined five legal arguments against reparations:

1. Since slavery was not illegal prior to the passage of the 13th Amendment (ratified 1870), consequently there existed no legal foundation for compensating the descendants of slaves for the crime against their ancestors when, in strictly legal terms, no crime was committed.

2. Since the U.S. government technically did not exist prior to June 21, 1788, determining the historical victims of slavery in order to justly apply reparations from the U.S. government exclusively to those who were enslaved under U.S. laws would be an unattainable policy.
3. Some areas of the South had communities of freedman, such as existed in Savannah, Charleston and New Orleans, while in the North, for example, former slaves lived as freedman both before and after the official creation of the United States in June 1788.
4. A reparations case in Chicago called *In re African American Slave Descendants* (2005) dismissed a high-profile lawsuit based on the fact that it was filed long after the statute of limitations had passed.
5. The Libertarian argument was stated in one of the party's press releases: "A renewed demand by African-Americans for slavery reparations should be rejected because such payments would only increase racial hostility." This is the reparation = societal anarchy argument.

Dr. Asperheim's argument for reparations came from the ideological left. Asperheim, an admitted liberal Democrat, based his reasoning for reparations on a historical paradigm. He thought that classical affirmative action remedies of the 1970s were not nearly enough. He called for the type of real, comprehensive reparations white people got from FDR's "New Deal" programs of the 1930s and the GI Bill of the late 1940s and '50s where official public policy designed government programs to benefit white men and to exclude and discriminate against black people of equal merit based solely on race.

Regarding the vaunted GI Bill first enacted in 1948, Dr. Asperheim quoted Ira Katznelson's book "When Affirmative Action was White" (2005) in arguing the program created the modern middle class and that the dirty little secret is black people were largely excluded from the GI Bill, even though black soldiers put their lives on the line in defense of America during World War II. In short, Asperheim believes in reparations for all black people based on historical *de jure* and *de facto* racial discrimination while viewing slave reparations as unworkable for pragmatic and logistical reasons.

The climax of the reparations forum was when Dr. Bongang spoke on the reparations issue from a global perspective, addressing issues like:

- ❖ The Berlin Conference (1884) where the European powers met essentially to carve up Africa and confiscate its vast largely untapped resources by exploiting and abusing the African people;

- ❖ African colonialism causing the death of a once vibrant and strong African culture;
- ❖ Can the treacherous acts of colonialism actually be repaid?
- ❖ Bongang's theory of colonialism as "crimes against humanity";
- ❖ Slavery = national genocide;
- ❖ How do we assign the blame?
- ❖ Africa's historical and intimate ties with their past colonizers;
- ❖ Africa seemingly being locked in a perpetual state of poverty;
- ❖ Beginning in the 1980s, the U.N.'s World Bank made numerous loans to Africa with many strings attached in an effort to keep the money out of the dictator's pockets and directed to the African people. Therefore, who owns Africa? The people? The dictators? The U.N.? China? The U.S.?

As a metaphor to his narrative on viewing reparations through the lens of African colonialism, Bongang cited the classic 1959 novel *Things Fall Apart* by Nigerian author Chinua Achebe. The title of the novel comes from William Butler Yeats' poem *The Second Coming*. Bongang disseminated Achebe's work through the eyes of his fated protagonist, Okonkwo, a local village leader and champion wrestler. His ill-fated attempt to assimilate to the white colonizers' modes of society and religion led this proud African leader to commit suicide. A tragic death, Bongang said, was a poignant symbol of the tragic toll colonialism took against Africa and continues to exact against her to this day.

Bongang ended with this profound and haunting question: How do we [black people] extricate ourselves from the ignominious legacy of slavery, colonialism and a slave mentality? (*Stunned silence from the audience*) Bongang ended his magnificent critique on reparations with this irrefutable logic: *Until we first deal with this problem [a slave mentality], no amount of reparations will ever cure our psychological, physical and spiritual condition.*

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 2

LETTER TO PROFESSOR LAURENCE TRIBE ON VERITAS

July 28, 2007

Truth crushed to the earth will rise again.

~ Dr. Martin Luther King

Veritas ~ Harvard's coat of arms and motto

*N.B.: Laurence Tribe (1941-) has been the Carl M. Loeb professor of Constitutional Law at Harvard Law School since 1968 and one of President Obama's most important mentors during his law school studies at Harvard (1988-91).

My Dear Professor Laurence Tribe,

For 20 years I wanted to write you this letter, but I didn't have the gravitas to do so coherently. Instead, I read, I listened, I observed, I sat patiently, I sat silently until now. For 20 years I read your books, your law review articles, your op-eds, studied your treatise on Constitutional Law (including the footnotes), read your numerous appellate and Supreme Court opinions and your amicus briefs. Why? So I could deliver to you and to the academy this most prescient message.

It was 20 years ago when I first heard your name during news reports of the contentious Supreme Court nomination of conservative jurist Judge Robert Bork. With exceeding interest I read that your critics had credited your behind-the-scenes lobbying efforts of key liberal senators on the Judiciary Committee with scuttling the nomination of Robert Bork, for liberals remembered Bork's role as "Nixon's hatchetman" of the "Saturday Night Massacre" in the firing of special prosecutor Archibald Cox, who was investigating President Nixon's involvement in the infamous Watergate scandal. But you went further. Your polemical book, *God Save This Honorable Court* (1985), embolden these senators ever more and put the nail in the coffin of the Bork nomination.

By the words you spoke and the words you wrote, October 1987 saw Ronald Reagan's nominee to the Supreme Court go down in flames as in Brunhilde's immolation scene of Wagner's *Götterdämmerung*. If I were Socrates, I'm sure he would pose these prescient questions to you: Professor Tribe, how does your tactics of politicizing the judicial process used against Robert Bork line up with *Veritas*? Professor Tribe, how does your *oeuvre* line up with *Veritas*? How does your collected works contribute to the "cultivation of the soul," as Socrates would say? For example, of the over 35 cases you argued before the Supreme Court, of the many infamies, one above all was the notorious case *Bowers v. Hardwick* in 1986, holding that a Georgia state law criminalizing sodomy, as applied to consensual acts between persons of the same sex, did not violate fundamental liberties under the principle of substantive due process. You almost won that case, losing in a contentious 5-4 decision. However, you were vindicated 17 years later in 2003, when the Supreme Court

overruled Bowers in *Lawrence v. Texas*, a case that ironically carried your name for posterity to forever remember this ignominy.

I remember your words at a Senate subcommittee hearing regarding the question of *who* will define marriage: the people or the courts? The narrative reads:

Legal experts across the political spectrum agree the Lawrence decision presents a federal judicial threat to marriage. Harvard Law professor Laurence Tribe has said, "You'd have to be tone deaf not to get the message" that Lawrence renders traditional marriage "constitutionally suspect." According to Tribe, the defense of marriage is now a "federal constitutional issue," and he predicts the U.S. Supreme Court will eventually reach the same conclusion as the Massachusetts court.

If law has *any* moral content, Professor Tribe, which I argue that it does in my law review article, "Reply to Judge Richard A. Posner on the Inseparability of Law and Morality," then how could you in good conscience persuade the Supreme Court that homosexual sodomy is a legitimate constitutional right? That traditional marriage between a man and a woman is now in 2007 "constitutionally suspect"? That literally 400 years of American history and the rule of law can be turned on its head to legalize the perverse and to outlaw the moral, virtuous and biblical? Is this *Veritas*, Professor Tribe?

Professor Tribe, in many ways we are diametrical:

- ❖ I am black and you are white.
- ❖ You are a Jew; I am a gentile.
- ❖ You are venerated scholar of constitutional law known and loved by all the great legal scholars all over the world. I am an anonymous, self-appointed scholar without an academic home, rejected by the law academy—though I have written five books on constitutional law, jurisprudence and political philosophy. Mocked and ignored by the academy, although I have edited 11 law review articles of noted legal scholars like Derrick Bell, Toni Massaro, Richard Delgado, Mari Matsuda and many others, edited 20 books, written over a dozen law review articles and over 150 columns and Socratic dialectical essays.

Also, like you I have argued before the Supreme Court; my books and articles are in the Chambers Library and in the collected papers of all three ideological branches of the Supreme Court, including my two law review articles on *Brown v. Board of Education* that foresaw three years before the constitutional defects of using race discrimination to fight race

discrimination. My ideas were even vindicated in the recent Supreme Court case, *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1* (2007), an opinion that didn't overturn *Brown v. Board of Education*, but did reject the state of Washington's school diversity plans. Chief Justice Roberts wrote the majority opinion:

For schools that never segregated on the basis of race, such as Seattle, or that have removed the vestiges of past segregation, such as Jefferson County, the way to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis . . . is to stop assigning students on a racial basis. The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.

Professor Tribe, I have different (not inferior) skills, education and expertise from yours, yet to date in this Land of Liberty I cannot secure employment to feed my children with my skills as you have done for over 40 years.

Professor Tribe, to the above discourse I ask this question: Have you or any other law professor, judge or justice of the Supreme Court that you know of served as an editor on one of the top three law reviews (Michigan Law Review) two years *before* being admitted to law school? Probably not. Yet, this is my legacy, but it is ignored until this day.

Professor Tribe, I don't want your pity or your affirmative action. This melancholy discourse is only addressed to you as a symbol of an academic class that has long since aborted Reason, Equity, Justice and Truth by separating law from morality; replacing the philosophy of the Constitution's framers, natural law, with its secular humanist counterfeit, Positive Law. Under your jurisprudence, professor Tribe, a philosophy of law that mandates a strict separation of law and morality, not only are unborn babies a contemptible, dispensable commodity, but my people, black people, could theoretically be enslaved yet again and my Jewish friends sent back to Hitler's crematoria.

To you, my dear professor Laurence Tribe, in the dialectical manner of Socrates, I reiterate this simple question: How does your life's work measure up to *Veritas* (Truth)?

Shalom,

Ellis Washington

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 3

HARVARD, THE IVY LEAGUE AND THE FORGOTTEN PURITANS

June 30, 2007

Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

~ Justice Louis Brandeis

There's always a conflict of interest when people who don't really like America are called upon to teach about its history.

~ Ellis Washington (a paraphrase of Ann Coulter)

How did the eight so-called "Ivy League" schools—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, Cornell and Dartmouth—go from being training grounds for Christian missionaries and ministers and respected citadels of higher education to what they are now—propaganda factories for every leftist, perverted, radical, tyrannical, failed ideology known to mankind?—Marxism, Darwinism, Freudianism, Higher Criticism, communism, multiculturalism, relativism, naturalism, positivism, socialism, liberalism, egalitarianism, feminist studies, gay studies, transgender studies, transvestite studies, outcome-based education, radical environmentalism, etc.

Did you know that America's oldest and most venerated colleges and universities like Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth were founded by the Puritans? Yes, those same Puritans who along with the Pilgrims were devout Christians and the original founders of America. What do we remember about the Puritans? Now, thanks in large part to the false prophets called "professors" of the Ivy League schools, we equate the Puritans inseparably with the Salem Witch Trials of 1692-95 where between 175-200 people were imprisoned, and, tragically, 20 innocent people were given the death penalty for allegedly being a "witch" based solely on the testimony of a few hysterical, emotionally unstable adolescent girls. This incident was indeed a dark chapter of history that has nevertheless been hyped up beyond reason by the secular left to erase the memory of the Puritans from the marketplace of ideas and from American history, from which they remain banished, even until this day.

Despite their Christian roots, currently all of the Ivy League schools are private and are not currently associated with any religion. Why? Because by the mid-1800s the secular revivalist movement called the Age of

Enlightenment (1600-1830) had thoroughly infected the academy. The French *Philosophes* led the movement—Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau, d'Alembert, Dumarsais and Diderot. There were "benevolent" tyrants: Napoleon, Catherine II, Leopold II, King George III; would-be tyrants: Robespierre, Saint-Just, the Indulgents, the Jacobins; as well as Anglo-American and Continental philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Kant, Paine, David Hume and John Stuart Mills, *some* of whom considered religion generally, and Christianity especially, as *passé*, anachronistic, barbaric and increasingly irrelevant to humanity's march towards humanism, secularism, higher learning and utopia.

Therefore, over time, as a new generation of professors and university presidents took over, the Ivy League schools forsook their explicitly religious mandate to train missionaries and ministers to spread the Gospel to the world and instead pursued newer fields of study that not only denigrated American's Judeo-Christian traditions, but were increasingly openly hostile to it. The 19th century saw a continued rise of empiricist ideas and their application to old and new disciplines of knowledge—physics, chemistry, biology, zoology, taxonomy, geology, paleontology, archaeology, anthropology, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, economics, political science. This was at the same time Charles Darwin's theories on evolution and non-theistic creation became popular among intellectuals and academics. Darwin's famous book, "*The Origin of Species*" (1859), became their new Bible—its priests and prophets, the professor, its pulpit, the classroom or the seminar, its temple, the academy.

Next came influential thinkers like Darwinians Thomas and Aldous Huxley, Engels, Marx, Hegel, Freud, Franz Boas, Mead, Weber, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Roscoe Pound, John Dewey, B. F. Skinner, Samuel Atkins Eliot and Charles W. Eliot (president of Harvard), and by the 1930s the Ivy League had totally become temples not only to secular thought, but they were increasingly hostile to orthodox religious ideas of any kind . . . except of course the new omnipotent religion of Liberalism.

The late 1950s saw the coming of age of the so-called baby boomer (the post-World War II generation, 1945-65) of whom many, having rejected the Judeo-Christian traditions of their parents, willingly embraced these ideas taught to them in the academy. As the 1960s progressed, this godless, hedonist, self-indulgent, entitled generation got their college degrees and even filled the graduate schools, receiving J.D.s, Ph.D.s, M.D.s, M.B.A.s and other advanced degrees.

Next the question is: Why have the Ivy League schools become so radicalized in modern times? Because they are filled with the progeny of the World War II generation, the baby boomers of the 1960s who have so thoroughly hijacked and perverted the original Christian/intellectual paradigm the Ivy League schools maintained in the beginning. However, progressives, liberals and humanists' unrestrained assault on reason, logic, religion, morality, politics, philosophy, education and capitalism didn't stop with the Ivy League schools. For example, the College of William and Mary (1693) was founded by Congregationalists (Puritans); Andover College (1778) was founded by Noah Webster to train missionaries; Rutgers (1766) was founded by Dutch Reformers; Dickinson College (1783), Smith, Bryn Mawr, Lehigh, Bucknell, Colgate, Swarthmore, Vanderbilt, Northwestern and on and on and on, all were founded either by Jews, Christians, Christian denominations or Christian religious organizations. In modern times, however, virtually all these colleges are temples to intellectual paganism.

Justice Louis Brandeis (1856-1941), the first Jewish person to sit on the Supreme Court and a brilliant legal mind, once famously remarked, "Sunlight is the best disinfectant." I hope this column was successful at shedding the light of clarity regarding the denigration of the Ivy League schools and other prestigious universities and showing how far they have devolved from their original mandate to train Christian ministers and missionaries to spread the Gospel throughout the world into institutions of higher perversion, avarice, excess, vanity and degenerate ideas.

Paraphrasing Coulter's august words in the context of this article—There's always a conflict of interest when people who don't really like America are called upon to *teach about its history*. History is the tragic narrative of the martyrdom of our geniuses. To the Puritans that gave America America, as well as Harvard, Yale and Dartmouth, setting the original Christian intellectual and academic legacy of the Ivy League schools, I say, truly *you* are the greatest generation.

ON THE ACADEMY — ESSAY 4

IS A COLLEGE DEGREE REQUIRED FOR SUCCESS?

October 06, 2007

Professors seemed to have only two things in common: they were personally ambitious, and they had renounced religion.

~ Paul C. Vitz, Ph.D. (Lecture notes delivered at Columbia University on the psychology of atheism)

Universities are our great fall, They teach only propaganda, that's all: Gramsci rules, no doubt, Marx! Lenin! they shout; Until America is left in a pall.

~ Paul (writer and reader of my WND column)

The 19th century (Age of Enlightenment/Romanticism) and the early 20th century (Progressive Era) saw the ascendancy of the academy, colleges, universities, higher education. With the academy came its attendant associations where the intellectual class, especially since the 1950s and 1960s, increasingly sought to cement its newly exalted position as the controller of society and dictator of culture.

Solidifying its education monopoly, the academic class over time would control the very gates of higher education, admissions, course requirements, degree offerings, graduation, licensing, college accreditation, degree certification, tenure—the very access to success in this life. Many people believe that to be “successful” in today’s society, one *must* have a degree. Yet, did you know, dear reader that long before the academic bureaucracy became entrenched in society ordinary people did extraordinary things *without* degrees?

For example, as late as 1954 there was a man that sat on the Supreme Court of the United States that not only never graduated from a prestigious law school, he only had one year of law school under his belt. He had no judicial experience, yet his legal mind was so superior to his contemporaries, FDR tapped him to become a justice on the Supreme Court (1941), and Truman four years later appointed him to be chief prosecutor for the U.S. at the Nuremberg Trials (1945-46). That man was Robert H. Jackson. Other justices of the Supreme Court were appointed without graduating from law school or taking the bar exam (Benjamin Cardozo) or who lacked impressive judicial experience (Frank Murphy), the latter

a lowly circuit court judge from Michigan before he was appointed to the high court by FDR. But how can this be?

In art, the correlation between a college degree and artistic genius are nil. As a matter of fact, there appears to be a reverse correlation between *not* going to art school or getting an art degree with artistic excellence. *None* of the greatest artists, sculptors or architects whose works we revere today had a "degree"—not Galileo, Rembrandt, Rodin, Botticelli, Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Caravaggio, Van Gogh, Manet, Monet, Goya, Picasso, etc. None went to what we today call "art school" or received a degree in "art studies," yet they were able to exercise their gifts without paying homage to some irrelevant, bureaucratic association or certification board that incidentally knows absolutely nothing about who or what makes transcendent art.

In classical music, the same is true all of the greatest composers and musicians whose music transcends art, including Josquin, Palestrina, Monteverdi, Vivaldi, Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Berlioz, Brahms, Schumann, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Liszt, Chopin, Wagner, Richard Strauss, Schoenberg and Berg. None graduated from a "school of music" or received a degree in composition, music performance, music education or music business, yet they ascended the very steps of Parnassus in music, and they were able to exercise their gifts without paying homage to some self-aggrandizing, bureaucratic association or certification board who with Pharisee-like fanaticism guard the portals of the academy, to graduate schools and thus to prestigious universities, well heeled positions in society and economic success, affluence and notoriety. This monopoly over the mind of We the People by the academy through higher education must be deconstructed.

When an honorary Ph.D. degree was granted to Benjamin Franklin (one of the greatest inventors of the 18th century and a high school dropout), he later wrote in his autobiography that he was loath to publicly acknowledge that honor despite the fact he did path-breaking work in physics and invented bifocals, the odometer, the lighting rod, electricity and many other great innovations we still use today. Franklin also helped write the Constitution, was ambassador to France, founded the Ivy League University of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society.

Other geniuses of humanity that did not have the Ph.D. or in some cases no degree at all include:

- ❖ Noah (no college, saved all humanity, for 4,000 years had built largest boat until the Queen Mary)
- ❖ Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (no college)
- ❖ Jesus Christ
- ❖ St. Augustine
- ❖ St. Thomas Aquinas
- ❖ George Washington (no college, commander in chief, president)
- ❖ Alexander Hamilton (our first and greatest secretary of treasury, taught himself law by reading law books)
- ❖ Napoleon
- ❖ Abraham Lincoln (no college, no law school but a lawyer and our greatest U.S. president)
- ❖ Frederick Douglass (ex-slave, abolitionist)
- ❖ Booker T. Washington (ex-slave, college builder)
- ❖ Albert Einstein (had trouble finishing high school)
- ❖ Alexander Graham Bell (college dropout)
- ❖ Thomas Edison (no college)
- ❖ Harry Truman (no college, judge and president)
- ❖ Sam Walton (no college, founder of Wal-Mart)
- ❖ Mother Teresa (no college)
- ❖ Bill Gates (richest man ever, dropped out of Harvard as a junior)
- ❖ Rush Limbaugh (college dropout, media genius)

I don't mean to denigrate the necessity of degrees in modern times (I have three), or associations or certifications, but just to state that like all organizations or bureaucracies of man, they are intended *not* to improve the quality of education or improve the standards of academic disciplines, but to centralize academic, educational and administrative authority in the hands of a university oligarchy. This centralization of educational authority determines who gets a degree, who gets that coveted Ph.D., MBA, J.D. or M.D., who can belong to their elitist academic associations or be bestowed with the coveted certification, or maintain the indispensable college accreditation. These certification and accreditation organizations have little to no correlation whatsoever to academic worthiness or vocational excellence. Why do they exist? Follow the money.

These associations, certification boards and accreditation institutions generate billions of dollars in annual revenue to determine college accreditation and fund the test-taking bureaucracy (MEAP, ACT, SAT, MCAT, LSAT, GRE, GMAT, KAPLAN, BAR-BRI, etc.). In this land of milk and honey, it's all about the money, power and control . . . not knowledge or wisdom. Thank goodness humanity's best and brightest

made their contributions before this entrenched and intractable education bureaucracy we call the academy came along with their degree requirements, academic associations, certification boards, teacher and professorial unions telling them that they had to have their stamp of approval to make such stellar contributions to humanity.

If you think that I write from hyperbole, I challenge the reader to take any core curriculum, examine any canon of great works, scrutinize the credentials of any of the geniuses the academic class venerate as the foundation of their disciplines, study and codify in their textbooks or write Ph.D.s about, and you will conclude that the following somber aphorism is most true: A professor is a mediocrity that is an expert on the works of great men.

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 5

OUR LEFTIST PROPAGANDA FACTORIES

October 13, 2007

A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and in his own house.

~ St. Matthew 13:57

This column is about truth vs. expediency; rigor vs. regression; trust busting vs. academic monopoly, serious scholarship vs. affirmative action scholarship. This column is an addendum to last week's column, *Is a college degree required for success?* and is about the scholarship of Arthur LaBrew and Eileen Southern—a comparative analysis exemplifying the shameful legacy of the liberal academy, their Stalinist control of the education bureaucracy, their defense of ignorance, slipshod scholarship, degree discrimination, liberalism run amuck and self-important elitism, all under the protection of the Ph.D. degree.

LaBrew met Southern in the early 1950s when they were both graduate students under the tutelage of that imminent medieval/renaissance scholar, professor Gustave Reese (LaBrew was at the Manhattan School of Music; Southern attended NYU). In 1971, Dr. Eileen Southern (1920-2002) published her most famous work, "The Music of Black Americans." The academy heralded her work as the most important contribution to black music history of the past 100 years, or since Monroe Trot-

ter's path-breaking book, "Music and Some Highly Musical People" (1878). However, LaBrew and a few other iconoclastic scholars like Gilbert Chase, Noel DeCosta and Dr. Robert Stevenson (UCLA) knew the true history of black contributions to classical music and were outraged, for they understood that Dr. Southern's work was a complete fraud filled with errors.

If Southern had written on any of the pre-eminent white classical masters—Palestrina, Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Wagner, Stravinsky, etc.—with that level of sophomoric, slipshod scholarship and carelessness regarding attention to details and facts, her manuscript *never* would have seen the light of day. However, the dirty little secret regarding the presumptions of affirmative action is where a black scholar or black subject matter is involved, the bar can be lowered to accommodate the maladroitness.

Below are a few examples of some of the horrible scholarship of Dr. Eileen Southern:

❖ A hundred years before the great white bandsman John Philip Sousa and 200 years before the trumpet virtuosity of Wynton Marsalis, there was a black bandsman, composer and trumpet virtuoso that played all of the most fiendishly difficult clarion trumpet works of Bach, Handel, Purcell, Mozart and other classical masters on a keyed bugle or a valveless trumpet. This magnificent artist was the Philadelphian, Francis Johnson (1792-1844).

❖ Southern wrote that Johnson was born in Martinique—wrong! In the liberal-controlled academy, there is a racist presumption that virtually any black person that does something of transcendent note must have gotten it from a white person or originated from a non-American place (Note Sen. Barack Obama's meteoric notoriety is due in large part to his mixed-race ancestry and spending his formative years *outside* America).

❖ Southern had the wrong birth year for Francis Johnson; LaBrew found the correct year by personally researching that info in the records of the Episcopal church where Johnson was baptized.

❖ Southern failed to understand the big picture of the life and times of Johnson, including the neighborhoods he lived in, *how* he learned music; *what* he did before becoming a musician; *who* were his predecessors; *why* was he chosen to play before Queen Elizabeth, etc.

❖ In her articles and books, Dr. Southern created extended passages of fictitious narrative to fill in the years she had neither the interest in

discovering nor skill to complete on her own merits regarding Johnson's stellar musical career.

By the time of the publication of Southern's book *The Music of Black Americans* in 1971, LaBrew had already published at his own expense and through his own organization (The Michigan Music Research Center) several books and over a dozen scholarly articles, but the mainstream music historians and the academy took little notice. Why? Several reasons:

1. LaBrew had only an M.A. degree; he didn't have a Ph.D. like Southern, so the presumption (false, I might add) was that his work wasn't up to the high academic standards or gravitas of other Ph.D. academics.
2. Because LaBrew didn't have a Ph.D., he wasn't invited to teach at any of the colleges or universities (even the historically black colleges ignored his work, thus the quote from the Gospel of St. Matthew at the beginning of this column).
3. Because LaBrew didn't have a Ph.D., book publisher Norton and other academic music book publishers would not publish his work;
4. In the myopic, bigoted minds of white (and black) academics and music historians, Eileen Southern wrote *the* book on this subject. She said all that was worthy of saying . . . or did she?

By the early 1980s, Southern's dreadful academic legacy could no longer be hid or ignored. She was then a professor at Harvard when LaBrew brought to the attention of the dean and faculty of the School of Music at Harvard and other elite Ivy League schools the years and years of blatant plagiarism of LaBrew's work and omission of his name in her articles, voluminous factual errors, mythological narratives and "scholars" created out of whole cloth—in additional to outright lies in Southern's works. Only then was Harvard forced to quietly pressure Dr. Southern to "retire." The case of Arthur LaBrew and Eileen Southern is merely a paradigm of a much larger problem in the academy of today that has long ago forsaken the original mandate of higher education—explicating biblical law, moral truths, an apolitical canon of *true* geniuses and dispensing academic excellence to the masses.

In modern times the academy has devolved into propaganda factories of radical liberalism and are basically populated by the aging baby boomers who enshrined in the citadels of higher learning atheism, evolution, relativism, humanism, dialectical materialism, egalitarianism (af-

firmative action), positivism, Darwin, Marx, Hegel, Freud, Mead, Dewey, Sanger, Spock, Kinsey, Justice Earl Warren, Woodstock/hippies worldview, Haight-Ashbury, Bill and Hilary Clinton, awarding a Nobel Peace Prize to Al Gore for his global warming propaganda film and mostly notably, a visceral hatred of America and her Judeo-Christian traditions that made this country the greatest in the history of humanity.

Finally, 27 years later *The New Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians* is giving professor LaBrew the honor of editing and writing various articles on black contributions to classical music prior to 1950. One of the editors, Raoul Camus, an expert on bands and military music, had recently read passages of LaBrew's *Black Music of the Colonial Period* (1977) and his magnum opus on Francis Johnson, *Captain Francis Johnson (1792-1844): Great American Black Bandsman Life and Works Volumes I and II* (1994), and was literally knocked out of his chair. Although Dr. Camus is a noted musicologist, surprisingly he had never heard of these works. To his credit, he immediately recommended professor LaBrew to an editorial and contributing writer position with *The New Grove Dictionary of Music*. LaBrew will help this venerable repository put its entire 25-volume encyclopedia on the Internet.

To you, professor Arthur R. LaBrew, indeed you are a true scholar and a brilliant historian of the first rank. Thank you for being my professor, friend, and father figure for the past 20 years. May your magnificent writings, your selfless worldview and your excellent teachings continue to exemplify to the self-important academy that a true scholar is not one who possess a Ph.D. degree, but one who is a *true* scholar indeed.

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 6

STALIN IN DETROIT

April 10, 2008

[State-controlled] education is a weapon, whose effect depends on who holds it in his hands and at whom it is aimed.

~ Joseph Stalin

As I traverse through the old neighborhoods of Detroit where I was born, played, went to school and church, I am a silent witness to utter devastation—block after block, mile after mile, neighborhood after

neighborhood—eastside, westside, northwest side, southside. In many respects, save for a few isolated areas, Detroit is perhaps America's largest ghetto. How did Detroit fall so far, so fast? Was the cause the riots of 1967, which 41 years ago drove out the white majority *en masse* along with white-owned businesses and the know-how of middle and upper class? Could it be the ascendancy of Detroit's first black mayor in 1974, that five-term firebrand, the irascible Coleman A. Young (1974-94), who in his acceptance speech essentially gave the middle finger salute to the 92 percent white and the 8 percent black demographic who *didn't* vote for him, saying, in effect, get the hell out of town?

Could any (or all) of those factors be the cause of the fall of Detroit?

As I traveled through Detroit's old neighborhoods, it suddenly came to me like a bright light from heaven. Yes, liberalism, or the secular faith that FDR-style, Big Government programs are indispensable to remedy all societal problems, is viewed by over 90 percent of blacks (and at least 50 percent of whites) as the 11th Commandment. Conversely, what institution or organization put those diabolical ideas inside people's minds? It was the public schools all along! Stalin was right that the offensive-weapon effects of state-controlled education "depends upon who holds it in his hands and at whom it is aimed." Whose hands are America's public education system in? That's right, the teachers and their powerful teachers union, the National Education Association.

The NEA is less an education association interested in improving quality education for all American students and more of a liberal special-interest group hell-bent on teaching socialist dogma and treacherous propaganda—"America sucks!" "Hip-Hop Summits," "safe sex," abortion, evolution, $2+2=5$, outcome-based education, *Heather has two mommies*, *Daddy's Roommate*, metal detectors and other insanities. Republicans weren't much better in the area of education reform. In 1994, after 40 years of being the loyal opposition, they regained congressional power under Newt Gingrich yet failed to even try to disband the moribund Department of Education, a bureaucracy instituted by President Jimmy Carter as a political payoff to the NEA.

FDR-style socialism and liberalism, established through the Department of [Propaganda] Education, is killing my people here in Detroit, in big and medium-sized cities and even in small towns across America,

and our politicians from President Bush on down are doing nothing to stop the genocide. Bush's education initiative, "No Child Left Behind," is a joke. A recent study by Gen. Colin Powell's "America's Promise Alliance" lists Detroit as having the worst public schools in America; over 75 percent of Detroit public school students drop out between grades 9 and 12. According to my mathematical calculations, that's a lot of children left behind.

Like many of America's oldest, largest cities, Detroit's state-controlled public schools date back to the 1830s and 1840s. For over 160 years this bloated, centralized, top-down administrative structure with its open hostility to morality and the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought has been ruthlessly enforced with Stalinesque efficiency through 75 years of litigation by leftist organizations.

Below is an open letter I recently sent to *all* the Detroit public high school principals as part of my own feeble efforts to stem the tide of violence, madness and mis-education that has plagued Detroit since the early 1960s. I was also outraged by the recent drive-by murder of yet another Detroit public school student who was to graduate in mere months before fate stood at the door:

April 3, 2008

To the principal of Cody High School:

My sincerest condolences regarding the death of one of your students, senior Jamaal Hurt, who was killed Monday [April 1], perhaps by one of his own classmates. My prayers are with his family and the entire faculty and student body at Cody High School.

Below is a notice regarding a new national column I'm writing on Detroit. I'm sending it out to as many businesses, schools, churches, clubs and organizations all over Detroit and the Metro-Detroit area as I can to try to stop the Spirit of Madness that has overtaken this once great city of my birth.

In this link, I wrote a piece in Jamaal's honor titled: "Detroit's tragic love affair with liberalism." Please send or post for all Detroit public school students and faculty, but especially to Jamaal Hurt's family members with my sincerest condolences.

Regarding my educational background, I descend from four generations of teachers. Both of my parents taught in Detroit (my stepfather, Jack Folsom, for over 35 years). I taught in Detroit from 1983-87, 1990-91, but later left education to attend law school in part because some De-

troit Public School students at Beaubien Middle School threatened my life simply because I told them to stop talking in class and the principal at that time treated it as a joke.

I would welcome the opportunity to speak to your students in any venue you deem proper.

Peace,

Ellis Washington, J.D.

Cass Technical High (Class of 1979)

Stalinism's greatest triumph against education through atheistic communism was not in killing hundreds of millions of people all over the world, but by killing the people's ability to reason, to think coherently, rationally based on logic, morality and classical modes of argumentation. Nowadays, it's all about emotion. A brilliant example of this is that Manchurian Candidate, Democrat Sen. Barack Obama. I'm convinced that he is devoid of reasoning and logical thinking. He and his wife, Michelle, has drunk every drop of Kool-Aid that Harvard Law School could pour down their throats (and then some). Stalin was right: "[State-controlled] education is a weapon, whose effect depends on who holds it in his hands and at whom it is aimed." By their allegiance to diabolical liberalism, the Democrat Party, the NEA and the white liberals controlling the teachers unions, together with their willing accomplices—principals and teachers in big cities across America—have killed Jamaal Hurt just as surely as his fellow comrade who pulled the trigger.

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 7

SYMPOSIUM—DIALOGUE WITH A CRAZY LIBERAL

November 26, 2008

Opportunity is not a handout. Liberalism is about opportunity. You can only regulate discrimination; you can't regulate attitude.

~ Dr. Johnnie Myers, Professor, Savannah State University

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form "dialectic"—

starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

❖ Socrates (a pseudonym for the author)

❖ Dr. Johnnie Myers

{*Setting: Savannah State University, 2008*}

Socrates: This symposium is held here today in the office of Dr. Johnnie Myers, a professor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Savannah State University. Dr. Myers, I've wanted to dialogue with you because politically and intellectually I am a conservative and you are a liberal. I wanted to try and breach the seemingly impassible wall of separation that divides us into warring ideological camps with neither side unwilling or unable to give credence to the other's political views.

What especially drew me toward you, Dr. Myers, is the surreal and haunting letter that you showed me a few weeks ago dated Sept. 10, 1964. It is from the Juvenile Court of Bibb County, and it states that you were arrested about a year before for trying to eat at a segregated restaurant, the Holiday Inn in Macon, Ga.

For context I cite the letter below:

Juvenile Court of Bibb County

Bibb County Courthouse

MACON, GEORGIA 31201

September 10, 1964

Re: Jonnie Mae Dumas

CITIZENSHIP SCHOOL

First Baptist Church

595 New St.

Dear Parents:

At the instance of the Juvenile Court of Bibb County a school of good citizenship will be held at the First Baptist Church at 7:00 P.M.

Each probationer from this court is required, as a condition of his or her probation, to attend this school. The school will begin Tuesday night September 15, 1964, and continue each consecutive Tuesday night through October 15, 1964.

Each child is required to have at least one parent or guardian attend these classes with them. In the event a parent has younger children that cannot be left at home, they may be brought along.

Very truly yours,
/s/Durward B. Mercer
Judge, Juvenile Court

Dr. Myers: Yes, Socrates. A group of adults from my church, Community Church of God in Macon, Georgia, and several of my friends (who were about 15 years old) through the leadership of Bill Randall, a deacon, NAACP member and a legendary community activist during that period, organized a protest of the *de facto* discrimination laws that were unofficially practiced against black people, namely restaurants that refused to serve black people solely on racial grounds.

As we entered the establishment, we demanded to be served like the white guests there and were bluntly informed by the manager, "We are not serving NIGGERS!" Since we refused to leave the premises, the police were called and our group was taken to jail. While the adults got out of jail later that day, my two friends and I had to stay overnight at a juvenile facility until our parents could pick us up.

Socrates: Fascinating! Tell me more.

Dr. Myers: The jail cell was at a nearby juvenile facility and was Spartan in every respect. The room was about the size of a small bedroom, dirty with a wire mesh screen. There was another girl in the jail who possessed the only mattress. There were three beds for four people. Later, we were allowed to get a mattress next door, which was paper thin and very uncomfortable. We were served Spam, which I refused to eat. To this day the smell of Spam reminds me of that hellish juvenile jail I was imprisoned in 45 years ago.

During the night, we were given an open-top bucket to use and the stench lingered with us all night. We passed the evening singing freedom songs until we fell asleep. At 5 a.m. we were awakened by the guard and allowed to use the bathroom for five minutes. Our parents came to pick us up the next day about 10 a.m. To this day I have never been so happy to see my mother as when she picked me up from jail that morning.

About a year later, we had to appear before a juvenile court judge and mandated to take four weeks of "citizenship classes." Taught by

black people, these classes were designed to break our civil rights spirit, to dissuade us from the protest tactics we used and most diabolically, to explicitly make us believe that our lives up to that point were wasted and that we had better change our ways or become “no account.”

Socrates: Did any Republicans try to help you in your fight for civil rights at that time?

Dr. Myers: {*incredulous expression*} No. We were all Democrats. I never even met a Republican until one of my professors I had in college; however, she was quiet about it. During my Ph.D. studies, I met people whom were considered “neoconservatives.”

Dr. Myers next gave a moving and eloquent monologue detailing key historical events that made black people move from the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, to the Democrats, including:

- ❖ In the 1920s, blacks felt increasingly abandoned by the Republicans for decades;
- ❖ To resolve a contested election, Ohio Republican Rutherford B. Hayes instituted the compromise of 1876, which ended Reconstruction and left blacks vulnerable to a revitalized Jim Crow South;
- ❖ The GOP doesn’t seem to appreciate the fact that blacks have always been about “self-help” philosophy as if they are teaching us something new. This view is both obnoxious and insulting.

Socrates: The GOP platform from top to bottom seems more aligned with the interests of black people and the black church, a tradition of which the majority still acknowledge—issues like abortion, Judeo-Christian values, low taxes, strong borders, strong national defense, anti-welfare, American exceptionalism.

For example, on legal abortion, of which President-elect Obama is a zealous proponent, according to the 2007 U.S. Census, over 50 percent of all viable black births end in abortion (503 per 1,000). Isn’t the Democratic Party the party of slavery, the party that precipitated the deaths of over 600,000 in the Civil War in part to keep black people enslaved; the party of Jim Crow, welfare and dozens of government programs that have all but destroyed the black family as we know it? Why, then, do black people vote 90-95 percent for the Democratic Party every election? Isn’t this national genocide?

Dr. Myers: {*affronted*} First of all, FDR’s welfare programs were designed specifically for poor whites. Secondly, there is a difference between pro-abortion and pro-choice. I believe Obama, like myself, is pro-

choice. Furthermore, the number of aborted black babies is high in proportion to whites because most black babies are aborted under some federal agency, and whites have surreptitious ways to hide their abortions: "Heather went away with a medical condition for a few weeks and had a procedure to remove a tumor"; "Shaniqua just had her abortion at the local clinic and kept on going with her life." The former abortion is not counted, the latter is.

Socrates: Can you foresee a time when black conservatives like Ward Connerly, Julius Wilson, Shelby Steele, Michael Steele, Clarence Thomas and others can bridge the intellectual and public policy gap with liberals like the Congressional Black Caucus, the civil rights establishment, yourself and the average black person who has voted for the Democratic Party for generations?

Dr. Myers: No, Socrates, I really don't see us coming together with black conservatives anytime soon because people like Clarence Thomas, Shelby Steele, Ward Connerly and most black conservatives seemed to have forgotten where they came from. The University of Michigan affirmative action cases for undergraduates (which prohibited race as a determining factor for admission) and law school (the court allowed race to be a determining factor while ignoring other discrimination factors like "legacy") are current examples of why blacks need affirmation action.

Socrates, until America becomes a country that lives up to MLK's dream where people "aren't judged by the color of our skin, but by the content of our character"; until that day arrives, we must still have affirmative action to give the less fortunate not a handout, but an opportunity to enjoy and live the American Dream.

Postscript

Dr. Myers: {as Socrates} Socrates, has the GOP reached out to you?

Socrates: {surprised, in a melancholy mood} You ask a very painful question that I try daily not to think about. For over 25 years I have reached out in vain to the GOP; in my books, my articles, my op-eds, via e-mail, letter, phone, fax, Socratic dialectical reasoning, you name it. The GOP's answer—silence of the lambs, nothing. I'm hoping that if Michael Steele becomes the chairman of the Republican National Committee things will change for black conservatives like me. I can only hope against hope that the GOP will stop being the party of aging, balding white men concerned

with their stock offerings, country club membership, cocktail parties and golfing and start being concerned with real, substantive and sustainable coalition building.

Dr. Myers, unless and until the GOP has a serious recommitment to becoming the party of Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan, the GOP will become the Whig Party of the 21st century—EXTINCT!

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 8

UNIVERSITIES OF SOCIALISM

October 25, 2008

Earlier this week as I was searching for the latest news, one item that caught my attention was titled, “Al Gore delivers environmental message at Harvard.” While I won’t launch into a diatribe about Al Gore and the merits and demerits of an impending global catastrophe, allow me to look at what I consider radical environmentalism from both a macro (large) and from a philosophical perspective.

How did we get here? How did Harvard University, America’s oldest (1636) and most prestigious university devolve so far intellectually as to lionize a despicable mental midget and snake oil salesman like Al Gore to export his demagogic brand of environmental propaganda? Ostensibly Gore was invited to help Harvard University launch its greenhouse gas reduction effort. Harvard thinks that by lowering its own greenhouse gas emission 30 percent by 2016 that this august achievement relegated to a small tract of land in Cambridge, Mass., will “help save the planet.” China, India, U.S. and Western Europe’s exponential greenhouse gas emissions notwithstanding, I smell a rat!

We live in revolutionary times, where since the 1890s progressive elites have waged war on every aspect of America’s exceptionalism—its educational, cultural, religious, legal, economic, business and intellectual traditions. Al Gore’s brand of radical environmentalism is just the latest of a plethora of sophistic ideas out of the liberal academy rooted in Marxism, socialism, egalitarianism, empiricism, positivism, postmodernism and other dangerous and failed ideas of the past.

Remember that the modern environmentalist movement grew out of 1960s counter-cultural revolution in America. Marxist radicalism, libera-

tion theology, pagan worship, FDR/LBJ welfare statism and other Machiavellian ideas, which couldn't be achieved via the democratic process, were surreptitiously brought in through the back door as a diabolical tactic for Democrats to take more of your liberty, self-reliance and money and give it to someone else that didn't earn it and therefore shouldn't have it. It's Marxist class warfare writ large.

Last Wednesday, I was invited to participate in a fascinating political forum on the differences between Democrats and Republicans sponsored by the junior class at Savannah State University. One of my colleagues, Professor Leonard McCoy, told the group that they should ask me to represent the Republican Party. I agreed to participate on the panel representing not so much the Republican Party but the conservative side of the argument. I knew that the fix was in.

One professor that I had invited earlier that day (Dr. Johnnie Myers, Associate Professor Social & Behavioral Sciences) attended the event and invited her class to attend. Dr. Myers and I had a spirited discussion on the fundamental policy issue of Democrats I referred to as "socialism" – using the force of law to take money from one group of people (producers) and giving it to another (non-producers). Dr. Myers was irritated at my characterization of the liberal welfare state of FDR and LBJ, and although I was vastly outnumbered (40-1) at this political form, I held my ground. Furthermore, I argued that Obama economic and domestic proposals amounts to socialism because if enacted will add \$1.3 trillion in new taxes to pay for his new welfare programs.

I stated that Thomas Jefferson's immortal words codified in the Declaration of Independence were a solemn promise to all Americans to be able to be free to fully enjoy "Life, Liberty and the *pursuit* of Happiness." The key word here is "pursuit." All Americans must diligently seek after what is good by using all of their God-given faculties, NOT have the government take the hard-earned money from one group of citizens and give it to another who did nothing to earn it. Thus I argued that socialism is not only unconstitutional, it is a betrayal of the original intent of the Constitution's framers. While I'm not sure if I was able to convince Dr. Myers, a number of students after the program and the next day told me how appreciative they were to hear another political philosophy other than liberalism and socialism on a college campus.

Returning back to Al Gore's keynote speech at Harvard University earlier this week on the impending apocalypse of manmade global

warming, Gore's thesis was this: unless we humans drastically change our lifestyle and energy usage to comport with his global warming thesis and the environmentalist elites at Harvard, mankind is doomed. I find Gore's credibility increasingly suspect especially since recently a growing number of Ph.D. scientists have risked their careers by predicting just the opposite of Gore's global warming theory—that the world has for the past 10 years been in a global cooling period.

Where is Gore's Ph.D. in atmospheric physics, geology, geothermal science or climatology? Gore failed to get into law school, was a "C" student at Harvard and now Harvard is saying that this political hack is the prophet that will save the world from our impending global catastrophe? I'm not convinced. The article on Gore's Harvard speech made this interesting remark: "Gore, Riffing off Harvard's Latin motto of [Veritas] "truth," he said the challenge is to find truth in the climate crisis and "use that as a basis of a new concept of who we are."

How, you may ask dear reader, can hundreds of Ph.D.s and other credentialed academics at Harvard, a repository of the best and brightest academic minds in the world, be so intellectually vacuous and naïve to believe the sophistic, unscientific premises of global warming while stubbornly ignoring all other plausible empirical evidence to the contrary? The great English writer George Orwell, who penned the book, *Animal Farm*, and *1984*—forgotten anti-totalitarian classics that mocked the progressive intellectuals, social engineers and secular academics of the 1920s–50s that gleefully followed the siren song of Darwin, Marx, Freud, Lenin, Mussolini, Stalin, Hitler, Mao and the myriad varieties of what Jonah Goldberg referred to as "liberal fascism"—said it best: "In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act."

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 9

HARVARD'S PROPAGANDA FOR OBAMA

September 20, 2008

Last week I did a review of Laurence Tribe, a professor of constitutional law at Harvard and his book, "The Invisible Constitution." Tribe's thesis is that the "real" Constitution is not so much in the black-letter text of the actual document, but in the unwritten, "recovered memories," hidden, "imagined experiences" and penumbral shadows. Tribe's legal philoso-

phy is antithetical to the original intent of the Constitution's framers and, in my opinion, is insufficient as a legitimate theory of constitutional law. At its foundation, Tribe's ideology is a secular, Marxist, socialist legal philosophy.

Professor Tribe's fellow colleague at Harvard, Cass Sunstein, a visiting professor of constitutional law from the University of Chicago Law School wrote a piece last week defending Barack Obama for the New Republic titled, "The Empiricist Strikes Back." Professor Sunstein's defense of Obama's controversial views on domestic and international policy utilized the technique of moderating his policies by placing Obama to the right of his growing legion of leftist critics in the fringe blogosphere who are angry at his recent surge to the center to counter Sarah Palin's popularity as McCain's V.P. candidate. I am not convinced.

Sunstein's arguments would be plausible if this were 1988—before the advent of conservative intellectuals like Joseph Farah, Dr. Michael Savage, Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Ann Coulter, Laura Ingraham, Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Antonin Scalia, Fox News, the Internet and many others in the so-called "alternative media." But it isn't 1988; it is 2008, and now any rationally minded person can look at Professor Sunstein's apologetic for Obama and determine almost immediately if it is truth or propaganda.

Unfortunately, these days most of what is coming out of Harvard and all the Ivy-League universities ignores or actively denigrates the original mandate of these prestigious institutions—seminaries to train Christian ministers to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ throughout America and the world. Over the past 150 years since the apotheosis of Darwinian evolution to the academy, higher education has devolved into socialist and Marxist propaganda factories. Because of Leninist entrenchment conservatism and ideas out of the Judeo-Christian tradition of intellectual thought have been increasingly marginalized.

Let me give you a few examples of this Pravdaesque technique from professor Sunstein's article:

❖ Throughout the article, Sunstein defines Obama with such words as "empiricist" (acquisition of knowledge through experience), "progressive" (code word for "liberal" or "liberalism" which since President Ronald Reagan, has become an infamous epithet), "independent thinker," "visionary minimalist" (advocating minimal [small] forms of government). Honestly, Sen. Obama possesses none of these qualities.

❖ Professor Sunstein writes: *Obama believes in an individual right to own guns*. Not so. Obama changed his view to support the Second Amendment and conventional conservatism because he saw the handwriting on the wall regarding the groundbreaking, pro-Second Amendment case, *D.C. v. Heller* (2008) where the Supreme Court majority overturned a 33-year handgun ban in Washington, D.C.

Other issues Obama has been forced to move to the right on—thus angering his liberal base—include:

❖ Obama's backtracking on his strong and early opposition to the Iraq war;

❖ Obama has said the death penalty may be appropriate for child rape;

❖ Obama has voted for wiretapping reform that includes retroactive immunity for telephone companies;

❖ Obama recently said that he does not want to reopen NAFTA negotiations unilaterally.

Sunstein writes: "They think that his recent departures from left-wing orthodoxy are a form of flip-flopping or some kind of betrayal." No Cass, Obama hasn't betrayed the radical left fringe, he is part of the leftist fringe whose voting record and radical association like Wright, Ayers, Dohrn, Alinsky, Fleiger brand him as a certified Marxist.

Furthermore, Obama has been increasingly frustrated and strident because he cannot tell America who he really is. Overtime this makes him appear less authentic and less Messiah-like. Since Aug. 29 when McCain picked Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin, a quintessential, authentic social conservative as his running mate, Obama has been dropping like a rock in the polls. Sunstein further comments: "But, by nature, he is also an independent thinker, and he listens to all sides." However, everyone (except for Professor Sunstein) knows by now that Obama was cited by the National Journal as the most liberal senator in Congress—meaning, out of 535 members, Obama has the most extremist voting record of all his colleagues in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. There is nothing "coming together," bipartisan or "independent" about Sen. Obama.

As a professor of constitutional law at Harvard, Sunstein should be ashamed of himself for presenting such fawning propaganda as a reasoned critique, as if his only readership were brainwashed cultists. I am not one such person. Conventional wisdom had Obama being so extreme in his views on FISA that he was even to the left of his own party.

He knew his support of a FISA bill that permitted lawsuits against America's own telecom companies—that willingly helped the FBI by diverting intercepted foreign phone communications of suspected terrorist plots against America—was not favored by the overwhelming majority of Americans.

What would Obama do, this “empiricist,” “pragmatist,” “visionary minimalist” as Sunstein referred to him, regarding FISA and America's war against international terrorism? As the consensus mounted even in the mainstream media that President Bush and the Republican minority were prudent and responsible to grant the telecom companies retroactive immunity from lawsuits by the rapacious liberal trial lawyers association and the ACLU. What sane individual could be against protecting Americans from terrorist attacks from other countries? Sen. Barack Obama that's who, despite what Professor Sunstein says.

In the final analysis, just as the advent of Sarah Palin, an authentic, reform-minded conservative Republican, witnessed the precipitous descent of Barack Obama in recent polls. Similarly, 20 years of conservative alternative media and the ideas from magnificent conservative jurists like Judge Robert Bork, Justices Clarence Thomas, Antonin Scalia, John Roberts, Samuel Alito, Judge Janice Rogers Brown, will hopefully one day cause the academy and Harvard University to live up to its own, long-forgotten motto—*Veritas*—Truth.

CHAPTER

~ 7 ~

ON RELIGION

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 1

A GIANT IN A WHEELCHAIR

December 01, 2007

All children are my children.

~ Julia Mae McCarty Green (1925-2007)

Dear reader, in today's column I write with a heavy heart, for last Saturday saw the passing away of a dear friend and mother-figure who mentored me many years . . . who loved me as her only son. For 30 years, I have known Mother Julia Mae Green, the first lady of Antioch COGIC in Detroit, Mich. Despite her neurological disorder (degeneration of the cerebellum) that had her wheelchair-bound for many years, Mother Green never saw herself as handicapped, or—if I may be so vulgar—she never saw herself as a cripple. She never complained of her plight—no, not one time. Simply stated, Mother Green was a giant in a wheelchair.

Elder Havius Green, the pastor of Antioch COGIC, was her devoted husband of 61 years. Together these magnificent people produced eight exceptional daughters. Daughter No. 6 was a high school friend who first invited me to her father's church. All eight daughters have earned advanced degrees (Ph.D.s and M.D.s) in medicine, education, music, linguistics and engineering. Ten months ago, when I first started writing for WorldNetDaily.com, I sent a few of my articles to Mother Green, for I knew that she would be more overjoyed than even I at this achievement. Below is the poem I attached with the writings:

March 22, 2007

To Rev. Havius Green

"I REMEMBER"

I Remember . . .

30 years ago you were a father to me when I had no father;

You taught me how to pray, how to give thanks to God,

How to study the Bible

I Remember . . .

Your wife, Mother Julia Green, teaching me how to type, how to write,

How to write books . . . to be Profound

I Remember . . .

Your 8 daughters embracing me, making music with me . . . Being the

Brother they never had

I Remember . . .

I Remember Antioch Church of God in Christ . . .

I Remember the Love . . .

I Remember . . .

How is this anonymous woman's life relevant to you and your life? I'm glad you asked. In American culture, people are taught to push and claw your way to "the top." Today's society is governed by such clichés as: "Might makes right." "I want to be famous!" "The meek shall *not* inherit the earth;" "Survival of the fittest;" "The end justifies the means;" "Nice guys finish last;" "Kill or be killed." Perhaps at one time or another we have used these sayings as guiding precepts in our own lives (hopefully, the last one only in a metaphorical sense). However, please allow me the opportunity to introduce you to another worldview: "*My strength is made perfect in weakness*"—for this was the guiding principle Mother Julia Mae Green *lived* for over 82 years.

To some people Mother Green was a frail woman to be pitied. That opinion is for people who with myopic vision only look at the *outside* of a person. However, to those of you who are more discriminating in your assessment of human character, I hope to persuade you that this woman was a giant—a giant temporarily confined in a wheelchair. Why?

❖ She was a path breaker. In 1942, in the midst of World War II, in the midst of *de jure* (by law) and *de facto* (by practice) racial discrimination and at the tender age of 17, Mother Green was the first black person to be hired by the Detroit Public Schools as a secretary. She would later use that skill to teach all eight of her daughters (in addition to many neighborhood kids) how to type on typewriters that she purchased.

❖ She was a community activist. For her outstanding contributions to the community, Mother Green received commendations from the governor of Michigan, Detroit News, Detroit Free Press, Michigan Chronicle, Jet and Ebony magazines and the NAACP.

❖ Her memoir, *From Underclass to Independence*, brilliantly chronicled her struggles to raise eight daughters in a violent and lawless big city like Detroit, to help them get their education and to tirelessly support her husband as he built Antioch COGIC and later did missionary work and founded other churches throughout Haiti, Cuba, South America and Africa.

❖ When she later founded an adjoining day care center named after Dr. Martin Luther King and co-founded with Pastor Green a children's hospital in Africa, Mother Green's motto was immortalized: "All children are my children."

❖ Mother Green practiced that philosophy with me in a most transcendent manner. Her only son (who was born in the same year as I) tragically died in his sixth month. Therefore, I became her son in his stead. As the poem above narrates, she taught me how to type, how to write, how to write books and to try always to be profound.

During the years I was in college, graduate school and law school, Mother Green would always send me letters of encouragement and love. Years later when I wrote an essay in her honor in my book, "Beyond the Veil: Essays in the Dialectical Style of Socrates," I mused about those times and wrote the following verses: "For over a dozen years, she and I have corresponded with one another via letters. You have not read a letter until you have received one from this Noble First Lady, for each letter written, each sentence expressed, each paragraph stated, screams Pain and Agony! Yet, she never screams. . . . She never said a mumbling

word. Even the envelopes I have kept, for they tell her story. The way the stamp is placed *somewhat* near the upper right-hand corner of the envelope cuts my heart like a two-edged sword, for I only have a very, very, very small inkling of the efforts it took to respond to my letters."

Dear reader, the next time you see a handicapped person, someone who is congenitally ill, blind, insane, a bum on the street, or someone whom you consider "misfortunate," take a *second* look and see what lessons God may be trying to teach you by that person's life. To the most Noble First Lady of Antioch Church of God in Christ, you were a giant in a wheelchair. And now that you have made your transition from this finite, earthly realm, you are free to fly with the angels.

ON RELIGION — ESSAY 2

OBAMA, BISHOP T.D. JAKES AND ME

June 12, 2008

For me it was almost *déjà vu* as I sat with my son. I remembered a little over 40 years ago watching the famous King speech with my dad. Similarly, I watched with my youngest son last night as a historical moment unfolded. He and I saw the dreams of slaves come true as the sons of slaves and the slave owners clapped their hands in one progressive sweep.

~Bishop T.D. Jakes

Since my last column, *Obama, me and our pastors*,¹ received many encouraging replies, I thought I would continue this theme in today's column regarding a recent controversial CNN.com commentary by megapastor Bishop T. D. Jakes praising Barak Obama, *Obama nomination gives 'goose bumps*.² Why would Jakes last Saturday get "goose bumps" of awe-inspiring emotion listening to Obama's speech claiming the Democratic Party presidential nomination? Obama, a certified Marxist, an enemy of the Christian evangelical movement and a unapologetic friend of the most reactionary forces in American society. Could Jakes and I be talking about the same man?

At the onset I must confess that Jakes' CNN commentary on Obama threw me for a loop. I first heard of the story Monday morning while

listening to radio talk-show host Mike Gallagher. My inner conflict is this: While I have little respect for the man and I view Obama as a Manchurian Candidate who seems incapable of putting two sentences together without his handy teleprompter, without stuttering or saying one of the following: "uuuhhh," "uuuhhhmmm," or "you know," I do have an abiding and personal respect for Bishop Jakes as a Christian leader whose ministry has been a central part in my life since about 1994, long before he became the megapastor he is today.

Kirkland & Ellis Law Firm, Chicago, Ill. (circa 1994)

I first came to know of Bishop T.D. Jakes and his ministry through a co-worker while I worked as a legal assistant at a blue-chip law firm in Chicago. This was a particularly stressful and turbulent period in my life as I moved from Atlanta to Chicago based on a tacit promise to be accepted into a graduate law program at John Marshall Law School there was renegeed upon. Also, the stresses of a new marriage, studying for the bar multiple times, working a flunky job for arrogant lawyers who had little regard for me as their peer, all caused me to have a crisis of spirituality.

Sensing my distress, a perceptive co-worker at the firm gave me a couple of sermons by Bishop Jakes and my intellectual, spiritual and psychological approach to life was gradually transformed. Jakes taught me to stop looking at external solutions to solve internal problems. In other words, the seeds to your greatness are within you; they just have to be activated by faith in God. This wasn't Oprah New Age spiritualism or Norman Vincent Peale's positive thinking, but applying simple, profound biblical precepts to real-life problems.

With such classic sermons as: "The Joshua Generation," "The Puppetmaster" and "Woman, Thou Art Loosed," Jakes taught me to think above and beyond my despairing circumstances to apply the Scriptures in fresh, new and transcendent ways. After listening to sermons of Bishop Jakes for about two years, I began sketching the outline to my first book, which I published in 1999, "The Devil is in the Details: Essays on Law, Race, Politics and Religion," followed by my second book in 2000 (revised ed. 2004), "Beyond the Veil: Essays in the Dialectical Style of Socrates," a book of 90 essays on a variety of subjects, many of them directly inspired by the sermons of this great preacher.

That said, Bishop Jakes getting "goose bumps" from listening to Obama's acceptance speech has caused me great distress and perplexity.

Why? Because I knew that Jakes is a true stalwart of the faith, and unlike Dr. Jeremiah Wright, Rev. Michael Pfleger, Rev. Al Sharpton, Rev. Jesse Jackson and other poverty pimps who built their careers on exploiting black pathology and anger, Bishop T.D. Jakes wouldn't sacrifice moral truth on the altar of political expediency, or exchange the priceless gifts of God for filthy lucre and for the capricious applause of mere men. No, no, no, not Bishop Jakes! After listening to talker Mike Gallagher's analysis of Jakes' commentary, I quickly pulled it up on the Internet and saw that the story was indeed true, that none other than the great Bishop T.D. Jakes had fallen prey to the intoxicating siren call of "Identity Politics" — blacks for blacks, whites for whites, white women for white women, homosexuals for homosexuals, one-legged, transgendered midgets for one-legged, transgendered midgets, etc.

On Obama, Bishop Jakes said:

Last night, I like most Americans of all stripes, watched with visible goose bumps as history was made. I sat with my 13-year-old son and looked from the screen to his eyes as Sen. Barack Obama became the first African-American in history to lead a U.S. major-party ticket when he claimed the nomination for the Democratic Party for president of the United States.

As if this weren't bad enough, Jakes went further in his effusive praise of Obama:

As the days and discussions of this political season continue, it is my sincere hope and prayer that we do not sink back into the abyss of political pettiness that has plagued our country and our lives for so many years. I am grateful to Sen. Hillary Clinton for giving, through this campaign, a chance for my daughters to see that their femininity is not a liability. Today both my sons and daughters came to understand that their ethnicity isn't viewed by progressive Americans as a limitation or a liability. . . . Congratulations, Sen. Obama.

It greatly pains me that Jakes has tarnished his reputation by joining his great name to Obama, but I am not in utter despair. Why? If it's Martin Luther, MLK Jr., Jerry Falwell, or Pat Robertson, while I admire the man, I try not to be a sycophant to any man. When I discovered that German theologian and father of the Protestant Reformation, Martin Luther (1483-1546), contradicted his entire life's work by frequently ranting against the Jews, calling them the vilest of names, I was saddened, I was

outraged, but I then went into triangulation mode—I separated Luther’s crisis of judgment, his anti-Semitic views and clung to his venerable theological ideas based on the legitimate, prudent, eternal truths of the Bible.

For Jakes to consider the nomination of Obama, a man with the most extremist voting record of the 535 members of the U.S. Congress, as “a victory for democracy that proves that our country provides possibilities for all people,” is beyond the pale, and I hope after Jakes hears the public outcry that he will do as Obama did to Rev. Wright and denounce him (or at least stand mute). In the meantime, I’ll keep listening to the excellent sermons of Bishop T.D. Jakes, but will ignore his political pronouncements, because while Obama gives Jakes goose bumps, his ideas and policies gives me and many other American citizens of good will the hives.

ON RELIGION — *ESSAY 3*

OBAMA, ME AND OUR PASTORS

June 07, 2008

This “constitutional scholar” [Obama] evidently sees the First Amendment as a license to “prevent the disruptive strains of fundamentalism from taking root in this country.”

~ Joseph Farah, CEO, WorldNetDaily.com (quoting Obama on the Religion Clause)

Prologue

I have purposely refrained from writing an entire article about Democrat presidential nominee Barak Obama since he entered the race and am only mentioning him here as a comparative analysis of my own religious background and to demonstrate that for good or evil, our friends are our destiny. Why?

To me, Obama is intellectually vacuous (despite his Columbia and Harvard pedigree). He seems incapable of putting two sentences together without excessively stuttering or saying “uuuhhh.” Because he is so wedded to radical, racist, socialist ideas and is so comfortable around people who promote policies that I and most reasonable Americans find contemptible, I cannot in good faith devote an *entire* column exclusively

on this mental midget. Like Obama, my father left me when I was very young (18 months), and I only saw him twice during my first 30 years of life. That said, I had read through enough biographies of great men and seen personally what happens to young boys who make the wrong life choices to realize that I had better seek out men in the community that could mentor me and teach me how to become a *real* man.

Cass Technical High School, Detroit, Mich. (circa 1978)

While my memory of exactly how it happened is indistinct, I remember one of Pastor Green's eight daughters (No. 6), a cheerful, gregarious young lady and fellow member of the orchestra there inviting me to her father's church. I accepted. Thus began my fateful connection to Antioch C.O.G.I.C., a marvelous congregation that would make an indelible impression on my life.

I first wrote of Pastor Green in an earlier column after attending the home-going service of his beloved wife of 61 years, Mother Julia McCarty Green. Upon first meeting Pastor Green, we had a Jonathan/David-like positive connection with each other and almost immediately he accepted me into his family of eight daughters as a long lost father would embrace his long lost son.

The contrast between Obama's former pastor and my pastor couldn't be more extreme. Unlike the worldwide notoriety of a Rev. Dr. Jeremiah Wright, Pastor Green is an unheralded minister of a small, modest church (about 50 members) in a declining neighborhood in Detroit. Pastor Green is quiet, circumspect, gentle and *very* intelligent; Rev. Wright is loud, reckless, harsh, opportunistic and a shameless demagogue. Obama took the well-traveled road that all Machiavellian, ambitious, unscrupulous men take, which is why men of this ilk are very dangerous and should never be given the reigns of political power—for they lust after money, power, control, legacy and the applause from the fickle crowds above all else. For example, Obama, just a few weeks ago, repeatedly defended the hatemonger Rev. Wright, but willingly threw his own grandmother under the bus for political advantage, slandered this sainted woman who lovingly raised him for years as a racist and "a typical white woman."

Why would this young, highly educated black man go out of his way to associate with such scoundrels? Why would he work with, actively seek the blessing of and praise such vile, reprehensible people as

political radicals Bill Ayers and his wife, Bernadine Dohrn, leaders of anarchist group the Weather Underground, who in the 1970s savagely bombed the U.S. Capitol, the Pentagon, the U.S. State Department and New York's police headquarters? Could it be that Obama sought out these radicals because he is a certified socialist with the most extremist liberal voting record in the Senate?

Returning to Pastor Havius Green, here are just a few things I remember that he did for me over the past 30 years:

- ❖ Pastor Green taught me how to organize and present my thoughts, my ideas, my worldview in a systematic manner; to speak in front of an audience without trepidation, because you never have to fear anything when you stand on the truth.

- ❖ Pastor Green taught me how to study the Bible in an organized process by not only reading the black letter text, but by studying ancillary materials like concordances, study guides and Hebrew/Greek dictionaries written by biblical scholars to improve one's *understanding* of the Bible.

- ❖ The first nine years I knew Pastor Green he gave me at least 10 different jobs to help me earn money during the summer for high school, college, grad school—from washing the windows of the church and parsonage and mowing the lawn to working as a teacher in the day care center, running a summer education program and teaching music to neighborhood children.

- ❖ Pastor Green raised many “education offerings” for me and many, many others, literally giving me thousands of dollars to help me in college and grad school.

- ❖ Pastor Green taught me how to help others and not be selfish by lovingly nursing his darling wife for over 30 years when her condition (degeneration of the cerebellum) slowed her mobility, but could not slow down her zeal for Life.

Obama and I are the same age (46, born one month apart) and, like conservative intellectuals Ann Coulter and Laura Ingraham and musicians Branford and Wynton Marsalis, are part of the tail end of the baby boom generation. In 1988, Obama and I arrived at Harvard at the same time. We both read the books and studied under the famous law faculty there—Laurence Tribe, Derrick Bell, Alan Dershowitz, Charles Ogeltree, Randall Kennedy and other law scholars who influenced our understanding and approach to the law.

After graduating from law school, I lived in Chicago from 1994-97. There I wrote several e-mails to Obama while he was as an adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, repeatedly asking if he could help me obtain a teaching position there. The response from this man who is down with helping "the disenfranchised"?—silence of the lambs—nothing. However, a fellow colleague of his at that same University of Chicago School of Law, senior lecturer Richard A. Posner, a white man, a Jew who was also the chief judge of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, not only frequently responded to my inquiries, he mentored me for the past 10 years and has graciously served as an academic reference on my behalf even though I wrote a law review article very critical of his humanist legal theories and positive law jurisprudence.³

Here is the critical difference between Obama and me, which I believe is inextricably linked to the ideas of our pastors: While I questioned the things I was taught at Harvard by assiduously and meticulously studying the books and scholarly articles written by the Harvard law faculty and other law scholars over many, many years, Obama (and his wife, Michelle) drank freely, fully and unreservedly from the well of the liberal academy at Columbia, Princeton and Harvard Law School. His *ipso facto* acceptance of radical ideas from the law academy (and Pastor Jeremiah Wright) without question thus causes me to view Obama not as a fully developed man, but as a Manchurian Candidate that seems incapable of having an independent thought apart from Marxist, socialist, liberal dogma. Such a person in my opinion is unworthy of the presidency (at least in America).

Epilogue

If 20 years ago Obama had only taken the road less traveled and joined my church, Antioch Church of God in Christ, and willingly submitted himself under the wise and un-theatrical tutelage of Pastor Green, a magnificent man of God, things would have been much better for him. True, there wouldn't have been any media there, no cameras, no Oprah sitting across the aisle, no assortment of political hacks from the corrupt Chicago Democrat Machine with their entourages making a circus out of a sacred service, but I guarantee you, Sen. Obama, that you would have received a rigorous religious grounding in Christianity that would have greatly aided you in making more prudent judgments *as a man* than you

have made thus far in your life due to the vulgar, racist and radical associations you continue to embrace.

Thank you, Pastor Havious Green, for teaching me how to love God, how to pray, study the Bible, speak the truth without fear . . . but most of all for making a man out of me.

ON RELIGION — ESSAY 4

UNTO US A SON IS GIVEN

December 24, 2008

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

~ Isaiah 9:6 (740-680 B.C.)

On the eve before the traditionally recognized birth of Christ, I am admittedly in a melancholy mood. Everything and everybody in the world seems to be hell-bent on insanity, immorality and self-destruction, yet I hear the words of Isaiah incessantly ringing in my ears, words George Frederick Handel intoned in music for the ages in his oratorio, "Messiah":

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

How can this be? How can a little Jewish baby born, according to astronomers, on April 17, 6 B.C. in Judea, a backwater province of the awesome Roman Empire, be called, "The mighty God, The everlasting Father, and The Prince of Peace"? As the world sits poised on the brink of self-annihilation where good men, wise women, courageous leaders appear virtually extinct, it seems that the words the great prophet Isaiah uttered 2,750 years ago are mocking us with his message of faith, hope and redemption. Yet, I am compelled to believe even in the face of utter despair. Despite the odds, despite the present world conditions, despite the rise of new dictators rattling sabers bolstered by resurrected dictators and evil ideologies of the past—China, North Korea, Iran, Russia, Vene-

zuela, Bolivia, the Muslim nations and our world leaders like Bush, Obama, Sarkozy, Merkle, Gordon Brown—our international organizations like NATO, the U.N., the EU, the IMF, the G-8, the G-20 and all parts of Western Europe are either mired in socialism or too stupid to read the handwriting of destiny on the wall. Indeed, the prophet was right who said, "God has used the foolish things of this world to confound the wise."

British Historian Paul Johnson, a modern-day prophet in his own right, in his prescient book, "A History of Christianity" (1976), wrote of these perilous times before the Second Coming of the Lord:

Certainly, mankind without Christianity conjures up a dismal prospect. The record of mankind with Christianity is daunting enough. . . . The dynamism it has unleashed has brought massacre and torture, intolerance and destructive pride on a huge scale, for there is a cruel and pitiless nature in man which is sometimes impervious to Christian restraints and encouragements. But without these restraints [Christianity], bereft of these encouragements, how much more horrific the history of these last 2,000 years must have been! . . . In the past generation, with public Christianity in headlong retreat, we have caught our first, distant view of a de-Christianized world, and it is not encouraging.

As a Christian who has dedicated his entire career, meager as it is, to propagating a Judeo-Christian worldview in all that I say, do or write, I believe with all my heart that during these last days the forces of darkness (Communism, Islam, paganism) will unite with the forces of good intentions and stupidity (humanism, socialism, liberalism, secularism, moral relativism, Bush, Obama, et. al.) to engage in one more grand push in their perverted minds to prove God and the Bible wrong. How? By foolishly supporting geopolitical policies rooted in anti-Semitism and moral relativism, but for God's intervention, the so-called "Two-State Solution" would lead to the annihilation of God's chosen people, the Jews; to once and for all "wipe Israel off the map" as Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has often promised to do once he secures a nuclear arsenal for Iran. There is a demonic, driving force behind why the forces of darkness throughout history have irrationally chosen tiny Israel to vent their insatiable wrath.

In response, what does the civilized world do at this critical juncture of history where all of humanity stands at the precipice of the abyss in the face of this evil against God and his only begotten Son?

- ❖ Israel keeps giving land for peace, yet the more land they give to the Arabs, the less peace and defensible land they have—yet Bush, Dr. Rice and Obama want a “Two State Solution”;
- ❖ Israel repeatedly threatens to bomb Iranian nuclear sites today, yet on June 7, 1981, it had the prescience to bomb the Iraqi nuclear sites of Saddam Hussein;
- ❖ President Bush, during his “legacy tour,” is humiliated at a press conference in Iraq when an obscure Iraqi journalist has time to throw two shoes at the so-called leader of the free world, while his stupefied Secret Service agents stand in frozen amazement;
- ❖ A ragtag band of Somali pirates on rickety speed boats has brought international shipping in the Gulf of Aden almost to a standstill while reaping over \$100 million and counting in ransom payments;
- ❖ Bernard Madoff, a Jewish billionaire, for years ran an “affinity fraud”—an unregulated Ponzi scheme against his own wealthy Jewish brothers and sisters, costing them \$50 billion, thus fulfilling the words of the ancient prophet as those who put faith in Caesar (money, government) and not God—Judges 10:13-14: *Yet ye have forsaken me, and served other gods: wherefore I will deliver you no more. Go and cry unto the gods which ye have chosen; let them deliver you in the time of your tribulation;*
- ❖ The Constitution is treated as toilet paper by the president, Congress and the courts as the private industries that help made America the greatest country in the history of the world are systematically nationalized by the federal government, while “We the People,” like sheep to the slaughter, foolishly give away our liberty to become wards of the Marxist socialist State.

Dear reader, during this blessed holiday season when we give tribute to God’s ultimate gift of his Son, Jesus Christ, as our redeemer from sin, do not fall into despair as you watch what is going on around you in this crazy world, but look unto the innocent babe in the manger about whom 750 years before his birth Isaiah eloquently prophesied, declaring his glorious coming with these immortal words of comfort, hope and redemption:

For unto a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting father, The Prince of Peace.

Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.

ON RELIGION — ESSAY 5

10 COMMANDMENTS OF POST-'60S LIBERALISM

March 31, 2007

Liberals love to boast that they are not “religious,” which is what one would expect to hear from the state-sanctioned religion.

~ Ann Coulter

This day, America and the world are in a dire cultural, political and spiritual crisis. The very existence of civilization as we know it seems to hang in the balance. Will America be what intellectual Bill Bennett calls “the [world’s] last best hope,” or will America (and the West) go the way of Holland, which in January of this year erected a monument in Amsterdam? The monument was not to Rembrandt, not to Grotius, not to Spinoza, not to van Gogh or to some other commendable icon of Dutch history which to revisionist historians are merely DWMs (dead white males). No, no, no! Now that liberals run the show in the West, in academia, in the courts, in the media, in politics, in culture, this monument, paid for by the good taxpayers of Amsterdam, blessed by the city fathers, is to the glorious Prostitute and to that ancient sacred art . . . prostitution. Take that, Spinoza!

The following narrative is a humorous (but grave) satire of a monumental legal code that served as one of the great pillars of Western civilization for thousands of years—The Ten Commandments. However, in my treatment, I will first change the setting from 1500 B.C. to modern times. Secondly, instead of Moses going up to Mt. Sinai to receive the Ten Commandments from God, in my liberal version, Walter Cronkite, that lion of liberalism who for almost 40 years surreptitiously (and complicit with the mainstream media) presented a benign, non-partisan, fatherly image as “America’s news broadcaster,” ascends Mt. Sinai. When he gets to the top of the mountain, God is not there. Nobody is there. “There” is only a blank line; “god” is only a *tabula rasa*, a blank slate to be whatever god you desire.

Since it would be cruel to engrave words into a stone, Cronkite, the scribe, writes down god’s laws in chalk (non-toxic, powderless chalk of

course—we must protect the environment). The following are the Ten Commandments Cronkite has written down for all humanity, for all ages (or at least until the next rain washes the chalk off the tablets of stone).

1. Thou *shall* be your own god (humanism), or everything shall be thy god (pantheism), or if you wish, there is no god (atheism), or it is impossible to know if god exists (agnosticism). Since you are god (or anti-god), thou *shall* believe (or not believe) anything you like.
2. Thou *shall* make any graven image of any god you desire, only use non-toxic, dustless chalk that is green-friendly and will erase quickly lest your god's Ten Commandments offend others who may perchance read your words in the next generation (or the next day) and may find your ideas a bit too judgmental.
3. Thou *shall* take the name of the Lord thy god in vain any time you desire, because we as Americans have freedom of speech and freedom from *all* judgmental religions like Judaism and Christianity.
4. Forget the Sabbath day (go to the football game) and don't keep it holy, for you are your own god and as god, you can do whatever you want to do whenever you want to do it.
5. Dishonor thy father and thy mother unless (due to their sex change operations) your father is now your mother and your mother is now your father, or if you're lucky, you now have two mommies, or you were born via in vitro fertilization—then you are to honor thy legislator or thy judge that allowed thy scientist to make the creation you have become.
6. Thou shall not kill unless you are a serial murderer, child molester, O.J. Simpson or a murderous Iraqi dictator, for you have done nothing wrong and shalt not be shackled with the guilt of others for exercising your freedom to choose. Thou shalt use thy freedom to choose to kill thy unborn baby in thy womb if thou and thy baby's daddy break up during the period of gestation and you now hate thy baby's daddy; or it's not convenient for you to be pregnant because thou might lose thy sexy shape; or because Planned Parenthood gave you a free choice voucher—whatever, whatever, whatever, whatever . . . (*ad infinitum*)
7. Thou *shall* commit adultery whenever thou art horny with anything (or anybody) thou wisheth to get thy freak on with. (Freedom of association, right?)
8. Thou *shall* steal if thou art poor, a bum, a deadbeat parent, an illegal alien, a member of any disaffected minority group, a politician trying to stir up class envy, or if thou art a member of the propaganda press and you steal military secrets and give them to America's enemies. That kind of stealing is all good.

9. Thou *shall* bear false witness against thy neighbor, especially if he is a right-wing, judgmental, mean-spirited, conservative Republican nut-job like Attila the Hun, Joseph McCarthy, Newt Gingrich, Tom "the Hammer" DeLay, Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, Ronald Reagan (*in absentia*), James Dobson, Margaret Thatcher, Mother Teresa (*in absentia*) or the pope.

10. Thou *shall* covet thy neighbor's house (property taxes to support godless public schools).

Thou *shall* covet thy neighbor's wife (Hollywood, opera, soap operas).

Thou *shall* covet thy neighbor's manservant *and* his maidservant (renaming illegal immigration an "amnesty program" for migrant workers from Mexico to curry favor with thy Republican corporate masters; or if you are a Democrat, to create a permanent block of uneducated voters that will be indebted to you for generations, i.e., the same strategy that FDR used to build his bulletproof coalition of Jews, blacks, Italians, Germans, Irish and other disaffected ethnic groups with his New Deal programs of the 1930s).

Thou *shall* covet thy neighbor's ox and his ass, and all that is thy neighbors (politicians that draft laws or judges that decree laws that in essence steal from "the rich" and give to "the poor" and call it "a tax credit," "socialism," "planned economy," "social engineering," "a gift," or as California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger recently called his proposed tax increase—"a loan"). Reasonable people call those government policies or judicial decrees stealing.

"And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw it (the rock 'n' roll bands at Woodstock) they removed, and stood afar off. . . ." and proceeded happily down the road to Perdition.

Note: For the original Ten Commandments, see Exodus 20.

CHAPTER

~ 8 ~

ON ECONOMICS

ON ECONOMICS—ESSAY 1

FAUST, GREENSPAN AND AMERICA'S FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

October 02, 2008

Let's plunge ourselves into the roar of time, the whirl of accident; may pain and pleasure, success and failure, shift as they will—it's only action that can make a man.

~Goethe's "Faust"

Irrational exuberance.

~Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, speech at the American Enterprise Institute regarding the escalation of financial markets, Dec. 5, 1996

Last week, David Blake wrote an intriguing article about America's growing financial crisis that, after I read it, inspired me to hearken back to my literary roots.

Perhaps the most significant literary contribution to 19th century Romanticism was the *oeuvre* by that magnificent German writer, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), particularly his dramatic epic poem in two volumes, *Faust* (1808, 1833). The narrative of "Faust" in brief was about an aging professor (Faust) toiling in his study, surrounded by books but painfully aware of the vanity of life—that he is running out of time. According to Michael Cumming's synopsis of "Faust," Part I: "Faust laments that though he has studied philosophy, medicine, law and theology he really knows nothing about the inner workings of the universe. Even his magic—powerful as it is—fails to lift the veil of mystery. On the brink of despair, he considers suicide." ¹

Enter Mephistopheles (Mephisto), that suave, sophistic angel from the underworld (Satan) who eagerly offers to grant the hapless professor Faust his one last wish, but as usual when dealing with an irredeemable, evil figure like Satan, there is a catch: Mephisto "offers to show Faust the secrets of the world and let him experience the profoundest pleasures," but when his life is over he must relinquish his immortal soul to him and do his bidding forever in hell. With that synopsis of Faust, let us move to today and America's current financial collapse. In this narrative, the American people are Faust. Everyone wanted a piece of the American Dream—the house with little or no money down, filled with furniture, cable TV, computers and all the amenities of life. There was only one problem: Millions of Americans who got homes over the last 25 years really didn't earn them and couldn't afford to keep them.

{*Scene change, Supreme Court, 1991*} Enter Supreme Court Justices Thurgood Marshall, joined by: Rehnquist, Stevens, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter. A year ago, I wrote a piece titled *A critique of Justice Thurgood Marshall* where I cited a landmark but misguided 1991 court case that sowed the seeds of "good intentions" for America's current financial mortgage crisis. Here is an excerpt:

In *Cottage Savings Association v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (1991): The End = Giving the poor access to home loans. Justice Marshall weighed in on the income tax consequences of the savings and loan crisis, permitting a savings and loan association to deduct a loss from an exchange of mortgage participation interests. The Means = Overruling the common law traditions dating back to medieval England protection the "right to contract" by mandating banks insure obvious bad loans of

the poor and when defaulted upon, banks deduct the loss (i.e., pass the loss on to the taxpayers, "We the People"). 2

{Enter Alan Greenspan [Mephisto] stage left} Greenspan told those millions of homeowners: "I am Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve. I am the man who saved the world. I and I alone have the power to control the most powerful economy in the history of world with just a lowering and a lowering and a lowering of the interest rates." This fiscal irresponsibility led to the speculative bubble, which started to burst in late 2007. My argument here is simple: Alan Greenspan, together with a litany of well-intentioned but boneheaded judicial opinions beginning with the Supreme Court, tried to be "fair" and "equitable" to people who had no business owning a mortgage or a home. These people should have remained renters until they had the 20 percent down to buy a home.

Thomas Jefferson's "pursuit of happiness" idea meant people were to work hard for the American Dream. It was not to be given to them. President Jimmy Carter's *Community Investment Act* (1977) raised home ownership from a "pursuit" to a constitutional right. It was irresponsible to grant millions of high-interest loans to the poor, many times with little or no money down, so they could buy a home when the mortgage companies, the Federal Reserve, secretary of the treasury, Wall Street investment banks and their supposed watchdog, the Securities Exchange Commission, all knew that this contract was a Faustian bargain with the devil and in due course would prove disastrous to America's economy.

These homeowners began to default on their loans *en masse* and went into foreclosure over the past 10 years. These delinquent mortgages I predict will cost America's taxpayers trillions of dollars to cover the losses. Meanwhile, the predictable cries from Wall Street, the mortgage industry, and soon the auto industry and other industries the experts haven't even anticipated, will all demand a "bailout" (corporate welfare). They will also want to continue gorging themselves at the government trough and will all want to be rewarded for their incompetent and fraudulent acts perpetrated upon the American people. On Sept. 18, David Blake wrote the following in *Financial Times*: "Where Mr. Greenspan bears responsibility is his role in ensuring that the era of cheap interest rates created a speculative bubble. He cannot claim he was not warned of the risks."

The main lessons of Goethe's "Faust" we should have learned (if it was still taught in our Stalinist public schools and colleges) would be that you can't get something for nothing. In the end, you must give the devil his due. Unfortunately "We the People," America's taxpayers, are the ones that will pay for the sins of others—Wall Street, Congress, the president, the SEC, the IRS, the Federal Reserve, the mortgage industry, the Supreme Court and lower courts, and the millions of American citizens who accepted mortgages they knew or should have known they couldn't afford.

Most to blame are the Democratic Party majority who exploited economic and racial differences by raising home ownership to the level of a constitutional right. As legislators, I hold them most liable in contributing to the tragedy of America's financial collapse. Financial expert Jonathan Hoenig, founder of CapitalistPig.com, said this week on Fox News, "You cannot save capitalism with socialism." I agree. If Congress is foolish enough to pass a \$700 billion dollar aid package for those corrupt, incompetent corporate executives of Wall Street and the mortgage industry that taxpayers will have to pay for, then perhaps the Preamble of our Constitution should be revised from: "We the People of the United States of America . . ." to "We the People of the Insane Asylum of America . . ."

ON ECONOMICS—ESSAY 2

OBAMA AND THE VIRTUE OF SELFISHNESS

November 05, 2008

Capital (money) is not the enemy of workers, but the friend.

~ Ken Blackwell, former Ohio secretary of state

It is one's own personal, selfish happiness that one seeks, earns and derives from love.

~ Ayn Rand, "The Virtue of Selfishness" (1964)

Writer Michael P. Tremoglie writing for The Bulletin earlier this week wrote a prescient piece titled, "Obama: Taxpayers Are Selfish." He was recalling an event Barack Obama spoke at last Thursday in Sarasota,

Fla., expressing his intent after he becomes president to change the tax code to help the economy. How would he achieve this?

"John McCain and Sarah Palin call (the tax increase) socialistic. I don't know when they decided they wanted to make a virtue out of selfishness," Obama said. Despite Obama's Occidental, Columbia and Harvard pedigree, on economics he is totally devoted to and blinded by the Marxist propaganda he learned at those schools. Why?—Because he studied at quintessential liberal academies where the lectures by his professors were less invitations to submit worthy opinions to the arena of ideas and more of an indoctrination factory.

I have never met people like Michelle and Barack Obama; persons who have in a Manchurian Candidate fashion accepted the Marxist socialist propaganda from their professors entirely without question. That's why Obama says what he says about economics. He actually believes that economic Marxism is the best way to go despite our 40 year Cold War with the old Soviet empire where America valiantly fought against Marxist and socialist ideas here and throughout the world, which were responsible for the ghastly deaths of over 100 million people since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Obama's characterization of a tax cut as selfishness in a revealing way seeks to justify both his socialist intent (taking money from producers and giving it to non-producers) as well as denigrating McCain and Palin's belief in laissez-faire capitalism out of the school of Ronald Reagan, Thomas Sowell, Milton Friedman and Adam Smith.

How will Obama the Messiah accomplish this feat? Obama plans to raise taxes only on the top 5 percent of America's taxpayers. In his tax scheme, he calls these people "the rich"—families that make over \$250,000 per year. However, this number has been questioned by a growing number of political pundits and economic experts as essentially untenable; therefore, Biden and Obama for the past three weeks have been back tracking on his "tax the rich" economic stimulus package.

Here is what Tremoglie wrote:

Mr. Obama said initially that only those who earn more than \$250,000 per year would be seeing their taxes increase and those making less than \$200,000 would have them cut. But his running mate, Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., said recently that the tax cut would go only to people making \$150,000 per year. Another Obama supporter, New Mexico

Gov. Bill Richardson, said the tax cut would apply to only families making less than \$120,000.

This is typical Big Government doublespeak from Obama straight out of George Orwell's anti-totalitarian novel, "1984." Obama realizes that the liberal media have been in the tank for him since he first entered the presidential race and has skillfully played the race card when it suits him. Furthermore, by exploiting liberal identity politics, the old media even sacrificed the white woman candidate (Hillary Clinton) in favor of the black man candidate (Obama). When people point out Obama's daily inconsistencies on economics, public policy, executive power, Congress, education, his past associates, foreign affairs, the United Nations, it is all covered up, or the liberal pundits in the mainstream media like Hitler's Goebbels or the old Soviet newspaper "Pravda" run interference as Obama's ministers of propaganda, raising outrageous allegations like: "racism," "divisive politics," "trying to keep the black man down" or in the words of Michelle: "Republicans are trying to tear people apart, but Barack is trying to bring people together."

Obama's recent criticism of Republicans' desire to keep taxes low as wanting to "make a virtue out of selfishness" is a perversion of the objectivist philosophy of Ayn Rand and her 1964 book "The Virtue of Selfishness," which was Rand's singular critique against socialism and for capitalism. Since FDR and LBJ and the apotheosis of Big Government liberalism in the 1930s and '60s, "selfishness" has become a dirty word. A better title for Ayn Rand's book would have been "The Virtue of Self-interest." Self-interest is what made America in just 230 years arise from being a backwater colony of England to the world's sole superpower in the 21st century—the mightiest nation in the history of humanity.

How did America achieve such greatness over other countries like France, England, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Russia, China, India, Africa, Iran, Iraq and other nations that existed for hundreds or even thousands of years? By doing the very things Obama says we *shouldn't* do—promoting free market reforms, rugged American individualism, hard work, saving money, living within one's means, investing in your family, starting businesses, employing people, paying your tithes and in short: maximizing your God-given talents for the benefit of God, yourself and humanity without excessive government taxation, bureaucratic interference and class-warfare policies rooted in Marxism.

In conclusion, Ayn Rand's objectivist philosophy says that, "It is one's own personal, selfish happiness that one seeks, earns and derives from love." Selfishness, or self-interest, is a good thing. Only unscrupulous politicians like Obama, Biden, Pelosi, Harry Reid and the Democratic Party want you to believe that keeping more of your own money to help your family is a bad thing—Ridiculous! Obama and other Marxists, socialists and progressives create self-perpetuating policies that are designed to increase their power by making people dependent on the god-State forever. In the words of Ayn Rand, socialism amounts to: "The man who is willing to serve as the means to the ends of others, will necessarily regard others as the means to his ends."

If Obama, Pelosi and Reid are successful at plunging America into the abyss of socialism and in resurrecting the welfare state of FDR and LBJ, the tragic results will be that over time fewer and fewer people that can work will predictably choose not to do so, but will do like their neighbors and suckle from the teat of Leviathan government. If liberals achieve Wilson, FDR and LBJ's dream of murdering the last vestiges of American individualism and exceptionalism, America will become like socialist Europe, and what the Soviet Union could not accomplish in 40 years of fighting a protracted Cold War with America, Obama the Marxist, with his majorities in both houses of Congress, will accomplish in four years, U.N.A.—THE UNITED NATIONS OF AMERICA, or U.S.S.A.—THE UNITED SOCIALISTS STATES OF AMERICA.

ON ECONOMICS—ESSAY 3

I PRAISE THE POOR

August 25, 2007

The poor ye always have with you. . .

~ Jesus Christ

Where would most politicians be today without the ubiquitous poor? "Oh Madame Poor, how so many craven pols, shyster lawyers, activist judges, cloistered, out of touch academics, Hollywood hacks, union thugs, bumbling bureaucrats have gotten rich in thy name?" "Oh

Madame Poor, how many government programs have been created in thy name?"—A Square Deal (Theodore Roosevelt), A New Deal (FDR), A Fair Deal (Truman), War on Poverty (LBJ), New Markets Initiative (Bill Clinton), Compassionate Conservatism and No Child Left Behind (George W. Bush), yet the poor are still in thy midst, . . . I praise the poor.

Despite the ineffectiveness of poverty programs to eradicate poverty, poverty and despair has only increased exponentially as more and more poverty programs are added somewhere throughout the world almost daily, costing taxpayers trillions of dollars in direct and ancillary costs. For example, former President Bill Clinton launched a poverty program in Malawi, Africa, in 2006 called Clinton-Hunter Development Initiative. I'm sure the millions Bill Clinton will raise for this effort will be money as well spent as the trillions spent on Africa since the end of colonial rule, but I am skeptical.

If Clinton really cared about saving the lives of Africans, he'd do what Sam Zaramba, head of health services in Uganda, did. He wrote in a recent op-ed: GIVE US DDT! Yes, that same "dangerous" chemical liberals banned 40 years ago due to the popularity of environmentalism patron saint Rachel Carson and her blockbuster book of 1962, "Silent Spring"—a book that led to the worldwide banning of DDT. Since that liberal policy of "helping the poor," tens of millions of Africans have needlessly perished due to the scourge of malaria, which at 350 million presently infected in Africa alone is much more of a plague than even HIV/AIDS (40 million infected). . . . I praise the poor.

Even economists have gotten into the "poor people hustle." On June 9, 2006, a stellar list of more than 500 signatories, including five Nobel laureates—Thomas C. Schelling (University of Maryland), Robert Lucas (University of Chicago), Daniel McFadden (University of California, Berkeley), Vernon Smith (George Mason University) and James Heckman (University of Chicago), signed an Open Letter on Immigration "reminding President Bush and all members of Congress of America's history as an immigrant nation, the overall economic and social benefits of immigration and the power of immigration to lift the poor out of poverty." Amazing! Now *immigration* is a poverty program? . . . I praise the poor.

In March, Democrat presidential candidate former Sen. John Edwards announced his candidacy in the bowels of New Orleans a year after Hurricane Katrina devastated that area so utterly. In the midst of a

devastated land, with broom in hand, hair perfectly coiffed, his fingernails without a crumb of dirt on them, Mayor Nagin and grateful black people as a back drop and cameras rolling, Edwards made his long-awaited announcement to run for president a second time. Certainly it cannot be doubted that Sen. Edwards cares for the poor . . . can it? After all, Mayor "School Bus" Nagin and the people that appeared with Edwards for his announcement seemed to think he was for the poor. ("He swept our streets, didn't he? That's more than what Bush did who just flew over Louisiana in a helicopter, right?")

But I saw your new house from afar, Sen. Edwards; from a helicopter's view. Your new 28,200 square foot mansion that cost \$6 million was certainly not in Hurricane Katrina country, not in Harlem, not in Watts, not in Detroit . . . but deep, deep, deep in the woods of North Carolina, just outside of Chapel Hill, far, far, far away from any of those blacks who swept the streets of New Orleans with you—and even further away from any poor person. I saw your palatial home that you clear cut acres and acres and acres of pristine woodland to build. Why? Because you love the environment, so . . . I praise the poor.

I have seen this movie before, dear reader. It is "Ground Hog Day" all over again. Now enters the next champion of the poor, the white liberals' guilt candidate, Barack Hussein Obama, with that JFK persona, powerful dynamism and Madison Avenue good looks; surely *this* man will deliver the poor from their poverty . . . won't he? But I saw you last year, Sen. Obama, with your political fundraiser friend Rezko Blagojevich, sipping martinis on the newly manicured lawn of your recently purchased \$1.5 million mansion. I understand, Senator, that you got that lovely house (and the land next door) for a sweet price as a political bribe from your now ex-friend Mr. Blagojevich. (You must understand dear reader that in the game of politics and war, a "friend" only lasts until one is indicted.) . . . I praise the poor.

And what of Lady Macbeth herself, Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton? Surely, *she* cares for the poor, the underclass and the disenfranchised? Wasn't her husband "the first black president"? During her years as first lady (1993-2001), she loved the poor so much that the first thing she tried to do was give away hundreds of billions of America's tax money to fund her "free" health care program, but the evil Republicans, lead by Rep. Newt Gingrich, scuttled her plans, and now she is back 14 years later as the leading presidential candidate promising "universal health

care for the poor" if elected. She said, "We may not be tan and rested, but we're ready!" The question isn't are *you* ready Sen. Clinton, Sen. Obama, Sen. Edwards and the other ambitious men running for president. The question is: Is America ready for you?

And that's why I praise the poor.

CHAPTER

~ 9 ~

ON SCIENCE

ON SCIENCE — ESSAY 1

DARWIN'S DEADLY DELUSIONS

August 02, 2008

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. . . .

~ Charles Darwin

[L]iving political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice.

~ Woodrow Wilson, Democrat presidential candidate, 1912

Prologue

Today's column continues my review of Dr. Benjamin Wiker's venerable opus, *10 Books that Screwed up the World and 5 others that didn't Help*. My

critique will be of the legendary English naturalist Charles Darwin (1809-82) and his famous treatise on the origins of mankind, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871).

As a prologue to this book review, I propose the question: Can an idea, a theory, even a delusion kill? A cursory review just of 20th century dictators who overtly or covertly embraced and applied Darwin's ideas about evolution, survival of the fittest and natural selection to humanity, resulting in tens of millions of corpses they left in their wake, lamentably beckons a resounding, Yes! Darwin's primary works on evolution theory, *Origins of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859), and later *The Descent of Man* (1871), legitimized the separation of morality and science, which for the next 150 years would thoroughly and systematically attack the suppositions behind traditional morality and imbue this "Third Way" (as the Nazis adopting Darwin's ideas would later call it) with the scientific legitimacy it needed to create a pagan, anti-God worldview rooted in fascism, socialism and eugenics and to propagate these diabolical ideas throughout the world.

'The Descent of Man': Precursor to the eugenics movement

In the opening chapter on Darwin, Wiker wrote: "Reading Charles Darwin's 'The Descent of Man' forces one to face an unpleasant truth: that if everything he said in his more famous 'Origin of Species' is true, then it quite logically follows that human beings ought to ensure that the fit breed with abandon and that the unfit are weeded out."¹ Subsequent generations of scientists, professors, humanists, intellectuals, politicians, judges and others would transmute Darwin's ideas into every conceivable aspect of society and culture through the vehicle of "social Darwinism" and, concurrent with new academic disciplines that grew out of 19th century Romanticism like "economics," "sociobiology," "sociology" and "cultural anthropology," would become very influential.

By the early 20th century, these people, whom today should be called fascists, were collectively part of the new avant garde of politics—the Progressives movement. Central to their new, bold and "experimental" ideas stood Darwin's evolutionary theory as the beginning of a grand, new Age of Enlightenment where anachronistic notions of God, the Bible and the Judeo-Christian traditions would be swept away (or in the case of Progressivism, incorporated) as the new secular zeitgeist took

center stage—Secular Man, or New Man, armed with science would dominate and then eventually purge the world of all the inferior races of humanity. The meek shall not inherit the earth, but the strong, the ruthless, the Machiavellian. “Survival of the fittest!” would be the rallying cry of social Darwinists.

Dr. Wiker continues his refutation of historical revisionists’ efforts to obfuscate or separate the hateful ideas of the eugenics movement rooted in virulent racism from Darwin’s purely scientific ideas of evolution: “Attempts to disengage Darwin from the eugenics movement date from a bit after World War II, when Hitler gave a bad name to survival of the fittest as applied to human beings. But it is impossible to distance Darwin from eugenics: It’s a straight logical shot from his evolutionary arguments.”²

According to Wiker, “Darwin believed that morality was neither natural nor God-given, but was itself the result of natural selection. Whatever actions, attitudes, or passions happened to contribute to the survival of an individual or groups were naturally selected. The virtue of courage, for example, was naturally selected, because in the struggle for existence the cowardly are wiped out right quickly and the manly types live on to breed happily with the appreciative maidens.”³ Wiker noted that Darwin was particularly interested in altruism, or more specifically, “sympathy”: Darwin said that “those communities, which included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members, would flourish best and rear the greatest number of offspring.”⁴

However, Wiker was not fooled by Darwin’s concession to the gift of mercy, which has been voluminously codified in the Judeo-Christian tradition for millennia, and writes that “It [Darwin’s view of ‘sympathy’] substitutes indiscriminate niceness for goodness in human affairs.” Darwin’s perverse ideas on humanity, sexuality and its place in nature create a slippery slope that (given the appropriate conditions) plunges all mankind into the abyss. Wiker writes, “In trying to treat every living thing as part of one moral whole, it ends up inverting the entire moral order and the natural order along with it. The outcome is the animal rights activist who, overflowing with sympathy for the chimpanzee, destroys medical research clinics.” He later says “that if humans being have rights, animals have rights as well.” Therefore, in Darwin’s “*The Descent of Man*,” Wiker cites that mankind is not a unique creation of God favored and distinct from the rest of creation, but Darwin’s ideas are

based on "the assumption that human beings are just one more animal on the evolutionary spectrum. If we are just one more animal, and so-called 'moral' traits are ultimately no more moral than any other evolved traits, then we obviously are not morally distinct from any other animal."

Darwin's conclusions in "The Descent of Man" are not very optimistic for humanity, especially for my people, as evident from the passage below:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. At the same time the anthropomorphous [i.e., most human-looking] apes . . . will no doubt be exterminated. The break will then be rendered wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as at present between the negro or Australian and the gorilla. ⁵

Darwin made the unscientific and tragic leap in *The Descent of Man* that external differences among the world's racial and ethnic groups necessitated a hierarchy that numerous dictators in the 20th century—Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, Franco, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot, et al.—would later to one degree or another exploit to diabolical ends. Applying Darwin's ideas on human evolution, sexual selection, evolutionary psychology and evolutionary ethics to government policies encouraged these tyrants to attack the basic human and natural rights of the people. With revolution, war, famine, disease and economic collapse raging throughout the 20th century, mass genocide was inevitable.

That the delusion of social Darwinism (or as I prefer to call Darwin's ideas, scientific racism or scientific mythology) is still regarded as science orthodoxy today is beyond the pale. That Darwin's racist and unscientific ideas are still taught as authentic science in public schools, colleges, universities as well as codified in public policy and judicial rulings is a terrible vulgarity, a travesty of justice and a betrayal to the academy's sworn allegiance to *Veritas*—Truth.

ON SCIENCE—ESSAY 2

CALIFORNIA BURNING

October 27, 2007

While California burns down, Harry Reid, from D.C. town,
Blames global warming, Cries, "It's so alarming!" But Rush proved
Reid's a clown.

~ Paul (a poet and reader of my WND column)

Last Tuesday at a press conference, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid made the ludicrous claim that the wildfires presently raging throughout Southern California were due to politics—that global warming was at least partly responsible for the blazes. "One reason why we have the fires in Southern California is global warming," the Nevada Democrat told reporters, emphasizing the need to pass the Democrats' comprehensive energy package presently stalled in Congress. A few minutes later in that *same* interview, the venerable senator was forced to retract his global warming theory by lying, obfuscating and saying he never said what everybody had heard him just say openly on TV. And Congress wonders why their approval ratings hover around single digits?

"Pressed by astonished reporters on whether he really believed global warming caused the fires, he appeared to back away from his comments, saying there are many factors that contributed to the disaster," reported WorldNetDaily.com. ⁶

At first I was outraged at Sen. Reid for once again trying to advance his myopic political agenda on the backs of the victims of a natural disaster. (Remember how the Democrats shamelessly politicized the Hurricane Katrina tragedy in Louisiana? Rapper Kanye West on national TV ranted: "George Bush doesn't care about black people!") But then I had a moment of pause. It does seem that California has more than its share of wildfires—more than any other place on Earth. Could there possibly be some public policy reasons why there are so many fires in California notwithstanding Sen. Reid's preposterous global warming fairytales?

As I was listening to the Laura Ingraham radio show earlier this week, the discussion was about the terrible California wildfires. One

caller was a smokejumper from Montana. Speaking with unusual clarity and rationality, he tersely stated some of the reasons why California has so many wildfires:

- ❖ Radical liberal environmentalist policies prohibit controlled burning of heavily forested areas. Big tree-logging companies need not apply!
- ❖ Years and years of dormant undergrowth in the forests provide perfect kindling for a fire-prone environment like California.
- ❖ The notorious Santa Ana winds, which during this time of year whip through Southern California, can reach speeds of up to 100 mph. (which are hurricane speeds).
- ❖ Two hundred years ago, much of California was a desert in its natural state with few residents. Since then the land has become increasingly populated. Moreover, for the past 50 years that state has had a building boom of lavish mansions and expensive homes built right in the middle of unnatural, man-made forested areas;
- ❖ People have planted trees, shrubs, grasses and plants around their homes that are not native to California and are very combustible. (For example, the caller suggested that the popular eucalyptus tree is neither native to California nor fire retardant).

Regarding the equally devastating California wildfires of 2003, in a revealing article published July 2003 in "Environmental News" by James Taylor, the writer discovered that the majority of the federal forest thinning proposals were tied up in needless and costly litigation by environmental Nazis. Taylor writes:

The GAO examined 762 U.S. Forest Service proposals to thin forests and prevent fires during the past two years. According to the study, slightly more than half the proposals were not subject to third-party appeal. Of those proposals subject to appeal, third parties challenged 59 percent.⁷

Appeals were filed most often by anti-logging groups, including the Sierra Club, Alliance for Wild Rockies and Forest Conservation Council. According to the GAO, 84 interest groups filed more than 400 appeals of Forest Service proposals. The appeals delayed efforts to treat 900,000 acres of forests and cost the federal government millions of dollars to address. Forest Service officials estimate they spend nearly half their time, and \$250 million each year, preparing for the appeals and procedural challenges launched by activists. On Thursday, Gov. Arnold

Schwarzenegger was promised billions of dollars in taxpayer dollars by the Bush administration (Schwarzenegger prefers the term "loan") to deal with this catastrophe of biblical proportions. However, I wonder, will the governor listen to that Montana smokejumper and urge the Legislature to pass mandatory controlled forest burning, undergrowth removal and clear-cutting policies? Don't hold your breath.

In an earlier column, I traced the triumph of the State over We the People back 75 years ago to FDR's unprecedented four term as president (1933-45). I surmise it is at that point in history when these radical environmentalist policies grew out FDR's New Deal programs, which have, since the 1970s, flourished and grown exponentially. Regarding the apotheosis of Big Government, I wrote the following:

What is FDR's legacy to America? In a word, Tyranny. C.S. Lewis put it is thusly:

Of all tyrannies, a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their consciences.⁸

FDR taught America to forsake the three things that made her great—free-market capitalism, its Judeo-Christian traditions and rugged American individualism. How? By pitting church against state, sacred against secular, men against women, race against race, rich against poor, creed against creed, Jew against Gentile, liberals against conservatives, class against class, the haves against the have nots. . . .

As millions of my fellow Americans watch the tragedy of California burning, I must add one more achievement of FDR's socialist revolution. He made common-sense public policy the servant of Machiavellian political expediency and pandered to small, shrill, extremist special-interest groups, all at the expense of the legitimate constitutional rights of We the People. Environmentalist, in the words of C.S. Lewis, are one of many present day "omnipotent moral busybodies" that "torment us for our own good."

In Roman antiquity, there was a prescient aphorism that stood for 2,000 years as a monument to bureaucratic arrogance, stupidity and ineptitude—"Nero fiddled while Rome burned." In modern parlance, it

could be iterated: As Sen. Harry Reid spews out nitwit global warming propaganda, California burned.

ON SCIENCE—ESSAY 3

SYMPOSIUM—FREUD'S LEGACY—DOES MEDICATION = HEALING?

September 22, 2007

I swear . . . to please no one will I prescribe a deadly drug or give advice which may cause his death.

~ Hippocrates (460-370 B.C.)

Hippocratic Oath for medical doctors

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form "dialectic"—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *veritas*—Truth.

Socrates: We are gathered here today at my academy to discuss and hopefully resolve an exceedingly vexing societal problem: Are America's psychiatrists, psychologist and clinicians responsible doctors that promote healing, or licensed drug pushers that habitually over medicate their patients for craven expediency and crass monetary gain?

Psychiatric community: (collective gasp!) We didn't come here to be lectured to by *you*, Socrates! We are respected doctors of the community and will not have our integrity impugned by a *mere* philosopher.

Socrates: Indeed. Before we begin this symposium, I would like to direct your attention to the recent case of Rebecca Riley, a 4-year-old little girl who tragically died Dec. 13, 2006, from a fatal overdose of medicines her parents administered to their child to treat her so-called bipolar disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, or ADHD, including clonidine, valproic acid, depakote, dextromethorphan and chlorpheniramine. As if the death of their only child wasn't enough to endure,

now the little girl's parents and their psychiatrist have been brought up on charges of murder. My question to the

Freud: I have *never* accepted the idea of "medicating" psychological problems, for it is no cure. My approach would have been to ask the little girl about her dreams, her fears, the deep dark recesses of her mind. I don't "heal" my patients; I cure them by only one thing—talk, not prayer, not sacrifice, not exorcism, not drugs, surgery, changing of diet, but recollection and reflection in the presence of a sympathetic, dispassionate professional.

Socrates: Indeed, Dr. Freud. I can see that your ideals on the study of the human mind, psychoanalysis if you will, has certainly influenced many others after you, yet there is consensus in the psychological community that you never actually *cured* anyone, and at one point in your career, Dr. Freud, you did treat patients with drugs—cocaine, I believe, was your drug of choice then, was it not Dr. Freud?

Freud: (convicted) Yes, Socrates, indeed it was. I was wrong.

Socrates: Let us hear from some of Freud's primary successors and the psychological, psychiatric and psychoanalytic schools they founded. I want to hear about their ideas in relation to medicine, healing and the Rebecca Riley case.

Carl Jung: (1st School—Analytical Psychology) Originally, I was a fervent disciple of Sigmund Freud, one of the first, but I later left him because of his radical ideas on sexuality. I vehemently objected to his Oedipus Complex, or the idea that an infant boy sexually desires his mother.

Joseph Campbell: (Mythology) My analytical approach to psychology dealt with my own popular writings on the hero myth (Judaism, Christianity, Islam and all religious belief). My therapy gives no regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

Alfred Adler: (2nd School—Individual Psychology) I, Alfred Adler, not Jung, was the first of Freud's inner circle to defect. I argued that neuroses arose not from libidinal forces but from overcompensation for feelings of insecurity. My therapy gives no regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

Carl Rogers: (Humanistic) My theories to treat mental illness or psychological problems was originally called client-centered therapy where the focus is placed on the experience of the patient. My therapy gives no regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

J.L. Moreno: (Psychodrama) My approach to treat neuroses was through studying how people interact in groups. Therefore, I devised the psychodrama, a technique that stresses role playing, creativity and spontaneity in reaching a catharsis. My therapy gives no regard to either religion or the metaphysical realm.

Harry Stack Sullivan: (Interpersonal Psychotherapy) My hands-on system encourages therapists actively to challenge, guide and support the patient during the session. My therapy gives no regard to either religion or the metaphysical realm.

Sandor Ferenczi: (3rd School—Active Therapy) In direct contrast with Freud's nondirectional methods, I, Ferenczi, helped develop Active Therapy, which allowed the analyst to play an active part in the session. My therapy gives no regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

Socrates: Now comes Otto Rank (*Birth Trauma*) Karen Horney (*Social Psychoanalysis*) Heinz Kohut (*Self Psychology*) Nancy Choddrow (*Analytic Feminism*). Note that none of these therapies gives regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

John Watson: (4th School—Behaviorism) B.F. Skinner: (*Stimulus & Response*) I, B.F. Skinner, followed Watson in ignoring unconscious motivations and focusing chiefly on observable behavior. My therapy gives no regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

Socrates: Now comes Aaron Beck (*Behavioral Therapy*); *Cognitive Therapy*; *Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy*; *Cognitive Behavioral Therapy*; *Rational Living Therapy*. Anna Freud (*Modern Freudian Psychoanalysis*), Peter Fonagy (*Psychodynamic Psychotherapy*) and *Psychodynamic Developmental Therapy*. Note that none of these therapies gives regard to morality, religion or the metaphysical realm.

Let us hear the conclusion of the matter. Regarding the Rebecca Riley case, we have heard Freud's analysis not to administer his drug of choice to treat young Ms. Riley (cocaine) but to talk to her, showing that Freud's perverse ideas about the mind, particularly childhood sexuality, has diminutive redeeming value; moreover it is dangerous to one's psychic health. We have heard from the five psychological schools of thought and the primary progenitors of each school, which all advocate in one form or another what Freud proposed: 1) all talk; 2) all drugs; 3) more talk/less drugs; 4) less talk/more drugs; 5) no talk/all drugs; 6) shock therapy; and 7) hypnotherapy.

Rebecca Riley is like Cassandra of ancient Troy whose seeming hysterics portended the doom of Troy by Achilles and the Greek legions, yet she was ignored, mocked by her own parents and later murdered. Likewise, from beyond the grave has the Rebecca Riley incident become a tragic case study against the anti-metaphysical, anti-historical treatments of the past, but also to the ineffectual and even diabolical treatment of people with mental illness who have to suffer under this new, enlightened generation of psychologists and psychiatrists, post-Freud.

Dr. Freud, since you and your progeny prefer to treat the *symptoms* rather than the *cause* of your patients' mental illness, this catastrophic state of affairs has only led an entire generation of people who in my day would be considered "normal" children in need of a parent's loving care, attention and protection, to instead be manipulated for craven medical expediency and crass financial gain by these legalized drug pushers, and condemned to an early grave.

CHAPTER

~10~

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 1

CLARENCE THOMAS' *MY GRANDFATHER'S SON*

October 20, 2007

The mob I now faced carried no ropes or guns. Its weapons were smooth-tongued lies spoken into microphones and printed on the front pages of America's newspapers. It no longer sought to break the bodies of its victims. Instead, it devastated their reputations and drained away their hope. But it was a mob all the same, and its purpose—to keep the black man in his place.

~ Clarence Thomas, *"My Grandfather's Son"*¹

The Greek philosopher, Aristotle, eloquently described a friend in this manner: "A single soul dwelling in two bodies." I cite this quote because, as I have just finished reading Justice Thomas's memoir, I found many passages astonishingly similar to my own life (like one soul dwelling in two bodies); so much so that I had to put the book down repeatedly so I would not stain the pages with my tears; so raw the emotion so

painful the rejection by those whom you thought would help you, but in your hour of greatest despair, instead, the only sound you heard was the cold, grave . . . silence of the lambs.

This column is in part a book review of Thomas's superlative memoir, *"My Grandfather's Son,"* but it is also a comparative analysis of my own precipitous journey in the course of this life that so paradoxically mirrors my dear mentor and friend. For the past 16 years that Justice Thomas has been on the Supreme Court, he has established a jurisprudence pedigree that, in my opinion, has already gone down in history as *the* most faithful jurist to the original intent of the Constitution's Framers and the rule of law in the history of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I believe Justice Thomas has a judicial record that is even more praiseworthy than his early mentor, Antonin Scalia, as well as John Jay (the first chief justice), John Marshall (the second chief justice), Joseph Story, Louis Brandeis, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Benjamin Cardozo, Felix Frankfurter, Earl Warren, William Brennan, William Rehnquist and yes, even Thomas' predecessor, the venerable Thurgood Marshall who few constitutional scholars have the courage to admit could care less about what the original intent of the Constitution's Framers was. And along with *his* "Scalia," William Brennan, left a legacy of liberal activist jurisprudence and shameless legislating from the bench that their opinions are considered sacred scripture and revered orthodoxy by the law academy and in all Democrat circles, even to this day. Below is a short comparative analysis of Justice Thomas' life and work, and the similarity to my own:

❖ Like Justice Thomas, I was rejected by my own father who named me after his father, my grandfather ("Ellis"). Like Justice Thomas's grandfather ("Daddy"), my grandfather, in a sense, became my surrogate father until his untimely death in 1972 when I was 11—my earliest memory of death.

❖ Like Justice Thomas recorded the wonderful impact his grandfather had on his life, so did I in a book titled *"Beyond the Veil: Essays in the Dialectical Style of Socrates.* The essay regarding my grandfather was in the section "On Manhood"—essay No. 17: "Grandfather Ellis Washington (A Tale of Two Fathers)."

❖ Like Justice Thomas, it took me many years to come to terms with my grandfather's love because I secretly hated my father for abandoning my mother when I was only 18 months old. Like Justice Thomas, I only saw my father twice in my first 30 years of life.

❖ Our grandfathers were from the same generation; men of the post-World War I, Jim Crow South who shared an unstoppable work ethic and moral resolve that was transcendent. I was fortunate; my grandfather was able to express his love to me more openly than Justice Thomas' grandfather and, by his magnanimous nature, showered on my siblings and me many gifts and money whenever he came to visit.

❖ Like Justice Thomas credits his grandfather with shaping his character, I attribute my grandfather's magnanimous spirit to why I have given away most of the books and articles I've written through the years (amounting to more than \$20,000) to family, friends, justices, think tanks, academics . . . and even strangers I've met on the streets.

❖ We both drove our beloved old Volvos during law school, even though they had many mechanical issues.

❖ We both share the same judicial philosophy (natural law, originalism, strict constructionist) and the same philosophy of life (Horatio Alger's self-help, moral uprightness and individual responsibility) and use it as our philosophy of life and work.

❖ We both share a love of great thinkers and books of the past (St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, the Constitution's Framers, Booker T. Washington, Richard Wright's "Native Son," Ralph Ellison's "The Invisible Man," the novel "To Kill a Mockingbird," Ayn Rand's "Atlas Shrugged" and "The Fountainhead," Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams). I read all those works and writers virtually at the same period in my life as Thomas did.

❖ Of the many outstanding passages from your memoir, one that was particularly poignant to me was the following—"I think segregation is bad, I think it's wrong, it's immoral. I'd fight against it with every breath in my body—but you don't need to sit next to a white person to learn how to read and write" (p. 163-64). That succinct, sublime statement had the dual intent of killing racial segregation as a betrayal of the clause in Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence—"All men are created equal," and the latter part shows me that the celebrated 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision was the moral thing to do, but tragically utilized the wrong judicial reasoning.

❖ Both of us uniquely know the ever-painful sting of being rejected, slandered (and ignored) by your own people for merely having ideas that white liberals and black elites forbid *any* black person to have. I wrote of this Kafkaesque groupthink in the column "What is Plantation Liberalism?"

To you Justice Thomas, You neutralized "Delilah in a blue dress" (Anita Hill) and all of your enemies not with vitriol, but with truth. Your

achievements, by overcoming so much, have paved the way for generations of future legal scholars, the underestimated, the iconoclastic and young people who are atypical thinkers to have hope. Your book has taught me that despite not achieving all the desires of my heart, I must daily work to leave a viable legacy for my son, Stone, by following your sterling example of devotion to God, love of America, veneration of the Constitution and rigorous personal discipline that your "Daddy" bequeathed to you and to your little brother, Myers, during your formative years. May *"My Grandfather's Son"* be second only to the Holy Bible in the number of sales worldwide.

ON SOCIETY AND CULTURE—ESSAY 2

TIME FOR REVOLUTION?

August 14, 2008

We're going to 'Bork' him [Clarence Thomas].

~ Florence Kennedy, at a feminist National Organization for Womyn rally (July, 1991)

As I begin preparation for my teaching duties at Savannah State University, a historical black college founded in 1890 and the oldest HBCU (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) in the state of Georgia, I have mixed emotions. Frankly, I fear for the intellectual integrity of my students—people whom I've never met. In less than a week, I will be teaching various courses on global politics, political philosophy, law and the judicial process, yet the lofty ideas and ideals I will seek to convey to my youthful minions at SSU will undoubtedly be contradicted by the glaring realities of the rule of law—how powerful men and women in expensive suits break the law with impunity and often go unpunished or receive much less punishment than you or I would receive if we did just *some* of what these people have done.

How can I teach my young students the values of venerating the rule of law and tailoring their lives to its laudable ideals when all around them are scoundrels in suits whose lives exemplify the cynical credo "Following the law is for suckers!" Take, for example, Detroit Mayor

Kwame Kilpatrick. As Detroit continues to implode, the latest events in Motown regarding this embattled mayor devolve to their inevitable end of infamy—a prison term (brief though it may be). One has to inquire: How can a man like Mayor Kilpatrick, who is obviously guilty of multiple felonies, continue as the leader of a major city like Detroit and be the front-runner for a third term in 2009?

A week ago, Ronald Giles, a controversial judge on the 36th District Court, who was appointed by the mayor and is reported to be in Kwame's back pocket, finally succumbed to national pressure and did the right thing. After the mayor violated the court's order and his parole not to leave the city without alerting the court for the *second* time, Judge Giles finally acted like a real judge rather than Kwame's crony and put the mayor in jail overnight on Aug. 7. A night in jail did not deter Kilpatrick's lawless ways, for on Aug. 12 Giles heard testimony that the mayor violated his bond for a *third* time, and this time Kwame's crony behaved as taught, gave a wink and a nod and did not put the mayor back in jail. Is this justice? While in jail a week ago, the wheels of justice were grinding on other acts of infamy to which the mayor would have to answer—most recently the charges brought by Michigan's attorney general, Mike Cox, regarding an incident about two weeks ago where the mayor allegedly cursed out and shoved two Michigan state police officers. Why?

The police were trying to serve a subpoena, not to the mayor who was unexpectedly at the home of his sister, Ayanna Kilpatrick, but to the mayor's friend and recipient of over \$100 million in city contracts, Bobby Ferguson, a man with a criminal record who himself is on bond for numerous criminal acts, including fraud, bribery, parole violation and assault. Last Friday afternoon, the mayor's father, former Wayne County Executive Bernard Kilpatrick, paid the \$50,000 cash bond to free his son. I wonder how much of that money is illegal payola funneled to his dad's consulting firm by Mayor Kilpatrick under the pretext of benefiting Detroit? Do you see the naked cronyism and illegal transfer payments of taxpayer dollars from crook, to crook, to crook?

If you wonder why our youth are so jaded to the rule of law, virtue and truth, just last week a blue-chip group of Detroit's movers and shakers—including business mogul Peter Karmanos, Art Blackwell, Highland Park's financial manager, prosecutor Kym Worthy, federal Judge Damon Keith, Conrad Mallet, former justice of the Michigan Supreme Court and

now CEO of Detroit Medical Center and a lawyer from the mayor's office—quietly met at the world headquarters of Compuware in downtown Detroit for the express purpose of hammering out a plea deal where the mayor can plead to several misdemeanor charges so that he won't have to give up his law license.

What, you may ask, would a pathological, narcissistic megalomaniac need with a law license? His Honor says, "So that he can take care of his family." Some of you may remember 17 years ago during the long hot summer of 1991 when Clarence Thomas, one of the few noted black conservatives in America even to this day, savagely and unjustly had his character assassinated by a gutless cabal of liberal pols, leftist pressure groups, feminists, judges and academics. All came out against this honorable man whose entire life has been a singular dedication to the ideas that made America the greatest nation on earth—rugged individualism, liberty, truth and that Horatio Alger pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps worldview.

Justice Thomas slept with no other man's wife. His wife did not beat two strippers and chase them out of the mayor's mansion. Justice Thomas has never mistreated those under his charge and as head of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission treated everyone with dignity and respect. (He was later vindicated for allegations involving Anita Hill.) After witness testimony and his "high tech lynching" speech, even his many detractors had to privately concede that Justice Clarence Thomas was a man of impeccable character, superior judicial intellect and represented the best ideas and ideals America has ever offered.

Why is Kwame Kilpatrick defended by Detroit's brain trust while Justice Clarence Thomas is reviled to this day? In a sane world, there would be no rational argument here, but as George Orwell said, "In times of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act." I'm feeling kind of revolutionary today, so I will tell the truth: Kwame Kilpatrick is an irredeemable man of the lowest ilk, and I rebuke all of those people propping him up to protect their jobs or their illegal bribes or the myth that black people, by virtue of race alone, are better qualified than anyone else to help black people. MLK said it is not the color of your skin, but the content of your character that makes the man (or woman).

Where is the NAACP? Where is the Urban League, Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Rep. John Conyers, Rep. Charlie Rangel, Rep. John Lewis, the Congressional Black Caucus, the feminist organizations, the ACLU and

all the others who crow about “social justice”? Where was social justice 17 years ago for Clarence Thomas when these people and many other organizations came out in unison *against* this honorable man? These radicals and leftist pressure groups have ridiculed virtually every judicial opinion Justice Thomas has written, though his legal works are paragons of moral truth, liberty, originalist jurisprudence and comply with the original intent of the Constitution’s framers to the letter. In a recent poll that asked black people whom you trusted more as a leader, Clarence Thomas got just 30 percent, while Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice received 50 percent and Democrat presidential nominee Sen. Barack Obama 90 percent. That poll speaks volumes on how deceived people have become in rightly judging character.

Liberalism, or the apotheosis of the statolatry or the god-state dominating every aspect of our lives, is killing my people in Detroit and is killing America. Unless we unite to prevent this menace of promoting the criminal and incompetent while demonizing the virtuous and honorable, then, dear reader, I have just four words for you—Let the revolution begin!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 3

A TALE OF TWO CITIES: GROSSE POINTE AND DETROIT

April 24, 2008

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times.

~ Charles Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859)

Prologue

Paradise Valley, Detroit, Mich. (*circa* 1967)

My younger brother, sister and I were literally bursting with anticipation as we sat by our living room window. My mother had made one of her rare trips to that enchanted place—a marvelous and exquisite land called, Grosse Pointe. On all of her previous trips to this splendiferous estate, a land flowing with milk and honey, she would always bring back truly beautiful items, things that I know she couldn’t have brought in

Detroit. Where was this delightful land? Was Grosse Pointe a mythological place? Eventually my mother would sometimes take us on shopping trips to Grosse Pointe. Only *then* were we sure that Grosse Pointe was a real place. Other hints I had was that a good friend of my mother, an uneducated, but very wise woman we called "Aunt Ruby," had been a maid to some wealthy families in Grosse Pointe. Through the years, her employers gave her many exquisite items in gratitude for her exemplary service to them. Some of those items Aunt Ruby would later give to my mother.

My sixth grade teacher, "Mrs. Vaught," was from Grosse Pointe, which was not surprising to me seeing she was my most favorite teacher ever. This woman did things as a teacher in the 1960s and '70s that would have gotten teachers today immediately fired. She treated all students (black and white) exactly the same (no affirmative action). If you were smart, you were praised. If you were intellectually challenged, you were encouraged to study harder, or consigned to "the slow class." Mrs. Vaught's classroom was immaculate. It was an honor to be chosen to clean the classroom. She would often send me to the corner store *during class time* to buy some "Mop-'n'-Glow" to mop the floors. Literally a section of our classroom was transformed by Mrs. Vaught into a living room with lace curtains, a Henredon sofa, matching mahogany coffee table and end tables, lamps, bookshelves loaded with the classics like Dante's "Inferno," Melville's "Moby Dick," the Bible, and to top off that spectacular space, a Persian rug.

Although we were poor kids living in the ghetto, she brought a sense of Grosse Pointe *to us* . . . not to put us down, but as a high standard for us to aspire to. Mrs. Vaught's tutelage has paid cerebral dividends for me to this day. Regrettably, for a fellow student named "Sylvester" whose sadistic tendencies inspired him to repeatedly piss upon the bathroom mirrors . . . apparently Mrs. Vaught's civilizing techniques toward my colleague were all in vain. After living in Detroit for more than 40 years, my parents moved to a lovely home in Grosse Pointe Woods in 1995 where they lived until my stepfather, Jack Folson, died 10 years later. Visiting their home gave me and my wife the idea in 2000 to move to Grosse Pointe, where we live to this day.

A Tale of Two Cities (Grosse Pointe, *circa* 1984)

During my time as a member of the Grosse Pointe Symphony (I played the French horn), as one would drive east along Jefferson Ave. from Detroit to Grosse Pointe, one would be confronted by signs of utter devastation—block after block of bombed-out, burned-down, barred or boarded-up buildings. Residential areas with only five to 10 houses on each block where 40 years ago had 30 to 40 homes on each block, pot holes that could break the axle on your car, citizens roaming the streets like zombies, aimlessly begging for money to buy cigarettes, drugs, alcohol—with no hope and in utter despair. Yes, there are signs of new home construction, but the houses look cheap and don't match the original ambience of the old neighborhood, and, oftentimes, these new homes are vandalized before the units can be sold, causing a "new ghetto" to be built right on top of the old ghetto.

Dear reader, what shocks the conscience most, is that moment when you first cross that imaginary line in the sand that divides the savage wilderness of Detroit from the civilization outpost of Grosse Pointe. Like the river Rubicon that to the Republic of Rome was taboo for a general to cross with an army, yet Julius Caesar boldly crossed the Rubicon in 49 B.C. with his Roman Legions. Here, the Rubicon I speak of is called, "Alter Road." When you cross Alter Road, you are immediately struck by the stark difference between neighborhoods. In Grosse Pointe, the old, stately homes are magnificent. The yards are immaculate. There are no loiterers around, no gangs in the streets running wild, no graffiti, no potholes, no security bars on the homes or business, no vacant lots turned into mini junkyards, no drug dealers, no drug addicts, police are visible—none of the ills that have plagued big cities across America for decades.

Why the stark contrast between Detroit and Grosse Pointe—two cities adjacent to one another? Of course, the socialists and the liberal academics will have a host of excuses:

- ❖ Grosse Pointe is all white. Detroit is all black.
- ❖ Grosse Pointe is a small, white-collar suburb. Detroit is a large, blue-collar inner-city.
- ❖ Grosse Pointe has more money for better schools and city services than Detroit.
- ❖ Grosse Pointe isn't as old as Detroit—1893 versus 1701.

❖ Grosse Pointe has thieves, drug addicts and crime just like Detroit. It just hides them better.

All of the above statements may be *factual*, but they are not *true*. Here is the truth:

❖ Grosse Pointe is virtually all white (97 percent), but is represented by peoples of all racial groups. Most affluent blacks *choose* to live in Detroit (downtown, Sherwood Forest, Palmer Woods, the University District, Rosedale Park) or in one of the many other upper-class suburbs bordering Detroit, like Southfield, West Bloomfield, Birmingham, Oak Park, Troy, etc.

❖ While Grosse Pointe is a white-collar suburb, and Detroit is a blue-collar city, this construction is due more to history and expediency rather than a conspiratorial racial animus against black people.

❖ Grosse Pointe, a comparatively small suburb that is actually five interlocking cities collectively called, "The Pointes" per capita has more money, better schools and city services than Detroit, but this is due to the fact that city officials of Grosse Pointe are better stewards of the tax dollars entrusted to them by "We the People." I don't need to retell the litany of fiscal irresponsibility, waste, fraud, abuse and cronyism by black leadership against their own people in Detroit dating back to 1974 when Coleman A. Young became the first black mayor of Detroit.

❖ Grosse Pointe's north/south border with Detroit is Mack Avenue. I have friends that live on the Detroit side, and most of the homes date back to the 1920s/30s era. These homes were built concurrently with those of Grosse Pointe, yet Grosse Pointe homes have been meticulously maintained, some for more than 100 years, while homes in Detroit's "East English Village" just a few hundred feet from Grosse Pointe and of the same era of architectural design, now lay in disrepair, targets of vandals, drug dens or abandoned altogether.

❖ Grosse Pointe has virtually no murder (one murder in 2005, the only one since its founding in 1893!) Detroit is not only the reigning "murder capital of America" but according to Forbes Magazine, "the most miserable city in America."

While I don't have the political demographic for Grosse Pointe (Democrat, Republican, Independent), I will assume that because it is an affluent city like others across America this is a Democrat town, yet I see none of the policy experiments liberals love to dump on inner cities. For eight years I have walked length and breadth of the "Pointes" almost everyday, and this is what I have *not* found:

- ❖ Bums, loiterers or graffiti
- ❖ Abortion clinics, wig shops or party stores
- ❖ Projects or "low income" public housing
- ❖ Detroiters bussed into Grosse Pointe schools
- ❖ "Public" parks open to all (Grosse Pointe residents only)
- ❖ So-called "Afrocentric," feminist studies or gay/lesbian studies curriculum,
- ❖ Legions of \$700-an-hour attorneys, naked cronyism, rigged bids for political pay-offs or strippers partying at the mayor's mansion at taxpayers expense as recently demonstrated by the antics of Detroit's Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick.

In conclusion, what has this tale of two cities revealed to us? What are the causes that have given us the savageness and utter despair of Detroit *right next door* to the idyllic, utopian qualities of Grosse Pointe? Pick a state. Pick any two contrasting cities in that state, and I bet you could write the same column as I have done here.

You can't logically blame *all* this on "the white man," on the lack of money, institutional racism or discrimination. Any rational person must concede that Detroiters should at least shoulder *some* of the blame for their plight based upon their own *individual life choices*. Secondly, liberal socialist policies dating back to FDR have utterly decimated big cities across America by purposely aborting America's can-do spirit, rugged individualism and self-initiative. Socialist programs: From the welfare that we freely give to 13, 14 and 15-year-old girls to have babies out of wedlock, to the social security we give to our senior citizens who are unduly burdening society and killing business that have to pay retirees' exorbitant social security and Medicare benefits, robbing society of their wisdom by "retiring" at 55 years old.

I truly believe that the difference between Detroit and Grosse Pointe resides within the transcendent qualities that Justice Clarence Thomas' grandfather ["Daddy"] taught him which are *de facto* illegal today: A tough love that transformed Justice Thomas from a boy into a real man, his daddy's Spartan discipline that cared enough for him to look Clarence Thomas and his brother, Myers, dead in the eyes and say, "The damn party's over!" Oh yeah, that's right, granddaddy (like Detroit) is dead . . . RIP.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 4

THE BEWILDERING MIND OF PRESIDENT GEO. W. BUSH

December 10, 2008

Democrats are liberals first.

~ Rush Limbaugh, conservative intellectual

I want to revisit the Kennedy Center Honors held last Saturday. When the media repeatedly looped President Bush giving legendary singer and liberal activist Barbra Streisand a kiss on the right side of her cheek, while for the past eight years giving conservative Republicans the backside of his hand, I had to seriously contemplate to myself . . . What makes President Bush act in the manner that he does? An excerpt from an article reads: "Art transcends politics this weekend," the longtime Democrat [Streisand] said beforehand. Still, she said it would have been "lovely" if she could have received the award while President-elect Barack Obama was in office.

Dear reader, please indulge me here. I mean no vulgarity, but in the tradition of Socratic dialectical reasoning, I am simply poisoning the question based on a series of bizarre occurrences by Bush going back to when our commander in chief mysteriously "choked" on a pretzel while watching a movie alone inside the White House. While admittedly this article is speculative, I do not intend to be mean-spirited. I sincerely want to understand the mind and actions of President Bush. Why does he do what he does? Are there some medication issues the American people should be aware of? After all, "We the People" have a right to determine whether America's president, the leader of the free world, the most powerful man of the most powerful nation in the history of the world, is psychologically strong enough to deal with being president of the United States. Even at this late hour in his presidency, I'm not at all convinced that he is.

Generally, we live in a free and open society, a culture that generally fosters a transparent inquiry of knowledge and information. While there are privacy laws regarding issues of national security, President Bush, as an elected official, gives up a certain amount of privacy to the public to serve the people as president. One of those modes of inquiry surrounds

his mental and physical fitness to be president, an inquiry that can and should be made whenever appropriate throughout his term in office. When I viewed footage of Bush giving Streisand a kiss, it was a surreal and disturbing experience for me, which brought to memory the terrorist Yasser Arafat kissing the hand of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin's widow, Leah, at his funeral, Nov. 6, 1995.

As a Christian and a lover of the Jewish people and the nation of Israel who has dedicated my entire career to furthering a Judeo-Christian tradition of intellectual thought, I considered Leah Rabin's affection for Arafat tantamount to treason, a blasphemous act that affronted many Israelis and other supporters of the Jewish state throughout the world. Why? Because the hand she held was stained with the blood of tens of thousands of innocent Israelis shed since 1946 when Arafat, just 17 years old, cut his rapacious teeth smuggling weapons into Palestine to kill Brits and Israelis, just after World War II. Eventually, Arafat murdered his way to the top by becoming head of the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1964, a rise to power he achieved by killing innocent Jews and Arab Christians who did not subscribe to his evil methods.

The writer of the article on Leah Rabin and Arafat in part wrote:

Leah Rabin's readiness at her late husband Yitzhak Rabin's funeral to show her true feelings about his former political associates and rivals by accepting a kiss of sympathy from his long-time rival within the Labor Party Shimon Peres but turning away from Likud Party leader Benjamin Netanyahu set off a spate of Leah-watching articles in both the U.S. and Israel. . . . The Washington Post reported that on his condolence call to the Rabin apartment in Tel Aviv, Yasser Arafat kissed the Rabin grandchildren and said, "You are my family now."

To use a biblical analogy, for Leah to allow a kiss from Arafat would be like Mordecai kissing the hand of Haman or Jesus kissing the hand of King Herod—unthinkable!

To explain the actions of liberalism and liberals, conservative Rush Limbaugh is fond of saying, "Democrats are liberals first." What this means beyond a superficial understanding is that if conservatism is a politics of the *Spirit* and liberalism is a politics of the *flesh*, then in their purest forms these two ideologies cannot logically or morally mix. Therefore, any Republican that ascribes to or accepts the underlying premises of liberalism is being self-contradictory. The basic presumptions of liberalism are:

- ❖ The Leviathan State is sovereign above God;
- ❖ The "common good" over individual rights; and
- ❖ The Marxist aphorism, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need," which is the central premise that created the FDR/LBJ and now Barack Obama socialist welfare state.

Conservatives and Republican politicians, to curry favor from the media or Democrats, endeavor to ape liberalism or socialist programs, causing them to exemplify contradictory and anti-conservative policies, thus assuring their descent into political oblivion (for example: George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush, Bob Dole, John McCain, et al.). Likewise, as with liberal Jews and other socialists of every racial cant, you must remember that "Democrats (Socialists) are liberals first." Therefore, there is a synergy with Bush kissing Streisand as when you see Leah Rabin allow the murderous Arafat the public affection of kissing her hand, while slandering conservative Netanyahu at every opportunity.

This human behavior transcends mere politics and ventures into the sacred realm of the soul and spirit—a defilement of the soul and a perversion of the spirit that views philosophy, politics, law, religion, economics, education, science, medicine and policy not through the lens of logic and reason, but through the paradigm of Nietzsche's, *Der Wille zur Macht* [Will to Power], a "self-overcoming," humanist "redemption." In other words, I want what I want, when I want it, how I want it, and God, logic and truth be damned! This is my attitude regarding the rise and fall of the Bush presidency: Let Bush kiss whomever he wants, let Bush gleefully offer hand sanitizers to Obama upon their first face-to-face meeting, let Bush appoint a "car czar" as a remedy to the financial woes of the Big Three automakers, let Secretary of State Condi Rice beg the queen of England to play a recital at Buckingham Palace while Muslim fanatics run wild all over the world, let President-elect Obama promise to give America FDR, part II (a "new New Deal"). . . . And when the entire invention collapses upon its own weight, I believe that America's rugged individualism will once again be resurrected from the ashes of socialism to rebuild a new and better America conceived in liberty, morality and *Veritas* (truth).

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 5

SPITZER, KILPATRICK AND THE ROAD TO PERDITION

March 13, 2008

Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before the fall.

~ King Solomon (*Proverbs* 16:18)

I, like all Americans and now the world, was stunned at the sensational scandal that broke on the front pages of the New York Times on Monday. I asked myself the question, "How could a man of such towering stature, talent, position, privilege and power throw it all away for a prostitute?" I answered myself: "None of those attributes have anything to do with morality"—and there is the rub. Since I was in the midst of writing my mid-week column about the crisis of leadership in Detroit, it became irresistible to me to do a comparative analysis of New York's egomaniac governor, Eliot Spitzer, and Detroit's pathological mayor, Kwame Kilpatrick, who incidentally delivered his "State of the City" address Tuesday.

I could have saved "America's first hip-hop mayor" a lot of time and money on speechwriters and his audience the inconvenience of trudging out in the cold and snow by writing the speech for him using just six words: Hey yo, Dog?—Detroit is screwed! To give you an idea of the efficiency of law and government of New York and the tolerance for the minstrel show here in Michigan, consider the following:

❖ Spitzer came to the press within hours of the news breaking of his affair with a prostitute. He resigned yesterday. However, in Michigan, over six years since Kilpatrick has taken office, published text messages conclusively prove that the mayor and Christine Beatty, his former chief of staff and lover, repeatedly lied under oath in a whistleblower lawsuit—a treacherous act that decimated families, costing the careers of four decorated police officers and the city over \$9 million.

❖ Both Spitzer and Kilpatrick are ambitious, arrogant, narcissistic men who possess a cunning, evil and pathological nature.

❖ Both men won elections in 2002—Spitzer being re-elected as attorney general with 66 percent of the vote and Kilpatrick garnering well over 55 percent in his race for mayor. Kilpatrick won a second term in

2006 by openly stealing the election. To date, not one Detroiter has had the vision to bring a campaign fraud lawsuit in protest.

❖ Spitzer won the governorship in 2006 after spending years as a district attorney and later attorney general of the Empire State, zealously fighting what he considered corporate greed and corruption within Wall Street. Kilpatrick, the son of two politically connected parents (his mother is the current chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus) was a state representative before becoming the mayor of Detroit.

❖ Spitzer saw himself as an incorruptible crusader of righteousness anointed to cast down the wickedness of the money changers of Wall Street. He was the sworn enemy of white-collar crime, the Mafia and organized prostitution, yet he apparently lived a double life regarding the latter. I wonder who paid the tab for his licentiousness.

❖ Likewise, Mayor Kilpatrick, in October 2002, had a wild party at his Manoogian Mansion replete with three strippers—one of them an aspiring young businesswoman, college student and mother of three named Tamara “Strawberry” Greene. Seven months later, Greene and another dancer would be murdered. According to 31-year law-enforcement veteran Lt. Alvin Bowman, the suspicious murders had the imprint of a trained police officer.

❖ Both men lavished their women with money, favors and trips. Spitzer (“Client No. 9”) reportedly paid his prostitute \$4,300 plus hotel and travel expenses by train from New York to the Synopsis Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. Kilpatrick did Spitzer one better: *In the midst* of all the embarrassing media coverage of the text messaging scandal with Christine Beatty, the mayor still found time to take a much needed vacation at a ritzy spa in North Carolina with his special woman Jan. 19-21. No, not his wife, Carlita, but a woman named, “Carmen Slowski.” The tab for Detroit taxpayers—\$900.

❖ Spitzer’s vengeance knew no end as he wantonly abused the power of his office to punish his political enemies, real and imagined. In a Nixonian move, Spitzer even used state troopers to spy on a Republican state senator, Joseph Bruno, and authorized the punitive use of the IRS on Bruno, on Hank Greenberg, the former CEO of AIG Corp., and against several prominent Wall Street bankers.

❖ In 2003, Mayor Kilpatrick asked his buddy Attorney General Mike Cox (a Republican) to call off the Michigan State Trooper’s investigation of a “party.” Cox then abused the power of his office to “investigate” the alleged party at the Manoogian Mansion, and you guessed it, Cox found no evidence of a party, calling the alleged party “an urban legend.”

❖ Spitzer, whose supporters once predicted that he would become “the first Jewish president,” is now a broken, pathetic little man—a laughing stock and a sobering example of how quickly the pride of man is cast down to perdition in a day.

❖ On the eve of his “State of the City” address Kilpatrick was blindsided by an affidavit submitted by Janice Rogers in the Tamara Greene obstruction-of-justice lawsuit. Ms. Rogers, an unassuming 65-year-old retired police station clerk, made the astonishing claim that in late 2002 while she was doing her normal clerk duties of reading and cataloguing incoming police reports, she read the actual police report where Carlita Kilpatrick allegedly assaulted Greene at a party at the Manoogian Mansion. Rogers claims the report said Greene was touching Mayor Kilpatrick in a manner that made Mrs. Kilpatrick upset, which resulted in Ms. Greene receiving a severe beat-down “with a wooden object.”

❖ Spitzer’s role models were Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Dewey and Rudy Giuliani, who were all zealous crusaders against public corruption, ambitious men who cleverly parlayed their vocation into prestigious positions of power.

❖ Here in Detroit, Kilpatrick is referred to as “The Barack Obama before there was a Barack Obama” because as he ascended the throne of power as mayor of Detroit in 2002 at the tender age of 32, his gregarious nature and political talents made people envision him after two terms of perhaps even becoming a governor or a senator.

In the words of former presidential candidate Ross Perot: “What’s that giant sucking sound?” It is the gubernatorial aspirations of Spitzer, Kilpatrick and Mike Cox going down the toilet. *Sic semper tyrannus*—Thus to all tyrants!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 6

SYMPOSIUM—KKK OR KKK (KWAME 'KLAN' KILPATRICK)?

March 06, 2008

Sometimes our talent can take us places our character cannot keep us.

~ Mildred Gaddis, host *The Mildred Gaddis Show*, WCHB-1200 AM, Detroit

When someone shows you who they are the first time, believe them.

~ Maya Angelou, Poet Laureate

Socrates (470-399 B.C.)—a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form *dialectic*—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates
- ❖ Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan
- ❖ Mayor Kwame “Klan” Kilpatrick, mayor of Detroit, Mich. (2002-present)

Prologue

Socrates: We are gathered here today at this Symposium to discuss the state of black America with an ironic twist. Forty years since the magnificent gains of the civil rights movement, 40 years since the marches of Dr. Martin Luther King with the glorious crescendo of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I ask this singular question: For the past 40 years were black people better off under the tyranny of the Ku Klux Klan or the “leadership” of Kwame “Klan” Kilpatrick?

Grand Dragon: For over 100 years,—from the end of the Civil War to the late 1960s, the Ku Klux Klan has terrorized black Americans with impunity from the shadows of the lynchman’s noose. Hidden behind white sheets in the dark of night under fiery crosses, our most effective weapons arise—fear, silence and complicity by ordinary American citi-

zens. Those were the good old days where the white man ruled everything. We didn't have all this crime and violence in our cities and towns. Good people could walk down the streets in peace and safety. The Negro knew his place!

Mayor Kilpatrick (outraged): "The Negro knew his place!" Grand Dragon, that's a very racist statement! In my city, the great city of Detroit, all of our citizens have freedom, liberty and access to all the wonderful qualities of life that were only a distant dream to my people 40 years ago under your evil, racist regime.

Socrates (to the Grand Dragon): Indeed. Let us examine the record. In 1968, you were the Grand Dragon of the national KKK headquartered in Birmingham, Ala. Your governor was George Wallace, a national symbol of resistance to racial integration. Your police chief was Bull Connor, a sadistic, pathological maniac that derived pleasure from torturing blacks who legally and peacefully protested for their civil rights. Yet, despite the stifling aspects of *de jure* (legal) and *de facto* (by practice) racial discrimination, black people in the main were on the ascendancy politically, economically and socially. However, ironically, when black Americans won the battle of racial integration, they concurrently lost the war of civilization.

Mayor Kilpatrick: I've been the mayor of Detroit since 2002. Black people are much better off than they were under the terroristic tactics of the KKK 40 years ago in Birmingham. It is beyond rational argument . . . isn't it?

Socrates: In *your* delusional world of argument, Mayor Kilpatrick, yes; however, in the world of rational argument, no. You, the civil rights movement and history are right to memorialize and chronicle the innumerable vicious acts of brutality and institutional racism that persist to this day, inhumane and racist treatment blacks and others have suffered under the hands of the KKK for over 100 years, oftentimes with the blessing of the local police and magistrates. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the irrefutable evidence of history that proves the state of black America was better in 1968 than in 2008.

Grand Dragon: That's because every good, red-blooded white American knew what the Klan stood for—we hated the Negroes, we hated the Jews, we hated the Catholics, we hated the immigrants, we hated the whites that didn't hate the Negroes, Jews, Catholics and the immigrants. Our party was the Democrat Party—The party that tried to secede from

the Union to maintain black slavery in America. Our motto—segregation today, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever!

Mayor Kilpatrick: You see, Socrates? You see?! Listen to that racist hate speech from the Grand Dragon of the KKK. I certainly am not like this white racist! I want to lift people up; the KKK wants to keep them down. I want to give people good-paying, respectable jobs; the KKK wants black people only to do servile work. I want to be the mayor of a living, thriving, dynamic city where everyone can live the American Dream; the KKK wants black people to live in ignorance, fear and despair.

Socrates (to Kilpatrick): If that is so, Mayor Kilpatrick, then why in 2008, after six years under your leadership, was Detroit christened by Forbes Magazine as "The most miserable city in America"? Why has your administration failed to govern effectively? There are widespread street light outages and mandatory audits lacking for two years, costing your cash-strapped city tens of millions in penalties from the state. Why does Detroit have the highest violent crime rate, the second-highest unemployment rate, the highest number of toxic waste sites, deplorable schools, astronomical school dropout and teen pregnancy rates?

Why does Detroit have such wretchedly poor city services, so much so that residents must pay an additional \$300 per year for garbage pickup? Why do your streets have such huge craters? Why does snow and ice remain unshoveled and people live in fear behind bars on their doors and windows because the criminal elements of the city are running wild—because they know that the police do nothing?

Grand Dragon: What Mayor Kilpatrick and by extension black leadership has done to their own people over the past 40 years has surpassed even the wildest dreams of the KKK. You abort over one-third of your own babies, killing them by the millions to this day. The KKK killed only a few thousands black people, and that was over a 100 year period. Most ironic is that election after election you vote for a political party whose major platforms are all directly against the vested interests of your own people.

At our height of power in 1925, the KKK had over 4 million members. We proudly marched 40,000 strong down Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House, yet our demonic hatred of blacks, Jews, Catholics and immigrants have no comparison with the pathology, despair, ignorance and black-on-black crime affecting the state of black America

today—terrorist tactics done by their own people in complicity with big-city black mayors, the public schools, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Democrat Party . . . yet, the KKK is called a racist organization?!

Socrates: Let us hear the conclusion of this matter. Are black people better off under the openly racist regime of Gov. George Wallace, police Chief Bull Connor and the Grand Dragon of the KKK, or are black people better off under the incompetent, arrogant and pathological black leadership of a Kwame “Klan” Kilpatrick?—KKK or KKK? It is a paradox that may not be able to be answered in this generation; however, posing this question offers the seeds of hope for a new generation of leadership that refuses to be defined by skin color, but will only be judged by the content of their character.

Until that apotheosis occurs there is only a negligible difference between the tyranny of the Ku Klux Klan of 1868-1968 and the tyranny of Kwame “Klan” Kilpatrick in 2008. On this I concur with Detroit radio talk-show host Mildred Gaddis who regarding the deplorable and tragic leadership of Mayor Kilpatrick in Detroit, eloquently stated, “Sometimes our talent can take us places our character cannot keep us.”

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 7

WHAT TO THE PRE-BORN BABY IS THE 4TH OF JULY? (A.K.A. TODAY’S UNBORN BLACKS: MORE VULNERABLE THAN SLAVES)

March 01, 2008

Power concedes nothing without a demand.

~ Frederick Douglass

Prologue

While I fully realize that the subject of abortion is an unspoken blasphemy in polite company, nevertheless during this political season I feel compelled to address this most critical issue of modern times. Why? Like slavery, abortion gives one person the power to terminate the life of another under the color of law.

Chattel slavery, or the idea that one man can own and sell another person as his own personal property, was outlawed in 1865 by force of

arms in the Civil War and *de jure* (by law) via the 13th Amendment. Nevertheless, American society has a modern form of slavery that in my opinion is vastly more clandestine and diabolical than America's 400-year experiment with "that peculiar institution" — abortion.

Below is an excerpt of what I consider Frederick Douglass' greatest speech and one of the greatest American speeches of all time. To stress my point on the slavery/abortion paradigm, I have modified the text of Douglass's speech about slavery to reflect modern abortion policy (i.e., "slavery" = "abortion"; "slave" = "pre-born baby"; "slaveholder" = "pro-abortionist").

What to the Slave is the Fourth of July? by Frederick Douglass

July 4, 1852, Rochester, N.Y.

Fellow citizens: Pardon me, and allow me to ask, why am I called to speak here today? What have I or those I represent to do with your national independence?

Are the great principles of political freedom and natural justice, embodied in that Declaration of Independence, extended to us? And am I, therefore, called upon to bring our humble offering to the national altar, and to confess the benefits, and express devout gratitude for the blessings resulting from your independence to us? . . .

This Fourth of July is yours, not mine. You may rejoice, I must mourn. To drag a man in fetters into the grand illuminated temple of liberty, and call upon him to join you in joyous anthems, were inhuman mockery and sacrilegious irony. Do you mean, citizens, to mock me, by asking me to speak today? If so, there is a parallel to your conduct.

And let me warn you, that it is dangerous to copy the example of a nation whose crimes, towering up to heaven, were thrown down by the breath of the Almighty, burying that nation in irrecoverable ruin. I can today take up the lament of a peeled and woe-smitten people. . . .

My subject, then, fellow citizens, is "American [abortion]." I shall see this day and its popular characteristics from the [pre-born baby]'s point of view. Standing here, identified with the American bondman, making his wrongs mine, I do not hesitate to declare, with all my soul, that the character and conduct of this nation never looked blacker to me than on this Fourth of July. Whether we turn to the declarations of the past, or to the professions of the present, the conduct of the nation seems equally hideous and revolting.

America is false to the past, false to the present, and solemnly binds herself to be false to the future. Standing with God and the crushed and bleeding [pre-born baby] on this occasion, I will, in the name of humanity, which is outraged, in the name of liberty, which is fettered, in the name of the Constitution and the Bible, which are disregarded and trampled upon, dare to call in question and to denounce, with all the emphasis I can command, everything that serves to perpetuate [abortion]—the great sin and shame of America “I will not equivocate; I will not excuse.”

I will use the severest language I can command, and yet not one word shall escape me that any man, whose judgment is not blinded by prejudice, or who is not at heart a [pro-abortionist], shall not confess to be right and just. . . .

What point in the anti-[abortion] creed would you have me argue? On what branch of the subject do the people of this country need light? Must I undertake to prove that the [pre-born baby] is a [person]? That point is conceded already. Nobody doubts it. The [pro-abortionists] themselves acknowledge it in the enactment of laws for their government. They acknowledge it when they punish disobedience on the part of the [pre-born baby]. . . .

The manhood of the [pre-born baby] is conceded. It is admitted in the fact that Southern statute-books are covered with enactments, forbidding, under severe fines and penalties, the teaching of the [pre-born baby] to [eventually] read and write. When you can point to any such laws in reference to the beasts of the field, then I may consent to argue the manhood of the [pre-born baby]. When the dogs in your streets, when the fowls of the air, when the cattle on your hills, when the fish of the sea, and the reptiles that crawl, shall be unable to distinguish the [pre-born baby] from a brute, then I will argue with you that the [pre-born baby] is a man! . . .

Would you have me argue that [the pre-born baby] is entitled to liberty? That *he* [not his mother] is the rightful owner of his own body? You have already declared it. Must I argue the wrongfulness of [abortion]? Is that a question for republicans? Is it to be settled by the rules of logic and argumentation, as a matter beset with great difficulty, involving a doubtful application of the principle of justice, hard to understand? . . .

There is not a man beneath the canopy of heaven who does not know that [abortion] is wrong for him. . . .

What, then, remains to be argued? Is it that [abortion] is not divine; that God did not establish it; that our doctors of [politics, medicine and law] are mistaken? There is blasphemy in the thought. That which is inhuman cannot be divine. Who can reason on such a proposition? They that can, may; I cannot. The time for such argument is past. . . .

What to the American [pre-born baby] is your Fourth of July I answer, a day that reveals to him more than all other days of the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To [the pre-born] your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation of tyrants, brass-fronted impudence;

[To the pre-born] your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are to him mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy's thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation of the earth guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than are the people of these United States at this very hour.

Go where you may, search where you will, roam through all the monarchies and despotisms of the Old World, travel through South America, search out every abuse and when you have found the last, lay your facts by the side of the everyday practices of this nation, and you will say with me that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America[s conception-to-partial-birth abortion policy] reigns without a rival.

Epilogue

Two of the three current presidential candidates, Obama and Clinton, are fanatically pro-abortion. This is particularly galling to me as a black man regarding Obama, for over one third (36 percent) of all abortions are by black women. According to 2007 U.S. Census Data, "Half as many viable black children are killed before they can be born as get the chance to live (503 per 1000 births)."

McCain, though pro-life, is lukewarm and rhetorically inept, and derives pleasure at disusing conservatives and their ideas at every opportunity. The consequence? A slave of 1808 has a better chance of life than a black pre-born baby of 2008.

Jefferson, in his Declaration of Independence, guaranteed all Americans three rights—"life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." These rights were "inalienable" meaning they derived from God and cannot be taken away by man. By failing to protect the most vulnerable in our midst, Americans should wonder: Do we therefore possess *any* rights that God is bound to respect?

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 8

DETROIT'S MIDDLE-FINGER SALUTE

February 28, 2008

I could see tension between the city blacks and the Detroit police increasing rapidly. Black militants and black radicals made their voices ring in rebellion. STRESS became a rallying point for black militants.

~ J. F. Spreen, "Who Killed Detroit? Other Cities Beware" (2005)

In my new mid-week column on Detroit, I am challenging myself to provide real solutions and not just list a litany of the city's ills, which, sad to say, since my people have been in power for the past 35 years, have literally turned Detroit—a formerly affluent, cosmopolitan and important city, once called "the arsenal of Democracy" and "Motor City"—into "the most miserable city in America." Like in the Garden of Eden, it all began so pure, with such hope, with such limitless possibilities and promise, but in place of the subtle, crafty snake was a diabolical and baseless philosophical assumption my people have stubbornly believed in like religious dogma—*the idea that a black man can govern black people better than a white man or a person of another race, not by his abilities, but because of skin color alone.*

While I understand this tribalism ethic, 40 years of black elected leadership in small, medium and large cities all across America has in the main had disastrous results for the majority black populations under their rule. Not because of race, but because of a wicked, failed ideology and political philosophy called *liberalism*. In 1974, Coleman Alexander Young, Detroit's first black mayor who later won four terms (1974-94), in his inaugural address was blunt and to the point. Young declared: "I issue an open warning right now to all dope pushers, to all rip-off artists, to all muggers: It's time to leave Detroit. I don't give a damn if they are

black or white, or if they wear Super Fly suits or *blue uniforms with silver badges*: Hit the road."

On the surface Young's rhetoric was compelling, but the devil is always in the details. Since I am writing this column with the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, we now know that Mayor Young had no intention of putting the criminal elements to flight out of Detroit because liberals thrive on chaos—but his speech was code language and a threat to the 91 percent of whites and 8 percent of blacks living in Detroit who *didn't* vote for him. Basically, that speech gave the middle-finger salute to these dissenters, urging them to get the hell out of town (including white police officers). Young's politics was a politics of vengeance, tribalism and crass cronyism that held Detroit hostage for 20 years and birthed a new generation of even more pathological leadership in Young's protégé, Detroit's current embattled mayor, Kwame Kilpatrick.

The first thing Mayor Young did after seizing executive control was to keep his campaign promise of disbanding a controversial unit within the police force called "STRESS." STRESS (Stop the Robberies, Enjoy Safe Streets) was a successful crime-fighting program using undercover police officers to act as decoys in stopping crimes in the more violent parts of the city. The immediately effective tactics of STRESS had caused certain black activist demagogues and craven liberal pols to complain that *they* were too often the targets of the unit's trigger-happy whites despite a 20 percent drop in crime. A few weeks ago I received an e-mail from a retired Detroit police officer named Larry Nevers (a member of STRESS), who was one of the officers unjustly and for crass political reasons put on trial regarding the 1992 accidental death of Malice Green—Detroit's version of the Rodney King affair. To avoid bad press the Detroit City Council in a gutless move quickly awarded Malice Green's family \$5.1 million in damages.

The notoriety from this racially hysterical case catapulted an inconspicuous DA of unremarkable talent (Kym Worthy) to win a large verdict against white police officers "who killed Malice Green," and parlay that into a judgeship and now her current position, Wayne County prosecutor. Yet, that same speed Kym Worthy used to exploit an accidental death of a unruly drug addict by the police, is slow as frozen molasses to bring perjury charges against Mayor Kilpatrick despite the vast powers and resources of her office and the fact that Detroit Free Press columnists have basically written the legal brief for her case. Mr. Nevers was also

kind enough to send me a copy of his 2007 book, "Good Cops, Bad Verdict," narrating that horrific chapter of his distinguished police career. Regarding STRESS, Nevers declared, "Sure, Coleman Young was partially correct when he accused STRESS of killing young black men, *but*, you have to ask yourself who was committing these acts of armed robberies? Young black men! Coleman Young failed to mention the STRESS officers that were killed or maimed doing their jobs."

It has been 34 years since Young disbanded STRESS. A dispassionate comparison of the results of a Detroit without STRESS versus a Detroit with this valuable crime-fighting unit is self-evident. Demonstrative of this fact was a recent article by Forbes magazine whereby Detroit added another dubious distinction to her infamous list of accomplishments—"The Most Miserable City in America." Forbes writes:

Imagine living in a city with the country's highest rate for violent crime and the second-highest unemployment rate. As an added kicker you need more Superfund dollars allocated to your city to clean up contaminated toxic waste sites than just about any other metro. . . . Misery is defined as a state of great unhappiness and emotional distress. The economic indicator most often used to measure misery is the Misery Index. The index, created by economist Arthur Okun, adds the unemployment rate to the inflation rate. It has been in the narrow 7-to-9 range for most of the past decade, but was over 20 during the late 1970s. . . . Crime and unemployment are closely linked. . . . Our three most miserable places bear that out (Detroit, Mich; Flint, Mich; Stockton, Calif.). All three are among the eight worst cities in terms of both unemployment and violent crime. . . .²

The citizens of Detroit should stop the craziness of electing people that look like themselves and instead elect leaders that were intelligent, competent, honest, humble and most importantly, not monolithic in their thinking and myopic in their political vision. In other words, stop electing socialist, liberal Democrats to all the seats of power in the city and Detroit will soon have a *real* Renaissance. Young's disbandment of Detroit's STRESS undercover unit 34 years ago only elevated the *stress*-level of all Detroiters of good will. Moreover, Young's shortsightedness and shameless pandering to the socialist, demagogic and militant elements of the city jeopardized the quality of life for all Detroiters, amounting to a de facto implementation of the DCEPA—Detroit Criminal Equal Protection Act.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—*ESSAY 9*

CLARENCE THOMAS: NO 'BLACK SELF-RESPECT'?

February 23, 2008

But I know that the vote of nine out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions.

~ Clarence Thomas

It goes without saying that a profound hatred of African people . . . sits at the center of American civilization.

~ Cornel West

Cornel West, professor of Religion and African American Studies at Princeton, is an eloquent, controversial and outspoken critic of conservatives and their philosophical ideas and ideals for America. Considered an avowed communist by his critics, West calls himself a "non-Marxist socialist." His 1980 doctoral dissertation which he adopted into a book in 1991 was titled: "The Ethical Dimension of Marxist Thought." West calls his methods "radical historicism" and seeks to show how Marx himself theorized a pure "socialism" and how it was distorted by three of Marx's most famous interpreters: Friedrich Engels, Karl Kautsky and Georg Lukacs. After the collapse of the old Soviet Union and the Berlin Wall, West, like many liberal intellectuals, tried in vain to clarify the non-Leninist stream of the Marxist tradition and recover its energy.

West has nursed a 20-year tirade against Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. Why all the hate against this quiet man? Professor West has it all—a B.A. from Harvard, a M.A. and Ph.D. from Princeton. He lives in an elite, lily-white neighborhood where he makes over \$300,000 per year as a professor at Princeton University. His books, largely lacking scholarly substance, are nevertheless best-sellers. His class "Introduction to African American Studies" was one of the most popular classes taught at Harvard. He is the recipient of over 20 honorary degrees. His lucrative lecture schedule takes him to cities, colleges and political venues all over America and throughout the world where

the crowds are large and the reviews are often stellar. He is the darling of liberal media, often appearing on all the major news networks and on NPR. He even does cameos in popular movies like "The Matrix Reloaded" and also recorded a rap song reading passages from his books to the rhythm of a rap beat, "Sketches of my Culture."

Yet, Thomas' prominent position on the Supreme Court makes all of Cornel West's professorial admiration from his students and colleagues at Princeton, Harvard, Yale and throughout the academy of no effect. Despite all of the applause, all of the accolades, all of the royalties from his books and rap songs, all of the notoriety from his black brothers and sisters, all appears to West like a mouth full of gravel.

West cannot abide the existence of a Clarence Thomas. No, he is not going to kill Thomas physically. West's weapons are what Thomas calls "smooth-tongued lies" that for 35 years West has mastered perfectly with his MLK-esque preaching style, his striking Malcolm X-Spike Lee appearance and mannerisms, and his ability to string together large words and phrases as a polemical discourse to "the powers that be." His abilities have made him like a rock star in the black community. In 2000, West coauthored a book with Henry Louis Gates Jr. at Harvard titled, "The African-American Century." In it West sought to honor the 100 "most influential African-Americans" of the 20th century. However, controversy immediately ensued because of the risky task, particularly for two prominent scholars, of leaving out other commendable candidates. In fact, the No. 1 omission is, you guessed it, Clarence Thomas. This omission amidst tributes to Jesse "Hymietown" Jackson, Spike Lee, America's most noted black propagandist in America whom as a moviemaker I consider the black Oliver Stone, and Tiger Woods, who doesn't even consider himself "black."

Why the omission of Thomas? In a word: jealously. Liberal intellectuals like West, despite their storied and affluent existence in the ivory towers of the Ivy League universities, deep down in their hearts are very insecure, miserable people with a very thin skin. As Ann Coulter has repeatedly remarked, "Liberals can't stand competition." Justice Clarence Thomas, a man of such towering and transcendent judicial intellect, courage and character, has all the attributes a demagogue hackneyed professor like Cornel West could never ascribe to. For instance, Thomas has a non-racial faith in the God of the Bible. West's "god" is a racial, Afrocentric socialist who despises capitalism and the rich, unless of

course you are a rich liberal—then “god” is largely irrelevant to your worldview in the first place. Thomas’ self-help conservatism is a philosophy of life, hope, empowerment and liberty. West’s “non-Marxist socialism” is a cynical worldview mired in envy, corruption, materialism, anger, irrelevance and ultimately genocide.

Clarence Thomas is a man’s man who during his formative years willingly submitted himself under the austere and sometimes-cruel tutelage of his beloved grandfather, for he knew that the lessons he learned would add to his character development. On the other hand, in 2000 when Cornel West was finally held accountable by Harvard President Larry Summers to stop all the rap crap, missing classes to campaign for Ed Bradley, trips to Hollywood to be in movies, and to start producing real, trenchant scholarship, West, like a spoiled, bratty little boy, got mad, cried racism to the press and fled to Princeton where he teaches today. Some critics have argued that West despises Thomas because he is a Republican, because he didn’t credit the civil rights movement for his success; that Thomas benefited from affirmative action by being admitted to Holy Cross and later Yale Law School, yet in his opinions has been against affirmative action. But I think it is deeper than that. Lani Guinier, Clinton’s failed nominee to the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department and now Harvard Law professor has remarked that Thomas calls for the need to “authenticate the blackness of public figures.” In a collection of articles collected by Princeton’s Toni Morrison, “Race-ing Justice, Engendering Power,” West uses words to criticize Thomas as lacking “mature black identity.” Like the notion of black authenticity, it identifies particular qualities in the black community by which black leaders must be judged. West never defines these qualities, but demands that they be based on “black self-love,” “black dignity and decency” and “black self-respect”—presumably qualities West believes Thomas lacks.

To his credit, West includes self-reliance advocate Booker T. Washington and Republican-leaning writer Zora Neale Hurston in the top 100, which indicate to me that ideology alone were insufficient to justify omission. However, I believe they were permitted to West’s Hall of Fame for two sarcastic reasons: 1) they are long dead, and 2) they are non-threatening to West’s fragile, liberal worldview mandating black victimhood. Finally, in my reading West’s oeuvre and listening to his exciting but vacuous speeches that many of my people reflexively fawn over so

utterly, I am reminded of a quote from George Orwell's classic "1984" regarding a mysterious, sinister and ubiquitous figure named "Goldstein." Orwell writes:

. . . [A]lthough Goldstein was hated and despised by everybody, although every day and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, his theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were, in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less. *Always* there were fresh dupes waiting to be seduced by him.³

Who is "Goldstein" today? Goldstein is the embodiment of contemporary liberalism that has so utterly poisoned and perverted the public schools, the academy, the churches, economics, law, politics, business, medicine, the media, society and culture. Professor Cornel West is Big Brother's Minister of Propaganda.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 10

DETROIT RAPPER: OUR MAYOR'S A MURDERER

February 21, 2008

. . . Gotta make her disappear dog, no exceptions, find out where she lives and conceal the weapon.

~ Detroit rapper—*The Virus*, "Strawberry Letter 313/If I Did It"

Fox2News reporter, Taryn Asher, last week interviewed local Detroit rapper "The Virus" regarding his new (and no doubt double platinum) hit song about a taboo subject few feel brave enough to address—Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick's role in the death of exotic dancer Tamara "Strawberry" Greene.⁴ "The Virus wrote an entire rap song about Strawberry. In it, he piggybacks conspiracy theories; writing damaging verses, depicting mayor Kwame Kilpatrick as the mastermind behind her murder. With his creative license, The Virus claims the mayor took a liking toward her [Strawberry], got caught and organized a plot to make her disappear," said reporter Asher.

After hearing news coverage about the sex, lies and text messaging scandal and all the notorious revelations of double murder, perjury,

criminal fraud, destroyed careers, whistleblower lawsuits, backroom secret deals and naked corruption reaching up to the highest levels in Detroit city government and beyond, The Virus was outraged. But what sparked The Virus' creative energy most was the unsolved murder of Tamara Greene—this young, exotic dancer and aspiring lingerie boutique owner. After dancing for Kilpatrick at a secret party at the mayor's Manoogian mansion in late 2002, seven months later Tamara Greene was dead, viciously killed in a drive-by shooting in front of her home on the city's northwest side—literally around the block from where I grew up on Roselawn at Outer Dr.—on April 30, 2003. This was also the very date Deputy Police Chief and head of internal affairs Gary Brown had completed his anticipated report implicating the mayor as indeed having had a party at the Manoogian mansion in addition to evidence of an affair with Christine Beatty, his chief of staff. Beatty was Kilpatrick's most trusted aide, whose services he was forced to terminate when the text messaging scandal broke last month.

What was officer Brown's reward for doing his job? His files were taken from his custody and he was forced from office, which caused Brown, along with officers Alvin Bowman, Harold Nelthrope and Walt Harris, to all be removed from duty for their part in the mayoral Manoogian party investigation. They subsequently filed whistleblower lawsuits against Kilpatrick and the city of Detroit. Collectively, they won over \$9 million. It has now been five years since Strawberry was consigned to a cold, desolate grave—her death unvindicated, her murder file gathering dust in Detroit homicide's cold case division. After three investigations, nothing. The first inquiry was by the Detroit police, which was quickly aborted by Kilpatrick's appointee, Police Chief Ella Bully-Cummings. There was also an investigation into Greene's death by the Michigan State Police and by Michigan Attorney General Mike Cox (a Republican!) who strongly asserted that no party occurred at the Manoogian mansion and any evidence linking Tamara Greene to a party there was "an urban legend."

The Virus could take no more! In one hour of pure creative inspiration, he sat down at his keyboard and wrote the now greatly anticipated rap requiem in memory of Tamara Greene, titled "Strawberry 313/If I did it"—the CD to be released this week by Quincy Jones' own Universal Records music label. The video is presently being shot at all of the venues surrounding Strawberry's life, including the bars and clubs she fre-

quented, City Hall and, of course, the mayor's Manoogian mansion. The narrative began all so beautifully (at least from the mayor's perspective). The Virus sings, "Strawberry, Baby, all you need is direction, now let me be your Angel and I'll be your protection." But as in the Garden of Eden, or a better analogy—King David and Bathsheba—things got real crazy real quickly.

The Virus pulls no punches, for he realizes that his protagonist is an arrogant, pathological narcissist that will do *anything* to stay in power . . . even murder? The Virus rhapsodizes:

I can't believe what I'm seeing, I'm watch'n the headlines, man these allegations go'n to get me some fed[eral] time.

I'm mad! I got to do someth'n quick [shotgun cock sound] or maybe I could tell the truth, then they know I ain't sh--!

Gotta make her disappear dog, no exceptions, find out where she lives and conceal the weapon. . .

The interview of The Virus ends on a high note through his executive producer, Jerome Almon, with the following eloquent words in the street vernacular and a poignant promise: "He supposed to be the hip-hop mayor, well, he took it too literal and went gangsta on us, right? So we gonna cut that out because we more gangsta than he is and we lay'n down the truth." Is Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick a murderer? While I don't believe he actually pulled the trigger that killed the exotic dancer, a growing number of people in Detroit, throughout America and around the world are beginning to believe that Kilpatrick and Bully-Cummings were part of a vast conspiracy reaching to the highest levels of Michigan government to keep that 2002 party at the Manoogian mansion a secret at all costs.

Why all the fuss over a stupid party? No party means no wife (Carlita Kilpatrick) crashing the party, perhaps even catching the mayor in the very act with Strawberry. This could have caused Mrs. Kilpatrick to give the "beatdown" that Strawberry suffered, causing the dancer to be hastily taken to the hospital by the mayor's bodyguards, where her medical records were soon mysteriously taken by one of the mayor's cronies. (Although computer copies of these medical records should exist.)

No party means no dancer, no beatdown, no medical records, allowing the mayor to distance himself from the crime scene, to protect his wife from embarrassing criminal battery charges possibly filed by the

dancer and to intimidate or remove *all* other people who might testify that there was a party at the mayor's mansion in 2002. Who could talk? Who would talk? Lt. Bowman testified that he told Police Chief Bully-Cummings of a connection between Greene's death and another dancer from Detroit killed in a similar fashion in Georgia.

Since this murder crossed state lines, where are the feds on this catastrophic case? Oh yeah, that's right, President George W. Bush's Justice Department is too busy making sure that the security fence *isn't* built on our southern border with Mexico; that our brave border agents like Ramos and Campean rot in a federal prison on the sole testimony of one sleazy Mexican drug dealer who shot at them. Why? Because these border agents shot back at this fleeing criminal, hitting him in the behind as he fled back to Mexico when his plans were thwarted for trying to bring in over \$1 million in drugs into America. But I digress.

On Thursday, Feb. 14, 2008, Mayor Kilpatrick lost his second court challenge to prevent the release of over 14,000 text messages between the mayor and his former lover/ex-chief of staff, Christine Beatty (only *four* months' worth of dialogue mind you!) On Friday, Feb. 15, Kilpatrick appealed a third time to the Michigan Supreme Court, but his time is running out. I'm sure the high court won't overrule the two decisions from the lower courts; there are no legitimate legal grounds to do so. What deep, dark, wicked secrets lay within the electronic lines of these text messages between Kilpatrick and his former lover? Perhaps murder? Stay tuned. I'll let you know next week.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 11

LIBERALISM TRIUMPHS IN DETROIT'S DEMISE

February 13, 2008

... I believe I'm on assignment from God in this position.

~ Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick

Liberals hate religion because politics is a religion substitute for liberals and they can't stand the competition.

~ Ann Coulter, "Slander" (2002)

Show me a monopoly (liberalism) and I'll show you a tyranny (Detroit).

As many of you may know, Detroit, or "Motown," has frequently been in the news as of late for many notorious reasons. The controversy centers primarily on Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, aka "America's first hip-hop mayor." If that moniker is true, there is a good reason why many adults over 40 despise this depraved, hip-hop thug culture. Much has been written on the prurient aspects surrounding the text messages the mayor exchanged with his longtime lover and now ex-chief of staff, Christine Beatty. Some of these communications were released Jan. 23 after the Detroit Free Press obtained them via a Freedom of Information Act request.

New details of this evolving, epic scandal brings into the fray Birmingham, Mich., attorney Norman Yatooma, the lawyer representing the 14-year-old son of Tamara Greene, one of the exotic dancers at the mayor's Manoogian Mansion party who was later murdered in a drive-by shooting in front of her house. On Monday, attorney Yatooma submitted subpoenas in federal court for 18,000 city workers in his quest to find out why the party that lead to the murder of Tamara Greene was covered up by the mayor and his surrogates. However, in this column I want to digress from the prurient to the political and philosophical, namely, is there some correlation between this Democrat mayor's personal failures and the collapse of liberalism in predominantly black cities across America?

What is liberalism? Generally, it is the political philosophy that the Leviathan State has all the answers to the intractable problems that have plagued mankind—from war, famine, pestilence, taxes, poverty, health care to race/racism, employment, discrimination, housing, economics, crime, law, education and the environment. I, too, believe that government has some role in addressing these concerns, but liberalism contends that not only is government *the* answer, it is the *only* answer. Seventy-five years since FDR's "New Deal" and 40 years since Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" programs, these societal problems have only grown exponentially as shyster lawyers, craven bureaucrats and rapacious pols on both sides of the aisle cry for more tax dollars to fund more ever-expanding government programs. For over 100 years, activist liberal judges have despised the original intent of the Constitution's framers, creating case law allowing confiscated tax dollars taken from one group

of people (producers) to be given to another group of people that didn't earn it (takers). Liberals call that "redistribution" or "socialism." I call that legalized thievery.

How does the failure of liberalism relate to our young black mayor here in Detroit? Mayor Kilpatrick, a liberal Democrat, was twice elected by a city that has the largest black population of any big city in America (88 percent). Like many big cities all over America, Detroit has been a singularly black city since the 1967 riots as whites (and many educated blacks) fled to the suburbs—and reminiscent of the majority whites had before them, black people robotically voted for skin color under the false presumption that a black person is intrinsically better to govern black people than any other race. These racist and diabolical suppositions have brought tragic consequences both in Detroit and in large cities all over America as one black liberal Democrat mayor after another has generally left their cities in more catastrophic shape than when they took office, yet black people keep putting black liberals in office. This is irrational politics. This is the crisis of philosophy.

Liberalism achieves and maintains its power primarily by two means: first, perverting human nature and the Constitution—for instance, slavery, abortion and the "separation of church and state." To exist and to flourish, liberalism demands a strict separation between morality and public policy, which means that liberalism takes all of the Ten Commandments, distorts them, and bequeaths to society the "Ten Commandments of post-60's liberalism." Second, liberalism divides and conquers. FDR (1933-45) won an unprecedented four terms as president not because he was one of the best presidents America has ever produced (the only "Roosevelt" enshrined on Mt. Rushmore is FDR's cousin, Theodore), but FDR was a master Machiavellian politician who perfected the art of "the end justifies the means."

FDR would do anything to win elections and wield political power. He built his bulletproof coalition of working-class white ethnics, New England elites, Hollywood, intellectuals, women, blacks, Jews, liberals, socialists, communists, anarchists and big-city machines like Tammany Hall in New York and later the Daly machine in Chicago—a formidable Democrat coalition that exists to this day. Originally, I titled this column, "Detroit's demise is the *failure* of liberalism," which is of course true, but Detroit and other big cities' predicament is not so much the failure, but the *triumph* of liberalism, for if people are prospering, thriving,

ing and living intelligent, happy and moral lives, liberalism withers on the vine and dies.

Liberalism only prospers where there is angst, societal upheaval, cultural chaos, crime, apostasy, disorder, jealousy, corruption and a zero-sum gain—the idea that all resources are finite, therefore if one group of people appears to be doing well, liberalism teaches another group that *their* success is at *your* expense and you've got to get even. Because of liberalism alone, Detroit has languished in despair for over 40 years—Detroit is often the murder capital of America; 50 percent of Detroiters are functionally illiterate; only 22 percent of entering high school freshman actually graduate from the Detroit Public Schools. And if you're an African-American male, you have 73 percent unemployment in your 20s if you drop out of school and a 60 percent chance of going to jail. Seventy percent of all black births in America are outside of wedlock. Black women are 6 percent of the population, yet have over one-third (36 percent) of all abortions in America.

Where is the Congressional Black Caucus on these critical issues affecting their own people? Oh, that's right, the chair of the CBC is none other than Mayor Kilpatrick's mother, Rep. Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick, D-Mich., who has literally been in hiding since the text message scandal broke. What good is a revitalized downtown Detroit if the people don't have the vision, discipline and intelligence to keep a city from becoming a ghetto throughout its neighborhoods? Indeed, Mayor Kilpatrick did not originate all these ills affecting Detroit. These tribulations originated from antiquity. However, liberalism, which I call the separation of public policy from morality, is the controlling philosophy of the Democrat Party for the past 75 years and has helped to exacerbate these and many other evils plaguing black people in cities and towns across America.

Liberalism will continue to plague American society and culture until a Reagan, a Churchill or a Plato's philosopher-king rises up to lead America away from liberalism, away from socialism and lead the people back to Reason, back to personal responsibility and back to civilized government. Obama, Hillary and McCain cannot and will not do this. Show me a monopoly (liberalism), and I'll show you a tyranny (Detroit).

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 12

ANOTHER PATHOLOGICAL BLACK MAYOR

February 02, 2008

The dirty little secret about America's big city black mayors over the past 40 years is that collectively their leadership record has been mediocre at best, pathological at worse. Their failure has been the dysfunction of liberalism and the entire civil rights movement from MLK on down—they put too much emphasis on *white guilt* and no emphasis on *black responsibility*. To this day, the consequences for black people across America have been apocalyptic.

Since the early 1970s, Detroit has had three black mayors, all liberal Democrats—Coleman A. Young (1974-94), Dennis Archer (1994-2001) and Kwame Kilpatrick (2001-present). If you think I write from hyperbole, just take a dispassionate look at Detroit, the ghettos, barrios, the projects, drugs, gang warfare, waste, fraud and abuse infesting our big cities across America for the past four decades. The grand dragon of the KKK himself couldn't have envisioned a more Faustian conspiracy against black people and their own vested interests. Regarding the nominee for the "pathological" category is Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, "America's first hip-hop mayor." In a blockbuster series of news articles, text messages and videos first published Jan. 23 by the Detroit Free Press titled, "Mayor Kilpatrick, chief of staff lied under oath, text messages show," the paper features in excruciating detail how the chief executive for the city of Detroit and his chief of staff/concubine, Christine Beatty, repeatedly lied under oath. I first wrote about this institutional incompetence and crisis of leadership happening to Detroit, the city of my birth, in a column titled, "I remember Detroit."

Kilpatrick and Beatty could face perjury charges regarding their longstanding affair and their part in the firing of police officer/bodyguard Harold Nelthrope, deputy police chief and head of internal affairs Gary Brown and a subsequent lawsuit by former police officer/bodyguard Walt Harris, during the whistleblower case in the summer of August 2007—a lawsuit that cost the already cash-strapped city of Detroit over \$9 million in punitive and compensatory damages.

A recent study commissioned by the Detroit Free Press demonstrated that with \$9 million, taxpayers of Detroit could have hired:

- ❖ 143 firefighters
- ❖ 126 police officers
- ❖ created 94 city parks
- ❖ demolished 1,200 dilapidated homes

This, in a city where large sections of Detroit look like riot-torn Nairobi, Kenya, the Gaza Strip or war-torn Beirut, Lebanon. According to the Detroit Free Press, the text messages show Beatty recalling the "decision that we made to fire Gary Brown." The newspaper examined over 14,000 text messages on Beatty's city-issued pager. The exchanges, which the Free Press obtained after the trial, cover two months each in 2002 and 2003. The Kilpatrick-Beatty relationship and Brown's dismissal were central to the whistleblower suit filed by Brown and Nelthrope. The two cops accused Kilpatrick of retaliating against them because of their roles in an internal affairs investigation of the mayor's security team—a probe that potentially could have exposed the affair.

The text messages cover a range of issues from mundane city business to political rumors to the latest episode of "American Idol." Kilpatrick and Beatty, both 37, were prolific in their frequent personal dialogue, including romantic comments: "I'm madly in love with you," Kilpatrick wrote on Oct. 3, 2002. "I hope you feel that way for a long time," Beatty answered. "In case you haven't noticed, I am madly in love with you, too!" Other texts contain sexual content, like this exchange on April 8, 2003: "Beatty: "And, did you miss me, sexually?" Kilpatrick: "Hell yeah! You couldn't tell. I want some more!"

At the whistleblower trial last summer, the mayor and Beatty repeatedly denied a romantic relationship. Both were married at the time of the text messages; Beatty later divorced. Plaintiff's attorney Michael Stefani asked Beatty the following question when she was on the stand Aug. 28, 2007: "During the time period 2001 to 2003, were you and Mayor Kilpatrick either romantically or intimately involved with each other?" Rolling her eyes, Beatty answered: "No." Kilpatrick testified for more than three hours the next day. Stefani asked him: "Mayor Kilpatrick, during 2002 and 2003, were you romantically involved with Christine Beatty?" Kilpatrick's response: "No." That's lying under oath. That's perjury.

The perjury charges would be brought by Wayne County prosecutor Kim Worthy. However, Worthy has a spotty record on upholding the rule of law and has been rumored to be complicit with the Kilpatrick administration in covering up a number of high-profile cases, including the case regarding the murder of Tamara "Strawberry" Greene, the exotic dancer present at a wild party Mayor Kilpatrick gave in 2002 at the Manoogian mansion. On April 30, 2003, *the very day* Gary Brown came out with his report about the mayor's Manoogian mansion party, Greene was viciously gunned down outside her home in a drive-by shooting. Another dancer at the "party" was later tracked down and killed in Atlanta, Ga. Mayor Kilpatrick has repeatedly said that "the party never happened" and arrogantly called the allegations of a party "an urban legend."

Prosecutor Worthy has sat on these murder cases for five years with no trial date set. Where are the feds on this case? Since one of the murders crossed state lines, the feds now have jurisdiction to investigate these cases, but they are MIA. Because of this travesty of justice, the 14-year-old son of Tamara Greene has recently filed a \$150 million wrongful death civil lawsuit against Kilpatrick, Police Chief Ella Bully Cummings, Beatty and other Detroit officials that allegedly obstructed justice regarding this case. On Jan. 25, Worthy, in a 45 second press conference, was defiant. She took no questions and flatly said that her office would "investigate" the perjury allegations, but would "take her time" and "would not be rushed by *anyone*." As I and many others predicted, mayor Kilpatrick has taken a page from the Clinton/Lewinsky playbook—throw the girl to the wolves (here, Christine Beatty), which was exactly what the mayor did on Jan. 28 ("Beatty quits city post").

Following a week of hiding from the media, on Wednesday, the mayor staged an appearance at his church and tried to rehabilitate himself in front of a bunch of preachers. He dragged out his humiliated wife in subzero weather and feigned remorse, not for violating his wedding vows and wantonly abusing his executive office, but for getting caught. Absent a recall effort by the citizens of Detroit, Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick can freely continue to destroy a once-proud city that 100 years ago was called, "The Paris of America" and 65 years ago was called, "The arsenal of democracy," and run it into the abyss of a first-class ghetto.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 13

BLACKS SLAVES AGAIN . . . TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

January 26, 2008

Cult leaders, driven by narcissism—they want to control others.

~ Dr. Michael Stone, "Cult Followers" TV program

Note: this column is part of a series of works written on a black theme with the purpose of the intellectual redemption of my people—mind, body and spirit. Other works in the genre include: "The treachery of Brown v. Board of Education," "Black Democrats and the battered wife syndrome," "What is plantation liberalism?" "Should public schools be Free?" among several others.

Dear Rev. Preacher:

I saw you the other day, Rev. Preacher. You were reading a prepared statement of support to your mistress as she, though shorter than you, looked *down* to you and upon all who witnessed this spectacle. She stands with that imperious grin on her face, that smug smirk that we have gotten so used to seeing on her for the past 35 years as year after year she does nothing verifiable for black people—yet she (and her husband, "the first black president") are anointed as the savior of us all.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, one of the greatest from your ranks, once said, "[A man should] not be judged by the color of his skin, but by the content of his character." If you honor this great man and his ultimate sacrifice to your people, why then do you continue to ignore his words, to desecrate the intent he had for all black people, his everlasting dream for all America—for black people to have equal access to achieve the American Dream?

You ask, "Ellis, how have we ignored Rev. King's words? We *are* continuing his tradition." I reply, what tradition? Exploiting racial polarization isn't MLK's tradition, for his national civil rights movement didn't focus on color as much as the person, the man, the woman to be allowed to fulfill America's covenant with herself. You say, "Ellis, what covenant do you speak of?" MLK once said, "I just want America to be true to what you wrote on paper." MLK dreamed of living in an America where—he quoted Jefferson—"We hold these truths to be self-evident,

that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

"Ellis, black preachers and the black church for over 200 years have been the backbone of black society in America and for over 75 years through alliances with the Democrat Party, black people have achieved some measure of political, social and economic power," said Rev. Preacher. Indeed, but at what cost? Let's examine the record:

❖ "Life"—Jefferson's first promise to all Americans in the Declaration of Independence was denied to your people from the beginning by the evil institution of slavery. Later, by Democrat politicians largely from the South and also by their *de facto* Brownshirts, the Klu Klux Klan. Two of the KKK's most notable members, Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., and Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, are both proud Democrats—their infamous membership in the KKK never repudiated by the Democrats to this day.

❖ "Life"—Let's talk about Margaret Sanger (1879–1966), founder of Planned Parenthood (1916), the most notorious abortion group in America that to this day has made billions worldwide by killing millions of innocent babies. Rev. Preacher, did you know that this onerous, racist, Jezebel-like woman founded Planned Parenthood with the primary purpose of eradicating the black race, which she deemed animalistic, pathologically criminal and inferior to white people on every measure? If she had lived today, Sanger would be exceedingly pleased that fully one-third of all abortions in America are by black women.

❖ "Liberty"—Black preachers across America have been in the forefront of controlling black people's political liberty every election year by demanding their flock vote for a political party that has an unashamed history of undermining your hopes, your dreams, your aspirations under the guise of helping you. On this point, Rev. Preacher, you and your colleagues have been like the overseers of the plantation during slavery times. You have been accorded just enough power by "Masser" to keep those in your charge "on the plantation"; otherwise, what use are you to the Democrat Party?

❖ "Liberty"—Despite the cover-up and journalistic malpractice by the liberal propaganda press, the race debate between Hillary and Obama has let out some deep, dark family secrets. Most onerous is the vile lie that the Democrat Party in general, and Bill and Hillary Clinton in particular, has taken substantively beneficial action on behalf of black people. Rather than stepping back and saying, "It's the black man's turn to be president," Hillary and the mainstream Democrat establishment has

this attitude regarding Obama: "Who does this uppity n----r think he is?!" It is classic plantation liberalism, and I am happy it was displayed for the world to see, at least for a brief time.

❖ "Pursuit of Happiness"—This most precious promise by Jefferson to the American people has been perverted by FDR's "New Deal" and LBJ's "Great Society" programs where liberalism perfected the Machiavellian techniques of seizing political power by stealing money from one group of people and giving the spoils to another group that didn't earn it.

What Jefferson and by extension MLK meant by the "Pursuit of Happiness" was an America eventually becoming a nation where *all* barriers and strictures to success would be removed by society so that each citizen would be hindered not by his color, gender or creed, but judged "by the content of his character," following the biblical aphorism "If a man doesn't work, a man shouldn't eat" and the limitless freedom of his imagination. Not shackled government largess, a "War on Poverty" or Rev. Preachers keeping the flock "on the plantation," but every person being free to use their God-given gifts to glorify God and help humanity.

Rev. Preacher, this is sadness. Stop the madness. Stop selling our people out year after year to curry favor with the Clintons and the Democrat machine. They have enslaved us long enough. Even Old Testament Israel, when they had backslidden, was usually under the tyranny of another nation for 40 years until "God raised up Judges to deliver them." Rev. Preacher, our people have been on the liberal Democrat plantation nearly 80 years—two generations of volunteer slavery. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes declared it best when he said, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough!"

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY — ESSAY 14

I REMEMBER DETROIT

September 01, 2007

Detroit . . . the Paris of America!

~ National sentiment (*circa* 1907)

You wanted him [Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick], Detroit, you got him . . .
 this guy is Coleman Young times 10. Detroit will never change. Ever.

~ "JohnSB," DetNews.com (Aug 29, 2007)

In today's column, I'm going to take a diversion from my usual offerings of national and international concern to visit my birthplace, Detroit, Mich., where I currently reside in a neighboring suburb. In case you haven't heard, "America's first hip-hop mayor" Kwame Kilpatrick, is currently embroiled in a very embarrassing public court proceeding that took more than four years to come to trial. The mayor is being sued by former bodyguard Harold Nelthrope and former Deputy Police Chief and Head of Internal Affairs Gary Brown for retaliation, loss of career and other charges under a whistle blowers statute.

Although the case just began Aug. 27, there is already much skullduggery and salacious charges of a wild party at the mayor's ['Manoogian'] mansion (a "party" that even Republican Attorney General Mike Cox said never happened).

❖ Shortly thereafter two exotic dancers who were at that "party" ended up murdered (one tracked down and killed in Atlanta, Ga.), the other dancer, Tamara Green, (a.k.a. "Strawberry") a college student and a working mother of three children, was beaten half to death by the mayor's wife at "the party." Medical records of this incident were mysteriously taken from the hospital. Shortly thereafter she was killed April 30, 2003 in a drive-by shooting in front of her home at Roselawn and Outer Dr. (literally around the block from where I grew up!)

❖ The mayor's chief of staff and concubine, Christine Beatty, accused of unlawfully firing Deputy Police Chief Oliver, justifies her actions due to a mysterious, "unsigned note" she received that led her to advise the mayor to fire Officer Brown just as he was uncovering embarrassing allegations about the mayor's numerous dalliances, infamies, etc. Under

oath, Mayor Kilpatrick testified that Deputy Police Chief Brown "didn't follow the chain of command."

A positive note I had a moment of nostalgia. I remembered a Detroit of a long bygone era that I would now like to recite to you dear reader in quasi-poetical verse titled—"I Remember Detroit":

❖ I remember 20 years ago talking to a little old white lady at the bus stop and she telling me in vivid, exquisite detail how she remembered Detroit prior to 1910, during an era when Detroit was called, "The Paris of America," so gorgeous was this French-named city that sat so regally on the banks of the Detroit River.

❖ I remember 57 years ago in 1950 my mother telling me how as a young woman from the deep south (Arkansas) that as soon as she and her sister graduated from high school, that they headed for "the promised land" of Detroit in hopes of securing a brighter future for their lives. (Then, Detroit had about 2 million people; now, in 2007, about 850,000).

❖ I remember reading of a time over 65 years ago as Hitler's Nazi menace was spreading across Europe in blitzkrieg, like a plague from hell—Poland and France had fallen and Great Britain stood at the brink. In desperation President Franklin Delano Roosevelt called upon the Big 3—GM, Ford and Chrysler to retool, to essentially become our "wartime Consiglieri" to borrow a phrase from the movie, "Godfather II", and stem the tide of Hitler's genocidal madness. Detroit heroically answered that fateful call and our great city was affectionately christened, "The arsenal of democracy."

❖ I remember 40 years ago when I was 5 during the hot, hot summer of 1967 and the infamous riot in that fateful month of July—chaos reigned in the streets; everything was on fire, looters running wild, soldiers marching down the streets with assault rifles in full riot gear, snipers on the rooftops of our local high school (Southeastern). "Mother, what's a 'sniper'?" "Boy, shut up and stop asking me so many questions?" as she sat glued to the TV set watching the daily news coverage of our once beautiful city—that "Paris of America" now in flames and descending precipitously into mayhem, destruction and death. I didn't know it then but a measure of my own childhood innocence went up in flames that day . . . a measure of innocence I have desperately tried in vain to recover these 40 years later.

❖ I remember after the riots of 1967 that a phenomenon sociologist called "white flight" occurred. Not only did white folks go in droves out of Detroit, but their businesses . . . gone, their tax dollars . . . gone, their

expertise . . . gone, their wisdom on how to keep Detroit “the Paris of America” . . . ALL GONE!

❖ I remember 34 years ago in 1973 when Detroit got its first black mayor—the irascible Coleman A. Young. He was big, bold, proud and loud. Mayor Young threw down the gauntlet—he gave white folks the middle finger, told them to get the hell out of town, and put his cronies in positions of power they weren’t trained for turning the “Paris of America” into his personal ATM bank card. (Regrettably, he wouldn’t be the last black mayor to do this treachery against his own people).

❖ I remember watching Fox News on July 30 and hearing former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich eloquently, but grimly citing recent educational statistics that chronicled only 22 percent of entering high school freshman actually graduate from the Detroit Public Schools [DPS]. “And if you’re an African-American male, you have 73 percent unemployment in your 20s if you drop out of school and a 60 percent chance of going to jail,” Gingrich said. These statistics affected me on personal level for I too attended DPS. I even graduated from the same magnet high school attended by Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick and Chief of Staff Christine Beatty (Cass Tech).

❖ I remember one good leader, Mayor Dennis Archer, a former chief justice of the Michigan Supreme Court. Although a liberal Democrat, he is a black man of great intelligence, affable character and competent leadership. He gave a yeoman’s effort during his two terms in office to right the ship of Detroit that Mayor Young so cavalierly scuttled, but alas, there was no *buffer* to compete with the 88+ percent black population making Detroit the most singular racial big city in America to this day.

“Ellis, what do you mean by ‘buffer’?” What I mean dear reader in conclusion is that in order for a city to become great it must first become good. You cannot have too many *negative elements* (whether that be people, cultural habits, societal predilections, welfare recipients, non-taxpayers, unchecked pathology, or youth caught up in the three Ps: Parole—Probation—Prison), without countervailing forces of *positive elements* (honest people, taxpayers, enlightened leadership, strong churches, effective schools, dynamic businesses, public punishment of lawbreakers and most important, a moral, intelligent, politically diverse citizenry [not just liberal Democrats]).

If the negative elements outweigh the positive elements, to the degree that it does will be the degree that city descends into the abyss of pathology, promiscuity, ignorance and crime. In other words, a first-

class city needs good people to shame the bad people for their bad acts. It is a bitter pill to swallow, but nature is inevitable. Until Detroit makes her transition from praising pathology, promiscuity, ignorance, crime and reelecting "gangsta" leadership, I prefer to remember a Detroit of a bygone era where the best of all races even in the midst of *de jure* and *de facto*, Jim Crow racial discrimination, had "a say" in keeping the Detroit the Paris of America. How? By making themselves the Paris of themselves.

I remember Detroit . . .

ON SOCIETY AND CULTURE—ESSAY 15

PC = PERVERSITY (NOT POLITICAL) CORRECTNESS

August 11, 2007

There are six things doth the Lord hate: yea, seven are an abomination to him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, An heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, A false witness that speaketh lies, and they that soweth discord among brethren.

~ King Solomon, *Proverbs* 6:16-17

I remember a few months ago reading an intriguing article on Breitbart.com about Amsterdam's red light district which recently unveiled a bronze statue. You may say, "Big deal, Ellis! Amsterdam is a very old European city and has perhaps hundreds if not thousands of statues all over the country." I would then say you have deduced correctly dear reader, but this statute is very different from the ones erected to Holland's best and brightest sons of a bygone era.

Who, you may ask, is the statute dedicated? Not Rembrandt, not William I of Orange, not Erasmus, not Grotius, not Spinoza, not Van Gogh, nay, this statute is to none other than the prostitute and to the ancient, glorious art of prostitution. And not just prostitution in Holland, but this statute memorializes prostitutes all over the world. Take that, Spinoza! Yes, but there is more dear reader. This very worthy expenditure of public funds has the blessings of the city authorities. The idea of this project came from the "former" prostitute, Mariska Majoor, who is

the creator of the illustrious Centre on Prostitution that she founded 10 years ago and is likewise prominently ensconced in the Dutch capitol of Amsterdam, that liberal Mecca of excess, vice and . . . "liberty."

The statue strikes a self-assured pose, "her hands on her hips, looking sideways towards the sky and standing on a doorstep," and we are told represents self-confident, poised womanhood. Just when you thought that society could sink no lower, somebody drives on the property, plunges into the abyss with a backhoe (excuse the pun) and starts. There has been much ink spilled on the cultural phenomenon called, "political correctness" which can be defined as adhering to and complying with the conventional thinking of mainstream liberalism. By "liberalism" I basically mean a socio-political ideology that mandates a strict segregation between politics (law) and morality.

Notwithstanding, I have never liked the term "political correctness," not because it is a useless and irrelevant term, but most of all because it is an inaccurate one. It is an inaccurate term because it trivializes and relegates profound moral issues affecting our culture to the banal purgatory of politic discourse. Here, I have coined a more lucid expression that utilizes the same acronym PC, but my idiom stands for "perversity correctness." Perversity correctness is a contemporary worldview in American and European politics and culture that expressly deconstructs and segregates religious judgments from public (or private) acts particularly in politics, but generally, throughout every aspect of culture and society including religion, education, economics, law, medicine, art, aesthetics, music, media, technology, etc.

What does this mean for American society and beyond? It means welcome to the "Alice in Wonderland" world of perversity liberalism where up is down, down is up, evil is good (there is no evil) and the only judgment one should render is against the hateful, Neanderthal conservative Republicans who want to judge us enlightened freethinkers who just want to have fun and live our lives in whatever manner we please. King Solomon, about a 1,000 years before the birth of Christ, in the book of Proverbs wrote a series of profound moral aphorisms that have the troubling refrain—*There are six things doth the Lord hate: yea, seven are an abomination to him:* The text continues in a beautifully poetic cadence what those seven things are. Due to the brevity of this article I will only list three. . . *An heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief . . . and they that soweth discord among brethren.*

I challenge any reader here to devise a more succinct and on point examination of contemporary society under the strictures of liberalism, which despite its glorious past going back to such luminaries as Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau, Adam Smith, Jefferson, John Stuart Mill, John Dewey, Woodrow Wilson, Louis Brandeis, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Benjamin Cardozo, FDR, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, has since the mid-1960s, descended into the intellectual nihilism of perversity correctness.

Enter radical liberal organizations like the ACLU, National Education Association, Planned Parenthood, National Organization of Women, The Trial Lawyers Association, North American Man/Boy Love Association, People for the Separation of Church and State, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and the Human Rights Campaign. These and other extremist groups have wreaked havoc on the rule of law to “devise wicked imaginations” (legalizing infanticide, banning God, prayer and Bible study from the public schools, *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966)—allowing the criminal to go free because the police have erred, blurring gender roles with the feminization of society); “feet that be swift in running to mischief” (banning the 10 Commandments and corporal punishment from the public schools and replacing the void with guns, gangs, gotta-get-paid and ghetto-lifestyle), “and he that soweth discord among brethren” (removing ‘Christ’ from Christmas displays, same-sex marriage, allowing pedophiles to re-offend, teaching 5 year olds about sex, deifying dogs over humanity (The Michael Vick case), appointing liberal activist judges that scorn the people and the rule of law), just to cite a few examples. One of the first things a despot does who covets power, who despises liberty, and exacts from the blood of the people a totalitarian state, is to reinvent history by removing monuments to old heroes and erecting monuments to new ones. That was what the Bolsheviks did in Communist Russia and Hitler did in Nazi Germany—Jews, Christians, were killed, imprisoned, “reeducated,” synagogues and churches burned to the ground.

In Amsterdam it is clear what direction they are going by their monument to prostitution; however, this is Amsterdam, a city like Sodom and Gomorrah which has long been on the road to perdition by sowing the wind and will in due time reap the whirlwind. I pray America will not follow her.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 16

QUEEN OPRAH AND HER ANOINTED SQUIRE

September 29, 2007

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times.

~ Charles Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859)

The only difference between a good person and a bad person is which way they turn their passions.

~ Bishop T.D. Jakes (Sermon on David)

In today's column, I would like to revisit the issue of celebrity and its myriad of seductive, intoxicating qualities. I wrote on this subject a few months ago in the column "Ira Einhorn, Al Gore and the cult of celebrity." Today's subjects, however, are TV talk-show host and media demi-god Oprah Winfrey and former pro football player and actor O.J. ("The Juice") Simpson. Why these two people, you may ask? Like many of my subjects, I have mused about them for many years; studying these people in detail and probing profound questions and predilections of human nature that made them the people they are today and shaped the impact they have on today's society and culture. Also, both of these icons are very interesting people that often generate front page news at will.

Several months ago, Oprah dramatically broke with her own personal apolitical tradition and publicly endorsed Sen. Barack Obama on her TV show. When asked why, she stated quite bluntly that until Obama's candidacy she never had a politician she felt excited about supporting. Three weeks ago, Oprah furthered her support for Obama by hosting a lavish political fundraising party that raised over \$3 million for his presidential campaign at her gorgeous Italian Renaissance Revival mansion in Montecito, Calif. It is on that party I want to focus the majority of my analysis—a case study into the mind of Oprah. First of all, what struck me negatively about that party was the Orwellian controls and bureaucratic strictures Oprah dictated on how the party would be organized:

❖ Admission = \$2,300 (no poor people subsidy for this event);

- ❖ No, you can't use my bathroom! You can't even come into my house. The party will be outdoors under tents;
- ❖ No cameras, no camera phones, no media coverage, no recording devices of any kind. To make sure this rule is enforced, all "guests" will be thoroughly searched;
- ❖ No, you can't drive your own car to my house. You must park eight miles away and be shuttled to my house by bus (now that's class all the way!);
- ❖ Although everyone paid the same "contribution," all partygoers are not equal. The real big names, like movie moguls David Geffen and Jeffrey Katzenberg, and actors Halle Berry, Will Smith and Jamie Foxx, will be with Oprah and the guest of honor at a certain area of her yard where one will have the privilege of mingling with Queen Oprah and her anointed squire. Burly bodyguards will enforce this segregation rule. (In India, they call this the caste system).

Well, dear reader, you may say, "It's Oprah's house! She can organize the party any way she pleases." I would reply, you are right, but herein lies the seductive, intoxicating qualities of human nature that I wish to further explore regarding Queen Oprah.

First, Queen Oprah has made her career boasting of her work in "helping the poor," "the needy," "the powerless," "the disenfranchised." Why weren't some of these poor people invited to the party? Second, if I'm paying \$2,300 to come to Oprah's house, then doggone it, when I get there, I'm going *inside* Oprah's house. I'm not standing in her backyard like a bunch of barnyard animals. Third, coming to this party is a chance of a lifetime. You mean to tell me I can't do any of the normal things a person would want to do to memorialize this event? —roll up to the front door in my fresh C-Class Benz spinning on 22s, take a couple of pictures of my wife and me at the party (to prove that we were actually there), mix and mingle with all the Hollywood big shots, etc. No, no, no . . . not at Oprah's house. Queen Oprah, that Sistergirl Freud without the credentials, that darling of mainstream liberalism, that Queen of the Soccer Moms, has created a repressive, smothering, virtual Orwellian environment at her home, where spontaneity, freedom, liberty and a good time has been left in the parking lot eight miles away.

He's baaaack! Just when you thought we were through with O.J. Simpson, the double murderer who was convicted in the civil trial and ordered by a judge to pay \$33.5 million in restitution damages to the Brown and Goldman families, he has forced himself into our lives once

again. This time, O.J. and his makeshift posse of burly thugs The Juice calls "my bitches" on Sept. 13 took the law into their own hands, entered a Vegas hotel room and at gunpoint took memorabilia back from two sports artifacts dealers O.J. claims stole it from him. For the record, he also stole several other items that had nothing to do with the now imprisoned ex-football star, ex-movie actor . . . ex-murder. O.J. is a psychiatrist's wet dream. He belongs on Oprah's couch with that Hollywood nitwit, Tom Cruise. O.J. has all the obvious best and worst traits of the human condition. We all remember in 1968 when he won the Heisman Trophy, we remember the NFL records he broke, the funny movies, the entertaining commercials, but . . . there is always a "but."

But we didn't see O.J. behind the scenes. We didn't see O.J., the violent man, the control freak that frequently ranted and raved like a neurotic lunatic. But we did catch a glimpse of the real O.J. caught on tape a few days ago and played to the world on TMZ.com where he and his thugs blatantly and wantonly committed armed robbery (allegedly) at a Las Vegas hotel. Simpson later quipped, "I thought what happened in Vegas, stays in Vegas!" No, O.J., it's "People who commit idiotic crimes in Vegas, go to prison *in Vegas*."

In summary, I wanted to illustrate through the lives of Oprah and O.J. how very talented, creative people can become dictatorial, oppressive, controlling and hypocritical (Oprah), as well as affable, enigmatic and murderous (O.J.). Human nature is very complex and awesome—we can be Nimrod, Jezebel, Brutus, Hitler, Joe Kennedy as well as David, Galileo, Einstein, MLK or Mother Teresa. Most of us fall somewhere in the middle. Bishop T.D. Jakes was right on point when he said, "The only difference between a good person and a bad person is which way they turn their passions." Likewise, Charles Dickens indelibly shows us the paradox of human nature in one of the greatest lines in all of English literature when he wrote, "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times."

To Oprah: Lighten up, get a *real* boyfriend that can become your husband. (Stedman Graham is a replica. He is the Black version of a blond bimbo). Adopt three or four children to teach *yourself* not to be so childish, self-absorbed and narcissistic. Retire from being "Queen Oprah" and become a normal, regular soccer mom like your legions of loyal fans that made you the idol you are today. To O.J.: All I can tell

you, man, is *sic semper tyrannus* (thus to all tyrants) and . . . don't drop the soap!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 17

WHAT RUINED DETROIT?

September 10, 2008

Mitch Albom is a prolific novelist, playwright, radio host and a sportswriter for the Detroit Free Press. He is also an internationally renowned author of several New York Times bestsellers, including: *Tuesdays with Morrie* and *Five People you Meet in Heaven*. Despite his coveted accolades as a writer, intellectually speaking Albom is a typical example of the consensus, liberal hack journalism that dominates Detroit, particularly in its coverage of the rise and fall of Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick.⁵ Albom's writing admittedly is clean, crisp, directed and entertaining, but not enlightening or revelatory. Albom, like his legions of socialist journalists across America, tells the reader the facts about *what* happened, but not *why* it happened. In his article cited above, Albom writes about the mayor's self-serving and outrageous farewell speech:

You done set me up for a comeback" were your final words, because you couldn't resist, as the curtain came down, one more grab of the spotlight. Instead of fessing up to a series of lies that paralyzed this city, cost it millions and turned it into an international embarrassment, you exited like a poor victim, swinging at some vast, invisible conspiracy, as if people in this state had nothing better to do than to mount an exhausting, eight-month campaign against you—full of your *own text messages*. As if it were other people who had extramarital sex in hotel rooms, fired cops, traded city money for silence and lied under oath, while you stood innocently on the sidelines.

If the liberal media are wondering why their 100-plus year monopoly over the press is essentially over; why they no longer have Synopsis control over what people hear, see and think; why journalists are being fired by the thousands across America due to a precipitous drop in readership and poor advertising sales; then look no further than Mitch Albom. If the mainstream media are wondering why even once-vaunted newspapers like the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Chicago

Tribune, the L.A. Times, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Detroit Free Press and many, many other news organizations, examples of what conservative intellectual Laura Ingraham calls "the dinosaur media," are falling by the way side, Mitch Albom's coverage of the downfall of Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick should give them a clue.

The excerpt from Albom's column contains all the elements that turn off many rational people who desire a fair and balance treatment of the news, not liberal propaganda. For example, Albom, like virtually all of his journalist colleagues, thinks and writes on a macro (big picture) level; however, most people in the technological age demand a more complete summation of the pivotal events of modern times. To help Mitch understand what theologian Paul Tillich referred to as issues of "ultimate concern," I would advise Mr. Albom in the following manner: Mitch, everyone knows that Kwame Kilpatrick is a scoundrel. What they demand journalists to answer are the *why* questions:

- ❖ *Why* are Detroiters collectively so dense in their thinking as to elect a known rogue, criminal and womanizer of this low ilk . . . twice?!
- ❖ *Why* was KK, up until his removal from office by Gov. Granholm, the front-runner for a third term for mayor of Detroit in 2009?
- ❖ *Why* is identity politics so entrenched in Detroit and in big cities across America that other dissenting or alternative viewpoints like mine and other conservatives have been scrupulously impugned, ignored and perverted? In my case for over 25 years during the period that I have been writing professionally.
- ❖ *Why* do Detroiters seem so incapable of using democracy to choose competent leadership?
- ❖ *Why* has the liberal media in Detroit and throughout Michigan committed journalist malpractice by being over six years late in conducting real, substantive news coverage of KK and his corrupt administration?
- ❖ *Why* did the liberal judiciary here in Michigan allow Mayor Kilpatrick to remain in office for another two weeks after the governor removed him on Sept. 4?

These examples of journalistic negligence cited above together with KK's criminal tendencies will only allow this villain and his cronies more time to shred incriminating documents, rip out the hard drives of all the city computers, cook the accounting books, raid the city coffers, set up golden parachutes for his loyalists, steal state funds from every possible city entity and finally set up his stooge, Wayne County Sheriff Warren

Evans, to keep his mayor's seat warm for him for four years, plunging the city into even more destruction. These are *why* questions you will never hear from any of the liberal media entities in Michigan because they have been in KK's back pocket for over six years and have literally served as the *de facto* Minister of Propaganda for KK and the Democratic Party.

If Detroit had a strong conservative Republican presence in this town, KK would never have lasted this long. (Remember, New York Gov. Eliot Spitzer voluntarily left office in *two days* when his infidelities were discovered). Also big-government liberalism, which is essentially socialism or the apotheosis of the god-State dominating every aspect of culture, society, law and politics, is the idol god leftist journalist's worship. If people actually realized this fact alone and united to revolt against this tyranny, it would be the death knell to the liberal media's remaining monopoly over newspapers, the Internet and TV. This state of affairs liberals cannot abide.

What's wrong with Detroit? . . . Liberalism. Dear readers, you see what happens to a once-great city like Detroit, known 100 years ago as "The Paris of America," known 65 years ago as "The arsenal of democracy" and 45 years ago as "Motown" and "Hitsville U.S.A." and in many respects the vanguard of the civil rights movement, as it quickly devolves into the abyss of monolithic, Stalinist groupthink. Who represents Detroit now? Michigan sadly has some of the most reactionary radicals of any state in America, people like: John Conyers, John Dingell, Carl Levin, Sander Levin, Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick, Bernard Kilpatrick, Gov. Jennifer Granholm, Debbie Stabenow, Tupac Hunter and many other socialists at every level of government. All of these pols are quintessential liberal hacks who never saw an abortion policy, a tax hike or a welfare program they wouldn't reflexively vote for. Because Gov. Granholm and the Democrat Party insisted on raising taxes and the Republicans here were too weak to stop them, these policies have plunged Michigan into a one-state recession causing tens of thousands of residents like myself to flee; where even the Big 3—GM, Ford and Chrysler, the foundation of Michigan's economy—have to go begging to the federal government for yet another multibillion dollar bailout.

In conclusion, dear reader, any rational-minded, introspective person looking objectively at Detroit must come to the understanding that Detroiters for the past 50 years have elected the wrong political leaders

with the wrong political philosophy. Consequently, this negligent and irresponsible voting by the people of Detroit has led the city down a rat hole of incompetent governance, slavish groupthink, black racism, failing public schools, endemic crime and despair. There is only one political philosophy that has dominated Detroit for the past 50 years and has enslaved its majority black citizenry by the actions of its own black leaders . . . LIBERALISM!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 18

IRA EINHORN, AL GORE AND THE CULT OF CELEBRITY

April 28, 2007

There is nothing new under the sun.

~ King Solomon (950 B.C.)

What is the Cult of Celebrity? First, it happens in every society in one form or another. It is when a man (or woman) does something either heroic, unremarkable, infamous or obscene at a particular time in history that is over exalted and hyped up beyond measure by society to such an excessive degree that it takes on a life of its own apart from the person, eventually metamorphosing into a cult. (Here, timing is everything). Eventually, that person is found out to be a fraud, a kook, a mediocrity or a maniac and is summarily thrown onto the ash heap of history—into the abyss of excess, vanity and irrelevance along with all the multitudes of other false prophets, traitors, charlatans, despots and demagogues from antiquity. Recent Cult of Celebrity inductees of the past 200 years are Benedict Arnold, Thomas Paine (post-“Common Sense”), Aaron Burr, Salieri, Darwin, Marx, Freud, France (1919-the present), the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, Margaret Mead, Margaret Sanger, Charles Lindbergh, Hitler, Alger Hiss, the Pulitzer Prize Committee, Dr. W.E.B. DuBois, Dr. Spock, Dr. Kinsey, JFK, Madeline Murray O’Hare, Walter Cronkite, “Rev.” Jim Jones, “Rev.” Al Sharpton, the Congressional Black Caucus, Britney Spears, ex-Duke prosecutor Mike Nifong, Rosie O’Donnell, the propaganda press, Virginia Tech mass murderer Cho Sueng-Hui . . . and virtually every Oscar winner since 1960.

In February, Al Gore received an Oscar for his movie/documentary on global warming, "An Inconvenient Truth," and there is buzz that he is a shoe-in to win the Nobel Peace Prize. The Cult of Celebrity Al Gore presently enjoys reminds me of another notorious character of the prior generation that had a similar Svengali-effect upon all levels of culture and society of his day. I speak of none other than that hippie, activist, fugitive and murder, Ira Einhorn. Who was Ira Einhorn? Einhorn was a major voice in ecological and anti-war movements in the 1960s and 1970s. He was a contemporary and friend of such socialist radicals as Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman. He also claimed to have been involved in creating Earth Day in 1970 and was a keynote speaker at the first Earth Day rally in Philadelphia that same year.

Einhorn possessed brilliant cognitive and rhetorical gifts. He studied at the University of Pennsylvania and had a five-year relationship with the beautiful Holly Maddux—a vivacious young lady from Tyler, Texas, who graduated from the elite Bryn Mawr College. However, after a while Holly grew weary of Einhorn's narcissism and his controlling nature. In 1977, she went to New York City and became romantically involved with Saul Lapidus. Einhorn was outraged and used his charm and cunning to lure Maddux back to his Philadelphia apartment (presumably to get her belongings) on Sept. 9. Holly was never seen in public again.

The mythic lives of Ira Einhorn and Al Gore are a case study of history tragically repeating itself. The self-will, arrogance and sense of entitlement of the baby boomer generation of which Gore and Einhorn are two of their elder statesmen, continues to contaminate modern society. For example, prior to the trinity from hell—the ACLU, the Warren Court (1953-69) and the Burger Court (1969-86)—and its systematic deconstruction of the Constitution, a scoundrel and demagogue like Einhorn would, after one appeal, be promptly and publicly hanged for so cruelly and callously murdering Holly, dismembering her body and, paradoxically, putting her mutilated remains inside the trunk she was to take her belongings in! Furthermore, if America was culturally rational, a snake oil salesman like Al Gore would be publicly mocked, horsewhipped or sued into oblivion as an utter fraud for his massive global warming scam perpetuated against the American people. However, these are perilous and perverse times we live in today where good is considered evil and evil touted as good, virtuous and laudatory; where the Cult of Celebrity

exalts its own like Ira Einhorn and Al Gore and gives them plaudits, prizes and a platform to spew their vile propaganda of lies and deceit—all legitimized by the best “scientific” opinions money can buy.

Three thousand years ago King Solomon said, “There is nothing new under the sun.” Following the logic of the wisest man that ever lived, I have noted some of the similarities between the cases of Einhorn and Gore:

- ❖ Both reveled in the fawning and sycophantic treatment from the propaganda press;
- ❖ Both enjoyed slavish obeisance by the academy and the scientific community;
- ❖ Both were enabled by socialites—Seagram’s heiress Barbara Bronfman paid Einhorn’s \$16,000 bail and aided his escape to Europe for 16 years. Sen. John “Heinz” Kerry and his heiress wife, Teresa Heinz, have just co-authored a propaganda tome touting Gore’s global warming thesis;
- ❖ Both men were lionized by the mental midgets in Hollywood;
- ❖ Shyster lawyers groups (ACLU, Trial Lawyers Association) and opportunistic politicians (Sens. Arlen Specter, Ted Kennedy and Hillary Rodham Clinton)—all supported Einhorn and Gore’s environmental scams (Specter made his bones by being Einhorn’s first defense attorney!);
- ❖ Incompetent legal system—Intimidated by Einhorn’s Cult Celebrity status, the Philadelphia police didn’t search Einhorn’s apartment for 18 months after Holly’s disappearance. Neighbors below Einhorn complained of the horrible stench and a mysterious dark stain on their ceiling, because Holly’s remains leaked through the trunk. Gore has got liberal activist judges in his back pocket eager to codify global warming hysteria into law.
- ❖ After his appeals ran out, Einhorn slit his throat before being extradited from France back to the U.S. Al Gore wants Americans to slit (or cut) the size of their “carbon footprint” so that he can run up \$30,000 in annual utility bills in of all places, Tennessee!
- ❖ Einhorn’s defense: The CIA murdered Holly and framed him due to his investigations into Cold War “psychotronics.” Al Gore says he invented the Internet; he is about to win the Nobel Peace Prize for telling Americans “we’re killing the planet,” and to avoid environmental catastrophe, Gore wants Americans to buy “carbon credits” from *his* company if you exceed your energy quota, etc.

Prometheus in a black dress and conservative writer Ann Coulter summarizes the Cult of Celebrity, the Zeitgeist of the 1960s and the death of rational thinking in modern times admirably and profoundly: "While the form of treachery varies slightly from case to case, liberals *always* manage to take the position that most undermines American [security]." Happy Earth Day!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 19

HERESY IN DENVER

August 28, 2008

You [Sister Helen Prejean] are a clear and present danger, not only to the survival of America, but to the Democrat Party. . . . In my opinion, she is more closely associated with being a witch than a nun.

~ Dr. Michael Savage

As I watched the Democratic convention this past week, I also was listening to my favorite radio talk-show host, that fabulous iconoclast and conservative intellectual, Dr. Michael Savage. Admittedly, the news coverage in my view was monolith and unremarkable. I considered the entire event a garish spectacle of nothingness. When I could take no more doublespeak, the commercials were over and I returned to listening to Michael Savage. One of the things I didn't see on any of the other networks, including Fox News, was Savage's in-depth, extemporaneous analysis of excerpts from a speech by the controversial Catholic nun Sister Helen Prejean at the inter-faith part of the convention on Monday.

At the time of this writing, the media self-censorship of this event was complete. Neither I nor several colleagues and media entities I contacted could find a single transcript (either video or print) of what she said at the convention. Orwellian, isn't it? The extensive excerpts Savage played of this Marxist false prophet amazingly paralleled the radicalism, hate, venal lies and revisionist history of Sen. Barack Obama's "former" pastor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright. As I listened to excerpts of Sister Prejean's speech, despite her monotonic voice and grandmotherly appearance, I had an uneasy feeling that I was listening to the words of pure evil and deceit spoken with the usual combination of glibness, arrogance and cer-

titude we have come to expect from liberals who think they are smarter than anyone else.

Sister Prejean is a noted anti-death penalty activist despite the Bible's repeated commandments throughout the Old and New Testaments mandating that murderers, or those who willfully and wantonly kill others without just cause, should themselves be put to death. The Romans called this ancient principle of natural law *lex talionis*—an eye for an eye. To her credit, Prejean is also a staunch pro-life activist. An autobiographical account of her life was published as a book in 1993, "Dead Man Walking," later adapted into a movie (1995) and an opera (2000) by the same name, which tells the story of Prejean (played by Susan Sarandon), who befriended Matthew Poncelet, a prisoner on death row (played by Sean Penn). Prejean also made a minor cameo appearance as a woman in a candlelight vigil scene outside Louisiana State Penitentiary.

Since the worldwide fame of the book, movie and opera of her anti-death penalty work, (all three works in my opinion are of increasingly dubious literary value) Sister Prejean has skillfully parlayed that notoriety bequeathed to her by the Hollywood left into a vehicle to espouse her radical ideas to the world—a combination of militant anti-death penalty rhetoric cloaked in the propaganda of liberation theology, Marxist economics and radical socialist politics that would make Stalin proud. Prejean's hackneyed brand of religious progressivism (fashionable in America from 1900-15 and the 1930s onward) can be easily summarized with the following mantras:

- ❖ The god-State wants us to use government to control others for the common or greater good [early progressivism founded in utilitarianism];
- ❖ White man = bad;
- ❖ People of color, women = victims of the white man's evil nature [post-1960s progressivism].

Sister Prejean, according to an article in the Honolulu Advertiser, received a standing ovation after calling for the creation of a peace academy, non-violent conflict resolution education in all schools, a shift from defense spending to social programs, and a government apology for the treatment of American Indians whom, she claims America committed genocide against and "stole their land." Later in that speech she claimed, "They let us be free to speak our minds today." On his radio show earli-

er this week, Savage picked up on the unintended consequences of letting liberals be free to speak their minds. This parade of radicals will demonstrate to the heartland of America how extreme liberalism has devolved just since the early 1960s when JFK ran on a conservative platform—from economics and civil rights to his hawkish foreign interventions and war policy. On many issues today, JFK would be considered to the right of Ronald Reagan!

That Obama obviously felt comfortable selecting Sister Helen Prejean, a certified Marxist, a radical nun and purveyor of the cult of liberation theology, as a convention speaker is beyond the pale. But why did Obama do it? First, Obama, like his “former” pastor, Rev. Jeremiah, is in agreement with her brand of Marxism rooted in the cult of liberation theology—a bizarre and perverse interpretation of the Bible filled with god-State utopianism, historical revisionism, vulgar racialism, class-based politics and Marxist economics.

Second, the Democratic Party, which, going back to FDR, scrupulously separated law from morality, thus dispelling the need of religion playing *any* viable role in politics, is now trying to learn from their mistakes of the 2000 and 2004 elections by actively soliciting the “religious vote.” Remember in 2004 when Bush narrowly defeated Kerry and the 2000 election in which Bush and Gore were so statistically close in electoral votes that it would be up to the U.S. Supreme Court to decide who would become our 43rd president? People of faith arguably tipped the scales in Bush’s favor both times. That said, there is an existing, intractable “religion gap” the Democrats must acknowledge and bridge before they will have any hope of securing the presidency again.

The blog AustuteBlogger.blogspot.com was one of the few venues that had anything substantive about Sister Prejean’s speech this week. The blogger summarized her perverse interpretation of the Eighth Amendment’s cruel-and-unusual-punishment clause in this manner:

What Prejean rails against was actually the means for saving the murderer’s soul, and not her pleas or her unconditional love.

Prejean’s blindness to this fact demonstrates a general blindness on the left: They are blind to the real causes of what they rail against and the recommend remedies, which would make the problems worse . . . such as higher taxes to help the poor. *This has never worked anywhere or at any time; it has always made things worse.*⁵

Notwithstanding its early religious roots, the progressive movement of today has an utter disregard, even a venal hatred of formal religion (particularly Christianity). That said, the inclusion of the so-called “inter-faith” conference as part of their convention platform can be only construed as a cynical gesture by the Democrats to have the appearance that liberals actually care about religious voters too . . . trust me, they don’t.

Liberals, particularly its political leadership, its diehard activists in unison with the mainstream media, have little use for any religious ideas in politics because since FDR, *liberalism* itself has become their supreme religion and god (little “g”), or to paraphrase Machiavelli—*Politics is the pursuit and acquisition of political power by any means necessary*. Sister Helen Prejean’s speech at the Democratic convention last Monday, although censored by the mainstream media, including omission from the official website of the DNC, was truly a shameful example of a person using her sacred office as a means to an ignominious end.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 20

CRITICAL THINKERS VS. KOOL-AID DRINKERS?

August 30, 2008

For the first time in my adult lifetime, I am really proud of my country, because it feels like hope [electing my husband as president of the U.S.] is making a comeback.

~ Michelle Obama (Feb. 18, 2008)

. . . That’s why I love this country.

~ Michelle Obama (Aug. 25, 2008)

Oh, what a difference six short months can make. While watching small clips of the Democrats’ national convention this week, I was struck by the audience and its reaction to the utter propaganda it was exposed to. Yet, like cult members brainwashed and transfixed by the words of their “leader,” audience members robotically accepted the doublespeak, no matter how utopian and outrageous, with repeated and exultant ova-tions. In the interest of fairness, next week in St. Paul, Minn., the Republicans will put on an equally galling display of political theater, spectacle

and doublespeak, saying whatever the audience wants to hear. To me it's all beyond the pale.

Presently, I am a new professor at Savannah State University where I teach five classes—three sections of American government (mostly freshman), American judicial process and international law (upper classmen). From the beginning, I am constantly admonishing my young students to “think critically,” “think outside the box,” “don’t follow the crowd because they may lead you and your generation into the abyss which may take years to recover from.” During my lectures, as I look into their bright, radiant eyes so full of hope and promise, I am saddened because when I hear their opinions, oftentimes I hear the Stalinist Party line—a litany of confused, utopian, impulsive and irrational ideas on the pivotal issues of our time. Confusion? How could it be otherwise for our young people in this age of compulsory K-12 education in our Stalinist public schools; propaganda factories full of anti-education, intellectual perversity, violence, failure and despair? Irrational ideas? How could it be otherwise, with our bloated, inefficient government where political hacks on both sides of the aisle are suppose to represent “We the People,” yet they have never read the black-letter text of the U.S. Constitution and, therefore, have little clue what this precious document means according the original intent Constitution’s framers?

“Ellis, what are you saying?” What I am saying dear reader is that listening to speech after speech after speech this week, one thing became crystal clear to me: Liberals don’t think, they *know* we are stupid. I realize this is a strong statement that will offend some, and I don’t mean to be personal, but how else could Michelle Obama last Tuesday night make these incredulous remarks over thunderous applause:

And in my own life, in my own small way, I have tried to give back to this country that has given me so much. See, that’s why I left a job at a big law firm for a career in public service, working to empower young people to volunteer in their communities, because I believe that each of us—no matter what our age or background or our walk of life—each of us has something to contribute to the life of this nation. . . .

[Barack will] achieve these goals the same way he always has: by bringing us together and reminding us how much we share and how alike we really are. You see, Barack doesn’t care where you’re from or what your background is or what party, if any, you belong to.

Following the Kennedy-Rockefeller-Clinton playbook, liberals love to crow about how they've given up so much money for a life of "public service." And by running for president of the most powerful nation in the history of the world, and the lucrative speaking fees and influence peddling that presidents and senators can command during and after they leave office, they are actually doing *us* a favor. I'm not persuaded. The implication being, "We're not like those money-grubbing conservatives; we love the people not money." Balderdash! That's why Michelle left a big-money Chicago law firm to work as a top executive for the prestigious University of Chicago Medical Center doing what? As V.P. of a very prestigious hospital, Michelle's job was maximizing company profits by dumping the poor, the elderly and the uninsured patients on other hospitals. Her blood money reward? Hospital brass more than tripled her annual salary to over \$317,000.⁷ Now that's public service. Her reference to Obama as "community organizing" is another canard. What is a community organizer anyway? Think race hustlers like Kwame Kilpatrick, Cornel West, Al Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, but particularly the Marxist ideas of Saul Alinsky, a 1930s and '40s-era radical socialist whose ideas again rose to great prominence during the counter cultural revolution of the 1960s and '70s.

Saul Alinsky, the iconic Marxist-anarchist, literally wrote the book on how to use the vehicle of community organizing to destroy established societal institutions in his seminal work, "Rules for Radicals" (1946). Remember that Obama, Clinton and many of their top advisers were enthusiastic Alinsky acolytes during their formative years. Time will not permit me to address the redux of FDR's New Deal and LBJ's Great Society programs Michelle, Barack and other speakers at the DNC promised all Americans. They are programs of which a growing number of historians, ministers, politicians, intellectuals and others deduced have done more harm to destroy the black family than hundreds of years of slavery in America. Yet Harvard-educated, Kool-Aid drinking Michelle and Barack, as dutiful servants on the liberal plantation, speak the propaganda that their masters have taught them to the letter.

As one who attended Harvard 20 years ago just after Michelle graduated from law school and concurrent with when Barack entered law school, I saw firsthand as students were regularly presented liberal propaganda as unassailable fact by certain faculty members there who pushed a Marxist, socialist or liberal worldview. However, I purposely

used my short time at Harvard not to take the easy road, by drinking the Kool-Aid, by uncritically accepting the Marxist and socialist ideas of the Ivy League, but to transform my worldview from god-state liberalism to Ronald Reagan conservatism. I made this transition, ironically, thanks to several shrill Michelle Obama-like angry feminists who ranted and raved against me at a party of all places, and drove me into the conservative camp.

Liberals love to use the class warfare rhetoric of Marxism to imply that education will lead to some abstract utopian enlightenment (“... and to make sure that every child in this nation has a world-class education all the way from preschool to college”). Nevertheless, with their coveted Ivy League pedigrees from Princeton, Columbia and Harvard, Michelle and Barack Obama seem unwilling or unable to think critically, to think independently as I am attempting to teach my young, college freshman students at SSU.

Lacking a consistent, strong father figure, I am convinced Barack Obama is not a fully developed and balanced man. But his history has shown him to be a magnet to extremist people and toward perverse, socialist ideas, thus he is a perfect prototype of a Manchurian Candidate. Michelle and Barack Obama are two very famous people of my generation, born at the tail end of the Baby Boom generation. They have not only drunk every drop of Kool-Aid (i.e., Marxist propaganda) that Columbia, Princeton and Harvard could pour down their throats, they wiped their mouths and went back for seconds.

One of my main goals as a college professor is not to make *converts* of my students to either the Democratic or Republican Party, but to *teach* my students how to think critically in all things, and even if they are occasionally thirsty, to remember the tragic deaths of those 921 followers of the Rev. Jim Jones cult 30 years ago and to never, ever drink the Kool-Aid!⁷

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY — ESSAY 21

BIRMINGHAM ON THE BRINK

May 29, 2008

The only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing.

~ Sir Edmund Burke

Many of my readership are aware that since January, in addition to my weekend column, I have endeavored during the week to present systematically proven, substantive policy ideas regarding the present crisis of leadership in Detroit and the legal battles of Mayor King Kwame Kilpatrick ("KKK"). However, since this epic drama of ghetto proportions has devolved recently into attempts by the prosecutor to recue the entire judicial bench of the 36th District Court, alleging conflict of interest by being on Kwame's payroll, or which judge threw grapes at some other judge's wife, my editor has graciously given me leave of Detroit to allow me to roam around to other cities and towns throughout America to address this critical question: *How has America's tragic love affair with socialism for the past 75 years, since FDR's "New Deal," worked out in America's cities, towns and villages in modern times?*

My first stop in this new series of articles takes us to the city of Birmingham, Ala. "Paul," a poet and one of my most avid readers whose work I have cited before, has been a resident of Birmingham for many years. A few months ago when I told him of my intent to relocate to either that area or Atlanta, Paul strongly discouraged me from moving to Birmingham. Below is a summary of his reasons why.

❖ "I know that Atlanta is the New York City of the Southeast. It rose from the ashes of the Civil War. The opportunities are more abundant there. In Birmingham, we were killed by racism, the Nazi George Wallace and ignorance. Birmingham proper is a ghost town, mostly law offices and accounting firms—and even those are moving. My daughter is an accountant at a former downtown office that moved from the city. Why?

❖ "The first day Mayor Larry Langford was in office, he increased sales tax a penny and doubled all business license fees. Red Diamond

Coffee Co., which has been a part of Birmingham for over 100 years, was denied a permit to expand its business. Why? Who knows? The City Council, I assume, wasn't extorting enough taxes from Red Diamond. Red Diamond moved its entire operation out of Birmingham and now they can't extort one thin dime.

❖ "In these tough and uncertain economic times, Mayor Langford is voting himself a pay increase along with that of the do-nothing City Council. Not just an itsy bitsy raise, but from \$88,000 a year to \$133,000. Not only is the city and county bankrupt, but now he is trying to pull the whole state in.

❖ "Langford has had four of his "Crime Summits," and murder rates have risen.

❖ "Jefferson County, where Birmingham is located, is on the brink of bankruptcy. It had to get a second extension on paying just the interest, \$83 million, on its sewer bond, which is over \$3.2 billion. How did this come about? The City Council, with Mayor Langford as chief architect, played fast and loose with the bond rates so that their cohorts could receive the maximum amount of fees for working and re-working the angles.

❖ "At the same time, Mayor Larry "Dome" Langford is going forward with the building of a \$1.5 billion sports dome and a \$55 million sports complex. As we both know, government estimates are rarely, if ever, accurate. One can always expect cost overruns. *Birmingham has no professional sports team.* That's like a homeless man spending \$20,000 for a watch band when he doesn't own a watch."

St. Augustine, in his magnum opus, "The City of God," said: "Remove justice, and what are kingdoms but gangs of criminals on a vast scale? What are criminal gangs but petty kingdoms?" How does St. Augustine's prescient ideas play out in modern times? In a word, EDUCATION.

FDR, LBJ, JFK, RFK, Carter, Teddy Kennedy, Patrick Leahy, Clinton, Clinton, Obama or your favorite socialist have done very little politically in comparison to the inimical effects of our Stalinist public schools and college systems whose ideas sadly will outlive us all and curse future generations. How? As Paul said, referring to an earlier article I had written about education, "By dumbing down children, you end with adults who think like infants. An infant is ego-centered and cannot think beyond itself." Paul is right on point. I would only add that the modern academy has effectively killed logic and critical thinking through moral

relativism and egalitarianism. It is increasingly difficult to make ethical or intellectual judgments if everything is equal.

How else could any political figure attract over 75,000 people standing for hours in the hot sun of Oregon just for a glimpse of this false political messiah named Barack Obama? An utterly vacuous man who just the other day said these sinister words that would make Goebbels blush with envy as the multitudes of "useful idiots" hung on his every word, saluting him with multiple ovations: ""We can't drive our SUVs and eat as much as we want and keep our homes on 72 degrees at all times . . . and then just expect that other countries are going to say OK." If this one statement by Obama doesn't give a profound pause to every red-blooded American who loves the Constitution and respects the legacy bequeathed to us in blood by our forefathers and the Constitution's framers, then truly I can say without equivocation that you have been successfully self-indoctrinated by America's Stalinist public school and university education systems if you went to college.

What business is it to Sen. Obama (or anybody else for that matter) what I drive, what I set my thermostat on at my home, or most importantly what *other countries* (perhaps energy efficient countries like Russia, China and India) think about America's energy usage? This is classic socialist thought straight out of Karl Marx, views championed by the academy, and should be vigorously fought against on every front inside the arena of ideas.

America! If you can be happy with an Obama, Clinton or McCain presidency or with the leadership of Birmingham's Mayor Langford and his ilk ruining our major cities, then do nothing. However, if you love America and venerate her sacred Constitution written in the blood of our forefathers, then do as Burke implied—fight! If you live in or know of a city whose quality of life was destroyed by failed, unconstitutional socialist policies, then send me an e-mail with some of the details and I will endeavor to trumpet your ideas to the world. Show me a monopoly (liberalism) and I'll show you a tyranny (Birmingham, Ala.).

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY — ESSAY 22

HOW THE DETROIT LIONS MIRROR THEIR HOST CITY

September 18, 2008

Detroit will not win for 50 years.

~ The curse of Bobby Layne (1958)

Detroit, you done set me up for a comeback!

~ Kwame Kilpatrick's last words as mayor of Detroit (Sept. 4, 2008)

This column is for all my football fans out there. However, for my political junkies, of course I will make a few political points in my analysis. Here I want to discuss the hapless, hopeless Detroit Lions football team and why they are so pathetic in relation to other football teams. Also, I will theorize how the Lions are related to the terrible leadership of ex-Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, a politically connected rogue elected to high office twice in an 88 percent black city. Let's start with the Detroit Lions. With the exception of the Arizona Cardinals' one championship victory (1947), there is no current NFL football team that has had such a drought since winning the national title (1957). Presently at 0-2, despite a 4-0 preseason record, why do the Lions play more like pussy cats? The reason is quite simple, despite the hundreds of millions of dollars it takes to buy and run an NFL franchise today. Admittedly, the irrationalism of human nature often prevents us from acting in our own best interests.

There are four basic reasons why the Detroit Lions are such a bad sports franchise: 1) poor leadership, 2) bad decision making, 3) toleration of a defeatist philosophy and culture, and 4) cynicism—the public will come to the games anyway. Let's compare the Detroit Lions with the city of Detroit, which ironically has been steadily devolving since about the same time—1957—the last year Motown had a Republican mayor in office (Albert E. Cobo). Is this just a coincidence? No, competence breeds liberty. Incompetence and corruption breed tyranny and despair.

Poor Leadership: The top leadership of the Detroit Lions is William Clay Ford (owner/chairman), William Clay Ford Jr. (vice chairman) and Matt Millen (president/CEO). This trinity of incompetence is at the root why the Lions are so bad. It's not that they get bad players, but these men don't seem to understand the game and thus how to hire good

coaches to bring out the best potential of each player. Similarly, in the 1950s, when Detroit had a population of 2 million, the city was an economic juggernaut known for good-paying auto industry jobs, manageable crime and a high quality of life. After several bungling white liberal Democrat mayors beginning in the late '50s leading to Detroit's first black mayor in 1974 (Coleman A. Young) and continuing through Dennis Archer and Kwame Kilpatrick, Detroit has had had terrible leadership, losing over 60 percent of its population over the past 50 years. Admittedly, Dennis Archer was a good mayor, but ironically the people tried to impeach him.

Bad decision making: The twin demons—apathy and ignorance—have doomed many good organizations and once-great cities of the past, leading to bad decision making. Think Arizona Cardinals late 1940s, the Pittsburgh Steelers in the 1980s and the San Francisco 49ers since 1995. All of these teams forgot what made them great and the people (the fans) didn't revolt, but settled for mediocrity decade after decade. The apotheosis of "the first black mayor" in the '70s has plunged this majority black city into a hellish nightmare of endemic crime, corrupt leadership, dwindling tax base, drug abuse, AIDS epidemic, a 78 percent high school dropout rate and, according to Forbes magazine, "The most miserable city in America." These were all bad decisions made by Detroiters against their own vested interests.

Toleration of a defeatist philosophy and culture: The Detroit Lions are perennial losers, and even though they are supposed to be professionals, they often promote a culture of defeat, incompetence and poor sportsmanship. This inimical culture of defeat frequently allows the Lions to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory, like the first two games they lost of the 2008 season where late in the game they were winning before self-destructing. Likewise, Detroiters, blinded for over 50 years by liberal philosophy and black racism, have a high tolerance for incompetent black leadership. Detroit is a liberal town, a city where virtually everyone votes for the Democrat Party and pledges unquestioned allegiance to the socialism of FDR/LBJ big government programs. Higher taxes to support an increasing welfare state are treated as a religious sacrament in Michigan.

Cynicism—the public will come to the games anyway: Detroit Lions fans are truly "fanatics" to a fault. They pack out Ford Field regardless of whether the Lions win or lose.

Similarly, Detroiters seem to vote for any crazy, corrupt, incompetent, psychopathic leader as long as he's black, eloquent, a Democrat, has a famous name and blames the all of Detroit's problems on the white man or Republicans. In the final analysis, what lessons can Detroit's black majority learn from the Detroit Lions? First, if you want to be a great city, you must first have a responsible, intelligent, teachable citizenry. Without that the republic will devolve downward to a democracy (mob rule), socialism, totalitarianism and eventually anarchy and nihilism.

Second, you must demand from yourselves and your leadership honesty, competence, morality. When any of these three pillars of good leadership are missing in a politician, then "We the People" must act decisively and remove the offending leader from office, lest his evil ways spread like a cancer throughout all city government. My advice to the NFL—To foster competition at the highest level, the league should give each team five to 10 years to make the playoffs or force that team into receivership for someone else to make it competitive.

Similarly, for the next 10 years the city of Detroit and its public schools should be taken over by the state and run by a city manager appointed by Michigan's governor (like neighboring Highland Park) until Detroiters can *prove* that they are indeed rational, responsible citizens able to elect competent, bipartisan leadership (liberals and conservatives) to govern all city affairs. Yes, race merchants and poverty pimps like John Conyers, John Lewis, Al Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, the ACLU, the NAACP and Kwame Kilpatrick (from jail) will squeal "RACISM!"—but I believe Detroiters would understand these austere measures are for the good of the city and therefore will reject activist demagoguery.

It is self-evident that neither the Detroit Lions nor the citizens of Detroit can proficiently run their respective organization and city affairs. Should "We the People" continue to waste hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars until their learning curve rises? I think not. Sell the Detroit Lions to another owner and appoint a city manager to run Detroit for 10 years while the governor appoints members to Detroit's school board from a neighboring city with excellent schools (Grosse Pointe, Bloomfield, Southfield) to reform our corrupt, violent and Stalinist public schools.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 23

ARBITRARY IDEAS: HOLLYWOOD,
REAGAN AND IMBECILES VOTING

September 27, 2008

Today, I will borrow an article style from that legendary economist and commentator of American culture and society, Hoover Institute fellow Dr. Thomas Sowell—particularly his column series he does from time to time on various issues of concern titled, “Random Thoughts.” My foray into this genre will be called, “Arbitrary Ideas.” Two pictures of Americana that haunt me to this day: One, the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by the diminutive President Harry Truman; Two, the ubiquitous white/colored water fountains from America’s Jim Crow era.

What precipitated the battle between MacArthur and Truman was after defeating Hitler’s Germany and Hirohito of Japan, the proactive general wanted to protect America’s vulnerable flank, i.e., defeat communist North Korea *and China*. Truman said no; Gen. MacArthur said you’re a fool. The president won, and the general was forced into early retirement. History has shown that America’s “tie” in the Korean War in 1955 vindicated MacArthur’s war policy over President Truman.

The second picture that haunts me is the segregated water fountains you see in all the history books. The white water fountain is always so clean and inviting. The black one is always dirty and disgusting. I asked the students in my American Government class this week: Why didn’t anyone 50, 75, 100 years ago think to clean to up the “colored” water fountain, to make it shine like the sun? Why? To show white people that black standards of cleanliness are just as high or better than white ones, but more importantly to demonstrate initiative, industry, pride and the power of the individual to change a racist paradigm.

The segregated water fountains are a sober metaphor dealing with racism. In other words, how much further would black people have gotten in America had they spent less time marching in the streets, “assailing the ears of [white] America” (W.E.B. Dubois’ philosophy) and more time studying in the library, holding each other accountable as productive citizens and daily practicing the “fundamentals of civilization”

(Booker T. Washington's philosophy)? I believe the transcendent words of JFK's Inaugural Address of January 1961: "The rights of man come not from the generosity of the State, but out of the mouth of God."

Last weekend, Hollywood came out yet again to present itself with an award—The Emmy Awards, which were the least watched in history. This reminds me of the biblical verse, "If the blind lead the blind they will both fall into the ditch." How many awards can these infantile adults give each other before someone will stand up and say enough is enough?! All of the Ivy-League educated advisers to the president, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Wall Street, the secretary of the treasury, the chairman of the SEC, the majority leaders in the Senate and House Finance Services Committee (Sen. Chris Dodd, Rep. Barney Frank) didn't predict nor can they seemingly solve our critical mortgage crisis and Wall Street collapse.

This scenario begs the question: Perhaps we should throw out the Ph.D. economists, the financial experts and investment bankers and get some philosophers and advisers of President Reagan to solve this financial crisis? How about some truth in advertising? What I mean is, regarding the shrill tone and hatred Democrat women have shown Republican vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin, the National Organization of Women should now be called the National Organization of *Liberal* Women. Ditto for the NAACP. Remember the summer of 1991 and how disparaging the entire civil rights movement was to Clarence Thomas during his Supreme Court hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee?

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a man whose country is the largest sponsor of worldwide terrorism for 40 years, speaking before the U.N. this week, received more applause, more respect from the media, liberal Democrats, academics, civil rights groups and foreign nationals than Justice Clarence Thomas has received during his 17 years on the Supreme Court . . . and Justice Thomas has never killed anyone. Activist judges, revisionist historians, politicians and civil rights groups love to congratulate themselves for outlawing poll taxes and literacy tests as relics of the America's racist past. I am not convinced. True, most times poll taxes and literacy tests were administered in a racially discriminatory manner, but that could have been remedied by the courts under the due process and equal protection clauses; instead, the courts capitulated, invalidated *all* poll taxes, literacy tests and many rational ID require-

ments. The result—now any dead person, illegal alien or imbecile can vote. And we wonder why we keep electing the politicians we deserve.

If you want to know why America cannot decisively win any wars as of late, compare the manner America fought World War II to the politically correct way we are fighting the Afghanistan and Iraq wars. Also compare the wartime leadership of FDR and Ronald Reagan to LBJ, Nixon, George W. Bush, Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter. Compare the brass-balls military leadership of men like Gens. Douglas MacArthur, Patton, Eisenhower, Marshall and Benjamin O. Davis Jr. to the Ivy-League degree generals like Wesley Clark, Earle Wheeler, David Jones, John Shalikashvili and Michael Mullen. As Golda Meir courageously led Israel (1969-74) and Lady Margaret Thatcher led England (1979-90), perhaps America needs a heroic woman figure like a Gov. Sarah Palin to show us metrosexual males in the 21st century what a real man is.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 23

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE A RIGHT?

October 15, 2008

Four rotten, stinking lawyers in black robes called judges told the people of Connecticut to take your religion and shove it to you know where.

~ Radio host Michael Savage, Oct. 10, 2008

Arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty abused to licentiousness.

~ George Washington

A few weeks ago, in my American Judicial Process class at Savannah State University, my students and I had a lively discussion on same-sex marriage, domestic partnerships and the constitutionality of states granting gay couples either the right to have “civil unions” or even going further—granting gay couples the legal right to marry. As you could imagine, discussing this emotional subject with a bunch of young students in their late teens and early 20s got rather spirited, to say the least. One student whom I’ll call “Amanda” confessed that she had been in a lesbian

relationship for several years, but is now in a relationship with a young man. Surprisingly, Amanda doesn't want special rights for gay couples and contends they shouldn't be allowed legally to marry on religious grounds, but she favors civil unions.

A male student I'll call "Ringman" saw that the emotional level was getting out of control and several times during the debate served as my sergeant of arms and kept the peace during the class discussion. Although a Christian, he sympathizes with giving gay couples equal rights to marry. A third student I'll call "Lexia" was probably the most emotional. She was in total disagreement with my stand on the domestic partnership issue and though she wasn't gay believed that gay couples should be allowed to marry and be granted full constitutional rights and protections as traditional married couples. Lexia was totally hostile to any other opinions to the contrary no matter the verity of their reasoning.

Since marriage isn't explicitly mentioned in the black letter text of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, nor the Bill of Rights, we can look at American cultural, social and judicial history as well as judicial precedent (*stare decisis*). Since 1789 when the Constitution was ratified and the governmental institutions set in place, including the Supreme Court and other lower courts, the historical record overwhelmingly shows that legal marriage was 100 percent between a man and a woman only. I told my students: With 220 years of moral and religious traditions in America's Constitution history as well as over 400 years since the landing of the Pilgrims at Jamestown, Va., where America's Founding Fathers purposely built their government upon the solid moral precepts of the Judeo-Christian tradition of intellectual thought, it should be unthinkable for a judge in 2008 by judicial fiat and a 4-3 majority to grant constitutional rights allowing gay couples to legally marry. However, that's what the Connecticut Supreme Court did on Oct. 10 in the case *Kerrigan v. Commissioner of Public Health*. How did the Connecticut Supreme Court come to this conclusion?

In modern times, America's experiment with granting various groups special constitutional protections began in the 1960s with black people and the civil rights movement. However, these civil and voting rights were not based on the moral suppositions of Christianity, morality and *Natural Law*—an integration of law and morality—but on raw, humanist, secular congressional power rooted in emotionalism, "social jus-

tice," might-makes-right and *Positive Law*—the separation of law from morality. On this point, one anonymous writer for UC Berkeley's Institute for Governmental Studies defined the moral vs. rights paradigm in this manner:

The traditional and still dominant view in the United States is that marriage is a legally recognized union of one man and one woman. This view is deeply embedded in *moral and religious* beliefs. An alternative view, with roots in the civil rights movement and the political activism of the 1960s, takes the position that marriage is a body of rights which should be extended, *as a matter of fairness and equality*, to couples who do not fit the one man/one woman definition. Many in the gay liberation movement have made the right to marry a key plank in their campaign for equal rights under the law. Over the past 44 years since the passage of the storied *Civil Rights Acts* (1964, 1968) and the *Voting Rights Act* (1965), it is not hard to see tactically how the jump was made from black rights to "gay rights." Gay activists, sympathetic members of Congress and liberal activist judges didn't go to court to argue the morality issues of their cause because the Bible has a clear prohibition against sodomy; therefore, these progressives argued for gay marriage on the basis of fairness and equality, attaching their cause to the lofty and moral ideas and ideals of the Rev. Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement.

The gay movement, and to a lesser degree the feminist movement and the environmentalist movement, from its origins was a full-blown war against America and her moral traditions founded in the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought.

Using the Due Process clause and the Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment, these Democrats in Congress and leftist activists like the ACLU, Lambda Legal, Equality Federation and the National Center for Lesbian Rights—along with their enablers: NOW, DailyKos, Huffington Post, the Washington Post, the New York Times and other entities in the liberal media—knew that there will be some secular activist court somewhere using a fairness argument rather than moral arguments and will grant gay people full constitutional rights to be married along with full inheritance, adoption, insurance and other rights formerly in the Synopsis domain of marriage.

You see, dear reader, once one makes the intellectual leap from the morality of our forefathers (Judeo-Christianity) by separating law from morality, church from state, reason from common sense, it becomes

clearer how American culture and society devolved so far so fast from the lofty ideals of George Washington, who once said, "Arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty abused to licentiousness." Compare Washington magnificent words to the recent opinion of the Connecticut Supreme Court, which held: "Interpreting our state constitutional provisions in accordance with firmly established equal protection principles leads inevitably to the conclusion that gay persons are entitled to marry the otherwise qualified same-sex partner of their choice." The fix is in.

Judges at all levels across America, because of Positive Law, which is the separation of law from morals, can now insert their own personal policy preferences, behave like super legislators and pervert the will of the people and American constitutional law and judicial history, because human nature tells the judge that nothing will happen to them—no impeachment, no protests, no pressure of any sort. How did homosexual marriage become a constitutional right? Once a judge makes the decision that, despite America's Judeo-Christian traditions enshrined in constitutional law and history, morality is irrelevant to judicial decision making, that morality is separate from legality, then the Constitution effectively becomes toilet paper and "We the People" become hostages terrorized by the whims of an oligarchy of 5 or 4 shyster lawyers in black robes. In the meantime America's republic is, for all intents and purposes, destroyed.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 24

IS LIBERALISM POLITICAL MADNESS?

November 15, 2008

The roots of liberalism—and its associated madness—can be clearly identified by understanding how children develop from infancy to adulthood and how distorted development produces the irrational beliefs of the liberal mind.

~Dr. Lyle H. Rossiter Jr., M.D., "The Liberal Mind: The Psychological Causes of Political Madness" (2008)

Are liberals clinically mad? This controversial question has been proposed and written about by many political pundits and conservative intellectuals, most notably, Dr. Michael Savage, a visionary radio talk show host from San Francisco, in his 2005 book, "Liberalism is a mental disorder." However, Dr. Rossiter, brings a solid background as a psychiatrist and non-partisan, and years of clinical experience dealing with mental disorders of every conceivable type—making his findings singularly unique, objective and difficult to ignore.

For 25 years, I myself have studied and written about political liberalism, which traces its origins to the 16th and 17th century and the Age of Enlightenment; particularly the writings of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Kant, Diderot, Jefferson and others. Political liberalism continued to modern times in the politics and political writings of William James, Walter Lippmann, Herbert Croly, Woodrow Wilson, FDR and LBJ, among others. I have also studied liberalism in all of its permutations and presuppositions, including democracy, natural law, natural rights, humanism, Marxism, utilitarianism, socialism, communism, progressivism, pragmatism, moderates, neoliberalism, conservative liberalism, the welfare state, etc.

While neither Dr. Rossiter nor myself postulate that all liberals are *ipso facto* clinically mad, there are many characteristics of liberalism that are associated with the classic symptoms of madness, including:

- ❖ creating and reinforcing perceptions of victimization;
- ❖ satisfying infantile claims to entitlement, indulgence and compensation;
- ❖ augmenting primitive feelings of envy;
- ❖ rejecting the sovereignty of the individual, subordinating him to the will of the government.

At Savannah State University, where I teach American government, international law and American judicial process, I am constantly waging intellectual warfare against my college students to forsake dependent, slavish ideologies rooted in emotivism, like liberalism, socialism, welfare statism and feminism, and instead to embrace critical thinking in all of their intellectual pursuits. Recently during a mock presidential debate I had organized where I played Sen. John McCain (as if he were a true conservative), I even slammed my fist on the table and in the spirit of Justice Clarence Thomas' grandfather, who told young Clarence as a child, "The damn party's over!" I reacted to the SSU students openly

praising FDR statism and the virtues of socialism or forcibly taking money from one group of people (producers) and giving it to another (non-producers). While the TV camera was rolling, I emphatically told the students at that debate to "Get off the damn plantation!"

The students, administration, faculty and staff were perhaps shocked at my characterization of the welfare state and its inimical effects on the black family, but I thought it had to be said so that we don't lose another generation of black students to failed, genocidal policies of the past. Dr. Rossiter conveyed those same sentiments but in a much less emotive tone when he wrote: "Like spoiled, angry children, they [liberals] rebel against the normal responsibilities of adulthood and demand that a parental government meet their needs from cradle to grave."

Whether you have a Ph.D. or a GED or fall somewhere in between, any government system or political philosophy based on taking trillions of taxpayer dollars and giving it to some lazy bum who didn't earn it and doesn't deserve it in my opinion is sheer madness—as is any political organization like the Democratic Party that achieves and seizes power by seeing people not as the Constitution's framers saw people, as individuals ("We the People"), but uses them as a cynical means to an unholy end—using Machiavellian, Marxist and Alinsky tactics, divide people into warring factions: men against women, blacks against whites, Jews against Muslims, proper against the perverse, handicapped against able-bodied, workers against employers, straight against homosexuals, "the haves vs. the have nots." It's all madness. Objectively speaking, liberalism is national genocide!

Let's apply Rossiter's theory that liberalism is a psychological disorder to today's politicians, Barack Obama and his Democratic primary opponent Hillary Clinton, two unashamed, big-government socialists. Rossiter writes:

A social scientist who understands human nature will not dismiss the vital roles of free choice, voluntary cooperation and moral integrity—as liberals do . . . A political leader who understands human nature will not ignore individual differences in talent, drive, personal appeal and work ethic, and then try to impose economic and social equality on the population—as liberals do. And a legislator who understands human nature will not create an environment of rules which over-regulates and over-taxes the nation's citizens, corrupts their character and reduces them to wards of the state—as liberals do.

The key phrase is "human nature." There is a profound ignorance and loathing in the political philosophy of liberalism against human nature. Where it is discussed in polite company it is done so in context of casting maledictions, ridicule and contempt upon Christians, Christianity and their belief in the synthesis of legality and morality; an idea adopted by the framers of the Constitution and held as absolutely indispensable to the survival of America's republic. To your average liberal intellectual or humanist academic, the Founding Fathers and the Constitution's framers were the lowest, vilest, murderous hypocrites on the face of the earth and only deserve our utter condemnation. We see this displayed daily on the liberal media, in the judicial system, in the Democratic Party, in its leadership, its committees and the policies they champion, both domestic and foreign. Virtually every word uttered, printed or recorded by liberals is a dishonorable, unbroken litany of treason against America's laws, economics, culture, society and her most sacred values.

Rossiter said that liberalism is "based on strikingly irrational beliefs and emotions; modern liberals relentlessly undermine the most important principles on which our freedoms were founded." Using legal logic and deductive reasoning, if, as Dr. Rossiter brilliantly delineates, liberalism is a psychological disorder tantamount to political madness and America just elected Barack Obama, who according to the *National Journal* is the most liberal member of both houses of Congress, who ran on a socialist platform of resurrection of the welfare state of FDR, then what does that say about our American citizens who have elected these people to have Stalin-like control over every aspect of our lives from cradle to grave?

Should we change our country's name from U.S.A. to U.A.A.—United Asylum of America?

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 25

WHERE'S GEN. PATTON WHEN YOU NEED HIM?

November 22, 2008

And he [Ishmael, the father of the Arabs] shall be as a wild ass among men; his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell over against all his brethren.

~ Genesis 16:12

No bastard ever won a war by dying for his country. He won it by making the other poor dumb bastard die for his country!

~ Gen. George S. Patton

Prologue

As I read the ominous headlines: "Somali pirates demand \$25 million ransom for supertanker"; "Somali pirates seize 9 vessels in 12 days"; "Yemen powerless to combat Somali piracy"; "Maersk says re-routing some of fleet due to piracy"—I nearly fell into despair. Then I listened to America's modern-day prophet Elijah, Dr. Michael Savage, rallying the troops on his radio show earlier this week, and my soul was revived. What did Savage say? While reading about the latest acts of naked piracy by these Islamic radicals who are causing an international catastrophe in the Gulf of Aden, Savage gave one of his classic impromptu monologues of which I can only paraphrase thusly:

Who is this Admiral Mullen? What does he mean he was "stunned" at the rise in piracy in that area? Is he crazy? Has he been on "The View" TV show or taking a cruise off the coast of California? Oh yeah, that's right Admiral Mullen is one of those Harvard-MBA-type military leaders that calls in his military commands on his trusty iPod. After Savage's fire-and-brimstone diatribe, I fell into a somewhat melancholy mood and silently uttered this Socratic soliloquy to myself: "Where are the real men? Where are the great generals like George Washington, William Tecumseh Sherman, Douglas MacArthur, George C. Marshall? . . . Where is Gen. George Patton when you *really* need him?"

These were exceptional Americans, real kick a-- leaders that accomplished their military mission *first* and asked questions later; men who

put America, her interests and the protection of her people above even their own lives. Savage then stated why in 1775 the U.S. Navy was created in the first place: to secure America's independence from our colonizer, Great Britain. After we declared independence from England, they removed their navy protection from America's commercial ships traveling in international waters, thus making our ships easy prey to the Barbary pirates, Muslim terrorists from Morocco, Algiers and Tunisia that plundered every commercial vessel they could, capturing dozens of American ships and stealing their cargo.

How did America act towards this Islamic aggression? John Adams, the ambassador to Great Britain, favored diplomacy; Thomas Jefferson, the ambassador to France, wanted blood, but he would have to wait 25 years until he became America's third president and greatly strengthened the Navy, immediately dispatching a fleet of warships to the Middle East to confront America's 19th century version of Muslim terrorists. It was America's unflinching resolve to fight Islamic terrorists who attacked our merchant ships that inspired one of the verses to the Marine's Hymn: "From the halls of Montezuma to shores of Tripoli . . ." "Montezuma" refers to the Battle of Chapultepec (1847), which took place during the Mexican-American War (1846-48); "Tripoli" refers to the First Barbary War (1801-05) and the decisive Battle of Derne.

Where did America go wrong?

When I was a little kid, I recall watching all those classic war movies and documentaries. One image that haunts me to this day is when President Harry Truman, that insecure little haberdasher, fired the great World War II hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Why? Because during the early days of the Korean War, MacArthur wisely wanted to be proactive and launch a frontal attack against China to prevent the looming communist menace from spilling over into the Korean peninsula where we were making great progress at routing the North Korean army. Truman balked, and MacArthur was called back home.

The victory parade MacArthur received down Broadway in New York on April 20, 1951, was perhaps the largest parade for anyone in American history. Moreover, to me it was a tacit symbol by the American people who essentially gave the diminutive Truman a collective middle finger salute for treating one of our greatest war heroes with such contempt. From that point onward in American military history, the

quality of leadership became substandard, compromised and increasingly feminized. Gen. George Washington, dead, Gen. Sherman, dead, Gen. MacArthur, dead, Gen. Marshall, dead, Gen. Patton . . . they're all dead! What military man do we have today to protect us? George W. Bush gave us a politically correct admiral with a Harvard MBA and no navy aircraft combat experience named Mike Mullen.

Here is an excerpt of the press conference Adm. Mullen gave on Nov. 17:

Q: Were you stunned or surprised by the attack on this large vessel today versus going after smaller boats?

MULLEN: I'm stunned by the range of it, less so than I am the size. These are pretty—they have proven to be pretty capable, can get on and off lots of vessels. I mean, this is a 300,000-ton—three times bigger than one of our aircraft carriers. But once there's an avenue to be able to get up on it, they—and it's—typically these ships, even that big, don't have that many—you know, the crews are not exorbitantly large. So once they have access, they seem to be able to get on and take over, which they've done in this case.

I don't know about you, dear reader, but I'm certain Gen. Patton would not have responded in this manner. I don't even think he would have granted a "press conference" because he would have been too busy blowing these Somali pirates to hell. Patton once remarked: "Nobody ever defended anything successfully, there is only attack and attack and attack some more."

Not with Navy Adm. Mike Mullen. "Attack" doesn't seem to be in his vocabulary; he seems part of this new generation of metrosexual military officers that are thoroughly feminized and politically correct in their training and war strategy. That's how Mullen rose through the ranks. The Washingtons, Shermans, MacArthurs, Pattons have all been thoroughly purged from the ranks of the U.S. military, and only Harvard MBAs are left to fill the officer core. No wonder America hasn't definitively won a war since World War II—our soldiers and our military leaders have been utterly emasculated by the socialist left!

Epilogue

Though Adm. Mullen is the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and holds control of the most powerful military in the history of humanity, a ragtag group of Somali terrorists on speed boats and wielding machine

guns have all but stopped commercial shipping in one of the busiest and most lucrative shipping lanes in the world. All the U.S., the "international community," the U.N., the Saudis, can do is pay the \$25 million ransom, and Adm. Mullen brags about the effectiveness of the enemy:

MULLEN: The—they're very good at what they do. They're highly, you know, they're very well-armed. Tactically they're very good. And so once they get to a point where they can board, it becomes very difficult to get them off, because clearly now they hold hostages. And from the standpoint of—the question then becomes, well, what do you do about the hostages? And that's where the standoff is. Instead of having a real man, an intelligent man, a competent man of action like Gen. Patton, whose resume in World War II alone solidified his place as arguably the greatest military leader in American history, we have the bungling incompetence of President Bush, the uselessness of Adm. Mullen and the vanity of U.N. diplomacy with terrorists. Dr. Savage concluded with these statements: "We need 'warriors' not 'worriers,'" and "If we have the greatest military in the world, but are afraid to use it, what good is it to us?" Where is Gen. George Patton when we really need him?!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 26

A CRITIQUE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

May 24, 2008

All I want from America is to be true to what you wrote on paper.

~ Martin Luther King

As an American, as a black man, I really love Dr. Martin Luther King. In his tragically short life of less than four decades, MLK, in a profoundly singular manner, embodied all of the potential, life, hopes and dreams of America—not only for black people, but for all Americans. MLK constantly challenged the powers that be to use their powers for good, to fulfill America's creed ". . . that *all* men are created equal." However, like all great men (and myths) MLK had a fatal flaw. It was a blind spot that he and the entire civil rights movement had that plagues and vexes black people to this day and in my opinion has been a crucial

reason why tens of millions of my people for the past 40 years have failed to either fully assimilate into the larger society, or even come close to achieving the "American dream."

What was MLK's blind spot? King and the civil rights movement's singular vision laid all of black America's demands for an end to racial discrimination and racism, for equal *rights* and true justice under the law, at the feet of white America, yet demanded little to nothing from black America to fulfill their important *responsibilities* as American citizens. I call King's blind spot a crisis of philosophy. At the genesis of his rise as a civil rights leader, MLK had a most critical choice to make, which was presented to America by two intellectual prophets of a previous era—Booker T. Washington (1856–1915) and W.E.B. Dubois (1875–1963). Which worldview would King choose to deliver his people from the savage bondage of Jim Crow, *de jure* and *de facto* racism, to the promised land of freedom, justice and *true* equality under the law?

Forty years since the storied protests of the civil rights movement and the assassination of MLK, history has spoken, and it is obvious that King and the entire civil rights movement chose to follow the philosophy of W.E.B. Dubois, a miserable and tragic worldview born of arrogance (Dubois' "talent tenth" philosophy), ignorance (liberalism), despair (anger, protest, litigation), and has forsaken the worldview of Booker T. Washington, born of self-discipline, morality and rugged American individualism (despite the odds). What did Dubois think was the proper manner for blacks to get their equal rights? We claim for ourselves every single right that belongs to a free American, political, civil and social, and until we get these rights we will never cease to protest and assail the ears of America.

In his defining book, "Up from Slavery," Booker T. Washington said: "The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of *severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing.*" In a commencement speech to the student body at Tuskegee almost 100 years ago, Washington could just as easily have been speaking to today's young people: "A race or an individual which has no fixed habits, no fixed place or abode, no time for going to bed, or getting up in the morning, for going to work; no arrangement, order or system in all the ordinary business of life—

such a race and such individuals are lacking in self-control, *lacking in some of the fundamentals of civilization.*"

Would to God that today's so-called black leaders: Rev. Jesse Jackson, Rev. Al Sharpton, Rev. Jeremiah Wright, Barak Obama, the Congressional Black Caucus and the all rest would trumpet Booker T. Washington's words and ideas to the masses, but they won't because they are all pretenders, poverty pimps, demagogues bought and paid for by liberal Democrat Party. Returning to MLK, we must not be selective in our praise of any historical figure, but critically examine him in the context of his times as well as his legacy in modern times. JFK said in this manner: "History, the final judge of our deeds." That said, no rational person or intelligent observer of history can say with any degree of authority that MLK and the entire civil rights movement took the right road in following the worldview, tactics and philosophy of Dubois over Washington.

Forty years after King's death one has only to look at the extensive anger, despair, anarchy and pathology throughout the black community to deduce that the civil rights movement's overemphasis on salvation through the welfare state and securing *group* equal rights from white people was only achieved at the expense of ignoring black people's *individual* personal responsibilities to God, to themselves, to their family and to humanity. A case in point is the outrageous hip-hop culture of the black community that for the past 30 years has made an art form combining music, political activism and aesthetics with nihilism. Hip-hop, a once obscure, subculture now dictates to the culture how to think, whom to vote for, who is an "authentic" black leader, who is an "Uncle Tom" . . . and which "ho" to give a beatdown to who won't follow directions.

Perhaps like MLK I am a dreamer also. However, I liken our contemporary plight to Old Testament Israel during the times of the judges. Because of collective bad life choices, sometimes the Jewish people had to wait a generation (40 years) to give God the requisite time to allow the old generation (and their ideas) to die in the grave before he would raise up a judge like Gideon, Deborah, Jephthah, Samson and others to deliver Israel from its many enemies, within and without. Nevertheless, at the end of this period of Jewish history was that terrible epitaph that is equally apropos in modern times: "In those days there was no king [viable leadership] in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

I often think: How can God deliver a people where over 90 percent of them don't even realize that they need a [political] redeemer? Where is this elusive American dream that MLK and the civil rights movement so passionately spoke of, wrote about and even died for. Where can *this* dream be found? Dubois contended that it is found through litigation and by constantly protesting the powers that be in the streets . . . "assail[ing] the ears of America." Booker T. Washington says, "Do all you can with what you have and never be satisfied." Can the American dream be found solely by the passage of civil rights acts, voting rights acts, though litigation in the courts, mass protests in the streets, or can the American dream be found in personal morality, discipline and in the monastic solitude of your local library? Can a man be truly free from chains on his wrists and ankles if his mind is still shackled? Never. While I love MLK and celebrate his legacy, I *live* Booker T. Washington . . . what about you?

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 27

DETROIT'S 'OPERATION SISTERGIRL'

April 17, 2008

You can take the [sister]girl out of the ghetto, but you can't take the ghetto out of the [sister]girl.

~ Conventional wisdom of inner-city Detroit

One of the intrinsic defects of a representative democracy is that politicians are human, not angels. Paraphrasing an idea of Bishop T.D. Jakes, "We can only catch what we fished out of your pond, and if your pond was a sewer, we got what we got." In other words, the nine representatives of the Detroit City Council—like elected officials *all over America*, from the president of the U.S. to your local dogcatcher—are merely a microcosm of what America has to offer—the good, the bad, the ugly . . . and the ignorant. For the nominee of the bad, the ugly *and* the ignorant categories is none other than Detroit City Council President Pro Tem Monica Conyers, wife of arch-liberal Rep. John Conyers, D-Mich., the

powerful chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who has been a member of Congress since 1965.

Last week, the council began its own investigative hearing into the police whistleblower lawsuit secret settlement agreement between Mayor Kilpatrick, former chief of staff, Christine Beatty, and two former police officers, deputy police chief and head of internal affairs Gary Brown and mayoral bodyguard Harold Nelthorpe—honorable men who were prevented and later fired for investigating a wild sex party the mayor had at his mansion in October 2002. Monica Conyers, as president pro tem, is the second-highest ranking member of the Detroit City Council. She is very concerned about council being sued by a Detroit resident because in October 2007 eight out of nine council members signed off on the \$9 million dollar whistleblower settlement agreement with virtually no due diligence on their part, a clear dereliction of duty.

The lone dissenting voice against the settlement agreement was Councilwoman Joann Watson who said: "They can sue you [city council]; I voted no." Watson has repeatedly let it be known that she alone voted against the settlement agreement to the growing dismay of Conyers. As the hearings ensued, Conyers demanded Watson stop interrupting and disrespecting her. She added: "We all know how you voted; you don't have to keep repeating it." Finally, in a fit of rage that shocked all of her council colleagues, as well as the packed assembly hall audience, Conyers vented her fury not on Watson, but on her superior, the man to her immediate left, Detroit City Council President Ken Cockrel Jr.

Despite a blistering Sistergirl diatribe that included a vicious series of *ad hominem* attacks against Cockrel's manhood, ironically it was Conyers that demanded respect as Cockrel tried in vain to conduct the hearing. "You're not my daddy!" "You do that at home, not here. Give me some respect 'cause I'm tired of that. You may not do that at home, but you do it in here," Conyers ranted. "Grow up!" she continued. "Control your house and you'll know how to treat women better." Cockrel reacted by saying that Conyers had no credibility to talk about the matter of respect while interrupting others. When Cockrel later threatened to adjourn the meeting, Conyers was defiant: "Do it, baby. Do it. Do it!" Later Conyers three times called Cockrel, a big man with a distinctively large cranium, "Shrek," a popular lovable green ogre from the movie series of the same name. As the two council members bantered

back and forth, angry shouts from the audience erupted: "You're disrespecting the citizens!" and "This is a shame!"

Regrettably, the city of Detroit is a perfect paradigm of the incompetence that is inevitable when you allow one political ideology (Democrat/liberalism) to dominate city government with no checks and balances by an opposing political viewpoint (Republican/conservatism). For example, six years after the mayor's orgy at the Manoogian Mansion, *not one* Detroiter has filed a petition to force Mayor Kilpatrick to resign. Likewise I predict that not one Detroiter will file a petition to remove Monica Conyers from office, a woman obviously bereft of reason, decorum, judgment and the ability to perform effectively her duties as president pro tem of a major American city.

The closest Detroit came to an ideological balance in modern times was during the 1950s when Mayor Albert E. Cobo (1950-57), a Jew and a Republican with great political skills and leadership abilities, competently governed the city. This was the zenith of Detroit's greatness when its population soared to 2 million. The American Dream is what drew tens of millions of black people to migrate from the South, including my mother and aunt, mere teenagers from Arkansas, to the big city "up north." Mayor Cobo was later honored by the city in naming our largest arena after him—Cobo Hall, in downtown Detroit. The quote above by Bishop T.D. Jakes applies to Detroit: "We can only catch what we fished out of your pond, and if your pond was a sewer, we got what we got." Detroiters have no one to blame but themselves and the racist politics blacks have practiced since seizing majority power in big cities across America these past 40 years.

It was that venerated liberal Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall who a few years after leaving the bench to conservative jurist Justice Clarence Thomas was asked what he thought of his black successor and quipped: "A black snake will bite you just as fast as a white snake will." True, true. But let's apply that same logic of Justice Marshall to 40 years of so-called black leadership in Congress, in the Senate, on public school boards, as classroom teachers, in big cities, in medium-sized cities and even in small towns across America.

Pick a state, pick a city and I bet you that nine times out of 10 the black leadership over city governmental affairs in majority black cities and towns has been abysmal. It's ironic that black racist politics irrationally do the same thing blacks have criticized whites for doing in

America for centuries—electing people *not* based on the content of their character, but by the color of their skin. It's liberalism. It's racism. It's madness, and it must end if America is to survive as a representative republic governed by a Constitution founded upon transcendent and heroic principles—"Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." Yes, Sistergirl Monica Conyers showed out Friday in Detroit. However, I believe that this was a planned *coup d'état*, that behind the scenes through her powerful and influential husband and his colleague, chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Carolyn Cheeks-Kilpatrick (who is my representative and the mother of Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick), deployed what I identify as "Operation Sistergirl."

Welcome to Alice in Michiganland where up is down, 911 calls go into voice mail, criminals running wild, psychopaths and nitwits run city government, a 75 percent high school dropout rate is tolerated, where conservatives like me with real solutions to big-city problems are ignored. Welcome to Detroit, where a city held hostage by a Stalinist, group-think mentality stuck on stupid gets you elected mayor (twice), or in Monica Conyers' case, elected council president pro tem, the second highest member of the Detroit City Council, who repeatedly refers to her superior as "Shrek."

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 27

DETROIT'S TRAGIC LOVE AFFAIR WITH LIBERALISM

April 03, 2008

Detroit was once a proud city
 Of proud people, smiles a plenty.
 The Leftist killed it in a stroke,
 Took away all pride & hope;
 Now, a third world place of pity.

~ Paul, poet and an avid WorldNetDaily.com reader

According to a new joint study just released Tuesday by the EPE Research Center and Americas Promise Alliance, Detroit's main school district has the nation's *lowest* high school graduation rate—24.9 percent (1 out of 4). The latter group is headed by retired four-star general and

former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell. Regrettably, this study only relied upon 2003-04 data. Five years later the Detroit Public Schools are *much* worse. As an ominous omen the day before, one of those potential graduates, Jamaal Hurt, 19, a senior at Cody High School, was murdered, viciously gunned down with eight bullets in a drive-by execution police believe was by one of his classmates. *"Dear Gen. Powell: I'm sorry to inform you but we will have to move Jamaal's name from the 'graduate' side of the ledger to the 'dropout' side."*

Or maybe in next year's education examination of 2004-05 data Gen. Powell should add a category for "dead" high school students since this demographic is growing faster than any other.

In virtually every article I've written about Detroit, I've tried to link my arguments to what I consider to be the No. 1 problem affecting this city and virtually all cities across America—*liberalism*. I wanted my analysis to go beyond pathology, promiscuity, ignorance, crime; beyond Obama and the racist, anti-American rhetoric of his mentor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright, beyond black racism, self-segregation and identity politics that's made Detroit a volunteer prison for its roughly 850,000 residents—to systematically scrutinize this invisible, insidious entity called liberalism. I don't expect the academic class, the black elites, the propaganda press and the liberal mainstream media in this one-horse town to properly analyze the gargantuan problems of Detroit because they (for the most part) are blinded by their own liberal bias and self-interests. Like their socialist and communist comrades, liberals naively believe if "X" government program just had "more funding" that the seemingly intractable problems decimating big and medium-sized cities all over America would be solved. Nonsense.

Since the early 1930s and FDR, Detroit has had a tragic love affair with liberalism, the consequences of which have to a degree been comparable to the sieges by the cruel superpowers of antiquity—Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, the Huns, the Mongols. True, in Detroit there are no siege works here, no boiling oil, flaming arrows, catapults or battering rams, yet the barbarian hoards are not only at the gates, but are *within* the city gates, and these people, infected by a stubborn liberal mindset, are surely killing this town. The invisible effects of liberalism in Detroit materialize in this manner—*Good People*: rational, educated, moral, homeowners, small-business owners, hard-working, taxpayers (producers), are outnumbered by *Bad People*: irrational, largely

emotion-driven, under 35, hedonists, mis-educated, criminal-record holding, demagogues, non-taxpayers (takers). If the latter group overtakes the former group, that city in time will become a social, economic, intellectual wasteland—a ghetto. This tragic refrain is repeated in cities of all sizes across America.

Gov. Jennifer Granholm, a woman once touted by the press as a vice presidential running mate for Sen. Hillary Clinton, has turned out to be an utterly incompetent figure despite in 2003 being handed on a silver platter a healthy government with a Standard & Poors AAA credit rating by three-term Republican Gov. John Engler. Gov. Granholm couldn't wait to raise taxes, infecting Michigan with one of the highest business exodus, unemployment rates and largest deficits of any state in America—a "one-state recession" while other states are having a record booming economy. Yet, the corrupt, incompetent Democrat leadership here in Michigan is silent regarding whether or not Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick should resign after Wayne County Prosecutor Kym Worthy brought a 15 count indictment against His Honor and his former chief of staff, Christine Beatty. Why won't the Democrat-controlled House force Mayor Kilpatrick to resign for the good of Detroit and the state of Michigan? Herein lies the dirty little secret of liberalism: Ironically, liberalism thrives best where there is rampant corruption, cronyism, anger, envy, despair and pathology, particularly against its most vulnerable citizens, blacks and Hispanics.

Think of liberalism like a deadly virus or a parasite. What does a parasite need to survive? That's right, a host or a living creature that it uses and abuses for its own pleasure. Applied to the crisis of leadership here in Detroit, liberalism is the parasite and the host is the 88 percent black majority. Like a giant, disgusting leech, for the past 75 years FDR-style liberal ideas and socialist programs designed "to help the Negro" have only sucked this city dry. If the largely white liberal Democrat machine in Lansing cared anything about Detroit and the economic health of Michigan's largest and most influential city, or for the best interests of black people, who nationally speaking are liberalism's most faithful constituency, voting Democrat at over 92-95 percent, then why doesn't Granholm act immediately and decisively to get Mayor Kilpatrick out of office? Gov. Granholm, as well as the all-black Detroit City Council has the constitutional authority to do so, but they are afraid of charges of "racism" by the city's demagogues.

The liberal Democrat hacks running Michigan into the ground (complicit with the pathetic, country club Republicans) aren't the least interested in *real* solutions for Detroit because, as I stated before, parasitic liberalism thrives in chaos, envy and victimhood. Also, Mayor Kilpatrick's sycophantic cronies realize when the mayor goes down, that they will all go down together. That's why the mayor's appointees publicly and vociferously disparage anyone who dares speak out against Kilpatrick, including daily attacks against prosecutor Worthy. Nevertheless, tick-tock-tick-tock, His Honor indeed has date with destiny.

AMERICA! Get yourself a big bucket of popcorn and a giant Coke, because the show KKK (King Kwame Kilpatrick) is about the give the world will make what the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) did to my people in Birmingham, in Selma, in Atlanta, in Mississippi, look like child's play. Show me a monopoly (liberalism) and I'll show you a tyranny (Detroit).

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 28

WHY BLACKS VOTE AGAINST THEIR OWN INTERESTS

March 29, 2008

But I know that the vote of 9 out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions.

~ Justice Clarence Thomas

It goes without saying, that a profound hatred of African people . . . sits at the center of American civilization.

~ Cornel West

About a month ago I wrote a column, "Cornel West and Clarence Thomas," that was a comparative analysis of these well-known intellectuals' diametrical worldviews—*liberalism*, or what West calls himself, a "non-Marxist socialist" vs. Thomas' *conservatism* out of the Judeo-Christian tradition of intellectual thought. In that piece I tried to offer some reasons why, despite his radicalism, incredulously professor West is such a beloved figure in the black community.

A few weeks ago, I got a lovely correspondence from Joyce Anderson, a dear lady I used to attend church with 30 years ago. In her e-mail

to me, she (a white person) expressed frustration at trying to explain to Barbara (a black woman): 1) Why I am a conservative, and 2) Why black people should not vote as a bloc for Barack Obama in the upcoming presidential election of 2008. Regarding question No. 1, I addressed in an earlier column. Question No. 2 will be addressed in this column.

I believe the answer lies somewhere within the lines of the head quotes cited above by Thomas and West. In this epic battle of ideas fought between metaphysical powers and mankind since antiquity, the seminal question arises—Identity Politics vs. Principle?—Tribalism vs. Truth? Like Old Testament Israel, who in its early history was divided into 12 tribes, the biblical narrative during this turbulent period was virtually always characterized by irrational wars, apostasy, petty infighting and tribal rivalries. Before the Golden Age of the United Kingdom Period that gave Israel her first three kings, Saul, David and Solomon, there were the Dark Ages of Judges 17:6—“In those days there was no king in Israel. Every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” Tribalism is incompatible with a republic.

Using Detroit, the city of my birth, as a paradigm of the apocalyptic disaster of black people voting for 75 years against their own vested interests, I find myself coming back to the prescient words of Clarence Thomas: *“But I know that the vote of 9 out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions.”* Thomas’ logic here is irrefutable and thus is ignored by black elites, white liberal academics, progressive intellectuals and the propaganda press. The veracity of his statement can be applied with equal authority to voting patterns by blacks since FDR formed his bulletproof coalition in 1932, which won him a record four presidential elections.

Since the 1967 riots, Detroit has steadily devolved from a cosmopolitan, dynamic city representing people of all political, intellectual, racial and ethnic groups, into a balkanized, racially gentrified and intellectually monolithic city of liberal Democrats, victimized by all the ills affecting big cities across America where large concentrations of black people tend to live. Yet, Clarence Thomas says, *“I know that the vote of 9 out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions.”*

Detroit, a city of churches where as a youth I remember counting five different churches in one block; a city that has more churches per capita than perhaps any other city on the planet. Yet, the Council of Bap-

tist Pastors of Detroit, relying on primitive, tribal group-think are allied with Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, a delusional psychopath whose lewd and thuggish behavior has already cost this cash-strapped city perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars in legal judgments, unused state tax dollars, canceled convention business and other potential businesses *and existing black residents* choosing to relocate to other cities and states with less “baby mama drama.” Yet, Clarence Thomas says, *“I know that the vote of 9 out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions.”*

Detroit, a city that, contrary to the recent jokes by comedian Jay Leno, has its major boulevards studded with magnificent Victorian-era mansions—homes to once-viable business—law firms, antique shops and four-star restaurants. Dwellings that are now being auctioned off at foreclosure sales for pennies on the dollar, *except* one Victorian mansion that houses Planned Parenthood headquarters at 8325 E. Jefferson Ave. Business is booming for this venal organization hell-bent on black genocide. Yet, I hear the words of Clarence Thomas, *“I know that the vote of 9 out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions.”*

I ask you, dear reader, why do black people vote against their own vested interests? Perhaps the answer can be found in the words of Clarence Thomas’ antagonist—Princeton professor of African-American Studies and Religion, Cornel West. West contends that “a profound hatred of African people . . . sits at the center of American civilization.” West’s conventional view, shared by many black people, has blinded them to the virulent racism and idiocy of Barack Obama’s minister, the Rev. Jeremiah Wright, who ranted: “We [America] started the AIDS virus. . . . We are only able to maintain our level of living by making sure that Third World people live in grinding poverty. . . .”

This is the very idea Sister Anderson was trying to disabuse Barbara from holding by urging blacks to vote as a bloc for Obama, a politician with a more extreme liberal voting record than even Teddy Kennedy, Patrick Leahy, Hillary Rodham Clinton or any U.S. senator in modern times.

West’s analysis purposely ignores the apocalyptic nightmare my people daily live under as virtual prisoners in their own cities and towns across America as a result of their Faustian bargain with that diabolical philosophy of liberalism—perverse ideas that in the early 1930s substi-

tuted the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob for the slave master god of the Leviathan State. Yet, Clarence Thomas says, *"I know that the vote of 9 out of 10 black Americans for the Democratic Party or for leftist kinds of policies just is not reflective of their opinions."*

Traversing the neighborhoods of Detroit I would guess that over 90 percent of the residential homes have their windows and doors barred. Detroiters live in a voluntary prison. Even new home construction is gutted by vandals before residents can move in. Many of the neighborhoods look like worn-torn Iraq, the West Bank and the shantytowns of Soweto, South Africa. Liberalism has utterly decimated my people; nevertheless we keep electing incompetent, socialist liberal hacks like Sen. Carl Levin, Rep. John Conyers, Rep. John Dingell, Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick and his mother, Rep. Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick, chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, to rule over us like lords of the medieval fiefdoms of antiquity or the African tyrants of today. How long, people? How long?! Dingell's socialism has oppressed us since 1955, and he is going for his record 28th term!

Political and societal redemption will only occur when black people learn to forsake identity politics. Stop voting for skin color (Obama); stop voting for gender (Hillary Clinton); stop serving as a mindless voting bloc for liberal policies that continue to enslave your hopes, your religious faith, your children, your future, and vote for a moral-based political philosophy rooted in the Judeo-Christian traditions of Truth and Liberty. Stop voting your color and start voting for your interests.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY — ESSAY 29

OBSCURITY WAS GOOD FOR ME

May 03, 2007

Twenty-five years ago, I wrote my first serious article. It was for my school newspaper (DePauw University). Originally, I wanted to be a regular columnist. I envisioned a weekly column entitled: "The Report from Washington." However, I was only able to convince the newspaper editor to let me write two articles.

Then, for the next 25 years, I labored in the abyss of obscurity.

Virtually no one knew about me, my writings or even seemingly cared what I had to say, although I believed that I had a unique voice.

For 25 years, I knew that I had ideas that would resonate with my people, with Americans, yet I remained in the abyss of obscurity.

A few years after the bitterness wore off, after my pity party, after I dried my eyes . . . I girded my loins like a man.

I grew comfortable there (in the abyss of obscurity). It was all good for me. There are no distractions there. It drove me to my knees in prayer and made me become a man of patience, of contemplation, of thought . . . of gravitas.

I began to look around to see whom I admired, whom I could learn from, under whom I could be a protégée. There was no one but birds, ants, squirrels, rocks, trees, flowers and on rare occasion, a few rabbits. . . . Oh, yes! And there was Beethoven. I had my audience!

I started reading, writing, editing and reading, writing, editing and reading, writing, editing. Then I started reading what I had written to God, to the birds, the squirrels, the ants, rocks, trees and sometimes, the rabbits.

They always listened to my crazy rantings and offered encouragement.

Later, there was the legendary historian, musicologist, author of over 35 books, piano virtuoso and founder of the Michigan Music Research Center, Arthur R. LaBrew, who is a genius and, like me, was ignored for 50 years by the academy, the media and his own people, yet he can trace his piano lineage back to Beethoven!

Twenty years ago, he took me under his wing and got me into Harvard. The college students *always* heard my voice and invited me to give my first lecture—it was on Beethoven.

Later, there were many, many letters and e-mails from my two new friends—Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas and Chief Judge Richard A. Posner, of the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals (Chicago), urging me Onward Ever! Backwards, Never!

A few years later, there were my friends, the Jews—Elie Wiesel, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Yad Vashem Library, The Simon Wiesenthal Center, The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Afterward, the Queen of England, Elizabeth II, the dean of Yale Law School, Guido Calabresi, Poet Laureate Dr. Maya Angelou, then Justices' Ginsburg,

Breyer, Souter and O'Connor, sent me letters in essence saying that I wasn't crazy and to keep on writing . . . and I did.

To this day, my people, my family, my friends, my protégées, my neighbors, my pastors at 10 churches I attended in four states and virtually all of their congregants treated me as a leper. Yet, in silence, I embraced their disregard and wore it as a badge of honor.

Ironically, societies' forgotten people—the maids, the janitors, the security guards, the secretaries, the legal assistants, the fax girls, the copy machine operators, the messenger boys, the waiters, the cashiers at the deli . . . the bums on the street, all bought (or at least read) my books and treated me as a great scholar with much love and honor. They were my new audience, and I vindicated their cause in my books.

Then there was Michigan defense attorney Che Ali Karega and the ministry of Bishop T.D. Jakes, and my thinking was forever transformed!

To the academy, I didn't have a Ph.D. To the law academy, I was an oddity that couldn't pass the bar exam. One mocked me; the other ignored me. I wore their maledictions as a crown of thorns.

Ten years ago, Joseph Farah, founder of WorldNetDaily.com, had the vision, courage and intellect to start WND, and it has flourished exceedingly and abundantly. For 10 years, it was my daily bread as I wrote books nobody purchased or read.

A few weeks ago, at this most commendable milestone of WorldNetDaily's 10th anniversary, I received a note from Joseph Farah asking me to join the publication as a commentator. I did not give him time to change his mind, and I promptly accepted.

Joseph recently told me that for years he had watched my career grow from afar and had admired my work. (His unwritten words were that he knew that I had potential, but it wasn't time yet). My weekly column is called: "The Report from Washington"—the same title God put in my heart exactly 25 years ago!

Exceeding gratitude to you, Joseph Farah, and to all the editors, writers and staff at WorldNetDaily for being a clarion voice of *Veritas* (Truth) when all other voices have been silenced or compromised.

EPILOGUE

Liberalism and Progressivism will always fail because it will always collapse upon the weight of its own immorality.

~ Anonymous

How does one bring to a satisfying conclusion a book of such vast scope and historical reach? I found the answer on a video blog campaign speech of Elizabeth Warren, former law professor of commerce and Obama's failed nominee to head his newly created Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Warren's controversial remarks on the campaign trail went viral on the internet in which she made an eloquent and singularly passionate case for Progressive economic policies as evidence that the recently minted Democratic candidate possibly will give incumbent Republican Senator Scott Brown a very competitive race for the chair of that old 'liberal lion' Teddy Kennedy held for 47 years.

In the video which was filmed at an event in Andover, Mass., Warren rebuts the GOP-touted notion that raising taxes on the wealthy amounts to "class warfare," contending that "there is nobody in this country who got rich on his own. Nobody." Warren rejects the idea that it is possible for Americans to become self-sufficient or even wealthy apart from Leviathan government largess. Warren was adamant on this point saying:

There is nobody in this country who got rich on his own. Nobody. You built a factory out there? Good for you. But I want to be clear: you moved your goods to market on the roads the rest of us paid for; you hired workers the rest of us paid to educate; you were safe in your fac-

tory because of police forces and fire forces that the rest of us paid for. You didn't have to worry that marauding bands would come and seize everything at your factory, and hire someone to protect against this, because of the work the rest of us did. Now look, you built a factory and it turned into something terrific, or a great idea? God bless. Keep a big hunk of it. But part of the underlying social contract is you take a hunk of that and pay forward for the next kid who comes along.¹

To most Americans who hold strong views about God, the Bible, American exceptionalism, natural law and the Constitution, little needs to be added to explain the arrogant and ignorant rant by Professor Warren. In a word it is an undiluted utterance of liberal fascism. The utter contempt Professor Warren and all Progressive elites have towards the American people and their important traditions like Christianity, American exceptionalism and market capitalism demonstrate how irredeemable, dangerous and destructive progressive ideas truly are and the great imperative that the Progressive Revolution be stopped. For over 140 years Progressives through their lens and cudgel of liberal fascism views America as a profoundly illegitimate and unjust country and through a legion of Machiavellian policy initiatives will endeavor to do everything in their power to deconstruct all of her foundational institutions and from the ashes erect a new, grand utopian society that will join the socialist states of the United Nations as part of the global community. It was David Horowitz a writer and reconstructed 60's radical wrote about Saul Alinsky—Obama's and Hillary Clinton's ideological mentor said, "Alinsky devoted his entire life to organizing a revolution in America to destroy a system he regarded as oppressive and unjust."

Candidate Warren's statement above models classical Marxism rhetoric that all success of any capitalist country is illegitimate and unfair and that it is up to the government guided by socialist, progressive elites as Obama, the Democratic Party and herself, to see that government gets its revenge, makes all things fair for everybody and makes the rich "pay their fair share" even if it is by force of law because as she said, "There is nobody in this country who got rich on his own."

Rich Lowry, editor of *National Review*, in a commentary about Professor Warren's ill-informed rant against American capitalism which in progressive terms places social justice above rational and just economic policy, made this interesting observation:

Focusing on infrastructure as the crucial support of entrepreneurial activity is like crediting the guy who built young Bill Gates' garage with the start of Microsoft. Yes, Gates needed a roof over his head, and garages are useful. But it was Gates who had the ambition to do more in his garage than store his car and lawn-care products. Incalculably more important than his physical surroundings were his imagination and business sense.²

Indeed, every time liberals, socialists and progressives drone on about "fair share" or "social justice" just remember that history eventually returns to truth and the "social justice" they speak about has little to do with real equality and more to do with egalitarianism—not the equality of opportunity (Jefferson's *pursuit of Happiness*), but the equality of results (socialism). Karl Marx, the father of socialism and communism in 1875 said it this way: *From each according to his ability, to each according to his need*. Well, *Liberté, Égalité, and Fraternité* didn't work out too well during the French Revolution (1789-99) and its infamous dechristianization campaign where the church was savagely attacked, ransacked and converted into "Temples of Reason." Tens of thousands of priests, nuns, clergy and Christians were drown, beheaded and viciously murdered just for being Christians. This so-called equality, this "social justice" was the precursor to rancid atheism of Marx and Hegel. This egalitarianism which isn't equality but an evil bastardization of the word which has descended through history since the French Revolution is not the equality of opportunity, but the equality of results. A genocidal madness justified the murder of 170,000 people in the Vendee alone to achieve their grotesque, utopian paradise. Therefore, social justice to President Obama, Professor Warren and their progressive legions in the Democratic Party dictate that utopian must be achieved by any means necessary.

In conclusion, below is an essay I wrote in 2011 which not only is derivative of the subtitle of these two volume—*Writings on Liberal Fascism through the Ages*—but possesses the historical extent of just how liberal fascism has so utterly infected, perverted and deconstructed every aspect of Western culture and modern society essentially turning America's Constitution which gave life to liberty into a suicide pact against We the People.

It is my earnest prayer and hope that all men and women of good will join with me to reclaim the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of government; to recover our culture and society back from

liberal fascists, Progressives and Progressive policies which every American president from Theodore Roosevelt to Barack Obama has with exceeding delight perpetrated this political nihilism and destructive assault on America's established moral order and our economic and legal structures all in the name of the "common good."

ON HISTORY — ESSAY 1

LIBERAL FASCISM THROUGH THE AGES

July 29, 2011

No matter how mad the plan is—Fraternité, the "New Soviet Man," the Master Race, the Great Leap Forward, the Cultural Revolution, Building a New Society, ObamaCare—a [liberal] mob will believe it.

In the world of the liberal, as in the world of Robespierre, there are no crimes, only criminals.

~ Ann Coulter

Saul Alinsky & Lucifer

Saul Alinsky is the father of community organizing, the Marxist-anarchist who so profoundly inspired generations of Democrat insurrectionists, including a young Barack Obama who in 1985 became a community organizer in Chicagoland and in the 1990s did legal work for ACORN, one of the most reactionary and fraudulent community organizations in America. Alinsky also inspired a former first lady and would-be president, Hillary Rodham Clinton, who in 1969 wrote her senior thesis at Wellesley extolling this villain who influenced generations of community organizations like—ACLU, La Raza, NOW, NAMBLA, PETA, AFL-CIO, NAACP, ACORN, Congressional Black Caucus, Human Rights Campaign, George Soros-funded socialist groups, LGBT agenda (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) and many other liberal mafia pressure groups.

To whom did Saul Alinsky dedicate his manifesto *Rules for Radicals*?—a book whose purpose was to deconstruct Christian nations and Western free-market republics. Let us read the dedication in the author's own words: "Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and histo-

ry (and who is to know where mythology leaves off and history begins—or which is which), the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom—Lucifer.”

Gideon

In my Sunday school class last week, we studied the story of Gideon found in Judges Chapters 7 and 8. Before he became a great judge of Israel, Gideon was a cowardly farmer who in fear threshed wheat in a winepress pit to prevent the pagans from stealing it. However, he had an epiphany, embraced God’s calling on his life, repented, destroyed his father’s pagan idols and, with an army of only 300 men, totally routed the Amalekite-Midianite legions of which the Bible said numbered so many soldiers and camels that it was “a host without number.” After this stupendous victory, Gideon had the unwise idea to collect a portion of gold from all his soldiers whereby he fashioned an ephod to commemorate the battle victory God gave Israel. After Gideon’s death, the Jews turned that ephod into an idol of pagan worship, causing the judgment of God to fall on Israel yet again.

Gideon teaches us that good intentions often lead to tragic consequences. So it is with America’s greatest liberal progressive presidents: Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ, Nixon, Clinton and Obama. All of these men had “good” intentions by stealing money from the rich and redistributing it to the poor who didn’t earn it. In the end, all that their Marxist, socialist, Keynesian schemes achieved was endemic laziness, societal ignorance, pathology and making Americans voluntary slaves to an ever-expanding government which grows at about \$4 billion per day to our present \$14.5 trillion debt.

American Loyalists

Mr. Milt Harris, one of my radio colleagues on Joshua’s Trail, had these profound words regarding the history of liberal Democrats, which from its beginnings was confederate with treason. In his monologue Milt said:

On the political front ever since George Washington defeated the British in 1781 at the Battle of Yorktown, Americans loyal to Britain, known as Loyalists, rather than accept defeat, began a siege to undermine the new nation. Later, in order to clandestinely expand their siege,

they founded the Democrat Party so they could enact politically damaging anti-Constitution legislation.

Now, 230 years later, the political descendants of the Loyalists (the Democratic Party) still dominate politics in all of the New England States including from Maine to as far south as Virginia.

Obama as FDR II

One will never understand *who* President Obama is, the man, unless you have a rudimentary understanding of history, politics, philosophy and economics. Obama is the liberal establishment's dream: the apotheosis and embodiment of all the fascist, atheist, anti-intellectual, nitwit liberal ideas pontificated in college lecture halls, spoken in university faculty lounges and written in books and academic journals few people have ever read. Socialists like Barack and Michelle Obama, Rahm Emmanuel, David Axelrod, Hillary Clinton, Tim Geithner, Lawrence Summers, Waserman-Schultz, Cornel West, Melissa Harris-Perry, and Obama's Supreme Court nominees, Sonya Sotomayor and Elena Kagan, despite their Ivy League pedigree, show virtually no moral understanding of law, history, politics, economics or philosophy, no critical thinking or logic skills and appear to have accepted utterly the vile, myopic propaganda of their Marxist professors without question. This groupthink mentality reminds me of FDR's adoption of Mussolini's aphorism: "Everything in the State, nothing outside the State, nothing against the State."

Conclusion

The French Revolution (1789-99) was an overt war by liberal intellectuals in France against Christianity, the church, the clergy, and came at the end of the Age of Enlightenment (1650-1800) and before the later romantic movements of Darwinian evolution, Marxist socialism and Nietzsche's relativism and atheism which all led directly to the decline of Western civilization. The previous intellectual trinity of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, was replaced with the imposter trinity: Marx, Darwin and Nietzsche (with Sigmund Freud thrown in for good measure).

Long before the Pilgrims, the Puritans and the founding of America in 1607, liberalism in all of its myriad of permutations, shadows and disguises infected the history of humanity—from Nimrod's Tower of Babel (precursor to the United Nations), Baal worship, idolatry, materialism, paganism, witchcraft, doctrine of Jezebel (pagan worship of god through

sex), doctrine of Molech (child sacrifice [i.e., abortion]), to slavery, secular humanism, democracy, Darwinism, communism, socialism, unionism, progressivism and living constitutionalism—it's all liberal fascism, it's all anti-God, anti-intellectual and Obama is using these pernicious ideas to purposely destroy America and deconstruct the U.S. Constitution so that he, the Democratic Party and its globalist allies can rule into perpetuity.

ENDNOTES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1. Jeffrey Toobin, *Will Clarence and Virginia Thomas succeed in killing Obama's health-care plan?*
http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2011/08/29/110829fa_fact_toobin (posted by August 29, 2011).
2. Blithe Spirit blog, *Clarence Thomas Praised in the New Yorker*,
<http://blithespirit.wordpress.com/2011/08/26/clarence-thomas-praised-in-new-yorker/> (posted Aug. 26, 2011).
3. Ezra Greenberg, *Jeffrey Toobin dismisses Originalism with usual Clichés*,
http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2011/09/jeffrey_toobin_dismisses_originalism_with_usual_cliches.html (posted Sept. 1, 2011).
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.

6. Ellis Washington, *Letter to Generation Y*, <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=322429#ixzz1Vrr1yNgX> (posted July 16, 2011).

PROLOGUE

1. Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), p. 86.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Id.* at 80.
4. George Orwell, 1984, (The Complete Works of George Orwell Online), Chapter 1, Part 1, <http://www.george-orwell.org/1984/0.html>, as quoted in Ellis Washington, *Thou shall not lie*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=96042#ixzz1Yzy2eOge> (posted April 25, 2009).
5. Ellis Washington, *I remember Allan Bloom, Part 2*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=312457#ixzz1VuTPEbVz> (posted June 18, 2011).
6. Herbert Hovenkamp, *The Mind and Heart of Progressive Legal Thought*, 81 *Iowa L. Rev.* 149 (October, 1995): [n.1] Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, or Selection in Relation to Sex*(1871); [n.2] 3 *Journal of Law & Economics* 1 (1960); [n.3] G.P.O. 1960; [n.4] See Thomas K. McCraw, *Prophets of Regulation* 210, 215, 219-220, 234-235 (1984); Stewart, *The Reformation of American Administrative Law*, 88 *Harvard Law Review* 1667 (1975). Landis had been the author in 1938 of the much more optimistic *The Administrative Process*(1938); [n.5] Kenneth J. Arrow, *Social Choice and Individual Value* (2d ed. 1963); [n.6] James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, *The Calculus of Consent*(1962).
7. Ellis Washington, *The Molech paradigm, Part 2*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=276749#ixzz1YgnDfMt7> (posted March 19, 2011).
8. Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), p. 154; also quoted in Ellis Washington, *An American Weimar Republic*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=315133#ixzz1VuVXLsom> (posted June 27, 2011).
9. *Ibid.*, 81.

10. Len Hart, *Bush Proves Karl Marx Right*, <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Bush-Proves-Karl-Marx-Righ-by-Len-Hart-081002-923.html> (posted October 2, 2008).
11. By David Emery, *NAACP Covers George Washington Statue at MLK Day Event*, <http://urbanlegends.about.com/od/government/ss/naacp-boxes-george-washington.htm> (posted Jan. 18, 2011). The reason? The NAACP was worried that a statue of George Washington might offend the audience. *See also*, *Jesus Missing From Obama's Georgetown Speech*, <http://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/Jesus-Missing-From-Obamas-Georgetown-Speech.html> (posted April 17, 2009). President Obama speaking in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., one of America's most venerated Catholic universities, had the audacity to cover up the beloved and enduring monogram symbolizing the name Jesus Christ: IHS.
12. See last passage of Goldberg: "Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers"
13. Associate Justice (1910-16); Chief Justice Charles Evan Hughes (1930-41), a progressive jurists who also ran for president of the United States 1916, demonstrated his utter contempt of not only the Constitution, but also *stare decisis* (judicial precedent), natural law and the rule of law. Justice Hughes said: "The constitution is what the judges say it is." *As quoted in* Ellis Washington, *The Inseparability of Law and Morality: The Constitution, Natural Law and the Rule of Law* (Maryland: University Press of America, 2002), p. 421, n. 8.
14. Goldberg, *supra* note 1, at 81.
15. Joseph Farah, *The long march to Bethlehem*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=119991> (posted Dec. 24, 2009).
16. Ellis Washington, *Why does the left so hate America?*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.printable&pageId=41877> (posted June 2, 2007).

CHAPTER 1

1. *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 349-62 (2003).

2. Benjamin Walker, *10 Books that Screwed Up the World: And 5 Others That Didn't Help* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2008), p. 208
3. Ibid.
4. This is a particularly weak argument. The fact that a certain violation is unlikely to occur has no relation to the substance of a constitutional provision. A rational legislature is also unlikely to prescribe the rack or gibbet as a form of punishment — nor was it likely to do so even at the time of the Founding — but this does not mean that the practice is not proscribed by the Constitution. See *id.* Justice Scalia encounters similar problems with regard to other theoretical applications of his Eighth Amendment interpretation. For example, the Founders clearly could not have considered whipping to be a cruel or unusual method of punishment. But even Justice Scalia admits that a modern statute providing for this form of punishment would be problematic. See Lessig, at 1187 (citing Antonin Scalia, *Originalism: The Lesser Evil*, 57 U. CIN. L. REV. 849, 864 (1989)).
5. *Ex parte Quirin*, 317 U.S. 1 (1942).
6. Ellis Washington, *OBLEPA – The Osama bin Laden Equal Protection Act*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php/index.php?pageId=43541> (posted Sept. 15, 2007).
7. Fifth Amendment Article, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fifth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution.
8. *Ashe v. Svenson*, 397 U.S. 436, 443 (1970).
9. Stanley Kurtz, *Chicago Annenberg Challenge Shutdown?*, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/225348/chicago-annenberg-challenge-shutdown/stanley-kurtz> (posted August 18, 2008).
10. Elaine McArdle, *In inaugural Vaughan Lecture, Scalia defends the “methodology of originalism*, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/news/spotlight/constitutional-law/scalia-vaughan-lecture.html> (posted Oct. 3, 2008).
11. Regarding the famous and comprehensive Lutz/Hyneman study on the writings America’s founding Fathers relied on the most when writing the founding documents that would govern this Republic, see Ellis Washington, *The Inseparability of Law and Morality*, (Maryland: University Press of America, 2002), p. 245-47.
12. McArdle, *supra* note 10.

13. Lyle Denniston, *Court blocks Ohio voter match order*, <http://www.scotusblog.com/2008/10/court-blocks-ohio-voter-match-order/> posted Oct. 17, 2008).
14. Bill Dyer, *Today's SCOTUS ruling does NOT mean there's no voting fraud problem in Ohio*, <http://www.hughhewitt.com/blog/print.aspx?guid=a1154751-cceb-4150-b57b-922cead19fe4> (posted Oct. 17, 2008).
15. Quotes from Barack Obama's 2001 radio interview cited in Ellis Washington, *Obama uncensored, 2001*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=79360> (posted Oct. 29, 2008).
16. Ibid.
17. See Drew Zahn, *Judge dismisses Obama birth certificate lawsuit*, <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=79086> (posted Oct. 25, 2008).
18. Over my academic career, I have written extensively about the writings and influence of Thomas Hobbes particularly his magnum opus, *Leviathan* (1651). See generally, Ellis Washington, *How Thomas Hobbes is helping destroy America*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=65756> (posted May 31, 2008); Ellis Washington, *The Inseparability of Law and Morality*, (Maryland: University Press of America, 2002), see index notes on Hobbes's *Leviathan*, social contract theory, law of Nature, Common law tradition, Natural Law and America's Republic at p. 459.
19. Ellis Washington, *Detroit's demise is the triumph of liberalism*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=56203> (posted Feb. 18, 2008).
20. See Wall Street Journal article by Professor Dershowitz on Gov. Eliot Spitzer, Alan M. Dershowitz, *The Entrapment of Eliot*, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB120536943121332151.html> on Spitzer (posted March 13, 2008).
21. Ellis Washington, *A letter to professor Laurence Tribe on Veritas*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=42781> (posted July 28, 2007).
22. Dershowitz, *supra* note 20.
23. *U.S. v. Carroll Towing*, 159 F.2d 169 (2d Cir. 1947).

24. Ellis Washington, *PC = perversity (not political) correctness* <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=42993> (posted Aug. 11, 2007).
25. See generally, Gun Owners Legislative Action Center, <http://capwiz.com/gunowners/home/>.
26. James Lindgren, *ABA Rankings on Judicial Nominees Are Biased*, WALL ST. J., August 6, 2001, at A13. "Professor Lindgren, a Northwestern University law professor, has strong conclusions and recommendations which are not confined to the original article. He states:
- I've just completed a statistical study of the ABA's ratings of appointees to the U.S. Courts of Appeals during the Clinton and first Bush administrations and can report that the facts don't support the ABA's claim of objectivity. The ABA may once have been objective, but it's not anymore.
- Id.* Later in the column he asserts that:
- The data suggest that when Bill Clinton took office, the ABA softened its standards, possibly emphasizing credentials such as temperament and philosophy that are harder to measure than experience and educational success. Now the ABA is back to rating Republican nominees – and is apparently back to its old harsh ways.
- Id.* In his concluding paragraph he admonishes the ABA by asking: Why hasn't the ABA itself noticed the large political differences in its evaluative processes and worked harder to understand, explain or eliminate them? Now that there are hard data that support the claims of its critics, it would be good to see fewer denials and more introspection and reform.
- Id.* Quoted in Michael J. Saks & Neil Vidmar, "A Flawed Search for Bias in the American Bar Association's Ratings of Prospective Judicial Nominees: A Critique of the Lindgren Study," 17 *Journal of Law & Politics* 219 (2001).
27. Thomas Sowell, *The Education of Minority Children*, <http://www.tsowell.com/speducat.html> (1974).
28. I wrote a series of law review articles highly critical of the famous 1954 Supreme Court case that allegedly desegregated the public schools, *Brown v. Board of Education*, which received some notice from the academy and among the many honors they received, one of the highest was being accepted into the private *Brown v. Board of Education* collection of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. See, Ellis Washington, "Brown v. Board of Education: Right Choice, Wrong Reason," 56 *Mercer Law Review* 716 (2004); Ellis Washington, "A Voice Crying Out in the Wilderness: A Word about Brown v. Board of Education," 39 *Valparaiso Law Review* 87 (2004).

29. Sowell, *supra* note 27.
30. See Washington, *supra* note 28.
31. Ellis Washington, *Mike Nifong and the sin of ambition*, http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=55662 (posted May 12, 2007).
32. Associated Press, *Federal prosecutors ask U.S. Supreme Court to consider Ressam case*, <http://www.peninsuladailynews.com/article/20071005/NEWS/710050304> (posted October 4, 2007). Associated Press story that came out on Wednesday about the Ressam case, which is being appealed by the Justice Department to the Supreme Court, the reporter wrote:

The U.S. Supreme Court has been asked to intervene in what federal prosecutors say is a procedural gaffe that led to a too-lenient sentence for a terrorist who brought explosive devices into Port Angeles in 1999.
33. *Medellin v. Texas*, 552 U.S. 491 (2008).

CHAPTER 2

1. Ellis Washington, *Goebbels, Paterson, Obama and the eternal lie*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=84061> (posted Dec. 20, 2008).
2. George Orwell, 1984, (The Complete Works of George Orwell Online), Chapter 1, Part 1, <http://www.george-orwell.org/1984/0.html>, as quoted in Ellis Washington, *Thou shall not lie*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=96042#ixzz1Yzy2eOge> (posted April 25, 2009).
3. Cam Simpson, *Blagojevich's Big Conference Call and Valerie Jarrett's Clean Break*, <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2008/12/10/blagojevichs-big-conference-call-and-valerie-jarretts-clean-break/> (Dec. 10, 2008).
4. Conservative intellectual Rush Limbaugh has often remarked you can't criticize presidential candidate Obama. American Digest, *Things You Can't Say About Obama: Riffing on Rush Limbaugh's 'Things You Can't Say about Obama'*, http://americandigest.org/mt-archives/bad_americans/21_things_you_c.php (posted Aug. 19, 2008).

CHAPTER 4

1. Benjamin Wiker, *10 Books That Screwed Up the World: And 5 Others That Didn't Help* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2008), p. 145.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 147.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., 164.

CHAPTER 5

1. Adopted from *Essay No. 24* in my book, Ellis Washington, *Beyond the Veil: Essays in the Dialectical Style of Socrates* (Maryland: Hamilton Books, 2000, 2004).

CHAPTER 7

1. Ellis Washington, *Obama, me and our pastors*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=66397> (posted June 7, 2008).
2. Ellis Washington, *Bishop T.D. Jakes, Obama nomination gives 'goose bumps'* http://articles.cnn.com/2008-06-04/politics/jakes_1_daughters-slaves-goose?_s=PM:POLITICS (posted June 4, 2008).
3. See generally, Ellis Washington, "Reply To Judge Richard A. Posner on The Inseparability of Law and Morality," 3 *RUTGERS J. OF L. & RELIG.* 1 (2001).

CHAPTER 8

1. Michael J. Cummings, *Faust by Johann von Goethe (1749-1832): A Study Guide*, <http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net/Faust.html> (2004, 2010 [rev. ed.]).

2. Ellis Washington, "A critique of Justice Thurgood Marshall," <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=61976> (posted April 19, 2008).

CHAPTER 9

1. Benjamin Wiker, *10 Books That Screwed Up the World: And 5 Others That Didn't Help* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2008), p. 85.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 91-2.
4. Ibid.
5. Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, with an introduction by John Tyler Bonner and Robert M. May (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), Part I, Chapter 6, 201.
6. World Climate Report Blog, *Fires Contribute to Global Warming?*, <http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2007/11/02/fires-contribute-to-global-warming/> (posted Nov. 2, 2007).
7. James Taylor, *GAO Forrest-thinning Study Sparks New Controversy*, <http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2003/07/01/gao-forest-thinning-study-sparks-new-controversy> (posted July 1, 2003).
8. C. S. Lewis, *God in the Dock* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002), p. 292.

CHAPTER 10

1. Clarence Thomas, *My Grandfather's Son: A Memoir* (New York: Doubleday, 2008), p. 269.
2. Kurt Badenhausen, *America's Most Miserable Cities*, http://www.forbes.com/2008/01/29/detroit-stockton-flint-biz-cz_kb_0130miserable.html (posted Jan. 30, 2008).
3. George Orwell, 1984, (The Complete Works of George Orwell Online), Chapter 1, Part 1, <http://www.george-orwell.org/1984/0.html>, as quoted in Ellis Washington, *Thou shall not lie*,

<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=96042#ixzz1Yzy2eOge> (posted April 25, 2009).

4. Regarding the unsolved murder of exotic Tamara Greene by ex-Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, Fox2News reporter Taryn Asher interviewed Detroit Rapper, 'The Virus', "MURDERCAP RECORDS FOX TV INTERVIEW," <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KJSdQLVAOOk> who wrote an entire rap-song about Tamara Greene (aka "Strawberry").
5. AusteteBlogger, *Nun Helen Prejean of "Dead-Man Walking" - Epitomizes The Mixed-up Left*, <http://astuteblogger.blogspot.com/2008/08/nun-helen-prejean-of-dead-man-walking.html> (posted Aug. 26, 2008).
6. University of Chicago Hospital brass more than tripled her annual salary to over \$317,000. See, David Catron, "Michelle Obama's Patient-Dumping Scheme," http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/03/michelle_obamas_patientdumping_1.html (posted March 2, 2009).
7. Of the 921 followers of the Rev. Jim Jones cult in 1978 in British Guyana, the overwhelming majority were Black Americans. See, Maurice Brinton, "Suicide for Socialism? - Brinton on the Jonestown massacre, 1978," <http://libcom.org/library/suicide-for-socialism-jonestown-brinton> (posted July 25, 2005).

EPILOGUE

1. Lucy Madison, *Elizabeth Warren: There is nobody in this country who got rich on his own*, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20110042-503544.html, (posted September 22, 2011)
2. Rich Lowry, *The Left's Lame New Excuse for runaway spending*, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2011/09/23/the_lefts_lame_excuse_for_taxing_the_rich_111455.html (posted September 23, 2010).

